Chapter 23

Jerusalem Domari

Yaron Matras

University of Manchester

Jerusalem Domari is the only variety of Domari for which there is comprehensive documentation. The language shows massive influence of Arabic in different areas of structure – quite possibly the most extensive structural impact of Arabic on any other language documented to date. Arabic influence on Jerusalem Domari raises theoretical questions around key concepts of contact-induced change as well as the relations between systems of grammar and the components of multilingual repertoires; these are dealt with briefly in the chapter, along with the notions of fusion, compartmentalisation of paradigms, and bilingual suppletion.

1 Historical development and current state

Domari is a dispersed, non-territorial minority language of Indo-Aryan origin that is spoken by traditionally itinerant (peripatetic) populations throughout the Middle East. Fragmented attestations of the language place it as far north as Azerbaijan and as far south as Sudan. The self-appellation *dōm* is cognate with those of the *řom* (Roma or Romanies) of Europe and the *lom* of the Caucasus and eastern Anatolia. All three populations show linguistic resources of Indo-Aryan origin (which in the case of the Lom are limited to vocabulary), as well as traditions of a mobile service economy, and are therefore all believed to have descended from itinerant service castes in India known as *ḍom*. Some Domari-speaking populations are reported to use additional names, including *qurbāṭi* (Syria and Lebanon), *mıtrıp* or *karači* (Turkey and northern Iraq) and *bahlawān* (Sudan), while the surrounding Arabic-speaking populations usually refer to them as *nawar*, *ɣağar* or *miṭribiyya*. The language retains basic vocabulary of Indo-Aryan origin, and shows elements of lexical phonology that place its early development within the Central Indo-Aryan group of languages. It retains conservative derivational as well as present-tense inflectional verb morphology that goes back to late Middle Indo-Aryan, alongside innovations in nominal and past-tense verb inflection

that suggest that the language was contiguous with the Northwestern frontier languages (Dardic) during the transition to early modern Indo-Aryan (cf. Matras 2012).

The first attestation of Palestinian Domari is a list of words and phrases collected by Ulrich Jasper Seetzen in 1806 in the West Bank and published by Kruse (1854). It was followed by Macalister's (1914) grammatical sketch, texts and lexicon, collected in Jerusalem in a community which at the time was still nomadic, moving between the principal West Bank cities of Nablus, Jerusalem and Hebron. This community settled in Jerusalem in the early 1920s, the men taking up wage employment with the British-run municipal services. In the 1940s they abandoned their makeshift tent encampment and moved into rented accommodation within the Old City walls, where the community still resides today. Between 1996 and 2000 I carried out fieldwork among speakers in Jerusalem and published a series of works on the language, including two descriptive outlines (Matras 1999; 2011), annotated stories (Matras 2000), an overview of contact influences (Matras 2007), and a descriptive monograph (Matras 2012).

A number of sources going back to Pott (1907), Newbold (1856), Paspati (1870), Patkanoff (1907), and Black (1913) provide language samples collected among the Dom of Lebanon, Syria, Iraq and the Caucasus. These are supplemented by a few more samples collected by ethnographers (cf. Matras 2012: 15ff.) and subsequently by data collected in Syria and Lebanon by Herin (2012). That documentation allowed me to identify a number of differences that appeared to separate a Northern group of Domari dialects from a Southern group, which latter includes the data recorded in Palestine as well as a sample from Jordan (see Matras 2012: 15ff.). That tentative classification has since been embraced by Herin (2014), who goes a step further and speculates about an early split between two branches of the language. To date, however, published attestation of Northern varieties remains extremely fragmented, notwithstanding recent work by Herin (2016; this volume), while the only comprehensive overview of a Southern variety remains that from Jerusalem.

Outside of Jerusalem and its outskirts there are known communities of Palestinian Doms in some of the refugee camps on the West Bank and Gaza, as well as in Amman, where a few families sought refuge in 1967. Numbers of speakers were very low in all these communities already in the mid 1990s and the language was only in use among the elderly. During my most recent visit to the Jerusalem community, in January 2017, it appeared that there was only one single fluent speaker left, who, for obvious reasons, no longer had any practical use for the language, apart from flagging the odd phrase to younger-generation semi-speakers. Jerusalem Domari, and most likely Palestinian Domari in general, must therefore now be considered to be nearly extinct.

2 Contact languages

Given the migration route that the Dom will have taken to reach the Middle East from South Asia, it is plausible that the language was subjected to repeated and extensive contact influences. Kurdish influences on Jerusalem Domari, some of them attributable specifically to Sorani Kurdish, and some Persian items, are apparent in vocabulary, while some of the morpho-syntactic structures (such as extensive use of person affixes, and the use of a uniform synthetic marker of remote tense that is external to the person marker) align themselves with various Iranian languages. There is also a layer of Turkic loans, some of which may be attributable to Azeri varieties, while others are traceable to Ottoman rule in Palestine; such items are numerous in the wordlists compiled by Seetzen and Macalister during the Ottoman period, but are much less frequent in the materials collected a century later (for a discussion of etymological sources see Matras 2012: 426–429).

The circumstances under which speakers of Domari first came into contact with Arabic are unknown. There are some indications of a layered influence: Domari tends to retain historical /q/ in Arabic-derived words, as in *qahwa* 'coffee', *qabil* 'before', *qaddēš* 'how much', as found in the rural dialects of the West Bank (and elsewhere), whereas contemporary Jerusalem Arabic (also used by Doms when speaking Arabic) shows a glottal stop, as in *ʔahwe, ʔabl, ʔaddēš*; the word for 'now' is *hessaʕ*, while Jerusalem Arabic has *hallaʔ*. It appears that the community has been fully bilingual in Arabic and Domari at least since the early 1800s, with knowledge of Turkish having been widespread among adults during the Ottoman rule. Due to the nature of the Doms' service economy, Arabic was an essential vehicle of all professional life, whether metalwork, hawking, begging, or performance, but Domari remained the language of the household until the introduction of compulsory school education under Jordanian rule in the 1950s–60s, at which point parents ceased to pass on the language to children. By the 1990s, use of Domari was limited to a small circle of perhaps around forty–fifty elderly people. Due to the multi-generational structure of households it was rare even then for conversations to be held exclusively among Domari speakers. Domari–Arabic bilingualism has always been unidirectional, with Arabic being the language of commerce and public interactions for all Doms, and more recently also of education and media, eventually replacing Domari as a home and community language.

3 Contact-induced changes in Jerusalem Domari

As a result of ubiquitous bilingualism among all Domari speakers, Domari talk is chequered not only with expressions that derive from Arabic, but also with switches into Arabic for stylistic and discourse-strategic purposes such as emphasis, direct quotes, side remarks, and so on. The structural intertwining of Domari and Arabic, and the degree to which active bilingual speakers maintain a license to incorporate Arabic elements into Domari conversation, pose a potential challenge to the descriptive agenda. In the following I discuss those structures that derive from Arabic, and are shared with Arabic (in the sense that they are employed by speakers both in the context of Domari conversation and in interactions in Arabic) but constitute a stable and integral part of the structural inventory of Domari without which Domari talk cannot be formed, and for which there is no non-Arabic Domari alternative. All examples are taken from the Jerusalem Domari corpus described in Matras (2012). Examples from Arabic are based on colloquial Palestinian Arabic as spoken in Jerusalem.

3.1 Phonology

The entire inventory of Palestinian Arabic phonemes is available in Domari; Arabic-derived words that are used in Domari conversation (whether or not they have non-Arabic substitutes) do not undergo phonological or phonetic integration, except for the application of Domari grammatical word stress on case-inflected nouns (e.g. *lambá* 'lamp.ACC', from Arabic *lámba*). The pharyngeals [ḥ] and [ʕ] are limited to Arabic-derived vocabulary. The sounds [q], [ɣ] and [ḷ] as well as [z] and [f] appear primarily in Arabic-derived vocabulary, but there is evidence that they entered the language already through contact with Turkic and Iranian languages. Less clear is the status of the pharyngealised dental consonants /ḍ, ṭ, ṣ/. These are largely confined to Arabic-derived vocabulary, but they can also be found in inherited words of Indo-Aryan stock, where they often represent original (Indo-Aryan) retroflex sounds (cf. *ḍōm* 'Dom', *pēṭ* 'belly'). An ongoing phonological innovation that is shared with Jerusalem Arabic is the simplification of the affricate [ʤ] to the fricative [ʒ] in inherited lexemes, e.g. *džami* 'I go' > *žami*. This triggers a corresponding simplification of [ʧ] to [ʃ], as in *lači* 'girl' > *laši*.

3.2 Morphology

Domari has not adopted productive word-derivational templates from Arabic. Arabic inflectional morphology, however, is productive with some Arabic-de-

rived word forms, resulting, in effect, in a compartmentalised morphological structure. Arabic-derived plural nouns tend to retain Arabic plural inflection, but indigenous (inherited, Indo-Aryan) plural inflections are added to the word: thus *muslim* 'Muslim', plural *musilmīn-e* Muslims-ᴘʟ 'muslims'; *madrase* 'school', dative plural *madāris-an-ka* (schools-ᴘʟ.ᴏʙʟ-ᴅᴀᴛ) 'to the schools'. While Jerusalem Domari retains inherited plural marking with nouns derived from both Indo-Aryan and Arabic, in the closely related variety of the nomadic Doms of Jordan the Arabic plural ending *-āt* is often used with inherited nouns: thus *putur* 'son', Jerusalem Domari plural *putr-e*, Jordanian Domari plural *putr-āt*.

Arabic person agreement inflection is retained with Arabic-derived modal and aspectual auxiliaries. The auxiliaries *kān* 'be', *ṣār* 'begin', and *baqa* 'continue' take Arabic verbal inflection, while *bidd-* 'want', *ḍall-* 'continue', and *ḥallī-* 'allow' take Arabic nominal-possessive marking:

(1)   a. kān-at   par-ar-m-a   wāšī-s
          be.ᴘʀꜰ-3sɢ.ꜰ take-3sɢ-1sɢ-ᴘsᴛ with-3sɢ
          'She used to take me with her.'

      b. dōm-e kān-u   kam-k-ad-a   ḥaddādīn-e
          dom-ᴘʟ be-.ᴘʀꜰ-3ᴘʟ work-ᴛʀ-3ᴘʟ-ᴘsᴛ blacksmiths-ᴘʟ
          'The Dom used to work as blacksmiths.'

(2)   a. ṣār   qaft-ar-i   min bɔy-os
          begin.ᴘʀꜰ.3sɢ.ᴍ steal-3sɢ-ᴘʀᴏɢ from father-3sɢ
          'He started to steal from his father.'

      b. ṣār-u   kar-and-i   ḥafl-e
          begin.ᴘʀꜰ-3ᴘʟ do-3ᴘʟ-ᴘʀᴏɢ party-ᴘʟ
          'They started to have parties.'

(3)   a. š-ird-i   ama-ke bidd-ha   qumn-ar
          say-ᴘꜰᴠ-ꜰ 1sɢ-ʙᴇɴ want-3sɢ.ꜰ eat-sʙᴊᴠ.3sɢ
          'She said to me that she wants to eat.'

      b. bidd-i   par-am   itžawwiz-om-is
          want-1sɢ take-1sɢ.sʙᴊᴠ marry-1sɢ.sʙᴊᴠ-3sɢ.ᴏʙʟ
          'I want to take her and marry her.'

(4)   a. ḥallī-hum   naḍḍif-k-ad-i   ehe   marn-an
          let.ɪᴍᴘ.2sɢ-3ᴘʟ clean-ᴛʀ-3ᴘʟ-ᴘʀᴏɢ these.ᴘʟ dead-ᴏʙʟ.ᴘʟ
          'Let them clean up these corpses.'

b. ḫallī-h   rʕi-k-ar   hundar
   let.IMP.2SG-3SG graze-TR-3SG.SBJV there
   'Let it graze there.'

Inflected Arabic-derived auxiliaries include the existential verb *kān-* 'to be', which is used in Domari, as in Arabic, as a past- and future-tense copula, supplementing the Domari remoteness or external past-tense marker *-(y)a*, which follows the lexical predication or predicate object:

(5) ihi   illi par-d-om-is   kān-at   yatīm-ēy-a
     this.F REL take-PST-1SG-3SG.OBL be.PRF-3SG.F orphan-PRED.SG-PST
     'The one [woman] whom I married [her] was an orphan.'

Arabic-derived auxiliaries are also inflected for tense following Arabic paradigms:

(6) lāzem tkūnu   itme mišaṭṭaṭ-hr-es-i
     must be.IMPF.SBJV.2PL 2PL dispersed-ITR-2PL-PROG
     'You must remain dispersed.'

This amounts, in effect, to a functional compartmentalisation in verbal morphology: both inherited and Arabic-derived lexical verbs take inherited Indo-Aryan inflection, while Arabic-derived modal and aspectual auxiliaries take Arabic inflection (for further discussion see Matras 2015).

Arabic person inflection is also found with the Arabic-derived secondary pronominal object marker *iyyā-*, complementiser *inn-*, and conjunction *liʔann-* 'because':

(7) ple   illi t-or-im   iyyā-hum
     money.PL REL give.PST-2SG-1SG.OBL OBJ-3PL
     'the money that you gave [it] to me'

(8) aɣlabiyy-osan š-ad-i   inn-hom min šamāl-os-ki
     majority-3PL say-3PL-PROG COMP-3PL from north-3SG-ABL
     hnūd-an-ki
     india-OBL.PL-ABL
     'Most of them say that they are from northern India.'

(9) na kil-d-om   barra liʔann-ha   wars-ar-i
     NEG exit-PFV-1SG out   because-3SG.F rain-3SG-PROG
     'I did not go out because it was raining.'

(10) payy-os   li?inn-o   ṭāṭ-i   kān
      husband-3sg because-3sg.m Arab-pred.sg be.prf.3sg.m
      'Because her husband was an Arab.'

Note that in example (9) the agreement is in the feminine singular, corresponding to the grammatical mapping of the Jerusalem Arabic construction 'it rains' where the (underlying) subject is the feminine noun *dunya* 'the world', while in (7), resumptive pronoun agreement with 'money', a plural noun, is in the plural.

Domari is seemingly an exception to the frequently cited generalisation that derivational morphology is more likely to be borrowed than inflectional morphology (cf. Moravcsik 1978; Field 2002; Matras 2009: §6.2.2). In fact, the constraint on the borrowing of word-derivational morphology results from the clash with the principle of the transparency of morphemes (cf. Matras 2009: §6.2.2): Arabic has few if any word-derivational morphemes that can be isolated, relying instead on complex morphological templates into which lexical roots are inserted. Nominal plural morphemes have both inflectional function (relevant to other elements in the clause) and derivational function (having independent meaning in standalone expressions). As shown above, they are replicated in Jerusalem Domari as an integral part of Arabic plural word forms. On the other hand, the replication of inflectional material on auxiliaries is not productive, in that it is not incorporated into the general lexicon, not even with lexical words of Arabic origin, but remains confined to the near-wholesale adoption of modal and aspectual auxiliaries from Arabic. In this respect, Arabic-derived inflectional paradigms in Domari constitute a case of both FUSION as defined in Matras (2009) – the wholesale non-separation of language systems around a particular functional category – and at the same time a case of functional compartmentalisaton as defined in Matras (2015) – the distinct treatment of functional sub-components of a category, here the verbal category, in regard to grammatical inflection.

3.3 Syntax

Generally, Jerusalem Domari shows full congruence with Palestinian Arabic in most syntactic functions. This includes word order rules and the formation of both simple and complex clauses. It also includes configurations such as mapping of tenses and modality to complement and conditional clauses, and the mapping of semantic relations onto case markers. The latter can be adpositional or inflectional. For nominal possessive constructions, Domari has two options. The first of those options, illustrated in (11a), is what we might call canonical Domari. It corresponds to the inherited Indo-Aryan pattern. The second option, illustrated

in (11b), corresponds to the common Palestinian Arabic construction, which is presented in (11c). Here Domari replicates the role of the Arabic dative preposition *la* by means of the inherited Domari ablative/possessive inflectional ending *-ki*:

(11)   a.   Canonical Domari
           bɔy-im   kuri
           father-1sɢ house
       b.   Convergent Domari
           kury-os   bɔy-im-ki
           house-3sɢ father-1sɢ.ᴏʙʟ-ᴀʙʟ
       c.   Arabic
           bēt-o   la-ʔabū-y
           house-3sɢ.ᴍ to-father-ᴏʙʟ.1sɢ
           'my father's house'

The canonical position of adjectives in Domari is, as in other Indo-Aryan languages, before the noun (12a), while in Arabic adjectives follow the noun. However, speakers show an overwhelming preference for avoiding pre-posed adjectives and instead make use of the non-verbal predication marker in order to allow the adjective to follow the noun (12b), thereby replicating Arabic word order patterns (12c):

(12)   a.   Canonical Domari
           er-i   qišṭoṭ-i šōni
           come.ᴘꜰᴠ-ꜰ little-ꜰ girl
           'A little girl arrived.'
       b.   Convergent Domari
           er-i   šōni qišṭoṭ-ik
           come.ᴘꜰᴠ-ꜰ girl little-ᴘʀᴇᴅ.sɢ.ꜰ
           'A little girl arrived.' [= 'A girl arrived, being little.']
       c.   Arabic
           ʔižat   bint zɣīre
           come.ᴘʀꜰ.3sɢ.ꜰ girl little.ꜰ
           'A little girl arrived.'

The emergence of nominal clauses, facilitated by the availability of non-verbal predication markers, might be regarded as an innovation for an Indo-Iranian language, which reinforces sentence-level convergence between Arabic and Domari:

(13) a. Domari
          wuda bizzot-ēk
          old.M poor-PRED.SG
      b. Arabic
          l-ḫityār   miskīn
          DEF-old.man poor
          'The old man is poor.'

Domari, like Arabic, shows a strong tendency toward SVO word order in categorical sentences in which a thematic perspective is established by linking to a known topical entity:

(14) mām-om putur yāsir gar-a   swēq-ē-ta
      uncle-1SG son   Yassir go.PFV-M market-OBL.F-DAT
      'My (paternal) cousin Yassir went to the market.'

By contrast, as seen in example (12), Domari shows consistent convergence with Arabic in regard to the position of the subject after the verb when new topical entities are introduced, especially with verbs that convey movement and change of state and in presentative constructions. Drawing on inherited morphology, this convergence in word order patterns also allows for the encoding of the pronominal experiencer–recipient through a person affix that is attached to an intransitive verb in presentative constructions, matching the Arabic construction:

(15) a. Domari   b. Arabic
          er-os-im   ḫabar   ʔažā-ni   ḫabar
          come.PFV-3SG-1SG.OBL notice   come.PRF.3SG.M-1SG notice
          'I received notification'

Complex clauses are also congruent with Arabic. Like Arabic, Domari shows three distinct co-temporal adverbial constructions. In the first, the subordinate clause is introduced by the conjunction 'and' and the verb is finite and indicative:

(16) a. Domari
          kahind-ad-i   ū   pandži našy-ar-i
          look-3PL-PROG and 3SG   dance-3SG-PROG
      b. Arabic
          b-yitfarražu   w   hiyye b-turʔuṣ
          IND-look.IMPF.3PL and 3SG.F IND-dance.IMPF.3SG.F
          'They watch her dance.'

In the second, the subordinated predicate appears in the present participle:

(17) a. Domari
          lah-erd-om-is   mindir-d-ēk
          see-PFV-1SG-3SG.OBL stand-PFV-PRED.SG.M
      b. Arabic
          šuft-o   wāʔef
          see.PRF.1SG-3SG.M standing
          'I saw him standing.'

The final option shows a nominalised verb, whose possessive inflection indicates the subject/agent, introduced by the preposition 'with' in the subordinate position alongside a finite main clause:

(18) a. Domari
          maʕ šuš-im-ki   tiknaw-ar-m-i   gurg-om
          with sleep-1SG.OBL-ABL hurt-3SG-1SG-PROG neck-1SG
      b. Arabic
          maʕ nōmt-i   b-tūžaʕ-ni   raʔbt-i
          with sleep-OBL.1SG IND-3SG.F-hurt.IMPF.3SG.F-1SG neck-OBL.1SG
          'As I sleep, my neck hurts.'

Relative clauses follow the format of Arabic relative clauses: they employ the Arabic-derived post-nominal relativiser *illi* and show the same distribution rules for pronominal resumption as in Arabic:

(19) ihi   illi par-d-om-is   kān-at   yatīm-ēy-a
      this.F REL take-PST-1SG-3SG.OBL be.PRF-3SG.F orphan-PRED.SG-PST
      'The one [woman] whom I married [her] was an orphan.'

Factual (indicative) complements are introduced by the Arabic-derived complementiser *inn-*, which carries Arabic-derived inflection (as in example 8 above), and show comparable clause structure as in Arabic:

(20) a. Domari
          džan-ad-i   in-na   dōm
          know-3PL-PROG COMP-1PL Dom
      b. Arabic
          b-yiʕrafu   in-na   dōm
          IND-know.IMPF.3PL COMP-1PL Dom
          'They know that we are Dom.'

Modal complements and same-subject purpose clauses show, as in Arabic, a subjunctive complement, without a complementiser:

(21)   a.   Domari
           bidd-i   dža-m   ḥaram-ka   ṣalli-k-am
           want-1SG go-1SG.SBJV mosque-DAT pray-TR-1SG.SBJV

       b.   Arabic
           bidd-i   arūḥ   ʕa-l-ḥaram   aṣalli
           want-1SG go.IMPF.SBJV.1SG to-DEF-mosque pray.IMPF.SBJV.1SG
           'I want to go to the mosque to pray.'

Adverbial clauses employ Arabic-derived adverbial subordinators, including *lamma* 'when', as in (22), or composite conjunctions consisting of a preposition and complementiser, such as *baʕd mā* 'after' and *qabil mā* 'before', as in (23) and (24), and generally follow Arabic sentence organisation and tense and modality distribution patterns.

(22)   lamma lak-ed-a   ḫāl-os   inǧann-ahr-a   bɔy-om
       when   see-PFV-M uncle-3SG crazy-TR.PFV-M father-1SG
       'When he saw his uncle, my father went crazy.'

(23)   baʕd mā ḫallaṣ-k-ed-a   kam-os   gar-a   kury-is-ta
       after COMP finish-TR-PFV-M work-3SG go.PFV-M house-3SG.OBL-DAT
       'After he finished his work he went home.'

(24)   qabil mā dža-m   ḫallaṣ-k-ed-om   kam-as
       before COMP go-1SG.SBJV finish-TR-PFV-1SG work-OBL.M
       'Before I left I finished my work.'

Conditional clauses similarly draw on the Arabic conjunctions *iza* and *law*, both 'if', and show similar distribution of tense and aspect categories, including the Arabic-derived impersonal marker of counter-factuality *kān,* literally 'was':

(25)   a.   Domari
           law er-om   ḫužoti   kān lah-erd-om-s-a
           if   come.PFV-1SG yesterday was see-PFV-1SG-3SG-PST

       b.   Arabic
           law žīt   mbāreḥ kān   šuft-o
           if   come.PRF.1SG yesterday be.3SG.M see.PRF.1SG-3SG.M
           'If I had come yesterday, I would have seen him.'

3.4 Lexicon

Jerusalem Domari shows extensive impact of Arabic on the grammatical lexicon, including almost wholesale reliance on Arabic-derived material for entire categories. In the pronominal domain, Domari employs, in additional to the secondary pronominal object marker *iyyā-* discussed above, also the Arabic reflexive pronoun *ḥāl-*, derived from the word 'state', combined with person/possessive inflection, and the Arabic reciprocal pronoun *baʕḍ-*:

(26) naḍḍif-k-ad-a   ḥāl-os
      clean-TR-PFV-M REFL-3SG
      'He cleaned himself.'

(27) tʕarraf-h-r-ēn   baʕḍ-ē-man-ta
      meet-TR.PFV-1PL RECP-PL-1PL-DAT
      'We met one another.'

Indefinite expressions draw on Arabic-derived forms of category determination including negative *wala*, free choice *ayy* and universal *kull*, which may be combined with inherited ontological markers, as well as on the ontological specifiers *ḥāǧ-* for thing and *maḥall* for location. Indefinite expressions that derive entirely from Arabic include temporal *wala marra* 'never', *dāyman* 'always', and universal-thing *kullši* 'everything'. Arabic-derived focus particles are *barḍo* 'also, too' and *ḥatta* 'even' and quantifiers are *kull* 'every, each' and *akamm* 'a few'. Interrogatives are generally inherited (Indo-Aryan), with the exception of *qaddēš* 'how much'. Numerals are all derived from Arabic with the exception of the lowest numeral forms ('one' to 'five' in citation function and 'one' to 'three' in attributive role) (see Tables 1–2); all ordinal numerals (*awwal* 'first', *tāni* 'second' etc.) are from Arabic.

Alongside a very small number of inherited prepositions that are used exclusively with pronominal (person-inflected) forms, most prepositions are derived from Arabic (Table 3).

Arabic-derived grammatical operators at verbal clause level include a series of modality adverbs such as *masalan* 'for example', *yimken* 'perhaps', *atāri* 'well', time adverbs such as *hessaʕ* 'now' and *baʕdēn* 'then, afterwards', and the phasal adverbs *lissa* and *lāyzāl*, both 'still'. As discussed above, Domari adopts Arabic modal and aspectual auxiliaries wholesale, i.e. along with their Arabic-derived inflection. This covers almost the full category of modal and aspectual auxiliaries including habitual/iterative *kān* 'be', *ṣār* 'begin', and *baqa* 'continue', *bidd-* 'want', *ḍall-* 'continue', and *ḥallī-* 'let', as well as the impersonal form *lāzem* 'must'. The

Table 1: Jerusalem Domari numerals

Numeral	Citation	Attribute
1	*ikak*	*-ak*
2	*diyyes*	*di*
3	*taranes*	*taran*
4	*štares*	*ʔarbaʕ*
5	*pʌndžes*	*ḫamis*
6	*sitt-ēk-i*	*sitt*
7	*sabʕ-ak-i*	*sabaʕ*
8	*tamāni-ak-i*	*tamānye*
9	*tisʕ-ak-i*	*tisʕa*
10	*das* 'ten', *ʕašr-ak-i*	*ʕašr*
20	*ʕišrīn-i, wīs-i*	*ʕišrīn*
21	*ʕišrīn ū ekak-i*	*wāḥed w ʕišrīn*
22	*ʕišrīn-i ū diyyes-i*	*tnēn w ʕišrīn*
23	*ʕišrīn-i ū taranes-i*	*talāte w ʕišrīn*
24	*ʔarbaʕ ū ʕišrīn*	*ʔarbaʕ w ʕišrīn*
100	*miyyēk hi, siyy-ak-i*	*miyye*
1000	*alf-ak-i*	*alf*

Table 2: Jerusalem Domari higher numerals

Numeral	Form
30	*talātīn*
40	*ʔarbaʕīn*
50	*ḫamsīn*
60	*sittīn*
70	*sabʕīn*
80	*tamanīn*
90	*tisʕīn*

Table 3: Arabic-derived prepositions in Jerusalem Domari

ʕan	'on, about'	*ʕašān*	'because'	*nawāḥi*	'toward'
maʕ	'with'	*minšān*	'for'	*qabil*	'before'
min	'from'	*min ɣēr*	'without'	*baʕd*	'after'
la, ʕala	'to'	*min/bi dūn*	'without'	*laɣāyet*	'until'
fi	'in'	*bēn*	'between'	*bi*	'in, for'
zayy	'like'	*ḥawāli*	'around'	*ḍiḍḍ*	'against'
ʕind (ʕand)	'at'	*min ḍamn*	'among'	*žamb*	'next to'
badāl	'instead of'	*ʔilla ɣēr*	'except for'		

only modal for which an Indo-Aryan form is retained is *sak-* 'to be able to'. Past-tense finite predications take the Arabic negator *mā* (alongside inherited *na*) while in non-finite predications the Arabic negation particle *miš* is used:

(28)   mā   lak-ed-om-is
       NEG see-PFV-1SG-3SG.OBL
       'I didn't see him/her.'

(29)   bay-os   miš kury-a-m-ēk
       wife-3SG NEG house-OBL.F-LOC-PRED.SG
       'His wife is not at home.'

Clause combining relies exclusively on Arabic-derived material (connectors and conjunctions) (see Table 4).

Likewise, the inventory of discourse particles and interjections is adopted in its entirety from Arabic: We find the interjection, tags and filers *yabayyi, yaḷḷa, xaḷaṣ, waḷḷa,* and *yaʕni*, as well as segmental markers with a lexical meaning such as *l-muhimm* 'anyway', *l-ḥāṣil* 'finally', *ṭayyib* 'well', *w ʔiši* 'and the like', *w hāda* 'and so on', *abṣar* 'whatever', and the filler *hāy* 'that'. The quotation particle *qal/ḥal*, from Arabic 'say', is not found in Jerusalem Arabic and appears to represent an older layer of Arabic influence (as indicated also by its phonological structure; see §2).

The content lexicon equally shows massive impact of Arabic. In the Jerusalem Domari corpus of narrational and conversational talk as well as sentence elicitation recorded in the 1990s (Matras 2012), almost two thirds of lexical items are Arabic-derived; the count includes single-word insertions from Arabic, including attributive nominal compounds (noun–possessor and noun–adjective), but excludes phrases containing a finite lexical verb that is Arabic-derived (which latter

Table 4: Arabic-derived conjunctions in Jerusalem Domari

w	'and'	*qabil mā*	'before'
wala	'and not', '(n)either'	*baʕd mā*	'after'
yā	'or'	*min-yōm-mā*	'since'
willa	'or (else)'	*iza*	'if'
bass	'but', 'only'	*law*	'if'
illi	relative pronoun	*bi-r-raɣim*	'despite'
inn-	'that'	*ʕašān*	'for', 'in order to'
liʔann	'because'	*minšān*	'for', 'in order to'
lamma	'when'	*ta*	'in order to'
kull mā	'whenever'		

are regarded as optional code-switches). Both Arabic-derived nouns and adverbs outnumber inherited (Indo-Aryan) counterparts by around 65% to 35%, while for verbs and adjectives the numbers are roughly equal. Around 26% of items of both the Swadesh 100-item list and the Leipzig–Jakarta 100-item list (Haspelmath & Tadmor 2009) are Arabic-derived. This puts Domari in the range of languages considered to be "high borrowers" by the Leipzig Loanword Typology Project (Haspelmath & Tadmor 2009). Meanings on the list that are replaced by Arabic loans in Domari include a number of animals ('ant', 'bird', 'fish'), activities ('to run', 'to fly', 'to crush'), elements of nature ('star', 'soil', 'shade', 'ash', 'leaf', 'root'), and some body parts ('knee', 'navel', 'liver', 'thigh'; also 'wing', 'tail'). On the whole, the meaning and usage of Arabic-derived lexemes matches that of Jerusalem Arabic. Creative processes are marginal and include such processes as the phonological volatility of /q/ (as [q], [x], [qx] and [g]), the alternation between *farǧik-* 'to show' (Arabic √*frǧ*) and *warǧik-*, and the occasional creative derivation such as *bisawahr-* 'to get married', from Arabic *bi-sawa* 'together'.

Arabic verbs are integrated into Domari through a light verb construction that draws on the inherited verb stems *-k-* 'to do' and *-h-* 'to become', which are grammaticalised into loan-verb adaptation markers (see Matras 2012: 240–244) that are sensitive to valency. This follows a strategy for the adaptation of loan verbs that is widespread across a geographical area stretching from the Balkans and the Caucasus through Anatolia and Western Asia and on to the Indian Subcontinent. For some verbs, alternating adaptation markers can indicate change in valency: *ǧawwiz-h-r-i* (marry-ITR-PFV-F) 'she got married', *ǧawwiz-k-am-is* (marry-TR-1SG.SBJV-3SG.OBL) 'I shall marry her off'. The core of integrated Arabic verbs generally derives from the Arabic subjunctive–imperative form, which in Arabic

never occurs in isolation from its person inflection in the prefix conjugation, as in *ǧawwiz-* 'marry', from **ǧawwiz* 'marry (off)!' or **tǧawwiz* 'get married!'. Note, however, that the vowel structure of the core does not always correspond to the subjunctive–imperative form of contemporary Palestinian Arabic, which is quite possibly a further indication of the layered historical influence of Arabic. Thus we find *s'il-k-ed-om* (ask-TR-PFV-1SG) 'I asked', from **s'il-* 'ask', while Palestinian Arabic has *isʔal* 'ask!', and *rawwaḥ-ah-r-a* (go-ITR-PFV-M) 'he travelled', while Palestinian Arabic has *rawwiḥ* 'go away!'.

3.5 Cross-category interplay

A typologically curious case of contact-induced change is offered by the use in Jerusalem Domari of three construction types that cut across structural categories. The first pertains to the comparative form of adjectives. In the absence of a structurally transparent, isolated and replicable marker of adjective comparison (comparative and superlative), Domari draws on Arabic word forms for all comparative adjective forms, even when an inherited (non-Arabic) word form is used for the positive form of the adjective, as illustrated in (30) (cf. Herin, this volume: §3.2).

(30) a. Domari
      atu   qaštot-ik
      you.SG small-PRED.SG.F
      'You are small.'

    c. Arabic
      inti zɣīre
      2SG.F small.F
      'You are small.'

    b. Domari
      atu   azɣar mēšī-m-i
      you.SG smaller from-1SG-PRED.SG
      'You are smaller than I.'

    d. Arabic
      inti azɣar minn-i
      2SG.F smaller from-OBL.1SG
      'You are smaller than I.'

This formation involves essentially the recruitment of an alternative, Arabic-derived item from the category of lexical items in order to carry out a grammatical procedure that is derivational–inflectional by nature (derivational in that it modifies meaning, inflectional in that it is inherently embedded into a syntactic relationship at the phrase level); thus we have a case of cross-category interplay.

A further case is that of lexical suppletion around Arabic-derived numerals. Domari and Arabic differ typologically in respect of numeral agreement: with Indo-Aryan numerals, the Domari noun appears in the default singular form, while in Arabic, numerals up to 'ten' take plural agreement. The clash is resolved in Domari in such a way that Arabic-derived numerals under 'ten' invariably trigger an Arabic-derived lexical item even when an inherited form of the corresponding lexeme is available:

(31) a. ḥkum-ke-d-os   taran wars maḥkame
          sentence-TR-PFV-3SG three year court
          'The court sentenced him to three years.'

     b. eh-r-a   ʕumr-om sitte snīn
          become-PFV-M age-1SG   six   year.PL
          'I turned six years old.'

Such alternation is systematic (see further examples in Table 5) and might be regarded as a case of bilingual suppletion, where every countable noun in the language for which an inherited (Indo-Aryan) word form exists also has an Arabic-derived counterpart that is used with numerals between 'three' and 'ten'.

Table 5: Some phrases from the corpus containing numerals and nouns

Inherited numeral and singular noun	Arabic numeral and plural noun
di dīs taran dīs 'two days three days'	*sabaʕ-t-iyyām* 'seven days'
taran mas 'three months'	*ḥamas-t-ušhur* 'five months'
taran wars 'three years'	*sitte snīn* 'six years'
taran zard 'three pounds'	*ḥamas līrāt* 'five pounds'

Finally, while Domari lacks a definite article, the Arabic definite article *l-* is employed with definite noun phrases where both the noun and the numeral-attribute are derived from Arabic:

(32) mar-d-e   l-ʔarbaʕ ḫurfān
      kill-PFV-3PL DEF-four lamb.PL
      'They slaughtered the four lambs.'

(33) dīr-os   it-tānye   eh-r-i   muhandis-ēk
      daughter-3SG DEF-second.F become-PFV-F engineer-PRED.SG.F
      'Her other daughter became an engineer.'

4 Conclusion

The comparison with Macalister's (1914) materials offers some scope for observations in respect of the historical development of contact-induced change over the past century in at least two areas of structure, namely the loss of Turkish-derived vocabulary as well as of some of the inherited Indo-Aryan vocabulary (around 55 words are attested in Macalister's materials that were not familiar

to the speakers I interviewed), and the adoption of fully-inflected modal and as-pectual auxiliaries, compared to their use as impersonal forms in Macalister's material. One has to bear in mind, however, that Macalister's corpus is based on work with just a single speaker. Nevertheless, these changes provide some indi-cation that the impact of Arabic continued to expand during the last century in which the language was spoken, a period during which the Doms lost much of their distinct culture and lifestyle as a result of the shift from a semi-nomadic ser-vice economy to a settled, wage-based but still socially isolated and stigmatised community.

The impact of Arabic on Domari prompts a theoretical challenge around iden-tifying a form of the language that is structurally inseparable from Arabic. This can be illustrated by the following two examples:

(34) a. Domari
         aktar min talātīn ḫamsa w   talātīn sana mā lak-ed-om-is
         more from thirty five   and thirty year NEG see-PFV-1SG-3SG.OBL

      b. Arabic
         aktar min talātīn ḫamsa w   talatīn sana mā šuft-ha
         more from thirty five   and thirty year NEG see.PRF.1SG-3SG.F
         'I haven't seen her for more than thirty, thirty five years.'

(35) a. Domari
         kān   ʕumr-om yimken sitte snīn sabʕa snīn
         be.PRF.3SG.M age-1SG   maybe six   years seven years

      b. Arabic
         kān   ʕumr-i   yimken sitte snīn sabʕa snīn
         be.PRF.3SG.M age-OBL.1SG maybe six   years seven years
         'I was maybe six or seven years old.'

Both (34a) and (35a) are unambiguously identifiable to speakers as Domari utterances; moreover, their meaning cannot be conveyed in Domari in any other way. Yet they each differ in just one single element from their respective counter-part Arabic utterances in (34b) and (35b): the use of the lexical verb with subject and object agreement (Domari *lak-ed-om-is* 'I saw her', Arabic *šuf-t-ha*) in the first, and the use of the 1SG possessive marker (Domari *-om*, Arabic *-i*) with the word *ʕumr* 'age' in the second. Despite being isolated examples, (34)–(35) illus-trate the considerable extent of structural overlap between the two languages. Furthermore, the examples discussed above of bilingual suppletion in number agreement and adjective comparison, and the productive use of Arabic person

agreement inflection with auxiliaries and with some complementisers and secondary object markers, mean in effect that active command of Arabic is a prerequisite for speaking Domari.

It follows that Domari provides us with an opportunity to reconsider the taxonomy of contact-induced language change phenomena. It is not a Mixed Language by conventional definitions (cf. Bakker & Matras 2013; Matras 2009: chapter 10) since the Indo-Aryan source of grammatical inflection in all word classes is overwhelmingly consistent with the source of basic lexical vocabulary and of deictic and anaphoric elements (demonstrative and personal pronouns, interrogatives, and spatial adverbs). Impressionistically speaking, it is a language with "heavy borrowing" in that it shows the adoption of Arabic-derived material in a wide range of different structural categories. But the distribution of some of this material, taking into account the ubiquitous active bilingualism among Domari speakers, lends itself to the postulation of several particular types of contact-induced structural change, which I have labeled above fusion (wholesale non-separation of languages around a particular structural category, e.g. clause connectors and modal auxiliaries), inflectional compartmentalisaton (the use of Arabic inflectional paradigms with particular functional categories, notably modal and aspectual auxiliaries), and bilingual suppletion (activation of speakers' full command of Arabic vocabulary and inflection for creative formations around number agreement and adjective comparison).

Further Reading

➢ Matras (2007) outlines contact influences on Jerusalem Domari in the context of a collection of chapters on contact-induced change in a sample of different languages.
➢ Matras (2012) provides a descriptive and historical overview of Jerusalem Domari and includes extensive discussion of contact-induced change in the individual chapters as well as a chapter devoted to the impact of Arabic.
➢ Matras (2009) is a general theoretical discussion of contact-induced change in functional-typological perspective and includes many examples from Jerusalem Domari.
➢ Finally, Matras (2015) discusses patterns of morphological borrowing and their theoretical implications and gives as one of the examples the compartmentalisaton of modal and aspectual auxiliaries in Jerusalem Domari.

Abbreviations

1, 2, 3	1st, 2nd, 3rd person		PFV	perfective
ABL	ablative		PRED	predication (non-verbal)
BEN	benefactive		PRS	present
COMP	complementiser		PRF	perfect (suffix conjugation)
DAT	dative		PROG	progressive
F	feminine		PST	past
IMP	imperative		RECP	reciprocal
IMPF	imperfect (prefix conjugation)		REFL	reflexive
IND	indicative		REL	relativiser
ITR	intransitive		SBJV	subjunctive
LOC	locative		SG	singular
M	masculine		TR	transitive
OBL	oblique			

References

Bakker, Peter & Yaron Matras (eds.). 2013. *The mixed language debate: Theoretical and empirical advances.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Black, George Fraser. 1913. The gypsies of Armenia. *Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society (new series)* 6. 327–330.

Field, Frederick. 2002. *Linguistic borrowing in bilingual contexts.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Haspelmath, Martin & Uri Tadmor (eds.). 2009. *Loanwords in the world's languages: A comparative handbook.* Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Herin, Bruno. 2012. The Domari language of Aleppo (Syria). *Linguistic Discovery* 10. 1–52.

Herin, Bruno. 2014. The Northern dialects of Domari. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 164. 407–450.

Herin, Bruno. 2016. Elements of Domari dialectology. *Mediterranean Language Review* 23. 33–73.

Kruse, Friedrich. 1854. *Ulrich Jasper Seetzen's Reisen durch Syrien, Palästina, Phönicien, die Transjordan-Länder, Arabia Petraea und Unter-Aegypten.* Vol. 2. Berlin: Reimer.

Macalister, Robert Alexander Stewart. 1914. *The language of the Nawar or Zutt, the nomad smiths of Palestine.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Matras, Yaron. 1999. The state of present-day Domari in Jerusalem. *Mediterranean Language Review* 11. 1–58.

Matras, Yaron. 2000. Two Domari legends about the origin of the Doms. *Romani Studies* 10. 53–79.

Matras, Yaron. 2007. Grammatical borrowing in Domari. In Yaron Matras & Jeanette Sakel (eds.), *Grammatical borrowing in cross-linguistic perspective*, 151–164. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Matras, Yaron. 2009. *Language contact.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Matras, Yaron. 2011. Domari. In Tatiana I. Oranskaia, Yulia V. Mazurova, Andrej A. Kibrik, Leonid I. Kulikov & Aleksandr Y. Rusakov (eds.), *Languages of the world: New Indo-Aryan languages*, 775–811. Moscow: Academia.

Matras, Yaron. 2012. *A grammar of Domari.* Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Matras, Yaron. 2015. Why morphological borrowing is dispreferred. In Francesco Gardani, Peter Arkadiev & Nino Amridze (eds.), *Borrowed morphology*, 47–80. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Moravcsik, Edith A. 1978. Universals of language contact. In Joseph H. Greenberg, Charles A. Ferguson & Edith A. Moravcsik (eds.), *Universals of human language*, vol. 1: *Method and theory*, 94–122. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Newbold, F. R. S. 1856. The Gypsies of Egypt. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* 16. 285–312.

Paspati, Alexandre. 1870. *Etudes sur les Tschinghianés ou Bohémiens de l'Empire Ottoman.* Osnabrück: Biblio.

Patkanoff, K. P. 1907. Some words on the dialects of the Transcaucasian Gypsies. *Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society (new series)* 1. 229–257.

Pott, August F. 1907. Über die Sprache der Zigeuner in Syrien. *Zeitschrift für die Wissenschaft der Sprache* 1. 175–186.