

RomIdent Working Papers

RomIdent
Working papers

Paper No.9

Functional Expansion and Language Change: The Case of Burgenland Romani

Dieter W. Halwachs

(University of Graz)

2012

Romani Studies 5, Vol. 22, No. 1 (2012), 49–66

<http://romani.humanities.manchester.ac.uk/virtuallibrary>

The project RomIdent is financially supported by the HERA Joint Research Programme (www.heranet.info) which is co-funded by AHRC, AKA, DASTI, ETF, FNR, FWF, HAZU, IRCHSS, MHEST, NWO, RANNIS, RCN, VR and The European Community FP7 2007-2013, under the Socio-economic Sciences and Humanities programme.



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
European Research Area



Funded under Socio-economic Sciences & Humanities

Functional Expansion and Language Change: The Case of Burgenland Romani

Language awareness among Burgenland Roma, which has been triggered by self-organisation with the goal of sociopolitical emancipation, resulted, among others, in the expansion of their Romani variety into formal domains. This ongoing process not only affects the functions of Burgenland Romani but also its structures. Furthermore, it also changed the primary contact varieties from dialectal and regional registers of Austrian German to spoken and written standard varieties. Naturally, these changes become most obvious on the lexical level, first of all, in the number of loans and neologisms. But not only the lexicon expands, also morphosyntax, case functions, and syntax undergo changes. The paper outlines and demonstrates both lexical expansion and structural changes on the background of the new model codes, spoken and written standards of Austrian German.

1 HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

Burgenland-Romani [BR] is a south-central variety of the Vend group which, like all south-central varieties, is strongly influenced by Hungarian. The current primary contact language is German which also under Hungarian administration of the region – today's easternmost county of Austria, Burgenland – played an important role and had an impact on the other languages spoken in this multi-ethnic area (see Halwachs 1998). There are only a few hundred speakers of BR. Their proficiency ranges from full competence of some mostly old but rusty speakers to passive part competence among some young speakers. The frequency of use in everyday life is quite low. German dominates in all domains. Generally, BR no longer functions as a language of primary socialisation (see Halwachs 2005a).

Until the 1930s BR was the primary intimate variety of around 6.000 speakers of whom only 10% survived the Holocaust. Traumatization by the genocide and the consequent destruction of the social structure as well as prolonged stigmatisation and discrimination triggered something like a self-imposed assimilation among some of the survivors but especially among members of the post Holocaust generations. This, among other things, increased exogamy, caused language denial and resulted in migration into urban anonymity. Linguistically this development was reflected by repertoire shift: German started to dominate in all domains whereas BR lost its functions in everyday life and was more and more seen as a language of the past. The consequences were

language attrition, language shift and language loss. Except maybe for a few individuals there was no language awareness among the group.

This only changed with the beginning of the self-organisation in the second half of the 1980s which – although many young Roma participated – was organised by non-Romani social workers. Self-organisation raised the question of identity and the activists became aware of their grandparents' culture and language. The role of language as conscious identity factor among the young organised Burgenland-Roma was boosted by experiences with other Romani groups where Romani still functions as the primary intimate variety. Initially this change in language attitude triggered emblematic language use and the fact that BR had almost lost all its functions in everyday life was perceived as language loss which consequently was interpreted as a symptom of cultural assimilation. Some months before the official recognition of the Roma as ethnic group or rather national minority ("Volksgruppe") in Austria in December 1993, this new language awareness resulted in substantial efforts to counteract language loss. Initiated by a young activist, Emmerich Gärtner-Horvath, and supported by Mozes F. Heinschink, one of the most experienced personalities in the field of Romani Studies, a project for the codification and didactisation of BR was started. After the initial achievements, which indicated that the project most probably would be able to work successfully, the cooperation between the Romani organisation in Oberwart and the Department of Linguistics at the University of Graz was supported by national and international donors. First substantial results were achieved in 1996 with a basic grammar, a glossary and draft versions of teaching materials. One year later regular BR courses were offered by the Romani organisation in Oberwart followed after two years by first classes on Romani in primary school. Parallel to the teaching efforts BR became a language of the media. A quarterly bilingual journal, a monolingual journal for children and regular broadcasts in BR in the local radio from 2000 on together with other text production – fairy tale books, children's Bible, etc. – dramatically increased the spoken and written use of BR in formal domains. Since then BR i.a. is also used as the fourth official language of the Burgenland – in addition to German, Hungarian and Croatian – on official web pages, for exhibitions and catalogues, in special Roman Catholic services and during pilgrimages, in ritualised greeting formulas of official addresses, etc.

2 FUNCTIONAL EXPANSION

Within one decade both the internal and the official status of BR changed dramatically: from an almost unknown isolated oral intra-group variety disowned by its speakers to the group's primary identity marker and the most prominent variety of an officially recognised Austrian minority language used in the media and taught in schools.

Triggered by the rising language awareness among young Romani activists and by their new language attitude BR underwent functional expansion parallel to the changes in its status. It developed into formal domains and turned from a language which functioned primarily as spoken intra-group variety in the social micro-cosmos into a language with a broad range of registers, covering both informal and formal domains.¹ Furthermore BR changed from an exclusively oral language into a written language. Finally, the contact of BR with the East-Austrian regiolect and with the Austrian German spoken and written standards intensified dramatically. The former strong influence of the Austrian German dialects of the region on BR was to some extent sidelined but did not end at all.

This functional expansion into formal domains in conjunction with emerging literacy and increasing influence of Standard German has resulted in structural linguistic changes that affect all linguistic levels.

3 STRUCTURAL LANGUAGE CHANGE

The starting point or rather the basis for comparison of the description of structural language change in BR is the codification as described in Halwachs (1998). The following account of recent developments in BR mainly focuses on nominal morphology in written texts and thereby refers to the productive patterns of derivation and integration as detailed in Halwachs (2001). The focus on nouns results from the "nominal style" of the German written standard, which is the primary model of functional expansion of BR. This again is reflected in the high number of nouns and adjectives among the "new vocabulary", i.e. the part of the lexicon which developed as a consequence of the expansion of BR.

3.1 Nouns

Aside from the integration of German nouns as loanwords, which form the majority of the nouns of the new vocabulary, also nominal creation via derivation and very rarely also compounding can be observed. The latter are mostly calques of German compounds. There are almost no cases of semantic expansion of existing nouns, which is the third possibility or strategy to enlarge the lexicon of a language.

The following list illustrates how German loans are integrated as masculine nouns into BR. All examples are accompanied by the plural forms and also contain the feminine derivations if attested.

1 It has to be noted that the expansion of BR into formal domains and the resulting increase of written and public use had almost no impact on the low frequency of use in the everyday life. BR acts – if at all – only as intimate variety in special situations. It is limited to marginal functions in informal domains (see Halwachs 2005b).

01	<i>docento</i>	< ger	<i>Dozent</i>	'lecturer'
	<i>docentscha</i>			'lecturers'
02	<i>botschofteri</i>	< ger	<i>Botschafter</i>	'ambassador'
	<i>botschoftertscha</i>			'ambassadors'
	<i>botschofterkija/-i</i>			'ambassador/-s (fem.)'
03	<i>fireri</i>	< ger	<i>Führer</i>	'leader'
	<i>firertscha</i>			'leaders'
	<i>firerkija/-i</i>			'leader/-s (fem.)'
04	<i>linguistikaschi</i>			'linguist'
	< <i>linguistik</i>	< ger	<i>Linguistik</i>	'linguistics'
	<i>linguistikaschtscha</i>			'linguists'
	<i>linguistikaschkija/-i</i>			'linguist/-s (fem.)'
05	<i>fürst</i>	< ger	<i>Fürst</i>	'prince'
	<i>fürstscha</i>			'princes'
06	<i>kamel</i>	< ger	<i>Kamel</i>	'camel'
	<i>kameltscha</i>			'camels'
07	<i>recl</i>	< ger	<i>Rätsel</i>	'riddle'
	<i>reclini</i>			'riddles'
08	<i>tema</i>	< ger	<i>Thema</i>	'topic'
	<i>temtscha</i>			'topics' ²

The nominative singular of example 01 – *docento* – exhibits the regular integration of masculine nouns of European origin into BR. But the plural in *-tscha*, which is the most productive plural morpheme in current BR, differs from the (former) regular xenoclitic pattern with the nominative plural in *-i*: *alato* 'animal', *alati* 'animals' < hun *állat*; *grofo* 'earl', *grofi* 'earls' < hun *gróf* < ger *Graf*.³

Another Greek-origin ending of xenoclitic masculines is *-i* (02-04) with the plural in *-tscha*. This pattern integrates numerous German nouns ending in *-er* and also marks derivations with the Hungarian-derived suffix *-asch* (04). The derivational base of *linguistikaschi* is a markerless

2 The writing system of BR is based on German conventions. Compared to "general" writing in Romani linguistics the following equivalents are used: x = ch / dž = dsch / š = sch / č = tsch. Furthermore, it has to be noted that aspiration in BR is limited to the initial position, that the voiced fricatives z and ž are devoiced and that ü and ö represent the vowels /y/ and /œ/ which only occur in German loans (see Halwachs 1996).

3 Romani nominal inflection and nominal classes are discussed in Elšik (2000). Bakker (1997) describes the Greek derived integration morphology of Romani. Matras (2002) serves as a basis for the description of structural phenomena in Romani in general.

masculine loan from German with the plural ending in *-tscha* and the regular agentive feminine derivation in *-kija*, plural *-kiji*.

The majority of German-derived masculines are markerless in the nominative singular (05-08) and show the regular plural in *-tscha*. The only exception are stems ending in *-C+l* which form the plural in *-ini*. This is an analogy to feminine nouns with the same stem final consonant cluster and *-ina* in the nominative singular (see 17 below). Compared to the recent integration of masculines with the nominative marked in *-o* a tendency to markerless integration of German-origin masculines has to be noticed. A development which clearly can be labelled as language change without any indices of language attrition. Ambiguous with respect to language attrition is the case with example (08). Usually loans ending in *-a* were integrated as feminines: *i boka* < hun *boka* 'ankle', *i roka* < hun *róka* 'fox'. While Hungarian has no grammatical gender, even some words denoting prototypical male animals like 'bull' – *i bika* < hun *bika* – were integrated into BR as feminines because of their ending. This pattern seems to be completely lost with German-origin masculine nouns ending in *-a* which are not integrated according to their shape but according to their German gender. There are only a few cases like *o tema* which – together with the only pre-European masculine in *-a*: *srasta* 'iron' – form a very small group of nouns.⁴

Compared to masculines the tendency towards markerless integration of nouns is not so strong with feminines. For German words with stems ending in *-a* and *-e* the general xenoclitic feminine integration is used (09, 10). At least in half of the cases observed, German-origin feminines with a consonantal stem ending are also integrated according to this pattern (11-13). But there is a strong tendency to use the plural suffix *-tscha* instead of the regular xenoclitic feminine ending *-i*. Markerless integrated feminines (14-16) regularly show the plural suffix *-tscha*. The integrations with *-ina* /*-ini* are limited to stems ending in *-C+l* and are exempt of the tendency to form the plural in *-tscha*.

09 <i>hala</i>	< ger <i>Halle</i>	'hall'
<i>hali</i>		'halls'
10 <i>piramida</i>	< ger <i>Pyramide</i>	'pyramid'
<i>piramidi</i>		'pyramids'
11 <i>konferenca</i>	< ger <i>Konferenz</i>	'conference'
<i>konferenci</i>		'conferences'

4 To interpret this as language attrition is maybe a very puristic approach. But if integrations like *o tema* increase in number and are no longer rare exceptions this might cause problems regarding gender-specific declension. Untrained speakers or writers could confuse the gender specific distinctions of oblique forms and use the feminine suffix *-a-* with masculines instead of the masculine *-is-*: e.g. *o tema*, dative *le tem-is-ke* > **la tem-a-ke*. There are already incidents of such confusions in texts but they are still treated as mistakes by both the readers and the writers if they are confronted with such forms in their texts or translations.

12	<i>akciona</i>	< ger	<i>Aktion</i>	'action'
	<i>akcioni / akcionscha</i>			'actions'
13	<i>struktura</i>	< ger	<i>Struktur</i>	'structure'
	<i>strukтури / strukturtscha</i>			'structures'
14	<i>fülfeder</i>	< ger	<i>Füllfeder</i>	'fountain-pen'
	<i>fülfedertscha</i>			'fountain-pens'
15	<i>gemajndi</i>	< ger	<i>Gemeinde</i>	'community'
	<i>gemajntscha</i>			'communities'
16	<i>partaj</i>	< ger	<i>Partei</i>	'political party'
	<i>partajtscha</i>			'political parties'
17	<i>biblina</i>	< ger	<i>Bibel</i>	'bible'
	<i>biblini</i>			'bibles'

There are also abstract nominalisations of verbal loans among the nouns of the new vocabulary of BR. The verbs are integrated in the "traditional" way with the integration marker *-in-* which is maintained in the corresponding masculine abstract nouns:

18	<i>famitlinipe</i>			'mediation'
	< <i>famitlinel</i>	< ger	<i>vermitteln</i>	'to mediate'
19	<i>forschinipe</i>			'research'
	< <i>forschinel</i>	< ger	<i>forschen</i>	'to research'
20	<i>khetanbutschalinipe</i>			'cooperation'
	< <i>khetan butschalinel</i>	< ger	<i>zusammenarbeiten</i>	'to cooperate'

Example 20 shows one of the rare cases of composition in BR where the adverb functioning as verbal particle is prefixed to the derived abstract noun: *khetan* 'together' and *butschalinel* 'to work' > *khetanbutschalinipe*.

Another possibility to create nouns is the use of the genitive, which usually functions similar to attributive adjectives, as independent substantive (21-26). The frequency of occurrence of this pattern is not very high, and never has been in BR. But it is still productive and contributes to the lexical expansion. For some of these genitive nouns German at least functions as the model which makes them very close to calques (23-26):

21	<i>lojengeri</i>			'cash register, cash box'
	< <i>loj</i>			'money'

22	<i>adiveseskero</i>			'presence, present'
	< <i>adi</i>			'today'
23	<i>vudaeskero</i>	≈ ger	<i>Türsteher</i>	'doorman, porter, door steward'
	< <i>vudar</i>			'door'
24	<i>badariskeri</i>	≈ ger	<i>Arzthelferin</i>	'medical assistant (fem.)'
	< <i>badari</i>			'medical doctor'
25	<i>gondolipengero</i>	≈ ger	<i>Denker</i>	'philosopher, thinker'
	< <i>gondolipe</i>			'thought, idea'
26	<i>vasteskero</i>	≈ ger	<i>Handy</i>	'mobile phone'
	< <i>vast</i>			'hand'

Together with markerless integration calquing is the most productive strategy of lexical expansion in BR. Example 27 shows a case of creative calquing which uses the paraphrase *angle dikel* 'to look ahead' as the basis for *angledikaschi* 'prophet'. The following example 28 is an agentive noun derived from a verb which is a literary translation from German into BR: *use = zu, dik-el = schauen*. The same applies for the other examples presented:

27	<i>angle-dikaschi</i>			'prophet'
	< <i>angle dikel</i>	≈ ger	<i>vorausschauen</i>	'to look ahead, to prophesy'
28	<i>use-dikaschi</i>			'viewer, observer'
	< <i>use dikel</i>	≈ ger	<i>zuschauen</i>	'to watch'
29	<i>ari-mukipe</i>			'release'
	< <i>ari mukel</i>	≈ ger	<i>auslassen</i>	'to set free'
30	<i>prik-bescharipe</i>			'translation'
	< <i>prik bescharel</i>	≈ ger	<i>übersetzen</i>	'to translate'

Another case of expansion by creation is the strategy of incorporating German compounds as calqued noun phrases into BR. The genitive attribute agrees in gender with the head noun, the number of the genitive form (sg. -Vs-ker-o / -a-ker-o // pl. -en-ger-o) is determined semantically by the model compound; e. g. example 32: *fatschuvtsch-en-ger-i* 'children's' > -en- (plural), *biblina* > -i (feminine). Contrary to the genitive noun phrase of Romani the article of compound calques in BR agrees with the head noun and not with the genitive: *i pajeskeri gurumni* 'the sea cow' : *le rakleskeri daj* 'the boy's mother'.⁵

5 For more information on the genitive in Romani see e.g. Koptjevskaja-Tamm (2000).

31 *o dokumentariskero film*

< ger *der Dokumentarfilm* 'the documentary film'

32 *i fatschuvtschengeri biblina*

≈ ger *die Kinderbibel* 'the children's bible'

33 *o molinipeskero kher*

≈ ger *das Gebetshaus* 'the prayer house'

34 *i pajeskeri gurumni*

≈ ger *die Seekuh* 'the sea cow'

Although this pattern of integrating German compounds as noun phrases was sometimes but rarely used before the expansion of BR into formal domains, the surge in recent texts is to be seen as language change caused by functional expansion based on the German standard.

Phonetically the forms of loans vary between the German dialect and the German standard. Some nouns like *fireri*, *gemajndi* < ger /fira/, /gema'ndi/ 'leader', 'community' show typical dialectal features, whereas others like *docento*, *fürst* < ger *Dozent*, *Fürst* 'lecturer', 'prince, ruler' correspond to the standard spelling and pronunciation. Cases like *botschofteri* (02) are somehow in between and reflect the pronunciation of the German regiolect or the East-Austrian German standard; the dialect pronunciation would result in **botschouftari* whereas the standard model would produce **botschafteri*. These differences in form are linked to the frequency and contexts of use and to the social prestige of the domains the words are associated with. This increase of integrations formally based on the regiolectal and standard pronunciation of German is a clear instance of language change by functional expansion which has written German as its primary model. If we think of "older" German loans like *roas* < ger /ro'as/ 'journey' and the corresponding verb *roasinel* 'to travel' which, according to the new model would be shaped as *rajsinel* and *rajsa* < ger *Reise*, this is quite a significant change.

3.2 Adjectives

The German-origin adjectives listed below show the same domain specific distribution of the phonetical models as outlined for the the nouns above: The shape of adjectives of everyday life like *flochi*, *gloti* (41, 42) which show the typical dialectal vowel shift a > o, e.g. /flax/ > /flox/ reflects their pronunciation in Austrian dialects, whereas the other loans are associated primarily with public domains and are modelled on the German standard. An adjective with high frequency of use in formal as well as informal domains like *intresanti* (47) < ger *interessant* 'interesting' stands between dialect and standard and is modelled on regiolectal pronunciation.

Only a few adjectives, which most probably have to be seen as derived from nouns (35-37), show typical inflected derivation suffixes of BR. In attributive function these inflected adjectives agree in gender, number and case with the corresponding head noun:

35	<i>historijuno</i>		'historical'
	< <i>historija</i>	< <i>Historia</i>	'history' ⁶
36	<i>partajutno</i>		'partisan, biased'
	< <i>partaj</i>	< ger <i>Partei</i>	'political party'
37	<i>butkulturano</i>		'multicultural'
	< <i>kultur-a</i>	< ger <i>Kultur</i>	'culture'

Example 37 is another one of the rare cases of compounding in BR which follows the pattern adverb+adjective: *but+kulturano*. Another calque of this type is *butschibtschengero* 'plurilingual' with a corresponding abstract noun *butschibtschengeripe* 'plurilingualism'.

Some new country-specific adjectives are formed with the suffix *-itiko* which – aside of the exception *mindenfelitiko* 'various' – exclusively characterises lexemes of this special semantic group:

38	<i>inditiko</i>	< ger <i>indisch</i>	'indian'
39	<i>holanditiko</i>	< ger <i>holländisch</i>	'dutch'
40	<i>schotitiko</i>	< ger <i>schottisch</i>	'scottish'

But all the inflected adjectives listed (35-40) can easily be replaced by their uninflected counterparts ending in *-i*: *indischi*, *partajischi*, etc. These are the typical nominative singular forms of dialectal German adjectives in attributive function which have always been integrated into BR in an unaltered uninflected form: *brauni* < ger /brauni/; *brauni gra* / *brauni grasta* : *parno gra* : *parne grasta* 'brown horse' / 'brown horses' : 'white horse' / 'white horses'. The vast majority of adjectival loans is uninflected and marked by the suffix *-i*.

41	<i>flochi</i>	< ger <i>flach</i>	'flat'
42	<i>gloti</i>	< ger <i>glatt</i>	'plain'
43	<i>aktivi</i>	< ger <i>aktiv</i>	'active'
44	<i>elektrischi</i>	< ger <i>elektrisch</i>	'electrical'
45	<i>etnisch</i>	< ger <i>ethnisch</i>	'ethnic'

6 German for history is 'Geschichte' which is not the model of *historija*. This might be a loan from another Romani variety, or – as BR has not much contact with internationally spread and widely used varieties – it is modelled at one of the other minority languages of the region, Hungarian and Croatian, or 'Historia' is seen as internationalism. Maybe integrations of this type are multi-causally determined.

46 <i>intresanti</i>	< ger <i>interessant</i>	'interesting'
47 <i>katolisch</i>	< ger <i>katholisch</i>	'catholic'
48 <i>kristlich</i>	< ger <i>christlich</i>	'christian'
49 <i>rasistich</i>	< ger <i>rassistisch</i>	'racist'
50 <i>tipisch</i>	< ger <i>typisch</i>	'typical'

Unlike adverbs derived from inflected adjectives, which are marked by -e – *Ov latsche vakere* BR. 'He speaks BR well.' – modal adverbs of uninflected adjectives are markerless:

51 <i>o praktisch verkcajg</i>	'the useful tool'
ger <i>das praktische Werkzeug</i>	
<i>Ov praktisch mulo hi.</i>	'He is practically dead.'
ger <i>Er ist praktisch tot.</i>	

Similar to the nouns of the new vocabulary in BR the adjectives show a tendency to formal reduction, lack of inflection and overt adaptation. This becomes obvious by the increasing number of uninflected adjectives and the resulting unmarked use of modal adverbs derived from uninflected adjectives. The suffix -i seems to become an integration marker for German derived adjectives irrespective of their variety affiliation.

3.3 Case

As described in Halwachs / Wogg (2000) BR exhibits replacement of synthetic cases by analytic constructions with prepositions. In comparison to other varieties the instrumental / sociative of BR is not affected by this process. The other oblique cases show the hierarchy of synthetic case stability mentioned in Matras (2002:94): The dative shows higher stability than the ablative and the locative.

Aside from the obligatory locative of personal pronouns in the prepositional phrase – e.g. *use mande* 'at me', *pale tumende* 'behing you (plural)' – there are only a view fossilised forms like *gaveste* / *foroste* 'in the village / city'. Furthermore some highly frequent integrated place names form synthetic locatives: e.g. *Betschiste* 'in Vienna', *Erbate* 'in Oberwart'.

As for the ablative, the case of source and origin, both synthetic and analytic formations are equally used and accepted by the speakers. Although there is a tendency that the more recently a word has been integrated into BR the more likely the analytic form prevails, the co-occurrence of the two formations can be described as an instance of competing norms. Besides synthetic case marking and the analytical prepositional (preposition + nominative) there is a third, rarely used possibility to

form ablatives. The German-origin preposition *fa* < ger *von* 'from' is, as a rule, followed by the synthetic ablative: *fa Betschistar : andar o Betschi : Betschistar* 'from Vienna'.⁷

Substitution of synthetic datives with the preposition *fi* < ger *für* 'for' are very rare in the codification sample and are almost treated as "mistakes" by competent speakers. By contrast in the "expansion sample", i. e. texts which were produced as result of the functional expansion, the number of analytic datives with *fi* has increased significantly. In the following examples the analytical prepositional phrases are contrasted with the corresponding synthetic case formations.

52

<i>fi</i>	<i>le</i>		<i>Romengere</i>		<i>koji</i>
for	ART.OBL.PL		RomGEN:NOM.PI		matterNom.PL

<i>le</i>		<i>Romengere</i>		<i>kojenge</i>
ART.OBL.PL		RomGEN:NOM.PI		matterGEN.PL

'for the matters of the Roma'

53

<i>than</i>	<i>fi</i>	<i>o</i>		<i>vakerdo</i>		<i>alav</i>
room	for	ART.NOM.M.SG		speakPRTC:NOM.M.SG		wordNom.M.SG

<i>than</i>	<i>le</i>		<i>vakerde</i>		<i>alaveske</i>
room	ART.OBL.M.SG		speakPRTC:OBL.M.SG		wordGEN.M.SG

'room for the spoken word'

Particularly noticeable in example 52 is the fact that the noun phrase is a genitive construction, although the German model most probably was a compound: *Romaangelegenheiten* 'Romani matters'. But cases like this are very rare in the expansion sample. Most of the noun phrases embedded into prepositional phrases show the nominative (53).

Another new development is the reactivation of the locative which in the following two examples is contrasted with its analytical counterparts:

⁷ The preposition *fa* 'from' as well as *fi* 'for' mentioned in the following paragraph are integrated into BR in their German dialectal form.

54

O Jesus Galilejate alo.
ART.M.SG Jesus galilleeLOC.F.SG cameM.SG

O Jesus andi Galileja alo.
ART.M.SG Jesus to galilleeNOM.F.SG cameM.SG

'(The) Jesus came to Galillee.'

55

Jerusalemate : andi Jerusalem 'in Jerusalem'
JerusalemLOC.F.SG in JerusalemNOM.F.SG

This development is not consistent, however. Quite often in one and the same text both possibilities are used by the translator:

56

ande pro foro Nazaret
in POSS.M.SG townNOM.M.SG NazarethNOM.M.SG

'in his town Nazareth'

le Nazaretiste, kaj ov bartschilo
ART.OBL.M.SG NazarethLOC.M.SG, ...

'in Nazareth, where he grew up

The use of the synthetic locative would have been possible in this case if the translator had used the circumlocution as shown in the contrasting phrase in the example above. In the codification sample circumlocution is one of the primary strategies to incorporate noun phrases or concepts with no lexical equivalents into BR. In this case the phrasal structure of the German model text – *in seine Heimatstadt Nazareth* – seems to have prevented the translator from using the synthetic locative which he obviously favours otherwise.⁸

An innovation in written BR is the functional expansion of the ablative, which is frequently used as marking the possessor.

8 It has to be noted that these locatives cause no problems of comprehension for the readers. Although the pattern is no longer productive in informal speech they seem to be familiar with the synthetic locative because of the fossilised forms which are quite frequent.

57

i kenva le angledikaschistar ≈ *das Buch des Propheten*
the book ART.OBL.M.SG prophetABL.M.SG

'the book of the prophet'

58

falati le Burgenlandistar ≈ *Teile des Burgenlandes*
parts ART.OBL.M.SG BurgenlandABL.M.SG

'parts of the Burgenland'

59

i phukajipeskeri tradicija le Romendar ≈ *die Erzähltradition der Roma*
the oral tradition ART.OBL.M.SG RomABL.M.PL

'the oral tradition of the Roma'

The corresponding German phrases which accompany the examples 57-59 indicate that standard German is not the model for the ablative in BR. The German phrases consist of a head noun marked by the nominative – e. g. *das Buch* 'the book' – followed by a genitive – *des Propheten* 'of the prophet'.⁹ But in the East Austrian regiolect the same relations are coded by phrases consisting of the head noun followed by a prepositional phrase with the preposition *von* 'of, from': *das Buch vom Propheten* 'the book of the prophet'. Presumably this German preposition triggers the use of the ablative as possessive. The regiolectal model of coding possessive relations seems to function as an intermediate mental stage in the translation process.

If the genitive precedes the head noun in the German standard model the possessive relation in BR is expressed by the genitive construction which almost parallels its German counterpart:

60

le Devleskero rajipe ≈ *Gottes Herrschaft*
ART.OBL.M.SG GodGEN.M.SG:NOM.M.SG reignNOM.M.SG

'the reign of god'

9 Although the pattern nominative + genitive is widely used in Romani it is not (or perhaps no longer is) used in BR, cf. **i kenva le angledikaschiskeri*.

la *Ceija Stojkakero* *vakeripe* ≈ Ceija Stojkas Sprache

ART.OBL.F.SG Ceija StojkaGEN.F.SG:NOM.M.SG languageNOM.M.SG

'the language of Ceija Stojka'

In example 62 the head noun of the prepositional phrase – *andi ... Walbersdorfatar* – is a calque of a compound – *Lehmgrube* 'clay pit' – which is realised as noun with preceding genitive – *luamakeri hef*. In the German model text this head is preceded by an attribute – *Walbersdorfer* 'of Walbersdorf' – which is derived from a noun. In BR such derivations usually are realised as genitives. The tendency of genitive substitution might be the reason why this specific attribute shows the ablative – *Walbersdorfatar*.

62

<i>Valami 1900 o kokali jeke schov metertscha bare tschoreskere valistar andi luamakeri hef Walbersdorfatar lakle ule.</i>	Um 1900 wurden in einer Walbersdorfer Lehmgrube die Knochen eines sechs Meter langen Bartwals gefunden.
--	---

'Around 1900 bones of a six meters long beard whale were found in a clay pit at Walbersdorf.'¹⁰

Maybe the use of the ablative form in *Walbersdorfatar* has also been supported by the preceding noun phrase where the ablative functions as possessive. This assumption is strengthened by the fact that the relation between *luamakeri hef* 'clay pit' and *Walbersdorf* could also be realised by a locative – *andi luamakeri hef Walbersdorfate* 'in the clay pit at Walbersdorf' – or a prepositional phrase – *andi luamakeri hef andi Walbersdorf*.

The ablative form in example 63 – *la Ceija Stojkatar* – is used, despite the fact that the German model – *mit Ceija Stojka* – clearly suggests the use of the sociative – *la Ceija Stojkaha*. Compared to the German text the ablative changes the meaning of the BR text insofar as *Ceija Stojka* is to some extent assigned the role of the producer of the film who is introduced by the next phrase: *kerdo la Karin Bergeratar* 'made by Karin Berger'.

¹⁰ BR *tschoreskero val* is a literally translation of German *Bartwal*. This is an extinct species of the family of baleen whales and not a confusion of ger *Bartenwal* 'baleen whale' with *Bartwal* 'beard whale'.

<i>jek nevo film pedar taj la Ceija Stojkatar, ker- do la Karin Bergeratar.</i>	ein neuer Film über und mit Ceija Stojka, von Karin Berger
---	---

'a new film about and with Ceija Stojka, produced by Karin Berger'

Examples like 62 and 63 indicate that the new possessive function of the ablative has remarkably increased the productivity of this case form. Some of the translators seem to use the ablative in all possible (and sometimes even in quite impossible) contexts. This is a situation that could be labelled, somewhat uncouthly, as "ablativomania".

3.4 Syntax

The functional expansion into formal domains and the resulting production of written texts has a significant impact on the structures of BR. As in comparable developments of other languages, aside from the lexicon, the syntax is most affected by this process. As the analysis of syntactical language change in BR is still being investigated only a superficial sketch of the observable phenomena is given in this paper.

Basically units of written language are more loaded propositionally and more complex syntactically than units of oral discourse. That does not mean that there are no syntactic relations between units of spoken BR. Aside subordination in conditional, causal, etc. constructions (see Halwachs / Wogg 2002:65ff.) there are chains of single proposition units which can be seen as main clauses connected by cataphoric or anaphoric elements or by simple repetition of elements:

64 *T'odola / o gadsche / so le noutnenca ciden / odola na dschanen te cidel ando schitikno.*

'And these / the non-Roma / who play sheet music (lit. what play with the [help of] notes) / these cannot play in the dark.'

65 *T'afka dureder ande gelo / ando vesch / taj uprosefkar mer oda kascht / savo ando suno
diklahi / oda kascht dikla / ...*

'And therefore he went further on inside / into the wood / and suddenly [he was] close to this
three / which he has seen in the dream / he saw the tree / ...'

In both examples – 64 is part of an interview, 65 of a fairy tale – there are units that function as postposed attributes in oral speech – 64: *so ... ciden* / 65: *savo ... diklahi* – but might be interpreted as relative clauses when transliterated. Both unit initial lexemes, – 64: *so* 'what' / 65: *savo* 'which one, who' – primarily function as interrogative pronouns in BR. But as their German counterparts *was* 'what' / *welcher* 'who' the BR pronouns also function as relative pronouns. Because German *was* 'what' only functions in dialects as generalised relative pronoun, it is obvious that *so* 'what', which shows far higher frequency in oral texts than *savo*, is not used in formal texts of BR. Only

savo which is associated with its German standard equivalent *welcher, der* is used in written text production. Example 65 shows the use of *savo* in a complex sentence of a journal text translated from German. Aside of the circumlocution in the relative clause which is marked by squared brackets the BR sentence parallels its German equivalent and demonstrates that written BR at least syntactically is almost a one-to-one copy of the German model.

65 *Aber viele Leute, die [über Romani Bescheid] wissen, sagen, dass das Wort
Ham but nipo, save [but pedar Romani] dschanen, phenen, hot o alav
But many people who [much about Romani] know, say that the word
'porrajmos' kein altes Romani-Wort ist.
'porrajmos' phuro Romano alav nan.
'porrajmos' an old Romani word not is.
'But many people who know a lot about Romani say that the word porrajmos is not an old
Romani word.'*

4 CONCLUSIONS

Although the functional expansion of BR into formal domains and the resulting development of written varieties still is a quite recent and still ongoing process some general tendencies of resulting language change can be formulated.

There is a tendency of formal reduction of nominal morphology with regard to both the number of productive morphemes and declensions; cf. the suffix *-tscha* as the only productive plural morpheme and the integration of uninflected adjectives. On the other hand there is a tendency of functional restructuring of the case system: the revival of the synthetic locative and the use of the ablative as possessor. This new ablative function is modelled on the German regiolect which seems to function as an intermediate mental stage in the translation processes from standard German into BR. Nonetheless, with regard to the syntax of written BR the German standard is the primary model.

This short description of recent developments in BR demonstrates that the ongoing language change triggered by functional expansion of the language into formal domains is basically caused by the change in the primary contact variety from the German dialect of the region to the Austrian German standard with the East Austrian regiolect sometimes functioning as a mental background model. This is a situation that leaves BR at least for the moment in an area of conflict between oral and written language.

REFERENCES

- Bakker, Peter. 1997. Athematic morphology in Romani: the borrowing of a borrowing pattern. In: Matras, Yaron, and Bakker, Peter, and Kyuchukov, Hristo, eds. *The typology and dialectology of Romani*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins: 1-21.
- Elšik, Viktor. 2000. Romani nominal paradigms: their structure, diversity, and development. In: Elšik, Viktor, and Matras, Yaron, eds. *Grammatical relations in Romani: The noun phrase*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins: 9-30.
- Halwachs, Dieter W. 1996. Die Verschriftlichung des Roman. *Grazer Linguistische Studien* 45: 1-32.
- Halwachs, Dieter W. 1998. *Amaro vakeripe Roman hi – Unsere Sprache ist Roman*. Texte, Glossar und Grammatik der burgenländischen Romani-Variante. Klagenfurt: Drava.
- Halwachs, Dieter W. 2001. Produktive Morphologie und lexikalische Expansion des Roman. In: Igla, Birgit, and Stolz, Thomas, eds. "Was ich noch sagen wollte ..." A multilingual Festschrift for Norbert Boretzky on occasion of his 65th birthday. Berlin: **Akademie Verlag**: 389-404.
- Halwachs, Dieter W., and Wogg, Michael. 2002. *Burgenland Romani*. München/Newcastle: Lincorn.
- Halwachs, Dieter W. 2005a. Roma and Romani in Austria. *Romani Studies* 5/15-2: 145-173.
- Halwachs, Dieter W. 2005b. Romani between the Scylla of language death and the charybdis of folklorisation. In: Muhr, Rudolf, ed. *Standard variations and language ideologies in different language cultures around the world*. Wien: Peter Lang: 121-136.
- Koptjevskaja-Tamm, Maria. 2000. Romani genitives in a cross-linguistic perspective. In: Elšik, Viktor & Matras, Yaron, eds. *Grammatical Relations in Romani: The Noun Phrase*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins: 123-149.
- Matras, Yaron. 2002. *Romani: A linguistic introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

APPENDIX

Texts in Burgenland Romani and German, which served as pool of examples.

<p>A <i>Fatschuvtschengeri Biblina ando Roman</i> <i>Andar o kenvi le Neve Testamentistar</i></p> <p>1 <i>O Jesus Galilejate alo. Odoj priko evangelijum le</i> 2 <i>Devlestar phukavlahi taj phentscha: I cajt kisni hi.</i> 3 <i>Akan le Devleskero rajipe kesdinel. Paruven tumen taj</i> 4 <i>gondolinen upro latscho phukajipe, savo me tumenge</i> 5 <i>anav.</i> 6 <i>Kada o Jesus ande pro foro Nazaret pal alo, suboton</i> 7 <i>ando molinipeskero kher gelo. Odoj andar i kenva le</i> 8 <i>angledikaschistar Jesaja angle gentscha: O gajst le</i> 9 <i>Devlestar, le rajestar, upre mande paschlol, mint ov</i> 10 <i>man ar rodija.</i></p> <p>11 <i>Andi heflina 10 duj jüngertscha le papal upreuschtime</i> 12 <i>talalinen; o Jesus te uso aposteltscha al taj le Dschelne</i> 13 <i>Gajstiha len sentinel. Upre del len, hot o tschatscho</i> 14 <i>patschajipe uso mindenfelitiko flogi te anen. 40 divesa</i> 15 <i>pali patraja ando them upre uschtino tal le</i> 16 <i>manuschenge le Dschelne Gajst bitschal.</i> 17 <i>I gemajndi le Christusistar Jerusalemate tradim ol, taj</i> 18 <i>o aposteltscha ar cidinen, vidschik le Jesusiskere alava</i> 19 <i>te phukan. Te paloda vakeren, hot ada vilago ar ovla.</i></p>	<p>Kinderbibel in Burgenland-Romani Aus den Büchern des NT</p> <p>Jesus kam nach Galiläa. Er verkündete das Evangelium Gottes und sagte: Die Zeit ist erfüllt. Jetzt beginnt Gottes Herrschaft. Kehrt um und glaubt die gute Botschaft, die ich bringe.</p> <p>Als Jesus in seine Heimatstadt Nazaret kam, ging er am Sabbat in das Gebetshaus. Dort las er eine Stelle aus dem Buch des Propheten Jesaja vor: Der Geist Gottes, des Herrn, ruht auf mir, denn er hat mich erwählt.</p> <p>In Heft 10 begegnen zwei Jünger dem Auferstandenen; Jesus erscheint auch den Aposteln und segnet sie mit dem Heiligen Geist. Er gibt ihnen den Auftrag, den rechten Glauben bei allen Völkern zu verbreiten. 40 Tage nach Ostern steigt er in den Himmel auf und sendet den Menschen den Heiligen Geist.</p> <p>Die Gemeinde Christi wird in Jerusalem verfolgt, und die Apostel ziehen aus, um überall die Worte Jesu zu verkünden. Sie künden vom Ende dieser Welt.</p>
<p>B <i>Schtendigi dikipeskero kedipe</i> <i>Thaneskero Museum Burgenland</i></p> <p>1 <i>Anglo valami 16 milijoni berscha pedar falati le</i> 2 <i>Burgenlandistar jek tato taj le ocejanenca phandlo</i> 3 <i>baro paj, i "Paratethys", bulhardo sina. Ande lakeri</i> 4 <i>küstninakeri regijona dschivnahi pajeskere gurumna,</i> 5 <i>delfintscha, valtscha taj bare hajtscha. Valami 1900 o</i> 6 <i>kokali jeke 6 metertscha bare tschoreskere valistar</i> 7 <i>andi luamakeri hef Walbersdorfatar lakle ule. Adi o</i> 8 <i>kokalengero ando naturakero historijuno museum</i> 9 <i>Budapestate te dikel hi.</i></p>	<p>Ständige Schausammlung Landesmuseum Burgenland</p> <p>Vor ungefähr 16 Millionen Jahren breitete sich über Teile des Burgenlandes ein warmes und mit dem Ozean verbundenes Meer, die Paratethys, aus. In seinen Küstenregionen lebten Seekühe, Delfine, Wale und grosse Haie. Um 1900 wurden in einer Walbersdorfer Lehmgrube die Knochen eines 6 meter langen Bartwals gefunden. Heute ist das Skelett im naturhistorischen Museum in Budapest zu sehen.</p>
<p>C <i>Poesija, savi teli cipa dschal</i></p>	<p>Schonungslose Poesie</p>

1 *Jek nevo film pedar taj la Ceija Stojkatar,*
 2 *kerdo la Karin Bergeratar.*
 3 *Pal trin autobiografischi kenvi taj jek kinoskero film*
 4 *(Ceija Stojka, 1999), "Telo deski seleni tschar" imar o*
 5 *pantschto khetanbutschalinipe hi maschkar i Ceija*
 6 *Stojka taj la filmeskera keraschkijatar Karin Berger.*
 7 *Taj meg buteder sar o avre butja, so odola duj khetan*
 8 *kerde, o nevo film jek keripe duge berschengere*
 9 *pajtaschagostar hi. O dokumentariskero film, savo 52*
 10 *minuti hi taj savo upre ada berscheskero Diagonale*
 11 *Gereciste te dikel sina, igen soralo hi, so pedar jek*
 12 *distancirti butschalinipe schoha na kerdo schaj ujahi. I*
 13 *Ceija Stojka phukal pedar i cajt ando Bergen-Belsen, i*
 14 *befrajung duach o Aliirti taj saj pharo sina, pal 1945*
 15 *ando dschivipe pal te lakel.*
 16
 17
 18 *Than fi o vakerdo alav*
 19 *O filmeskero team mer i Karin Berger taj lengero*
 20 *kamaschi Joerg Burger terdschon i Ceija Stojka taj*
 21 *lakero barikano phukajipe ando anglutno than.*
 22 *Filmischi stilmittel (maschkarutne titl, atmosferischi*
 23 *sekvencen) tschule and bescharde on. On tschak use*
 24 *dininen, o dschivipeskero phukajipe la Ceija Stojkatar*
 25 *te strukturirinel taj use jek kompakti filmischi*
 26 *phukajipe te kerel. O arajipe hi jek latscho*
 27 *interviewakero film, so loke taj godschikane kipenca*
 28 *andi scene bescharde ol. I Karin Berger schofintscha*
 29 *le, le vakerime alav oda than te del, savo leske pekal,*
 30 *kaj o kipengero barvalipe ande la Ceija Stojkakero*
 31 *vakeripe schaj virkinel. Oj odaleha sikal upri*
 32 *phukajipeskeri tradicija le Romendar, savi jek ando*
 33 *garudo blijanimi kunstakeri forma hi. I Ceija Stojka*
 34 *sikal aja tradicija ande lakero dschivdi form. Ham*
 35 *"Telal o deski seleni tschar" nan schukar kerdi poesija,*
 36 *ham jek bibastalo terdschipe, savi jek desch*
 37 *berschengeri tschaj adaj phukal.*
 38
 39

Ein neuer Film über und mit Ceija Stojka,
 von Karin Berger
 Nach drei autobiographischen Büchern und einem
 Kinofilm (Ceija Stojka, 1999) ist "Unter den Brettern
 hellgrünes Gras" die bereits fünfte Zusammenarbeit
 zwischen Ceija Stojka und der Filmemacherin Karin
 Berger. Und sie ist in einem noch größeren Ausmaß als
 die bisherigen Veröffentlichungen ein Ergebnis dieser
 langjährigen Freundschaft. Der 52 min lange
 Dokumentarfilm, der auf der diesjährigen Diagonale in
 Graz uraufgeführt wurde, besticht durch eine Intensität,
 die über ein distanziertes Arbeitsverhältnis kaum
 herstellbar gewesen wäre. Ceija Stojka erzählt darin über
 ihre Zeit in Bergen-Belsen, die Befreiung durch die
 Alliierten und wie schwer es war, nach 1945 wieder ins
 Leben zurück zu finden.

Raum für das gesprochene Wort
 Das Filmteam rund um Karin Berger und ihrem
 Kameramann Joerg Burger rückt die Persönlichkeit
 Ceija Stojkas und deren beeindruckende Erzählgabe in
 den Vordergrund. Filmische Stilmittel (Zwischentitel,
 atmosphärische Sequenzen) werden sehr reduziert
 eingesetzt. Sie dienen lediglich dazu, den Lebensbericht
 Ceija Stojkas zu strukturieren und zu einer kompakten
 film-ischen Erzählung zu verdichten. Das Ergebnis ist
 ein einfühlsamer Interviewfilm, mit einfachen, klaren
 Bildern in Szene gesetzt. Karin Berger gelingt es, dem
 gesprochenen Wort jenen Raum zu geben, der
 notwendig ist, die Zwischentöne und den Bilderreichtum
 in Ceija Stojkas Sprache wirken zu lassen. Sie verweist
 damit gleichzeitig auf die reiche mündliche
 Erzähltradition der Roma, die eine im Verborgenen
 blühende Kunstform entstehen ließ. Ceija Stojka
 verkörpert diese Tradition in ihrer vitalsten Form. Es ist
 jedoch im Fall von "Unter den Brettern hellgrünes Gras"
 keine beschönigende Poesie, sondern eine des
 Schreckens, die die Erlebnisse, Gefühle und Erfahrungen
 eines 10 jährigen Kindes schonungslos offen legt.

Dieter W. HALWACHS is *Head of the Research Unit for Plurilingualism* at the language centre *treffpunkt sprachen* of the *University of Graz*. Heinrichstraße 26/2, 8010 Graz, Austria. dieter.halwachs@uni-graz.at