

RomIdent Working Papers

Paper No.14

The Burgenland Romani experience



RomIdent
Working papers

Dieter W. Halwachs (University of Graz)
2013

<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

The Burgenland Romani Experience

Burgenland Romani (BR), or *Roman*¹ as it is referred to by its speakers, is an isolated variety on the western edge of the former greater Hungary and as such a South-Central dialect of the so-called *Ungrika Roma*², a term which collectively refers to the Roma who have been living on former and current Hungarian territory from the 15th century onwards. Codified in the 1990s as a direct result of the self-organisation of its speakers in a commissioned project, BR is today used in the media, in the classroom, and sometimes also in other public domains. Despite being the Romani variety probably most present in the public and thus most prominent in Austria, BR is nonetheless acutely threatened by extinction. The following account aims to describe this development of BR from a thriving group language to a codified variety with public functions while at the same time experiencing a sustained decline in use in the domains of everyday life. This also allows for conclusions for the development of other Romani varieties in particular and also for dominated languages in general.

1 Sociohistorical Summary

First references to Roma on the former west-Hungarian territory of today's Burgenland, Austria's easternmost province, date back to the 15th century, while first documents about Roma settlements date back to the second half of the 17th century: In 1664 and 1674, Christoph Battyhány, Earl of Németujvár/Güssing, initiated the settlement of Roma in today's southern Burgenland. During this period, the Roma's situation depended on the respective ruler. In contrast to being relatively unaffected on Battyhány territory, the imperial residence prohibition to solve the "Gypsy problem" on Esterházy and church territory were enforced almost as radically as on Austrian territory. The negative culmination of this persecution were the "Gypsy hunts" of the baroque era under Charles VI in the first half of the 18th century. The policy of assimilation by his successors, Maria Theresa and Joseph II was no less inhumane:

¹ Roman is a product of suffix reduction in high-frequency adverbs. The adjective *Románes*, which *inter alia* also functions as a noun for the language itself, changes via *Románe(h)* to *Román*.

² In addition to *Ungrika Roma*, the term *Romungri* is also used as a collective name for the Roma who have lived in the former greater Hungary for centuries; their Romani varieties are known collectively as *Romungro*. The ethnonym *Romungri* is often used pejoratively by other Roma groups to denominate Roma who – from their perspective – have been assimilated and who no longer maintain or have forgotten the old traditions and customs of *Romanipe*, of being truly Roma.

registrations, forced settlements, forced adoptions, prohibition of language, etc. Despite conditions improving for the Roma for a short period at the beginning of the 19th century did the general attitude of the authorities resemble that of Joseph II's reign: Legal hold against Roma still existed and the basis for its execution, i.e. the registrations, were continued. The conscription of 1873 for the first time contained references to newly immigrated horse dealers, *Lovara*, in north Burgenland's Seewinkel.³ This "Gypsy invasion" is met with rules for sedentism, which were tightened even more during the First World War: Horses and wagons were confiscated, men between the ages of 18 and 25 were drafted, those unfit for service and women were legally obligated to work within the "Kriegsleistungsgesetz".⁴

The annexation of Burgenland by Austria after a referendum in 1921 only changed the situation of the Roma little.

[S]chon 1922 erging ein Erlass der Burgenländischen Landesregierung, alle Zigeuner in ihren Heimatgemeinden festzuhalten, sie am Umherwandern zu hindern und gegen fremde Zigeunerfamilien mit der Ausweisung und Abschiebung vorzugehen. (The Provincial government of Burgenland issued a law in 1922 already to retain all gypsies in the home villages, to prevent them from travelling and to proceed with the eviction and deportation of alien Gypsy families.)

Mayerhofer (1988: 37)

Over the following years, Roma were registered, the fingerprints of all Roma over the age of 14 were taken, a photo register was created and the gendarmerie carried out censuses which show an increase in the Roma population from about 5,000 to approximately 7,000 between the years 1925 and 1927. Against the background of commonly held prejudices against Roma, this increase also contributed to putting the blame for the economic crisis and general unemployment of the interwar years on the Roma population. This also challenged the relationship between Roma and other population groups in Burgenland – Germans, Croats, Jews, Hungari-

³ *Lovara* < hun *lo* 'horse' with the *nomina agentis* suffix sg *-ari* / pl *-ara* are so-called *Vlach Roma*. After the abolition of serfdom and slavery in the principalities of Moldova and Walachia – *Valachia* > *Vlach* – they left the region of today's Romania in large numbers from the mid 19th century onwards. The strong Hungarian imprint of *Lovara Romani* indicates that its speakers probably originate from the transitional region of Hungarian-dominated Transylvania and the Romanian principalities of Moldova and Walachia. They probably already pursued their mobile professions, *inter alia* horse trading, on Hungarian territory before the mid 19th century.

⁴ For a detailed history of the Roma in Burgenland see Mayerhofer (1988: 11-52); for the history of Burgenland Roma after 1945 see especially Baumgartner/Freund (2004).

ans – which had remained fairly stable until the beginning of the 20th century. Although located at the bottom end of the value spectrum and geographically located at the fringe of settlements in so-called "Gypsy houses", the Roma were integrated into Burgenland villages and market towns by providing niche services as blacksmiths, musicians, basket makers, harvesters, etc. Each settlement had their "Gypsies", felt connected with them to a certain degree and also felt somehow responsible for them. Yet the economic crisis and the assignment of blame on the Roma, which was both reflected as well as encouraged by the press through the persistent raising of the "Gypsy question", fundamentally changed the relationship between gypsies and the majority population:

Um 1921 hatten zwei Drittel der Bevölkerung Mitleid mit den Zigeunern und ein Drittel verachtete sie; der Anteil der Verächter wuchs im Lauf der Zwischenkriegszeitjahre immer stärker an, und nach ihrer Deportation im Dritten Reich ließen die Zigeuner im Empfinden der Mehrheit kein echtes Vakuum mehr zurück. (Around the year 1921, two thirds of the population pitied the Gypsies and one third despised them; the proportion of the latter increased over the interwar years and after their deportation in the Third Reich, the Gypsies did not leave a true vacuum in the perception of the majority population.)

(Mayerhofer 1988: 59f.)

The situation of the Roma became exacerbated in the 1930s and the "preparations" for the policy of annihilation and the genocide by the Nazis tangibly culminated in *Die Zigeunerfrage: Denkschrift des Landeshauptmannes für das Burgenland (The Gypsy Question. Exposé by the Governor of Burgenland)* published in 1938.⁵

In May 1938 Roma were banned from attending school, followed soon after by the revoking of their right to vote and the prohibition of intermarriage. The same year saw the issue of the order to deport all male Burgenland Roma who were not needed for harvesting to Dachau and Buchenwald. In November 1940, the Lackenbach internment camp was opened and one year later, 2,000 inmates were deported to Łódź/Litzmannstadt where they all perished. The Auschwitz decree of January 1943, which ordered the extermination of all "racially inferior persons", had a massive impact on Burgenland Roma who had been registered, interned and were consequently "ready" for deportation to the concentration camps.

⁵ A critical discussion of the author Portschy can be found in Mindler (2006).

According to estimates, fewer than 10% of those deported from Burgenland to the concentration camps as "Gypsies" survived. Baumgartner/Freund (2004: 52) claim the number of victims to be around 9,500 and quote a document by the gendarmerie from 1952 referring to a count in the year 1948 when 870 Roma were registered as living in Burgenland. It can be assumed that hardly any of them were *Lovara*. They have had their principal place of residence in the greater Vienna area at least since the second half of the 20th century. The same shift to greater Vienna and other cities in eastern Austria holds true of several Austrians with Burgenland Roma heritage. The end of Nazi terror rule and the Second World War by no means meant the end of stigmatisation and discrimination. The attitude towards Roma both within wide circles of the majority population as well as from the authorities has remained negative since 1945. The challenges, problems and harassments which the survivors had to face from the authorities have been comprehensively documented by Baumgartner/Freund (2004). The attitude of parts of the population best illustrates the fact that even today one can hear regret being voiced at regulars' tables in pubs about there having been survivors.

Bearing in mind that the genocide almost completely destroyed the social fabric of Burgenland Roma, it is hardly surprising that the continued discrimination results in a kind of self-prescribed forced assimilation. The integration into the village community and the solidarity within the extended families had allowed the Roma to at least partly process the discrimination and suffered humiliation until the interwar years. While the degree of integration into multiethnic village communities decreased in the interwar years, the genocide destroyed extended families. Many family members, especially the generation of grandparents, were victims of the genocide. Without the comfort of the group, traumatised by experiences in the concentration camps and continuously marginalised and discriminated against, many Roma no longer wanted to be "Gypsies". The symptoms of these efforts of assimilation are the migrations into the anonymity of cities in eastern Austria, primarily to Vienna, and also a comprehensive rejection of their own ethnicity. This resulted in a refusal of endogamy, name changes and sometimes even in the renunciation of parents and relatives.

Those Roma who remained in Burgenland and who could not integrate themselves socio-economically and therefore did not merge into the majority population, bore the stigma of "the Gypsy" even in the second half of the 20th century. The continued discrimination manifested itself on the housing and job markets as well as in public life: "Gypsies" were rarely welcomed as tenants or buyers, they were avoided as direct neighbours and continued to live at the fringes of settlements. Job vacancies posted at employment centres with the caveat "No

Gypsies" were not uncommon, as were bans on young Roma to enter pubs or public recreational facilities.

This marginalisation, which to a certain degree was "obediently" accepted, in addition to the background of the holocaust trauma and combined with social policies which only fought symptoms, paved the way to social malaise. The partial exclusion from work and social life and the resulting lack of prospects promoted unemployment and resignation which was passed down from one generation to the next. The perception among some was that education and training were pointless because being a "Gypsy" meant that they would not be given a chance anyway. Additionally, the Roma interpreted the murder of relatives and ancestors in Nazi extermination camps as the justification for the state's duty to financially support them. These financial allowances had been the only recognisable benefit within an exclusively reactive social policy for decades, but without any accompanying social-political measures led to a vicious circle of a misguided sense of entitlement, social malaise and mawkishness. The lacking sociopolitical concepts regarding the Roma had a particularly strong effect on education. Roma children who did not comply with the normative requirements of the educational system due to their social situation and their sociocultural background were put into special schools for children with developmental disorders and mental deficits. "Being Gypsy" was thus equated with mental disability. Consequently, many Roma did not have any or no sufficient school graduation certificate to be able to enter vocational training. It seems as if the social system dealt with the descendants of the holocaust survivors, much as it did with the survivors themselves, only regarding their financial claims. The fact that this was insufficient and sometimes even aggravating and humiliating for those affected has already been outlined above.

To summarise, one can describe the development of the Burgenland Roma until the 1980s as that of a marginalised ethnic minority transforming into a fringe social group. Their ethnic identity was increasingly equated with social malaise by the majority population and its authorities. "Being Gypsy" became synonymous with social marginalisation and the consequent immense problems, a fact which in the perception of large proportions of the population was at least partly self-inflicted.⁶ Apart from the romanticised Hungarian "Gypsy music", no cul-

⁶ Almost every resident of Burgenland of course knows one "Gypsy who is diligent and clean and who does not steal". This does, however, not affect the stereotypical prejudice portraying quite the opposite. A pattern which appears to be a constituent element of the German-Austrian relationship with the other: Nearly everybody knows or knew a Jew, a "Jugo" (derogative term for people from the former Yugoslavia), a Muslim, a "Neger" (the German equivalent of English "nigger"), a Turk, etc. who, despite existing stereotypes against the respective collective, does not correspond with this stereotype at all.

tural values were associated with Roma, let alone a substantial contribution to a valued diversity.

It was not until the second half of the 1980s that the first sustainable self-organisation was put into action. Dedicated social workers motivated young Roma – although faced with fears and reservations on behalf of the older Roma – to no longer accept the discrimination from the majority population and the authorities and to become active. This was the first serious step towards overcoming the social problems as well as to countering the "obedient" suffering of prejudices and marginalisation and the resulting mawkishness on behalf of the Roma.

The trigger for this development was a pub barring issued in 1987 against young Roma. The federal president at the time visited Oberwart after receiving a complaint about this and tried to solve the problem on site. Subsequently, the initiative *50 Jahre "Anschluss" Österreichs an Deutschland – eine Studie zur Erfassung der Lebenssituation der burgenländischen Zigeuner und Juden im Hinblick auf zu schaffende soziale, kulturelle und sonstige Unterstützungsprojekte (50 years after the "Anschluss" – a study to survey the situation of Burgenland Gypsies and Jews with regard to required social, cultural and other support projects)* was commissioned within the commemorative year 1988. Results of this initiative included *inter alia* the *Verein Roma* in Oberwart, which was founded in 1989. It was followed in 1991 by the Viennese association *Romano Centro* and the *Kulturverein österreichischer Roma*. The latter was also a major contributor to the recognition of Roma as an Austrian ethnic group by the Austrian National Council, the Austrian parliament, on 16 December 1993.⁷

2 Sociolinguistic Situation

BR is part of the South-Central Romani dialects, as are all other varieties spoken by primary migrants in the former greater Hungary.⁸ Varieties closely related to BR are spoken in Slovene Prekmurje and the adjacent part of Hungary with a Slovene minority, the so-called Vend. These varieties are hence also called Vend and Prekmurje Romani. These three today rather easily distinguished varieties were most likely part of a continuum until the beginning of the 20th century. After the First World War the development into the three varieties occurred due to the distribution across three states with partly strict limits and borders. The former connection is not only linguistically obvious, but can also be seen for instance in sur-

⁷ For a detailed account see Baumgartner/Freund (2004: 208-218).

⁸ For more information about the dialectology of Romani see Matras 2005 and the same author's online fact-sheets available at <http://romafacts.uni-graz.at/>.

names which are identical across the borders. Loose connections, primarily between Burgenland and Prekmurje Roma but also with families living in Hungary, were re-established in the last decades of the 20th century, yet Romani no longer played the role it once had.

The ancestors of today's Burgenland Roma grew up with BR as their language of socialisation for centuries. BR was their intra-group code and intimate variety which was used within the family and among friends. In addition to dominating the private domains of the social microcosm, BR was also used in the social macrocosm, i.e. in everyday inter-group contact with other Roma, both known and unknown. The languages of the surrounding population were also used, which made Roma plurilingual in their everyday life. Those who got around a lot spoke all other languages of the former west Hungary: German, Croatian and Hungarian. In formal domains, which were almost exclusively restricted to contact with the authorities, the respective dominant language of the three listed above was used depending on situation and context. Hence the linguistic repertoire of the Roma also showed their sociopolitical status: BR dominated exclusively in the private domain and was only used with other Roma in everyday life, a symptom of marginalisation and, seen in connection with their plurilingualism in daily life which went as far as being able to speak all other languages of the region, was also an indication of their integration at the bottom end of the social ladder. At the same time, plurilingualism in everyday life and in the public sphere also reflected the dominance of all other ethnic groups as well as the dependence of the Roma on these groups as mobile service providers. The outlined sociolinguistic situation of Burgenland Roma existed until the interwar years. Although plurilingualism decreased both in everyday life as well as in formal contexts – political changes meant that German increasingly dominated the other languages – BR still dominated in the private domains of the social microcosm. Children grew up with BR, their mother tongue was a natural part of their ethnic identity and as such was not consciously perceived. This situation also prevailed in the internment and concentration camps.

The first documentation of Roman stems from this time. The following text by SS-Standartenführer Sievers from January 1943 to the then dean of the Philosophical Faculty at the University of Vienna, SS-Hauptsturmführer Christian, demonstrates that genealogical research is conducted by order of the SS research institution, prompted by the suggestion that relics of "Aryan myths" had been found in Roma fairy tales:

Wie ich beim Reichskriminalamt Zentralstelle für Zigeunerfragen in Erfahrung bringen konnte, sind von den annähernd 9000 Zigeunern, die bis vor kurzem im Burgenland sesshaft waren, ca. 5000 bereits umgesiedelt worden. [...] Da für die Abfassung des Dissertationsthemas über die Sprache der burgenländischen Zigeuner vermutlich nur wenige Leute verhört zu werden brauchen, würde sich dieses auch im Konzentrationslager Lackenbach bei Wien durchführen lassen. Besondere Eile ist geboten, da, wie die Zentralstelle für Zigeunerfragen mitteilte, in Kürze weitere Aktionen bezüglich Umsiedlung durchgeführt werden würden. (As I was able to find out from the Reichskriminalamt Zentralstelle für Zigeunerfragen, approximately 5,000 of the almost 9,000 Gypsies, who until recently were resident in Burgenland, have already been moved. [...] As the interviews for the dissertation about the language of the Burgenland Gypsies will probably only require a few interviewees, it could also be carried out in the Lackenbach concentration camp near Vienna. There is a certain degree of urgency as the Zentralstelle für Zigeunerfragen has informed me that further action regarding their relocation will be carried out shortly.)

(according to Heuß 1992: 104f.)

It is unknown whether the PhD student assigned to carry out the "interrogations", Knobloch, knew about the background of the research assignment and the conditions at the Lackenbach camp. In an interview in 1990 he denied having known about them (Eder 1993: 241).

The dissertation was accepted in 1943 and published in 1953. The fact that Knobloch, a young PhD student, followed his supervisor's suggestions and recorded data in Lackenbach is not in itself disturbing – which career-driven student would not follow their supervisor's advice? Yet what must be criticised is the fact that Knobloch's introduction in the preface of the publication in 1953 refers to Christian's support and Knobloch moreover thanking "den braunen Kindern dieses sorglosen Völkchens" (Knobloch 1953: 8; transl.: "the brown children of this carefree little people") without mentioning the problematic context of his research or the genocide at all.

The genocide was, as mentioned above, a disruptive time of radical change in the sociohistorical development of Burgenland Roma. Even today its consequences have not been overcome. The social structure within the extended family, which functioned until the interwar years, has been irretrievably lost, as has the long-standing integration of Roma into the village community. This of course also affects the passing down of language, which suffered particularly because the generation of grandparents, which is essential for the passing on of minority

languages, was most affected by the murder in the concentration camps. Due to the self-chosen forced assimilation of many Burgenland Roma, BR is also for the first time seen as part of a negatively connoted ethnic identity and is as such rejected as "Gypsy", alongside "being Gypsy" in general. The resulting language rejection is another step along the route of BR turning from a thriving to an endangered Romani variety. This is also enforced by its character as a secret language, which developed against the background of the trauma of the genocide and as a reaction to the continuing discrimination of those Roma who stayed in Burgenland and who did not assimilate and become part of the majority population. The demands for secrecy are on the one hand based on fears that knowledge of Roman by the majority population may harm the Roma, but also results from the concern of being stigmatised as "Gypsy" because of the use of BR. These fears of stigmatisation have *inter alia* led to Roma speaking only in the respective dominant language, mostly German, among themselves if *Gadže* ('non-Roma') are present in order not to stand out as "different". This avoidance is of course also a strategy for denying outsiders access to acquiring Roman skills. The demand for excluding *Gadže* from communication processes by an intra-group code is not only based on utilitarian grounds, but also on negative experiences and anxieties. Interest in Roma, their culture, way of life and language was often connected to data collection and consequently to the intensification of discrimination and persecution. Hence keeping BR secret also leads to an increased subjective sense of security and thus serves the mental intra-group hygiene.

The development outlined above means that BR becomes a conscious factor of identity of its remaining speakers. Among them is also the last generation of speakers who were socialised with BR. These Roma, born during and in the years after the Second World War have to a large extent preserved their language competence. Their use of BR in informal domains is illustrated in the following example from 1969:⁹

⁹ *Sammlung Heinschink, Phonogrammarchiv der OAW / Archiv Nr.: B 37244 PHA (SH 1937).*

*Upro them ajom X / mer Y / odoj
dur samahi / enja berš odoj
samahi / džimeg o haburi sina /
akor kher gejam / korkor samahi,
t'afka fuat džalahi / igen lače na
džalahi amenge / mindig iste
džanahi le kojaha / te hal anahi /
te kudulinel iste džanahi, o
džuvla / o murša nana kher / na
džalahi amenge igen lače / afka
fuat gelo / taj akor mri daj murše
peske lija / t'odoleha khetan le
sina, te soharel / na soharde
mentiš / fuat ladnahi / buti
kerlahi / ov fotosinlahi, džanes,
pirča, čurča kerlahi, kača
šlajfinlahi taj saj buti / ham te
hal sin amen mindig / tikno
džukloro amen sina / le borsen
astarlahi / mindig sin te hal / le
grasta sin / biknelahi len t'afka,
dur berša / kija, panč vaj šov
berša afka gelo /akor kher gejam
/ fačuvča, mri phen, so i bareder
sina / oja imar phuraneder sina /
andi šul na geli / amen meg terne
samahi / andi šul kesdinčom te
džal / duj samahi / uso cile Roma
/ čak duj fačuvča / ham amen
phare kerahahi te siklol / ham
meg džalahi / valasar gelo /
siklijam / andi šul lače gelo / ofto
berš duax likerčom.*

Auf die Welt kam ich in X / nahe Y /
dort sind wir lange gewesen / neun Jahre
sind wir dort gewesen/ solange der Krieg
war / danach gingen wir nach Hause /
alleine sind wir gewesen und so ist es
fortgegangen / sehr gut ist es uns nicht
gegangen / immer haben sie gehen müs-
sen mit der Sache / zu essen haben sie
gebracht / betteln haben sie gehen müs-
sen, die Frauen / die Männer waren nicht
zu Hause / es ist uns nicht sehr gut gegan-
gen/ so ging es fort / und dann nahm sich
meine Mutter einen Mann / und mit dem
war sie zusammen, um zu heiraten / ver-
heiratet waren sie nicht gleich / fortge-
fahren sind sie / gearbeitet hat er / er hat
geflickt, weißt du, Töpfe, Messer hat er
gemacht, Scheren hat er geschliffen und
solche Arbeit / aber Essen hatten wir
immer / einen kleinen Hund hatten wir /
die Igel hat er gefangen / immer gab es
zu essen / er hatte Pferde / hat sie lange
Jahre verkauft / etliche, fünf bis sechs
Jahre ging es so / dann gingen wir nach
Hause / Kinder, meine Schwester, die
größer war / sie war schon älter / in die
Schule ging sie nicht / wir sind noch jung
gewesen/ in die Schule fing ich an zu
gehen / zwei sind wir gewesen / aus all
den Roma / nur zwei Kinder / aber wir
haben uns schwer getan zu lernen / aber
es ist doch gegangen / irgendwie ging es
/ wir lernten / in der Schule ging es gut /
acht Jahre hielt ich durch.

I was born in X / close to Y / we spent
a long time there / we were there for
nine years / while the war was on /
then we went home/ we were alone
and that's how it continued / we
weren't doing very well / they always
had to walk with the thing / they
brought food / they had to go and beg
the women / the men were not at home
/ we weren't doing very well / that's
how it continued / and then my mother
took herself a man / and she was with
him to get married they didn't marry
straightaway / they left / he used to
work / he used to tinker, you know, he
made pots, knives, he whetted scissors
and such work / but we always had
food / we had a small dog / he used to
catch hedgehogs / there was always
food / he had horses / traded them for
many years / it went on for several,
five to six years / then we went home
children, my sister, who was bigger /
she was already older / she didn't go to
school / we were still too young/ I
started to go to school / there were the
two of us / of all the Roma / only two
children / but it was difficult for us to
study / but somehow we managed /
somehow it worked / we studied / it
went well at school / for eight years I
persevered.

This informal, oral account with its associated typical characteristics – one statement roughly corresponds to one sentence with a preposition – contains only few German lexemes: Although the lexeme *iškola* for 'Schule' ('school') is available, the use of *šul* < Ger. *Schule* is logical in this context, as the language of instruction at school was German. The case of the verb stem *šlajf-* < Ger. *schleifen* ('to whet'), for which the verb *mor-el* 'he/she whets' would also be available, is similar: The customers of the service of whetting knives, scissors and tools mainly spoke German, which is also reflected in the often encountered job title *šlajferitike Roma* 'Schleifer-Roma' ('whetting Roma'), a term which some of the neighbouring groups also use as an ethnonym.¹⁰ The particles *fuat* < Ger. *fort* (away) and *duax* < Ger. *durch* (through/by) are integrated into BR due to the replication of German prefix verbs: *fuat džal* 'fortgehen' ('to continue'), *fuat ladel* 'fortfahren' ('to drive away') and *duax likerel* 'durchhalten' ('to persevere').¹¹ The reproduction of German or rather German dialectal patterns is not only found in prefixes and particle verbs, but also in phraseology and idiomology in general. In the text at hand this is *inter alia* illustrated by the expressions 'auf die Welt kommen' ('to be born', lit. 'to come into the world') *upro them avel* and 'anfangen in die Schule zu gehen' ('to begin to go to school') *kesdinel te džal andi šul*. The simultaneous reproduction or replication of lexis and structure of the dominating language are not as much a symptom of language attrition as of general phenomena occurring in language contact. Lexical but also structural acquisitions of the dominating language into the dominated are to be expected and the rule in contact situations with heavily asymmetrical relationships.

In terms of structure, the BR of the postwar period was hardly different from that of the interwar years. Yet the functional changes were profound. The influence of German had already increased in the interwar period and mainly edged out the other minority language of Burgenland, i.e. Croatian and Hungarian, in their everyday use. Yet in the postwar era, German affected the functions of BR not only in everyday domains, but also in the private ones. BR was only used in public-informal contexts with familiar acquaintances – if at all. In addition, German was increasingly used in private-informal domains within the family and among direct neighbours. Over the course of time, BR was pushed back to only few functional niches and moreover lost its former dominance in the private domains of the social microcosm.

¹⁰ The ethnonymic character of *šlajferitiko* Rom is also given by the suffix *-itiko*. In BR this almost exclusively only occurs in adjectives derived from ethnonyms and demonyms: *englitiko* 'English') *horvatitiko* 'Croatian' *rustitiko* 'Russian', etc.

¹¹ Since Romani does not possess a synthetic infinitive, the third person singular present tense indicative is used as a lemmatic form or citation form.

The functional restriction of BR also reduced its frequency of use and, in connection with the negative attitude towards it, also endangered its transgenerational transmission. On the one hand, BR was avoided in many areas of everyday life, yet on the other the Burgenland Roma had also developed the attitude found among many plurilingual minorities: that the stigmatised ethno-language would only hinder their children from becoming part of the affluent wider society. The primary reason for this attitude was rooted in the monolingual education system which usually considers the competence of pupils in dominated minority languages to be an educational barrier or which turns it into such. Consequently, BR was typically only spoken by the grandparents' generation and was rarely used for communication between the parents and grandparents. The primary language between the generations was German. Even parents who were fully competent in Roman usually spoke almost exclusively German with their children.

This situation was additionally aggravated by the general social developments of the second half of the 20th century: The change of rural structures due to mechanisation and industrialisation of agriculture had profound effects on the village community and *inter alia* forced the Burgenland Roma to give up their traditional niche occupations for economic reasons. The simultaneous disappearance of the three-generation-household meant that grandparents were no longer the primary guardian figure – and thus language facilitator – for the children. In addition, intermarriage increased and the life as commuters or rural exodus also affected the Burgenland Roma.

The consequences of this outlined functional development of BR until the 1970s were language loss, language adoption and looming language death. Language loss primarily affected the younger generation who, if at all, only acquired partial competence in BR: Active partial skills ranged from use in private contact with grandparents and the use of some expressions and phrases to passive competence, which in turn ranged from understanding almost anything that is said in BR in the environment, to passive knowledge of some phrases and words, to not understanding any Roman at all. Seen as a group, Burgenland Roma children and adolescents only had a monolingual German repertoire.¹² The generation of parents used BR – if at all – in communication with their parents, i. e. the generation of grandparents, or as the language at special occasions. BR thus only occupied functional niches, as shown in the example below:

¹² Due to the sociopolitical developments in the 20th century, competence in Croatian and Hungarian also declined significantly. Only Roma living or having grown up in Hungarian or Croatian villages were still competent in one of the other two minority languages of Burgenland.

A: <i>Meg prindžares man? Me i A som, X-iskeri phen, ando Y.</i>	Kennst du mich noch? Ich bin die A, die Schwester des X, aus Y.	Do you still know me? I am A, sister of X, from Y.
B: <i>He, dur na diklom tut. Sar džal tuke?</i>	Ja, lange hab' ich Dich nicht gesehen. Wie geht es Dir?	Yes, I haven't seen you a long time. How are you?
A: <i>Lačo, taj tumenge?</i>	Gut, und Euch?	Fine, and you?
B: <i>Palikerav, lačo. Ačen andi Beči?</i>	Danke, gut.	Thanks, fine.
A: <i>Ja, seit fünfzehn Jahren schon. ...</i>	Wohnt ihr in Wien?	Do you live in Vienna?
	<u>Ja, seit fünfzehn Jahren schon. ...</u>	Yes, for 15 years already. ...

This sequence of a conversation opening took place in 2002 between two approximately 60-year-old women after a funeral which brought together many Burgenland Roma from the wider area. Both women had not seen each other for years and re-establish the long-lost contact with the help of their former intimate variety, Roman, which they probably spoke with each other as children. After this introduction, the familiarity is again established and the rest of the conversation is continued in German. Such use of language is typical for language groups immediately after the transition from a dominated language to the dominating majority language. While the competence in the minority language does exist, it is not used in everyday life, but only in exceptional cases as the one shown above.

Although the generation of grandparents does still maintain full competence in Roman, there are only few opportunities to actively use it. This turns many into so-called *rusty speakers*: Due to lacking practise in speaking the language they no longer have access to words and structures in the few situations when they still use BR and consequently replace them with spontaneous borrowings and structures from the dominant German.¹³

In the second half of the 20th century, Burgenland Roma found themselves, as mentioned above, transitioning from one language to another with BR being replaced by German in all domains, or already having been replaced in the repertoire of the younger generation. The language formerly used in private domains was threatened by language death as it, with developments continuing as they were, threatened to probably lose all functions within a few generations. At the beginning of the 1980s, BR was a minority language bound for extinction

¹³ This was often observed during the codification work: For example in one of the interview situations, the competent speaker of BR substituted the word for 'Schulter' ('shoulder') with the similar sounding *šulteri*, which has been integrated into BR. Only when the interviewer insists on there potentially being another word and spending a long time thinking about it does he remember the pre-European *phiko*.

which experienced hardly any appreciation by its speakers and which the majority population, if perceiving it at all, stigmatised as "Gypsy".

Only the beginnings of self-organisation at the end of the 1980s changed the attitude towards the language. In addition to social and political tasks, the newly founded associations were also involved with cultural concerns from the very beginning. The resulting contact to other Roma organisations meant that the Burgenland Roma got in touch with members of Roma groups in which Romani still dominated the internal communication, such as the *Kalderaš* and *Lovara* who had settled in Vienna. Romani was not so much the primary means of everyday communication among the latter but rather the language of a romanticised past of true "Roma identity", *Romanšago*. Nevertheless, or probably exactly because of it, Romani is used at official events within the self-organisation. Such occasions and experiences *inter alia* contributed to the representatives of Burgenland Roma perceiving the transition to another language and the decline in the use of Roman as a loss. This was the first sign of positive language awareness. BR was seen as an integral part of their identity which resulted in initial concerns about language use and language maintenance. Although opposed by the elder generation and established members of the association of Burgenland Roma because of the aforementioned demand for secrecy, young Roma tried to find ways of countering language death. The Romano Centro association subsequently established contact with linguists at the University of Graz, which would develop into the *Roman Project*.

3 The Roman Project

The Roman Project, officially entitled *Projekt zur Kodifizierung und Didaktisierung des Roman* (*Project for the Codification and Didactisation of Roman*), was initiated in the year 1993 by Mozes F. Heinschink, who is held in high regard beyond Austria's border as a researcher and friend of Roma and who established contact between young Burgenland Roma and the author. The confusion and feelings of being overwhelmed resulting from the spontaneous promise to help preserve BR "from extinction" was met with the only correct advice from the then head of the department and other experienced colleagues from the Department of Linguistics at the University of Graz: defer linguistic knowledge and scientific standards, go and meet the Roma and "act like a human".

Initially the Roman Project was a tentative "learning by doing" experience: First, cautious queries were accompanied by parallel project seminars in which knowledge about Roma and Romani were compiled jointly by teachers and students. The most important factor in this ini-

tial phase, however, was the active participation of the research team in the Burgenland Roma associations and the participation in their events. The resulting mutual trust forms the basis for a successful collaboration whose main results are briefly outlined below:¹⁴

- 1995: ABC spelling book
- 1996: Grammar, glossary, texts and teaching materials
- 1997: Extra-curricular language courses
- 1998: Bilingual quarterly magazine and children's magazine in Roman,
- 1999: For the first time Roman was used on Radio and taught at a school
- 2000: Illustrated volume of fairy tales and bilingual text volume including a CD

The status of Burgenland Romani changed fundamentally within a decade because of the project. At first, Roman was hardly perceived in public, barely passed down and used. It was the endangered oral "language" of a marginalised group who were isolated even within the Roma community. Even its speakers had disdain for the language. Over the course of the project and against the backdrop of general political developments, Roman has by now developed into the most prominent variety of an officially acknowledged Austrian ethnic minority language and is used both in the media as well as in education. In addition, Roman has become the primary factor of identity not only of its few competent speakers, but of the majority of Burgenland Roma.

The prerequisites for the successful implementation of the project were, besides the aforementioned trust between linguists and Roma as the basis for cooperation, especially the following factors:

- The Roma themselves took the initiative.
- The Roma themselves were involved actively and equally in the work process.
- The participating Roma respected the linguists as experts.
- The results were propagated and disseminated by a widely accepted and valued representative of the Burgenland Roma.

3.1 Framework Conditions

The Roman Project is initiated at the ideal moment. It is connected to the first sustainable self-organisation by young Roma and occurs in a generally positive socio-political atmosphere which leads to the recognition of Roma as an ethnic group. This in turn accelerates the sense

¹⁴ The events around the murder of four Roma in February 1995 briefly threatened to compromise the project but never seriously endangered it.

of a new era and for the first time ever leads to the development of a positive Roma identity, not only among Burgenland Roma themselves but also within the majority population.

The situation of the documentation and characterisation of BR is, however, different or even contrary. Apart from the aforementioned, commented texts from the 1940s (Knobloch 1956) and a few scattered text fragments which are either badly documented or not at all, there is only a single edited and annotated text based on the transcription of an audio recording (Heinschink/Meissner 1976). This text is part of 18 conversations spanning almost four hours, which are conducted in BR and German in the years 1968 to 1971 and 1993. The recordings of the first series dating from 1968 to 1971 contain about two hours in BR, the conversations recorded in 1993 amount to almost an hour.¹⁵

The barely edited texts give a first impression of BR despite the ephemeral basis and allow for comparison with other, well-documented Romani varieties. This enables the development of specific survey strategies at the initial stages of the codification process.

3.2 Codification

Codification as a task assigned by the representatives of a speaker community is rather extraordinary and facilitates access to the community, yet it also has rather problematic aspects. The participation of members of the ethnic group is initially limited to activists and outsiders. While the first act more like commissioners and initiators than like informants, the latter expect prestige and appreciation from the commissioners and the speaker community due to their role as "primary informants". This sometimes leads to overcompliance in the survey and consequently to distorted results. The project team moreover notices time and again that primary informants try to gain a monopoly on the contact with the researchers and to block the participation of other speakers or to at least have a say in their involvement.¹⁶ The "normal speaker" as an informant is thus at least initially not directly accessible for the research team.¹⁷

¹⁵ These recordings are archived in *Sammlung Heinschink* in the *Phonogrammarchiv der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* and are in part accessible online: <http://catalog.phonogrammarchiv.at>.

¹⁶ The role of remuneration of the informants remains debatable. It must be mentioned that the aspect of money is a highly sensitive issue in the co-operation both with representatives of minority organisations as well as with informants in research contexts. The monetary aspect can hinder research activities or even make them impossible, unless dealt with consistently and transparently.

¹⁷ "Normal speakers" are members of the speaker community who use BR in everyday life, do not play a leading role in the process of self-organisation, are not active members of the associations and who consequently act neither as activists, nor as primary informants.

The "normal speakers" are also not involved in the association's activities as such, because they act in a specific, non-routine context. In addition, BR is, if at all, only a side issue during the active participation of the research team in the community life of the Burgenland Roma association. Due to communicative necessity, intelligibility and the specific nature of the domain, BR is barely used in these public situations, even by the few participating competent speakers. The aforementioned strategy of avoidance must be mentioned in this context, in particular among older speakers. The aim not to attract attention for being "different" and the attitude towards the ethnic language as a form of protection against outsiders who do not understand it is significant. The participatory observation in public situations therefore do not yield any usable results with regard to the codification of BR. However, it does shed light on its functionality and the language attitude of its speakers. The same holds true of semi-public situations such as the communicative behaviour of Burgenland Roma in the association's clubhouse. This location serves as a centre for information and communication, as a classroom for afterschool learning support, etc. The use of BR in all these contexts is, however, the absolute exception.

Due to this situation, the contact with speakers of BR is initially restricted to working sessions in the association's clubhouse and only then leads to the involvement of normal speakers. The collaboration with BR speakers takes place in three stages:

- Stage 1: Contact and working sessions between the research team and primary informants in the association's clubhouse. The collaboration starts to take shape, starting from surveys, initially only on lexical but increasingly also on structural characteristics, eventually resulting in joint text analyses and text production. Furthermore planning of
- Stage 2: Contact and working sessions between primary informants and other BR speakers in their everyday environment. Indirect involvement of "normal speakers" through colleagues from the ethnic community who have been trained for these tasks during the working sessions in Stage 1 and who are, *inter alia* because of this task, integrated into the research team as equal members. This results in
- Stage 3: Contact between linguists of the research team and normal speakers of BR in their everyday environment.

The contact situations outlined in these three stages partly run in parallel: the linguists' field research with the activities of the primary informants; the working sessions during the entire

survey period. The work process is divided into four steps with regard to content, which also run partly in parallel:

- Survey
- Graphisation
- Text collection
- Analysis

3.2.1 Survey

Initiatives for the preservation of dominated minority languages usually aim at the graphisation of the ethnic language, its use in the media and language teaching. The required survey of the language's sociolinguistic situation and the issue of its vitality and functionality as well as its acceptance within the speaker community and that of the objective represented by the speaker community's representatives are thereby often neglected. The aim of the survey is consequently to determine whether the project results expected by the Burgenland Roma representatives – strategies and material to counteract the impending language loss – in fact correspond to those of the ethnic group. The survey hence not only aims to obtain information about language use, but to also to investigate language attitude and the concerns of the speaker community regarding BR's status and functionality.

The survey is carried out in southern Burgenland and in parts of central Burgenland in the spring and early summer of 1994.¹⁸ Surveys are, as mentioned above, still met with continuing fears of registration due to experiences in the past of leading to intensified discrimination and persecution. Therefore only Burgenland Roma, the abovementioned primary informants, act as interviewers which not only has a positive impact on the survey itself, but on the entire project:

¹⁸ As the self-organisation originates from the town and district of Oberwart in southern Burgenland, the centre of the codification efforts is also located there. The primary informants' good contacts stretch to central Burgenland (the town and district of Oberpullendorf), but not to northern Burgenland. The Roma residents there are not actively taking part in the emancipation efforts and rather disapprove of the association's projects and consequently also the codification. This may well be due to the historic association of northern Burgenland with Esterházy and church territory. Forced assimilation ordered by the imperial Hapsburgs had been implemented far more vigorously than on Battyáni territory, which *inter alia* included today's southern Burgenland and parts of central Burgenland. This may partially be responsible for the by far stronger scepticism to the opening up towards the majority population connected to the self-organisation in the north. Yet this is barely relevant for the codification. Informal contacts with Roma from northern Burgenland during the more advanced phases of the abovementioned third stage showed that their BR varieties do not differ significantly from those spoken in southern and central Burgenland, apart from local and idiolectal characteristics.

- The co-operators from the ethnic group finally realise that they are actively involved in a project in the interest of the ethnic group.
- The use of anonymous questionnaires which are completed together with familiar people demonstrates to those surveyed that they will in no way be registered and need not fear negative consequences.
- The project becomes known and largely accepted as its aims are explained by Roma who are actively involved. This emphasises the fact that it is a project by the Roma and that scientists are effectively collaborating as commissioned, skilled labour.

320 of the 400 circulated questionnaires are returned, which is regarded as an initial big success.¹⁹ The questionnaire consists of 61 questions covering three areas:

- Questions 01-09: General questions
including age, sex, household size, etc.
- Questions 10-47: Language use
language competence, language use according to domains;
- Questions 48-61: Language attitude
"mother tongue", vision of the future functionality of BR

The ratio of female to male interviewees is 44% to 56%. Regarding age, almost 75% of those interviewed are part of the established age group of 20- to 50-year-olds. The fact that only barely 7% of those surveyed live in a three-generation-household confirms the social change and the abandonment of the structure of extended families, which of course influences the passing down of language: Everyday contact between grandparents and grandchildren is an essential factor in the preservation of dominated minority languages.

The results confirm the low use of the language which has already been suspected based on the impressions hitherto gained. BR still functions as the intimate variety in some few families. It is, if at all, used almost exclusively in private situations in parallel with German, which dominates all domains.

¹⁹ The result of the 1991 Austrian census shows 122 persons with "Romanes" as their everyday language (Statistik Austria 2002a: 19), 93 of whom live in Burgenland (Statistik Austria 2002b: 18). The response rate of 320 questionnaires relativises these numbers and demonstrates the issues of demographic representation of the use of languages other than the respective national language. The 2001 census survey question had a change in format: "Kästchen zum Ankreuzen statt Texteintragung" (Tick a box instead of insert text) to indicate Austrian ethnic group languages. The result of 208 speakers in Burgenland coincidentally fits with the estimated number of fully competent BR speakers of around 200 based on the impressions and experiences gained during the codification. Demographic data about minority affiliation and the use of minority languages are, as mentioned above, not very sound.

When questioned about their attitude towards the language, the majority of those interviewed, including those who rate their BR language competence as very low, name BR as their "mother tongue". More than 90% of interviewees want to see BR being used more frequently in the future. This is connected to the demand for books, newspapers, the use of BR in the media and especially also in the classroom, which includes the demand for suitable teaching materials. This confirms the necessity to supply Burgenland Roma with the means and opportunities to support the preservation of their language and therefore also the preservation of their group identity.²⁰

It can be assumed that the positive attitude towards the use of BR and its expansion in formal written functions is more the result of the survey itself rather than a depiction of the general attitude of Burgenland Roma towards their language, which at the time of the survey is barely used and is being threatened with extinction. BR does not have any significant meaning for the majority, yet the survey spreads the attitude of the activists and primary informants towards language among wide circles of the ethnic group and effectively creates positive language awareness.²¹ This does however not change the fundamental result of the survey which is also seen as an implicit feasibility study of the project. In the end it confirms that the implementation of the planned codification results may on the one hand contribute to the preservation of the language and also – which retrospectively is the far more significant – contribute to an increase in the self-esteem and self-confidence among Burgenland Roma through the validation of their ethnic language and thus also of their ethnic culture.

3.2.2 Graphisation

A written form is the prerequisite for the emancipation of dominated languages as its use signifies functionality in public formal domains and is connected to prestige. In the case of an orally transmitted language such as BR, graphisation is hence of utmost importance. The aim is to create useable conventions which are accepted by the majority of the ethnic group. Group-external aspirations, primarily language policy but also scientific interests, are considered to be of less importance. The graphisation process's primary objective is to strike a balance between diverging aspirations of the speakers, linguistic necessities and established international graphisation tendencies.

²⁰ For a detailed documentation of the survey see Halwachs/Ambrosch/Schicker (1996).

²¹ Similar aspects apply to the codification work itself. BR is not only described in its state prior to the project activities, but its changes caused by the codification are also discussed.

The initial stage comprises considerations of adopting scientific conventions of graphisation which use diacritics following the pattern of South Slavic Latin script. Yet the majority of Burgenland Roma rejects them when asked. This is best illustrated by the quote by one colleague from the ethnic community:

"Ein Horvath mag eben keine kroatischen Stricherln." ("Well, a Horvath simply doesn't like Croatian scrawlings.")

During discussions, vague aspirations about the graphisation arise beside the realisation that the adoption of already existing conventions is not constructive. To clarify this, a word list is used to survey 40 persons. The subjects are asked to translate German lexemes into BR with the expected BR lexemes aiming especially at the graphisation of affricatives and plosives. The lists are then read out and recorded and the words are, if possible, checked by comparing them to recordings of texts featuring conversational speech. The examples in the following table show a clear preference for following a German pattern, which is subsequently also implemented:

N°	List 1	List 2	List 3	International	English	Graphisation
1	<i>beng</i>	<i>peng</i>	<i>benk</i>	<i>beng</i>	'devil'	<i>beng</i>
2	<i>dukavav</i>	<i>tukavaf</i>	<i>dugawaw</i>	<i>dukhavav</i>	'I hurt'	<i>dukavav</i>
3	<i>dschaf</i>	<i>tschav</i>	<i>tschaf</i>	<i>džav</i>	'I go'	<i>dschav</i>
4	<i>gotschar</i>	<i>godschar</i>	<i>gocsar</i>	<i>godžaver</i>	'wise'	<i>godschar</i>
5	<i>jack</i>	<i>jag</i>	<i>tschag</i>	<i>jakh</i>	'eye'	<i>jak</i>
6	<i>jag</i>	<i>jack</i>	<i>tjak</i>	<i>jag</i>	'fire'	<i>jag</i>
7	<i>prahlpe</i>	<i>pralipe</i>	<i>prallibe</i>	<i>phralipe</i>	'fraternity'	<i>phralipe</i>
8	<i>tschatscho</i>	<i>tschadscho</i>	<i>csacso</i>	<i>čačo</i>	'true'	<i>tschatscho</i>
9	<i>tschukel</i>	<i>dschugel</i>	<i>gyukel</i>	<i>džukel</i>	'dog'	<i>dschukel</i>
10	<i>tschuwli</i>	<i>tshufli</i>	<i>gyuvli</i>	<i>džuvli</i>	'woman'	<i>dschuvli</i>

The variance within these ten selected examples from three lists of words in relation to the conventions applied in the international scientific context illustrate the issues of graphisation:

- The affricatives /tʃ/ and /dʒ/ in examples 3, 4, 8, 9, 10 are mostly replicated with the graphemes <tsch> and <dsch> following the German standard; in examples 8, 9, 10 in

List 3 also in line with Hungarian <cs> and <gy>. Yet the Hungarian spelling can be neglected. It occurs rarely and if it does, the subjects are usually inconsistent in their graphisation and also apply conventions based on German: see examples 3, 5 in List 3.

- Just like the use of the two affricative graphemes, the written production of voiced and voiceless plosives is rather arbitrary. This is the result of a strong German-dialectal influence on BR phonetics which in turn is connected to the fact that German is the primary language of Burgenland Roma. The contrast in the German standard between fortis or voiceless, aspirated plosives on the one hand and lenis or voiced, unaspirated plosives on the other has been largely neutralised in the German contact varieties of BR and in final sounds of the standard. Aspiration differentiates voiceless plosives from formerly voiced ones in BR too. This prompts the decision to follow international conventions both with regard to the graphisation of affricatives as well as plosives where <č> and <dž> are represented by the graphemes <tsch> and <dsch>; see also columns 4 and 6 in the table above.
- The aspirated, unvoiced plosives, the so-called *tenuis aspiratae* /p^h, t^h, k^h/, are a typical characteristic of Romani which developed from the Old Indian *mediae aspiratae*. As in many other Romani varieties, the medial and final aspiration in BR can no longer be verified. Yet in the initial position, surveys of minimal pairs have demonstrated differences in the intensity of aspiration, such as *perav* : *pherav* 'I fall : I fill'. In German, and consequently also in BR, unvoiced plosives are slightly aspirated in all positions. Due to this difference in intensity, initial aspiration is marked, thereby connecting BR to the graphisations of other varieties through marking a typical Romani characteristic. This phonological characteristic does not occur in other European languages. The participating linguists explain to the BR speakers that this is a unique feature of their ethnic language, a fact which they recognise and subsequently accept.
- With the sibilants /s/ : /z/ and /f/ : /z/ the dichotomy [± voiced] has also been neutralised, which is why they are expressed by <s> and <sch>. The realisation of the grapheme <z>, which would express the voiced fricative and, following the German example, would have been the affricative /ts/ is thus also avoided.²²

²² The realisation of graphemes following a German pattern – German is the language of literacy and the everyday written standard language of Burgenland Roma and thus the dominating model – is a general problem in graphisations which has been largely solved.

- In German the labial fricative /v/ is represented by the graphemes <f>, <v>, <w>. Avoiding <w> in the graphisation of BR explicitly marks the dichotomy between /f/ and /v/.
- Labial fricatives help illustrate another graphisation strategy: the primacy of the morphological criterion over the phonological. Due to the aforementioned neutralisation of plosives and fricatives in the final position, the lexeme for 'village' is realised as /gaf/. Yet as the labial always occurs as /v/ in the case forms, /gaveste/ 'in the village', the lexeme is written as *gav* in the nominative. This approach also corresponds to the strategy of attuning BR's written form to international conventions whenever possible; /gav/ is the general realisation and thus also the graphisation.

This outline of the graphisation of BR gives both an impression of the general issues as well as of the need to find a balance between the speakers' visions, linguistic necessities and international conventions. This appears to have been accomplished to a certain degree. Although the graphisation is criticised on an individual basis to this day, mainly relating to the written form of individual lexemes, the chosen conventions and the majority of written lexemes are acceptable for the predominant majority of speakers.²³

In the end, a simple test is decisive for the acceptance of the graphisation. School children with German as their mother tongue and hardly any competence in BR are given short introductory explanations and then read out short texts in which competent BR speakers recognise their language. The proponents of the codification activities and elder, competent speakers make the final decision based on this practical test. The graphisation is thus also a learning process for the research team. What may appear to be the optimum from a linguistic point of view, i.e. the graphisation following the pattern of South Slavic Latin script in the case at hand, does not always correspond with the prevailing language attitude of the speaker community. Clusters of consonant graphemes such as *fatschuvtscha* 'children' may be regarded as less ideal than *fačuvča* using diacritics, yet they comply with the language attitude of the predominant majority of BR speakers and are thus the appropriate graphisation.²⁴

The process of graphisation as a cooperation between colleagues from the ethnic community, primary informants and the research team under consideration of the prevailing attitude of speakers firmly illustrates the equal status of Roma and linguists during the work process.

²³ For a detailed documentation of the process of graphisation, the chosen strategies and corresponding results see Halwachs (1996).

²⁴ Apart from the examples given in this section, BR in this work is quoted in the today internationally conventional scientific notation using diacritics based on the South Slavic Latin script for reasons of legibility.

The codification of BR thus explicitly becomes the mutual objective of a co-operation on an equal footing.

3.2.3 Text Collection

The collection of texts as an essential prerequisite for codification is a permanent process which had already begun in the preparatory stages with the analysis of the few existing written texts and the recordings from the *Sammlung Heinschink* which span about three hours. Further recordings are carried out over a period of almost five years between autumn 1994 and summer 1999. The text collection is thus expanded to a total of approximately 50 hours. Apart from an additional seven hours which are archived in the *Sammlung Heinschink*²⁵, the majority of the remaining 40 hours of recordings are being made by colleagues from the ethnic community. They have been prepared and trained as part of their collaboration during the codification process on how to conduct non-standardised interviews. The only guideline they are given is to create an atmosphere in which the conversational partners permit audio recordings and to encourage them to narrate fairy tales, stories and historical-biographical events. Yet as the texts' primary use is for linguistic analysis, the content is always subordinate to the process and flow of the conversation. The primary focus is on everyday, spoken BR which could hardly be recorded in direct contact between competent speakers and these unfamiliar linguists, if at all. Competent speakers of BR are usually older speakers who use their language as the aforementioned protection mechanism. The colleagues from the ethnic community are typically personally acquainted with their conversational partners, which forms the basis of trust needed for a heart-to-heart conversation. The assignment of the colleagues from the ethnic community additionally demonstrates not only to themselves but above all also to the ethnic members who do not take part in any of the association's activities that the codification is in fact an enterprise by Burgenland Roma and not merely a scientific investigation. This aspect is time and again conveyed and confirmed throughout the codification process.

More than 50 persons take part in the 70 conversations, which last from several minutes to one and a half hours. Of these 50 people, fewer than 10% are under 30. More than half the interviewees are over 60, with the majority of speakers in their seventies at the time of recording. This is relevant as the speakers of this group were born in the interwar years, a time when

²⁵ Mozes Heinschink uses a private visit to southern Burgenland in December 1994 to support the project by recording an additional nine conversations covering personal histories, fairy tales and stories. These tapes are also archived in the *Phonogrammarchiv der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (Austrian Audicovisual Research Archive of the Academy of Science)*. A selection of them is accessible online: <http://catalog.phonogrammarchiv.at>.

BR functioned as the primary means of communication within the family and in the community's everyday life, hence being their language of socialisation.²⁶ The conversations with these speakers also prove to be the most elaborate and productive. Apart from seven conversations in the *Sammlung Heinschink*, they are conducted by a colleague from the ethnic community of the postwar generation who is competent in the language and who is familiar to the interviewees. This constellation facilitates the conversations and ensures their quality, making it the core of the text collection with regard to the linguistic analysis. This foundation is complemented by conversations with speakers from the postwar period in whose childhood BR had still partly been equal to German. Although the use of BR within this age group has decreased over the course of time, those Roma who stayed in Burgenland are usually still actively competent in BR.²⁷ The interviewees of this generation thus also make an essential contribution to the codification. Towards the end of the recording period, another two hours of read-out text are recorded. Once the colleagues from the ethnic community are fairly confident with the conventions of graphisation, some of them commence putting down stories and fairy tales in writing. The latter are often reproductions of common German folk tales.²⁸

The linguists' recording initially focuses on the documentation of lists of words and sentences whose genesis and function are elaborated on in the following section. These lists are also consulted during the weekly meetings of colleagues from the ethnic community and linguists in the association's clubhouse, thereby serving as field research notes for better comprehensibility and also to check the results yielded in this context. The working language in these meetings is German. The linguists start recording conversations after the establishment of contact with members of the ethnic group who are not directly involved in the codification process. The predominant majority of these recordings are, however, completed after the period relevant for codification. These texts expand the collection beyond the 50 hours of recordings described here, yet they do not play any role in the text analysis during the codification process. They contribute to the lexical collection of BR, which is being documented to this day. The same applies to the additional text production by

²⁶ This age group constitutes the generation of survivors of the genocide in the concentration camps. Their biographical stories are therefore documents of *oral history*. Moreover, they are essential resources of the oral tradition, of fairy tales and stories which no longer played a role in everyday life of Burgenland Roma at the time the codification took place. Yet these stories are essential for the development of a positive, ethno-cultural awareness.

²⁷ Conversations with speakers of this generation in greater Vienna occur in German and are consequently not part of the text collection.

²⁸ These texts and the corresponding recordings document the literate use of BR for the first time. Note also the script for the film *Amen sam so amen sam – We are what we are* produced in 1995.

colleagues from the ethnic community. 50 hours of recordings for the codification of a linguistic variety may at first glance appear rather sparse, yet when considering the sociolinguistic situation of BR – limited functionality, few competent speakers, using intra-group language as protection against outsiders, etc. – 70 recordings are a rather large number. They are in any case sufficient for documenting both the core lexicon and the fundamental structures of BR and to ensure the necessary verification of conversational speech of other analysis results. These are based on the aforementioned surveys of the lists of words and sentences, which can also be considered part of the extended text collection.

3.2.4 Analysis

The beginning of the analysis is, just like the text collection, marked by the few materials existing before the beginning of the project. They allow for BR to be put into relation with other Romani varieties, thereby facilitating *inter alia* the development of initial interview strategies at the beginning of the work process. It commences with questions regarding information about base lexemes such as personal pronouns, idiomatic expressions such as salutations, which are embedded in rather trivial conversations about general topics regarding BR. This informal meta-discourse enables linguists to also verify the results gained from the initial analysis of written resources. Yet far more important is that the frame conditions for the future working sessions with the colleagues from the ethnic community are developed in these conversations. Despite the preparation of lists, questions or texts as a frame for each meeting, they do not follow any predefined models or strategies, but are conducted in a spontaneous manner appropriate to the situation. The results of these meetings which are expected due to this general framework are, however, only one possible outcome which is subordinate to the respective process and the dynamics of the conversation. Any result relating to BR is desired, even if it has not considered the prepared materials. Working sessions are therefore open to all kinds of findings and in the end yield the results necessary for the codification precisely because of this strategy.

The analysis is also conducted following the three stages outlined above in the section relating to text collection: Linguists initially collaborate with the colleagues from the ethnic community who then work with other competent BR speakers. Finally the linguists also work with other speakers. The interview situation can be divided into three areas or three processes relating to content which run in parallel:

- Lexical elicitation
- Grammatical elicitation
- Combined elicitation and text analysis

3.2.4.1. Lexical elicitation

During the lexical analysis, introductory informal word surveys, which primarily serve as verification of existing resources and to give an impression of the metalinguistic abilities of the colleagues from the ethnic community, are followed by elicitations using prepared word lists. The structured surveys initially focus on pre-European vocabulary, i. e. lexemes of Indo-Aryan, Iranian, Armenian and Byzantine-Greek origin.²⁹ More than half of these approximately 1,000 lexemes exist in BR, as in many other Romani varieties. BR consequently also possesses the usual homogeneity of Romani in its basic vocabulary. Swadesh's (1971: 283) word list contains 100 basic lexemes, 92 of which are of pre-European origin: Two are each from Iranian, Armenian and Greek, while the predominant majority of 86 lexemes are of Indian origin. The remaining eight lexemes originated in European languages: three in Slavic³⁰, four in Hungarian and one in German. This list also shows the lexical strata and hence BR's contact languages. The pre-European and some of the Slavic borrowings are general characteristics of Romani; those from Hungarian and German are specific to the variety. They typify BR as a South-Central variety of the former greater Hungary whose western border had been linguistically characterised by German for centuries and which is now dominated by German due to it being Austrian territory.

The lexical elicitation focuses on completing the word fields in basic domains such as terms for colours, family relations, etc., based on the results of the initial word list surveys, including those mentioned as part of the graphisation above. The lexemes elicited in this phase are primarily from European contact languages.³¹ This had been expected, as in an asymmetrical contact situation any lexeme of the dominant language is a potential lexeme in

²⁹ The resource for this is the "inherited vocabulary" of Romani as summarised by Boretzky (1992).

³⁰ In this context, Slavic includes South Slavic varieties. The vocabulary of this stratum of BR consists of lexemes which occur in several of these languages. Specific borrowings from Burgenland Croatian can only be found in those BR varieties whose speakers are in close contact with Croatian speaker communities. An example of this is the so-called "Liebinger dialect", which was documented by Knobloch (1953). Such local varieties of BR are, however, rarely in use when the codification is carried out and hence irrelevant.

³¹ The relationship between pre-European and European lexemes roughly corresponds with that of Selice Romani which was documented in the *World Loanword Database* (WOLD) by Elšik (2009).

the dominated language.³² It is hence only logical that a large number of lexemes surveyed in German are expressed through German borrowings.

Remembering the language use of "the elderly" results in alternative designations from Slavic and Hungarian or, as already shown in the example quoted in footnote 13 *phiko: šulteri* 'Schulter' ('shoulder'), in a pre-European lexeme. Multiple names occur rather frequently. Hungarian-based *somsido* for 'Nachbar' ('neighbour') is for instance mentioned in one of the texts recorded by Knobloch (1953: 37). The lexical elicitation however reveals *noxberi*, which has its origin in German and which exists beside the substantivised adjective *pašutno*, which is derived from the local adverb *paše* 'nahe' ('close') and which is probably also formed following the German pattern: German *nahe*, *benachbart*, *der Benachbarte*, *der Nachbar* (*close*, *neighbouring*, *the neighbouring*, *the neighbour*). At the time of the survey, the majority of BR speakers identify *noxberi* as the primary lexeme while *pašutno* is still acceptable and *somsido* proves unfamiliar to most.

BR used in conversational speech contains a large number of lexemes integrated from German. They often occur in the bilingual mode in the shape of spontaneous borrowings which is *inter alia* connected to the rare use of the language. When specifically asked during the survey, speakers however prefer lexemes which did not originate in German. If a non-German lexeme for an everyday term is missing, then the colleagues from the ethnic community try to obtain the missing information from older speakers. The non-transparent origin of Hungarian- or Slavic-based lexemes and their "foreignness" probably make them more acceptable in BR as opposed to the German borrowings. In the metalinguistic discourse during the survey, informants for instance prefer *betovtscha* – plural of *beto* < hun. *betű* 'letter' – meaning 'alphabet' over the also possible *alfabeto*, which often occurs as a spontaneous borrowing from German. The lexical elicitation can thus also be characterised as a process between the reality of spontaneous borrowings from German and the claim for independence through lexical differentiation from this dominating language.³³ In some cases, multiple terms

³² Here BR is part of an areal contact scenario between German, Slavic and Hungarian, which can be illustrated by the lexeme *kirali* 'king': *kirali* < hun *király* < sla *kralj* < ger *Karl* = Karl der Große (Charlemagne).

³³ Dictionaries of Romani varieties are initially used by the colleagues from the ethnic community in order to obtain non-German lexemes. They have entered the association through contact with other Roma groups. This is by the way one of the aforementioned cases of overcompliance by the colleagues from the ethnic community at the beginning of the collaboration. Yet as these dictionaries document strongly varying varieties, this problem can be resolved rather easily.

In some few cases this contact with other Roma groups and Romani varieties results in interdialectal borrowings. In today's written texts the term *kris* 'court', which was unknown during the period of codification but which is generally used in Romani, now replaces the synonymous *grixt* < ger 'Gericht' ('court') used

which developed through the integration of European lexemes into BR, change the range of meaning of pre-European lexemes. In general language use, for instance *drom* 'path', 'road', 'journey', which originated in Greek, is reduced to the meaning of 'path' through the integration of *uca* < hun *utca* 'street' and the synonymous *poštita* and through the adoption of *roas* < ger dialect /roas/ 'Reise' ('journey').³⁴ The original range of meaning is preserved in the combinatory use of *drom* in noun phrases, which corresponds to German compounds: *dromeskero bučaši* 'road worker'. BR's lexical semantics is equally affected by the German dialectal idiomology: Parallel to German, 'to make music' for instance is expressed by *khelel* 'to play'. The verb *bašel*, which is generally used in Romani for this, only has retained the meaning of 'to bark'. The case of *bijanel*, whose original meaning was 'to bring forth life, to give birth, etc.' is similar: Through replication of the German idiom 'auf die Welt kommen' ('to come into the world'), *upro them avel*, it was reduced to 'to lay eggs'. The lexical elicitation, however, does not only make BR's vocabulary accessible, but also gives an indication of its phonetics, such as for instance the lengthening, often also diphthongisation, of stressed vowels – *kher* [k^heir] 'house' – or the loss of alveolar nasals in intervocal positions under nasalisation of the resulting diphthong – *paj* [pãi] < *pani* 'water'.

The results of the word list survey, which is carried out in the discourse context of the cooperation with the colleagues from the ethnic community, are the first documentation of the lexical diversity of BR, examples of which have been given above. The elicitation regarding the basic domains results in approximately 2,000 lexemes. The lexicon is further expanded within the text analysis, increasing the number of entries to more than 5,500 by the end of the codification process.³⁵

3.2.4.2 Grammatical elicitation

Embedding the lexemes surveyed in sentences in order to determine their range of meaning and functionality as well as further checks regarding forms of plurals and inflections during

in conversational speech. The only difference is in the gender: generally feminine, yet masculine in BR, which corresponds with the integration of neuter nouns such as ger *das Gericht* ('the court').

³⁴ The wider range of meaning of pre-European lexemes is due to the orality of Romani. The specific meaning of multifunctional lexemes in oral languages is inferred by the participants during conversation due to contextual disambiguation. It is only when contact with standardised, written languages is established and as the written use of Romani begins that a clearer lexical differentiation with precise semantics is required. Due to the lacking situational disambiguation of context, terms with a more limited range of meaning and more precise semantics guarantee comprehensibility.

³⁵ The results of the lexical elicitation are summarised in Halwachs/Ambrosch (1999) and have by now been integrated into Romlex, a multilingual and multidialectal documentation of the Romani lexicon which is accessible online at <http://romani.uni-graz.at/romlex/>.

the working sessions has linked the lexical analysis with the grammatical from the beginning. The grammatical analysis also runs discursively within the working sessions, yet unlike during the lexical elicitation, prepared sentence lists are only used sporadically. The aim is to verify and entrench BR's basic structures – the morphology of inflection, derivation and integration – as well as syntactical structures – as a whole. The phonology of BR is effectively a side-product of the graphisation and has already been roughly documented by the time the most intense stage of the grammatical elicitation occurs. It is only verified and complemented during the structural analysis.

The first step consists of the morphosyntactical results from the lexical elicitation and from the analysis of existing texts being put into relation to the varied descriptions about the general structure of Romani. The aim is to develop preliminary inflection paradigms, which are rather patchy. They are subsequently discussed and completed during the working sessions. Three strategies are employed at this stage:

- Structural questions
- Translations of phrases
- Surveying passive competence

Structural questions are part of the metalinguistic discourse within the working sessions and concern direct questions about grammatical categories, about the declension of nouns – gender, number, case – and the conjugation of verbs – person, number, tense, mood, aspect. The questions are of course phrased in a way that is comprehensible for and clear to the colleagues from the ethnic community.³⁶

The translations of phrases refer to the request made to the colleagues from the ethnic community to translate spontaneously formed syntagmata or short phrases from German into BR. This is on the one hand to verify the results of the metalinguistic discourse, and on the other to survey complex facts which cannot be phrased clearly on the level of conversational, everyday speech.

Two strategies are applied when surveying passive competence: one direct and the other indirect. The direct survey of passive competence consists of the linguists forming grammati-

³⁶ This is one of the aspects of the aforementioned advice of "acting like a human" and deferring linguistic knowledge while cooperating with the Burgenland Roma. Phrasing linguistic content so that it is intelligible to all is incidentally a permanent challenge of the codification process – not only within the structural survey but especially with regard to the questions on behalf of the colleagues from the ethnic community concerning the background of survey situations and the structures of BR. This shows the research team *inter alia* that complex linguistic connections are only understood if one can also describe them using everyday speech.

cal structures and paradigms as well as phrases and sentences in BR. The colleagues from the ethnic community confirm or correct these, with the latter often resulting in discussions and thus in outcomes which exceed those expected. The indirect survey of passive competence sees the linguists act as language students using BR in everyday conversation with the colleagues from the ethnic community while trying to use relevant phrasal structures. Some of them are partially formed in conversational speech, others are prepared and applied at appropriate occasions. In such situations the colleagues from the ethnic community, being the competent speakers, take on the role of language teachers and correct the linguists' BR. This also sometimes results in structural questions and phrasal translations which implies that the three types of strategies are not applied independently of each other, but rather combined as appropriate.

The elicitation process itself runs less linearly and more cyclically. Questions arising in the working sessions are discussed between the colleagues from the ethnic community and the linguists. The results are reflected upon and documented by the linguists and taken up again in a more refined manner in the subsequent workshops of the research team. As this process is repeated several times, results are reached through a cyclical process of questions, reflexion, documentation and refinement which is facilitated through regular, weekly meetings between colleagues from the ethnic community and the linguists of the research team.

The grammatical analysis results in an initial, comprehensive structural description of BR. Its inflectional morphology displays the differentiation customary in Romani regarding pre-European and European lexical strata. The verbs of existing contact languages are for instance indicated with an integration marker, as opposed to the pre-European ones: *pis-in-el* < sla *pisati* 'he/she writes' as opposed to *ker-el* < inc *karoti* 'he/she makes/does'. Another such example are masculine nouns. Those from European languages are often integrated with the ending *-i* in the nominative singular such as for instance *gajeri* < ger 'Geier' ('vulture') with the plural ending in *-ča* and *-is-* in the oblique case singular: *gajer-ča* or *gajer-is-ke* 'dem Geier' (dative). The same plural and oblique suffixes also occur in masculine nouns that do not end in vowels, such as *traktor* < ger *Traktor*, *traktor-ča*, *traktor-is-ke*. Masculines integrated with *-o* such as *bokl-o* < hun *ablak* 'window' feature *-i* in the plural and *-os-* in the oblique case: *bokl-i* and *bokl-os-ke*. However, pre-European masculine nouns ending in *-o* or consonants feature an *-e* or *-a* in the plural and *-es-* in the oblique case singular: *bakr-o* < inc *barkara* 'sheep', *bakr-e*, *bakr-es-ke* or *manuš* < inc *mānuša* 'man', *manuš-a*, *manuš-es-ke*. These suf-

fixes of European lexemes are part of BR's productive integration morphology which allows any lexeme from a dominant language to become a lexeme of BR.

Of Romani's eight cases, the synthetic vocative is replaced by the nominative in BR just like in German. The locative has only survived in fossilised forms such as *for-os-te* 'in (the) town'. Rather than case forms, they act as locative adverbs. Locatives are formed analytically through prepositions followed by nominatives. An example of such a prepositional case is the also common *ando foro* 'in (the) town'. Such competing forms occur especially in the ablative: *for-os-tar*, *andar o foro* 'from (the) town'. Using the synthetic case through analytical formation is induced by contact and sometimes also applies to dative functions such as *fir o raj* as opposed to *le raj-es-ke* 'for the master', yet not to the instrumental and sociative cases: *-a-ha* 'with the knife', *kečk-a-ha* 'with the goat'. As demonstrated by the individual case forms, BR retains the two-level case system of Romani, as do all other varieties.³⁷

The verb system displays the aspectual basic dichotomy [\pm perfective] typical of Romani, or rather the differentiation between the non-perfective present stem: *ker-av* 'I do/make' and the perfective stem: *ker-č-om* 'I did/made'. Formally the latter is the present stem extended by a formative or a perfective marker.³⁸ The tense is encoded by suffixation of the morpheme *-ahi*: *ker-ahi* < **ker-av-ahi* and *ker-č-om-ahi*. While the differentiation between the perfective preterite *ker-č-om* and the non-perfective *ker-ahi* is retained in texts containing conversational speech by competent speakers – *Idž džalahi uso mojakero taj diklom ada džukel*. 'Yesterday he went to the inn and saw this dog.' – it often correlates with the distinction between perfect and imperfect tense in standard German in existing translations. The German sentence *Er ist in die Schule gegangen und lernte viel*. ('He went to school and learned a lot.') is for instance translated into BR as *Andi iškola gejom taj but siklolahi*. The German perfect tense corresponds to BR's perfective and the German imperfect tense to the non-perfective preterite. This process is an example of language change induced by contact as a consequence of BR's expansion into formal, written functions which occurred following standard German patterns. At this point the infrequent language use of the usually rather young translators must probably also be taken into account.

³⁷ This agglutinating trait of the generally synthetically inflected Romani is an Indo-Aryan characteristic: In addition to the three primary cases (nominative, oblique and vocative), five secondary cases (ablative, dative, genitive, instrumental/sociative and locative) are formed through secondary suffixation of the oblique. Depending on the entities' discourse prominence, the nominative or oblique function as accusative. For further details see Matras (2002: 85).

³⁸ For information about the general morphology of Romani verbs see Matras (2002: 117ff.). This is the most comprehensive structural description and consequently the grammatical reference both for the fundamental structures of Romani as well as its variety-specific characteristics.

The morphological homogeneity in the noun and verb system exists despite language change. The same applies to syntax. Both phrasal and sentence syntax largely conform to the structures described by Matras (2002: 165ff.). Yet contact-induced change in BR is also observed in this area. Due to the influence of Hungarian – word order in Hungarian is rather variable with a tendency towards verbs in the final position – the verb in declarative sentences in BR is often found in the final position: *I mačka kermusen astarel*. 'The cat mice catches.' Generally, Romani displays a SVO sentence structure in neutral declarative sentences which is also the case in pronominal objects in BR: *Ov garul len*. 'He is looking for them.' The contact-induced Hungarian SOV structure of nominal objects is, however, increasingly being replaced by the SVO structure in written use due to the growing influence of German: *O biro phučel le Rome, so oda phekal*. 'The mayor asks the Rom what he needs.'³⁹

3.2.4.3 Text analysis

Grammatical structures such as those outlined above are verified by texts containing conversational speech, but are partly also only discovered and included during the analysis. Text analysis begins with the transcription of conversations which is initially performed by the colleagues from the ethnic community. The transcriptions are discussed with the linguists during the working sessions. The linguists subsequently standardise the transcriptions according to conventions of graphisation and notation and analyse them both on a lexical as well as on a grammatical level. The results are again discussed and refined as part of the aforementioned cyclic elicitation process until a consensus is finally reached. The transcriptions by the colleagues from the ethnic community and their help in analysing the transcripts again constitute a learning process for the linguists in the research team. This also increases their metalinguistic and language competence in BR, eventually enabling them to carry out transcriptions and analyses independently.

Text analysis is a central aspect of the grammatical description in the codification process. The results of surveys and discursive working sessions contribute substantially to the results, yet are sometimes challenging as German is the source language of word lists, requests for translations, etc. as well as the means of communication in the joint working sessions of colleagues from the ethnic community and linguists. While translating phrases, sentences, etc., the speakers of BR are in a bilingual mode with an increased dominance of German due to the

³⁹ From this perspective, BR changed syntactically typologically from the original Indo-Aryan SOV order to SVO under Greek influence, then to SOV under Hungarian influence and finally due to German's linguistic dominance back to SVO.

communicative framework conditions imposed by the cooperation. This does not affect the lexical aspect of the elicitation – in this regard the colleagues from the ethnic community make a great effort to find lexemes that are not of German origin – as much as the grammatical aspect. For instance the functional differences between the perfective and imperfective preterite forms, for example between *kerčas* und *kerehahi* 'you did/made', cannot be resolved during the survey process. The answers given by the colleagues from the ethnic community are either neutral in that both forms could be used to express the past, or the functionality of the two forms is explained in parallel to the German differentiation between perfect and imperfect. Yet the analysis of texts containing conversational speech by older speakers of BR demonstrates the aspectual differences between processes or conditions in the past whose completeness is irrelevant from the speaker's perspective, and perfective, infrequent events which are completed in the past. However, the verification of grammatical structures based purely on texts containing conversational speech is sometimes challenging. In the entire text corpus of approximately 50 hours, there are merely two examples of the perfective preterite which acts as pluperfect in most Romani varieties, such as *ker-č-om-ahi*. The paradigm reconstructed based on these examples is confirmed by a survey of passive competence and the translation of phrases, as is their functionality. Both forms of conversational speech do not act as pluperfect but as perfect subjunctive and/or irrealis: *ker-č-om-ahi* 'I would have done/made'. Surveys confirm that this is the only function used in BR.

This last example shows that often only a combination of text evaluation and analysis through structural questions, translation of phrases and the survey of passive competence leads to useful results. In general, results from the text analysis are superordinate to mere survey results in the grammatical elicitation. Data collected from discursive survey situations or from survey lists must in any case be verified by using texts containing conversational speech in order to not only describe potential structures but also their functionality in general language use.

3.2.5 Methods and principles

The codification of BR does not follow any methodological guidelines or models. The only requirement is to collect sufficient materials, texts and relevant information to be able to describe BR and to ensure a straightforward implementation of the results in formal domains, primarily in education and the media. The appropriate method of each open task is inherent depending on the respective situation. Both intuitive metalinguistic knowledge of the partici-

pating colleagues from the ethnic community and their competence as BR speakers, as well as the participating linguists' intuitive knowledge of linguistic structures in general and of Romani in particular paired with their field research experience are an integral part of the codification process. The sum of the intuitive knowledge among the members of the research team is applied accordingly during each work process in order to reach the respective objective.

The strategies outlined above are part of this process-inherent methodology. Surveys of word lists, structural questions, surveys of passive competence, text analysis, etc. as a given in language surveys are often tied into set methodological and content-related rubrics. They thus often only result in what is expected as a self-fulfilling prophecy. Yet this is not the only argument for an approach open to all results during the codification process. Imponderabilities in the cooperation with the colleagues from the ethnic community such as changing involvement and fluctuating commitment also contribute, as does the low language use within the ethnic group. It is thus for instance often not predictable whether structures are to be elicited with the help of the colleagues from the ethnic community in the working sessions, or whether further field research or conversations with older, competent speakers are necessary. Consequently the respective methodology is chosen intuitively and according to the situation because, as mentioned above, any result delivering useful information regarding the survey of Romani is desirable.

This intuitive, open-minded approach in the codification of BR is based on three principles:

- Flexibility
- Participation
- Practicability

The priority of flexibility and spontaneity in the codification process over a schematised approach which follows a checklist has already been discussed above. Spontaneity appropriate to the situation, as opposed to detailed, predefined guidelines, yields results useful for the codification in almost any situation.

Participation concerns the cooperation of the BR speakers in the codification process as equal partners on the one hand, and the participation of the linguists of the research team in the association's activities and process of self-organisation on the other. The latter aspect sometimes also takes priority over working towards results within the codification process.⁴⁰

⁴⁰ Following the murder of four Roma in February 1995 in Oberwart and the subsequent media frenzy and political implications, the working sessions are rededicated in support of general logistical and content-related

The linguists' participation in the activities of the ethnic group is only limited to time spent in the association's clubhouse before and after the working sessions and attendance at special occasions. The linguists hardly take part in everyday life and their participation can thus only partly be referred to as participant observation.

Practicability in the work process, accepting the feasible as opposed to the planned while neglecting the prepared in favour of what is currently possible is tightly connected to flexibility. Yet the principle of practicability also concerns the implementation of the codification results which already commences during the elicitation and which to a certain extent is also built on consensus. Only an approach which guarantees results that can be implemented in practice leads to the desired outcome, the use of BR in formal contexts and appropriate measures for potential language preservation.

3.3 Results

The primary result and basis of all other codification products is a written variety of BR with a descriptive grammar and recorded vocabulary.

The first product is an ABC spelling book (Halwachs/Horvath/Ambrosch/Sarközi 1995), which primarily presents the graphisation.⁴¹ In accordance with the wishes of the representatives of the Burgenland Roma, it is designed traditionally: a linear sequence of the individual letters and combinations with word lists, short sentences and illustrations of lexemes of the basic vocabulary, especially persons, animals and everyday commodities. In its role as the first BR book, the spelling book has more symbolic character than practical use.

The indirect imparting of graphisation through computer games is far more effective compared to the spelling book. Solving the tasks given in simple games requires lexical knowledge and awareness of orthography of individual lexemes of BR, some of which are provided acoustically. In addition to visitors of the association who are also given the ABC spelling book, the games are often played by children and adolescents who benefit from the association's learning support programme. As these children often only have low competence in BR or none at all, these games also contribute to language instruction. Yet the far more important issue is the increase in language prestige. In the 1990s language computer games are rare and the use of a marginalised and stigmatised minority language such as BR in this con-

support of the association – the codification work temporarily becomes secondary. Apart from this period, the cooperation is always focussed on the codification but does not exclude other activities. Working sessions are not only targeted at results, but also serve socialisation and support of the association's projects.

⁴¹ The ABC spelling book is freely distributed among member of the ethnic group, as were the following publications.

text is, at least in rural Austria, extraordinary. The resulting transfer of technology prestige to language prestige contributes to the increased interest in BR, especially among children and adolescents.

The lexical documentation of BR (Halwachs/Ambrosch 1999) has been covered as extensively as the grammatical description. It follows, *inter alia* particularly with regard to its practicability in teaching materials, established guidelines and comprises the three areas of phonology, morphology and syntax with the discussion of morphology being subdivided into nouns, verbs and particles. Practical and tested models are given priority over linguistically challenging ones or the use of a single theoretical descriptive model. The fundamental principles of the structural documentation of BR, which was first comprehensively presented in Halwachs/Wogg (2002a, 2002b), are practicability and straightforward feasibility.

3.3.1 Language Teaching

First versions of a dictionary, grammar book, glossaries and structural partial descriptions for internal use are available early on and form the basis for the development of teaching materials. From the beginning the focus is on an illustrated textbook (Halwachs/Martens/ Gläser 1998a) including detailed annotations. The textbook is to take the form of a comic for which the future primary target group, represented by the pupils benefitting from the association's learning support, choose the characters featured in the comic. They select a pair of fantasy characters, hybrids between animals and aliens, a kind of two-legged giraffe in blue trousers and jacket with yellow stars. In the first unit of the book, these two fall from the sky in a box, are delivered to the school by the postal service and from thereon attend school together with the children. The framework and form of the textbook are important as they, as decided by the primary target group, are diametrically opposed to the ethno-folkloristic character often found in teaching materials in the European minority context. The content of the book comprises everyday school life, as well as short stories which serve as a vehicle to teach fundamental communicative skills. The imparting of ethnic tradition commonly found in textbooks of this kind is left out of consideration.⁴² The actual teaching material comprises a detailed commentary for teachers (Halwachs/Martens/Gläser 1998b). In addition to texts and their translations which are part of each unit, the textbook also contains a comprehensive description of the featured lexis and idiomology as well as their underlying grammatical forms and the communica-

⁴² The traditionalistic direction of teaching materials is usually decided upon by older representatives of the respective minority, often ignoring the presentation which would be appropriate for the target audience in favour of ethno-folkloristic conveyance of traditions.

tive acts. The commentary moreover contains instructions and suggestions on how to entrench the content of each unit through games, as well as philosophical annotations aimed at the children to discursively intensify the content of each unit. For instance the arrival of the two alien characters in the textbook is used as the basis for a discussion about 'being alien and different' and about 'similarities and differences'. The key is to treat the topics from the children's perspective, a skill which the participating contributors are specifically trained for.

Teacher training is carried out in parallel to the codification and development of teaching materials. The colleagues from the ethnic community who are interested in this part of the process develop the materials in close co-operation with the linguists and thus gain the skills to also apply them appropriately. The extracurricular language courses are held from autumn 1997 and are taught by a team of colleagues from the ethnic community and linguists. In addition to sporadic courses which primarily convey the written form of BR, the language courses are aimed at the children and adolescents in the association's surroundings. The experiences gained during the extracurricular courses form the basis for the teaching of BR as a voluntary subject at the primary schools in Oberwart/Felsőőr/Erba and in neighbouring Unterwart/Alsőőr/Telutni Erba. BR is subsequently also offered at the Hauptschule Oberwart. To participate in the classes offered as a weekly two-hour course after the morning's lessons, the children have to be signed up by their parents. The multilingual secondary school in Oberwart, which offers German, Croatian and Hungarian as languages of instruction, also offers BR classes, as does the University of Graz. Curricula and appropriate teaching materials are developed for primary schools as well as secondary schools and for university level education. Due to fluctuating demand which goes hand in hand with the participants' commitment and barely existing framework conditions – the educational authorities are, apart from verbal support, relatively passive regarding the use of BR in schools – there is no continuity of teaching at schools. Extracurricular classes are, however, demand-oriented and offered continuously.

3.3.2 Language use in public

The use of BR in public domains commences long before the teaching of BR. Initially limited to only a few occurrences of oral use – *inter alia* in the religious context using intercessions translated into BR during a Catholic mass held by a bishop⁴³ – the symbolic, formal use in-

⁴³ The Catholic church of Burgenland has supported the self-organisation of Burgenland Roma from the beginning, as demonstrated by the appointment of a Roma pastor and assistant as well as other measures over the years.

creases with the graphisation. In addition to bilingual, written invitations to events and oral welcomes in BR, further sacral texts, mostly prayers, are translated and used during services dedicated to the Roma. As those colleagues from the ethnic community familiar with the conventions of graphisation begin to write down stories from their memory, the production of functional texts within the context of the association increases and the symbolic use of BR at public events becomes standard. The next step is the publishing of print media:

- *Mri Tikni Mini Multi* 'My Little Mini Multi', a monolingual children's magazine published six times per year since 1998;
- *Romani Patrin* 'Roma Gazette', published since 1998, initially quarterly and now only twice per year;
- d|ROM|a – the name is a blending of *Roma* and *droma* 'paths' – a magazine which by now has taken the place of *Romani Patrin* as a quarterly publication.⁴⁴

With the introduction of private radio broadcasters in Austria, BR is for the first time also used within *Radio Mora* in 1999. After the failure of this initiative by the ethnic Croatian group of Burgenland due to financial problems⁴⁵, the federal broadcasting station ORF takes on the commitment of producing programmes in Romani.⁴⁶ To this day the overwhelming majority of speakers and producers of these programmes, in which BR is almost the only Romani variety spoken in Austria that is used in bilingual radio and television programmes, primarily consists of colleagues from the ethnic community of the Roman project.

The text publications produced towards the end of the codification process, which are repeatedly presented in readings and other cultural events, are also part of the public language use of project results. They are edited fairy tales and stories from the text collection. An illustrated storybook containing fairy tales in BR (Ambrosch/Gärtner-Horvath/Halwachs/Wogg 2000)⁴⁷ is followed by a bilingual annotated text volume (Halwachs/ Gärtner-Horvath/Wogg 2000) including audio recordings (Fennesz-Juhász/Wogg/Wallaszkovits 2002)⁴⁸. The fairy

⁴⁴ *Mri Tikni Mini Multi* and d|ROM|a are available online at <http://www.roma-service.at/>, *Romani Patrin* at <http://www.verein-roma.at/>.

⁴⁵ In addition to other problems, the funding of radio programmes through the *Volksgruppenförderung* of the Austrian Federal Chancellery is not always used specifically for radio initiatives taken over by private carriers due to market regulations.

⁴⁶ They are produced at *Landesstudio Burgenland* and within the framework of *Radio Kaktus* and are also available online at <http://volksgruppen.orf.at/roma/>.

⁴⁷ A digital version of the storybook as well as the ABC spelling book and the textbook are available at <http://romaniprojekt.uni-graz.at/>.

⁴⁸ These publications, as well as the entire Roman project, are funded by the *Volksgruppenförderung* of the Austrian Federal Chancellery. Subsidies from the EU, the Austrian Federal Ministry for Education, the Arts

tales of the monolingual publication form also part of the bilingual one. These text anthologies not only form the end of the codification process, but also document the Burgenland Roma's oral culture for the first time. Especially the fairy tales and songs, of which only 19 and seven respectively are able to be recorded,⁴⁹ are the last remains of a once rich tradition which due to the social developments in the second half of the 20th century has been lost. The transmission and use of the language has continuously decreased, primarily because of the self-imposed forced assimilation as a reaction to the persistent discrimination after the Nazi genocide which destroyed the Burgenland Roma's social structure and also due to the general social change which *inter alia* puts an end to extended families living together. The generally increased exposure to the media also contributes to the decline of the oral culture. The collected fairy tales and songs are therefore its last relics which are sometimes being reconstructed and edited as part of what is effectively detailed language archaeology. The text publications mark the end of the codification process.

4 Consequences and Follow-ups

The intense stage of the codification process and six years of close cooperation between BR speakers and linguists are followed by a period of consolidation. In addition to the continuous expansion of the text collection, the work focuses on establishing teaching activities and the use of BR in the media. The focus is on the transfer of responsibility for on-going activities and the initiative of future projects from the university members of the research team to the colleagues from the ethnic community who have been involved in the process.⁵⁰ This objective is helped by the restructuring of the Burgenland Roma's self-organisation which occurs simultaneously. Primarily because of the increase in commitment, the responsible organisation of the Burgenland Roma, the association *Verein Roma* in Oberwart, is beginning to show considerable signs of wear after more than ten years of service. One of the consequences of

and Culture and the Province of Burgenland as well as the generosity of committed private individuals also contribute to the funding of the Roman project.

⁴⁹ After the intense stage of codification, contacts with other speakers resulted in the addition of several fairy tales, stories and songs. However, this does not slow the disappearance of the oral tradition.

⁵⁰ Activities in the context of minority languages, which are in the long run only performed and determined by researchers, can hardly be considered sustainable. They usually only satisfy academic vanity rather than represent the concerns of those affected. If the results of the documentation of a minority language are not actively used and further developed by the speaker community, then further activities should not be determined by outsiders either. Science does its duty by documenting a language or a language variety as part of mankind's cultural evolution. The use of the results and the future use of the minority language is however always up to the speaker community – the majority is obliged to create and ensure the framework conditions to make this possible. Yet their definition and the demand for them is again the duty of socio-politically relevant research.

the shift of responsibilities is the establishment of the association *Roma-Service*. Its main focus is on language-based cultural work with language teaching and the public use of BR as its primary objectives. The association is sustained by young Burgenland Roma and former researchers from the codification team. They cooperate according to their qualifications as equal members under the leadership of a member of the ethnic group and work towards the realisation of the association's goals.⁵¹ The basis of the cooperation is the results of the codification. The consequences are extralinguistic and sociolinguistic as well as intralinguistic and structural changes which result in changes in the function, status and language itself.

Functional change, which commenced long before the codification process, manifests itself in changes to the collective linguistic repertoire of Burgenland Roma:

Domain	1920s	1960s	2000s	Description
public	GERMAN Croatian/Hungarian	GERMAN	GERMAN	Varieties of public-formal domains used in administration, politics, in the media, education, religious practice, etc.
everyday	GERMAN Croatian/Hungarian Romani	GERMAN Croatian/Hungarian Romani	GERMAN	Varieties of the social macrocosm used in everyday life with acquaintances, in the workplace, during leisure time, etc. and with strangers when shopping etc.
private	German Croatian/Hungarian ROMANI	GERMAN Croatian/Hungarian Romani	GERMAN Romani	Varieties of the social microcosm used in private with the partner, within the family, among friends, etc.

The capital letters in this list emphasise the dominance of the respective language, the font size symbolises its frequency of use. "1920s" stands for the interwar years and the situation prior to the Holocaust. The "1960s" are a transitional phase in which BR at least still functions as an additional language in informal domains.

Triggered by the genocide and enforced by the social developments in the second half of the 20th century, a significant decrease in both multilingualism and use of BR is noticeable. This process, which is described in Chapter 2 as the shift from BR and other minority languages of Burgenland to German in everyday and private domains, results *de facto* in collec-

⁵¹ For relevant activities and results see <http://www.roma-service.at/>.

tive monolingualism. Depending on the speaker's age, family affiliation, interests, etc., individual competence in BR is not excluded, yet the general means of communication, the preferred language or default language of Burgenland Roma across all domains is German. BR is, if at all, only used in few, usually private situations, among older members of the ethnic groups and sometimes also in conversations between the older members and those of other age groups.⁵² Other situations in which BR is used are found at get-togethers at special occasions such as festivities or funerals. The example given in Chapter 2 of such a specifically situational use of language is recorded during a funeral in 2002. On the other hand, BR is not observed at the funeral of a well-known member of the ethnic group in 2012, neither in communicative, nor in a symbolic function. Although this observation certainly does not mark the end of any use of BR, it is further evidence that the Burgenland Roma are now effectively monolingual in German.

Comparing the sociolinguistic situation of BR at the beginning of the 21st century with that during the first half of the 20th century against the background of socio-historical developments, the conclusion is that BR's vitality is destroyed in the concentration camps, together with a majority of its speakers. The resulting decrease in language use, the continuous change of language is probably irreversible. The codification will not change this situation significantly. Seen from a communicative functional perspective, it has, if at all, only an effect on the language use of so-called "activists", members of the ethnic group who are actively involved with the self-organisation and process of emancipation.

Domain	Younger	Eldest	Activists	Description
public	GERMAN	GERMAN	GERMAN Romani	Varieties of public-formal domains used in administration, politics, in the media, education, religious practice, etc.
everyday	GERMAN	GERMAN Croatian/Hungarian Romani	GERMAN Romani	Varieties of the social macrocosm used in everyday life with acquaintances, in the workplace, during leisure time, etc. and with strangers when shopping etc.
private	GERMAN Romani	GERMAN Croatian/Hungarian Romani	GERMAN Romani	Varieties of the social microcosm used in private with the partner, within the family, among friends, etc.

⁵² N.B.: Only the communicative functions of BR are discussed here.

"Younger" in this table represents those under 50, "eldest" those over 70. The competence and use of BR within the age group of 50 to 70 form the transient area between the two groups listed. "Activists" are exclusively younger members of the ethnic group whose communicative behaviour sometimes also influences their social environment. Usually the language use of Burgenland Roma under the age of 50 corresponds with the effective monolingualism shown in the table above. Only in very few, isolated cases is BR used in the private domain and even less often in the everyday domain. It is usually used when speakers from the group of those over 70 partake in the conversation. They use BR among themselves more often than members of other age groups. If members of this age group live together with younger generations, then they are more likely to use BR among themselves occasionally. Three generations living together is, however, as mentioned in Chapter 2, the exception. Changing from BR to German and its dominance in all domains thus both marks the repertoire of older as well as of younger members of the ethnic group whose communicative behaviour remains largely unaffected by the codification, even if they sometimes participate in the association's activities. For most Burgenland Roma the use of BR in such situations constitutes part of the aforementioned niche functions and has no sustained effect on their communicative behaviour in general.

Functional change triggered by the codification is only found in the subgroup of the "activists". They sometimes also use BR in a communicative function in their association and rather less frequently in informal, everyday contact with familiar members of the ethnic group who are competent in BR. The use of BR in its symbolic function in public formal domains is particularly significant to members of this group. Symbolic oral use of BR is usually accompanied by a consecutive interpretation into German, thus ensuring the communicative function and general comprehensibility of the respective statements for all participants – members of the ethnic group and also those of other groups. These public, formal statements also differ from the informal use of BR by their literate style and reflect the language change triggered by the codification.

Contact-induced language change is first and foremost based on the change in contact varieties which results primarily from the written form. While BR had been influenced by the dialectal and regiolectal varieties of German prior to the emancipation movement and the resulting codification, the contact spectrum expands and shifts with written use to supra-regional varieties and standards. The German writing standard acts as the primary model for the expansion of BR in formal functional dimensions. This not only results in the integration

of domain-specific vocabulary, but also has effects on BR's grammatical structures. In contrast to informal oral texts such as the example in Chapter 2 above which showed only few lexemes from German in which one statement roughly corresponds to a sentence with a preposition, the syntactic structures of written expansion texts of BR are more complex and contain a higher number of borrowings:

<p><i>Aja publikacija, savi uso Wiener Festwochen presentirim ol, andar o kulturakero festival Romale!10 ari ali, savo ando linaj 2010 la akademijatar Gereci o dujtovar kerdo ulo. Romale! jek seletoskeri formahi, savi la diskusijake, la presentacijake taj le famitlinipeske la kunstatar, kulturatar, la politikatar taj le forschinipestar le Romendar andi Europa dininel.</i></p>	<p>Diese <u>Publikation</u>, die nun auch im Rahmen der <i>Wiener Festwochen</i> <u>präsentiert</u> wird, ist aus dem <u>Kulturfestival Romale!10</u> hervorgegangen, das im Sommer 2010 von der <u>Akademie Graz</u> zum zweiten Mal veranstaltet wurde. <i>Romale!</i> ist eine <u>Plattform</u>, die der <u>Diskussion</u>, der <u>Präsentation</u> und der <u>Vermittlung</u> von <u>Kunst</u>, <u>Kultur</u>, <u>Politik</u> und <u>Forschung</u> der Roma in Europa <u>dient</u>.</p>	<p>This publication, which is now also being presented as part of the <i>Wiener Festwochen</i>, has emerged from the Romale!10 festival of culture, which was organised by the <i>Akademie Graz</i> in the summer of 2010 for the second time. <i>Romale!</i> is a platform serving the discussion, the presentation and the imparting of art, culture, politics and research of Roma in Europe.</p>
--	---	--

This text sample taken from the magazine d|ROM|a (30/2/2011: 10) largely follows the German template. The overwhelming majority of borrowed lexemes are domain-specific adoptions from the German standard that have been integrated into BR.⁵³ Yet the translation not only replicates lacking lexis, but also German syntax. Attributive relative clauses for instance were relatively rare in spoken BR prior to the written use of the language with *so* 'what' as the relative pronoun and not *savo* 'that, which'. Both phrasal as well as sentence syntax in this short sample text almost exactly follow the German standard, which is a general characteristic of the written use of BR.⁵⁴

⁵³ The striking aspect in this is the replication of ger *Plattform* with *seletoskeri plata*. Formally this corresponds to the structures of BR as a genitive noun phrase which is usually used for the expression of German compounds. Lexically, *plata*, which is borrowed from German, is combined with *seleto* < hun *szelet* ger 'Scheibe' ('disc'). In colloquial German, *Scheibe* also stands for *Schallplatte* (vinyl record) with the short form *Platte* which appears to have motivated the use of *seleto* for ger *Platt-*.

⁵⁴ A detailed discussion of contact-induced language change cannot be offered in this context; see *inter alia* Halwachs (2012).

Translations and other written texts are only produced by a handful of members of the ethnic group. This is also common to other expanding minority languages and would not pose a problem as such if there is sufficient monitoring or rather feedback from competent speakers or critical readers.⁵⁵ Yet due to the extremely low use of the language, this does not occur, thereby entrenching idiosyncrasies and leaving inconsistencies and mistakes uncorrected. As the language use usually reduces written texts to their symbolic function and pushes the status aspect into the foreground while neglecting the informative function, this lacking monitoring by speakers and readers does not currently have any severe effects on the linguistic behaviour of the few active users of BR within the ethnic group. It may, however, lead to lasting language change also in spoken BR in the unlikely case that the language is revitalised.

The codification only has peripheral effects on the collective linguistic repertoire of the Burgenland Roma and relatively little influence on the informal oral use and thus the oral style of BR. Language change manifests itself particularly in the written use and the symbolic oral use in public formal domains which usually also follows the literate style. In contrast, the status of BR changes significantly and over the course of the 1990s develops from that of a stigmatised minority variety to that of a recognised ethnic group language. This is the result of the codification which was initiated by the ethnic group's emancipation efforts against the background of the general political development. The written form and public language use are thus significant symbols of the Burgenland Roma's emancipation which finds its expression above all in the prestigious use in the media and in education. BR thus becomes an important element of identity, not only for the activists that take part in the emancipation efforts, but for the entire ethnic group.

However, this newly emerged language prestige has, as repeatedly mentioned above, no significant effect on language use. The same applies to the activities for language preservation. After the intense stage of the codification, they appear to establish themselves in the educational sector in the form of teaching at primary and secondary levels, yet are soon again almost exclusively reduced to the extracurricular context.

Der Erfolg des Sprachunterrichts an den Schulen lässt sich mit Zahlen weniger gut messen.

Die Erfahrung der letzten Jahre hat gezeigt, dass die ursprünglich verfolgte Strategie, an so

⁵⁵ In the bilingual magazine it is primarily the German texts which contain information, thereby fulfilling the communicative function. The texts in BR mainly have a symbolic function and are usually only read as a supplement. In the case of published texts of the oral tradition, the functionalities are usually reversed among competent speakers. Contrary to the literate style of translated text, they follow the familiar oral style. This also ensures acceptance and use of the monolingual *Mri Tikni Mini Multi*, which is incidentally not only read by children, but also by adolescents and adults on a regular basis.

vielen Schulen wie möglich Roman-Unterricht in Form von Unverbindlichen Übungen anzubieten, nicht zielführend ist. Freiwilliger Sprachunterricht am Nachmittag ist im Vergleich zu Fußball oder Tanz wenig konkurrenzfähig. [...] Eine weitere Erkenntnis aus den letzten Jahren: Man kann eine Sprache nicht mit Sprachkursen und Schulunterricht erhalten. Deshalb gestalteten wir beispielsweise den Roman-Kurs in Deutsch Kaltenbrunn komplett neu. Vordergrundig ein Kochkurs, trägt er den Sprachunterricht direkt in die Familie – wir treffen uns mit Vertretern aller Generationen in der Küche, kochen und sprechen dabei nur Roman. (The success of language teaching in schools cannot be measured in numbers. The experience gained over the last years has shown that the original strategy of offering Roman classes as a voluntary subject at as many schools as possible proved unsatisfactory. Voluntary language classes in the afternoons are less appealing than football or dance courses. [...] Another realisation from the last years is that a language cannot be preserved through language courses and teaching in schools. This is why we for instance redesigned the Roman course held in Deutsch Kaltenbrunn. While ostensibly a cooking class, it takes language teaching right into the family – we meet members of all generations in the kitchen, cook together and only speak Roman.)

(d|ROM|a 31/3/2011: 22)

Activities such as the Roman cooking class bring together families and their neighbours as well as each community's elders. Such meetings, which do not occur every day, correspond with the aforementioned use of BR at specific occasions and are placed between communicative and symbolic functionality. Yet compared to the barely existing effect on language use in private and everyday domains, such activities contribute to the knowledge about BR especially among the younger participants and develop their language competence and above all create language awareness. The resulting and probably most important effect of such activities is the contribution to a positive image of being a *Rom* or *Romni*. This can especially help children and adolescents to better deal with the ethnic stigmatisation and the connected discrimination in everyday life or to counterbalance it with a positive, ethnic awareness. Ethnic self-confidence increases self-esteem and moreover contributes significantly to the integration of young Roma.

The integrative aspect is also the only economic argument for the financing of the codification of a minority language which is barely used and its follow-up projects. Ethnic self-confidence and self-esteem increase the ability of stigmatised fringe groups to integrate and therefore contribute significantly to minimising the resulting social costs of this marginalisa-

tion. In the case of BR two further arguments arise. On the one hand there is the legal obligation of the Republic of Austria to support and fund cultural projects by the Burgenland Roma. On the other hand there is also a moral obligation to demonstrate respect to this ethnic culture as part of Austrian culture – an ethnic culture which, together with its bearers, was largely destroyed in the concentration camps.

Revitalising BR as a language of everyday life will probably prove impossible due to lacking framework conditions and language change that has already progressed too far. Even under optimal conditions it would hardly be possible to reactivate the communicative functions of BR. Yet to continue to ensure the integrative aspect of the codification and the resulting activities, relating measures by the ethnic group are to be adequately and continuously supported into the future.

References

- Ambrosch, Gerd / Gärtner-Horvath, Emmerich / Halwachs, Dieter W. / Wogg, Michael. 2000. *Kaj pe sina, kaj pe nana. Amare pamaristscha*. Graz: Romani-Projekt.
- Baumgartner, Gerhard / Freund, Florian. 2004. *Die Burgenland-Roma 1945-2000. Eine Darstellung der Volksgruppe auf der Basis archivarischer und statistischer Quellen*. Eisenstadt: Burgenländisches Landesarchiv (= Burgenländische Forschungen, Band 88).
- Boretzky, Norbert. 1992. Zum Erbwortschatz des Romani. *Zeitschrift für Phonetik, Sprachwissenschaft und Kommunikationsforschung* 45: 227–251.
- Eder, Beate. 1993. *Geboren bin ich vor Jahrtausenden. Bilderwelten in der Literatur der Roma und Sinti*. Klagenfurt/Celovec: Drava.
- Elšík, Viktor. 2009. Selice Romani vocabulary. In: Haspelmath, Martin / Tadmor, Uri. eds. *World Loanword Database*. Munich: Max Planck Digital Library. <<http://wold.livingsources.org/vocabulary/9>> (2013-06-28).
- Fennesz-Juhász, Christiane / Wogg, Michael / Wallaszkovits, Nadja. 2002. *Schun so me phukavav ... Romane pamaristscha, phukajiptscha taj gila andar o Burgenland – Hör, was ich erzähle ... Märchen, Erzählungen und Lieder der Roma aus dem Burgenland*. Graz: Romani-Projekt CD 1.
- Halwachs, Dieter W. 1996. Die Verschriftlichung des Roman. *Grazer Linguistische Studien* 45: 1-32.
- Halwachs, Dieter W. / Ambrosch, Gerd / Schicker, Dieter. 1996. *Roman, seine Verwendung und sein Status innerhalb der Volksgruppe. Ergebnisse einer Befragung zu Sprachverwendung und Spracheinstellung der Burgenland-Roma*. Graz: Romani-Projekt.
- Halwachs, Dieter W. / Horvat, Erika / Ambrosch, Gerd / Sarközi, René. 1996. *Amen Roman pisinás* ['Wir schreiben Roman']. Klagenfurt/Celovec: Hermagoras.
- Halwachs, Dieter W. 1998. *Amaro vakeripe Roman hi – Unsere Sprache ist Roman. Texte, Glossar und Grammatik der burgenländischen Romani-Variante*. Klagenfurt/Celovec: Drava.

- Halwachs, Dieter W. / Glaeser, Ursula / Martens, Katharina. 1998a. *Amen Roman siklojas* ['Wir lernen Roman']. Graz: Romani-Projekt.
- Halwachs, Dieter W. / Glaeser, Ursula / Martens, Katharina. 1998b. *Lehrerkommentar zum Lehrbuch Amen Roman Siklojas mit kinderphilosophischen Anmerkungen von Daniela Camhy . Arbeitsbericht 4a des Projekts Kodifizierung und Didaktisierung des Roman*. Graz: Romani-Projekt.
- Halwachs, Dieter W. / Ambrosch, Gerd. 1999. *Wörterbuch Roman — Deutsch. Arbeitsbericht 7a des Projekts Kodifizierung und Didaktisierung des Roman* . Graz: Romani-Projekt.
- Halwachs, Dieter W. / Gärtner-Horvath, Emmerich / Wogg, Michael. 2000. *O Rom taj o beng. Romane pamaristscha, phukajiptscha taj gila andar o Burgenland / Der Rom und der Teufel. Märchen, Erzählungen und Lieder der Burgenlandroma*. Klagenfurt/Celovec: Drava.
- Halwachs, Dieter W. / Wogg, Michael. 2002a. *Grammatik des Burgenland-Romani (Roman)*. Arbeitsbericht 9 des Projekts Kodifizierung und Didaktisierung des Roman . Graz: Romani-Projekt.
- Halwachs, Dieter W. / Wogg, Michael. 2002b. *Burgenland Romani (Roman)*, München/Newcastle: Lincom.
- Halwachs, Dieter W. 2012. Functional Expansion and Language Change: The Case of Burgenland Romani. *Romani Studies* 22/1: 49-66.
- Heinschink, Mozes F. /, Meissner, Paul. 1976. Der arme Zigeuner und der Teufel – O čoro rom taj o beng. *Mitteilungen zur Zigeunerkunde* 2: 6-10.
- Heuß, Peter. 1992 Kulturpolitik im Dritten Reich. In: Strauß, Daniel. ed. *Die Sinti/Roma-Erzählungen im Kontext europäischer Märchenkultur. Berichte und Ergebnisse einer Tagung*. Heidelberg: Dokumentations- und Kulturzentrum Deutscher Sinti und Roma: 85-108.

- Knobloch, Johann. 1953. *Romani-Texte aus dem Burgenland. Berichte, Erzählungen und Märchen der burgenländischen Zigeuner, aufgezeichnet, übersetzt und mit sprachlichen Bemerkungen versehen.* Eisenstadt: Burgenländisches Landesarchiv (= Burgenländische Forschungen, Band 24).
- Matras, Yaron. 2002. *Romani: a linguistic introduction.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Matras, Yaron. 2005. The classification of Romani dialects: A geographical-historical perspective. In: Schrammel, Barbara / Halwachs, Dieter W. / Ambrosch, Gerd. eds. *General and Applied Romani Linguistics.* München: Lincom: 7-26.
- Mayerhofer, Claudia. 1988. *Kultur und Geschichte der Burgenland-Roma von der Ersten Republik bis zur Gegenwart. 2., verbesserte Auflage.* Wien: Picus.
- Mindler, Ursula. 2006. *Tobias Portschy: Biographie eines Nationalsozialisten.* Eisenstadt: Burgenländisches Landesarchiv (= Burgenländische Forschungen, Band 92).
- Swadesh, Morris. 1971. *The origin and diversification of language.* Chicago: Aldine.
- Statistik Austria. 2002a. *Volkszählung 2001: Hauptergebnisse I – Österreich.* Wien.
- Statistik Austria. 2002b. *Volkszählung 2001: Hauptergebnisse I – Burgenland.* Wien.