

Functional expansion and language change: The case of Burgenland Romani

Halwachs, Dieter W . Romani Studies ; Cheverly Vol. 22, Iss. 1, (2012): 49-66.

[ProQuest document link](#)

ABSTRACT

Language awareness among Burgenland Roma, which has been triggered by selforganisation with the goal of socio-political emancipation, resulted, among others, in the expansion of their Romani variety into formal domains. This ongoing process not only affects the functions of Burgenland Romani but also its structures. Furthermore, it changed the primary contact varieties from dialectal registers of Austrian German to spoken and written standard varieties. Naturally, these changes are most obvious at the lexical level in the large number of loans and neologisms. But not only the lexicon expands: morphosyntax, case functions, and syntax undergo changes too. The article outlines and demonstrates both lexical expansion and structural changes against the background of the new model codes, namely, spoken and written standards of Austrian German. [PUBLICATION ABSTRACT]

FULL TEXT

Headnote

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

Keywords: Romani language, Burgenland, Austria, language planning, Romani dialects, language change (ProQuest: ... denotes formulae omitted.)

i. Historical overview

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

Until the 1930s BR was the primary intimate variety of around 6,000 speakers of whom only 10 per cent survived the Holocaust. Traumatization by the genocide and the consequent destruction of the social structure as well as prolonged stigmatization and discrimination triggered something like a self-imposed assimilation among some of the survivors but especially among members of the post-Holocaust generations. This, among other things,

increased exogamy, caused language denial and resulted in migration into urban anonymity. Linguistically, this development was reflected by repertoire shift: German started to dominate in all domains whereas BR lost its functions in everyday life and was more and more seen as a language of the past. The consequences were language attrition, language shift and language loss. Except maybe for a few individuals there was no language awareness in the group.

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

2. Functional expansion

Within one decade both the internal and the official status of BR changed dramatically: from an almost unknown isolated oral intra-group variety disowned by its speakers to the group's primary identity marker and the most prominent variety of an officially recognised Austrian minority language used in the media and taught in schools. Triggered by the rising language awareness among young Romani activists and by their new language attitude, BR underwent functional expansion parallel to the changes in its status. It developed into formal domains and turned from a language which functioned primarily as spoken intra-group variety in the social micro-cosmos into a language with a broad range of registers, covering both informal and formal domains.¹ Furthermore BR changed from an exclusively oral language into a written language. Finally, the contact of BR with the East-Austrian regiolect and with the Austrian German spoken and written standards intensified dramatically. The former strong influence of the Austrian German dialects of the region on BR was to some extent sidelined but did not end at all. This functional expansion into formal domains in conjunction with emerging literacy and increasing influence of Standard German has resulted in structural linguistic changes that affect all linguistic levels.

3. Structural language change

The starting point, or rather, the basis for comparison of the description of structural language change in BR is the codification as described in Halwachs (1998). The following account of recent developments in BR mainly focuses on nominal morphology in written texts; it therefore refers to the productive patterns of derivation and integration as detailed in Halwachs (2001). The focus on nouns results from the nominal style' of the German written standard, which is the primary model of functional expansion of BR. This again is reflected in the high number of

nouns and adjectives among the 'new vocabulary', the part of the lexicon which developed as a consequence of the expansion of BR.

3.1. Nouns

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

The following list illustrates how German loans are integrated as masculine nouns into BR. All examples are accompanied by the plural forms and contain the feminine derivations as well, if attested.²

... The nominative singular of example (i) - docento - exhibits the regular integration of masculine nouns of European origin into BR. But the plural in -tscha, which is the most productive plural morpheme in current BR, differs from the (former) regular xenoclitic pattern with the nominative plural in -i: alato animal', alati 'animals' <hun allât; grofo earl', grofi earls' <hun gróf< ger Graf³

Another Greek-origin ending of xenoclitic masculines is -i (2-4) with the plural in -tscha. This pattern integrates numerous German nouns ending in -er and also marks derivations with the Hungarian -derived suffix -asch (4). The derivational base of linguistikaschi is a markerless masculine loan from German with the plural ending in -tscha and the regular agentive feminine derivation in -kija, plural -kiji.

The majority of German-derived masculines are markerless in the nominative singular (5-8) and show the regular plural in -tscha. The only exception are stems ending in -C+I which form the plural in -int. This is an analogy to feminine nouns with the same stem final consonant cluster and -ina in the nominative singular (see 17, below). Compared to the recent integration of masculines with the nominative marked in -0 a tendency to markerless integration of German-origin masculines has to be noticed. A development which clearly can be labelled as language change without any indices of language attrition. Ambiguous with respect to language attrition is the case with example (8). Usually loans ending in -a were integrated as feminines: i boka <hun boka 'ankle', i roka <hun róka 'fox'. While Hungarian has no grammatical gender, even some words denoting prototypical male animals like 'bull' - i bika <hun bika - were integrated into BR as feminines because of their ending. This pattern seems to be completely lost with German-origin masculine nouns ending in -a which are not integrated according to their shape but according to their German gender. There are only a few cases like o tema which - together with the only pre-european masculine in -a: srasta 'iron' - form a very small group of nouns.⁴

Compared to masculines the tendency towards markerless integration of nouns is not so strong with feminines. For German words with stems ending in -a and -e the general xenoclitic feminine integration is used (9, 10). At least in half of the cases observed, German-origin feminines with a consonantal stem ending are also integrated according to this pattern (11-13). But there is a strong tendency to use the plural suffix -tscha instead of the regular xenoclitic feminine ending -i. Markerless integrated feminines (14-16) regularly show the plural suffix -tscha. The integrations with -ina | -ini are limited to stems ending in -C+I and are exempt of the tendency to form the plural in -tscha.

...

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

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

Another possibility to create nouns is the use of the genitive, which usually functions similar to attributive adjectives, as independent substantive (21-6). The frequency of occurrence of this pattern is not very high, and never has been in BR. But it is still productive and contributes to the lexical expansion. For some of these genitive nouns German at least functions as the model which makes them very close to calques (23-6):

...

Together with markerless integration calquing is the most productive strategy of lexical expansion in BR. Example 27 shows a case of creative calquing which uses the paraphrase angle dikel 'to look ahead' as the basis for angledikaschi 'prophet'. The following example 28 is an agentive noun derived from a verb which is a literary translation from German into BR: use = zu, dik-el = schauen. The same applies for the other examples presented: ... Another case of expansion by creation is the strategy of incorporating German compounds as calqued noun phrases into BR. The genitive attribute agrees in gender with the head noun, the number of the genitive form (sg. -Vs-ker-o / -a-ker-o // pi. -en-ger-o) is determined semantically by the model compound; for instance, example (32): fatschuvtsch-en-ger-i: children's' >-en- (plural), biblina >-i (feminine). Contrary to the genitive noun phrase of Romani the article of compound caiques in BR agrees with the head noun and not with the genitive: i pajeskeri gurumni 'the sea cow' : le rakleskeri da] 'the boy's mother'.⁵

...

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

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

3.2. Adjectives

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

Only a few adjectives, which most probably have to be seen as derived from nouns (35-7), show typical inflected derivation suffixes of BR. In attributive function these inflected adjectives agree in gender, number and case with the corresponding head noun:

(35) historijuno 'historical' <historija <Historia 'history'⁶

(36) partajutno 'partisan, biased' <parta] <ger Partei 'political party'

(37) butkulturano 'multicultural' <kultur-a <ger Kultur 'culture'

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

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

(38) inditiko <ger indisch 'indian'

(39) holanditiko <ger holländisch 'dutch'

(40) schotitiko <ger schottisch 'Scottish'

But all the inflected adjectives Usted (35-40) can easily be replaced by their uninflected counterparts ending in -i: indischi, partajischi, etc. These are the typical nominative singular forms of dialectal German adjectives in

attributive function which have always been integrated into BR in an unaltered uninflected form: brauni <ger /brauni/; brauni gra | brauni grasta : parno gra : porne grasta 'brown horse' / 'brown horses' : 'white horse' / 'white horses'. The vast majority of adjectival loans is uninflected and marked by the suffix -i.

(41) fiochi <ger flach flat'

(42) gloti <ger  att plain

(43) aktivi <ger aktiv active'

(44) elektrischi <ger elektrisch electrical'

(45) etnischi <ger ethnisch ethnical'

(46) intresanti <ger interessant interesting

(47) katolischi <ger katholisch catholic'

(48) kristlichi <ger christlich christian

(49) rasistischi <ger rassistisch racist'

(50) tipischi <ger typisch typical'

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

(51) o praktisch! verkcajg 'the useful tool' ger das praktische Werkzeug

Ov praktisch mulo hi. 'He is practically dead.' ger Er ist praktisch tot.

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

3.3. Case

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

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

As for the ablative, the case of source and origin, both synthetic and analytic formations are equally used and accepted by the speakers. Although there is a tendency that the more recently a word has been integrated into BR the more likely the analytic form prevails, the co-occurrence of the two formations can be described as an instance of competing norms. Besides synthetic case marking and the analytical prepositional (preposition + nominative) there is a third, rarely used possibility to form ablatives. The German-origin preposition fa <ger von 'from' is, as a rule, followed by the synthetic ablative: fa Betschistar : andar o Betschi : Betschistar 'from Vienna'.⁷

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

(52) fi le Romengere koji

for art.obl.pl Rom.GEN:NOM.PL matterNOM.PL

le Romengere kojenge

art.obl.pl RomGEN:NOM.PL matterGEN.PL

'for the matters of the Roma

(53) than fi 0 vakerdo alav

room for art.nom.m.sg speakPRTC:NOM.M.SG wordNOM.M.SG

than le vakerde alaveske

room ART.OBL.M.SG SpeakPRTCobl.M.SG WordGEN.M.SG

'room for the spoken word'

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

Another new development is the reactivation of the locative which in the following two examples is contrasted with its analytical counterparts: (54) O Jesus Galilejatealo.

ART.M.SG Jesus galilleeLOC.F.SGcameM.SG

O Jesusandi Galilejaalo.

ART.M.SG Jesusto galilleeNOM.F.SGcameM.SG

'(The) Jesus came to Galilee.'

(55) Jerusalemate : andi Jerusalem

JerusalemLOC.F.SG in JerusalemNOM.F.SG

'in Jerusalem'

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

(56) ande pro foro Nazaret

in POSS.M.SG townNOM.M.SG NazarethNOM.M.SG

'in his town Nazareth'

le Nazaretiste, kaj ov bartschilo

ART.OBL.M.SG Nazareth.LOCM.SG . . .

'in Nazareth, where he grew up'

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

(57) i kenva le angledikaschistar ~ das Buch des Propheten

the book art.obl.m.sg prophetABL.M.SG

'the book of the prophet'

(58) falati le Burgenlandistar ~ Teile des Burgenlandes

parts art.obl.m.sg BurgenlandABL.M.SG

'parts of the Burgenland'

(59) i phukajipeskeri tradicija le Romendar

the oral tradition art.obl.m.sg RomABL.M.PL

'the oral tradition of the Roma ~ die Erzähltradition der Roma

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

function as an intermediate mental stage in the translation process.

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

(60) le Devleskero rajipe

ART.OBL.M.SG GodGEN.M.SG:NOM.M.SG reignNOM.M.SG

'the reign of god' = Gottes Herrschaft

(61) la Ceija Stojkakero vakeripe

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

'the language of Ceija Stojka = Ceija Stojkas Sprache

In example (62) the head noun of the prepositional phrase - ondi . . . Walb er dor fatar - is a caique of a compound - Lehmgrube clay pit' - which is realised as noun with preceding genitive - luamakeri hefi In the German model text this head is preceded by an attribute - Walbersdorfer of Walbersdorf' - which is derived from a noun. In BR such derivations usually are realised as genitives. The tendency of genitive substitution might be the reason why this specific attribute shows the ablative - Walbersdorfatar.

(62) Valami 1900 0 kokalijeke schov metertscha bare tschoeskere valistar andi luamakeri hef Walbersdorf atar lakle ule.

Um 1900 wurden in einer Walbersdorfer Lehmgrube die Knochen eines sechs Meter langen Bartwals gefunden.

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

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

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

(63) jek nevo film pedar taj la Ceija Stojkatar, kerdo la Karin Bergeratar.

ein neuer Film über und mit Ceija Stojka, von Karin Berger

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

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

3.4. Syntax

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

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

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

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

(65) Tafka dureder ande gelo / ando vesch / taj uprosefkar mer oda kascht / savo ando suno diklahi l oda kascht

dikla / . . .

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

In both examples - (64) is part of an interview, (65) of a fairy tale - there are units that function as postposed attributes in oral speech - (64): so . . . ciden / (65): savo . . . diklahi - but might be interpreted as relative clauses when transliterated. Both unit initial lexemes, - (64): so 'what' / (65): savo 'which one, who' - primarily function as interrogative pronouns in BR. But as their German counterparts was 'what' / welcher 'who' the BR pronouns also function as relative pronouns. Because German was 'what' only functions in dialects as generalised relative pronoun, it is obvious that so 'what', which shows far higher frequency in oral texts than savo, is not used in formal texts of BR. Only savo which is associated with its German standard equivalent welcher, der is used in written text production. Example (65) shows the use of savo in a complex sentence of a journal text translated from German. Aside of the circumlocution in the relative clause which is marked by squared brackets the BR sentence parallels its German equivalent and demonstrates that written BR at least syntactically is almost a one-to-one copy of the German model.

(65) Aber viele Leute, die [über Romani Bescheid] wissen, sagen, dass

Ham but ñipo, save but pedar Romani dschanen, phenen, hot

But many people who [much about Romani] know, say that

das Wort 'porrajmos' kein altes Romani-Wort ist.

o alav 'porrajmos' phuro Romano alav nan.

the word 'porrajmos' an old Romani word not is.

'But many people who know a lot about Romani say that the word porrajmos is not an old Romani word.'

4. Conclusions

Although the functional expansion of BR into formal domains and the resulting development of written varieties still is a quite recent and still ongoing process some general tendencies of resulting language change can be formulated. There is a tendency of formal reduction of nominal morphology with regard to both the number of productive morphemes and declensions; cf. the suffix -tscha as the only productive plural morpheme and the integration of uninflected adjectives. On the other hand there is a tendency of functional restructuring of the case system: the revival of the synthetic locative and the use of the ablative as possessor. This new ablative function is modelled on the German regiolect which seems to function as an intermediate mental stage in the translation processes from standard German into BR. Nonetheless, with regard to the syntax of written BR the German standard is the primary model. This short description of recent developments in BR demonstrates that the ongoing language change triggered by functional the expansion of the language into formal domains is basically caused by the change in the primary contact variety from the German dialect of the region to the Austrian German standard with the East Austrian regiolect sometimes functioning as a mental background model. This is a situation that leaves BR at least for the moment in an area of conflict between oral and written language.

Sidebar

This article is based on a presentation at the Seventh International Conference on Romani Linguistics at the Charles University, Prague, in September 2006. The editors acknowledge the contribution of the conference organiser, Viktor EISik, who acted as consulting editor for this article.

Footnote

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

Footnote

2. The writing system of BR is based on German conventions. Compared to "general" writing in Romani linguistics the following equivalents are used: x = eh; dz = dsch; §= sch; è= tsch. Furthermore, it has to be noted that

aspiration in BR is limited to the initial position, that the voiced fricatives *z* and *ʒ* are devoiced and that *üand* represent the vowels /y/ and /ce/ which only occur in German loans (see Halwachs 1996). 3. Romani nominal inflection and nominal classes are discussed in ElSik (2000). Bakker (1997) describes the Greek derived integration morphology of Romani. Matras (2002) serves as a basis for the description of structural phenomena in Romani in general.

Footnote

4. To interpret this as language attrition is maybe a very puristic approach. But if integrations like *0 tema* increase in number and are no longer rare exceptions this might cause problems regarding gender-specific declension. Untrained speakers or writers could confuse the gender specific distinctions of oblique forms and use the feminine suffix *-a-* with masculines instead of the masculine *-is-*: e.g. *0 tema*, dative *le tem-is-ke* > **la tem-a-ke*. There are already incidents of such confusions in texts but they are still treated as mistakes by both the readers and the writers if they are confronted with such forms in their texts or translations. 5. For more information on the genitive in Romani see e.g. Koptjevskaja-Tamm (2000). 6. German for history is 'Geschichte' which is not the model of *historija*. This might be a loan from another Romani variety, or - as BR has not much contact with internationally spread and widely used varieties - it is modelled at one of the other minority languages of the region, Hungarian and Croatian, or 'Historia' is seen as internationalism. Maybe integrations of this type are multi-causally determined. 7. The preposition *fa* 'from' as well as *fi* 'for' mentioned in the following paragraph are integrated into BR in their German dialectal form. 8. It has to be noted that these locatives cause no problems of comprehension for the readers. Although the pattern is no longer productive in informal speech they seem to be familiar with the synthetic locative because of the fossilised forms which are quite frequent.

Footnote

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

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

References

References

- Bakker, Peter. 1997. Athematic morphology in Romani: The borrowing of a borrowing pattern. In: Matras, Yaron, Bakker, Peter, and Kyuchukov, Hristo, eds. *The typology and dialectology of Romani*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 1-21.
- Elsik, Viktor. 2000. Romani nominal paradigms: Their structure, diversity, and development. In: ElSik, Viktor, and Matras, Yaron, eds. *Grammatical relations in Romani: The noun phrase*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 9-30.
- Halwachs, Dieter W. 1996. Die Verschriftlichung des Roman. *Grazer Linguistische Stuthen* 45: 1-32.
- 1998. *Amaro vakeripe Roman hi - Unsere Sprache ist Roman*. Texte, Glossar und Grammatik der burgenländischen Romani-Variante. Klagenfurt: Drava.
- 2001. Produktive Morphologie und lexikalische Expansion des Roman. In: Iгла, Birgit, and Stolz, Thomas, eds. "Was ich noch sagen wollte ..." A multilingual Festschrift for Norbert Boretzky on occasion of his 65th birthday. Berlin: Akademie Verlag. 389-404.
- 2005a. Roma and Romani in Austria. *Romani Studies. Fifth Series*. 15(2): 145-73.
- 2005b. Romani between the Scylla of language death and the charybdis of folklorisation. In: Muhr, Rudolf, ed. *Standard variations and language ideologies in different language cultures around the world*. Wien: Peter Lang: 121-36.
- and Wogg, Michael. 2002. *Burgenland Romani*. München/Newcastle: Lincom.
- Koptjevskaja-Tamm, Maria. 2000. Romani genitives in a cross-linguistic perspective. In: ElSik, Viktor and Matras, Yaron, eds. *Grammatical relations in Romani: The noun phrase*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 123-49.

Matras, Yaron. 2002. Romani: A linguistic introduction. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

AuthorAffiliation

Dieter W. Halwachs is Head of the Research Unit for Plurilingualism at the Language Centre Treffpunkt Sprachen of the University of Graz. Address: Heinrichstraße 26/2, 8010 Graz, Austria. dieter.halwachs@uni-graz.at

Appendix

Appendix

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

A. Fatschuvtschengeri Biblina ando Roman. Andar o kenvi le Neve Testamentistar

O Jesus Galilejate alo. Odoj priko evangelijum le Devlestar phukavlahi taj phentscha: 1 cajt kisni hi. Akan le Devleskero rajipe kesdinel. Paruven rumen taj gondolinen

5 upro latscho phukajipe, savo me tumenge anav.

Kada o Jesus ande pro foro Nazaret pai alo, suboton ando molinipeskero kher gelo. Odoj andar i kenva le angledikaschistar

10 Jesaja angle gentscha: O gajst le Devlestar, le rajestar, upre mande paschlol, mint ov man ar rodija.

Andi heftlina 10 duj jingertscha le papal upreuschtine talalinen; o Jesus te uso

15 aposteltscha al taj le Dschelne Gajstiha len sentelinel. Upre del len, hot o tschatscho patschajipe uso mindenfelitiko flogi te anen. 40 divesa pah patraja ando them upre uschtino tal le manuschenge le

20 Dschelne Gajst bitschal.

I gemajndi le Christusistar Jerusalemate tradim ol, taj o aposteltscha ar cidinen, vidschik le Jesusiskere alava te phukan. Te paloda vakeren, hot ada vilago ar ovia.

B. Schtendigi dikipeskero kedipe Thaneskero Museum Burgenland

Anglo vaiami 16 miljoni berscha pedar falati le Burgenlandistar jek tato taj le ocejanenca phandlo baro paj, i "Paratethys", bulhardo sina. Ande lakeri küstnakeri

5 regijona dschivnahi pajeskere gurumna, delfintscha, valtscha taj bare hajtscha. Vaiami 1900 o kokali jeke 6 metertscha bare tschoeskere valistar andi luamakeri hef Walbersdorfatar lakle ule. Adi o kokaleng

10 ero ando naturakero historijuno museum Budapestate te dikel hi.

C. Poesija, savi teli cipa dschal

Jek nevo film pedar taj la Ceija Stojkatar, kerdo la Karin Bergeratar.

Pai trin autobiografischi kenvi taj jek kinoskero film (Ceija Stojka, 1999), "Telo

5 deski seleni tschar" imar o pantschto khetanbutschalinipe hi maschkar i Ceija Stojka taj la filmeskera

keraschkijatar Karin Berger. Taj meg buteder sar o avre butja,

so odola duj khetan kerde, o nevo film jek keripe duge berschengere pajtaschagostar hi. O dokumentariskero film, savo 52 minuti hi taj savo upre ada berscheskero

10 Diagonale Gereciste te dikel sina, igen soralo hi, so pedar jek distancirti butschalinipe schoha na kerdo schaj ujahi. I Ceija Stojka phukal pedar i cajt ando BergenBelsen, i befrajung duach o Aliirti taj saj

15 pharo sina, pal 1945 ando dschivipe pal te lakel.

Than fi o vakerdo alav O filmeskero team mer i Karin Berger taj

20 lengero kameraschi Joerg Burger terdschon i Ceija Stojka taj lakero barikano phukajipe ando anglutoo than.

Filmischi Stilmittel (maschkarutne titl, atmosferischi sekvencen) tschule and bescharde on. On tschak

25 use dininen, o dschivipeskero phukajipe la Ceija Stojkatar te strukturinel taj use jek kompakti filmischi

phukajipe te kerel. O arajipe hi jek latscho interviewakero film, so loke taj godschikane kipenca andi scene

30 bescharde ol. I Karin Berger schofintscha le, le vakerime alav oda than te del, savo leske pekal, kaj o kipengero

barvalipe ande la Ceija Stojkakero vakeripe schaj virkinel. Oj odaleha sikal upri phukajipeskeri tradicija

35 le Romendar, savi jek ando garudo blijanimi kunstakeri forma hi. I Ceija Stojka sikal aja tradicija ande lakeri

dschivdi form. Ham "Telai o deski seleni tschar" nan schukar kerdi poesija, ham jek bibastalo

40 terdschipe, savi jek desch berschengeri tschaj adaj phukal.

Kinderbibel in Burgenland- Romani Aus den Büchern des NT

Jesus kam nach Galiläa. Er verkündete das Evangelium Gottes und sagte: Die Zeit ist erfüllt. Jetzt beginnt Gottes Herrschaft. Kehrt um und glaubt die gute Botschaft, die ich bringe.

Als Jesus in seine Heimatstadt Nazaret kam, ging er am Sabbat in das Gebetshaus. Dort las er eine Stelle aus dem Buch des Propheten Jesaja vor: Der Geist Gottes, des Herrn, ruht auf mir, denn er hat mich erwählt.

In Heft 10 begegnen zwei Jünger dem Auferstandenen; Jesus erscheint auch den Aposteln und segnet sie mit dem Heiligen Geist. Ergibt ihnen den Auftrag, den rechten Glauben bei allen Völkern zu verbreiten. 40 Tage nach Ostern steigt er in den Himmel auf und sendet den Menschen den Heiligen Geist.

Die Gemeinde Christi wird in Jerusalem verfolgt, und die Apostel ziehen aus, um überall die Worte Jesu zu verkünden. Sie künden vom Ende dieser Welt.

Ständige Schausammlung Landesmuseum Burgenland

Vor ungefähr 16 Millionen Jahren breitete sich über Teile des Burgenlandes ein warmes und mit dem Ozean verbundenes Meer, die Paratethys, aus. In seinen Küstenregionen lebten Seekühe, Delfine, Wale und grosse Haie. Um 1900 wurden in einer Walbersdorfer Lehmgrube die Knochen eines 6 meter langen Bartwals gefunden. Heute ist das Skelett im naturhistorischen Museum in Budapest zu sehen.

Schonungslose Poesie

Ein neuer Film über und mit Ceija Stojka, von Karin Berger

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

Raum für das gesprochene Wort

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

DETAILS

Subject:	Language; Linguistics; Syntax; Roma
Location:	Austria
Publication title:	Romani Studies; Cheverly
Volume:	22
Issue:	1

Pages:	49-66
Number of pages:	18
Publication year:	2012
Publication date:	2012
Publisher:	Liverpool University Press
Place of publication:	Cheverly
Country of publication:	United Kingdom, Cheverly
Publication subject:	Literature, European/Eastern European, Anthropology
ISSN:	15280748
Source type:	Scholarly Journals
Language of publication:	English
Document type:	Feature
Document feature:	References
ProQuest document ID:	1014187664
Document URL:	https://search.proquest.com/docview/1014187664?accountid=13936
Copyright:	Copyright Liverpool University Press 2012
Last updated:	2012-09-20
Database:	Art, Design &Architecture Collection,Social Science Premium Collection

LINKS

[Linking Service](#)

Database copyright © 2019 ProQuest LLC. All rights reserved.

[Terms and Conditions](#) [Contact ProQuest](#)