

ROMA AND ROMANI IN AUSTRIA*

The Austrian Roma and "Austrian Romani" can be seen as paradigmatic of the social and linguistic situation of Roma in the so-called Western affluent society. Just like in many Central and Western European countries, the Austrian Roma population comprises several groups. These differ both in their socio-political status and in their socio-cultural background, which results in dialectal and sociolinguistic variation. Social heterogeneity and linguistic variation connected with the self-organization in the course of international developments concerning ethnic minorities have effects on the functionality and the status of Romani; the results of these processes are outlined in exemplary function for the Austrian situation.

1 THE AUSTRIAN ROMA

The Austrian Roma, which were officially recognized as Austria's sixth ethnic group in December 1993, can only be compared to other ethnic groups to a certain extent. Contrary to Croatians, Slovenes, Hungarians, Czechs and Slovaks, the Roma do not have, among others, a nation-state which – like a mother country – could support their cause and could thus contribute to the preservation of culture and identity. Furthermore, the Austrian Roma do not really have a closed area of settlement – one of the criteria for ethnic groups. Besides, the Roma cannot be regarded as a homogenous group. The individual subgroups within the Austrian Roma differ, among others, in their socio-cultural background and socio-political status.

According to serious estimations, at least 25.000 Roma are living in Austria and can be differentiated into at least 5 bigger groups: In the order of their length of residence in Austria, these five are as follows: *Burgenland-Roma*, *Sinti*, *Lovara*, *Vlax-Roma – Kalderaš, Gurbet, ...* – and Muslim Roma – *Arlje, Bugurdži ...* – from former Yugoslavia.

1.1 Demographic Parameters

The above-mentioned list does not include those Roma who have come to Austria from the Balkans and ex-communist states in Eastern and Southeastern Europe since the late 80s. A part of them, who had existing social contacts, joined the groups of migrant workers who came from the Balkans from the 60s onwards. There aren't any demographic statistics on this particular subgroup yet, neither are there statistics on those Roma who came to Austria from other countries, such as Slovakia, Hungary, Romania etc. These are included under the caption "Others" in Table 1, which shows the demographic parameters of the individual groups:

Table 1	Country of Emigration	Time of Immigration	Area of Settlement	Religion	Status
<i>Bgld-Roma</i>	Hungary	15./16. century	Burgenland Eastern Austrian cities	Catholic	autochthonous
<i>Sinti</i>	Balkans	14./15. century.	primarily cities	Christian	autochthonous
	Bohemia & Moravia Southern Germany	~ 1900			
<i>Lovara</i>	Hungary & Slovakia	~ 1900	primarily cities	Catholic	autochthonous
	Hungary	1956			allochthonous
<i>Kalderaš, Gurbet, ...</i>	Former Yugoslavia Serbia, Montenegro, ...	from the mid- 1960s on	primarily Vienna area	Orthodox	allochthonous
<i>Arlje, Bugurdži, ...</i>	Former Yugoslavia Kosovo, Macedonia, ...	from the mid- 1960s on	primarily Vienna area	Muslim	allochthonous
"Others"	Eastern- & Southeastern Europe	from the end of the 1980s on	primarily Vienna area	various	illegal

* the article was published in *Romani Studies* 5; 15/1 (2005), pp. 145-196.

1.1.1 Country of Emigration and Time of Immigration

The first immigrants into the German-speaking – Central European culture area were the Sinti, whose presence has been documented since the 15th century. A certain continuity in settlement on what is today Austrian territory can, however, only be proven from the second half of the 18th century onwards. The fact that in Northern Italy and Russia Sinti groups are nowadays called *Estrexarja* (Austrians) attests to a high mobility of the first immigrants. It is highly probable that the majority of Sinti who are living in Austria today settled here only in the course of the 20th century.

The *Burgenland-Roma* are the group which has been living longest on Austrian territory: they have been immigrating since the late 15th century from Central Hungary and have not left the Western Hungarian area (since 1921 Burgenland) since.

The immigration of *Lovara* in the late 19th century and of the *Sinti* around 1900 can also be called an internal migration: both the *Lovara* and the majority of *Sinti* had come from areas of what was at the time the Austrian-Hungarian Monarchy; the first from Hungary and Slovakia, the second from Bohemia and Moravia, today's Czech Republic. A few *Sinti* families also came from Southern Germany. Additionally, some *Lovara* fled to Austria in 1956 in the wake of the so-called "Hungary Uprising".

Due to the migration of workers from the 60s onwards, there has been an influx of Roma from former Yugoslavia: *Vlax-Roma* – *Kalderaš*, *Gurbet*, etc. – primarily from Serbia, as well as Muslim Roma – *Arlije*, *Bugurdži*, etc. – primarily from Kosovo and Macedonia. As has already been mentioned, there are no demographic statistics on the increased immigration of Roma from the former Eastern Block and Yugoslavia from the late 80s onwards. It is however possible that this last group is the biggest one; then, the above-mentioned total of 25.000 could be doubled. These considerations are more or less well-founded speculations.

1.1.2 Area of Settlement

The majority of Austrian *Lovara* and of the immigrants from the Balkans are living in the Vienna area. *Sinti* can mainly be found in cities, and there is a gradient from East to West as far as their numbers are concerned. Also those immigrants who came to Austria from the late 80s onwards settle almost exclusively in cities, mainly Vienna.

Solely the *Burgenland-Roma* are living, in the vast majority, in rural areas or smaller cities, such as Oberwart, which is – due to the murder of four Roma in February 1995 – the best-known Austrian city with a Roma population. Among the *Burgenland-Roma*, however, there has to be differentiated between those who acknowledge being Roma and those who are merely of Roma origin. The members of the second group who do not declare themselves as Roma, have been moving on towards Eastern Austrian cities, particularly towards Vienna, since the 1950s. They are, in the vast majority, assimilated to the majority population (which usually knows nothing about their origin), and can thus be counted only partially among the Austrian Roma. This is the reason why they have not been included in the above-mentioned total of 25.000 Austrian Roma.

1.1.3 Religion

The Roma's religious affiliation commonly depends on the majority population in the country of emigration. Membership of more recent Christian denominations has, up to now, only played a secondary role.

The *Burgenland-Roma* and *Lovara* are almost exclusively of Roman-Catholic faith, which reflects both their Hungarian origin and their Austrian surroundings. The population of both countries is in the vast majority of Catholic faith. Among the *Sinti* there are also some Protestants, but it has to be said that for the *Sinti* in general religion has little significance.

The religion of the immigrants from the Balkans reflects the majority faith of the country of origin. The same is true for the more recent immigrants. The *Kalderaš* and *Gurbet*, coming from Serbia are of Orthodox faith, the *Arlije* and other groups that came from the Southern Balkans or Turkey are Muslims, and are thus placed in the Western Rumelian Ottoman cultural tradition.

The Roma's religious affiliation mainly determines their festive traditions. Religion can be, as is the case with the Austrian Roma, an element of division – among others because of the

different calendar. A *Džurdževdan*-pilgrimage to a Catholic place of pilgrimage in the 90s was the single exception. Not only Catholics, but also members of Orthodox and Muslim faith participated in this event – most probably without the Catholic priest leading the pilgrimage knowing.

1.1.4 Socio-political Status

The socio-political status of the individual groups is one more element for differentiation. According to the Austrian law, an ethnic group is defined among others by a common language, a closed area of settlement, and by the criteria of whether they are autochthonous. Long-established, or autochthonous are those groups which have been living on the Austrian national territory for generations; this includes the *Burgenland-Roma*, *Sinti* and the *Lovara* who immigrated around 1900; together with the Roma who came from Hungary in 1956, they make up a maximum of 20% of the above-mentioned total of 25.000.

The *Lovara* who fled Hungary in 1956 have, as a rule, the Austrian nationality, but are regarded as allochthonous by those authorities which interpret the laws "rigorously". The same is true for the migrant workers of the *Kalderaš*, *Gurbet* and *Arlije*, as long as they have the Austrian nationality or a residence permit.

In practice, this differentiation is not carried out consistently. Because of cultural common ground and the same or similar Romani varieties, the status of the more recently immigrated *Lovara* and *Vlax-Roma* from the Balkans can be questioned. This is why these groups are tacitly treated as autochthonous Roma by more liberal members of the authorities, and can thus sometimes profit from the ethnic groups' rights. The grey area between autochthonous and allochthonous also includes the Muslim Roma.¹

The migrants of the late 80s and 90s of the 20th century remain de facto excluded. As a rule, they have neither the Austrian nationality nor a valid residence permit. According to the authorities, they are staying in Austria illegally and thus have no rights arising from the status as ethnic group.

1.2 Emotional Parameters

For the living together of the Austrian Roma the demographic parameters play a secondary role. Their living together, or rather their co-existence, results from the mutual attitude towards the individual groups. These do depend to some part on demographic parameters, but are generally determined by emotional parameters. Table 2 gives a survey of these:

Table 2	Affiliation	<i>Romanipe</i>	Self-Esteem	<i>Gadže</i>
<i>Bgld-Roma</i>	Austrians	settled/ <i>RomUngri</i>	low (inferior)	–
<i>Sinti</i>	Austrians	nomadic/"original"	high (superior)	–
<i>Lovara</i>	Austrians	nomadic/"original"	high (superior)	– / Ø
<i>Kalderaš</i> , ...	Immigrants	nomadic/"original"	high (superior)	Ø
<i>Arlije</i> , ...	Immigrants	settled/ <i>Xoraxane</i>	high (neutral)	Ø
"Others"	Foreigners			

1.2.1 Affiliation

Concerning the Roma's affiliation, the same division as with the other population can be seen: Austrians and Non-Austrians (= immigrants). This differentiation into native and foreign corresponds only partly to the socio-political differentiation into autochthonous and allochthonous: the *Lovara* who came to Austria in 1956 are considered native, which is partially a result of the historical pairing Austria – Hungary, and of the relatively long presence of *Lovara* in Austria. Immigrants from former Yugoslavia are, notwithstanding their formal integration, the Austrian nationality or permanent residence permits, considered as a foreign element in the Austrian population; this judgement determines the picture they have of themselves: the Roma who came to Austria as immigrant workers in the 60s consider themselves – regardless of their formal integration – foreigners.

A separation into Austrians and Non-Austrians reflects a scale of values which dates back to the monarchy: the Germans, and to a lesser extent, the Hungarians as ruling peoples are contrasted by the Slavic peoples as peoples which were ruled over. Even though a big part of at least the Eastern Austrian population has Slavic roots, this scale of values determines the living together of groups of different origin and ethnic affiliation up to this day; not only for the majority population, but also for the Roma.

The most recently, in the late 80s, immigrated Roma are oftentimes considered foreigners by those groups who came to Austria as immigrant workers. These native Roma, as they see themselves, consider the new ones mainly as economic refugees and spongers; an attitude similar to that of the vast majority within the Austrian population.

To sum up, the emotionally marked parameter "affiliation" results from the origin of each group of Roma or, in other words, from the social status of the majority population of the country of origin as seen by the Austrian population. The criteria "affiliation" is not absolutely congruent with the socio-political status of the individual Roma groups, but does correlate: the differences in status of the individual groups as set down by the authorities correspond to the criteria of differentiation in the understanding of the majority population and to the internal criteria used by the Austrian Roma; this fact has negative influences on the effort of emancipation, as "autochthonous" Roma-representatives use this differentiation as an argument to keep their share of public funds as high as possible.

1.2.2 Romanipe

A further emotional parameter which is, to a certain extent, marked by the folkloristic-romantic picture the *Gadže* (Non-Roma) have of the Roma, concerns the criteria of "originality", "authenticity", of "being true Roma", the *Romanipe*. The most important characteristic of this parameter is the dichotomy between nomadic and settled. Those Roma who have been settled for a long time are considered as "assimilated" and, as far as the traveling Roma are concerned, do not respect the traditional customs.

None of the groups that see themselves as representatives and guardians of the true *Romanipe* are truly nomadic. It is only the memory of partially nomadic professions, such as smiths, horse dealers, musicians etc., that is better preserved in these groups than in others. Connected to this, however, is the claim for independence, which can mainly be seen by the efforts of the *Lovara*, *Kalderaš* and also *Sinti* to be as independent of the *Gadže* as possible: they prefer self-employment and consequently avoid – if possible – being on a pay-roll.

Within the Austrian Roma society, *Arlije* and *Burgenland-Roma* are considered "settled" and thus at least partially assimilated. The common term for the Burgenland-Roma, *Rom-Ungri*, is pejorative and implies both a long period of being settled and the loss of their *Romanipe*. *Xoraxane*, as the *Arlije* are called by Non-Muslim Roma from the Balkans, signifies "Muslims, Turks" or settled Roma living in the Western Rumelian Ottoman cultural tradition.

1.2.3 Self-Esteem

Closely connected to the parameter of *Romanipe* is the self-esteem of the individual groups. With the exception of the *Burgenland-Roma*, all groups of Roma living in Austria consider themselves superior to the others, also including the *Gadže*.

This feeling of superiority leads to social values which differ from group to group. The only invariable is the *Burgenland-Roma's* position at the lowest end of the scale. This position is caused – in the eyes of other Roma – by their being settled and the ensuing loss of *Romanipe*. This low regard from other groups of Roma has caused a feeling of inferiority of the *Burgenland-Roma*. They consider themselves "half-breeds", a feeling that was reinforced by their experiences during the Nazi regime: firstly, because the Nazis considered the *Burgenland-Roma* as half-breeds between Roma and the "scum of the majority population" and, as a consequence, as "particularly unworthy life"; secondly, because the *Burgenland-Roma* were strongly affected by the genocide which destroyed a social structure which could not be restored until now. The *Burgenland-Roma* are stigmatized twice: once, as "gypsies" by the majority population, and once as "assimilated" by Roma society.

The *Sinti*, who were also strongly affected by genocide, see themselves in a whole other light: as a rule, they feel superior to all other Roma and think a clear distinction important.

This feeling of superiority is most probably linked with the *Sinti*'s long presence in the Central European German-speaking area. Just like the Jews who had been living in Germany and Austria for a long time and wanted to clearly distinguish themselves from the more recently immigrated Eastern Jews between World War I and II, the *Sinti* want to distinguish and consequently distance themselves from the new arrivals from the East. This led to problems in the late 80s, at the beginning of the emancipation movement and in the course of the quest for recognition as ethnic group. Roma organizations which used the term *Sinti* in their name were under threat of legal sanctions required to drop the term *Sinti*. Moreover, the *Sinti* were not willing to open up to the majority population, which became necessary in the course of the emancipation movement and the quest for recognition as ethnic group. This is the reason why in Austria – from a purely legal point of view – the *Sinti* are subsumed under the term *Roma*. Additionally, the *Sinti* are not really interested and involved in the activities of the ethnic groups. There is no organization with a continuity similar to the *Roma* organizations.

The *Vlax*-groups – *Lovara*, *Kalderaš*, *Gurbet*, etc. – feel superior to the *Sinti* and *Arlije*, and the *Burgenland-Roma*. The highest position in their scale of values is naturally held by their own group, the second place by other *Vlax-Roma*, followed by *Sinti* and *Xoraxane*, and the *Burgenland-Roma* at the end. Even though other groups of *Vlax-Roma* are considered to be quite close and sometimes almost of equal value, there is no real living together among the *Vlax*-groups, only a co-existence. Not even the Viennese organization *Romano Centro* which represents – perhaps as only organization in Europe – several groups of *Roma*, among them several *Vlax*-groups, can achieve more than a cooperation of individual members of different groups. Cooperation of different groups with equal values and equal rights, and plans and measures carried out by all groups together remained impossible to this day.

The self-esteem of the *Arlije* is quite high, but does not have a discriminatory effect. Because of their different socio-cultural character - Muslims versus Non-Muslims – the *Arlije* consider all other *Roma* and *Sinti* as *Gadžikane Roma*, by which they understand Christian *Roma* who do not belong to them and who have other customs and traditions. Because of their nomadic tradition the *Vlax-Roma* are also called *Čergarja* , "tent *Roma*", by the *Arlije*; being settled, and to some extent, urban, and integrated into the majority population, the *Arlije* distinguish themselves from the afore-mentioned *Vlax-Roma*.

1.2.4 Attitude towards *Gadže*

Another difference is the individual Austrian *Roma* groups' attitude towards the majority population, the *Gadže*. Cautious or indifferent acceptance or rejection of the *Gadže* are closely connected to the amount of time the individual groups spent in the Central European – German cultural area. Whereas the *Roma* who came from the Balkans in the second half of the 20th century are cautious, but indifferent or in some cases even open towards the majority population, the *Burgenland-Roma*, the *Lovara* and *Sinti*, who in some cases have been living in Central Europe for centuries, mistrust the *Gadže*, and sometimes the *Sinti* literally cut themselves off from the majority population. The *Lovara* who immigrated in 1956 stand in-between cautious indifference and rejection.

The current attitude of the individual groups towards the *Gadže* depends primarily on their experiences with the majority population. While the immigrants from the Balkans – a stigmatized fringe group in their country of origin – also talk about their relatively good relationship with the majority population, the *Roma* who have been living in Central Europe for centuries continue to be outsiders who are discriminated against. Apart from folkloristic-romantic stereotypes, they are not accepted by the majority population. The negative peak of discrimination and persecution was the genocide during the Nazi time, which particularly affected the *Burgenland-Roma*, the *Sinti* and *Lovara*. The *Roma* in Serbia were also particularly affected by the holocaust, but contrary to the Austrians, the Serbian majority population participated very little or not at all. In Austria, however, the population did not only accept the internment and abduction of *Roma*, but sometimes even supported this actively. As a consequence, of about 8.000 *Roma* who had been registered in *Burgenland* in the 1930s, only a few hundred survived. The social structure of all three groups - *Sinti*, *Lovara* and *Burgenland-Roma* – were destroyed almost completely by the holocaust. This caesura continues to have effects and determines the relationship with the majority population. Furthermore, stigmatization and discrimination did by no means stop after the Nazi regime.

The following fact should get the Austrian population thinking: the Roma's negative attitude and their mistrust towards *Gadže* rises in proportion to the length of their stay in the Central European – German cultural area.

The individual groups of Roma are subject to stigmatization and discrimination in varying degrees, but their history of exclusion and persecution is the most obvious common ground and the most important link between the various groups of not only the Austrian Roma but of the whole European Roma society.

Regardless of this common element – a history of exclusion and persecution – the living together of the Austrian groups of Roma is rather a co-existence than a cooperation. Even though marriages between members of different groups take place, there is no regular relationship between the individual groups. With the exception of sporadic meetings of a few activists, there is little inter-group contact and, as a result, little solidarity. The reason for this is again the Roma's existence as a fringe group for centuries: on the one hand, it is easier for a minority that is discriminated against to survive in smaller groups, but on the other hand marginalized population groups have no political or economic power, which in turn stops the development of bigger social structures.

2 AUSTRIAN ROMANI

In Austria there are no clear linguistic-political concepts concerning Romani; neither on a national nor on a regional or local level. The starting point of initiatives that try to establish Romani within the rights provided for in the ethnic group laws are exclusively organizations or private individuals, which are, however, supported by public institutions as a rule. The difficulty in establishing Romani as an equal language of an ethnic group lies in the heterogeneous character of the "Austrian Romani", as well as in the little use of that language in the individual groups.

2.1 Linguistic Parameters

With reference to Karl Kraus who once said that the only thing separating the Austrians and the Germans was their common language, it could be said that the most obvious socio-cultural common ground of the Roma are their different linguistic varieties.

Romani is a heterogeneous bundle of varieties with a homogenous lexical and morphological core, but without a homogenizing standard. This lack of a standard is again a result of the Roma's existence as fringe groups: only societies which can dispose of the necessary power to build political, economic or cultural centers develop a standard which is generally accepted in a particular area because of the existing power structure. The Roma were up to now denied every possibility to build such centers of power, and as a consequence, no generally accepted standard of Romani could develop.

Thus, the Austrian Roma population is also heterogeneous from a linguistic point of view. Table 3 offers a survey of the linguistic heterogeneity and discusses both the structural parameters "classification" and "contact languages", and the emotional parameter "attitude":

Table 3	Classification	Contact languages	Attitude
<i>Bgld-Roma</i>	Central	<i>Hungarian (Bgld-Croatian) German</i>	+
<i>Sinti</i>	Northwestern	German	+/-
<i>Lovara</i>	Vlax	Romanian Hungarian German	-/+
<i>Kalderaš, ...</i>	Vlax	Romanian Serbian German	Ø/+
<i>Arlje, ...</i>	Balkan	<i>Turkish Macedonian/Albanian (Serbo-Croatian) German</i>	Ø/-

2.1.1 Classification

The classification of the Roma varieties is in accordance with the latest research. The Austrian Romani comprises varieties of four of the seven branches defined by Matras (2002):

Burgenland-Romani and the Southwestern Hungarian *Vend* variety and the Northwestern Slovakian *Prekmurje* variety form the *Vend*-group of the Southern Central Romani sub-branch, which also includes the so-called "*Rom-Ungro*" variety, to be found in Hungary and Slovakia.

Rómanes or *Sintitikes*, as the *Sinti* call their variety of Romani, is part of the *Sinti-Manuš* subgroup of the Northwestern branch.

Contrary to the varieties of the *Lovara* and *Kalderaš*, which are part of the Northern *Vlax*-sub-branch, the varieties of the *Gurbet* are counted among Southern *Vlax*.

The Romani varieties of the *Arlije* form one of the largest dialectal continua on the Balkans. The variety of the *Bugurdži*, also mentioned in this text, is part of an independent sub-branch within the Balkan branch of Romani.

2.1.2 Contact Languages

The vertical position of the contact languages in Table 3 reflects the sequence in time of the various contact situations. Apart from this chronological order of the more recent borrowing stratas this table also shows potential multilingualism of the individual groups of speakers. Multilingualism is only potential, because no group has achieved the complete spectrum of competence.

All Austrian varieties of Romani have the German influence in common; this influence, however, has had different effects, because the length of stay within the German-speaking area varies. *Sinti*-Romani is marked strongest by German, followed by *Burgenland-Romani* and *Lovara-Romani*; in the latter case, differences between the two subgroups can be seen: the Romani of the 1956 immigrants is less influenced by German than that of the 1900 immigrants. Also, there is very little influence of German on the Romani varieties of the immigrants who started coming to Austria in the 1960s.

2.1.3 Attitude towards Romani

For the *Kalderaš* and *Gurbet*, the two groups with a continuous linguistic tradition, Romani is a natural part of their identity. It does not, however, play a role as a conscious marker of identity. It is one factor among several equally important ones which together make up their ethnic self-confidence.

In the *Lovara*'s case, things are not so clear: on the one hand, the importance of one's own language for the way one sees oneself and for the group identity is emphasized – primarily by members of the older generations –, but on the other hand these ideas oftentimes remain "lip-service". Romani is not passed on to the younger generations. Some of them are already assimilated as far as language is concerned and only have – if at all – a passive competence of Romani.

The situation of the *Sinti* is similar. Here, too, a part of the younger generation is de facto monolingual German-speaking. Contrary to the *Lovara*, however, *Rómanes* or *Sintitikes* is, as a rule, a factor of their identity – even if they are linguistically assimilated. This most probably reflects the attitude towards language that prevails in the Austrian *Sinti*: for them, *Rómanes* is a taboo in-group-marker which must under no circumstances be "revealed" to the *Gadže*. This attitude, resulting from the traumatic holocaust experience, can also be found, to some extent, with older *Lovara* or *Burgenland-Roma*, but not with the same consistency and consequences. The *Sinti*, *Kalderaš*, *Gurbet* and the linguistically still competent *Arlije* consider Romani only rarely as "protective language". They have no feeling of resentment against *Gadže* who show interest in their language and want to learn it.

For the *Burgenland-Roma*, their variety of Romani is the most important marker of identity; even for those members of the group who – according to their own assessment – have only little or passive linguistic competence. This attitude is the result of Roma self-organization thanks to which representatives of the *Burgenland-Roma* came into contact with members of other Roma groups. It was only the realization that these "other" Roma predominantly use Romani for their group-internal communication, that made the *Burgenland-Roma* con-

sider the decline in their use of Romani a loss. Then, activities to preserve their language became the main concern in their cultural work, making Romani a primary factor of identity.

It is interesting to see that the importance of Romani as factor of identity rises in correlation to the declining use of it. The only exception to this tendency are groups in which a change of language has taken place; thus, Romani as marker of identity was replaced by the majority language of the individual country of origin, as was the case for the *Arlije* from Prilep/Macedonia, who will be discussed later on.

2.2 Multilingualism and Language Use

Table 4 gives a survey over the linguistic repertoire of the individual Austrian Roma groups, showing multilingualism of the individual groups and the use of individual linguistic varieties and thus of Romani:²

The *Kalderaš* and *Arlije*, from which only the subgroup from Prilep/Macedonia is mentioned in this table, are paradigmatic of other groups that came from the Balkans, such as the *Gurbet* whose linguistic repertoire is similar to that of the *Kalderaš*.

Generally speaking, this table shows the following: the younger the speakers and the more public the communicative situation, the more German diatypes dominate. With the exception of the repertoire of the older members of the recently immigrated *Kalderaš* and *Arlije*, German alone is the acrolectal diatype; in other words, German is the primary variety of language used in the public sphere. The fact that the older generations of *Kalderaš* and *Arlije* still use the language of their country of origin in an acrolectal function is connected primarily with the intact links to Serbia and Macedonia, and the ensuing contact with these countries' authorities.³

Table 4		BASILECT	MESOLECT	ACROLECT
SINTI	O	GERMAN Romani	GERMAN (Romani)	GERMAN
	Y	GERMAN (Romani)	GERMAN (Romani)	GERMAN
BGLD.-ROMA	O	GERMAN Romani	GERMAN (Hungarian or Croatian) [Romani]	GERMAN
	Y	GERMAN (Romani)	GERMAN [Hungarian or Croatian] [Romani]	GERMAN
LOVARA	O	GERMAN Romani	GERMAN (Hungarian) Romani	GERMAN
	Y	GERMAN (Romani)	GERMAN (Romani)	GERMAN
KALDERAŠ	O	(German) Serbian ROMANI	(German) Serbian Romani	(German) SERBIAN
	Y	German Serbian ROMANI	German (Serbian) Romani	GERMAN
ARLIJE	O	(German) MACEDONIAN Romani	German MACEDONIAN (Romani)	German Macedonian
	Y	GERMAN Macedonian (Romani)	GERMAN Macedonian (Romani)	GERMAN

O.....older generation(s)
Y.....younger generation(s)
Basilect.....Diatypes of the social microcosms (family, friends, etc.)
Mesolect.....Diatypes of the social macrocosms (acquaintances, place of work, etc.)
Akrolect.....Diatypes in public life (authorities, school, media, etc.)
Diatype.....functionally defined linguistic variety
CAPITAL LETTERS.....primary Diatype
().....little use
[].....very little use
italics (Lovara).....only true for those Lovara who immigrated in 1956

With the *Sinti*, *Burgenland-Roma* and *Lovara* of both generations and the younger generation of the *Arlije*, German diatypes are dominant in their whole repertoire; German varieties are the primary or single diatype in the repertoire strata and thus in all linguistic domains. This is linked to the individual groups' or subgroups length of stay in the German-speaking area, but also to the relatively high degree of assimilation (particularly true for the *Lovara* who immigrated in 1956 and for the younger generation of the *Arlije*), which is not only expressed by the domain-specific use of language. The index of assimilation is the German dominance in the basilect and its use as intimate variety in their social microcosm.

The reason for the linguistic assimilation is, of course, the German-speaking surrounding: kindergarden, school, place of work, semi-public life – shopping, free time activities etc. – and the media – newspaper, radio, TV etc. – are "German". Another important factor is the attitude of some parents who think it would be better to talk only in German with their children in order to "simplify their journey through life". Behind this attitude are mainly economic considerations: only a high competence of the majority language makes education and thus being part of the affluent society possible. Using the stigmatized intimate variety, Romani, makes climbing the social ladder more difficult.

If one considers the "self-ordained forced assimilation" of the *Burgenland-Roma*, their "no longer wanting to be Roma" – caused by the negative experiences during the World Wars and after them – it becomes clear why the attitude towards language outline earlier – Romani will only be a hindrance for their children's future lives – is most clearly pronounced in this group.

The mesolect which comprises the diatypes of the social macrocosm of the semi-public sphere – work, shopping, communication with acquaintances etc. – displays (with the exception of the *Sinti*) a high degree of multilingualism in all groups.

The *Burgenland-Roma* are sometimes competent speakers of other Burgenland minority languages. The significance of Hungarian and Croatian diatypes in their repertoire has decreased over the decades, correlating with the decreasing use within the Hungarian and Croatian minorities themselves. Only older Roma which are living in Hungarian or Croatian towns or linguistic enclaves still have full competence. The younger generations only have, if at all, passive partial competences in Hungarian and Croatian. In the acro- and basilect of the *Burgenland-Roma*'s repertoire the language of other ethnic groups have almost no significance anymore.⁴

The same is true for the Hungarian language in the *Lovara*'s repertoire: Hungarian varieties function neither as basilectal nor as acrolectal diatypes. Also, it has mesolectal function only for the older generations of the subgroup which immigrated in 1956, and only if families or individual people still or again have contact with their relatives and friends in Hungary.

Contrary to the *Burgenland-Roma* and *Lovara*, both mesolect and basilect of the *Kalderaš* and *Arlije* are trilingual. With the *Kalderaš*, Serbian is losing its importance for the younger people, which can also be seen in its sparing use as mesolectal diatype. The reason for this development is the young ones' weaker bond with their parents' country of origin. The older people use Serbian with other close friends and acquaintances that also came from the Balkans as immigrant workers, but also with the *Gadže* in their country of origin. Because of these contacts Serbian varieties function as both meso- and acrolectal diatypes.

For the *Arlije*, the Macedonian language is not only a means of communication with other immigrant workers and *Gadže* in the country of origin, but also functions as a "linguistic link" between the generations. Hence the basilectal function of Macedonian, which has taken the place of Romani as intimate variety – in the Prilep subgroup, as has already been said. The younger the speakers, the more Romani loses its significance in the repertoire. Macedonian is the common language of all generations and a group-building factor. Romani is generally used only as internal means of communication of the older generations, and, partly, for the contact with other Roma from or in the country of origin.

With the *Kalderaš*, the internal communication is dominated by Romani. It is the primary basilectal diatype and also functions as mesolectal diatype in the contact with other groups of *Kalderaš* and *Vlax-Roma*. The reason for this is the – above-mentioned – generally intact socio-structure and the cohesion within the families and clans which knows no boundaries.

Family cohesion and intact social structures are the primary parameters for the use of Romani for the *Lovara* who immigrated in 1956. Families that have such a cohesion and

where traditional conventions of living together are still valid also use Romani as intimate variety. If this cohesion doesn't exist, Romani is little or not used for internal communication.

Things are similar with the *Lovara* who immigrated in the previous century, the *Burgenland-Roma*, and the *Sinti*, too. Wherever they managed to overcome the caesura caused by genocide – the loss of their socio-structure because the grandparents' generation, so important for the preservation of cultural and linguistic tradition, was murdered – and to re-establish the former structure, Romani is still used as an equal basilectal diatype along with German. For the *Sinti* and *Lovara* who are living in the vast majority in urban areas, the situation differs from family to family, from subgroup to subgroup. Those *Burgenland-Roma* who stayed in the rural area, in Burgenland, have a few linguistic enclaves in which *Burgenland-Romani* is used along with German as equal basilectal diatype.

As mesolectal diatype, Romani is used by older rather than younger speakers. Romani is important during the mobile summer period, when *Sinti* come into contact with other, domestic or foreign, groups. The *Lovara* use their variety of Romani in the contact with other *Lovara* or *Vlax-Roma* groups. *Burgenland-Romani* is very rarely used as mesolectal diatype, and if it is used, only for the contact with linguistically related groups in Slovenia, Hungary and Slovakia that also speak Southern Central varieties. However, contact with members of these groups is quite rare because of the *Burgenland-Roma's* isolation within the European Roma society.

The table of repertoires above does not include the acrolectal function of individual Romani varieties which have only been added recently. Because of its use in the media and the internet, Romani is nowadays also used in a public-official context. However, this is a use which could be called "domain-reduced": in acrolectal domains – education, politics, economics, law – Romani is still not used. Besides, the medial use is restricted to "elites" and is partially determined by "non-Roma". This is the reason why this function has not been added to the description of the collective repertoires of the individual groups of speakers. The same is true for the use of Romani varieties in church, at public functions and in the international-political context; these are all situations which are restricted to a few representatives of individual groups, and are thus not to be added to the collective repertoire. Concerning the new acrolectal functions, caused by political changes – self-organization, acknowledgement as ethnic group, organization on an international level – it remains yet to be seen whether Romani will be able to assert itself in these domains. It would be very desirable if this extension in the dimension of functions in the acrolectal domains would help to stop – or even better – to invert the declining use of Romani in mesolectal and basilectal domains.

2.3 Romani in Education

Romani has absolutely no function or tradition as language in which lessons are conducted or as language of education. The main reason for this is the lack of a written tradition, which is a result of the Roma's existence as fringe groups: stigmatized and marginalized groups do not have the necessary political power at their disposal which is the indispensable basis for the development of economic or cultural centers, which in turn are the prerequisite for building a linguistic standard and, as result, a functioning educational system.

Things are similar for Romani as subject in school. Stigmatized like its speakers, it was for a long time perceived as autonomous language only by scientific outsiders and philanthropist philologists. With only a few exceptions, Romani is regarded an obstacle to education rather than as a part of education. It was only in the course of the self-organization, a result of the Roma's quest for emancipation and of the multilingualism and intercultural awareness which became more important in the second half of the 20th century as a reaction to migratory movements, that Romani was perceived integratively – if only in a peripheral way – by the educational establishment.

As far as Austria is concerned, this development is reflected only in the 1998 amendment to the law protecting the minorities in Burgenland, passed in 1994, which has a "constitutional character":

Section 6: Particular linguistic instruction

§ 14. (1) In Burgenland, an additional instruction in Croatian and Hungarian should be made possible according to demand for Austrian citizens of Croatian and Hungarian

descent, also in these types of school not mentioned in section 2 to 4. Similarly, an additional instruction in *Romanes* is to be made possible for the *Burgenland Roma*.

Section 7: Administration

§ 15. The Landesschulrat for Burgenland (administration for education) has to set up an own division for the matters of [...] 4. teaching Croatian, Hungarian and *Romanes* in other schools. (Source: <http://www.bka.gv.at/bka/dokumente/MSGburgenland.pdf>)

These two mentions of *Roma* and *Romanes* have to be seen as emblematic rather than "touching upon reality".⁵ Apart from the fact that these passages explicitly talk about the *Burgenland-Roma* only, a minority within the ethnic group, there are no regulations on how to carry out these ideas, no starting points, or linguistic-political activities on behalf of the responsible provincial authorities which take the socio-linguistic situation of Romani in general and *Burgenland-Romani* in particular into account.

Thanks to the initiative and the efforts of individual people from the ethnic group and from the educational system, *Burgenland-Romani* is now taught as "unverbindliche Übung" (optional supplementary subject) in elementary schools in the Oberwart area. Together, it was possible to overcome both juridical and administrative obstacles; obstacles caused by the fact that there are no people (yet) who acknowledge themselves as members of the ethnic group who have both the necessary linguistic competence and fulfill the formal criteria demanded by the educational authorities – a result of a marginalization that lasted for centuries.

The supplementary lessons in elementary schools in the Oberwart area, which share the emblematic character of all judicial dealings with Romani, have up to this day remained isolated cases; Romani isn't taught at all in other Austrian schools.

Extra-curricular activities, such as adult training courses in Romani, which are offered by the *Volkshochschule* (adult training center) of the *Burgenland-Roma* in Oberwart and Eisenstadt are also singular cases sponsored from federal funds, just like the courses in *Burgenland-Romani* and *Kalderaš-Romani* offered by the university of Graz. To mention all Austrian activities concerning the teaching of Romani, only the courses in *Kalderaš-Romani* at the University of Innsbruck and the sporadically held language courses by the Viennese organization *Romano Centro* have to be enumerated.

Compared to the state of ten years ago, this could be seen as a success. Compared to what would be absolutely necessary to preserve the language, the emblematic-symbolic character of these activities becomes clear. Even though the emancipation of Romani from the official language German is utopian, a stronger approximation to the status of the languages of other ethnic groups should be possible even if one takes the lacking written tradition and the non-existing status of official language in any country – which the other ethnic groups can claim – into account.

2.4 Romani and the Culture Industry

If we do not take pejorative criteria, based on prejudices, into account, like those of the (German-speaking) members of the educated classes who grant the Roma and their language, if at all, only a certain folkloristic value, Romani as carrier of a profound oral tradition could undoubtedly be seen as a cultural language equal to that of other ethnic groups. This cultural dimension of Romani is heavily threatened by modern media. Marginalized fringe groups are to the biggest part excluded from media productions, but participate passively in these products – as consumers. In this way, the primary expression of the oral tradition, storytelling, is driven to the background. In connection with the monolingual (the language of the majority) educational system, the competence and use of Romani is losing its function as carrier of culture. The use of Romani as language of the media as described in the next chapter has only little importance and a symbolic character rather than a real informative, educational or entertaining function – which are the primary functions of media products.

2.4.1 Electronic Media and Print Media

The electronic and print media should support the use of the languages of ethnic groups, as is indirectly guaranteed by the Austrian ethnic groups law and by two treaties by the European Council which were ratified by the Republic of Austria. The "Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities" includes the following passage:

The Parties shall not hinder the creation and the use of printed media by persons belonging to national minorities. In the legal framework of sound radio and television broadcasting, they shall ensure, as far as possible, ... , that persons belonging to national minorities are granted the possibility of creating and using their own media. (section II/Article 9.3) (Source: <http://www.humanrights.coe.int/Minorities/>)

The topic "Media and Minorities" is discussed in far greater detail in the "European Charter of Regional and Minority Languages". Article 11 of this Charter, ratified in 2001, obliges the Republic of Austria to ensure the use of the languages of the ethnic minorities on the radio, in TV and the press and to support – if possible – the construction and work of the ethnic groups' own channels and newspapers.⁶

2.4.1.1 Electronic Media

The trigger for the use of Romani in the electronic media were not the laws and treaties mentioned above, but the liberalization of the media market and the ensuing possibility of private radio stations. That in turn caused the former holder of the monopoly, the state-run broadcasting company ORF, to get active.

In April 2000, *Radio Mora*, an organization which includes Croatian and Hungarian organizations and the organization *Roma*, started to broadcast programs in all languages of Burgenland's ethnic groups within the offer of the private corporation "Antenne 4". Due to financial reasons – reduction, and later on a complete cut, of public sponsorship – work had to stop in November 2001. At the time, *Burgenland-Romani* is marginally present in the radio programs and – to an even lesser extent – in TV programs of the state-run regional Burgenland broadcasting company; this "measure" allows Romani if not the same, at least similar rights as Hungarian and Croatian, which have been present in programs for some time.

The starting point of all radio activities concerning Romani in Vienna is the organization *Romano Centro*. After a two-year break this medium-wave station run by the ORF at 1476 kHz started operating again in 1997 with a whole new task: from the very start it was *Radio 1476's* essential goal to create a stage for international meetings and integration. From April 1997 to June 1998 *Radio Romano Centro* broadcasted a 30-minute-bilingual program once a month, with various cultural and political topics concerning the Roma.⁷ With the end of *Radio Romano Centro* other radio stations took over the broadcasting time, which is still offered on *Radio 1476* in varying quality as far as content and language is concerned.⁸

Romani in the electronic media is among others a result of the ORF's reorganization of the domain responsible for the languages of ethnic groups; a reorganization made necessary because of the ratification of the Charter for regional and minority languages.

Apart from these half-hour radio programs, the Roma, their culture and thus also Romani are once in a while the topic of ethnic group-specific, German-speaking radio and TV programs. The programs that are on and those that are planned taken together can, however, account only for about 360 minutes of Romani use in the radio per month, and sparing use on TV, even if all possibilities are used to the maximum. This frequency of presence in Austria's electronic media confirms the – above-mentioned- primarily symbolic function of Romani – conveying information is, in the vast majority of cases, left to the programs in the language of the majority.

The use of Romani in Austrian film productions plays only a secondary role, but is still worth mentioning in view of the generally sparing use and function of Romani in a public-cultural context. Two productions have to be emphasized: the 1995 *Amen So Amen Sam*, a 26-minutes portrait of the Burgenland-Roma produced by Hans Panner for the organization *Roma*, and the feature film *Ceija Stojka*, a 84-minutes portrait of the well-known Austrian Romni by Karin Berger. But also in these films, Romani has – among others because of the German subtitles – only a symbolic-emblematic function and is used rather to illustrate the autonomous culture.

2.4.1.2 Print media

In Austria, no newspapers, weekly or monthly journals are published in Romani.

The only periodical which uses Romani exclusively is the children's *Mri Tikni Mini Multi*, which has been published six times a year by the association *Roma Service* in cooperation

with the organization of Burgenland-Croatian teachers, *Zora*, since December 1997. It is a 24-page journal with traditional content, for decades typical of that kind of publication: short stories, riddles, and other word games.

The oldest journal, now also well-known and appreciated beyond the bounds of Austria, *Romano-Centro*, has been published by the Viennese organization of the same name as bilingual quarterly journal since June 1993. The individual contributions are offered both in German and *Kalderaš-Romani*, and fairies, stories and songs of other Roma groups are presented in the variety of that group. Apart from these cultural contributions and short information on Roma-specific events in and around Austria, this journal also offers longer articles on the present situation of the Roma in various European countries, topical political commentaries by the editors and articles and commentaries by visiting personalities, for instance Vaclav Havel and other more or less well-known personalities. The journal *Romano Centro* is addressed to both the Roma and *Gadže*.

The second quarterly journal, *Romani Patrin*, published since January 1998 by the organization *Roma*, is addressed primarily to the *Burgenland-Roma*. The content is partly similar to that of the model *Romano Centro*: topical and general articles on the situation of Roma in other European countries, fairies, narratives and songs of other Roma groups which are also presented in the individual group's variety. Additionally, *Romani Patrin* offers a focus on special articles on the historical and present-day situation of the *Burgenland-Roma* and on various activities within the ethnic group and the organization *Roma*. Since January 2004, *Romani Patrin* has been reduced almost completely to accounts of the *Burgenland-Roma* and the organization itself. Taking the look behind *Burgenland-Romani* is a new quarterly journal, *dROMa*, by the organization *Roma Service*.

Another quarterly journal *Romano Kipo*, published by the Viennese "*Kulturverein Österreichischer Roma*" uses Romani in a classical emblematic function, namely exclusively in the title.⁹ The articles of this journal deal mainly with Austrian topics, the activities of the organization and its main representative, who is at the time head of the Roma "*Volksgruppenbeirat*" (ethnic group advisory council), which was to a great extent responsible for the official recognition of Roma as an ethnic group in 1993.

If the Austrian Romani print media are taken together, it has to be said that the situation is similar to that of the electronic media, and this situation will most probably not change in the recent future.

2.4.2 Other Cultural Activities

The starting point of cultural activities are mainly the already mentioned organizations – the "*Kulturverein Österreichischer Roma*", the organization *Roma Service*, the organization *Roma* and the organization *Romano Centro* – but additionally the organization *Ketani* in Linz has to be mentioned. The spectrum of events of these organizations ranges from historical exhibitions about the Roma's history (mainly about the holocaust) to music and theater plays and pilgrimages, celebrations and balls.

The only organization with exclusively cultural focus is the organization *Romanodrom – Rotatheater*. Apart from performances by the *Rota-ensemble*, whose model is the Roma ensemble *Pralipe*, there are occasional theater projects of the organization *Roma* – such as "*I kali tschasarkija/The black Empress*" – rehearsed together with the writer Peter Wagner – and of guest performances by foreign Roma ensembles like the Slovakian *Romathan*, the above-mentioned ensemble *Pralipe*, or the *Sinti* puppeteers from the Southern Germany area which are now and again invited by the organization *Ketani*.

One of the foci of cultural activity is – how could it be different, in view of the majority population's clichés - music, every organization supporting at least one group, which results in CD productions etc.¹⁰ In this context, *Ruža Nikolic-Lakatos* and her family, *Pera Petrović* and his ensemble, the *Samer-Band* and the young group *Romano Rath* from Burgenland have to be mentioned. With the exception of the *Samer-Band*, these groups sing exclusively in Romani. The *Lovara* singer *Ruža Nikolic-Lakatos* and her band, made up of her husband and her sons, are similarly well-known in the whole of Austria as *Harry Stojka*, who is known not only for his Roma-specific productions. He has recorded several CDs with Romani texts together with his father, *Mongo Stojka* and other family members. *Harry Stojka* and his Cousin *Karl Ratzer* are internationally renowned (jazz) guitarists. Furthermore, *Zipflo Wein-*

rich's "Sinti-Swing-Formation" and the singer *Tony Wegas*, who, however, recorded only one single song with Romani lyrics, have to be mentioned.¹¹

Apart from *Ilja Jovanović's* (2000) poems and a few narratives and poems in *Romano Centro* and *Romani Patrin* there is no literary text production in Austria. The autobiographies of *Ceija Stojka* (1988, 1992), *Karl Stojka* (Stojka/Pohanka 1994), *Mongo Stojka* (2000) and *Mišo Nikolić* (1997, 2000), written in German, are important for the Austrian Roma, because these contemporary documents contributed to the Austrian Roma's understanding of themselves. A similar function is perhaps fulfilled by the both monolingual - Romani – and bilingual – Romani/German – collection of texts in Burgenland-Romani (Ambrosch et al. 2000, Halwachs et al. 2000) and Lovara Romani (Cech et al. 2000, 2001), accompanied by CDs with fairy tales and songs (Fennesz-Juhász/Heinschink 2002, Fennesz-Juhász/Wogg 2002), by the *Romani-Projekt*.¹² The number of bilingual readings rose because of these publications and contributed to making Romani better known and to raising public awareness for an autonomous Romani culture.

The significance of Romani in the context of various exhibitions on culture, history, and the present-day situation of the Roma is similar. The target groups of such exhibitions are primarily pupils and interested *Gadže*, so Romani is subordinated to German as means of conveying information and again functions only as symbol of the Romani culture.

The use of Romani in a religious context is symbolic only. In masses and pilgrimages – among others to Mariazell – made especially for the Roma, *Burgenland-Romani* and, to some degree, *Lovara-Romani* is used in songs, plays and intercessions; this is an expression of the Roma groups' affiliation to the Catholic church, and of the Church's high regard of the Roma; in Burgenland there is, among others, a priest specially for all Roma concerns. Efforts for translating the bible into Romani which are common in other countries have not been made in Austria yet – this is probably a result of the Catholic Church's lack of interest: Catholic Roma speak German anyway.

2.4.3 Assessment of the Cultural Situation

The present-day situation of Austrian Romani is precarious. Its primary cultural function, the oral tradition, is losing importance: passing on fairy tales, stories and songs, which indirectly pass on the traditional social structure and its rules, by word of mouth is driven to the background because of the Roma's passive participation in the modern information society and because of the monolingual (majority language) school system. Active participation in the modern culture industry is made impossible by a marginalization that lasted over centuries and also prevented a cultural development similar to that of the majority population. Additionally, the Austrian Roma do not constitute a lucrative target group for the culture industry: firstly, because of their small number, and secondly because they are multilingual and can thus also be reached by productions in the majority language.

All this shows clearly that medial and cultural productions in Romani have only an emblematic-symbolic character. The question that remains to be asked is who the real target group of these "marginalia of culture industry" are: the Roma themselves or the *Gadže* supporters and advocates of a multicultural society?¹³ If one takes into account that in the vast majority of cases *Gadže* initiate public-cultural initiatives and media products by the Roma, one could conclude that the "consumers of multiculturalism" are the primary addressees of Romani-products. This thought is strengthened by the fact that with many cultural events of the Roma the *Gadže* form the majority of visitors; the danger lies in the threat of folklorizing the Roma's public-cultural activities. Following this line of argumentation, Romani as carrier of culture can be placed between the scylla of extinction and the charybdis of folksy and ethno-romantic folklorization. This scenario of Romani's place between "death and apparent death" cannot be dismissed, but in reality matters are more complex. A majority of Roma approves of this Romani culture initiated by *Gadže*.¹⁴ Besides, the Roma are usually proud that their language fulfills the same requirements as that of the majority population and other ethnic groups. This does not change the fact that the emblematic function of Romani in the public context prevails over the informative one, but it shows that using Romani in a public-cultural and medial context does make sense: if literature, music, newspapers, radio and TV programs etc. in Romani raise the Roma's self-esteem and, at the same time, show the majority population (or those who will listen) that the Roma have an equal, autonomous culture,

these products surely contribute to the social integration of the Roma. In how far Romani can assert itself in this process of integration remains to be seen.

3 Conclusion

European institutions do make a contribution to the public presence and the preservation of Romani; both indirectly by recommendations and treaties as was the case with the European Council, and directly by supporting educational programs like that of the European Union. The *Romani Projekt* or, more exactly, one part of it, the project "*Kodifizierung und Didaktisierung des Burgenland-Romani*" was one of the first Austrian projects to be supported by European Union's *Socrates* program. There are also some more projects, co-financed by the EU, where Austrian Roma organizations participate. Here, however, the organizations are only partners, not coordinators: the administrative work is extremely time-consuming and complex, and the organizations with their limited infrastructures oftentimes give up after leafing through the application requirements and forms. Additionally, the relatively high share of national financing is impossible to achieve for the organizations. Also, a rather high number of domestic and foreign project partners has to be found, which makes things more difficult: the Roma and Roma organizations only rarely have the necessary contacts and international networks at their disposal to build and manage the demanded project structure. The Roma's self-organization is relatively "young" and because of the socio-political situation – marginalization, survival in smaller groups etc. – not yet ready to fulfill such requirements. These EU requirements can be seen as a contribution to the organizational development and as an opportunity to form new contacts, but there are also dangers in asking too much of the Roma organizations: projects are coordinated by long-established educational institutions who dispose of both the necessary infrastructure and the contacts which are necessary to get national sponsoring. This means that the public funds are not, or only to a small part, of benefit to the Roma. The biggest part of the funds is used for administrative and representative means of the Non-Roma organizations which coordinate the project. Additionally, it could be that these Non-Roma organizations "take measures to make the Roma forcedly happy; in the form of politically correct positive discrimination", and that they carry out projects without active participation of Roma – according to the motto "We are doing great things for you Roma"-, projects which may not touch upon the real needs of those concerned. The more adequate method for establishing Roma projects – "What do you want to do for yourselves, and how can we help?" – is used much too rarely. Notwithstanding these difficulties, the European Union makes important contributions to the preservation of culture and language, and to the social integration of Roma. The fact alone that there are special measures for supporting the Roma, making the Roma an EU concern, gives a higher status to the concerns and activities of Roma organizations and makes the national authorities deal with, and not negate, the concerns of the Roma like with that of other population groups.

The Austrian situation is typical of many Central and Western European countries: a heterogeneous Roma population consisting of several groups, living in Austria legally, with different cultural backgrounds, showing a certain degree of self-organization; and a number of illegal immigrants who have no possibility to legalize their stay and are thus excluded from all federal benefits and support. Consequently, there is a socio-political division into legal and illegal, in addition to the existing socio-cultural heterogeneity. However, the European Roma society tries to act as one group at least on an organizational level. For this, it would be necessary to level off the socio-political differences, and the Roma would have to have the opportunity to find a homogeneity on a higher level – despite their socio-cultural differences. Every group must have the possibility to tend to their own cultural values, active participation in the educational system and the media being a prerequisite. If one's "own" is safe, "the other" can be accepted more easily. If the Roma manage to create equality between the various socio-cultural values of the individual groups, their social integration into the majority population will be easier. The question if Romani will continue to be a fully functioning language after such a process of integration remains – even with utopian ideal measures for support in the area of education and the media – open.

LITERATURE

- Ambrosch, Gerd, Emmerich Gärtner-Horvath, Dieter W. Halwachs, Michael Wogg, et al. eds. 2000. Kaj pe sina, kaj pe nana. Amare pamaristscha, Graz/Oberwart: Romani Projekt/Verein Roma.
- Cech, Petra, Christiane Fennesz-Juhasz, Dieter W. Halwachs, and Mozes F. Heinschink. eds. 2000. Tusa ande akhoren khelos ... Lovarenge Paramici, Graz/Wien: Romani-Projekt/Romano Centro.
- Cech, Petra, Christiane Fennesz-Juhasz, Dieter W. Halwachs, and Mozes F. Heinschink. eds. 2001. Te na dikhas sunende ... Lovarenge paramici, tertenetura taj gjila. / Fern von uns im Traum ... Märchen, Erzählungen und Lieder der Lovara, Klagenfurt: Drava.
- Fennesz-Juhasz, Christiane. 1996. Tondokumente europäischer Roma. Die Sammlung Heinschink im Phonogrammarchiv der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, in: Handbuch der Tsiganologie. Joachim S. Hohmann, Joachim. ed. Pp. 272-281. Frankfurt/M.: Peter Lang.
- Fennesz-Juhasz, Christiane, Dieter W. Halwachs, and Mozes. F. Heinschink. 1996. Sprache und Musik der österreichischen Roma und Sinti, in: Romani I. Dieter W. Halwachs. ed. Pp 61–110. Graz: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft (= Grazer Linguistische Studien 46).
- Fennesz-Juhasz, Christiane, and Mozes F. Heinschink. 2002. Kodo phende e Romora ... / Dies erzählten die Rom ... Lovarenge paramiči taj gjila/Märchen und Lieder der Lovara. CD. Graz: Romani-Projekt.
- Fennesz-Juhasz, Christiane, and Michael Wogg. 2002. Schun, so me phukavav .../Hör, was ich erzähle ... Romane pamaristscha, phukajiptscha taj gila andar o Burgenland/Märchen, Erzählungen und Lieder der Roma aus dem Burgenland. CD. Graz: Romani-Projekt.
- Halwachs, Dieter W.(1993) Polysystem, Repertoire und Identität. Grazer Linguistische Studien 39/40. Pp. 71–90.
- Halwachs, Dieter W., Emmerich Gärtner-Horvath, Michael Wogg, et al. eds. 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: Drava.
- Heinschink, Mozes F., and Ursula Hemetek. eds. 1994. Roma – das unbekannte Volk. Schicksal und Kultur. Wien: Böhlau.
- Hemetek, Ursula. 2001. Mosaik der Klänge. Musik der ethnischen und religiösen Minderheiten in Österreich. Wien: Böhlau.
- Jovanović, Ilija. 2000. Budžo – Bündel. Đila – Lieder. Landeck: Emirgân Yayınları Ed.
- Matras, Yaron. 1999. Writing Romani: The Pragmatics of Codification in a Stateless Language. Applied Linguistics 20/4. Pp. 481-502
- Matras, Yaron. 2002. Romani: A Linguistic Introduction. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Nikolić, Mišo. 1997. ... und dann zogen wir weiter. Lebenslinien einer Romafamilie. Klagenfurt: Drava.
- Nikolić, Mišo. 2000. Landfahrer. Auf den Wegen eines Rom. Klagenfurt: Drava.
- Pott, August Friedrich. 1844. Die Zigeuner in Europa und Asien. Ethnographisch-linguistische Untersuchung, vornehmlich ihrer Herkunft und Sprache nach gedruckten und ungedruckten Quellen. Erster Teil: Einleitung und Grammatik. Halle: Heynemann.
- Stojka, Ceija. 1988. Wir leben im Verborgenen. Erinnerungen einer Rom-Zigeunerin. Wien: Picus.
- Stojka, Ceija. 1992. Reisende auf dieser Welt. Aus dem Leben einer Rom-Zigeunerin. Wien: Picus.
- Stojka, Karl, and Reinhard Pohanka. 1994. Auf der ganzen Welt zu Hause. Das Leben und Wandern des Zigeuners Karl Stojka. Wien: Picus.
- Stojka, Mongo. 2000. Papierene Kinder. Glück, Zerstörung und Neubeginn einer Roma-Familie in Österreich. Wien: Molden.
- Tichy, Heinz. 2002. Die Europäische Charta der Regional- oder Minderheitensprachen und das österreichische Recht. Klagenfurt: Hermagoras.

- ¹ The juridical importance of the differentiation between allochthonous and autochthonous is clearly shown by the Amendment to Article 8 of the Federal Constitution (Bundesverfassungsgesetz), which came into force in the year 2000:
- (1) *The German language is, regardless of the federally acknowledged minorities rights, the official language of the Republic.*
- (2) *The Republic (federal government, provinces, local authorities) acknowledges its grown linguistic and cultural diversity, which is expressed by autochthonous ethnic groups. The language and culture, the continued existence and preservation of these ethnic groups are to be respected, protected and supported.*
(Source: <http://www.bka.gv.at/bka/dokumente/art8BVG.pdf>)
- ² For more information on the model used here see Halwachs (1993)
- ³ Furthermore, at least a part of the older generations has to use German only in a public-official context, and even then, younger family members, competent speakers of German, translate for them.
- ⁴ The significance of Hungarian and Croatian has been decreasing over the last decades because of the socio-cultural changes –disappearance of rural isolation, migration to big cities, etc. – and because of the fact that the languages of these ethnic groups have no connection whatsoever to the contents of youth culture, and touch upon no areas that would be interesting for adolescents.
- ⁵ General terms for the "language of *Roma, Sinti, Kale*, etc" are *Romanes* and *Romani*:
- *Romanes*: derived from an adverb: *Me romanesh vakerav*. 'I speak "roma".' This term is almost exclusively used in the German-speaking area.
 - *Romani*: derived from an adjective: *romani čhib* 'Roma-tongue, Roma-language', this term is used in the English-speaking area and on an international level. Additionally, most terms for New-Indian languages, to which Romani belongs, end in *-i*: *Hindi, Panjabi, Maharathi, Bengali, ...*
- In order to use the terms consistently, only the international term *Romani* is used here, and varieties called: *Burgenland-Romani, Kalderaš-Romani, etc.*
- ⁶ For more information see, among others, <http://www.bka.gv.at/bka/volksgruppen/sprachencharta.html> and Tichy (2002).
- ⁷ The 15 programs can be found on the internet at <http://emap.fm>.
- ⁸ Also see <http://1476.orf.at/>.
- ⁹ For more information about the emblematic function mentioned repeatedly in this article see, among others, Matras (1999).
- ¹⁰ The starting point for establishing Roma music in Austria were the work and projects of musical ethnologist Ursula Hemetek at the beginning of the 1990s. Thanks to her, the Roma were perceived by the general public (see among others Heinschink/Hemetek 1994, Hemetek 2001).
- ¹¹ For more information about music see Fennesz-Juhász/Halwachs/Heinschink (1996).
- ¹² For information on the Romani-Projekt see <http://romani.uni-graz.at/romani/>. The bilingual books with accompanying CD are part of at least 5 books published by Drava. The basis for these publications is the material in Heinschink's collection in the Phonogramarchive of the Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (Austrian Academy of Sciences). (Also see Fennesz-Juhász 1996).
- ¹³ "Multiculturalism is the culture of the affluent society lacking (ethno)culture."
(Southwestern Hungarian Anonymus 2nd half of the 20th century)
- ¹⁴ One question remains open in this context, namely in how far the fact that Roma were in the past "culture-service nomads", primarily musicians, that tried to cater to the *Gadže's* predilections, is of significance.