'Terminological' Processes in North-Central Romani

M. Hübschmannová & J.V. Neustupný

'Terminological' Processes in North-Central Romani

M. Hübschmannová
Department of Romani Studies, Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic

J.V. Neustupný
School of Languages, Cultures and Linguistics, Monash University, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

This paper applies the management model of language to Romani in the Czech Republic, showing how intellectualisation processes in discourse lead to the solution of problems associated with the creation of functional dialects or Languages for Special Purposes (LSP). These problems include, but are not limited to, the building-up of terminologies. The authors suggest that, for Romani and other emerging languages, a dynamic framework is needed, where features of LSP are seen both as results of processes and as processes as such. An analysis of Romani discourse data enables them to identify two different approaches to simple management of LSP. As a conclusion, the authors assess the perspectives of Romani LSP and formulate several practical as well as theoretical recommendations.

The Romani Community

The Romani communities in the Czech Republic are considered to include between 200,000 and 300,000 people and thus account for between 2% and 3% of the overall population. With the fast rate of dissolution of the Slovak minority within the Czech matrix community (Neustupný & Nekvapil, 2003), they aspire to becoming the largest non-Czech community group in the country.

While using the term 'community', we do not imply the existence of an integrated social network: the Romani community is internally highly stratified beyond the degree visible to casual non-Roma observers. It is also necessary to note that the boundaries of the Romani communities do not overlap with state boundaries. What can be called the North-Central Romani community is distributed both in the Czech Republic and in Slovakia, with smaller extensions to Hungary, Poland and the Ukraine. This is the largest Roma group in the Czech Republic, and in its case not only structural similarity but also the generation and maintenance of social networks is involved. A relatively large South-Central Romani community, centred in Hungary, resides in Slovakia and is also represented in the territory of the Czech Republic. The Vlaxi communities (see Elšík, 2003 for details), though not large in the Czech Republic or in Slovakia, are even more dispersed. This paper will be mainly concerned with the largest group, speakers of North-Central Romani.

The socioeconomic status of the Roma in the Czech Republic is low. Although there are intellectuals and other elites, and the level of education is steadily improving (though such improvement remains hidden under the influence of unemployment), it is true that the relative number of unqualified workers is higher than in the matrix population.

The Romani language has not been established as a regular language of education, and although used as the vehicle of literature and some periodical publications (such as *Romano hangos*, *Romano vod'i* or *Romano džaniben*), it has failed to widely penetrate into work domains where many languages for special purposes (LSP) are developed and employed. Potentially of importance are translations of community announcements solicited by various arms of the local and national governments. The relationship between Romani and Czech is diglossic, with Czech occupying the position of the High language and Romani being basically restricted to the daily-life domain and some community uses. Like all other minority languages in the Czech Republic (Neustupný & Nekvapil, 2003), Romani is not a language that would be well maintained. In fact, the overall numbers of speakers are declining, although there is also a trend to increase the maintenance of the language both at individual level and the level of some families.

This paper will attempt to establish what prerequisites and potential for language used for specialised purposes exist and try to assess in what domains and situations it should be developed at present and in the near future.

Problems of Terminology

The traditional approach to the development of language as employed outside the daily-life domain is through the concept of 'terminology'. However, terminology does not provide a satisfactory framework. It implies (1) concentration on terms, (2) concentration on inventories rather than processes, and (3) a one-sided regard to the generation rather than the management process.

Terms only?

Already in the Prague School of the 1930s, Vančura, in a pioneering paper on 'the language of commerce' Vančura (1936: 161; cf. also Nekvapil, forthcoming) noted that 'a technical language, such as the language of commerce, has nearly always been identified with special terms and formulas employed (and not with the whole speech or text for technical purposes)'. He required the consideration of whole documents, letters, contracts, economic articles and news, advertisements, etc. Vančura considered his 'special languages in general and the language of business in particular' as specimens of 'functional dialects'. The theory of functional dialects, styles and languages was developed to great precision in the pre-war Prague School especially by Havránek, whose papers have been reprinted in Havránek (1963). Some of his work, translated by Garvin (1964), is available in English (see also Havránek, 1983). This is where the concept and the term 'intellectualisation' originated (cf. Gonzales, 1988, 2002; Liddicoat & Bryant, 2002).

There are other concepts such as the German *Fachsprache* 'language for special purposes', which has received extensive treatment in Hoffmann *et al.* (1998/ 1999). Terms specific to English until recently, though also reflected in the

Fachsprache volume, are LGP (Language for General Purposes) and LSP (Language for Special Purposes). This provides an expedient framework that does not limit itself to terminology, although some earlier publications which employ the terms do in fact restrict their attention to that point of view (e.g. Picht & Draskau, 1985). A survey is available in Nekvapil (forthcoming), who considers the terms suitable for further work in the area.

It is essential to widen the framework for understanding technical, scientific and other special languages beyond the registration and classification of lexical items. Language in general is much more than a static configuration of words, and this must apply to our thinking about terminology as well.

In the case of Romani it will also be necessary to assess not simply terms and formulas but a wide range of issues that contribute to the use of the language in the situations of LSP. An example of discourse structuring in other than daily-life speech can be seen in the following Romani conversation, recorded in September 2004 (R = Romani, m = male, 31 = serial number of speaker):

Interviewer: *A džanel the gadžikanes perfekt, the romanes perfekt.* 'He speaks perfect Czech as well as Romani.'

Rm31:   *Gadžiknes kavkes, hoj šaj moderinel. To znamená, hoj jov vlastně e čechiko duma džanel feder mek sar – so o gadže džanen.* 'His Czech is such that he can act as a moderator. That means (to *znamená*, from Cz.) that he actually (*vlastně*, from Cz.) knows Czech better than, what the Gaje [non-Roma] can do.'

Deriving conclusions from a previous sentence requires the choice of one of several sophisticated devices. Here Rm31 chooses Czech (*to znamená* 'that means', and *vlastně* 'actually').

Results or processes?

Features of the functional dialects or LSP (the term which will be used in this paper) should be seen both as results of processes (as the traditional 'terminology' approach has it) and as processes as such (cf. also Gonzales, 2002). In the latter case the questions 'how is the inventory used' and 'what other processes occur' apply. Of course, these questions are always paralleled by asking what relation these processes carry to processes that use Czech; in other words, to the influence of Czech on Romani in discourse. For this purpose a discourse analysis approach is needed. For example, how is the frame of an interview segment generated, or what intellectualisation or automatisation/foregrounding takes place in a particular discourse?

For Romani and other emerging languages, a dynamic framework is needed more than in major modernised languages. Studies that aim to create inventories of terms are not the priority area. For emerging languages, the question of inventories of terms is obviously secondary to capturing the process of creating the LSP.

The process-centred approach is thus eminently suited to languages such as Romani which cannot be expected to develop LSP to the same extent as large or medium-sized European languages. Still, LSP processes which are already present and which will further extend into the future should not be neglected by language managers.

Management of LSP processes

LSP is generated by using strategies that produce LSP discourse. However, when such generative strategies do not work in a satisfactory way, management strategies are employed to reach a satisfactory output. In languages with underdeveloped LSP, such as Romani, the management processes are of great importance. One of the basic issues is how to deal with intellectualisation. According to Havránek (in Garvin, 1964: 6–9), the process of intellectualisation means adaptation of language to 'the goal of making possible precise and rigorous, if necessary abstract, statements, capable of expressing the continuity and complexity of thought, that is to reinforce the intellectual side of speech'. On the other hand, automatisation/foregrounding (1964: 9) is also of importance, with automatisation removing attention paid to LSP, while foregrounding makes it more attractive because of focusing on form. Intellectualisation cannot be achieved simply by using resources that already exist in the language, because such resources are insufficient. Problems in LSP discourse are noted, evaluated, and adjustment is sought (Jernudd, 1994). In the case of Romani it is necessary to clarify this process and to show what are the major strategies that 'correct' (manage) the deficiencies. They may be, for example, strategies producing new features on the basis of indigenous means (e.g. those of word formation), borrowing strategies (which produce loan words, etc.) or loan-translation strategies (which translate from another language, using the material of the language in question).

In the case of Romani, any policy that aims at the strengthening of LSP must take into consideration not only the generation of LSP from existing resources but also management strategies that help the Roma communicate in situations where resources are scanty, but where the requirement of producing LSP discourse cannot be ignored. This is the theme that will be developed in this paper.

The Use of Romani in the Work, Public and Education Domains

The Romani language

A note about the Romani language should be added here. It is grammatically as well as lexically a language of Indian origin, closely analogous to contemporary Indo-Aryan languages of North India. Although there is no mutual intelligibility, the analogies are wide-ranging and can be easily identified. For example, in grammar:

Romani	Bengali
tu-ke 'to you'	*tu-ke* 'to you' (dative)
kher-e 'at home'	*ghor-e* 'at home' (obsolete locative)
tel-e 'under'	*tal-e* 'under' (obsolete locative)
dža! 'go'	*ja!* 'go' (imperative)
geľam 'we went'	*gelam* 'we went' (past perfective)

while in the lexicon, apart from the previous examples, the following can also be quoted:

Romani	Hindi
bal 'hair'	*bal* 'hair'
gav 'village'	*gav (gaon)* 'village'
džov 'oats'	*jou* 'oats'
kalo 'black'	*kalo* 'black'

The Romani proverb *Me raňi, tu raňi, ko pherela paňi* 'I am a lady, you are a lady, who will bring water?' has an exact counterpart in Hindi *Men rani, tu rani, koun bharega jaega pani*. (Note that Hindi and Bengali examples are provided here because the languages are widely known. Historically speaking, Romani is of course not an offshoot of Hindi or Bengali.)

In the course of their diaspora, the Roma accepted a considerable number of words from languages of the areas through which they moved: Persian, Armenian, Greek, and later Hungarian, Slovak, Czech and other languages.

Word-formation procedures are rich (Hübschmannová, 1984; Hübschmannová *et al.*, 1991). These word-formation strategies should provide an important base for the creation of terminologies.

A trend has appeared recently to use Hindi words to enrich the Romani lexicon (Cortiade, 1986; de Gila Kochanowski, 1996; Jusuf, 1980), and some of the Hindi-based terms have been accepted in practice; e.g. *lekhipen* 'orthography' or *lekhado* 'author'. The same principle occasionally appears in the variety of Romani under investigation, e.g. *džar* 'word stem/base' from Hindi *jar*.

There are a number of dialects that vary largely, but even at considerable geographical distance do not cause complete loss of intelligibility. Since the Czech Roma were mostly exterminated in concentration camps during World War II (Nečas, 1999), their dialect is virtually extinct. In the Czech Republic the dialectal group most widely represented is that of North-Central Romani, spoken by post-war emigrants from Slovakia, and formerly called Slovak or Slovak-and-Czech Romani (Hübschmannová & Neustupný, 1996). All data used in this paper refer to this group.

Romani has mostly been spoken in the domain of daily life, but traditional occupations led to incipient LSP. At present, contemporary usage has resulted in the appearance of situations that respond to the exigencies of the public and education domains and require a further development of LSP.

Traditional situations

LSP developed in the traditional professions of the Roma, such as in smithery, basket making, brick making and brick laying, and music. In the area of cultural communication many other areas show the results of terminological activities such as, for example, the terminology of narration:

paramisi	'story'
vitejziko paramisi	'story about heroes'
pherasuňi paramisi	'humorous story'
džungaľi paramisi	'erotic story'
bari paramisi	'a long story' (mostly *vitejziko*)
charňi paramisi	'a short story' (mostly *pherasuòi* or *džungaľi*)

vakariben	'semiformal or informal story'
vakariben pal o mule	'story about ghosts'
vakariben pal o dada	'story about ancestors'
paramisaris	'story-teller'

Although these examples mostly employ original Romani roots or old loan words, this is not characteristic for all areas. The Roma have lived within the matrix of majority societies, and the need to retain isomorphism with the language of their non-Roma customers was paramount. Yet some elements remained indigenous, as in the language of blacksmiths, e.g. *trast* 'iron', *te kerel bešindos* 'to work while sitting', *phurdel pišot* 'to work the bellows' – *pišot* is of Armenian origin. The rich possibilities of Romani word-formation processes were fully utilised.

Contemporary situations

In the work domain, the Roma are mostly active in groups where non-Roma also participate or directly occupy leading positions, and in these situations the use of Romani is unthinkable. However, sometimes teams consisting purely of Roma workers exist. In this case the majority language (Czech) may be used, but some Romani LSP activity may be going on. The authors have been unable to identify particular examples of such activities.

Some situations from the education and other domains currently play an important role in the development of Romani as a LSP.

(1) Educational situations at Charles University in Prague where a special class exists at the advanced undergraduate level to introduce linguistic theories and where Romani is used as the medium of communication. (The class has been taught by MH.)

(2) Seminars in Slovakia organised by the State Pedagogical Institute (*Štátny pedagogický ústav*) in Bratislava for Roma who have completed tertiary education and are teaching in special Roma classes: the first gymnasium grade in Košice (since 2003–2004), the Basic School in Košice, and the Roma Conservatory in Košice. The language of the seminars, conducted by MH, is mostly Romani.

(3) Political meetings of the *Romská občanská iniciativa* (Civic Initiative of the Roma) (*ROI*) in 2003, in which MH participated. Romani was used in part, with code-switching between Romani and Czech. Some participants used Romani more extensively than others, with at least one who seemed to employ it consistently.

(4) Political meetings of the international congress of the International Romani Union (IRU) which met in Prague in 2000 where a number of Romani dialects were used for five days. To use Romani was the rule, not an exception, and according to MH's assessment approximately 90% of all communication was conducted in the language. All Czech delegates also used Romani. The current situation seems to be that in the case of international meetings of the Roma the use of Romani as a *lingua franca* has been established as a rule.

(5) The language of the radio. There is a Roma programme entitled *O Roma vakaren* [The Roma Speak] on Czech Radio, but apart from the language of songs Romani plays only a limited role there. On the other hand, Romani is alive on the Internet station *Rota* http://www.dzeno.cz/?r_id=33 where both music and the spoken word appear; the programme has listeners throughout the world.

(6) Written language situations. The use of written Romani can be summarised as follows:

- books published in the Czech Republic with the main text fully in Romani (four volumes published since 1990);
- books with part of the text in Romani (approximately 35 titles);
- children's books (including books publishing material from children's literary competitions);
- periodicals partly in Romani (no periodical is fully published in Romani);
- other printed matter (posters, maps, New Year greeting cards, materials from IRU meetings, etc.);
- official brochures, etc., published by local government;
- forms and questionnaires;
- religious promotion material.

Distribution is one of the basic problems for the further development of Romani written media.

Literature is the basic production tool for creating language that can be used in a variety of types of LSP. It creates experience in the use of strategies for the intellectualisation of language and automatises its use. Intellectually loaded discussion cannot proceed without concurrent development of literature. In the historic development of national languages, literature has played an important role and commanded considerable prestige. Such literature need not always be fiction.

This argument suggests that at present the development of *any* literature in Romani plays an important role in the overall development of Romani, including the development of prerequisites for LSP. Management is often most apparent at the lexical level and that level perhaps attracts most conscious attention. A number of authors have commented to MH on the extent of their creation of new lexical items. Note, however, that the experience is much wider. Authors have to struggle with the overall structure of each work, selection and arrangement of topics, use of speech acts (e.g. questions), division into paragraphs and sentences, and many other aspects of text. This is an intricate task, the complexity of which frequently escapes observers or readers.

Management for LSP

The term 'management' is not used here simply as a better alternative to 'policy' or 'planning'. True, unlike 'policy', it does not suggest that the only level that matters is that of political bodies, and unlike 'planning' it does not refer to a concept of social change that prevailed at the end of the 1950s (cf. Neustupný, 1994). It refers to a wider range of issues. Already at the beginning of the 1980s it

was claimed that, among others, the following issues should be attended to in any theory of language problems (Neustupný, 1983):

(1) The full range of language problems should be mapped.
(2) All stages of the management process (including decoding of a problem, design for its removal, and the implementation of the design) should be accounted for.
(3) The priority of socioeconomic problems over communication (and communication problems over problems of grammatical competence) should be recognised.
(4) The myth of 'objectivity' of language planning should be abandoned.
(5) The empirical base of language management should be sought in the micro-analysis of language problems.
(6) A framework that works with more than the national level of language management should be generally accepted.

Although the idiom of the day still did not use the term 'management', the term 'planning' appeared in the paper sparingly. The term 'management' was used for the first time in a manuscript written jointly with Jernudd (Jernudd & Neustupný, 1987) in which point (4) was expanded, mainly as Jernudd's reaction to Weinstein (1987), to cover the social-science concept of 'interests'. To the present authors, and a host of those who have worked within the same tradition of research, 'language management' involves all the points (1) to (6) and more (for example, issues connected with positive evaluation of language; for a bibliography see Muraoka, 2004). Independently of this theory, many colleagues active in the study of language problems and other contiguous areas have emphasised individual points that coincide with 'language management' or further develop it (Neustupný, 2004).

The Language Management framework has been applied to the study of terminology in a remarkably clear way by Jernudd (1994). In his paper he has particularly emphasised the point that when studying terminology, scholars should investigate not simply what adjustments have been made, but also what inadequacies, notings and evaluations of terminology took place in discourse. He also emphasised that interests are in play: some adjustment strategies (such as accepting terminology from the Latin/Greek lexicon) favour the middle class. Jernudd directly calls for 'attention also to the language of the dirty and uneducated automobile workers' (1994: 75). Both of these emphases are applicable not only to terminologies but to LSP in general, and possess a considerable heuristic value for the treatment of Romani.

Already in 1973 'correction' (later 'management') processes were divided into three types according to when management takes place: pre-, in- and post-correction (Neustupný, 1978). What processes of *pre-management* take place in LSP? There may be avoidance of words, sentences or discourse in general. On the other hand, there is more active pre-management in many LSP situations in any language (speakers preparing what to say, and how to say it) and we should expect that this also takes place in Romani. As a matter of fact, this is a management strategy that should probably be recommended to speakers. What processes of *in-management* are used, where noting, evaluation and adjustment occur? For example, speakers may switch to the majority language (Czech) with-

out noticing, they can notice but not evaluate such behaviour negatively, or they can attempt to avoid it through such processes as translation from Czech into Romani as the discourse develops. Another in-management procedure occurs when Czech words are used but are introduced through 'apology formulae' such as 'in Czech it's called . . . '. *Post-management* includes noting and evaluation of preceding discourse (their own, or by others) as well as all 'organised' management acts, such as language policies. All these processes appear in our data.

Language management can be simple or organised (point (5) above). Simple management is management of language directly in discourse, while organised management means that more than one discourse is involved: there are several or many participants who share the management process, they have recourse to their previous knowledge, beliefs and attitudes, and communicate about the process. A typical example of organised management is a language policy of the state.

The question of simple management for LSP in Romani is how individual speakers in individual communicative situations note inadequacies in their communication, evaluate them and adjust them. Simple management is the ultimate source for organised management. Most of our analysis in this paper will be devoted to it.

One of the authors (MH) remembers a meeting on the then current political situation held in 1993, still in the undivided Czechoslovakia, in the city of Prešov (a LSP situation) – the language used was Romani and it abounded in the use of strategies such as *ad hoc* borrowing, skilful paraphrase, and *ad hoc* word formation such as *mal'iko ministerstvos* 'the ministry of agriculture'. Three terms appeared for 'the Government': *šeral'ipen*, *uprune raja* and *rayaviben*, and they have been used, alternatively, till now. Similarly, individual participants in the 2000 congress of the IRU, held in Prague, faced problems in their use of congress Romani (a LSP task) and sought adjustment through the application of strategies such as coining new words. In doing so they engaged in managing the language, but this management was not a policy-type organised management. They neither discussed the process with other participants, nor applied any theories or conscious beliefs about language. What they used was their competence to manage language problems in discourse, which forms a part of speakers' overall communicative competence. The results of individual processes of simple management may not have been fully incorporated into Romani; some new coinages may be remembered and generally accepted, but it was the process itself, the discovery and practising of new management strategies, that was of more lasting value.

In a recent meeting of a Romani speaker from Rumania with MH, at which issues of education were discussed (a LSP situation), Romani was used, although English was also available to both speakers. As in the IRU example, it was necessary to overcome dialectal differences. However, apart from such dialectal problems, the two speakers were actively involved in managing the LSP situation. The means of communication they were using either activated previous management experience or were strategies applied for the first time in this encounter.

In narratives, Roma participants sometimes directly point to the item that has been managed. In an interview, Rm32 reports the following about his conversation with a non-Czech Roma:

> . . . I didn't know, of course, how to render *dôležito* ['important' in Slovak] in Romani. And there were moments when it was necessary to use the word, 'well Rudi, that's *dôležito*'. And he says 'what is that?'. 'OK, you don't understand'. And I said '*importantno*'. You see, and now this word is being used by all Roma . . . the Roma, who interpret in Strasbourg or Brussels, they all say *importantno*. (Translation from Romani by MH)

Two management processes are referred to in this passage. One has already been made covertise (changed into a generative process): the use of the Slovak word *dôležito* for 'important'. The second process is the replacement of the word by an internationally comprehensible loan word.

Note that simple management is not always obvious on the surface. Speakers can engage in extensive management processes, noting their inadequacies, evaluating them, planning adjustment and implementing it, with some of these being conscious or semi-conscious for them, but unnoticeable for other participants, to whom the segment of speech appears quite fluent and unproblematical. For example, if they use circumlocutions or *ad hoc* coinages skilfully, their listeners will not notice that management has been going on. In such cases the existence of language problems and their management can only be established through research techniques such as follow-up interviews, brain-wave recording, use of eye cameras and similar techniques (Neustupný & Miyazaki, 2002).

Generation and Management of LSP: Two Examples

In this section we shall quote data from two brief conversations between MH, Rm1 and Rm2. The interviewer, MH, one of the authors of this paper, is a native speaker of Czech but started using Romani at the age of 21. She is a semi-native speaker of the language, whose competence is not questioned by the Romani community.

Rm1, who participated in Conversation 1 (5.5 minutes), is 45 years old. He was born in Slovakia but when he was eight the whole extended family (*famel'ija*) moved to Prague. In his 20s he spent two years in Canada, visiting relatives, subsequently was unemployed and then worked in various manual jobs; currently he is a taxi driver. He possesses the experience of writing short specimens of prose on folkloristic topics in Romani. His wife is ethnically Czech.

The interviewee in Conversation 2 (6.5 minutes) was the 57-year-old Rm2. His family, an elite among the Roma, came from Slovakia but he himself was born in Prague. He first worked as a cleaner at Czech Radio, then as a repairer and now as the head of the repairs/maintenance department. For several years he was also an announcer on Romani radio. He writes poetry for children in Romani. His second wife is ethnically a Roma and although she does not speak Romani, she understands the language and helps her husband type his poetry manuscripts.

Following the conversations, follow-up interviews (henceforth FU interviews; Fan, 2002; Neustupný, 1999) were conducted by MH with each of the two interviewees, to establish what conscious management was undertaken by them in the course of the conversations. Both the conversations and the FU interviews were recorded and transcribed. MH opened the interview with Rm1 by asking:

> *Aven ajso lačho, phenen mange, so pal tumari goďi ačhiľa aver vaš o Roma pal e baršoňiko revolucija?*
> 'Be so kind and tell me what, in your opinion, has changed following the velvet revolution.' (The use of 2nd person plural address, of the French *vous* level, enhances the LSP character of the interviews.)

and the second interview with:

> *So pal tumari goďi ačhiľa vaš o Roma aver pal kodi baršoňiko revolucija?*
> 'What, in your opinion, has changed in the case of the Roma after the velvet revolution?'

This sets the scene for an interview on a political topic and such an interview requires a LSP adequate to the situation. Let us see in what way the Romani participants met the requirements. (Note that the data used here derive from conversations. The strategies used by the same speakers in the written language would probably be different.)

Conversation 1

Lexical processes

Avoidance

We felt that avoidance of lexical items, a type of pre-management, was practised in the conversations. For example:

> *… šaj thoven kadej* 'you can put it [the tape recorder] here'. (Rm1, segment 1)

There is a distinct possibility that the lexical item for 'tape recorder' was excluded through the process of pre-management (expectation of a problem).

Sometimes avoidance of a more technical vocabulary item seems to be motivated by Rm1's reluctance to disclose details of his situation rather than by avoidance of LSP. For example, in sgm. 5, Rm1 does not want to go into details of his relationship as a taxi driver to the owner of a taxi guild. He strongly denies that he would be working for a company and then presents a vague characterisation that:

> *Kerav paš e – phirkerav ko-o jekh čha. Tel jekh čhavo phirav.* 'I work, I drive the taxi for a (Roma) boy, under a (Roma) boy',

and only subsequently admits that this is a company. In a sense, the speaker satisfies the requirement of avoiding providing a certain piece of information by skilfully blurring the content.

Phrase loan

There is only one switch to Czech longer than a single lexical word. When Rm1 says that he never stops his taxi, he goes on by saying:

> *Protože dyby řikali, že odoj te terd'uvel na džal* 'Because if they said that (*protože dyby řikali, že*, from Czech) one shouldn't stand there '

The speaker evokes here the situation, which is unpleasant or even insulting for him, and it is probably this emotional involvement in the sentence that promotes

the switch. The motivation is difficult to explain here by local intellectualisation. This management is not for LSP, though it still remains a case of management.

Social system terms and management for intellectualisation

There were a number of social system terms introduced from Czech/Slovak into Romani during the Communist era: these include *ustav* 'institution (for children)' or *ubitovňa* 'dormitory for adults'. These words appear in Rm1's conversation in the following passage (sgm. 16), where other loan words also figure as markers of a discourse about social issues:

> *Me na džanav. Perdal o Roma nane but jako feder, mišľinav. Bo dikhen, kecik Roma hine pro ulici, so phirkeren, so fetinen, kecik pro ubitovňa hine, kecik andro ustavi den, že na sťihňinen olen te del te chal, nebo nane len buči. So perdal Romende feder? Paš o komuňisti len sas buči, sas jisto, keci khera len sas, savi šukar – šukar zarizimen lenge sas . . . ?* 'I don't know. For the Roma there is nothing much such as (*jako*, from Cz.) better, I think (*mišľinav*, from Sl.). Because (*lebo*, from Sl.; old loan word) look how many Roma live on the street (*ulici*, from Cz./Sl.), who wander about, who take drugs, how many live in dormitories (*ubitovňa*, from Sl.), how many give children to institutions (*ustavi*, from Cz./Sl.) . . . because they do not manage (*stihňinen*, from Sl.) to give them food, because (*nebo*, from Cz.) they have no work. What is better for the Roma? In communist times they had work, there was certainty (*jisto*, from Sl.), how many flats they had, how beautiful, how beautifully appointed (*zarizimen*, from Cz./Sl.)

Most of the loan words are not simply taken from Czech/Slovak and inserted into Romani sentences. Some are adapted into Romani verbs (*mišľinav, stihňinen, zarizimen*) and some would be unusual in Czech/Slovak (*jako; jisto* in the sense of 'certainty'), while still others are used in a way that is impossible in Czech/Slovak (in Czech/Slovak 'on the street' does not allow the preposition *pro; nebo* cannot be used in the sense 'because').

The existing loans (*ustav, ubitovňa, komunist'i*, etc) generate LSP discourse here. Some other loans (*stihňinen, zarizimen*, etc.) are not strictly speaking semantically required: they could be replaced by other words or circumlocutions. However, their selection improves the given discourse as LSP. They respond to the need for a more intellectual style of speaking, and as such can be classified as examples of management. This management is not for individual lexical items but for a more intellectualised style of speech.

Note that loan words such as *mišľinav* 'I think' (from Sl./Cz.) (Rm1, sgm. 1), *rozkazinla* 'orders' (from Sl./Cz.) (Rm1, sgm. 4) possess an intellectualising effect. This has been confirmed in the FU interview. When pushed to say whether these loans can be replaced by indigenous vocabulary, Rm1 suggested other expressions that lacked the intellectualising accent (*merkinel* or *dikhel* 'to look' for *rozkazinla* 'to order'), but he obviously was unhappy with the replacement. Within the Roma situation even *zarizimen* 'appointed' is a LSP choice because to appoint flats with furniture is not an item of the original Roma culture.

In the case of some lexical items it is their meaning that clearly carries their intellectualising function. The use of the word is then a clear case of management for intellectualisation. For example, in the sentence:

Oda hin miro názor. 'That is my view (*názor*, from Cz.).' (Rm1, sgm. FU 2)

the word *názor* 'view' is a loan from Czech, where it already is an intellectualising expression. It is further foregrounded because of the final position of a segment and carries an intellectual meaning. In the FU interview the speaker was asked whether there was a Romani word for the content and after thinking a while, he denied the existence of such a word. This again shows that a loan word is not avoided by Rm1 if it is necessary to convey an intellectualised content: whether there is an expression in the Romani lexicon seems to be a matter of secondary importance. A search is not necessarily executed.

In sgm. 15 Rm1 uses the word *pohibos* '(possibility of) movement', derived from Czech, as a key terminological word for the area of the social movement of the Roma:

> … *phenen, že šaj džan avri, že feder pohibos – te manušes nane love, ta so kerla avri? Lebo kaj džala?* '. . . one says that they [the Roma] can go out [travel], that there is better movement (*pohibos*, from Cz.) – but when people have no money, what should they do out? Or where should they go?'

The Czech word *pohyb* is Romani-ised through the attachment of a Romani ending: *pohibos*. In the FU interview, Rm1 was unable to replace this loan with a native Romani lexical item.

Loan words such as *lehko* 'easy', from Czech/Slovak, when used attributively about *but'i* 'work' must be considered as a taxonomy of working conditions and, therefore, as an item which is the result of management for intellectualisation:

> *oda nane varesi lehko but'i* 'it is in no way an easy (*lehko*, from Cz./Sl.) work'.

In the FU interview, Rm1 was pushed towards explaining why he did not use the traditional word *loki* 'light'. He confirms that he uses the word *loki*, but in this case he had to speak fast. This explanatory idiom is unlikely to reflect the deep reasons for his choice.

A similar example is the use of *všelijaka* in the following sentence:

> *Te račik phirel, džanen, že všelijaka manuša phiren račik.* 'When they drive at night, you know, various (*všelijaka*, from Cz.) people come at night.'

In the FU interview, Rm1 suggested that he should have used the Romani word *chočsave* for 'various', but we feel that the LSP character of his discourse would suffer should this replacement be implemented. By using the loan word *všelijaka*, he foregrounds the word, turns attention to it.

New coinages

Almost all expressions that carry LSP markers are loan words, except for the word *gend'ija* 'books'. This is a newly coined word in Romani:

> . . . *al'e že aven avri gend'ija, al'e kolestar o Roma na chana!* 'but that books are coming out, but the Roma cannot eat them.' (sgm. 16)

Rm1's usage is particularly interesting here because in her question the interviewer used a loan word from Czech/Slovak: *knižki* 'books'. LSP is generated here through the use of an existing special term.

Loan translations

The FU interview revealed that Rm1 noted the word *baršniko*, 'velvet', used by MH in segment 1 in reference to the 'velvet revolution' that closed the period of Communist Party rule in 1989. He did not understand the word (which, he claims, is currently used in Romani in reference to corduroy) but took the meaning from the word *revolucija* and the context. This is an important indication of what can happen with LSP lexemes unknown to the speakers; speakers manage the situation in the following way:

> noting →
> negative evaluation (comprehension needed) →
> adjustment (the use of guessing, Rm1 says *domislinďom* 'to guess', on the basis of contextual clues).

From the FU interview it appears that this management chain is well known to Rm1, and possibly often applied.

Rm1 reports in the FU interview another case: the word *džanľol* 'it means' was used in the FU interview by the interviewer, and when Rm1 is subsequently asked whether he knew the word he said *na šunďom, aľe achaľuvav* 'I haven't heard it, but I understand' (FU sgm. 5). Also, MH in one of her FU questions uses a recently coined Romani word *maškarthemutno* 'international' that has a very transparent structure (*maškar* 'between', *themutno* 'national'). It is very likely that Rm1 has heard the word for the first time but he employs it in his answer as if it were a long standing component of his lexicon.

Sometimes Rm1 just breaks the existing norms, as when saying *chudľa jakhenca* 'he caught by eyes' (*jakhenca*, instrumental case) instead of *jekhendar* (ablative case) (FU sgm. 4). or *Oda zijand* 'that (is) pity'. These constructions are based on Czech/Slovak models.

According to the FU interview, Rm1 noted his usage of the term *pre mateřsko* 'on maternity leave' and suggested with laughter that, perhaps, he could have said:

> *Chacha! No šaj pes phenel, 'hin la cikňi čhajori, khere laha hiňi', no.* 'Ha, ha. Well I could have said "she has a baby daughter, she is at home".'

However, he agrees with the interviewer that such a circumlocution would not convey that maternity leave is subject to social payment and adds that he has never heard any other expression.

The treatment of connectors

Connectors are of importance for any LSP. A social science discourse, such as required in our conversations, cannot exist without relatively complicated sentence structures. In Indian languages and also in traditional Romani, connectors of course exist but they belong to a type different from European languages. In Romani, in general, connectors are unstable and are 'relexicalised' in new language environments. Conversations 1 and 2 contain a number of connectors taken from Czech/Slovak, such as *protože* 'because' (sgm. 2). These play an important role in management for intellectualisation.

In his response to MH's question about how Roma networks developed after the end of the communist era in 1989, Rm1 (sgm. 3) says:

> *Paš o komuňisti sas feder le Romenge, <u>lebo</u> sas buči sakones, <u>a</u> sas jistota, <u>že</u> oja buči tajsa le Romes ela. Adaď(ž)ives šaj keren, <u>a</u> tajsa les imar na len andre but'i. <u>Šaj</u> – vareso – kadava životos kanakes pal e revolucija kajso sid'ardo vareso hino.* 'In the time of the communists the Roma were better off, <u>because</u> everyone had work, <u>and</u> there was an assurance <u>that</u> tomorrow, too, the Roma will have work. Today he can work, <u>and</u> tomorrow they will not take him to work any more. <u>Maybe</u> – our life after the revolution is somehow busy.'

In this paragraph, the articulateness of which may not be fully apparent in our translation, the Romani speaker uses four connectors (underlined above) and one connection without a connector ('Today he can work . . . '). This structuring represents an act of management towards intellectualisation of the paragraph. The connectors are *lebo* 'because' (from Slovak *lebo*, at least partly automatised in the variety of Romani under examination), *a* 'and' (from Sl. / Cz. *a*), *že* 'that' (from Sl. / Cz. *že*), and *šaj* 'maybe' (from the Romani *šaj*). The use of *že* may have been triggered by the immediately preceding *ad hoc* lexical borrowing from Czech *jistota* 'assurance, certainty' that adds the management of intellectualisation to the paragraph. It is not a coincidence that the paragraph appears at the beginning of the conversation, where its LSP character is strongly felt.

The following sentence does not convey a particularly intellectualised content but its structuring is intellectually loaded:

> *Buď vičinena le čhaven anebo tumenge kerena korkoro, kaj te – kaj te – džal avri.* 'Either (*buď*, from Cz.) you call the boys or (*anebo*, from Cz.) you handle it yourself, so that, so that he gets out.'

This sentence follows a long complicated section that already contains Czech loan connectors *že* 'that' and *nebo* 'or'. Note that in this example the form of the connector is the stylistically high *anebo*, which is not frequently used in Standard Czech conversation. Nevertheless, it remained unnoted in the FU interview.

Some other connectors used by Rm1 are also by no means general in Czech / Slovak, such as *třebasže* 'although' in the following sentence:

> *Varekana, varekana mange dav třebasže volno, al'e jinak sako gjives phirav.* 'Although sometimes, sometimes I give myself free time (*volno*, from Cz.), but otherwise (*jinak*, from Cz.) I drive daily.'

The pattern here agrees with other discourse of Rm1: borrowing of a connector is connected with borrowing a lexical item within the same sentence. Note that *volno* is a LSP term in an employee's language. *Jinak* could be expressed by a Romani word, but its content is also intellectualising and within an environment of extensive interference it easily follows the lead of the preceding *třebasže* and *volno*. (However, the word *jinak* with the same meaning is also used in sgm. 8.) Incidentally, in the FU interview the speaker noted the 'non-Romani' character of the phrase *varekana mange dav volno* 'I give myself free time', laughs and says 'it cannot be said like that, it must be "I'm at home, I don't work"' (*som khere, na kerav but'i*). He also accepts MH's suggestion that the same content could be formulated as *čučo d'ives* 'free day'. All this is in response to a series of MH's questions about how the interview could have used purely Romani language; but the Romani-like rephrasings lose the intellectualisation effect of the original sentence.

False starts and hesitation

Replanning of sentences occurs in the conversation of both speakers and some of it (or most of it?) is connected with lexical problems, where a more 'interview-like' LSP expression is being sought. This seems to be the case in:

> *. . . na phiren, nane avka veselo sar sas pal o, pal o khera . . .* ' . . . [the Roma] don't go, it's not so lively (*veselo*, from Cz.) as it used to be, from one home to another . . . ' (Rm1, sgm. 2)

Hesitation appears here to intervene in the plan to say 'the Roma don't go from one home to another', which looks too conversational. Another phrase, 'it's not so lively as it used to be', is inserted. This insertion includes the Czech word *veselo* 'lively' that as a loan gives the passage an intellectual flair. This word, in more traditional speech, has the form *vešelo*; the speaker commented in the FU interview that *veselo* is a word that is used among younger speakers. Note that this segment is at the beginning of the interview, where the LSP character of the encounter is strong. It should be noted that the first part of the same sentence contains the loan conjunction *protože* 'because' that also has an intellectualising effect. (There is a Romani alternative for this conjunction, *vašoda*, which Rm1 knows and uses, although it does not appear in Conversation 1.)

Among the routine management expressions belongs 'verbal weed' (hesitation words, fillers, indeterminacy of expression) which do appear in Conversations 1 and 2. Müllerová *et al.* (1992) and Neustupný and Nekvapil (2003: 307) have claimed that such expressions are common in Czech in a variety of situations. It is surprising that Rm1 shows almost no verbal weed, except for finishing sentences with *no* 'yes':

> *Duj berš a jepaš lake. No.* 'Two and a half years. Yes.'

But *no* is a weak expression. Is this an attempt to intellectualise Rm1's speech? It may be significant that the very informal expression *žejo* 'isn't it' only appears in the FU interview, not in Conversation 1 itself (as Rm1 himself notes, it corresponds to *ta na* in traditional Romani). The use of verbal weed is normally automatised and as such is difficult to investigate through the FU interview.

High and Low varieties

An advantage of Romani in the case of LSP, in comparison with some other languages, is the absence of the Low variety of speech, such as appears in Czech diglossia (the difference between the Standard / High and Common / Low varieties of speech). There are regional varieties but no Low varieties in common everyday speech. This improves the possibilities of intellectualisation (cf. also our discussion in the case of Conversation 2).

Traditional stylistic figures

Coming closer to the language of LSP can be achieved by figures of speech such as those employed in traditional narration. However, the use of figures of speech does not stand out in Rm1's conversation. There are occasional sentences using gradation:

> *. . . bešena trindžene, štardžene, šaj tumen maren!* ' three people, four people come in and sit down, they can beat you up!' (sgm. 10)

A rhetorical question appears in the following case:

> *Sostar darav? Sostar darav. Sako daral. Te račik phirel, džanen, že všelijaka manuša phiren račik.* 'What I am afraid of? What I am afraid of. Everyone is afraid. To drive the taxi at night, you know that various (*všelijaka*, from Cz. / Sl.) people use the taxi at night.'

On the whole, the use of traditional figures for Rm1's conversation has been limited.

Content

Special rules of conduct exist in LSP situations such as an interview, but they are not necessarily used in our conversations. In segment 1 of Conversation 1, MH holds the tape recorder, used for recording the conversation, in her hand and Rm1 says *šaj thoven kadej* 'you can put it here', pointing to a table. In an everyday conversation such a remark would remain unnoted but in an interview it is the prerogative of the interviewer to decide where equipment would be placed.

In the course of Conversation 1, speech topics do not move away from the theme of the interview (changes in the life of Roma after 1989) but the degree of their elaboration remains relatively low. Rm1 has well noted that this is an interview but has failed to elaborate its content.

Rm1's attitudes to his language and his idiom

Attitudes to Romani are a significant component of individual language management. The FU interview revealed that Rm1 realises that in the interview he should speak Romani without Czech words. This represents a major language management (pre-management) strategy. He believes that, except for the word *pre mateřsko* 'on maternity leave', he did not use a single Czech word:

> *Na phenďom ani jekh čechiko lav, na?* 'I haven't said a single Czech word, have I?'

The FU interview did not allow us to establish in what way he employed this attitude to switch the management process in Conversation 1. We can assume that it played a momentous role; nevertheless, the filter to stop interference from Czech lacked efficiency. Even in this sentence he uses the Czech word *ani* 'not even', and his speech is characterised by frequent borrowings throughout.

Rm1 claims that contemporary Romani is different from that of the previous generation. According to his idiom he would adjust to the pure older language of the older generation but, he asserts, the young Roma do not understand the old language any more (FU sgm. 2 and 8). He says he mostly speaks with them in Czech anyway. In the FU interview (sgm. 3) he defends the form *siďardo* 'busy' from the verb *siďarel* 'to hurry' by simply stating that *avka pes vakarel* 'that's how one speaks'. In other cases his excuse for possible deviations was that he was speaking fast. In other words, his idiom used to explain his language is not highly developed. Sometimes he accepts that what he said was a deviation from Romani norms as in the phrase *mange dav volno* 'I gave myself holidays' and corrects his language in the FU interview. We know that in his own original writing he strongly pre-manages his language, using a dictionary to identify correct lexical selections.

In the FU interview, the interviewer suggested that the word *mateřsko* 'maternity leave' would not be understood by Roma from other countries, but he does not react to the suggestion. This seems to indicate that at the level of discourse the problem of the international unity of the Roma does not play an important role for this speaker.

Conversation 2

The interviewer and the topic of Conversation 2 were identical with Conversation 1. However, the character of speech in this conversation and the relevant LSP processes were totally different. Rm2 did not rely much on the interviewer's guidance. He produced speech readily and in large quantity. It was more like a series of monologues than a dialogue and was sometimes reminiscent of a waterfall that was difficult to interrupt.

Lexical processes

General

There are loan words but they are mostly used generatively, not as a means of management of problems. They tend, therefore, to be well-established loans, and as such derive mostly from Slovak (the language of the original territory of North-Central Romani) rather than from Czech. Examples from the first segment of the conversation are:

> *požičinelas* 'lent them'
> *placos* 'square' (from German, through Slovak)
> *klejenca* 'keys'
> *pametinav* 'I remember'
> *vojna* 'military service'
> *slugadžis* 'soldier'
> *duminel* 'he thinks'
> *furt* 'all the time' (from German, through Slovak).

The level of intellectualisation of these words is relatively low.

Items marked as intellectual

The intellectual vocabulary necessary for the topic of the interview includes old common international loan words such as *kapitalismus, komunismus, revolucija, demokracija*. They all appear in the conversation.

Some Romani words or phrases have an intellectualising effect, because of their content:

> *dujto mariben* 'second (world) war' (sgm. 1)
> *šaj lekharav nebo pisinav* 'I can write or write'

The first verb 'to write' (*lekhar-*) is a new form introduced into intellectualised Romani by Cortiade on the basis of Hindi and used here to enhance the LSP character of the interview. The second verb (*pisin-*) represents a post-management (expected lack of comprehension of *lekhar-*) and is based on Slovak/Czech; Rm2 employs it to confirm the meaning of the first, still somewhat unusual, form.

Another new expression Rm2 uses is *sikhaviben* 'education':

> *nane koda sikhaviben* ' they haven't got that education'

This selection manages the language by marking it as an intellectual social-science LSP. Each speaker who occasionally or frequently deals with intellectual content possesses a repertoire of words such as this. To collect them and introduce them into general usage is a matter of considerable importance.

Loan translations

Rm2 uses the principle of loan translations both to increase his vocabulary and to intellectualise his phraseology. The first category can be exemplified in the following passage from Conversation 2:

> … *dživas andro kosmický – sar phenen o Čechi – andro kosmický věk. Kosmicko dživipen.* ' we live in the cosmic – as the Czechs say – in, *kosmický věk*' (Cz., 'cosmic / space age'). Kosmicko *dživipen* (Rom. 'life').

This example is highly illustrative. Firstly, a Czech term is not just introduced in a sentence. There is a management routine 'as the Czechs say' that in a way constitutes an apology for using foreign material in a Romani sentence. We know that in some other 'cultural languages' it is difficult to introduce foreign material without a similar form of an apology. Some Romani speakers obviously use the same procedure. Secondly, the Czech phrase is quoted and then translated into Romani by coining a new word on the basis of an 'international' one (*kosmicko*), and combining it with an existing intellectual lexical item, *dživipen* 'age'.

Loan translations are also used to foreground some phrases. For example:

> *me som uľardo* 'I have been born' (sgm. 1)

This phrase is possible in Romani but has not been used in idiomatic Romani so far. Its structure relies on the Czech *jsem narozen*. The traditional phraseology prescribes forms such as *me uľiľom Prahate* 'I have been born (active verb) in Prague.'

A similar positive attitude to loan translations can be seen in Rm2's attitude to the term *baršoňiko revolucija* 'velvet revolution' used in the opening question by MH. The term was discussed in the FU interview, and Rm2 claimed that he had never heard the word in Romani but that he understood it perfectly. Interestingly, he immediately adopted it and used it himself in the interview. In the FU interview he actively approved of some other loan translations such as *šudrarďi* 'refrigerator'.

The treatment of connectors

The connectors *a* 'and' and *že* 'that' are used frequently but it would be difficult to claim that, as in the case of Rm1, this speaker uses Czech / Slovak connectors widely to manage the intellectualisation of his speech. As a matter of fact, the absence of connectors is conspicuous.

False starts and hesitation

Surprisingly, Rm2 shows more false starts than Rm1. For example:

> … *našťi phenav – sar te chudava čino andre historija miri – me uľiľom Prahate Našťi phenav aver Roma – na esas len varekana so – na te chal* 'I cannot say – when I start a little about my history – I have been born in Prague I cannot say about other Roma – sometimes they didn't have – didn't have much to eat

On the one hand this hesitation reduces fluency and as such contradicts rules of intellectual LSP discourse; on the other, it shows that the speaker carefully considers his content, as befits the interview situation.

High and Low varieties

In the case of Rm1 it was mentioned that unlike Czech, spoken Romani is not available in a High and Low variety (Standard and Common Language; see Neustupný & Nekvapil, 2003: 233–7). The language is neutral in this respect. The same can be said about Rm2. The fact is made conspicuous, in Conversation 2, by the insertion of a relatively long quotation of speech in Czech referring to what the speaker told his wife. This is given entirely in Czech, and the variety is Common Czech (the Low variety). This level of Czech does not correspond to the neutral level of the speaker's Romani, and in Czech may be considered unsuitable for the interview situation.

Content

The content of the interview agrees with the style of the LSP of the interview. It is sophisticated, even if the language itself does not use any dramatic devices, and there are many false starts. The following is a specimen of the content of Rm2's discourse:

> *Te džava čino opreder la goďaha – d ivas andro kosmický – sar phenen o Čechi – andro kosmický věk. Kosmicko dživipen. A manuš – oda nejšukareder d ivipen, te manuš uľol pre kadi planeta. Pre kadi phuv. Andre koda vesmiros oda nejbareder, nejšukareder, te manuš uľol pro svetos. A te uľol pre kada svetos, ta koda manuš kamel te dživel. A te les nane kodi kupeľnica, sar dikhen pre Slovensko, sar nane so te chal, kole čhavoren nane so te chal nebo dareso – a len hin savoro! A jon pes na doresen paš koda, so bi kampelas lenge. Aòi choc darekana phiren vaš o paňi nebo nane koda nebo so te chal, nane koda <u>sikhaviben</u>, so bi lenge kampelas, a kola manuša, so uľon pre kadi planeta, kamen te dživel, bo uľiľa kadaj, a kamel tiž te sikhavel, me kadaj som! Me kadaj som, me kadaj dživav!*

> 'When I think on a more sublime level – we live in a cosmic – as the Czechs put it, in *kosmický věk*. A cosmic life. And human beings – the most beautiful thing is when they are born on this planet. On this earth. In this universe, it is the greatest thing, the most beautiful thing to be born in this world. And when human beings are born in this world, they want to live. And when he hasn't got a little bathroom (not even a humble bathroom), as you see in Slovakia, they do not have enough to eat, children haven't got enough to eat, or what – and THEY have got everything. Sometimes not even that, they go to fetch water, or they haven't got this, or nothing to eat, they lack the education they would need, and the people who are born on this planet they want to live, because they were born here, and they want to show: I am here, I am here, I live here!'

Attitudes to Romani and the speaker's idiom

In the FU interview, Rm2, similarly to Rm1, made a number of statements about his language. Rm2 presented an optimistic view that Romani is being developed and standardised, and maintained that this developed and standardised language should be used by Romani speakers such as himself. Towards the

end of the FU interview he repeated his positive attitude to Romani, and his concern that the language might be abandoned by the Roma.

Summary: Conversations 1 and 2

We can summarise the main results of our analysis in the following points:

Rm1's speech:

- the awareness of an LSP situation is obviously present;
- average output; not particularly rich or intellectualised content;
- the intellectualisation of Rm1's discourse is realised through a number of ad hoc processes rather than by using established terminologies;
- loan words obviously used as a means of intellectualisation management;
- elaborate loan connectors employed for intellectualisation management;
- possibly limited verbal weed;
- the perspective of international use of Romani LSP is absent;
- the speaker does not possess a sophisticated system of overt attitudes to his language use.

Rm2's speech:

- the awareness of a LSP situation is obviously present;
- prolific in output and intellectualised content;
- the intellectualisation of Romani is not achieved through the use of terminologies;
- loan words used, but not conspicuous;
- loan connectors do not stand out;
- the strategy of loan translations is actively used;
- the perspective of international use of Romani LSP is present;
- there is a sophisticated system of attitudes to language.

It would be difficult to generalise on the basis of two conversations. The selection of other speakers might have revealed different sets of strategies, such as the use of indigenous word-formation procedures. Also, it is important to realise that these sets (in particular the first one) are not automatically applicable in the written language. However, the strategy sets employed by Rm1 and Rm2 are important in contemporary Romani and should be seriously considered when designing adjustment for the language.

Organised Management

The transition from simple to organised management is an important issue. In Romani LSP the authors wish to emphasise the basic character of simple management. However, issues identified at that level should be raised in organised management. This is at present not the case either in Romani or, for that matter, any other language. A survey of existing organised management relevant to Romani LSP will be discussed in the order of levels at which it occurs.

Individual level

In the case of many sophisticated speakers of Romani, individual management for intellectual language is very strong. Individual management of written texts was documented in Hübschmannová and Neustupný (1996). The issue of purism occasionally arises, as in the suggestion of replacing the word *kvitkos* 'flower' of Slovak origin by *lulud'i*, with the same meaning (MH's recent discourse data). The latter word is felt to be more indigenous, although, in fact, it is of Greek origin.

At the end of articles by individual Roma politicians and others written in Czech, summaries in Romani often appear. This is at the request of the authors and thus reflects their individual management of language – mostly management that fulfils the symbolic function. The result is the creation of intellectualised Romani texts.

Among individuals as agents of language management it is necessary to count both Roma and non-Roma personnel. The translators of many texts into Romani, Dr Viliam Zeman, Dr Vlado Oláh, Jan Horváth, Dr František Godla, the late Dr Bartoloměj Daniel, etc., are of Roma descent. However, we have noted above that MH (who is not a Roma) took part (or initiative) in many acts of LSP management. The translation of summaries for Romani authors, mentioned in the previous paragraph, is often executed by *gaje* (non-Roma) students of the language who thus play an important part in the creation of Romani as LSP. This participation of non-native individuals is a principle that can be found, in the past, in other languages as well.

Association level

At the level of the Roma associations, the creation of the Czech-Slovak orthography can perhaps be adduced. It took place after the establishment of the Union of Gypsies-Roma in 1969 and has been described and commented on on a number of occasions (e.g. Hübschmannová & Neustupný, 1996: 100). Linguistic terminology is being created by Czech and Slovak specialists in cooperation with the Macedonian linguist Šaip Jusuf and Serbian author Rajko Djurić. No other attempt to establish a LSP terminology is known to the present writers.

Organisation level

The Soros Foundation is active in supporting Roma activities, some of which concern the Romani language.

Local and central government level

To our knowledge there is no local or central government policy with regard to using Romani as a LSP language. In Slovakia, which has signed the Charter of Minority and Regional Languages, 52 localities with more than 20% Roma population should display orientation and other signs in Romani. This obligation has not been honoured.

While the Slovak Government has published brochures in Romani that defend its stances and actions (and distributed them to local governments where they have been placed in storage), the Czech Government is not prolific in producing translations. The 2001 Census questionnaire was translated into

Romani (among 10 other languages; translator Dr Viliam Zeman), but this was an initiative of the Census office rather than the Government at large. If further translations aim at assisting the establishment of Romani as a LSP, they should identify needs of the Roma community and respond to them, rather than provide translations for the symbolic value of the act. Only in that case will the translations find their way to the readers.

One of the prerequisites for the development of LSP is literature, and the Czech Central Government is singling out budgets for supporting the Romani press (Neustupný & Nekvapil, 2003). Another breeding ground is school education and in this respect policies are meagre. Romani is taught at the Roma High School in Kolín, the Evangelic Academy in Prague (by distance education), and the Faculty of Philosophy, Charles University, where it is available up to the postgraduate level. It is an elective subject at a few other tertiary institutions.

Conclusion

This paper suggests that in many cases it is inappropriate to approach the issue of terminology from the point of view of terms developed as the result of terminological processes. The framework applied here can be placed within the family of LSP studies. We have followed Jernudd in emphasising the necessity of having recourse to the management model of language. This seems to be particularly important in the case of Romani, where the creation of languages for special purposes, including the build-up of terminologies, has only started. An attempt has been made to show how intellectualisation processes in Romani discourse lead to the solution of LSP problems.

The picture presented in this paper is not pessimistic. Although one should not expect that Romani will develop a wide range of LSPs in the near future, there are situations of use that will support limited development and there is no reason why language managers should not wholeheartedly support it.

The most important point in the case of Romani is to acknowledge the role of intellectually sophisticated language as the basis for any further development. Further maturation of the language of literature (not only special and technical literature) is one prerequisite. Another prerequisite is in the language of education. Our *first recommendation* is to reinforce the management of Romani in these two domains.

Our *second recommendation* is to systematically increase the number and types of situations in which LSPs are naturally used and managed. Only if situations of use are established can usage be effectively acquired. A radical increase in the use of video media is essential, while it is equally important to pay attention to the distribution and use of printed material.

In the discourse data presented in this paper we have identified two different approaches to the LSP issue. A warning has been raised that although these two approaches are significant, they may not be the only ones available. One of the approaches was basically through direct borrowing, while the other mainly utilised loan translations. *Our third recommendation* is that a much larger amount of discourse data be assembled both from spoken and written Romani and that a variety of management approaches, revealed in such data, be carefully considered. The object of discourse management is not only lexical items but discourse

in general. Through discourse management, not only a limited set of items is acquired but also strategies that can lead to further successful management processes. Discourse management should be recorded and turned into the starting point for organised management. Components of LSP that result from discourse and subsequent organised management should be collected and made available to language activists and teachers. There will be variants for many items, but even though managers' evaluation may be appended, it would be too early to attempt to standardise. The traditional approach through the creation of terminology should be avoided.

Fourthly, although we cannot recommend the flooding of Romani with items and grammatical procedures from base languages such as Czech or Slovak, it seems certain that the development of LSP for Romani requires models that are at least partly automatised (through the experience of speakers in the use of the base languages) and this means borrowing. There is obviously a need for ad hoc management that can be satisfied by such borrowing strategies. As the example of *importantno* quoted in this paper shows, borrowing need not be from individual base languages. Optimally, the process should stop at ad hoc borrowing and should be followed by processes of systematisation and further adjustment (including loan translations) in organised management. In our data, the existence of anti-loanword strategies has been confirmed. Although only a few coinages on the basis of indigenous word-formation strategies appeared in our data, they are common in other sources and should be carefully considered for future terminological work.

Fifthly, while accepting the principle of borrowing, it is advisable to allow for mutual intelligibility between different varieties of Romani that is endangered if loans from different base languages (Czech, Slovak, Hungarian, German, etc.) are widely applied. The perspective of international cooperation, made obvious several times in this paper, should not be neglected.

Our *sixth recommendation* is to systematically develop currently existing strategies to deal with variation in language. These also include guessing strategies, that seemed to be well represented in our data. The assumption that the development of the LSP must go hand in hand with standardisation is mistaken: variation can be retained.

Finally, we want to return to the requirement already emphasised with regard to terminology by Jernudd (1994). Management for LSP, as language management in general, should not think of the middle class alone. Management for Romani should aim at the millions of the Roma and fully incorporate their interests into the overall framework.

Correspondence

Any correspondence should be directed to Milena Hübschmannová, Charles University, Department of Romani Studies, Ovocný trh 5, Prague 1, 116 36 Czech Republic (hubschmannova@volny.cz).

References

Cortiade, M. (1986) *Romani Fonetika thaj Lekhipa* [Romani Phonetics and Orthography]. Titograd: Pobjeda.

de Gila Kochanowski, V. (1996) *Le Roi des Serpentes* [The King of the Snakes]. France: Wallada.

Elšík, V. (2003) Interdialect contact of Czech (and Slovak) Romani varieties. *IJSL* 162, 41–62.

Fan, S.K. (2002) Follow-up interview. In J.V. Neustupný and S. Miyazaki (eds) *Gengo Kenkyu no Hoho* [Methods in Language Studies] (pp. 87–95) (In Japanese). Tokyo: Kuroshio.

Garvin, P.L. (1964) *A Prague School Reader on Esthetics, Literary Structure and Linguistics*. Washington: Georgetown University Press.

Gonzales, A. (1988) The intellectualization of Filipino. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 20 (2), 3–6.

Gonzales, A. (2002) Language planning and intellectualization. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 3 (1), 5–27.

Havránek, B. (1963) *Studie o Spisovném Jazyce* [Studies on Standard Language]. Prague: Academia.

Havránek, B. (1983) The functional differentiation of the standard language. In J. Vachek (ed.) *Praguiana. Some Basic and Less Known Aspects of the Prague Linguistic School* (pp. 143–64). Prague/Amsterdam. (Originally published in Czech in *Spisovný jazyk a jazyková kultura*, Praha, 1932).

Hoffmann, L., Kalverkämper, H. and Wiegand, E.H. (eds) (1998/1999) *Fachsprachen/Languages for Special Purposes. Ein Internationales Handbuch zur Fachsprachenforschung/An International Handbook of Special-language and Terminology Research*. Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft 14.1, 14.2. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Hübschmannová, M. (1984) Nominalization in Slovak Romani. *Quadrenal del Siculor Gymnasium, Rassegna dela Faculta di Lettere e Filosofia dell'Universita di Catania* 14, 27–70.

Hübschmannová, M. and Neustupný, J.V. (1996) The Slovak-and-Czech dialect of Romani and its standardization. *IJSL* 120, 85–109.

Hübschmannová, M., Šebková, H. and žigová, A. (1991) *Romsko-český a Česko-romský Kapesní Slovník* [*Romani-Czech and Czech-Romani Pocket Dictionary*]. Prague: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství.

Jernudd, B.H. (1994) Term(inological) problems. In M. Brekke, O. Andersen, T. Dahl and J. Myking (eds) *Applications and Implications of Current LSP Research* (vol. 1) (pp. 72–83). Bergen: University of Bergen.

Jernudd, B.H. and Neustupný, J.V. (1987) Language planning: For whom? In L. Laforge (ed.) *Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Language Planning* (pp. 69–84). Québec: Presses de l'Université Laval.

Jusuf, Š. (1980) *Romani Gramatika – Romska Gramatika* [*Romani Grammar*]. Skopje: Naša kniga.

Liddicoat, A.J. and Bryant, P. (2002) Intellectualization: A current issue in language planning. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 3 (1), 1–4.

Müllerová, O., Hoffmannová, J. and Schneiderová, E. (1992) *Mluvená Čeština v Autentických Textech* [*Spoken Czech in Authentic Texts*]. Jinočany: H&H.

Muraoka, H. (2004) Bibliography of language management. In *Language Management in Contact Situations* (vol. 3) (pp. 233–40). Reports on the Research Projects 104. Chiba: Chiba University, Graduate School of Social Sciences and Humanities.

Nečas, C. (1999) *Nemůžeme Zapomenout* [*We Cannot Forget*]. Praha: Prostor.

Nekvapil, J. (forthcoming) The development of languages for special purposes. In U. Ammon, N. Dittmar, K. Mattheier and P. Trudgill (eds) *Sociolinguistics. An International Handbook of the Science of Language and Society* (2nd edn). Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter. (A Czech version of this paper has been preprinted in *Přednášky z XLV. Běhu Letní Školy Slovanských Studií*, Praha FFUK 2002, pp. 117–32.)

Neustupný, J.V. (1978) *Post-Structural Approaches to Language*. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press.

Neustupný, J.V. (1983) Towards a paradigm for language planning. *Language Planning Newsletter* 9 (4), 1–4.

Neustupný, J.V. (1994) Problems of English contact discourse and language planning. In T. Kandiah and J. Kwan-Terry (eds) *English and Language Planning* (pp. 50–69). Singapore: Academic Press.

Neustupný, J.V. (1999) Následné (follow-up) interview. *Slovo a Slovesnost* 60 (1), 13–18.

Neustupný, J.V. (2004) The historical position of language management theory: An update. In *Language Management in Contact Situations* (vol. 3) (pp. 1–7). Reports on the Research Projects 104. (In Japanese; summary in English.) Chiba: Chiba University, Graduate School of Social Sciences and Humanities.

Neustupný, J.V. and S. Miyazaki (2002) *Gengo Kenkyu no Hoho* [*Methods in Language Studies*]. Tokyo: Kurosio.

Neustupný, J.V. and Nekvapil, J. (2003) Language management in the Czech Republic. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 4 (3&4), 181–366.

Picht, H. and Draskau, J. (1985) *Terminology: An Introduction.* Surrey: University of Surrey.

Vančura, Z. (1936) The study of the language of commerce. *Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Prague* 6, 159–64.

Weinstein, B. (1987) Language planning and interests. In L. Laforge (ed.) *Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Language Planning* (pp. 33–58). Québec: Presses de l'Université Laval.