Para-Romani revisited*

YARON MATRAS
University of Manchester

1. *Romani, "Gypsy languages", and jargons*

Seldom does one encounter as much confusion in popular views surrounding the identity and affiliation of languages, as in the case of the relations between Romani, "Gypsy languages", and secretive jargons. This, although considerable clarity was already evident in specialised descriptions in the second half of the eighteenth century, with law enforcement officers being able to draw a strict distinction between the jargon of the Roads and the Gypsy language (see the *Rotwelsche Grammatik* of 1755, Frankfurt; and the *Sulzer Zigeunerliste* of 1787, Stuttgart), and scholars convincingly demonstrating an historical connection between the latter — the Gypsy language — and the modern languages of India (Rüdiger 1782; Grellmann 1783). While the jargon of the Roads was being compiled in the form of vocabulary items loosely-connected in the entangled web of ever-changing relations within a diverse population of social "outcasts", the Gypsy language — later to be coined *Rommany* by the novelist George Borrow, based on an indigenous appellation — was recognised for its internal linguistic coherence.

1.1 *Sources of confusion*

Why then the confusion? A number of factors appear to be responsible. First, we are dealing with a continuum of speech varieties all of which have at least a *connection* with the social context of peripatetic, or sedentary but socially isolated groups, who specialise in providing particular services. In some cases, group identity revolves around a particular occupational profile (cattle traders, musicians, carcass-removers, masons, etc.). In others, a shared occupational profile coincides with endogamous structures and a variety of shared attitudes, fashions, and material culture. These, when passed from one generation to an-

---

other, will give rise to a feeling of ethnic or ethnic-like identity even in the absence of a clearly defined territorial origin or a full-fledged everyday language unique to the group (as in the case of the Irish and Scottish Travellers, or of the Jenisch of Germany and Switzerland). As for the Roms and affiliated groups (Sinti, Manuš, Romaničel, Gitanos, Kale), the inherited ethnic, linguistic and socio-cultural traits can, and often do overlap with a particular pattern of economic activities.

Second, social and economic contacts among marginalised, specialised, and peripatetic groups have led to mutual linguistic influences. Romani has certainly had an impact on the vocabularies of in-group secret varieties or jargons. In a number of cases, Romani dialects may be argued to have themselves absorbed items through contacts with specialised trade or secret in-group varieties, or indeed to have developed functions similar to those of secondary secret vocabularies or jargons, in addition to serving as the everyday language of the Romani family unit and ethnic community. Moreover, it is arguable that in some Romani communities, most clearly those in the western fringe areas of Europe (Scandinavia, Britain, and Iberia), this latter function of an in-group language used for secondary communication has over time replaced the primary function of Romani as an everyday community language, the change carrying with it a structural shift from a full-fledged, Indic-derived inflected language to a "mixed", "intertwined", or "contact" variety, drawing on Romani primarily for its vocabulary (so-called "Para-Romani"; see in particular the contributions by Boretzky and Bakker to this volume; and see discussion below).

To these two factors that directly concern the functional and structural typology of the speech varieties — their employment in a context of social isolation and a service-providing economy, and the mutual influences and functional similarities among them — one should add two additional causes for ambiguity in common perception. The first of those is the use of the label "Gypsy" as a cover designation for peripatetic groups on the one hand, and on the other as synonymous with the ethnic self-appellations of those (Europeans) whose language is the Indic-derived *romanes*, and for whom *rom* serves as an endonym and often as an actual ethnonym. Finally, the image of "Gypsy languages" is significantly shaped by conceptions, and often misconceptions, of the internal diversity of the dialects of Romani in both vocabulary and grammatical structure. My first concern here is therefore to contribute some disambiguity into these sources of potential confusion.

1.2 *The diversity of Romani dialects*

Beginning with the latter — the diversity of Romani dialects — it is sufficient to consult the numerous descriptions in order to convince oneself of the structural coherence of Romani as a full-fledged language. The shared components of core vocabulary and grammatical structure have recently been highlighted in Bakker & Matras (1997), and need not be repeated here. Nonetheless, Romani dialects do show a rather unique compositional typology, one which they, in fact, also appear to share with other Indic languages spoken outside of India by groups who specialise in providing services — crafts, trade, or entertainment —, whether settled or itinerant. Examples are the idioms of the *Ḍoma* of the Hunza valley in northern Pakistan (Lorimer 1939) or the *Dom* of Syria and Palestine (Macalister 1909-1913). It has been suggested that, like the *Rom* of Europe and Asia Minor, these groups are descended from the Indian *Ḍom* caste of metalworkers, entertainers and providers of other services (cf. Hübschmannová 1997: 11-14; Hancock 1988: 192). The most salient feature that Romani shares with these languages is the preservation of an Indic core vocabulary, along with productive inflection and derivation, combined with a largely unrestricted license to incorporate vocabulary and over time to undergo morphosyntactic convergence, or indeed even actual morphosyntactic fusion in selected areas of grammar with contiguous or coterritorial languages. These traits have led to classifications of Romani as lexically "deficient" (Boretzky 1989) and grammatically "parasitic" (Wexler 1997).[1]

Although there is no reason to assume a priori that the language-contact behaviour of Romani and other related, Indic-derived "Gypsy languages" would not generally be in line with universals of longterm grammatical change through intense contact, there are nevertheless a number of sociolinguistic factors which they share and that are unique to them — most notably social isolation within an economically specialised, non-territorial endogamous group, mobility, permanent multilingualism, and the lack of any literary or other normative linguistic traditions. The question therefore arises, to what extent linguistic conservatism in such communities may be motivated among other things also by socioeconomic factors, specifically by the need to preserve a functional in-group register for the purpose of secondary communication in special situations. This includes identifying and reinforcing group membership, as well as secret communication

---

1 Wexler's (1997: 156) claim, however, that "Romani grammar *everywhere* has its source in the coterritorial or contiguous non-Romani languages which the Roma also control" ignores the productivity of Indic-derived verbal, but also nominal inflection paradigms even with incorporated loanwords (see below), as well as the internal grammaticalisation processes involving Indic-derived material, by which morphosyntactic convergence is often achieved.

in the presence of bystanders. I shall return to this issue in the discussion of structural and functional affinities between some varieties of Romani and special jargons below.

1.3 *The label "Gypsy" and the question of a Gypsy language*

The next problem area concerns the use of labels. The safest option in a descriptive account is to use analytical terminology when referring to purely sociological phenomena — "itinerant trades and services", "peripatetic groups", etc. — basing it on shared distinctive features that are observable, and avoiding misleading labels that might suggest the existence of a yet more intimately-bound collective. The word "Gypsy" can then be reserved for the context of an ethnic group and its numerous subdivisions of Indic origin, whose everyday language shares core structural features; i.e. it can be applied as synonymous with *Romani*. The difficulty remains in classifying communities that show an overlap of peripatetic profiles of diverse ethnic origins, with a strong affinity to Romani culture and language sharing spiritual conceptions, fashions, and vocabulary with the Romani community in the stricter sense. The existence of such in-between or mixed communities is significant for the diffusion of Romani-derived linguistic items into non-Romani speech; but it has also inspired statements doubting the mere existence of a coherent Romani linguistic-ethnic identity and origin.

Lucassen (1996) for instance exposes an indiscriminate use of the label "Gypsies" which accompanies the ideological and administrative marginalisation by the (German) state of peripatetics and other minorities of diverse origins and identities, from the eighteenth century onwards. He then concludes that, since the label is applied to diverse populations, Gypsy ethnic identity is overall fictitious, embodied primarily by the wish to "conquer" or control the activities of non-mainstream populations (see similar argumentation in Willems 1996, and elsewhere). Common sense however certainly does not eliminate in any way the possibility that the various groups referred to indiscriminately as "Gypsies" might also contain a collective which does in fact share ethnic origin, a sense of identity, a full-fledged language, and aspects of inherited material and spiritual culture, i.e. Roms or Gypsies in the strict sense. Lucassen disregards not only this logical possibility, but also the empirical evidence — linguistic and anthropological — for coherence within Romani populations.[2]

---

2 Indeed, in many of the writings of the "anti-Indianist" school, the burden of proof is reversed by way of rhetoric, disregarding any of the details of linguistic descriptions, yet claiming that linguists are inspired by the mere *possibility* (and exotic attractiveness) of an

Lucassen and Willems join a view already represented by Judith Okely (1983, 1984). In a summary of her "anti-Indianist" position, Okely (1984: 52) wrongly portrays the argument in favour of an Indic origin (and so in support of a coherent Romani-Gypsy linguistic-ethnic identity) as an "assumption that the Gypsies were once self-contained, perhaps with a self sufficient economy and culture". Okely's own conviction is that "Gypsies are dependent on a larger economy and are obliged to maintain continuing relations with a wider society. Their economy and culture can never be self contained" (ibid.). But this view is in fact easily reconcilable with an Indic origin, if one assumes, as Romani linguistics in the past century has generally done (cf. Grierson 1888; Hancock 1988: 192; Hübschmannová 1997: 1-14), that the European Roms are descendants of the Indian Doms and so part of a socio-economic caste, specialising in itinerant services and crafts, who migrated to the Near East, Asia Minor, and finally Europe, where at the time of their arrival, to use Okely's words, they were able to take advantage of "material conditions ... [allowing] a range of opportunities for a minority or persons who might choose to reject wage-labour, and exploit geographical mobility and a multiplicity of occupations where there were gaps in the system of demand and supply of goods and services" (Okely 1984: 52-53). Thus the socio-economic profile which Okely considers constitutive of Gypsy society can certainly go hand in hand with a close-knit, peripatetic group of Indian origin and so with the retention of ethno-linguistic and cultural identity ultimately inherited from India.

Nor can Okely's (1984: 55) claim that "it would seem unlikely that a once 'pure' Romanes can ever have been the Gypsies' sole or dominant language" withstand the argument that, as a mobile, linguistic-ethnic minority of foreign origin, the Gypsies will have become multilingual at a very early stage, remaining so until this very day, except in the westernmost fringe areas of Europe, where Romani has gradually been replaced by non-standard varieties of the majority language.[3] There is therefore no sustainable contestation of the existence of a full-fledged Romani language in Okely's (1984: 55; cf. also 1983: 9) statement that the Gypsies "can never have approximated to economic self sufficiency nor linguistic isolation. In order to earn their living, the Gypsies have always needed to be fluent in the languages of the surrounding non-Gypsies. It would be of little use if Gypsies could only tell fortunes in Romany to non-Gypsies." Like most linguistic minorities, sedentary or itinerant, it is safe to assume that the Roms have always been multilingual and so able to use the majority language for external interactions, as any observation of Romani-speaking communities today will confirm.

---

3 Or under direct political pressure to assimilate, as in parts of the Habsburg monarchy.

Okely (followed by Willems 1996) is consistent in her attempts to rebut claims put forth by linguists — using quotation marks when referring to 'Romani', and even implying that *romanes* is an outside label introduced by non-Gypsy researchers[4] — but she does not seem to make the effort to actually check their validity. In fact, none of the linguistic arguments put forth in support of a coherent Romani linguistic entity and its affinity with the modern languages of India has been seriously challenged since first formulated by Rüdiger (1782).[5] The only attempt to do so is of recent date, by Wexler (1997), who follows closely Okely's general line. Though setting out to prove that Romani has no independent — much less so a coherent — grammar, that Indic-derived grammar in the language is not productive, and so that the distinction between Romani and Para-Romani cannot be upheld, Wexler concentrates mainly on selected items from the Romani lexicon, which, beyond its core element, is indisputably diverse.

Wexler's only argument that actually does pertain to grammar concerns the split in the way Indic inflectional patterns are assigned in Romani to pre-European vs. European lexicon, commonly termed "thematic" and "athematic" grammar, respectively (see Boretzky 1989; Hancock 1995). Wexler (1997: 132) tries to refute the distinction — in an attempt to dispute systemic regularity in Romani — arguing that European loans share thematic stress-placement in non-nominative nominal inflection cases. Apart from the fact that the thematic/athematic distinction hardly rests on this particular detail, Wexler's examples confirm that the Indic-derived nominal inflection, albeit with different vocalic integration of the root (i.e. athematic connecting patterns), is also assigned to European loans, and so that it is indeed productive in the language. This, contrary to the idioms termed "Para-Romani" (cf. Bakker & Van der Voort 1991), where no such productive Indic-derived inflectional morphology can be found (though selected items of Indic derivational morphology are occasionally used for camouflaging, compounding or lexical enrichment purposes). Wexler further attempts to deconstruct the thematic/athematic distinction by showing that thematic (pre-European) elements may take analytical case, an observation which however is perfectly in line with mainstream Romani linguistics and the recogni-

---

4 Cf. Okely (1984: 52): "the languages which they [="the Gypsiologist linguists"] broadly call 'Romanes'".
5 Both Okely and Willems comment primarily on the work of Grellmann (1783), who is a convenient target, since much of his writing is plagiarised, and since he represents the contemporary mainstream, hostile and prejudiced attitudes toward the Gypsies, advocating their assimilation. Rüdiger on the other hand was not only original in his linguistic work, basing much of it on first-hand empirical observations drawn from a Romani speaking informant, but he was also a critic of his times, repentant of society's injust treatment of the Gypsies, and calling for a change in attitudes.

tion of an ongoing typological shift, with current variation between synthetic and analytic case formation (see Matras 1997).

A recent language-related exchange is representative for the debate among the "anti-Indianist" and "mainstream" schools: Hancock (1997: 184) addresses writers' stereotypical preconceptions of Gypsies, where claims are made that the Romani language lacks such concepts as 'duty', 'possession', or 'truth', and so that Romani people lack the corresponding notions. Among the Romani terms cited by Hancock as evidence for the lexical resources of the language and its dialects are phonological variants of some items, semantically extended inherited items, as well as adopted loans. This leads Okely (1997: 201), in a rebuttal, to suggest that the very same stereotypical preconceptions are the result of filtering out "all linguistic forms which cannot be labelled Indian", which in turn reveals according to Okely "yet another consequence of the search for the pure Indian self-sufficient culture".

1.3 *Underlying "Gypsy languages": Overlap with argots and trade jargons?*

If indeed the European Roms, like other Indian-speaking groups with similar occupation profiles in the Near East and Central Asia, are somehow connected with the Indian Dom caste of craftsmen, entertainers, and itinerant traders, then it is conceivable that their "original" culture was indeed Indian but not necessarily self-sufficient, to use Okely's terms. From a linguistic viewpoint this could mean that their everyday language was coherently Indic in structure, but that they may have in addition employed not only foreign idioms but also specialised trade or in-group jargons for secondary communication. Such special speech forms exist among the Doms of India: Cape (1924) noted the use of special camouflaging affixes, reversal and substitution of phonemes, metaphorical semantic extension — all strategies of lexical disguise that are well-known from other secret and special languages (cf. Sornig 1981; Sulán 1963).

European Romani, Hunza Ḍumāki, and Near Eastern Dom are all Indic languages of the 'Inner' or Central branch of Modern Indo-Aryan, but they show some significant differences that do not allow their classification as descendants of any single regional variety. What they have in common, beyond their overall linguistic-genealogical affiliation, is rather their survival, in isolation outside of India, as languages of socially marginalised, service-providing communities. Further examples are the Indian language called *Inku* spoken by some of the peripatetic *Jat* communities in Afghanistan (Rao 1995: 82-85), or even the Rajasthani-related speech of the *Parya* of Tajikistan and Uzbekistan (Payne 1997; cf. Oranskij 1977). The ethnographic similarities among some of these

groups are partly also reflected in the languages they speak — the contact be-haviour already mentioned above (i.e. the retention of a rather minimal core vo-cabulary of Indic origin, along with inflection and derivation patterns, with a largely unrestricted license to adopt foreign items), and the use of caste-name derivations as endonyms (*Dom, Rom, Lom, Jat*). A shared feature in connection with the latter is the presence of a collective term for 'stranger' or 'Gentile' who is not part of the group, in Romani (*gadžo*) and Near Eastern Dom (*kaččā*).

It seems plausible that the forerunner of Romani may have been exposed to the influences of jargons already in early stages. But contrary to the assertions of Okely (1984: 56) and Wexler (1997: 130), there is no reason to assume that the use of trade jargons should exclude the retention of a coherent Indic language. On the contrary, the fact that Romani shows no obvious traces of pre-European manipulative (camouflaging) structures suggests that outside of India, a coherent minority language unknown to outsiders may have itself served both purposes, that of primary communication, and that of secondary or specialised linguistic interaction — including that of a jargon the employment of which serves as an act of inclusion or exclusion from the group (see Burke 1995: 14).[6]

1.4 *Romani elements in non-Romani speech*

Given this possible background, and especially what we actually know about the socioeconomic profile of Romani-speaking communities in Europe, it is not sur-prising that Romani came to be used in similar environments with specialised varieties, argots, or jargons. The impact of Romani on such vocabularies is well-documented. At least two Romani items appear in Halit's (1934) Turkish vocabulary of Istanbul argot — *habe* 'food' (Rom. *xabe*) and *nanay* 'none' (Rom. *nane/nani* 'is-not'). The presence of a number of Romani items in Shelta, the secret vocabulary of Irish Travellers, is noted by Grant (1994: 132). Treimer (1937: 74-81) puts the estimated number of Romani-derived items in the Czech underworld argot *Hantyrka* at over one hundred, providing ample documenta-tion, and Sulán (1963: 9) cites a Romani component of 5% out of 1400 entries in a corpus of Hungarian secret vocabulary. A similar number of Romani items is documented for Stockholm slang (Kotsinas 1996; cf. also Ward 1936), and

---

6 Hancock (1992: 39) strongly argues against the idea that the ancestors of the Roma were engaged in similar professions in India as they typically carry out in Europe today, and points to the fact that words for metals and those involving other "typical" professions are often borrowed from European languages. But this only strengthens the impression that the Romani language reflects the so-called non-self-sufficient character of Romani economy: it is Indic in core, but it also draws on ever-changing contact constellations to supplement vital functions.

Leschber (1995) found that young Rumanian students were familiar with at least several dozen colloquial Rumanian items of Romani origin. A Romani compo-nent has been documented for non-standard usages — including secret jargons, local slangs, and general colloquialisms — in other European languages as well, the compilations for Dutch (Kluyver 1934), Italian (Pasquali 1935), French (Esnault 1935), and those for German contained in Wolf (1985) being just some examples. In these descriptions Romani items appear to cover a continuum ranging from the most specialised secret jargons to more generally known yet still *socially marked* slangs.

Modern studies of language contact have understandably begun to take an intensified interest in Romani as the *absorber* language for structural contact in-fluences. In view of the long list of contributions documenting the impact of Romani on non-Romani, of which only few were cited above, there is room for a concentrated methodological effort to re-examine the role of Romani in enrich-ing, sustaining, or indeed even helping to create specialised varieties of *other* languages. In pursuing this goal, the present collection follows the pathfinding compilation by Bakker & Cortiade (1991). Like the former, it focuses on Romani structures that are not embedded into a coherent Romani grammatical framework. It is also prudent in adopting a label for the phenomenon, avoiding an overall commitment to either "Gypsy languages", "slangs and jargons", or "Para-Romani". The latter term, "Para-Romani", may now be well-established in the working context of Romani linguistics as a designation for the use of ex-tensive Romani vocabulary in a non-Romani grammatical framework (see Bakker & Van der Voort 1991; and contributions by Bakker and Ladefoged to this volume). The present discussion downplays somewhat its status as a self-evident notion, highlighting instead that "*Para*-Romani" — literally what is spo-ken beyond Romani, and so by implication, diachronically replacing it — is, rather, an analytical *point of view*. One might also view such idioms as cases of language shift involving a highly specific context of usage and thus giving rise to new, non-standard varieties of the target language.

The common denominator of the present collection is the focus on the posi-tion and function of the Romani element in what may be considered *non-stan-dard varieties of speech*, and so in one sense or another sub-varieties of the ma-jority, mainstream, or "host" language. These are understood partly in the con-ventional sense as non-codified, sector-specific lects; but they are also consid-ered in a functional framework as strategies of group-inclusive and group-ex-clusive communication and as instruments for linguistic-communicative accom-modation — as discussed in the programmatic contributions to this volume by Burridge and Rijkhoff. The selection of case-studies represents a continuum of Romani influences, and includes literature-based interpretations of non-standard

varieties that draw heavily on Romani — i.e. those commonly classified as "(European) Gypsy languages" or alternatively as "Para-Romani" or "Romani Mixed Dialects" — by Boretzky, Bakker, Grant, and Ladefoged; source-based studies of secret jargons with a partial Romani component — by Ladefoged, Matras, and partly Grant and Bakker; and empirical studies of the distribution of single Romani-derived items in contemporary non-standard varieties — by Leigh, Pistor, and partly Matras.

2. From Romani to Para-Romani

The first dimension addressed is the emergence of non-standard varieties that draw heavily on Romani and can be assumed to have closer historical links with the language. The methodological difficulty in describing such varieties lies in the lack of any recent, first-hand documentation of actual linguistic interaction in any such speech form. Evolution theories are thus dependent on interpretations mainly of transmitted vocabularies; texts occur only marginally and their authenticity is often questionable (see discussions in Bakker and Boretzky, both this volume). The fundamental issue surrounding the analysis is the precise nature of the relation between such vocabularies and Romani proper.

2.1 The structural continuum

A point of general agreement is that so-called Para-Romani languages show a grammatical framework that is non-Romani (cf. Bakker & Van der Voort 1991). This would seem to allow a straightforward classification of Para-Romani varieties as mere vocabularies, rather than "languages". These vocabularies are embedded into non-standard varieties of the majority or "host" language that has absorbed them. Such systems are documented for varieties of English, Spanish, Basque, Scandinavian, Serbian, Greek, and arguably for other languages as well. Yet approaches to the issue differ. Firstly, there is the traditional indiscriminate classification of all varieties spoken by Gypsies — whether coherently Indic in grammar, or mere vocabularies — as "Romani". This view, mainly represented by descriptions from the first half of the 20th century or earlier (and recently joined by Wexler 1997) is responsible for labels that are still in use, such as "Angloromani", "Basque Romani", or "Norwegian and Swedish Romani"; these are misleading as they suggest reference to coherent varieties of the Romani language, rather than vocabularies that are selectively borrowed from it (cf. Kenrick (1979), who proposes "Romani English" instead of "Anglo-

romani"). An alternative approach, represented by Boretzky (this volume) and Boretzky & Igla (1994), acknowledges that we are dealing with the outcome of a process of language shift away from Romani, but also that the Romani lexical impact merits a particular categorisation, one that can be achieved in the broad context of a (lexicon-based) structural dialectology of Romani — hence the label "Romani Mixed Dialects", as distinct from "conservative (Romani) dialects", the latter referring to Romani proper. A third view, represented by Bakker (this volume), attributes the mixed structure to a distinct language type — "mixed" or "intertwined" languages (see also Bakker 1997; Bakker & Mous 1994) —, a type which will generally show a more or less consistent split in the sources of lexicon and grammar.

How exactly this split is to be defined in order to enable a clear-cut distinction between Romani and Romani-based vocabularies, is a matter which still deserves explicit discussion. A basic view of "grammar" would want to consider phonology, productive morphology, clause-level syntax as well as noun- and verb-phrase syntax, and so-called function words. In phonology, dialects of Romani proper differ from their respective contiguous languages[7] primarily in their preservation of distinctive aspiration in voiceless stops, as well as, in some dialects, a uvular/flap opposition for <r>. There is therefore not much to be considered in terms of material loss through the shift away from Romani grammar. In clause-level syntax, Romani varieties show differing degrees of convergence with coterritorial languages. One area that proves to be relatively resistent to change is the maintenance of a factuality-based split in verbal complements, while word order at the clause level for instance is highly susceptible to contact influence. The shift from Romani to non-Romani in the grammaticiser language may therefore be said to be gradational in this domain. As for phrase-level syntax, some compositions appear to have been inherited along with Romani vocabularies, though the extent of their rule-based productivity remains to be investigated. Function words do appear in so-called Para-Romani varieties, and in fact the presence of Romani-derived pronouns, interrogatives, and adverbs is used by Bakker to distinguish Para-Romani from secret languages with a Romani component, which latter are argued to lack them.

This brings us to the issue of morphology. On the whole Para-Romani varieties appear not to use productive Romani morphology. This statement needs some hedging, however. The extent of nominal derivational morphology contained in the Romani vocabularies can be considerable, which suggests that at least some underlying rules are (or rather: were) accessible to speakers of Para-

---

7 This pertains, of course, to established contact languages that have had an impact on a given Romani dialect for at least several generations, and not to contact languages that have recently become contiguous through migration of Romani communities.

Romani. One of the characteristics of Para-Romani is indeed its lexical creativity, drawing partly on Romani derivational resources. This holds to a much lesser extent for nominal inflection, where remaining patterns can on the whole be said to be frozen, stereotype expressions (consider Caló *mansa* 'I', and *tuque* 'you'; Rom. *man-sa* instr. 'with-me', *tu-ke* dat. 'for-you'; see Leigh, this volume). Yet Romani itself already shows a partial retreat of nominal inflection (cf. Matras 1997), most noticeable in the extreme reduction of case inflections — in fact their disappearance altogether, except for stereotype forms — in English Romani (Smart 1862-1863). Whether the English Romani situation can be assumed to be typical of Romani varieties of the geographical "fringe" that have given rise to Para-Romani vocabularies is a matter for speculation, as hardly any documentation on the latter is available.

The borderline between Romani and non-Romani "grammar" is therefore best situated in the domain of verbal inflection, or indeed predication as a whole. Contributors to this collection will agree, it seems, that a variety can be classified as "Para-Romani" if its sentence structure regularly revolves around a non-Romani construction of the predication. The reliability of the predication-as-borderline may also draw on the fact that no dialect of Romani proper is known to show decomposition of verbal inflection. This being said, however, there still remain at least two difficulties. Firstly, we know of semi-productive, non-Romani verb inflection patterns in some Romani dialects, notably in the Ajia Varvara Vlax variety of Athens (Igla 1996: 214-219) as well as in non-Vlax dialects in Bulgaria, where Turkish-derived loan verbs show Turkish verb inflections while the majority of verbs, including more recent loans, are accommodated into the Indic-derived inflection. There are thus non-Romani predications even in dialects with an overall Romani grammatical framework. Second, and this argument figures prominently in Grant's discussion of the emergence of Angloromani (= English Para-Romani) in this volume, English Romani (proper) shows occasional infiltration of English-based verbal morphology. The following data from Smart (1862-1863: 80) illustrate how the Romani and English copula forms may be used interchangeably within the same corpus:

(1) *Dik, savo see? A gorgio?*
     'Look, who is [that]? A stranger?'

(2) *Covvo Moosh is a gryengro*
     'This man is a horse-dealer'

Naturally, it would first appear that the corpus simply documents code switching or code mixing, hence the alternation. But for Smart's informants, both (1) and (2) were considered "Romani". If Smart's data indeed show a stage of ongoing transition between Romani and Para-Romani, as Grant suggests, then one

would be inclined to attribute the alternation to the differentiation of registers or styles, of which speakers themselves seem to have been aware, having used the term "deep Romani" for the more conservative type. But even within "deep Romani", verb inflection is to some extent variable. Consider the following data, taken from notes on English Romani collected by T.W. Norwood in Cheltenham, Cheshire in April 1863:[8]

(3) *Kanna shummus tarno, I used to jiv   kerrasty*
     when was.1SG young   live.Ø house.LOC
     'When I was young, I used to live in a house'

(4) *We shall jassa   kallako*
              go.1PL.FUT tomorrow
     'We shall go tomorrow'

Both examples show productive Romani inflection (person and tense on verbs; locative case on a noun) and independent clause and phrase syntax (Pro-drop in the first clause of 3, lack of indefinite article). At the same time, some tense-aspect forms are English, carrying with them English personal pronouns. This in turn results in a hybrid construction in (3), where by analogy with English the Romani root *jiv* 'to live' is employed as an infinitive; and in the doubling in (4) of tense and person marking, which appear both in English and as inflections on the Romani lexical verb.

The inevitable conclusion from (1)-(4) is that the notion of a "grammaticiser" language is ambiguous here, while the "lexifier language" is clearly Romani. This means that, in transitional stages, it is difficult to argue either for a complete substitution of Romani grammar through the grammar of the contiguous language, *or* for a plain insertion of Romani lexical items into the strict framework of the contiguous language. It is, however, plausible that the speakers who produced these sentences were making a conscious choice in favour of Romani lexical vocabulary. On this basis, so-called Para-Romani might be defined as a process of *diminishing grammatical competence* coinciding with a deliberate effort to *maintain lexical competence*. Why this should be the case, is subject to considerations of the functions of Romani and Para-Romani, and will be taken up again in the section on 'Explanatory models' (2.3) below.

8 Source: Scott Macfie Collection 4.1-5, University of Liverpool Special Archives (Gypsy Collections). See also Grosvenor (1910: 217-219).

2.2 *The functional continuum*

A key question when drawing the borderline between Romani and Para-Romani is whether a distinction can be made between the contexts of usage of each type of speech. Romani has been characterised above as the everyday language of the Romani family unit and ethnic community. The structure of Romani vocabularies embedded into non-standard varieties of contiguous languages, however, resembles the structure of artificially created cryptolects or secret languages, the main feature of which is a manipulated lexicon (cf. Burke 1995). Moreover, mobility and social isolation as the shared socioeconomic contexts of usage might suggest a functional affinity between Para-Romani and jargons.

Bakker (this volume) argues however for a functional separation between Para-Romani and secret languages, and so for a functional affinity between Para-Romani (at least in its earlier stages) and Romani proper, claiming that Para-Romani will have equally been used as an everyday native language of the community. This initial function was only subsequently lost, giving rise to the secondary use of Para-Romani attested in most descriptions. Boretzky (this volume) also admits this possibility, suggesting that the lexical-semantic resources of Para-Romani varieties will have enabled full everyday communication at a level similar to that of Romani proper (i.e. taking into consideration multilingualism and the availability of second-language resources). There are however few sources that could provide direct evidence for the use of Para-Romani as a native everyday language, and so this view depends mainly on an interpretation of texts (see Bakker, this volume, for details). A suggestion in support of the native-language-like hypothesis is made by Prince (1907) in his description of the "English-Romani jargon of the American Roads". Though largely unreliable as a source of lexical entries (see Sampson 1908), Prince (1907: 273) nevertheless claims first-hand information when depicting a language that is "still very much alive, as the small children may be heard pratting in it constantly, and it will probably continue to live in its present form as long as the law permits these wanderers to camp on the highways".

Some methodological parameters for a functional distinction among speech varieties are proposed in the contributions by Burridge and Rijkhoff (both this volume). To follow Burridge's terms, varieties will differ in the extent to which they are X-phemistically marked: Avoiding offence and loss of face (euphemism), or causing offence (dysphemism), can be either primary or secondary functions of structures of speech, or indeed of entire styles, registers, or speech varieties. A special lexicon embedded into a non-standard variety can therefore be X-phemistically specialised. Burridge's understanding of euphemism as avoidance of loss of face is compatible with the interpretation of the

use of special vocabularies to bypass mainstream norms and rules on communicative interaction while avoiding the sanctions that this entails (see Matras 1996, and this volume). Following Rijkhoff, a language can be considered as specialised for secondary communication (and so as a special language, or jargon) if encoding bystander deixis (for indirect communication, or for negative or positive accommodation) becomes its primary function. In fact, the employment of linguistic camouflage is interpreted as evidence for the existence of the bystander as a third dimension (in addition to S-Speaker and A-Addressee) on a theoretical model of linguistic interaction.

It seems that here too, Romani and Para-Romani may be accommodated on a gradational continuum. Data from Holzinger (1993: 206) of authentic narrative discourse in the Sinti dialect (=German Romani proper) reveals speakers' awareness of the euphemistically-marked usage of Romani items in the non-standard German speech of the *Jenisch* (cf. also Matras, this volume). The following example documents a humorous anecdote about a Jenisch person (significantly referred to in Sinti Romani as *čor* 'thief'), who buried stolen chickens in the ground, then uncovered them after several days, expressing his statisfaction that they were not yet spoiled for consumption. The actual punchline of the story involves the Jenisch's attempt at a disguised usage, but his confusing of *phub* 'ground' with *bul* 'behind, anus', through which the protagonist looses face in front of the narrator's audience:

(5) *Lajas len vi draus o phub lo, sungaso.*
     'Och', phenaso, 'drei Tage in die <u>bul</u> und nichts <u>khandelt</u>'

     'He took them out of the ground, he smelled them.
     'Och', he said, 'three days in the <u>anus</u> and nothing <u>stinks</u>''

The underlined words represent Romani items in the German utterance cited from the protagonist. The story itself is told in Romani. Thus we have a metaphorical switch from Romani to non-standard German, authenticizing the quotation. Further, we have an insertion of Romani items in the quotation attributed to the German speech of the Jenisch, which conveys the sharing of a secretive plot with an imaginary addressee. This is the intended euphemistic effect of the Romani component, as appreciated by the Sinti Romani narrator. Finally, there is a mix-up in the choice of Romani words, a narrative manipulation based on the euphemism-dysphemism conflict relation; added to that is, in the external evaluation of the utterance, the tension between secondary competence in Romani (Jenisch) and genuine competence on the part of the narrator. Overall, the story shows the availability of a style in which Romani items are marked for X-phemistic value. Significantly, for the Romani-speaking narrator this style consists of Romani items embedded into a *German* utterance.

But there is also room to consider some usages of Romani proper as X-phemistic or inherently bystander-oriented. Beginning with the attitude of many Romani-speaking communities toward their language, we find, especially among speakers of northwestern dialects — Sinti in Germany and neighbouring countries, and Finnish Romani — but also elsewhere, a reluctance to share the language and its structures with outsiders, and often deliberate attempts to prevent outsiders from learning the language. This view of the language as secretive suggests of course that a form of negative accommodation belongs to its perceived functions. This is partly supported by structural evidence. As mentioned, all dialects of Romani have exonyms for 'non-Gypsy', *gadžo* being the propotyical expression, alongside *xalo*, *koraxaj*, and others; their existence reinforces the impression that general reference to human beings is viewed from the perspective of intimate in-group communication. In more specialised domains, most dialects of Romani also have secretive, euphemistic terms for 'policeman', *xalado* 'clean-washed', *klisto* 'mounted', and *čingalo*, *phuralja* both 'trouble-maker(s)' being just some examples. Euphemistic terms for 'Jew' — such as *biboldo* 'unturned' (=non-baptised), or *čindo* 'cut' (=circumcised) — are found in northern varieties, while Vlax dialects for example do not hesitate to use terms congruent with contact languages, such as *židovo*.[9]

This latter detail is indicative of a general split among the European dialects of Romani which is of relevance to our present discussion. Where in other varieties of Romani the adoption of loanwords seems unproblematic in any semantic domain, a cluster of structurally related dialects spoken mainly in the northwestern fringe regions of Europe shows preference for internal compositions and derivations, and even euphemistic formations that are strongly reminiscent of cryptolectal formations in secret jargons. It is noteworthy that the same cluster of dialects tend to show a preference for specific endonyms — *kale* 'blacks', *manuš* 'person', *romaničel*, *sinte* — over a general ethnonym or an occupational term (while *rom* survives in the word 'husband/wife' as well as in the name of the language, *romanes*). This can be seen as a token of social and ethnic isolation, which in turn might have brought speakers of these dialects closer to itinerants of non-Romani origin. Indeed, speakers of these dialects tend to specialise in itinerant services and have traditionally been mobile and marginalised into extreme social isolation — more overwhelmingly so than speakers of central or eastern European dialects of Romani many of whom became sedentary and engaged in a variety of occupations earlier on. Moreover, there appears to be an underlying structural affinity between the northwestern dialects and at least

some of the well-documented Para-Romani varieties (in Spain, Britain, and Scandinavia; cf. Boretzky, this volume), and so one may assume that it is the northwestern cluster of dialects from which Para-Romani largely emerged, perhaps through increasing assimilation of Romani speakers into non-Romani itinerant populations.

This suggests a gradual shift of balance between the "everyday", bystander-neutral communicative function of Romani, and the in-group secretive function with a functional affinity with artificial secret languages. For the Sinti dialect of Romani, a prominent representative of the "cluster", Liebich (1863: 90-92) already notes the creation of numerous cryptic-interpretative placenames that are strongly reminiscent of compositions in Rotwelsch, Jewish cattle traders jargon, and other secret varieties: *xamaskero foro* lit. 'the eating-town' for 'Breslau', based on *bres-* > *freß-* German 'to eat'; *xačerdino them* lit. 'burnt country' for 'Brandenburg', based on German *Brand* 'fire', and so on. Günther (1915: 16-19) points out similarities between Sinti-Romani and Jenisch (the secret vocabulary of itinerant showpeople and tradesmen in southwest Germany; see Matras, this volume) in drawing on existing internal lexical-semantic resources for creative, euphemistic lexical compositions: Romani *muleskro kher* lit. 'dead man's house', Jenisch *Begerkittle* of the same composition, for 'coffin'; Romani *xačedo gib* lit. 'burnt wheat', Jenisch *g'funktes Gib* for 'malt', and so on. Typical of Sinti and British Romani is the use of Romani genitive derivations especially for the creation of words relating to human beings, professions, and economic resources such as animals, food, or agricultural terms. The reliance on internal creations rather than on borrowings, which are the preferred option in other Romani dialects, suggests a need for concealed communication already within the grammatical framework of inflected Romani (see also Wagner 1937).

2.3 *Explanatory models*

Hancock (1970), inspired perhaps by contemporary developments in Creole studies, attributes the creation of a Romani-English mixed variety to fellowships of Romanichal Gypsies with English vagrants, whose linguistic blend resulted in a "compromise language, only used when each group was together" (1970: 43). What followed according to Hancock's scenario was a replacement of the original Romani by the Romani-English pidgin, "giving rise to a now creolized Anglo-Romanes dialect". In subsequent writings (1984, 1992), Hancock remains committed to this core idea of a population mixture giving rise to a mixed language with a Romani-based lexicon. Thus Angloromani is viewed as the product of English outlaws, ex-soldiers, and beggars interacting with Gypsies in

---

9 An interesting parallel case is Judeo-German, where we find not only an exonym (*goj*), but also euphemistic expressions for Christian institutions such as 'priest' or 'church' (*galex*, *tifle*). Judeo-German gave rise to various jargons employed by Jewish robbers, beggars, and traders (cf. Matras 1996).

the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, Scandoromani possibly as the result of in-termarriage with non-Gypsies. Hancock argues however for an overlap of different functions, stressing the relevance of mixture with non-Gypsies and the employment of an in-group language for secretive purposes at the initial stage, where Romani was used "as a lexical reservoir for maintaining and enriching it as a cryptolectal register" (1992: 46-47). At the same time he sees a connection between the subsequent preservation of the in-group variety and the need to rein-force (a re-defined?) Gypsy ethnic identity and provide "protective insulation from the establishment" through linguistic means. On Hancock's model, then, Romani vocabulary will have entered non-standard varieties of the mainstream majority language (English, Scandinavian, Spanish) via a process of deliberate creation, from a form of Romani proper still employed in the Romani commu-nity. Once a mixed variety with a non-Romani grammatical framework was cre-ated, it took over the functions previously held by Romani proper, with speakers then abandoning the latter.

An alternative scenario proposed by Kenrick (1979) sees the decline of Romani proper as a process *leading* to the emergence of a secondary Gypsy eth-nolect, rather than resulting from it. Kenrick bases his argument on ongoing language attrition in isolated dialects of Romani, notably Finnish Romani, and to a lesser degree Sinti. Diminishing grammatical competence, so the claim, will ultimately have led to language shift, though access to selected Romani vocabu-lary was still maintained for the purposes of in-group, protective, or secretive communication. Kenrick's explanation could be accounted for through Myers-Scotton's (1993) Matrix Language Turnover model: What begins as embeddings from L2 into an L1-matrix, leads ultimately to a switch to an L2-matrix with L1-embeddings. A similar argument is presented by Grant (this volume), based on an interpretation of the data provided for English Romani (cf. examples 1-4 above).

Boretzky's (this volume) account of the emergence of what he refers to as "Romani Mixed Dialects" shares some ideas with both Hancock's and Kenrick's models. Like Hancock, Boretzky argues against a process of plain language at-trition, noting firstly that it is precisely the lexical component that would have been initially replaced, followed by a reduction of the grammar, rather than vice-versa. From the extent of the lexical resources available in Romani Mixed Dialects he concludes that the "creators" of these varieties will have had direct access to a productive, full-fledged inflected Romani proper (or "conservative dialects", in Boretzky's terminology). At the same time Boretzky acknowledges, much like Kenrick, that mixed varieties only emerged *after* the loss of inflected (conservative) Romani. The complex network of contacts which such an expla-nation entails — the creators of mixed varieties would need to have lost inflected

Romani and at the same time had active access to its entire productive lexicon — is resolved in Boretzky & Igla (1994: 63) by postulating a split within the speaker population, with varying degrees of access to the language. In his con-tribution to this volume Boretzky hypothesises that Romani Mixed Dialects may have emerged in interaction among descendants of earlier Romani immigrants who had almost lost command of Romani as a result of language attrition and gradual language shift, and a new wave of immigrants with full command of Romani who were integrated into the longer-settled communities, enriching their vocabularies.

There thus appear to be two central points of controversy: First, whether or not Para-Romani varieties coexisted with Romani proper during their emergence stage; and second, to what extent they were created consciously, or even artifi-cially. Only Ladefoged (this volume) is rather direct in his conclusion that Scandinavian Para-Romani was a conscious creation, the creators having had the Scandinavian host language as their mother tongue. Most accounts are less straightforward in regard to this question, but tend nevertheless to acknowledge a need for a special language for secondary communicative purposes at one stage or another.

Not so Bakker's (this volume) inclusion of Para-Romani in his general model of language intertwining (Bakker 1997; also Bakker & Mous 1994). The model seeks to explain the natural emergence of mixed languages that draw on separate grammaticiser and lexifier languages. The process is said to differ in its structural aspects from other types of language genesis, though it is motivated by the same conventional communicative needs. Bakker's hypothesis receives some support from Boretzky's (this volume) assessment that the Para-Romani lexicons *could* have sustained normal everyday communication. In its theoretical outlook, Bakker's model appears incompatible with either the Matrix Language Turnover model (Myers-Scotton 1993) and so with the language attrition hy-potheses suggested by Kenrick (1979) and Grant (this volume), or with Hancock's (1992) view of the role of Romani proper as a lexical reservoir for cryptolectal purposes at the creation stage. It tries instead to avoid both re-grammaticisation and re-lexification as explanatory scenarios, emphasising si-multaneous intertwining as an autonomous mechanism.

One must however keep in mind that Para-Romani always remains embed-ded into a sociolinguistic continuum along with (other) varieties of the gram-maticiser language. It differs significantly from cases like Michif (Bakker 1997), where speakers of the mixed language no longer have access to either of the un-derlying, contributing languages. Even if it was perceived by speakers as a dif-ferent "language", there is no denying that the development context for any Para-Romani variety was governed by the need to safeguard a separate, non-self suf-

ficient (i.e. non-mainstream) socioeconomic network. One might therefore define the breaking point away from Romani proper as a *turnover of functions*, rather than just a turnover of structures, where the need to retain a special variety is stronger than the ability to transmit a coherent linguistic-grammatical system. Normal language transmission then gradually gives way to *selective replication* of linguistic material (see Matras, this volume). The turnover-of-functions hypothesis allows to account why, as Boretzky (this volume) points out, lexicon is retained, while in normal situations of language attrition lexicon is easily compromised: Since the motivation for selective replication is primarily to by-pass mainstream communicative norms, priority is given to material that is pragmatically most salient for this purpose, namely to items that encode *meaning*. Speakers of Romani varieties with diminishing grammatical competence will thus have had a functional-communicative interest in preserving vocabulary, an interest that overrides the constraints of structural development patterns observed in normal situations of language attrition.

3. *Between Para-Romani and jargons*

Not every employment of Romani lexical items in a non-Romani grammatical framework is classified as "Para-Romani". Differentiation criteria focus on the quantity and proportion of Romani items, their structural composition, the ethnic background of speakers, and the functions of the special vocabulary. A further point for discussion is the motivation for acquiring Romani items that are not inherited from an underlying form of inflected Romani.

3.1 *Differentiation models*

A plain structural consideration is based on an evaluation of the proportion of Romani items. Angloromani, as well as the Scandinavian Para-Romani varieties, are said to show few lexical components of non-Romani origin. By contrast, secret varieties such as Rodi or Swedish thieves' jargon (Förbrytarspråk; see Ladefoged, this volume), draw on Romani, but not exclusively on Romani, as a lexical reservoir. One assumption, strongly supported by Bakker and pursued by Boretzky (both this volume), is that a higher proportion of Romani items testifies to direct historical links with Romani, while a smaller Romani component that exists alongside special vocabulary items of other origins may have been borrowed through an intermediary source.

For the Romani element in German secret languages (Matras, this volume), it can be shown that most items derive from a shared though limited lexical pool, while some varieties have been enriched with further vocabulary of Romani origin, possibly through direct links with Gypsies. This does not necessarily mean, however, that they were formed exclusively within a once Romani-speaking community. Significantly, none of the empirical studies in this collection are able to document special vocabularies that are exclusively of Romani origin, and even Leigh's recordings of Caló contain items of non-Romani, and partly of unknown origin. Nor does quantity alone provide a reliable indication of the functions served by the vocabulary in its earlier stages. A comparison of the everyday Jewish ethnolect with the special vocabulary of Jewish cattle traders in southwest Germany (Matras 1996) has shown that *lexical re-orientation*, i.e. the deliberate recruitment of Hebrew-derived vocabulary for use in the trade jargon, results in a much higher proportion of Hebrew vocabulary than *lexical retention* of inherited terms for everyday reference in the general, non-specialised ethnolect. This makes perfect sense if one considers that the camouflaging function of the special vocabulary can only be sustained through extensive lexical manipulation.

Bakker (this volume), in distinguishing between Para-Romani and secret languages, relies on the ethnic composition of the speakers as well as on internal structural features of the vocabulary — the presence (in secret languages) versus absence (in Para-Romani) of structural camouflaging devices. As regards the ethnicity of the speakers, some contemporary itinerant communities that employ Romani-derived lexicon are indeed aware of ethnic and cultural links with Gypsies, but do not regard themselves as part of the Romani community, nor are they seen as such by Roms or Sinti (see Matras, this volume). Others however define themselves as Gypsies, but appear no longer to be able to maintain a strict distinction between Caló and *jerga* or "slang" (Leigh, this volume). Indeed, if one were to follow Hancock's (1970, 1984) scenario for the emergence of Para-Romani, then Para-Romani should be expected to accompany ethnic admixture rather than Romani ethnicity.

As for camouflaging devices, their usage even *within* Romani proper was already noted above. Naturally, secret varieties will differ in the extent to which they rely not only on Romani vocabulary, but also on camouflaging structural devices. A correlation between the two is plausible, though Bakker's view that lack of camouflaging devices is an indication of a lack of special secretive functions can be contested on the grounds that a secret language with sufficient foreign lexical resources will not need to rely on camouflagng devices, while one with little access to genuine foreign and incomprehensible vocabulary (such as Shelta, cf. Grant 1994) will depend more strongly on manipulative construc-

tions. Once again, it appears safer to define a continuum, with features such as the quantity and proportion of Romani-derived lexical items, the ethno-cultural affinity with Roms, and a modest extent of structural admixture with other manipulative resources, figuring at the far side, where closer links with an underlying Romani-speaking community may be assumed.

3.2 *The saliency of the Romani component*

The question arises how and why Romani items have entered speech varieties at the opposite end of the continuum. A partial answer was already provided above in mentioning the overlap of socioeconomic contexts and partly communicative functions in which both Romani and secret jargons of various kinds were used. Yet the relation between Romani and *jargons* is asymmetrical: Romani might be argued to have been used in contexts along with jargons, or indeed to have taken over jargon-like functions itself, and hence to have provided input into contiguous jargons. But there are numerous jargons that have not adopted a Romani component (cf. discussion in Matras, this volume).

A key differentiation must therefore be made, as implied partly by Bakker's discussion (this volume), between special vocabularies for which Romani provides a natural reservoir of lexical enrichment, and those for which Romani-derived items are one *option* among several or many. The flexible, liquid character of some vocabularies of the latter category is attested in the presence of alternative sets for a wide range of concepts, drawing on both Romani and non-Romani synonyms (see discussion of Jenisch in Matras, this volume). This need not however lead to definite conclusions regarding a functional differentiation of the two types of vocabulary. In part, it simply reflects the contradicting mechanisms that are observable within the secret vocabularies of close-knit peripatetic communities, which show extreme consistency in the retention of old special lexicon items (cf. Grant 1994 on Shelta, and see the history attested for some Rotwelsch items in Wolf 1985), and at the same time a tendency toward constant lexical renewal. This conflict might be regarded as reflecting both protective preservation of social structures and attitudes, and economic, geographical, and often religious-spiritual flexibility that make the community receptive to new fashions.

Foreign vocabulary is, in such a constellation, not only functional for the enrichment and renewal of a disguised lexicon, but also exotic and therefore fashionable. Romani, wherever spoken, is inherently non-mainstream and so a typical "anti-language". The best testimony for its appreciation as such among non-Romani itinerant and other specialised communities is perhaps the word

gadžo Rom. 'non-Gypsy', and slang or jargon for 'stranger, one who is not part of the group' — a word that is ever-present in secret or special vocabularies that are not exclusively Romani-based (cf. Pistor, and Matras, this volume). Its position at the top of the list of Romani items borrowed into jargons reflects admiration and imitation of the close-knit structures of the Romani community. For socially marginalised peripatetics, Romani, like Judeo-German, was regarded as a prestige language, and Romani norms as prestige norms.

4. *Romani impact on a continuum*

My concluding remarks are devoted to the continuum of Romani impact — a notion that surfaces at various levels throughout this collection. There are firstly internal gradations applied in the respective descriptions. Burridge highlights the compatibility of the analyses presented here with various positions on the scale of euphemistically-marked usages of Romani. Bakker, though emphasising a strict separation of Para-Romani and secret languages, nevertheless follows a diachronic continuum in structure — from Romani as a lexifier language and on to Para-Romani, and in function — from Para-Romani as an everyday native language, to Para-Romani as a special vocabulary. Similarly, Boretzky sees Romani Mixed Dialects at the far edge of a structural entity with the most conservative dialects in the opposite position. For Grant, the development from English Romani to Angloromani (i.e. Romani to Para-Romani) is transitional and follows a gradual descrease in the productivity and distribution of Romani grammar and inflection. Ladefoged stresses the quantitative gradation in the Romani component of special vocabularies that draw primarily on Romani, versus those that rely on it only in part. A similar approach is taken by Matras to the Romani component in German secret varieties, with a scale ranging from the Jenisch type with strong Romani admixture, on to the general mixed Jenisch type, through to the average Rotwelsch type, and ending with colloquial German. Finally, there is the speaker continuum, represented in Pistor's contribution by the diffusion of Romani items across generations among users of local Berwick slang, and in Leigh's observations on the different degrees of personal competence among speakers of Caló.

This allows us to identify two general scales in the interpretation of the Romani component in non-standard speech. The first pertains to the mere *quantity* of available Romani items, the second to their *quality* — the extent to which speakers depend on Romani for certain communicative functions, and the precise definition of those functions. Some varieties of Romani proper are used extensively for secondary, bystander-oriented or X-phemistic purposes; Sinti has

been cited above as an example. Though self-evidently high on the quantitative scale, secondary usages of Sinti are functionally derived. Nevertheless, varieties of Romani proper such as Sinti, and especially English ("deep") Romani as mentioned by Grant, may be taken as a starting point towards a continuum leading to the functional incorporation of Romani into non-standard varieties of contiguous languages. Following on the scale are non-standard in-group varieties that are based entirely on Romani vocabulary. These include the prototypical Para-Romani vocabularies — older Angloromani as discussed by Bakker, Scandinavian Para-Romani as outlined by Ladefoged, or the older Caló sources considered by Boretzky. The interpretation of their emergence remains controversial, but there is nevertheless general agreement on their potential (or diachronically subsequent) function as special or secret vocabularies.

Next in line are in-group varieties whose exclusive usage for secondary purposes is uncontroversial, and which show overwhelming though not exclusive Romani impact. An example is Manisch or Giessen Jenisch, cited by Matras. Considerable Romani impact follows in various degrees in other secret vocabularies (Rodi, Jenisch, Rotwelsch, Förbrytarspråk; as discussed by Ladefoged, Matras, and Bakker). A still lower position on the continuum might be assigned to the occasional usage of Romani-derived vocabulary in contexts which involve manifestation of consistent in-group identity, as in the case of present-day Caló as documented by Leigh. This is followed by the presence of Romani items in local slangs, whose secondary function is not connected to any permanent close-knit group affiliation, but serves rather as an occasional marker of regional identity and as an indicator of temporary vernacular culture; this is demonstrated by Pistor for the local slang of Berwick-upon-Tweed. Lowest on the continuum are those isolated Romani items that have found their way into general colloquial speech, irrespective of non-mainstream group affiliation.

To sum up this discussion, I should like to highlight three general methodological questions raised by the present collection: First, the issue of language-genealogical affiliation in cases of extreme mixtures, and the precise structural criteria that allow to determine whether or not a vocabulary can represent an underlying, coherent parent language. For Romani and Para-Romani, it is the question of the borderline between Indic and non-Indic, and so between Romani proper and non-standard varieties of the respective contiguous languages. Second, there is the question of where a speech variety begins to serve as a secondary means for special communication, rather than a native language for everyday purposes. Boretzky's (1989) controversial position regarding the "deficiency" of Romani vocabulary, and some of the arguments cited in the present discussion, suggest that a clear-cut distinction between Romani and Para-Romani is not entirely self-evident. Finally, there is the issue of the genesis of

mixed varieties of the Para-Romani type, and the question where exactly a variety ceases or begins to be a deliberate and conscious creation, as opposed to a naturaly transmitted medium. The present collection offers, along with the controversies which it does not attempt to bypass, also some possible solutions, drawing on a number of analytical components that are not often integrated. These include a theoretical consideration of the pragmatic functions of a variety in the context of a particular speech event, the societal function of a variety relative to the stylistic options that are available and the conceptual and normative constraints that are imposed on the content of messages, and last but not least the nature of speakers' access to, and command of structural resources.

References

Bakker, Peter. 1997. *"A language of our own". The genesis of Michif — the mixed Cree-French language of the Canadian Métis.* New York: Oxford University Press.

----   and Hein van der Voort. 1991. Para-Romani languages: An overview and some speculations on their genesis. In: Bakker, Peter and Marcel Cortiade, eds. *In the margin of Romani. Gypsy languages in contact.* Amsterdam: Institute for General Linguistics. 16-44.

----   and Marcel Cortiade, eds. 1991. *In the margin of Romani. Gypsy languages in contact.* Amsterdam: Institute for General Linguistics.

----   and Maarten Mous, eds. 1994. *Mixed languages. 15 case studies in language intertwining.* Amsterdam: IFOTT.

----   and Yaron Matras. 1997. Introduction. In: Matras, Yaron, Peter Bakker and Hristo Kyuchukov, eds. *The typology and dialectology of Romani.* Amsterdam: Benjamins. vii-xxx.

Boretzky, Norbert. 1989. Zum Interferenzverhalten des Romani. (Verbreitete und ungewöhnliche Phänomene). *Zeitschrift für Phonologie, Sprachwissenschaft und Kommunikationsforschung* 42:3 357-374.

----   and Birgit Igla. 1994. Romani mixed dialects. In: Bakker, Peter and Maarten Mous, eds. *Mixed languages. 15 case studies in language intertwining.* Amsterdam: IFOTT. 35-68.

Burke, Peter. 1995. Introduction. In: Burke, Peter and Roy Porter, eds. *Languages and jargons. Contributions to a social history of language.* Cambridge: Polity Press. 1-19.

Cape, C. Phillip. 1924. Some words and sentences illustrating the Argot of the Doms. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* for 1924, 239-244.

Esnault, Gaston. 1935. Ciganismes en français et gallicismes des cigains. *Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society* 3rd series, 14, 72-86; 127-148; 190-196.

Grant, Anthony P. 1994. Shelta. The secret language of the Irish Travellers viewed as a mixed language. In: Bakker, Peter and Maarten Mous, eds. *Mixed languages. 15 case studies in language intertwining.* Amsterdam: IFOTT. 123-150.

Grellmann, Heinrich M. 1783 [1787] *Historischer Versuch über die Zigeuner, betreffend die Lebensart und Verfassung, Sitten und Schicksale dieses Volkes seit seiner Erscheinung in Europa und dessen Ursprung.* Göttingen Dietrich.

Grierson, George A. 1888. Ḍoms, Jâts, and the origin of the Gypsies. *Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society* 1, 71-76.

Grosvenor, Lady Arthur. 1910. A pilgrim's progress. *Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society* new series, 3, 204-224.

Günther, L. 1915. Vorbemerkung (Preface), Wittich, Engelbert. Die jenische Sprache. *Archiv für Kriminal-Anthropologie und Kriminalistik* 63,1-22.

Halit, Mehmet. 1934. *Istanbul argosu ve halk tabirleri*. Istanbul: Burhaneddin matbaası.

Hancock, Ian. 1970. Is Anglo-Romanes a creole? *Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society* 3rd series, 49, 41-44.

---- 1984. Romani and Angloromani. In: Trudgill, Peter, ed. *Language in the British Isles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 367-383.

---- 1988. The development of Romani linguistics. In: Jazayery, Mohammad Ali and Werner Winter, eds. *Languages and cultures. Studies in honor of Edgar C. Polomé*. Berlin: Mouton der Gruyter. 183-223.

---- 1992. The social and linguistic development of Scandoromani. In: Jahr, Ernst Håkon, ed. *Language contact: theoretical and empirical studies*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 37-52.

---- 1995. *A handbook of Vlax Romani*. Columbus: Slavica.

---- 1997. Duty and beauty, possession and truth: lexical impoverishment as control. In: Acton, Thomas and Gary Mundy, eds. *Romani culture and Gypsy identity*. Hertfordshire: University of Hertfordshire Press. 180-187.

Igla, Birgit. 1996. *Das Romani von Ajia Varvara*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Holzinger, Daniel. 1993. *Das Rómanes. Grammatik und Diskursanalyse der Sprache der Sinte*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft.

Hübschmannová, Milena. 1997. Domšti hubendíci v Indii. *Romano Džaniben* 3-4/97, 11-25.

Kenrick, Donald. 1979. Romani English. In: Hancock, Ian F., ed. *Romani sociolinguistics* (*International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 19), 111-120.

Kluyver, A. 1934. Romani words in Dutch slangs. *Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society* 3rd series, 13, 1-8.

Kotsinas, Ulla-Brit. 1996. *Stockholm-slang. Folkligt språk från 80-tal till 80-tal*. Stockholm: Norstedts.

Leschber, Corinna. 1995. Romani lexical items in colloquial Rumanian. In: Matras, Yaron, ed. *Romani in contact. The history, structure and sociology of a language*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 151-176.

Liebich, Richard. 1863. *Die Zigeuner in ihrem Wesen und ihrer Sprache*. Leipzig: Brockhaus.

Lorimer, D. L. R. 1939. *The Ḍumāki Language*. Nijmegen: Dekker & Van de Vegt.

Lucassen, Leo. 1996. *Zigeuner. Die Geschichte eines polizeilichen Ordnungsbegriffes in Deutschland 1700-1945*. Köln-Weimar-Wien: Böhlau Verlag.

Macalister, R. A. S. 1909-1913. A grammar and vocabulary of the language of the Nawar or Zutt, the nomad smiths of Palestine. *Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society*, new series, 3, 120-126, 298-317; 5, 1-4, 289-305; 6, 1-4, 161-240.

Matras, Yaron. 1996. Sondersprachliche Hebraismen: Zum semantischen Wandel in der hebräischen Komponente der südwestdeutschen Viehhändlersprache. In: Siewert, Klaus, ed. *Rotwelschdialekte*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 43-58.

---- 1997. The typology of case relations and case layer distribution in Romani. In: Matras, Yaron, Peter Bakker and Hristo Kyuchukov, eds. *The typology and dialectology of Romani*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 61-93.

Myers-Scotton, Carol. 1993. *Duelling languages. Grammatical structure in codeswitching*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Okely, Judith. 1983. *The Traveller-Gypsies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

---- 1984. Ethnic identity and place of origin: The Traveller Gypsies in Great Britain. In: Vermeulen, Hans and Jeremy Boissevain, eds. *Ethnic challenge. The politics of ethnicity in Europe*. Göttingen: edition herodot. 50-65.

---- 1997. Cultural ingenuity and travelling autonomy: not copying, just choosing. In: Acton, Thomas and Gary Mundy, eds. *Romani culture and Gypsy identity*. Hertfordshire: University of Hertfordshire Press. 188-203.

Oranskij, I. M. 1977. *Fol'klor i jazyk gissarskix Par'ja (Sredneja Azija)*. Moscow: Akademija Nauk.

Pasquali, Pietro S. 1935. Romani words in Italian slangs. *Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society* 3rd series, 14, 44-51.

Payne, John R. 1997. The Central Asian Parya. In: Akiner, Shirin and Nicholas Sims-Williams, eds. *Languages and scripts of Central Asia*. London: SOAS. 144-153.

Prince, J. D. 1907. The English-Rommany jargon of the American roads. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 28, 271-308.

Rao, Aparna. 1995. Marginality and language use: The example of peripatetics in Afghanistan. *Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society* 5th series, 5, 69-95.

Rüdiger, Johan Chr. Chr. 1782. [1990]. Von der Sprache und Herkunft der Zigeuner aus Indien. In: *Neuester Zuwachs der teutschen, fremden und allgemeinen Sprachkunde in eigenen Aufsätzen, 1. Stück*. Leipzig. 37-84. Hamburg: Buske.

Sampson, John. 1908. Anglo-American Romany. A review with some observations on various methods of collecting the Gypsy tongue. *Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society* new series, 11, 74-84.

Smart, Bath C. 1862-1863. *The dialect of the English Gypsies* (Appendix to the *Transactions of the Philological Society for 1862-1863*). Berlin: Asher & Co.

Sornig, Karl. 1981. *Lexical innovation. A study of slang, colloquialisms and casual speech*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Sulán, Béla. 1963. Probleme der Argotforschung in Mitteleuropa. *Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwissenschaft* 18, 5-14.

Treimer, Karl. 1937. *Das tschechische Rotwelsch. Entstehung und Schichten*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

Wagner, Max L. 1937. Stray notes on Spanish Romani, Chapter 2: Cryptolalic formations in other Romani dialects. *Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society* 3rd series, 16, 27-32.

Ward, H. Gordon. 1936. Romani words in Swedish slangs. *Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society* 3rd series, 15, 78-85.

Wexler, Paul. 1997. The case for the relexification hypothesis in Romani. In: Horvath, Julia and Paul Wexler, eds. *Relexification in creole and non-creole languages. With special attention to Haitian Creole, Modern Hebrew, Romani, and Rumanian*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 100-161.

Willems, Wim. 1996. Außenbilder von Sinti und Roma in der frühern Zigeunerforschung. In: Giere, Jaqueline, ed. *Die gesellschaftliche Konstruktion des Zigeuners. Zur Genese eines Vorurteils*. Frankfurt: campus. 87-108.

Wolf, Siegmund A. 1985[2]. *Deutsche Gaunersprache. Wörterbuch des Rotwelschen*. Hamburg: Buske.