

UNIVERZITET U BEOGRADU
FILOLOŠKI FAKULTET

Hedina D. Sijerčić

**LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE OF ROMA
WITHIN TRANSLATION IN THE WESTERN
BALKANS: POETRY IN SELF-TRANSLATION
(JEZIK I KNJIŽEVNOST ROMA U PREVODU
NA ZAPADNOM BALKANU: POEZIJA U
AUTOPREVODU)**

Doktorska disertacija

Beograd, 2018.

UNIVERSITY OF BELGRADE
FACULTY OF PHILOLOGY

Hedina D. Sijerčić

**LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE OF ROMA
WITHIN TRANSLATION IN THE WESTERN
BALKANS: POETRY IN SELF-TRANSLATION
(JEZIK I KNJIŽEVNOST ROMA U PREVODU
NA ZAPADNOM BALKANU: POEZIJA U
AUTOPREVODU)**

Doctoral dissertation

Belgrad, 2018.

БЕЛГРАДСКИЙ УНИВЕРСИТЕТ

ФИЛОЛОГИЧЕСКИЙ ФАКУЛЬТЕТ

Хедина Д. Сиерчич

**ЯЗЫК И ЛИТЕРАТУРА РОМИ В ПЕРЕВОДЕ
В ЗАПАДНЫХ БАЛКАНАХ:
ПОЭЗИЯ В АВТОПРЕВОДЕ**

Докторская диссертация

Белград, 2018.

PODACI O MENTORU I ČLANOVIMA KOMISIJE:

MENTOR:

dr Mirjana Daničić, docent

Filološki Fakultet, Univerzitet u Beogradu

ČLANOVI KOMISIJE:

DATUM ODBRANE: _____

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Above all, I would like to thank my supervisor Dr. Mirjana Daničić, Assistant Professor, for her valuable support and guidance of my work, and express my profound thanks for her willingness to help me with my dissertation. Also, many thanks from whole my heart to Prof. Dr. Jelena Filipović and Prof. Dr. Igor Lakić for their selfless support and advice giving me through their expertises in linguistics, sociolinguistic, translation studies and Romani studies.

I would like to thank Ruždija Ruso Sejdović for his support and constant help, giving me information and advice related to Romani authors and literature, for his consent to use the self-analysis of his and my poems and his written work. My thanks also go to Mehmed-Meho Saćip and Nedjo Osman for giving me consent to analyze their poems, and for the support I needed for my work. I also wish to express my sadness for the loss of my friend and poet Mehmed-Meho Saćip who left us on 23rd November 2015, and who will no longer be able to see the finalization of this thesis. *Te del o Del tuke lahki phuv Meho!*

I could not have completed my studies without the help and love of my family who cared about me in different ways. The spirit of my father Derviš Tahirović has always been with me, giving me the strength to keep going and reach my goal, knowing and aware that he is proud of his čhej Dina.

JEZIK I KNJIŽEVNOST ROMA U PREVODU NA ZAPADNOM BALKANU: POEZIJA U AUTOPREVODU

REZIME: Ova disertacija razvija i kreira, po prvi put, u području historiografije Zapadnog Balkana, analizu romske književnosti (poezija) u prevodu, uzimajući u obzir veću dinamiku romskog jezika, kulture i književne produkcije. U kontekstu ove teze tražim i ispitujem dvojezične/višejezične romske pesnike/pisce koji prevode sami sebe odnosno svoja dela.

Iako dvojezični/višejezični, romski pesnici/pisci svesni su potrebe autoprevođenja radi razumevanja ne samo od strane čitalaca pripadnika većinskih naroda i njihovih većinskih jezika, nego i od strane svojih (romskih) čitalaca pripadnika drugih romskih grupa koji govore različite romske dijalekte. Kao jedan od značajnijih faktora bitnih za dvojezično i višejezično autoprevođenje je individualno samopouzdanje u svoje sopstveno pisanje. Na autopreвод, kod romskih pesnika i pisaca, pored samopouzdanja utiče još nekoliko faktora: samosvest o razlikama između dijalekata, svesnost o razlikama u običajima i navikama, svesnost o razlikama u nivoima znanja romskog i razlikama u novoima znanja većinskog/ih jezika, a koje zavisi od individualnog nivoa obrazovanja.

Cilj disertacije je da pruži adekvatno razumevanje i analizu romske književnosti, romskog jezika i prevoda romskog jezika u opštem kontekstu književnog prevođenja, a posebno u činu autoprevođenja poezije. Ova disertacija sadrži uvod, četiri poglavlja i zaključak: Prevodilačke nauke i romsko pisanje (Poglavlje I), Romski jezik – romani čhib (Poglavlje II), Kritički pristupi romskom pisanju u prevodu (Poglavlje III), i Kritičke analize romske poezije (Poglavlje IV).

Prvo poglavlje razmatra različite pristupe prevodilačkih nauka, ali se fokusira na one najkorisnije za analizu višejezičkih pesama i diskusije o romskom prevodu u analitičkim okvirima prevodilačkih nauka. Drugo poglavlje predstavlja opšte informacije o romskom jeziku, romskom pisanju i književnosti, kao i specifične informacije o romskom jeziku na Balkanu.

Treće poglavlje objašnjava metode korištene za prikupljanje i definisanje korpusa romske poezije, kao i metode vođenja jezičke i književne analize u poeziji odabranih romskih pesnika. Četvrto poglavlje analizira četiri odabrana pesnika: Ruždiju Rusu-Sejdovića, Mehmeda Mehu Saćipa, Nedju Osmana i Hedinu Tahirović-Sijerčić koji govore i pišu na različitim romskim

dijalektima, koji su višejezični, koji sami prevode svoja djela, i koji u nekim slučajevima sami analiziraju svoja djela.

Kroz analize i auto-analize pesama navedenih pesnika istražujem ne samo višejezičnost i autoprevođenje u romskom kontekstu, nego i uslove života između jezika i poznavanje više jezika. Nastojim da objasnim način na koji interkulturalni dijalog u poeziji odražava 'dekolonijalnu strategiju' kojom pesnici pokušavaju da progovore svojim romskim glasom, a kao odgovor na vekovnu reprezentaciju od strane Drugih.

Moja tvrdnja je da romski pesnici najradije sami prevode svoja dela. U autoprevodu romski pisci 'prevode sebe' i 'transformišu sami sebe' u njihovom književnom izrazu. Bez obzira da li su njihove pesme napisane na dijalektima romskog jezika kao izvorni tekst ili u autoprevodu, sve verzije se međusobno nadopunjuju. Svaki naredni autoprevod nastavlja lanac komplementarnosti.

Ključne reči: Romi, romski, poezija, prevod, autoprevod, višejezičnost.

Naučna oblast: translatologija, jezik, književnost, romske studije, prevodilačke studije, kultura.

Uža naučna oblast: prevodilačke studije, translatologija.

LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE OF ROMA WITHIN TRANSLATION IN THE WESTERN BALKANS: POETRY IN SELF-TRANSLATION

ABSTRACT: This dissertation develops and creates, for the first time, and in the area of the Western Balkans historiography, an analysis of Romani literature (poetry) within translation, taking into account the larger dynamics of Romani language – Romani čhib, culture, and literary production. In the context of my thesis, I seek to investigate bilingual/multilingual Romani poets/writers who self-translate.

Even though bilingual/multilingual, Romani poets/writers are aware of the need to be self-translated in order to be understood not just by majority language readers but also by own (Romani) different dialect speaking readers. While self-translating Romani writers ‘translate themselves’ and ‘transform themselves’ in their literary expression through self-translation. Their self-translation, besides self-confidence in one’s own writing, influence several factors: self-awareness about differences between dialects, cultures, customs and habits; levels of knowledge of Romani; and levels of knowledge of majority language(s), which depend on individual levels of education.

The goal of the dissertation is to provide an adequate understanding and analysis of the Romani literature, Romani language and Romani language translation in the general context of literary translation, and in the act of self-translation, in poetry in particular.

The dissertation comprises an introduction, four chapters and a conclusion: Translation Studies [TS] and Romani writing (Chapter I), The Romani language – Romani čhib (Chapter II), Critical approaches to Romani writing in translation (Chapter III), and Critical analyses of Romani poetry (Chapter IV).

The first chapter considers various TS approaches but focuses principally on those most useful for analysis of the multilingual poems and discussion on Romani translation within the analytical frameworks of TS. The second chapter presents general information on Romani čhib, Romani writing and literature, and specific information concerning Romani čhib in the Balkans.

The third chapter explains the method I used to gather and define my corpus of Romani poetry, it discusses the way of linguistic and literary analyses in selected poetry by Romani poets.

The fourth chapter analyses four selected poets: Ruždija Ruso Sejdović, Mehmed-Meho Saćip, Nedjo Osman and Hedina Tahirović-Sijerčić who speak and write in different Romani dialects, who are multilingual, self-translate and in some instances self-analyse their poems.

Through analyses and self-analyses of the poems and the poets' self-translations I explore not just multilingualism and self-translation but also the condition of living between languages and knowing several languages. I seek to explain how the intercultural dialogue present in the poetry could reflect a 'decolonial strategy', by which poets attempt to reappropriate their own Romani voices – in response to centuries of representation by Others.

My assertion is that Romani writers (poets in this case) do and prefer to translate their own work. Whether their poems are written in Romani čhib dialects as an original text or in self-translation, all versions complement one another. Each subsequent self-translation continues chain of complementarity.

Keywords: Roma, Romani, poetry, translation, self-translation, language, multilingualism.

Scientific area: Translation Studies, language, literature, Romani studies, culture.

Narrow/special scientific area: translation studies, translatology.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER I – TRANSLATION STUDIES AND ROMANI WRITING	8
1.1 Translation as a practice.....	9
1.2 Source and target relations.....	11
1.3 Readerships, translators and reception	13
1.4 Problematizing translation relationships.....	18
1.5 Self-translation.....	22
1.6 Multilingualism.....	28
CHAPTER II – THE ROMANI LANGUAGE (ROMANI ČHIB)	35
2.1 Romani čhib – spoken and written.....	37
a) Spoken, written or conversational language – what is the ‘proper’ language?.....	42
b) Romani čhib and its identity.....	46
c) The problem of standardization.....	47
2.2 Romani dialects.....	51
2.3 Neologisms and loanwords.....	55
2.4 Contact languages – a mixed Romani čhib.....	58
2.5 Romani language in literary context.....	60
a) Romani literary production written by Roma in Romani čhib and non-Romani language/s – a dilemma of categories.....	61
b) Romani literary production – and the inclusion of Romani women writers	63
c) Romani literary production – its origins in orality.....	66
d) Romani literary production – on the question of ‘mother tongue’, ‘native language’ and translation.....	74
CHAPTER III – CRITICAL APPROACHES TO ROMANI WRITING IN TRANSLATION	76

3.1	Defining corpus.....	76
	<i>Procedure of selection</i>	79
3.2	Relevance of personal background.....	81
3.3	Self-reflexivity as a method.....	85
3.4	Importance of self-translators.....	89
3.5	Linguistic-literary analysis.....	91
3.6	Proposal of typology of critique.....	104
 <u>CHAPTER IV – CRITICAL TRANSLATION ANALYSES OF ROMANI POETRY</u>		<u>106</u>
4.1	Ruždija Ruso Sejdović.....	107
	a. Biographical information and literary production.....	107
	b. Analyses of Poem “Phiripe – Putovanja”.....	111
	c. Analyses of Poem “Autoportreti – Autoportret”.....	119
4.2	Mehmed-Meho Saćip.....	133
	a. Biographical information and literary production.....	133
	b. Analyses of Poem “Cahra – Čerga”.....	135
4.3	Nedjo Osman.....	145
	a. Biographical information and literary production	
	b. Analyses of Poem “Ma bijan man - Beni doğurma - Gebäre mich nicht - Nemoj me	
	rađati [Don’t Give Birth to Me]”.....	147
4.4	Hedina Tahirović-Sijerčić.....	160
	a. Biographical information and literary production.....	160
	b. Analyses of Poem “Drabarni –Gatara”.....	162
	c. Analyses of Poem “CV 6 – CV 6”.....	174
 <u>CONCLUSION</u>		<u>185</u>
	<i>Invisible writers and translators</i>	187
	<i>Thinking about future of translation in the Romani context</i>	189
	<i>The future of Romani čhib</i>	191
 REFERENCES.....		193

ANNEX I – BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES	225
Avdić, Šemso (1950 - ..)	
Berberski, Slobodan (1919 - 1989)	
Borde, Andrew (1490 – 1549)	
Demir, Ljatif (1961 - ..)	
Dimić, Trifun (1956 - 2001)	
Djuric, Rajko (1947 - ..)	
Eminova, Akile (1961 - ..)	
Franz, Philomena (1922 - ..)	
Haliti, Bajram (1955 - ..)	
Hancock, Ian (1942- ..)	
Horvat, Jožek Muc (1965 - ..)	
Jusuf, Šaip (1932 or 1933 - 2010)	
Krasnići, Alija (1952 - ..)	
Nikolić, Jovan (1955 - ..)	
Paćaku, Kujtim (1959 - ..)	
Ranjčić, Gina (1830 – 1891)	
Sejdić, Marko Aladin(1970 - ..)	
Sejdić, Rasim (1943-1981)	
Serbezovski, Muharem (1950 - ..)	
Stojka, Ceija(1933 – 2013)	
Taikon, Katarina (1932 – 1995)	
Wajs, Bronisława Papusza (1908 or 1910 – 1987)	
 ANNEX II - ANALYSED POEMS.....	 234
 ANNEX III - LIST OF POETS AND LANGUAGE PAIRS.....	 243
 ANNEX IV - ROMANI LITERARY WORKS/ MY CORPUS	 245
 ANNEX V - QUESTIONARY FOR AUTHORS	 295
 ANNEX VI- DECISION: THE ROMANI ALPHABET	 297
 BIOGRAPHY.....	 301
 APPENDIX 1, APPENDIX 2, APPENDIX 3	 302

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

TS	Translation Studies
TL	Target language
SL	Source language
TT	Target text
ST	Source text
DTS	Descriptive Translation Studies
AL1	Author's language (first)
AL2	Author's language (second, in self-translation)
AL3	Author's language (third, i.e. successive language version)
NAL1	Not an author's language (first version of English translation)
NAL2	Not an author's language (second version of English translation)
NAL3	Not an author's language (third version of English translation)
NAL4	Not an author's language (fourth version of English translation)

Please note that all foreign-language terms in the text have been translated into English by the author for ease of understanding.

INTRODUCTION

This PhD dissertation develops my present and ongoing research on Romani literary works, contextualizing them through the perspective of translation studies (TS) research and within the larger dynamics of Romani studies – Romani čhib¹, culture, and literary production and reception. In the context of my thesis in particular, I seek to study Romani writers who write and translate themselves, to investigate how their language can be understood in self-translation, and also find the reasons why and in which ways the source and target language(s) complement each other in self-translation.

Investigating Romani writing through the prism of translation opens up multiple avenues of inquiry that may provide further insight into multilingualism and TS research. As a preliminary, certain characteristics are important to keep in mind when approaching Romani literary and artistic expression, ones that potentially have an impact later on the practical process of translation as well as on the history of translation practices. It is critical to be aware of all the differences within Romani čhib and its dialects, culture, habits and customs in order to understand the complexities of translation and its processes in context.

Translation studies research allows us to reflect on the general and specific characteristics of Romani čhib, of Romani writing and literature, and of the different approaches taken to translation in the social and cultural context.

Firstly, because Romani language dialects have traditionally not been taught in national educational institutions and since many of Romani people speak them only at home and in Romani local community spaces, multilingualism – or perhaps more exactly, plurilingualism as defined by the EU (CEC 2014) – can be considered a norm.²

¹ Throughout the dissertation, Romani language will be referred to and written as Romani čhib. I will also use Rom (man of Romani origin in the singular), Roma (men and also people of Romani origin in the plural), Romni (woman of Romani origin in the singular), Romnja (women of Romani origin in the plural), and Romani (an adjective).

² In the 2009 Council of Europe *Plurilingual and Pluricultural Competence Report*, “Plurilingual and pluricultural competence refers to the ability to use languages for the purposes of communication and to take part in intercultural interaction, where a person, viewed as a social actor has proficiency of varying degrees in several languages and experience of several cultures.” Because proficiency varies, “...the strategies used [...] may vary according to the language or language combinations [...]” and thus “...it does not result of a simple addition of two or more monolingual competences in several languages[;] it permits combinations and alternations of different kinds.” (https://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/Source/SourcePublications/CompetencePlurilingue09web_en.pdf).

Secondly, because there is no physical, geographical Romani nation-state, with an associated legal and political apparatus supporting national language (including standardisation) policies and an infrastructure promoting development of a national culture.

Thirdly, because Romani 'identity' in effect has multiple linguistic-cultural conjugations worldwide rooted in and depending on specific local histories and degrees of assimilation into local nation-state cultures linguistically and culturally.

These basic facts alone require consideration of TS approaches that problematize and nuance the conventional dichotomous concepts of source and target language-cultures and identities as associated exclusively with single nation-states or compact geographical territories. Furthermore, an important part of Romani history is uniquely anchored in the Balkans and in the Eastern and Central Europe. There have been clear calls as of late from within the discipline of TS to 'turn' a view toward translation practices and traditions within eastern Europe (Tymoczko 2006, 2007; Baer 2011) and elsewhere, and with the exception of Toninato³ and Folaron⁴, there are virtually no academics in translation studies who have explored translation practices occurring within the Romani community, which collectively constitute the largest minority group (Anon, 2011) in the European Union.

It is significant to point out the constant challenge of representation encountered when writing as a Rom/Romni. The act of writing is an *a priori* struggle that presents various dilemmas of representation simultaneously – of the self, of the self as a man and/or woman, of a minority / minoritized culture, and against centuries-old representations made by other(s). The act of creative writing and translation carries with it the weight of translating simultaneously one's own heritage to counteract existing prejudices and stereotypes, in order for one's individual artistic voice to be effectively heard and understood. Individual voice in "[...] the works by Romani authors represent the effort to affirm themselves as subjects – and not mere objects – in the public discourse on their identity" (Toninato 2004, 342).

My experience as a multilingual Romani woman, journalist, writer, self-translator, translator, educator, community activist and representative has revealed time and again that translation is a vibrant cultural practice not only within Romani communities settled in the Western Balkans and southeastern Europe but also within the broader, global 'Romani

³ <http://www2.warwick.ac.uk/fac/arts/modernlanguages/people/toninato> Accessed November 2017.

⁴ <http://www.translationromani.net/en> Accessed November 2017.

community' worldwide. Even though Romani community is mostly bilingual and very often multilingual it depends on every day translation. Their language is constantly dissolving, deconstructing, changing and surviving within the contact languages they live with and in.

Translation always involves different languages and different cultures. There is not just two and more languages but also two and more cultures which come into contact, inseparably. “[T]ranslation is not only a linguistic act, it is also an act of communication across cultures” (House 2014, 3). Translation is intercultural communication requiring intercultural understanding which is the “basis of a crucial concept in translation: that of functional equivalence” (House 2014, 4). If there is not knowledge about linguistic and culture specificities in any contact language between author and reader the problem of intercultural understanding appears. This problem can be solved in the translation by the translator. At the same time, languages express cultural and social realities, and we are able easily to recognize the position of each of them.

Romani people, their culture and ways of life, as well as Romani migration history, combine to create and construct Romani identity as a symbolic expression, with symbols first bound to nomadism (Tahirović-Sijerčić *in* Khalifa 2014), to romantic and exotic cultural illusions of Romani women and men, and to depictions of their ‘free lifestyle’ by European authors, majority societies and nobility. This can lend itself, as Kyle Conway wrote when thinking about sociologists and translation, to an “investigat[ion of] cultural translation as a function of displacement” (Conway 2012, 21-25)⁵. This displacement is two-fold in the context of Roma. Because Romani people have been forced to displace internally and move long distances with their families, they have been obliged to constantly ‘negotiate their way’ (*Ibid.*) through each successive community they join, whether temporarily or permanently. At the same time, non-Roma majority societies have projected (and somewhat canonized) cultural images of Roma as nomadic, without questioning why.

Postcolonial scholars such as Homi Bhabha see cultural translation “as a tool, to challenge oppressive or restrictive social norms” (*Ibid.*).

⁵ “Cultural translation is a concept with competing definitions coming from two broad fields, anthropology/ethnography and cultural/postcolonial studies. In anthropology, it usually refers to the act of describing for members of one cultural community how members of another interpret the world and their place in it. In cultural studies, it usually refers to the different forms of negotiation that people engage in when they are displaced from one cultural community into another, or it refers to the displacement itself.” (Conway 2012, 21)

Cultural translation desacralizes the transparent assumptions of cultural supremacy, and in that very act, demands a contextual specificity, a historical differentiation within minority positions (Bhabha 1994, 228).

Contesting this imaginary image by Roma themselves is relatively recent. For most, there has simply been no opportunity to think or to be concerned with education which is the key to prosperity and survival of any ethnic group. The struggle for many has been focused on the fight against poverty and discrimination in order to obtain the bare necessities of life. From this perspective, the concept of cultural translation as a process that occurs as a function of displacement becomes an interesting one to reflect on. The result of the historical trail of migration and displacement is visible in the cultural and literary production by Roma. The recently emerging transnational Romani literary 'corpus' reveals not only a body of literary work produced in various Romani language dialects; it also contains – significantly – literary works produced in the diverse nation-state languages in which Romani writers have been educated.

There are many questions which should be answered, in particular the reasons why many Roma authors do not write exclusively in 'the Romani čhib'. Why is this the case? A preliminary answer could be found in the problem of standardising the Romani language, especially vexed when the individuals leading the way do not have the backing or benefit of an institutional framework – educational, governmental or otherwise. More often than not, authors 'translate' and transform themselves in their literary expression when they choose to write in one or more of the other languages they have learned and lived in, within their respective countries of residence.

Inevitably, tensions and questions arise with regard to the politics, power relations and ideologies that exist between the social agents of literary and translation production and reception, specifically in terms of Romani language dialects, national languages, scripts and alphabets, and their constant relation to a global language such as English. Moreover, Romani literary production – whether expressed in local Romani language dialects, a standardized version of Romani, in other national languages, or in translation – occupies a very small and fragmented niche in terms of global literary production (including translations). It becomes necessary to question and describe the specific historical specificities and conditions for production that exist in each area. An accurate portrayal of global Romani literary production and the role of translation would require research and analysis of the dynamics specific to each individual country or region.

While an international perspective is beyond the scope of this dissertation, I hope that this focus on the Western Balkans – which is the origin of much existing literary production and translation of Romani writers thus far – can provide an initial framework for investigating some or all of the questions urgently needing to be addressed. In line with these priorities, the poets and poems I have chosen for analysis will highlight a conceptual reframing of self-translation in a multilingual context with reference to Roma. The research questions I favour in my work are complex in their apparent simplicity, but constitute a first step in addressing issues of translation from within a Romani perspective and translation studies. What are the reasons that many Romani writers write in a Romani language dialect? Why and to what extent are they ‘translating themselves’ and ‘transforming themselves’ in their literary expression? What is the role of self-translation in Romani literary expression and aesthetics?

By considering some aspects and features of the various, emergent ‘systems’ of Romani literary authorial production and translation in the Balkans through the descriptive research process in TS, we can begin to more systematically observe and understand the different relations that emerge between source language(s) and target language(s) production and readerships in a fluid transnational cultural space.

Research in TS has begun to build on its foundation of linguistic and literary research in bilingualism and multilingualism to consider practices of self-translation from a new angle. New ideas and concepts such as “translingualism” and “translanguaging” are also emerging. (Wei 2014, Canagarajah 2011, Garcia and Wei 2014). They are directly related to bilingual and multilingual manipulation of language and cultural codes as social practices. In addition to pursuing questions of translation for the first time in a Romani context, my work also suggests that translanguaging and translingualism can reflect the Romani poetic experience and condition of knowing and living between languages and cultures.

This dissertation comprises an introduction, four chapters and a conclusion: Translation Studies and Romani writing, (Chapter I), The Romani language (Romani čhib) (Chapter II), A linguistic-literary, self-reflexive translation studies methodology for a critique of Romani writing in translation (Chapter III), and Critical translation analyses of Romani poetry (Chapter IV).

The first chapter considers various TS approaches but focuses principally on those most useful for analysis of the multilingual poems and discussion on Romani translation within the analytical frameworks of TS.

The second chapter presents general information on Romani čhib, Romani writing and literature, and specific information concerning Romani language in the Balkans. Included is information on Romani dialects, neologisms, loanwords in Romani, and the contact language effect. The chapter likewise discusses Romani literary production, categories such as 'Romani writer' and 'Romani literary writing', and questions the connection between 'mother tongue' and the language(s) of translation from a translation approach.

Chapter III introduces critical approaches to Romani writing in translation. Thinking about the way how best to analyse the participants in research i.e. Romani poets and self-translators, I found myself thinking about my way of writing and my experience which is not so much different as theirs are. It meant that my involvement in this work as a researcher, writer, self-translator and translator was also a part of the same large Romani community as my participants were. My intention was to raise up silenced voices through Romani representation and self-representation, hoping to be understood, and to motivate cultural change. It arose the questions about relevance of personal background, of subjectivity and validity of this work. My inspiration to be involved with multiple identities in this work, as a researcher, participant and as a critic, brought me to ethnography and autoethnography approaches which are complementing each other. Through the relevance of personal background and importance of biographies and autobiographies, reflexivity and self-reflexivity, I found the way with the others of accomplishing wider cultural, social and political understanding. That allows me to use the first person narrative in my work. A linguistic-literary analysis introduces the widely used word-for-word Vinay's and Darbelnet's translation procedure which also raised other questions such as comparison, importance of equivalence in self-translation, motives, readership etc. In the proposal of typology of critique considering subjectivity, identity and self-consciousness in literary scene, I pointed out the issue of critics in the practice of self-translation in Romani context, and paid attention to the practice of self-translation which presents self-translation in Romani context.

Chapter IV analyses the poems of four selected multilingual, self-translating poets who speak and write in different Romani dialects. In the chapter, I provide their biographical information and short histories of their literary production. Through linguistic and literary, ethnographical and autoethnographical analyses, self-translations and self-analyses of the poets' own poems, I explore concepts of translation in a multilingual context within Romani čhib and

Romani translation, giving also a short introduction of new concepts of translanguaging and translingualism in translation within the Romani context.

My assertion is that Romani poets/writers engage in an act of active self-translation as an almost natural part of their writing, and an outward expression of their multilingual selves. Their poems, written in Romani čhib dialects, and composed as an original text alongside their self-translations, complement one another. Subsequent self-translations of self-translations continue a chain of complementarity.

By positioning my research within the frameworks of translation and multilingualism, I seek to propose a preliminary model of analysis and critique for Romani literary expression in self-translation from within the Romani community. Self-translation, in this case, can be seen as a kind of decolonising⁶ response, one performed in a ‘translingual’ space of personal and collective recovery, healing, and development – a reclaiming of identity against historical legacies of marginalisation, discrimination, repression and even genocide. It is also ‘always already political’ (Denzin at all. 2008, 3), and “research is always already both moral and political” (Denzin 2005, 934). Indigenous self-translator’s voice self-represents and acknowledges the truth seen within eyes, experience and knowledge from one’s own community. So does also Romani self-translator’s voice self-represents and acknowledges truth and experience producing knowledge seen and observed with the Romani eyes.

In that way producing the Romani knowledge decolonizing response helps me also to realize where the position of myself is. I am totally aware that this position is in-between. I am at the same time both, a researcher and the researched. At the same time I experience marginalization and otherness but also privileges to recognize the need to give and present my voice, Romani voice in a Romani community and outside the Romani community, which is a call for “the pressing need for scholars to decolonize and deconstruct those structures within the Western academy that privilege Western knowledge systems and their epistemologies [...] making Western systems of knowledge the object of inquiry” (Denzin 2005, 936).

Writing autoethographies in self-translations in my thesis I bring out the question of producing knowledge by Romani researchers attaching it to the academic structures where personal and professional life and experience are on the path be to decolonized and to be met.

⁶Denzin, Norman K., Yvonna S. Lincoln and Linda Tuhiwai Smith, eds. (2008). *Critical-Indigenous Methodologies*. Los Angeles/London/New Delhi/Singapore: SAGE.

CHAPTER I – TRANSLATION STUDIES AND ROMANI WRITING

Despite constant migration, abandonment, marginalization and discrimination, Romani people⁷, the Roma, have preserved their language, Romani,⁸ customs, beliefs, culture and traditions. In environments where they have not been persecuted, tortured or killed, they settled with their families and created Romani settlements, eventually merging urban culture with traditional rituals. Within the rights and obligations established by majority society governments, education was mandatory. Roma began to be educated and gradually their commitment to literacy grew. The result has been an increased sense of the value of one's own culture and tradition. In its own specific way, use of the Romani language is making it possible to create the history of the Roma in a written form, by Roma themselves, and allowing them to present their written creative work.

Since the goal of my dissertation is to provide an adequate understanding and analysis of the Romani language translation in the general context of literary translation, and in the act of self-translation, in poetry in particular, it is necessary to consider some of the conceptual frameworks that translation studies provide in order to gain insights into their application in the Romani context.

It should be born in mind that historically Romani people⁹ have not had their own nation-state, that the history of their migration has spread them geographically widely around the world, and that their position as 'others' has brought them into the sphere and status of ethnic groups or

⁷ Romani people – “Roma- a European nation with Indian roots. The Indian origin and affiliation of the Roma is most obvious linguistically, by the language still spoken by many members of this heterogeneous ethnicity. The Roma consist of various groups, which are labeled with different ethnonyms-self designations as well as external designations: Arlije, Calé, Gurbet, Kaale, Kalderaš, Lovara, Manuš, Sepečides, Sinti, Ursari, etc.; many groups also use the self-designation Roma. Usually all these designations are summarized- sometimes even together with population groups of non-Indian origin-by pejorative denomination ‘Gypsies.’” [Romani] Project-Dieter W. Halwachs.

⁸ “Romani, the common language of the Roma, the Sinti, the Kale and other European population group summarised by the pejorative denomination gypsies, belongs to the Indo-Aryan branch of the Indo-European language family and is the only New-Indo-Aryan language spoken exclusively outside of the Indian subcontinent.” (Zatreanu and Halwachs 2003, 3).

⁹ “The Roma are a non-territorial nation whose common language is in the process of becoming standardizes, and for whom extant traditional practices and self-identification are as diffuse as their dynamic expressions in relation to dominant cultures.” (Cynthia Levine-Rasky and Hedina Tahirović-Sijerčić, “Introduction”, in *A Romani Women's Anthology: Spectrum of the Blue Water*, Inanna Publications and Education Inc.: Toronto, Canada, 2017, 8).

national minorities in the countries they live. It is evident that the language they speak, Romani čhib, has survived only in the context of their bilingualism and/or multilingualism.

While investigating the history of translation theories, I realized that there were advantages of individual theories and concepts, as well as shortcomings, which were important to consider in my work. As I grew to understand and compare them, it became clear that in the context of my experience and research, some of them were complementary and dependent on each other, analogous to a reading of the Romani poetry texts themselves, where original and self-translations complement and depend on one another. By understanding and analysing translation studies theoretical frameworks in relation to Romani čhib and writing, I hope to make a contribution to current translation studies research from a transnational perspective that is guided by literary, multilingual, and sociologically-oriented paradigms through the lens of self-reflexivity.

1.1 Translation as a practice

Traditional definitions in the field have implied an understanding of translation as the transformation from one source language (SL) text into one target language (TL) text often from the vantage point of monolingual target speakers and readers. (Gambier and van Doorslaer 2010, Munday 2012, Millán and Bartrina eds. 2013, Baker and Saldanha eds. 1998/2009/2011). The translation process has been seen as a transfer and transformation of linguistic and cultural codes from one language system into another, taking into account the cultural codes and practices associated with each language. The concept of translation in early translation studies research generally implied a one-to-one correspondence of language in terms of nation-state or culture with an emphasis on standard language. This concept implied transfer from one national context into another, expressed through the historically prevalent strategies of ‘literal’ or ‘free’, and more recent ‘foreignisation’ or ‘domestication’, without fully problematizing the ‘original source language’ (Venuti 1995, 1998, Bassnet and Lefevere 1990, Munday 2008, 2012). The ‘cultural turn’ in TS (1990s) would introduce contemporary issues and debates from literary and cultural studies, and in so doing highlight postcolonial, gender, and power dynamics and relations as constructed through language and discourse.

However, it was reading Israeli scholar Itamar Even-Zohar’s (1990, 47) call to consider the “innovative role [of translation] within the target language” that initially provided me with a

path to start thinking about Romani literature and its translation, and about the approaches to translation possible in the Romani context (see Chapter II on literature). Within his theoretical framework of polysystems, Even-Zohar, cited in Pym (2010, 72), sees translation playing an innovative role when: “(a) a polysystem has not yet been crystallized, that is to say, when a literature is ‘young,’ in the process of being established; (b) a literature is either ‘peripheral’ (within a large group of correlated literatures) or ‘weak,’ or both; and (c) there are turning points, crises, or literary vacuums in a literature.” Contrary to homogeneous, static systems, the polysystem is proposed as a system that is “heterogeneous and dynamic [...], emphasiz[ing] the multiplicity of intersections [...] and stress[ing] that in order for a system to function, uniformity need not be postulated.” (Even-Zohar 1990, 12). It recognizes the need to ground theoretical abstraction in concrete local, historical contexts. It accounts for bilingual and multilingual communities. As noted further by Pym (2010, 151) elaborating on Even-Zohar, “a textual model from one system is not just used in another; it is integrated into the relations of the host system and thereby both undergoes and generates change [...] with] transfer seen as occurring both within and between systems.”

The literature of and written by Roma, once exclusively traditional and oral, only started to be published in the 20th century (Djurić 2010, 6). Compared to the more developed literary systems in languages with which Romani is in contact, the Romani literature ‘system’ is “young” and still in the process of establishing itself: it is “peripheral” and “weak”. The existence of literary vacuums until the 20th century, including the invisibility of Romani literature within the contexts of other national literatures, is a tangible product of their history. “Romani literature” has been predominantly characterized by the literature written by others occupying a more central position in the global circulation of knowledge. Given that Roma have little to no opportunity of being educated in a Romani language institution anywhere, the central literary positions are those occupied by literatures of diverse nation-states and national languages. The few literary works (comparatively speaking) that Roma write are often not in the Romani language, except at times for poetry, a main reason why poetry was selected for analysis in this dissertation.

A polysystems approach helps to discover and differentiate the multiple systems that intersect within the broader constellation of works to be included under the category of Romani literature. They include works in various national canons of literature produced in many different languages around the world, works produced in diverse Romani dialects and written in different

scripts, and works translated into and from Romani. The production of Romani literature in one or more Romani dialects is small, young, and peripheral. According to Even-Zohar, translation production, i.e. subsystem within the greater literary polysystem, is generally and proportionately smaller. The translation of Romani literature into and from the various Romani dialects is even smaller, with self-translation –the focus of my dissertation analysis– occupying a very important role.

1.2 Source and target relations

Understanding the more ‘systemic’ approach furnished by Even-Zohar (1978, 1990) led me to the conceptual frameworks proposed by another Israeli scholar, Gideon Toury, and known within the broader category of Descriptive Translation Studies (DTS). While linguistic theoretical frameworks laid the early foundation for TS, DTS sought to describe rather than prescribe the shifts, modifications, and effects of translation as a source text was translated into a target text. Toury describes translation as a “norm-governed activity”, where norms refer to the adherence and transfer of certain values and ideas deemed or accepted as appropriate by a source or target community in a given situation. In a situation of translation, Toury proposes,

[t]he ‘value of translation [...] may be described as consisting of two principles whose realizations are interwoven in an almost inseparable way: the production of a text in a particular culture/language which is designed to occupy a certain position, or fill a certain slot, in the host culture, while at the same time, constituting a representation in that language/culture of a text already existing in some other language, belonging to a different culture and occupying a definable position within it. (Toury 2012, 69)

The two principles Toury refers to are “adequacy” and “acceptability”, constituting what he defines as the “initial norm”. While translating a work, a translator may lean towards adequacy and adhere to the norms and textual relationships of the source text, and/or lean towards acceptability, that is to say, the norms that originate and act in the target culture itself. (Toury 2012, 79) As summarized in Munday (2012, 189), “[Toury’s] TT-oriented theoretical framework combines linguistic comparison of ST and TT and consideration of the cultural framework of the TT [with an] aim to identify the patterns of behaviour in the translation and thereby to ‘reconstruct’ the norms at work in the translation process.”

Patterns of behaviour reflect norms which can in turn lead to the formulation of ‘laws’, two of which are the law of growing standardisation and the law of interference (Toury 1985,

1995). The law of growing standardisation emphasizes target texts, observing that translations “manifest greater standardisation than their source” (Toury 1995, 274). Pym (2010, 82) explains that in this view, translations are “simpler, flatter, less structured, less ambiguous” when compared to non-translations, and that the more peripheral their status, the more they tend to “accommodate to established models and repertoires” (Toury 1995, 274). Toury’s second law, the law of interference, observes that “phenomena pertaining to the make-up of the source text tend to be transferred to the target text” (Ibid., 282), i.e. translations have elements and words from their source texts. He speaks about “replac[ing] source-text textemes with ad hoc combinations” (Ibid., 281) which are equivalent and acceptable to the target culture and which fulfil functions in the target language(s). Tolerance of these source text elements and words is very high even though equivalence very often is not met. As Pym (2008) notes, both the law of standardisation and the law of interference depend on sociocultural factors and they are subject to social conditions.

While norms and ‘laws’ cannot yet be wholly used as a method of analysis for the Romani context due to a very limited number of Romani literary works actually published, thinking about the source and target cultures in terms of norms provided me with additional translation context. For example, the Romani language is not resistant to interference, and both writing and translation in Romani can tend to be coloured by a majority target language (depending on specific individual regions) and the social conditions in which Roma have historically lived. From a more target-oriented perspective, a norms approach raises multiple questions as to the target reader culture, and which criteria for norms would actually constitute an adequacy or acceptability analysis. To what extent would a translator take into consideration the needs of different target reader cultures? In terms of translation reality, Romani čhib and its translation can be considered as peripheral, and Romani culture as (sub)culture, one historically marginalized and represented by (o)thers who have historically stereotyped them. Romani translation has found its own place, in its own (sub)culture, among its own people, through a model of translation that is uniquely bound to and within the Romani community. It expresses itself, especially in literary form, by the act of self-translation.

1.3 Readerships, translators and reception

My readings of translation studies and target-oriented approaches in TS led me to contemplate more seriously on the role of the reader in a Romani literary context. Who reads literary works authored and/or translated by Romani writers, whether written in the Romani language or in a non-Romani language? How do readers receive and respond to the literary work? What do publishing houses actually imply by publishing a Romani work? How to interpret the fact that no body of literary criticism exists for Romani literature written and/or translated in the Romani language? How to examine the role of the Romani translator as a reader who writes through translation for a different set of readers in another language/culture?

Reception Theory (*Rezeptionästhetik*) was first introduced in Germany in the 1960s and early 1970s by the literary theorist Hans-Robert Jauss. Its focus shifted from the interaction between author and the text to one between the text and its reader or reading public. It takes into account the collective social effects of art in a specified historical time with the attention paid to the moral values that exist within cultural-sociological settings. Another Reception Theory approach was introduced through the Konstanz School. It is associated with the concept 'Lehrstelle' (Textual Gaps) proposed by Wolfgang Iser. He was concerned with the many unexplained things in a text, i.e. the gaps in a text that readers fill in a subjective way in order to actively and constructively receive its meanings. Around the same time, scholars in the U.S. were developing Reader Response Criticism, to investigate and conceptualize the reactions and experiences of readers when reading texts. What effects does the reading have on a reader? One of the movement's most influential scholars, Stanley Fish, proposes a reader profile that is particularly useful when thinking about translators.

[M]y reader is a construct, an ideal or idealized reader; somewhat like Wardhaugh's "mature reader" or Milton's "fit" reader, or to use a term of my own, the reader is the informed reader. The informed reader is someone who

- 1. is a competent speaker of the language out of which the text is built.*
- 2. is in full possession of "the semantic knowledge that a mature...listener brings to his task of comprehension." This includes the knowledge (that is, the experience, both as a producer and comprehender) of lexical sets, collocational probabilities, idioms, professional and other dialects, etc.*
- 3. has **literary** competence (Fish 1980, 86-87).*

As “informed readers”, translators (as well as critics) interpret a text and construct its meaning through the act of reading. They interpret an author’s textual cues to assist them in understanding as closely as possible the meaning, or potential meanings, that the author tries to convey. Reader response criticism furthermore stresses the subjectivity of the reading experience, where not only two individual readers could have two different interpretations; a reader who re-reads the same work some years later may also have an interpretation that is different from an earlier reading, in part based on his or her subsequent experiences and knowledge of life.

Reader-response criticism likewise takes into consideration social practices and the readers’ environments, including the diverse religious, social and cultural values that affect reading (Kennedy and Gioia, 1995). If, as Toury explains, translation is a norm-guided activity, with translators adhering or distancing themselves according to the two principles of adequacy and acceptability, then a focus on the translator’s act of reading the ST becomes an important one. The reception of the translated literary (or non-literary) work cannot be explained solely in textual terms; the reader and his or her social environment and experience matter. Kenesei (2010), focusing on the reception of poetry, notes how similarity and difference between the cultures of the ST and TT would come to bear on the translator who mediates two cultures:

[...] the more common features the two cultures share, the easier the adaptation of the poem to the target culture. Not only are the common cultural roots to be considered but the topic or the message of the poem, too. The deeper the poem’s connections are in a historical or traditional background, the bigger the challenge for the translator to transfer the message to those readers in the target language. (2010, xx)

The focus on reception and readers is an important area of concern in TS, including DTS which examines how translated texts function in the target culture. A translation that is viewed as a product of the target context, within the receiving culture, can highlight the role that translation has in helping to create the identity of the target culture. Reception in the target culture is marked by readership, but also by publishers and other histories such as the history of publishing, the history of the book, and the history of reading, with the associated social and economic factors they imply (Chan in Angelelli and Baer 2016, 89). Reflecting on how the focus of reception theory could change, Chan notes that “Perhaps we will see, at long last, some shift in the writing of reception history, away from the translator who reads, toward the reader who translates”

(Chan in Angelelli and Baer 2016, 91). In the Romani context, this move to start from the reader who translates could easily begin with Romani self-translators.

Reception and Reader Response theoretical approaches in TS are valuable for thinking about pertinent questions on translation and reading in the Romani context. While it may still be too early to frame one's analysis of Romani literary writing with these theories due to the sparse literary production, the questions themselves are useful. Romani literature, for instance, does not yet have an adequately written history by Roma; oral history may have more immediate relevance in many cases. Literary literacy is not widespread. Publishing in Romani is still very modest and disparate, with publishing by official or well-known national publishers usually revolving around the Romani non-governmental organizations.

The situation of Romani readership is one of great concern. It is difficult to ascertain general expectations in terms of reception, because needs are neither being met for non-Romani readers and readerships or Romani readers and readerships. Until Roma create their own canon of literature in Romani and until Romani literary writing is included in the national canons of literature of other nations, it will have no general readership, and the questions about reception in a Romani context will stay unanswered. It is necessary to form a proper readership among different Romani groups according to the dialects that Romani writers/poets write and self-translators translate. An appropriate readership needs to have knowledge about dialects. A history of Romani interpretation and 'reading' of meaning might not begin with text. Historically, Roma groups moving from one location to another left non-textual signs that were not necessarily easily interpreted by other Roma groups who could be following in their paths.

[M]eanings varied and a specific tribe's symbols and signs, as well as their culture and differences in dialects, lifestyle, traditions, beliefs and habits, were not known by others.
(Tahirović-Sijerčić 2014, 78-79)

Romani readership today remains more specific than general, and needs to be further researched. Romani poets, self-translators and translators create their own readerships on an individual level, depending on their personal ability to attract people. They share memories and experiences. As TS scholars Brems and Ramos Pinto note, "[s]haring a writer's/poet's memories with the readers or audience is the only advantage in the process of reading, and reception stays at an individual, subjective level which focuses on real readers (Brems and Ramos Pinto 2013, 142-147). At the same time, an author's readership is progressively created. The act of writing in Romani čhib and

self-translating into a non-Romani language also play an important role in propagating Romani culture and identity, in cultivating and feeling the sense of an ethnic belonging to Roma, and in transferring a message to readers in non-Romani culture/s. Using a non-Romani (or majority) language is likewise connected to the need to reach out as much as possible to non-Romani readers, and to create non-Romani readership and criticism.

My readings of descriptive translation studies and target-oriented functionalist approaches in TS have also led me to contemplate more seriously the role of the translator in a Romani non-literary context. “Skopos theory” emerged in the 1980s, and places heavy emphasis on the ‘aim’ or ‘purpose’ (‘skopos’) that guides the production of a translation. According to this perspective, it is the target culture which “defines [a translation’s] adequacy” (Vermeer *in* Venuti 2000, 222). In this sense, the function of the ST is not necessarily the same as the function of the TT. In fact, a single ST can have varying skopoi and thus multiple TTs, each of which can be considered to be a translation. If multiple translations for multiple purposes can exist for a single ST, then the ‘authority’ of the ST is diluted and destabilised; the ‘correct’ way to translate depends on its function-to-be in the target culture.

Toury claims that all translational phenomena can be seen in translators’ involvement to the textual relations and norms embodied in the source text (adequacy), or to the relation in which the translators’ follow the linguistics and rhetorical norms of the target language and culture (acceptability). (Toury 1995, 56). The central role in the translation process is given to the translator i.e. “‘the’ expert in translational action” (Vermeer *in* Venuti 2000, 228), as the only person who can make the decisions on how and if something is to be translated. Holz-Mänttari prefers the translator being considered to be the expert in cross-cultural communication, in a consultative position that views translation as more than the act of translating, editing, and adapting (Venuti 2000, 216). The translator should be aware that many different goals exist, and that the goal(s) determine(s) how and why many translations can emerge from a single ST. “The Skopos rule thus reads as follows: translate/interpret/speak/write in a way that enables your text/translation to function in the situation in which it is used and with the people who want to use it and precisely in the way they want it to function. (Vermeer 1989, 20; translation from Nord 1997, 29).” (Pym 2010, 45). A very important role of translator is his/her communicative interaction between members of two different cultures as the only one who has a knowledge of

both (Nord 2013, 205). It question of responsibility i.e. of 'loyalty' as a moral mission in which a translator informs the readership about any changes.

The guiding principle of different purposes inspiring the creation of different translations in target cultures is manifested in two ways in the Romani context. On one hand, Romani people have been translated and represented by others both literally and metaphorically. From a Romani perspective, a 'purpose-oriented' translation focus can and does spark mistrust, as Roma have not had much opportunity to 'translate' and represent themselves. The decisions of who translates, what should be translated and how, are not always controlled by Roma or by Roma who understand the implications and effects of translation on the target readership. On the other hand, Roma who have now begun to write, translate, and represent themselves guide the 'purpose' of their translations and the translation processes. In literary expression, it is manifested as self-translation. Nord's concept of 'loyalty' i.e. moral mission of translators, becomes very important in my work, especially in its relation to ethnography and autoethnography, as related to the questions about responsibility of self-translators, representation and self-representation, consciousness and self-consciousness mirrored in reflexivity and self-reflexivity.

Thinking about Romani translation in the context of a Skopos-oriented framework raises other considerations. Purposes are clearly different and first dependent on directionality, whether Romani is being translated (and by whom) into majority language(s) or whether source texts written in majority language(s) are translated into Romani. Translation implies a not-yet-standardized Romani written with many elements and words incorporated from other non-Romani majority language(s) due to its historical linguistic trajectory and to the fact that Romani is always a minority language by default. Readers within a given translation's targeted readership are not homogeneous, with Romani readerships and general readerships not being the same in each country. This complicates research on which and whose needs and expectations are being met, and what is considered to be acceptable. Skopos approaches can assist in clarifying these heterogenous conditions and ambiguities.

However, as observed rightly by TS scholars, Skopos theory can be critiqued for its non-inclusion of literary texts (Nord 1997, 109-22), whose purpose (including notions of aesthetics) are more complex. It tends to reflect the different translation purposes associated with everyday, non-literary texts, with an emphasis on quality and accuracy of information that does not necessarily place as high a value on style. While non-literary Romani translation is not within the

scope of my dissertation, it is worth mentioning that multiple purposes in this context could be addressed in a future research. Because of common Romani bilingualism and/or multilingualism and the way different dialects are used in Romani writing, the decisions on if and how to translate often arise. They bring with them complicated questions like the purpose of translation and/or self-translation, what the target culture is, what the source culture is, and if the target culture is flexible and changeable or both.

1.4 Problematizing translation relationships

As developed over time, it began to integrate many of the perspectives and approaches being adopted within various social, cultural and literary movements – including post-structuralism, postcolonial, cultural studies, and the social sciences – calling for interdisciplinarity (Hermans 1999, 146) and for researchers “not [to] be wholly neutral, detached, objective or external” in their analyses of translation practice. In the scope of literary work by Romani authors/writers in Romani čhib and their translation, translation has played very different roles in very different historical and cultural contexts. The ‘cultural turn’ in TS (Snell-Hornby, 2006a) provides additional insights. This turn focuses on analysing the cultural effects in and of translation, where translation does not happen in a vacuum or in isolation but as part of “an ongoing process of intercultural transfer”, one that “rarely, if ever, involves a relationship of equality between texts, authors or systems” (Bassnett and Trivedi 1999, 2). According to Bassnett and Lefevere, translation

is 'felt' to be the process of acculturation, in which translation has, traditionally, been seen as a key element, takes place not just between cultures, but also inside a given culture, any given culture. (1998, 9)

This passage proves enlightening for the Romani context. Throughout history, Romani people have always depended on translation, and through processes of translation they have entered into the cultures of others due to the fact that they have always been living in the other's geographical space, in the other's national states, and within the other's cultures and languages. To survive, they have needed to constantly participate in processes of translation, emerging as bilingual or multilingual, which is what they have been traditionally and historically. Consequently, Romani translation has taken place between different cultures and between different languages but also

inside their own culture due to cultural and dialect differences, the result of practices of migration, forced migration, and internal displacement.

The prolific “cultural turn” in TS changes the perspective on the position of translation, which is no longer seen just as a linguistic transfer of texts on a presumed basis of equality, but as a strategy that links two cultures with potentially unequal status in society and an unequal power relationship (Asad in Clifford and Marcus 1986, 141-164). National histories, including the literary histories and cultural histories of two and very often more cultures, can have very different perceptions of translation. As Pym notes, the “cultural turn” nevertheless remains as “part of the intellectual background of the descriptive paradigm” and the term itself “was proposed by Snell-Hornby [1990] and legitimated by Lefevere and Bassnett [1990] whereby TS should focus on the cultural effects of translation” (Pym, 2010, 149). The historical presence of Romani culture has depended overwhelmingly on target cultures of mostly non-Romani culture. The cultural turn does open up pertinent questions on rewriting, on the question of what constitutes a translation, on the different meanings in translation, on self-translation, on gender and translation, and on language and identity.

These questions of translation are very important in the Romani context. Power relationships between majority and minority cultures explain the position of the Romani language, culture and translation. Self-translation emerged in response to the need for the Romani voice, raised by the Romani culture’s own writers and authors, to be heard. At the same time, the voices of self-translators and translators of Romani origin struggle against an unequal status in society and unequal opportunities for development. The socio-political status of countries where Roma live creates and determines the nature and extent of the Romani culture’s development and raises questions on Romani cultural identity.

Translation has also been seen “as a metaphor for post-colonial writing” (Tymoczko 1999, 19), where questions on the colonized and oppressed, margins and centre, and silenced voices have been addressed. The postcolonial context takes into account linguistic and cultural diversity, power relations and ideologies, including discussions on ‘minority’ languages in relation to ‘majority’ audiences. The postcolonial theoretical frameworks for the study of literary texts and their translation, and concepts such as ‘third space’, ‘hybridity’, ‘in-betweenness’, and ‘cultural differences’ bring out the power of translation, one based on the “performative nature of cultural communication” (Bhabha 1994, 326) in relation to cultural

identity. Sensitive to the ‘instability’ of language and meaning, they investigate the relationships within and between texts, and on the translator and his or her position. More recently, postcolonial literature seen as “world literature”, in practice mostly English-language postcolonial literature (D’haen 2012, 90), is being critiqued for the permanent records it can make on diaspora, migrancy, border-crossings, in-betweenness, and hybridity. Questions on the use of language in translation continue to be raised for writers from the periphery. Spivak, for example, in “Politics of Translation” (1993) claims that translation undermines the ‘Third World’ culture and makes stronger the dominance and power of English. Some authors adopt the language of the colonizer, some of them move from periphery to the centre adapting the language of the centre for their “own purpose” (Williams 2013, 29), as in the case of Salman Rushdie (1991, 17). Some of them are “endlessly creating” themselves (Bhabha, 1994, 8). The very ideology of the cultural turn can therefore be seen as a part of postcolonial translation discourse.

The postcolonial context as addressed by TS can potentially and partially address some of the Romani specificities, but there are some shortcomings which make it not entirely applicable to the Romani context. For example, Romani čhib is not indigenous to a national territory. Romani čhib and culture do not have the same type of colonization history as many of the types of nation-states and territories studied in the postcolonial context. Most notably, Romani čhib and culture manifest themselves in specific geographical areas in different ways due to histories of migration (Matras 2005) still being investigated and written. Since the TS postcolonial literature does not deal comprehensively with migration, the approach has its shortcomings in this respect. Within the scope of world literature as a projection of Western thought (D’haen 2012), postcolonial theory can potentially bring into consideration and into question the invisibility of Romani literature in the canon of world literature (see Chapter II). The lens of world literature might serve as a way by which to study how cultures recognize themselves through their projections of “otherness” (Bhabha 1994, 12). More critically, however, the use of English as a required *lingua franca* for studying world literature through works such as anthologies would not apply to Romani. “In *Death of a Discipline* (2003) Spivak enlarged on her suspicions regarding the use of English as the necessary *lingua franca* for the study of world literature through anthologies” (D’haen (2012, 87), which would also apply to Romani written work, because written and translated published works in Romani and the Slavic languages generally come from

the region of former Yugoslavia.¹⁰ Nonetheless, postcolonial critiques on power, political agendas, and international relations have had an important impact on reconceptualizing translation (Williams 2013, 30) and multilingualism (D'haen 2012, 22).

The “cultural turn” in TS has at times intersected with the sociological approaches in TS. They have focussed on 'texts' rather than on translators, and additionally on sociology, sociolinguistics or cultural analysis. (Pym, 2004)

As Wolf (2014) states, the “sociological turn” sees translation as a social practice and foregrounds the role of agents in the translation process:

Gradually, the conviction took shape that any translation is necessarily bound up within social contexts: on the one hand, the act of translating, in all its various stages, is undeniably carried out by individuals who belong to a social system; on the other the translation phenomenon is inevitably implicated in social institutions, which greatly determine the selection, production, and distribution of translation, and, as a result, the strategies adopted in the translation itself. [...] [A] series of works [...] have contributed to the emergence of a 'translation sociology' and have brought about important insights into the construction of a public discourse on translation and the self-image of translators and especially onto the translation process itself [...] (see Gouanvic 1999, Inghilleri 2003, Wolf and Fukari 2007, Pym, Shlesinger, and Simeoni 2008.) (Wolf in Angelelli, 2014, 10-11)

The sociological approaches to translation in TS foreground translation processes in social theories investigating society in terms of diverse social spaces and social configurations. Bourdieu's concepts of field, capital, habitus, and illusion have (Bourdieu, 1977) been productively used to investigate the roles of various social agents in translation and interpreting. Ethnographic approaches (Fynn, 2010) consider agency and reflexive practices that underscore the subjectivity of individuals involved in or analysing the translation process and context. An ethnographer can adapt and use a mix of methods appropriate to a situation and as a participant observer is socially and physically immersed in the case to accumulate local knowledge, must be constantly self-critical and reflexive to ensure an analytical description and interpretation of the case.

Since there is no universal and general translation theory or approach that can be applied to all translations, and because of differences which have to be investigated within the context of different languages and cultures, in addition to the balance of power between cultures

¹⁰ Since I analyse the poets from former Yugoslavia this applies just for former Yugoslavia.

(Tymoczko 1998), Tymoczko's more recent and non-systems oriented 'cluster concept' of translation (2007/2010/2014)) is useful insofar as it purports not to prescribe in advance what constitutes and does not constitute a translation, thereby providing equal conceptual status to translations from all cultures internationally.). Tymoczko builds on Toury who "opened the way for cultural self-definition within the field of translation studies [...] beyond Eurocentric positions giving permission to self-representation regarding the basic data of translation by people who know it best in their cultures" (Tymoczko in Hermans ed. 2006, 21).

The cluster concept approach to translation also gives a framework for an ethical internationalization of the field of translation studies, allowing for self-definition of translation by all cultures thus far been dominated by Western logocentrism. (Tymoczko 2007/2010/2014, 105)

The cluster concept allows translation theory to include related translations which are very close to the ST and those which are very free, operating 'at the rank of the word' and 'at the rank of the entire text, and so on', inviting a cross-cultural conceptual approach that includes concepts and self-definitions of translation that are marginalized (Tymoczko 2007/2010/2014, 98). This approach seems able to provide a conceptual space where the Romani context can be investigated, including the translational relationship that metaphorically extends to the broader context of 'a people translated'.

1.5 Self-translation

The concepts of translation and equivalence in the Western tradition have undergone many transformations and turns (linguistic, cultural, sociological, etc.) during the formation and history of TS as an academic discipline. Within these turns, an important, recent shift in thought entails reconsidering the practice of self-translation in terms of bilingualism and bilingual writing (Condirgley 2013, Grutman 2013, Hokenson and Munson 2007, Râbacov 2013). Hokenson and Munson suggest that a bilingual person

"designate[s] anyone who, in addition to speaking and writing one language idiomatically, has acquired a high degree of control over the spoken and written forms of a second language and [...] has authored work in both languages." (Hokenson and Munson 2007, 12).

Following Hokenson and Munson (2007, 14) bilingual writers are “authors who compose texts in both languages, and translate their texts between those languages,” being able to “write in both languages with near-native handling of grammar, idioms, discursive registers, and stylistic and literary traditions” (Ibid.). As bilingualism and biculturalism are prerequisites for self-translation and are often a result of exile, migration and displacement (Butler 2013, Williams 2013), they also touch on complex questions of identity. Bilingual writers, i.e. authors-translators, their languages and cultures are constantly and repeatedly in connections, and while using self-translation as strategy they “explore their specific linguistic condition: a bilingual or fragmented identity.” (Tassiopoulos 2011, 43-44). It is a necessity that self-translation can be studied in relation to concepts of language, culture and society.

Self-translation is usually understood and defined in its most basic form as a product and act of translating one’s own writing into another language, i.e. “the translation of an original work into another language by the author himself” which “cannot be regarded as a variant of the original text but as a true translation ([1976]: 19)” (Montini 2010, 306). Thinking about self-translation and self-translator raises many questions such as: what is self-translation, is self-translation a translation, is self-translation a true translation, what terminology use is appropriate, in which way translation would be done if the text was translated by an ordinary translator, what is the value of self-translation, etc.?

Rainier Grutman (2009a) considers that

[t]he term ‘self-translation’ can refer both to the act of translating one’s own writings into another language and the result of such an undertakings.[...] Since self-translation involves an equally important decision, it may prove useful to consider, in addition to the actual use authors make of their languages, the attitudes and feelings they develop towards them. (2009a, 257)

Decision making about the use of languages involves feelings toward them, and feelings to make decision about the use of appropriate terminology. Diversity in the use of terminology in self-translation for texts such as the ‘autotranslation’ and ‘true translation’ that Koller (1979) used made a difference because of the issue of faithfulness and accent changes that may be satisfactory in the autotranslation done by a self-translator, a true translation done by an ordinary translator may bring uncertain reactions from the author (1979, 197). Also, Fitch (1988) made a distinction between ordinary translators and self-translators, claiming that an advantage of self-

translators lies in understanding his/her own intention and the culture of his/her original work better than ordinary translators (Fitch 1988, 125). The other terms such as ‘original’ and ‘self-translation’, or ‘first version’ and ‘second version’ produce diverse understandings and problems faced by self-translators who work from smaller languages:

[...] by seeing their second text (chronologically speaking) granted the status of an entirely new creation, a 'second original', they run the risk of the original version being marginalized, disqualified or even effaced. (Grutman in Cordingley 2013, 75)

In the debate on what is an ‘original work’ and what is a ‘self-translation,’ Raymond Federman in his discussion on Beckett¹¹ says that

*[a]n original creative act (whether in French or in English) always proceeds in the dark...and in **ignorance and error**. Though the act of translating, and especially of self-translating, is also a creative act, it is performed in the light (in the light of the existing original text), it is performed in **knowledge** (in the knowledge of the existing text), and therefore it is performed without error - at least at the start. In other words, the translation of a text reassures, reasserts knowledge, the knowledge already present in the original text. But perhaps it also corrects the initial errors of that text. As a result, the translation is no longer... an approximation of the original, or a duplication, or a substitute, but a continuation of the work, of the workings of the text. (emphasis in the original) (Federman 1987 in Attar 2005, 140).*

Since performed in the light and knowledge self-translation is not considered just as duplication of original, it is continuation of the work, or as another creative work. In that way, self-translation takes away the line or borderline between “original” and “translation” and both texts, build onto each other, and are incomplete if considered as a single version (Fitch 1988), their overlapping content should be regarded together as complementary to each other (Hokenson and Munson 2007), and neither of the two versions should be ignored (Kumakhova 2005, 302). Building onto each other, completing and complementing each other, where the original and self-translation have been in a constant dialogue, has its relevance also in the Romani context. The original text and the self-translation are complementing each other, they are seen as caused by necessity, and the self-translated text needs to revert to the original text, “rebounding from one language to another” (Santoyo 2013, 30) where complementarity is bound in their intertextual dialogues. In that way, “the risk of the original version being marginalized, disqualified or even effaced” (Grutman in Cordingley 2013, 75) is diminished.

¹¹ Samuel Beckett wrote in two languages, English and French. Beckett has been an intriguing subject of literary criticism for more than seven decades, and his work was ignored until the eighties.

Inspired by Bakhtin's¹² theory of dialogism (1981), Hokenson and Munson make dialogic connections within bilingual works, especially in self-translation. They make it clear that texts are involved in a dialogue with other texts and with "those of the literary fields of their reader's languages" (Hokenson and Munson 2007, 198). Each version of the text includes a different audience; therefore, there is a cultural gap between the two (Ibid.).

Investigating the area of overlap between texts Pym (1998) argues that every translator is 'a minimal intercultural' living and working not only the hypothetical gap between languages, and between two cultures, but in the middle of them, combining several language and cultural competencies at once, and constructing a 'contact zone' of overlaps and intersections (Pym 1998, 181). In this 'contact zone' of overlaps and intersections we can find bilingual, bicultural, multilingual and multicultural self-translation and self-translators where questions about identity and translator's subjectivity appear (Robinson 2001).

Autobiographic writings are used for understanding and expressing self-translators identity. Using the opportunity to self-translate, self-translators see their own ability in the same way that a bilingual or multilingual writer uses different languages as a way to present their own experiences. In that way the self-translation is a continuation of the original and can have also an independent status in depend of the readership i.e. audience.

Since national literary traditions do not accept self-translators' specificity, they propose a self-translation approach that accepts "a large definition of bilinguality" in order to recreate "the ambient multilingual conditions of earlier periods, when writers routinely elected to write and adopted dialects and languages, ever widening the compass of the bilingual text and its audiences" (Hokenson and Munson 2007, 211).

When considering the intersection between self-translation text analysis, linguistics analysis and cultural analysis with its original version we see that self-translation is not just a reproduction of the original. It is a complex process which, besides language knowledge, also includes knowledge of writing, use of expressions in both versions, the role of subjectivity and

¹² "Dialogism is the characteristic epistemological mode of a world dominated by heteroglossia. Everything means, is understood, as a part of a greater whole-there is a constant interaction between meanings, all of which have the potential of conditioning others. Which will affect the other, how it will do so and in what degree is what is actually settled at the moment of utterance. This dialogic imperative, mandated by the pre-existence of the language world relative to any of its current inhabitants, insures that there can be no actual monologue. One may, like a primitive tribe that knows only its own limits, be deluded into thinking there is one language, or one may, as grammarians, certain political figures and normative framers of "literary languages" do, seek in a sophisticated way to achieve a unitary language. In both cases the unitariness is relative to the overpowering force of heteroglossia, and thus dialogism. (Bakhtin 1981, 426)

emotions raised upon writing and self-translating, reflections on self and on the other, and the goal that a writer/self-translator has after finishing his/her work.

The questions on subjectivity, identity and self-consciousness on the literary scene turned critical attention to the practice of self-translation, and

[i]t has been insufficiently recognized in literary criticism and even in translation studies, where there is [...] a distinct tendency to overestimate the creative aspect of self-translation. (Grutman and Van Bolderen 2014, 330)

As already said, in self-translation an author has his/her authorship of the work, is in position to decide how its text should be translated, and at the same time he/she is a self-translator who reworks and/or rewrites his/her text, owns intellectually and morally the original text, but also at the same time creates an other original, and has the right to change the original text. According to Santoyo in Cordingley (2013)

[o]nly the author retains the right to change, alter, deform or distort the reflected image inaccuracies, because the 'mirror' is not something foreign to him or her: the author is, de facto, the 'mirror' in which the original looks at itself. (Santoyo in Cordingley 2013, 28).

Self-translation, in terms of process, is “a specific type of language transfer” (Grutman and Van Bolderen 2014, 327).

The first consideration is related to the direction of transfer of the language. Self-translator creates a second version from his/her native language in his/her acquired language, i.e. minority language transferred into national language/s. A very important bidirectionality of a self-translator is created by his/her bilinguality and bicultural background. Also, the transfer of the language can be from the national, majority to the native, i.e. minority language, and from the native, i.e. minority language, to the national, majority language.

The second consideration is the gap of time between an original and its self-translation. Self-translator can transfer his/her text to the second language at the same time while the writing is still in progress in the first language. This transfer of the language is tagged as “simultaneous self-translation” (Grutman 2009, 259). Also, a self-translator can transfer his/her text in the second language later after the text is written or published even in other language/s. This transfer is tagged as a delayed or consecutive self-translation.

In the case of Romani writers, direction of transfer is mostly from minority i.e. native original language to the majority national language. In this work there is an example of the

transfer from national majority language to the minority Romani. In relation to the gap of time, self-translation in my work is mostly simultaneous, but it does not mean delayed or consecutive self-translations are not involved, in a few cases, which was confirmed by the authors in the questionnaire I asked them to answer.

The advantages of self-translation are clear when transferring one's work into the second language; the time needed for finding other translators is saved, i.e. not wasted; self-translators "become their own ambassadors, agents, and even career-brokers" (Grutman and Van Bolderen 2014, 325); a rise in self-consciousness about the perception of one's own text and certainty of one's own translation; native language writers enter through self-translation into a common language where the work might be presented; self-translation can be "a tool for individual self-promotion" (Ibid.).

Also, one of the advantages on self-translation is reflection of the authors' own interpretation of his/her words. It supports the idea that readers should be bilingual and/or multilingual in order to fully understand the author's interpretation of the original language i.e. source text. Also, readers should be aware of the translation as an extension or continuation of original text.

Shortcomings might appear because of the negative treatment by some writers who consider self-translation as a waste of time and absurd; the others censure self-translation as being political in their fight against the marginalization of minority languages, and some are concerned that majority languages will disqualify minority languages. (Ibid.)

The advantages of self-translation in the Romani context beside these listed are: knowledge of spoken regional languages, their awareness of the need to be self-translated in order to be understood by own (Romani) different speaking readers and by other majority readers, and their awareness of their positioning or rather 'lack of positioning' in the major literary canon. Why do Romani poets self-translate? Romani poets/writers are bilingual and/or multilingual and they write bilingually and/or multilingually. Referring to the findings from the questionnaire for authors (see Annex V) the Romani authors are conscious about their own use of language(s) and tend to think they would not be translated well by others or even by other Romani poets, due to historical distrust. Other significant factors for translating bilingually and multilingually include individual self-confidence in one's own writing; differences between dialects, customs and habits; levels of knowledge of Romani; and levels of knowledge of

majority language(s), which depend on individual levels of education. When writing and self-translating their own poems, Romani poets and writers tend to save the prosodic features of the original while exhibiting their cultural, social and political consciousness.

Self-translation in Romani context is translation of an original creative work by the authors themselves where the original and self-translation are constantly complementing each other in an intracultural and in an intercultural dialogue in relation to Romani readers, and at the same time where the original and self-translation are in an intercultural dialogue as two independent creative works in relation to the non-Romani readers.

1.6 Multilingualism

Social and cultural TS critiques on power, political agendas, and international relations have had an important impact on reconceptualizing translation (Williams 2013, 30) and have been increasingly focused on the connection between multilingualism and translation (Grutman 2009, Meylaerts 2006, 2010, Bhatia and Ritchie 2013), in the fields of literary translation, community interpreting, localization, language policy etc. As stated by Meylaerts, “[a]t the heart of multilingualism, we find translation” (2010, 227).

One integral concept to translation and literary multilingualism is heteroglossia¹³ (Grutman 1997) where a “variety of ‘languages’” exist, each of them placing its own perspective on reality. Every individual speaks using some of these varieties, creating the language of work, of song, of poetry; “each speaker/individual may be said to be heteroglot¹⁴ (‘many tongued’)” (Quinn 2006, 196).

¹³ In linguistics, the term *heteroglossia* describes the coexistence of distinct varieties within a single linguistic code. The term translates the Russian *разноречие* [raznorechie] (literally "different-speech-ness"), which was introduced by the Russian linguist Mikhail Bakhtin in his 1934 paper *Слово в романе* [Slovo v romane], published in English as "Discourse in the Novel." Bakhtin argues that the power of the novel originates in the coexistence of, and conflict between, different types of speech: the speech of characters, the speech of narrators, and even the speech of the author. He defines heteroglossia as "another's speech in another's language, serving to express authorial intentions but in a refracted way." It is important to note that Bakhtin identifies the direct narrative of the author, rather than dialogue between characters, as the primary location of this conflict. (Reference.com)

¹⁴ “[A]t any given moment of its historical existence, language is heteroglot from top to bottom: it represents the co-existence of socio-ideological contradictions between the present and the past, between differing epochs of the past, between different socio-ideological groups in the present, between tendencies, schools, circles and so forth, all given a bodily form. These "languages" of heteroglossia intersect each other in a variety of ways, forming new socially typifying "languages." (Bakhtin 1981, 291)

Since the Roma arrived in Europe, at least 80 variations and dialects of the Romani language have developed, and not all of them are mutually understandable (Bakker et al. 2000; Matras 2002), and each has its own perspective in realities where they are spoken, so a certain condition of heteroglossia in Romani writing can be said to exist. The writing of Romani poets also reflects the linguistic status and individual experience of each person living in a different society as a migrant and/or as a minority or ethnic group. Their ‘original’ text complements its ‘self-translated’ text; poems are written with the intention to be read together i.e. reading one version in relation with another - bilingually and multilingually. As such, they “disturb the boundaries of each cultural space” (Simon 2006, 15), but at the same time it also reduces the number of possible readers.

In the Balkans, multilingualism is characteristic not only of many Romani speakers specifically, it is also representative of populations in general. Because Balkan Roma live in multilingual societies, they speak and/or write, read, translate, and/or self-translate multilingually. Despite the many definitions already established for multilingualism, there is one in particular that could be applied in understanding Romani writing and translation. Provided by Wei (*in* Wei and Moyer 2008, 4), it states that “[a] multilingual individual is anyone who can communicate in more than one language, be it active (through speaking and writing) or passive (through listening and reading)[...]”. This definition is useful for conceptually framing a multilingual Romani context.

Interactions between different languages and their role in social life as well as code-switching behaviour can be considered the strengths of multilingualism (Edwards 1994). However, they also open up complex questions of identity and its perception. This is especially true when considering the roles of Romani poets and writers in society (Hancock 2006). Transnational migration brings along major demographic changes, such that nations are more diverse and geographically transformed territorially. It “[...] has resulted in new patterns of migration and post-migration, termed ‘superdiversity’” (Martin-Jones et al. 2012, 7) and which refers to the meshing and the interweaving of diversities (ethnicities, differences, social locations and the paths of various immigrant groups in the 21st century (Ibid.). The various faces of immigration opens up questions of immigrating languages (Backus *in* Bhatia and Ritchie 2013, 719) a context which could be taken into consideration for Roma as historical migrants since they

carry Romani čhib with them (Hancock 2010; Courthiade 1991 and 1998; Matras 2002; Djurić 2010).

Multilingualism in the Romani context is an important lens through which to understand translation on several levels. Neologisms and loanwords always play an important role in the bilingualism and/or multilingualism – “refer[ring] to the coexistence, contact, and interaction of different languages” (Wei 2013)- that characterize their daily lives. In everyday situations, Roma interact with others in different majority society languages, speaking a mixed language which, as noted by Ritchie and Bhatia, reflects a natural aspect of bilingual behaviour (2013, 349). In this way, they unconsciously adapt the majority language as part of their native language. The intersection of languages leads to the use of neologisms and confers a clear element of hybridity to the text in translation (Simon 2011, Wolf 2000, Young 1995).

„Hybridity takes on special importance in context where there is a heightened and historically anchored consciousness of cultural and linguistic mixing. Indeed, both translation and hybridity have become key terms in accounting for the ways in which divided, recovered and reconstructed identities are configured within the wider cultural forums in which they wish to participate. In this sense, both translation and hybridity are alternatives to ideas of assimilation (loss of identity) and multiculturalism (the multiplication of discreet and separate identities)“.
(Simon 2011, 51)

The practice of using loanwords and neologisms reflects the inequality and power that exist between minority and majority society languages, where political influence can create a marginalization of “certain populations” (Simon 2011, 52). This practice is noticeable with Romani language speakers when they use loanwords and neologisms from the majority society, signalling a very strong dominance of majority society on Romani people which, historically, are an ethnic group or minority wherever they reside.

Like bilingual postcolonial authors who are in a space ‘between’ their native language and a colonizer language, Romani bilingual and multilingual writers exist within a space of Romani čhib in contact with other languages through loanwords and neologisms. “Having developed within and across a great number of national and ethnnc boundaries, Romani literature is linguistically hybrid”. (Toninato 2014, 71).

Besides hybridity reflected in Romani writing (non-literary as well as literary), there are models adopted from other literary traditions. Translators and self-translators sometimes adopt models from other literary traditions. For instance, they can choose a form for the TT that looks

and feels like the ST form. Holmes, in his discussion on verse translation, refers to this translation strategy as "mimetic form", saying that although the form may prove strange and unacceptable in the target literary tradition, its introduction could bring in new features that eventually acquire a permanent status in the literary system ("Mimetic Form", Shuttleworth and Cowie 2014, 64). As Pym notes, "Holmes sees these options as being appropriate to different historical situations", with "mimetic form tend[ing] to come to the fore 'in a period when genre concepts are weak, literary norms are being called into question, and the target culture as a whole stands open to outside impulses' (Holmes 1970: 98)" (Pym 2010, 69). Appearances of these types of forms emerge both in Romani writing and translation, in conjunction with the contact language effect that characterises everyday use of the language by Romani users. These forms invite new characteristics in the literary system, and some of them achieve a more permanent status. In my opinion each self-translation is a mimetic form of the Romani original version and also vice versa because of the complementarity of the versions. The feature in Romani writing of using the grammar and orthography of the country of former Yugoslavia (or countries the Roma poets/writers live) already gave Romani written poetry a mimetic form.

However, the differences which are caused by contact language effects interact with translator creativity during the translation process, leading to self-created words that reflect their diverse and subjective life experiences. They guide the different approaches taken to texts and translation by which individual 'norms' are created. As Toury notes, norms "are acquired by the individual during his/her socialisation [...]", "serv[ing] as criteria according to which actual instances of behaviour are evaluated" (Toury 1995, 62). In this sense, the 'norms' for Romani are guided both by the contact language effect that reflects majority-minority power relations, and the degree to which an individual Romani writer integrates the mixed language with his or her own creativity.

Multilingualism has not always been entirely embraced by academic translation studies. Indeed, many of the case studies involving multilingualism in relation to literary creation and translation focus on specific literary strategies. Moreover, as noted by Cenoz and Gorter (in Simpson 2011, 402), the concept of multilingualism has most often been divided into individual and social dimension(s), with a focus on the number of languages involved (more than two), and degrees of fluency ('level of proficiency') in the languages (*Ibid.*). New research on

multilingualism over the past few years has expanded its definition to reflect multilingual realities in a much more comprehensive way. Other categories are being established, some of them also useful for understanding Romani writing and translation in the context of the Balkans. For instance, *metrolingualism*¹⁵ as a product of modern, urban interaction (Otsuji and Pennycook 2010, 245) describes people of different backgrounds and their linguistic diversity, their everyday speech and how their multilingualism functions in different social spaces when walking, talking, joking, eating, buying and selling, no matter what the language in use is (Pennycook and Otsuji 2015, 2). *Metrolingualism*

'describes the ways in which people of different and mixed backgrounds use, play with and negotiate identities through language'. Rather than assuming connections between language and culture, ethnicity, nationality or geography, metrolingualism 'seeks to explore how such relations are produced, resisted, defied or rearranged; its focus is not on language systems but on languages as emergent from context of interaction' (2010, 246) (2015, 14).

Technologies and globalization continue to underscore the multilingual nature of the world at large. While scholars have tended to equate multilingualism and bilingualism negatively “with detrimental effects in cognitive ability” (Cenoz and Gorter in Simpson 2011, 404) and to “define literacy according to monolingual ideologies”, they are now having to revise their understanding of how multilingual individuals actually function. Canagarajah (2013) espouses the notion of ‘translingualism’ which is valorised as an urban and postmodern practice, as a social issue, and as performative (2011), while García and Wei (2014), for example, prefer ‘translanguaging’ an approach which is a variety of multilingual practices that are not just a combination and mixture of two languages but involves creative strategies by language users (Wei 2014). Developing and transforming speaker skills, knowledge, experience and beliefs help to create their new identity as multilingual speakers.

For example, a starting point of translanguaging envisions the language practices of bilingual people as the norm, embracing a vision of ‘third space’ where questions of race, class, and gender can be addressed (Canagarajah 2013; Garcia and Wei 2014). It is also an everyday

¹⁵ “The term *metrolingualism* [...] was originally developed by extending the notion of *metroethnicity* (Maher, 2005) to refer to ‘creative linguistic conditions across space and borders of culture, history and politics, as a way to move beyond current terms such as multilingualism and multiculturalism’ (Otsuji & Pennycook, 2010, 244).” (Pennycook and Otsuji 2015, 14)

practice, where multiple languages are used in the same conversation without the functional separation associated with the use of different languages (Sachdev, Giles and Pauwels 2013).

For Canagarajah (2013),

[...] translingual enables a consideration of communicative competence as not restricted to predefined meanings of individual languages, but the ability to merge different language resources in situated interactions for new meaning construction. [...] [T]he term translingual treats textual practices as hybridizing and emergent, facilitating creative tensions between languages. The term also helps us go beyond the dichotomy mono/multi or uni/pluri.

while for García and Wei (2014),

[b]ilingual [/multilingual] speakers select meaning-making features and freely combine them to potentialize meaning-making, cognitive engagement, creativity and criticality. Translanguaging refers to the act of languaging between systems that have been described as separate[. It] is transformative and creates changes in interactive cognitive and social structures that in turn affect our continuous languaging becoming.

Indeed, numerous terms, as reiterated by García and Wei, are currently being used to indicate the “fluidity of language practices in the world today: crossing, transidiomatic practices, polylingualism, metrolingualism, multivocality, codemeshing, bilanguaging [...]” (Ibid.) This fluidity that tries to express the lack or porosity of borders has implications on how we analyze and critique ‘source’ and ‘target’ texts in translation. From a translingual perspective, and as articulated by Canagarajah, the focus would need to fall on actual practices:

We need to focus on practices rather than forms because the translingual orientation treats heterogeneity as the norm rather than the exception. In monolingual ideologies, meaning is guaranteed by the uniform codes and conventions a homogeneous community shares. When we move beyond bounded communities and consider communication at the contact zone (whether in precolonial multilingual communities or postmodern social media spaces), we are unable to rely on sharedness for meaning. It is practices that help people negotiate difference and achieve shared understanding. [...] Just as these negotiation strategies are developed through socialization in contact zones and multilingual communities, we are also finding that people are bringing certain dispositions that favor translingual communication and literacy. These dispositions –similar to Bourdieu’s concept of habitus– constitute assumptions of language, attitudes toward social diversity, and tacit skills of communication and learning. Examples of such dispositions include an awareness of language as constituting diverse norms; a willingness to negotiate with diversity in social interactions; attitudes such as openness to difference, patience to co-construct meaning,

and an acceptance of negotiated outcomes in interactions; and the ability to learn through practice and critical self-reflection. (Canagarajah 2013)

'Reading', i.e. understanding, a writer's ability to negotiate and maneuver multilingually is critical, as "one important characteristic of the multilingual is the ability to move between different languages", behaving more or less like a monolingual at times, or mixing languages at others (Wei, in Wei and Moyer 2008). They can "adopt the language of the monolingual interlocutor(s) and deactivate their other language(s)" or "access or select words from two languages to produce sentences when in bilingual mode" (Wei on Grosjean, in Wei and Moyer 2008, 13). They can learn to select – through socialization and socially constructed language and cultural practices – certain linguistic resources, and choose "to maintain and change ethnic group boundaries and personal relationships, and construct and define 'self' and 'other' [i.e. identity] within a broader political economy and historical context (Wei, in Wei and Moyer 2008, 13-15). Such is the context of the poets and poems I have selected for analysis.

Bhatia and Ritchie support translanguaging as "natural" to multilinguals (2004, 794). In the case of Romani čhib, Romani people are both additive multilinguals and/or subtractive multilinguals. They adapt other languages but create sentences when "in bilingual mode". While writing and translating in Romani, they mostly use grammar based on majority official language(s), because of the fact that Romani is still not institutionally standardized and accepted by the international Romani community. Within individual societies, they create sentences according to their socially constructed language and cultural practices. They change their ethnic group boundaries and personal relations, and create identity within a broader political, economic and historical context (Wei *in* Wei et al. 2008). Proud of their linguistic heritage, Roma will retain their ability to write in their mother tongue, but "[t]heir literary experimentation should be placed into the context of the multi-/poly-/hetero-/translingual reality" they "inhabit" (Wilson 2011, 137).

Since Romani has not been standardised internationally, just regionally (see Chapter II), various social movements are also taking over language and translation in the Romani community. In the absence of standardisation, translanguaging as a communication practice of Roma, would not be considered a barrier for their literary expression, but it would remain a barrier of education in Romani.

CHAPTER II – THE ROMANI LANGUAGE (ROMANI ČHIB)

This chapter on the Romani language has been envisioned to contextualize the linguistic and cultural information that will be provided in my subsequent discussions on Romani translation within the analytical frameworks of translation studies. As such, it does not have as its purpose to directly and comprehensively engage with the important, detailed linguistic debates underway in Romani studies. Hence, it is necessarily selective, and therefore subjective. In order to take this scholarship into account most thoroughly and productively for my thesis, I have decided to present the linguistic information according to the following criteria. Firstly, information concerning Romani čhib specificities that ultimately influence the production of Romani literature in translation in general will be introduced through discussion points which are relevant to all geographical regions, for example: salient features of the Romani language, standardization, dialects, etc. Secondly, specific information concerning the Romani language in the Balkans, particularly in the former Yugoslavia, will be introduced through scholarship in the region, due to the fact that it currently has the most tangible impact on language and cultural initiatives underway here. In this sense, the information presented serves to contextualize, as underscored by Gideon Toury, the systems in which translation actually occurs and by which definition(s) 'translation' is to be understood within this frame of reference.

[...] translations [must] be regarded as fact of the culture that would host them, with the concomitant assumption that whatever their function and systemic status, these are constituted within the target culture and reflect its own systemic constellation. (Toury 2012, 18)

In line with the first criteria mentioned, my sources will reflect the historical and comparative linguistic work carried out by various international scholars, Roma and non-Roma alike. It is important to understand that the Romani čhib linguistic trajectory is slowly being pieced together on the basis of comparative, historical linguistic research that is taking place in multiple areas of study: Indian languages; Middle Eastern languages (Persian, for example); Byzantine Anatolian and Ottoman histories; and linguistic studies in European, Russian,

Scandinavian, South and North American languages, to name but a few.¹⁶ These studies not only attempt to pinpoint the time and place of the 'birth' of the Romani čhib and its subsequent development in Europe and in diaspora. They also have a direct consequence on the ethnic, or ethno-national, identities of Roma throughout the world. The results of the research affect socio-political situations in terms of the ways Roma groups are perceived and the means by which they can advocate for linguistic and cultural rights. These include, for example, their official¹⁷ or non-official status as minority language or ethnic group with rights to education in their language and translation.^{18/19}

In line with the second criteria mentioned, my sources will reflect Romani scholarship in the region of the former Yugoslavia, where important initiatives concerning standardization are currently underway. Some of this scholarship itself relies on prior historical and comparative linguistic work carried out by international researchers. What is important for our purposes here is the way the research has played a significant role in determining the parameters for the creation, translation and publication of Romani works, and for diverse educational and cultural policies and initiatives for Roma concretely in this geographical area. Throughout the chapter, I will refer to the Romani Macedonian researcher and professor Ljatif Demir and his self-translated bilingual²⁰ publication *Gramatika e romane čhibaki/ Gramatika romskoga jezika* (Demir and Durmiš 2012) in 2012. The work, and its underlying concepts, has served as a textbook at the Faculty of Philosophy in Zagreb, Croatia, where from 2012 to present time have been taught Romani language courses at the Department of Indology and Far Eastern Studies. In addition to

¹⁶Various historians and linguists will be presented throughout the chapter. For further information, see Annex I – Biographical notes.

¹⁷At the present time, Romani is an official language in the Municipality of Šuto Orizari in Skopje, Macedonia.

¹⁸“Romani has been recognized as a minority group and/or language in different places at different historical times. For example, in 1925, the Soviet Union granted the Romani population national minority status and the right to be educated in Romani. In the Americas, Colombia officially recognized Romani as an ethnic group in 1999 and granted status of protection in 2010. Other initiatives have been implemented historically in The Republic of Macedonia, Serbia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Slovenia, Czech Republic, Slovak Republic, Romania, Poland, Hungary, Germany, Austria, the Netherlands, Croatia, Romania, Russia, Norway, Sweden and Finland. Some countries have ratified the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages and included Romani as one of their minority languages.” (Folaron 2011)

¹⁹“Out of the 25 countries that have ratified the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages (ECRML), 15 have officially recognised Romani as a minority language traditionally present on their territory. This is the highest number of ratifications for a single language under the Charter and it reflects, among others, the status of Romani as a European language.” Statement adopted by the Committee of Experts of the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages (ECRML) on 5 November 2015 on the occasion of the International Romani Language Day, <http://www.roma-alliance.org/en/page/182-5th-november--international-day-of-romani-language.html>, Retrieved in November 2015.

²⁰ Romani and Croatian/ also in Macedonian

the theories and research presented in this book, lectures to the students have combined information from the bilingual²¹ *Gramatika e rromane čhibaki/Gramatika romskog jezika* by Rajko Djurić (2005) translated by the Romani poet Ali Krasnići; the bilingual²² *Pravopis romkog jezika* (Djurić 2011) and *Standardizacija romskog jezika* (Djurić 2012) also authored by Rajko Djurić; the English-based Kalderaš dialect²³ language learning textbook *Learn Romani / Das-dúma Rromanes* by Ronald Lee (2005), and dictionaries by various Romani authors²⁴ published in the area of the former Yugoslavia and Canada, used for its compatibility with dialect vocabulary, common loanwords and neologisms, etc.

2.1 Romani čhib – spoken and written

After leaving India (as groups of “proto-” or “pre-” Romani people) most notably around 1000 CE²⁵ and residing in Anatolia in the 11th through 13th centuries, the first Romani groups²⁶ arrived in the Balkans and spread during the 14th–15th centuries (Hancock 2002/2005/2007) in what has sometimes been designated as “the first wave” (CE 2008a) into Europe. The departure from India and move through Anatolia are events interwoven historically with certain calamities and the upheavals and reorganization of societies at all levels during the times of the Ghaznavid, Byzantine Anatolian, Seljuq/Sultanate of Rûm, and early Ottoman empires. From the time of departure from India, the Romani language underwent influences from Greek, Armenian, Turkish, and some Persian and Kurdish. Most recently, historical linguists and historians have provided evidence that the multilingual, multi-ethnic character of the Byzantine Anatolian society in which these first groups had lived helped to forge the earliest Romani identity and to

²¹Romani and Serbian

²²Serbian and Romani

²³English-Romani

²⁴Lee 2010 and 2011; Demir and Demir 2010; Haliti 2011; Krasnići 2012; Petrovski and Kozum 2008; Tahirović-Sijerčić 2010a and 2011/2013; Uhlik 1983

²⁵Earlier dates, between 5th and 7th centuries, have traditionally been proposed. Some linguists include Dom, Rom, and Lom peoples as all belonging to the category of Romani. They argue that the early migrations (5th-7th c.) traditionally cited in Romani Studies literature are Romani. However, others point out the different historical and linguistic trajectories of these groups, and agree that the early migration dates are in reference to the Dom, but not to the Rom who entered Europe, therefore not Romani. Differences of opinion lead some to state that Romani groups spent different periods of time in different regions such as Persia, Armenia, Afghanistan, etc.

²⁶Romani people in Europe appear under different names. Among themselves they are called Rom or Roma, Sinto or Sintura, Manuš or Manuša, Kalo or Kale etc. The name constitutes a label for ethnicity. The meaning of some of these names, like Rom and Manuš, is *man* and their plural means *people*. Other group and subgroup names have derived in relation to the question of Romani origins and the problem of identity. These include, for example, Ashkali, Egyptian, Travelers, etc.

consolidate a common spoken language (*koiné*) that had its roots in a variety of Indian dialects,²⁷ although this evidence is still debated by Matras (Matras 2011) and Halwachs (Zatreanu and Halwachs 2003). By the 15th century Romani groups had migrated into central, western, and eastern Europe (the “second wave” of migration into Europe). In addition to their prior history of dislocation, movement and displacement by war, conflict and power struggles, by the 16th century they began to experience deportations and expulsions within Europe (CE 2008). With time, their presence on the continent began to interest researchers, mostly philologists and linguists who were trying to explain the Romani language and the origins of the Romani people. It is now an established fact that many of the ancestors of Roma²⁸ were originally from India (Djurić 2010, 45; reference to Rüdiger 1782/1990), but also that the long and diverse historical linguistic and cultural trajectories of Romani people have yielded different experiences as lived out through migration. As noted by Hancock (2010a),

While our earliest linguistic, cultural and genetic components are traceable to India, Romanies everywhere essentially constitute a population that acquired its identity and language in the West (accepting the Christian, Greek-speaking Byzantine Empire as linguistically and culturally Western).

Although precise details of the Romani historical timeline are still debated among scholars, some classification and periodization schemes have proven useful as the results of their research have progressed. Classification is often based on the evolving developments in historical and comparative linguistics. For example, Marcel Courthiade (1991) has proposed three historical strata, or waves of migration, based on certain similarities and differences between dialect groups: (i) Balkan-Carpathian-Baltic; (ii) Gurbet-Čergar²⁹ and (iii) Kelderaš-Lovari³⁰. Hancock (2002/2005/2007) has argued for a historical periodization in *Romani: O Teljaripe* (“The Move

²⁷The research on Anatolia has been meticulously presented by Adrian Marsh (Marsh 2008).

²⁸Many of the ancestors of Roma lived in India, but there were never any actual self-denominated Roma in India till some went there from the Middle East or Europe.

²⁹According to Yaron Matras (2008), the Gurbeti dialect reflects an early confluence of Balkan and Vlach dialects. “The Southern Vlach Dialects: These dialects are spoken in Serbia and Montenegro, Croatia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Macedonia, southern Romania, Bulgaria, Greece, Albania, and Turkey. They include the dialects of the Gurbet or Džambazi and groups known by other names such as Kalburdžu and Čergar. [Ill. 2b]”.

³⁰ Cited in Matras (2002, 219): “An elaboration on the model of migration waves is found in Cortiade (1991; also Courthiade 1998), who distinguishes three so-called ‘historical strata’: the Balkan-Carpathian-Baltic wave (Miklosich’s migrations), and within it the subsequent spread, from German territory, of the Sinti dialects into neighbouring territories; the Gurbet-Čergar (or Southern Vlach) migrations from Romania into the southern Balkans; and the Kelderaš-Lovari (or Northern Vlach) migrations from Romania into central, eastern, and western Europe as well as overseas.”

out of India’), *O Aresipe* (‘Arrival in Byzantium and the West’) and *O Buxljaripe* (‘Out into Europe’). I will discuss the linguistic classification in more detail in the section on dialects. Periodization markers have also been created to help explain the stages of the history of the language in terms of research and its application, including for pedagogical objectives. In the Balkans, for example, Demir and Durmiš (2012), basing themselves on Djurić (2005) have proposed that the history of the Romani language be seen through three periods: the pre-scientific period; the scientific period; and the period of reform and creativity. I will present this periodization here.

The first, “pre-scientific” period encompasses all the known texts written on the Romani language between the years 1500 ca. and 1782.

The facts about the oldest known text on the Romani language change in accordance with new discoveries that emerge from investigation and research, and differ in the sources; most cite that

[...] the oldest text was published in 1537 in “The fyrst boke of the introduction of knowledge” by Andrew Borde. (see Annex I) [...] This text contains 15 sentences, and it is clear that the words were noted by someone who did not know Romani; still, nowadays, with a good knowledge of Romani, they can be understood. In 1597 the book “De Literis & Lingua Getarum sive Gothorum, item de notis Lombardicis, quibus accesserunt specimina variarum Linguarum” was published by the author Bonaventura Vulkanikus Brugensi. In a section titled “De Nubianis erroneis, qous Itali Cingaros Appellant eorumque Lingua”, this author notes around 70 Romani words which, as he explained, are from Joseph Scaliger (based on Miklošič.ⁱⁿ Acković 2012, 13-14).³¹

A new reference about the oldest text on the Romani čhib is cited by Yaron Matras in *The Languages and Linguistics in Europe* (2011) that is to say:

The earliest known attestation of Romani has only just recently been discovered in a manuscript dating from around 1515 composed by Johannes ex Grafing, who may have collected his material in Vienna (Knauer 2010). A text published by Andre Borde in 1542 contains sample phrases in Romani thought to have been collected in England or France. The earliest known attestation from the Balkans is in the travel diary of Evliya Qelebi from 1668 (Friedman and Dankoff 1991).

³¹ “The copy of this text is located in Museum of Romani culture in Belgrade.” (my translation, Acković 2012); online sources can be found here: <https://archive.org/details/fyrstbokeintrod01boorgoog> [*Fyrst Boke...*]; <http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k930027/f118.image.r=.langEN> [*De literis...*]. Retrieved 02.2017.

The second, “scientific” period begins notably with the publication of the article

[...] “*On the Indic language and Origin of the Gypsies*” from the German author Johann Christian Christoph Rüdiger (1782). During this period, new views developed on the Romani language because of the development of comparative Indo-European linguistics. (Demir and Durmiš 2012, 11)

It is the “first published work that postulates an Indian origin of the Romani language and its connection to languages of the Indian subcontinent such as Hindi and Bengali.” (Pereltsvaig 2012; see also Matras 2002). Research on the Romani language would grow throughout this period largely thanks to contributions from the linguists and scholars who lived and worked in the 19th century: George Borrow; Alexandros Paspatis; August Friedrich Pott, Franz Miklošič; Heinrich von Wlislocki, and others³². During this time, it was determined that the Romani language is related to Sanskrit (Clébert 1967, 223-234; Djurić 1987, 267; see also Pereltsvaig 2012), in India, which would lead later scholarship to confirm that it belongs to the Indo-Aryan sub-branch of the Indo-Iranian branch of the Indo-European language family, [and is [...] one of the [New-]Indo-Aryan³³ diaspora languages³⁴ almost exclusively spoken outside of the Indian subcontinent (Halwachs *et al.* 2013).

Since it is an Indian language, it shares its earliest and most basic words with other languages in India: the Romani word *pani* meaning “water” for example, is exactly the same in Hindi, Panjabi, Nepali, Bengali, Marathi, Sindhi, Gujarati and fifty other Indian languages (Hancock 2002/2005/2007, 9).

Meanwhile in 1888, the Gypsy Lore Society was founded in Great Britain. It had as its object to study Gypsy cultures³⁵, and produced a great deal of material that tended to reflect a non-Roma folkloric perspective of Romani culture. Its most well-known publication was the *Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society*.

The third period of “reform and creativity” is one that began to recognize the need to explain and research the Romani language in a more in-depth way. In the Balkans/former

³² Borrow 1841, 1851 and 1874; Paspatis 1861 and 1870; Pott 1844 and 1846; Miklosich 1872-1881 and 1874; von Wlislocki 1994.

³³ New-Indo-Aryan (NIA) languages had only two genders (unlike the Old- and Middle-Indo-Aryan), which is the case for Romani.

³⁴Uhlik 1983, 12; Halwachs *et al.* 2013, 3; Hancock 2002/2005/2007, 9; Kochanowski 1989, 192

³⁵ The organization later extended its study to travellers, as its mission statement now reflects: <http://www.gypsylorociety.org/>.

Yugoslavia, this third period was marked first by a Symposium on the language and culture of the Roma in Sarajevo in 1986³⁶. For our geographical context, three events are particularly worthy of note.

(i) First, differences in the use of letters and alphabets were recognized on the basis of comparative studies of Romani dialects, which was acknowledged by the Commission for the standardization of the language of the Roma in Serock, Poland in 1990, within the framework of the Fourth World Romani Congress (Demir and Durmiš 2012, 11)

(ii) Second, after this Congress, the Commission on the Romani language composed of Roma and non-Roma linguists took place in Skopje, Macedonia in 1992.³⁷ One of its aims was to agree on general principles of the Romani language on the basis of phonetics based on the Romani language of the region (Macedonia, Bulgaria, Serbia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, Croatia and Slovenia). These principles also addressed the transcription and transliteration of the Romani language written in the Cyrillic alphabet (used in Macedonia, Serbia, Bulgaria and Montenegro) into the Latin alphabet, which was used not only in these countries but in other countries as well.³⁸

(iii) Third, a regional conference on the process for standardisation of the language was held in Sarajevo in 2010 and ended up in 2012.³⁹ It addressed the dialects, and included participants from the former Yugoslavia. Most prominent during this process were the contributions by Rajko Djurić, who subsequently published his work in the book *Standardisation*

³⁶ (Demir and Durmiš 2012, 11); Sarajevo Institute for Studying National Relationships, *Romani language and culture* (Sarajevo, Institut za proučavanje nacionalnih odnosa, 1989), XVIII –XIX; “The Sarajevo Institute for Studying National Relationships organized The International Scientific Assembly: Romani Language & Culture from June 9th to June 11th in Sarajevo-Ilidža. [...] The Collection, for the most part, contains fifty reports and statements written by researchers of the Romani language and culture from Yugoslavia and twelve other countries: India, Italy, Greece, Hungary, Rumania, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Spain, Great Britain, France, German Democratic Republic, United States of America.” I attended this Symposium, where the first radio program titled “Lačno djive, Romalen!” [Good afternoon Roma/People!] was produced live as a gala finale of this event. At that time, in 1986, I was the first graduate journalist of Romani origin in former Yugoslavia; I edited and moderated the bilingual radio program in Romani and Serbocroatian.

³⁷ Codification is intended for teaching the Romani language as a school subject in the Republic of Macedonia. (Demir and Durmiš 2012, 22)

³⁸ Discussions are also ongoing concerning local majority languages in post-Yugoslavia, with which Romani is in contact.

³⁹ Conference “Romani language, history and culture – yesterday, today, tomorrow” was held and organized by the Romani information centre Kali Sara first time in June 2010 in Sarajevo because of a need expressed by all participants to standardize the Romani language at the regional level in order to get the Romani language included as a subject in the national teaching curriculum.

of the Romani language during the same year.⁴⁰ The standardization process and its acceptance are not yet fully endorsed by all Romani language experts in the region due to the unequal involvement of all participants in the region of former Yugoslavia, some of whose requests have gone unheeded. The question of standardization of the Romani language continues to be a divisive one, and reflects not just the problems of politics in terms of minority languages and cultures, and their representation, but also discrepancies of Romani experts and their involvement in the language politics.⁴¹

a. Spoken, written or conversational language – what is the ‘proper’ language?

Before embarking on a discussion about standardization of the language, it is helpful to know a few basic facts about the Romani čhib overall. Roma people speak in various dialects⁴², with many mutually intelligible aspects when spoken in conversation. The “basic issue of the Romani čhib is the usage of diverse orthography, as well as diversity in phonological expressions” (Demir and Durmiš 2012, 21-22). The development of any language, including Romani, depends on socio-economical development and political changes in a country, and the language issue is a matter of identity and power.

Linguistically, it is largely a synthetic language⁴³. Matras, Bakker and Kyuchukov (1997, xi) provide a brief description of the Romani language as a ‘grammatical unity’, in terms of its unity despite diversity:

⁴⁰ Djurić 2012. This work states recommendations on the proper use of the Romani written language. It has resulted, in 2013, in the adoption of the recommendations for guidelines to teach standard Romani in the educational system in Serbia. The Institute for the advancement of education approved the certified program Standardization of the Romani language for school years 2014/2015 and 2015/2016. (Information provided by Marija Aleksandrović in September 2014 at the IATIS Regional Workshop in Novi Sad, Serbia, and by Ljuan Koka, a director and leader of the Center for education of Roma and ethnic communities and a partner of the National Roma Council of Serbia, through email correspondence on 29.09.2014.)

⁴¹ This situation is a delicate one.

⁴² As noted by David Crystal (2010), “one of the most difficult theoretical issues in linguistics is how to make a satisfactory distinction between language and dialect” – the “criterion of mutual intelligibility works much of the time; but, unfortunately matters are not always so simple”; “one common problem with this criterion is that dialects belonging to the same language are not always mutually intelligible in their spoken form.” The distance analysis of Courthiade and the historical sociolinguistic descriptions of Matras show there exist a large cluster of overlapping Romani dialects which are mutually intelligible to educated speakers. But equally they show there are a minority of dialects called Romani which do not fall within this cluster.

⁴³ “[...] In favour of the statement that Romani is basically a ‘synthetic’ language only supplemented by analyticity, is the elaborate and differentiated Romani morphology. [...] In the ‘synthetic’ types, grammatical meanings are formally expressed in the frame of a polymorphemic word unit together with a lexical meaning. [...] The opposing word structure principles of cumulation and glutination are crucial for determining the typological character of a ‘synthetic’ language.” (Elšik 1997, 28-29)

Romani morphology is best characterized by a delicate balance of inflective features inherited from Older Indo-Aryan, agglutinative features which parallel some of the later developments in Modern [New] Indo-Aryan and in Modern Indo-Iranian as a whole, and a more recent tendency towards analytic formation characterized by structural renewal and the grammaticalization of items of Indo-Aryan stock. These processes which involve inherited Indo-Aryan morphology partly overlap with grammatical borrowing of unbound, semi-bound, and in some cases bound morphemes from the European contact languages.

The core Romani čhib has two genders (feminine, masculine), two numbers (singular, plural), and eight cases: nominative, genitive, dative, accusative, vocative, instrumental, locative, and ablative. It has no infinitive. A number of its sounds have been imported from majority society languages⁴⁴. It is often referred to as a “contact language” (Matras 2002) due to the fact that the ‘inherited lexicon’ would expand upon contact with other languages and manifest itself as a multitude of dialects. While there is sometimes considerable dialectal variation, the core vocabulary of many dialects is more or less one in common, and can be compared in many dictionaries published around the world.⁴⁵

The concept of ‘core’ is important in terms of the Romani čhib. This core vocabulary is considered to be shared across the dialects (Hancock 2010; Matras 2002; Halwachs, Klinge and Schrammel 2013). As noted by Hancock (2010, 57),

[although] «any originally acquired characteristics [the dialects] [...] might still share, which constitute the genetic, linguistic and cultural so-called ‘core of direct retention’ are greatly outweighed by characteristics accreted from the non-Romani world, [...] reunification (or more accurately, unification) movement[s] seek –as I do myself– to emphasize the original, shared features of each group rather than those acquired from outside which separate them [...].

Matras (2002, 21-25) and others also refer to the ‘core’ and ‘inherited lexicon’:

The Early Romani legacy amounts to around 1,000 lexical roots, beyond which Romani dialects each show various layers of lexical borrowings from individual European languages. The total number of pre-European lexical roots found in all dialects of Romani put together is estimated at around 800, though this number is rarely found in any single variety of the language. In addition, there are between 200 and 250 shared lexical roots of

⁴⁴ The term “majority society language” is used in Romani studies literature to refer and to describe the society and language(s) with which Romani is in contact. Romani is always considered to be a minority language, one whose development has been intertwined with the languages (and issues) of the individual societies in which Romani dialects are in contact with.

⁴⁵ See footnote 13.

Greek origin. Of the 800 shared pre-European items, we find alongside the Indo-Aryan core around 70 Iranian and perhaps some 40 Armenian roots [...]. The original Indo-Aryan component in the Romani lexicon thus amounts to somewhere between 650 and 700 roots, though figures may differ considerably for individual dialects. [...] There are several possible interpretations of the notion of inherited lexicon in Romani. A broad view might include shared items of Byzantine Greek etymology, and so allow 'inherited' to correspond to the Early Romani period. [...] By far the largest loan component in the inherited Romani lexicon is the Greek layer. [...] The second largest contingent of pre-European loans comes from Armenian. [...] [M]odern Romani linguistics has often failed to take into account the strong Greek and Armenian presence in Anatolia in previous centuries. Elsewhere (Matras 1996b) I have suggested that the Persian, Kurdish, Armenian, and indeed even the earlier Greek components could in principle have been acquired in close geographical proximity to one another, namely in eastern and central Anatolia."

Halwachs, *et al.* (2013) brings the position of Romani into a broader context:

From a structural point of view Romani may be described as a heterogenous cluster of varieties with a homogeneous core – a common morphology and a common lexicon- but without any generally accepted homogenizing standard. The latter is often perceived as a shortcoming but relates to the vast majority of the languages of the world. Only 2-3% of the approximately 6-7,000 languages have developed a generally accepted standard. First and foremost, a standard is a means of administration which is developed by a politically, economically and culturally dominant group to control and rule a territory inhabited by different groups of speakers. On the one hand, a dominant group imposes a standard on dominated groups, on the other hand, dominated groups take over the standard to participate in political power. Roma never have dominated over territories and ruled over others and consequently their language has not developed a standard variety: a 'fate' Romani shares with the majority of the languages of the world.

In its proposed standard form, the Romani language comprises between 34 and 38 sounds, and its alphabet derives from its phonetics. In the dialects of the Romani language, there is a slight variation in the number of sounds, and differences in the pronunciation of a single sound can be found in some of the diverse dialects. The Romani language has its own dynamics, and is influenced by various local, regional and national languages and dialects spoken in the particular countries where Roma live. The grammatical structure of the Romani language can be distinguished by observing the way dialects are used in diverse speech communities.

Despite the many differences in speech (dialects), the Romani language is one and the same distinctive language and only at first glance it may seem that the diversity is endless and unsystematic. These differences are mainly in phonetics and phonology, or in various embodiments of Romani sounds in individual speech patterns. (Demir and Durmiš 2012, 23)

The importance of both the written and spoken forms of the language in relation to a literary language for Roma cannot be underestimated. The distinction has to be made from conversational language. Aspirations for a literary language require some effort. Romani people tend to tread lightly on this ground for want of ease and convenience, and so the conversational language that they have learned to speak is unconsciously most prevalent in our communities. The difficulty is compounded due to geographical segmentation, separations among speech communities, and to the conditions in which many are obliged to live in their communities. The lack of education and of possibilities to learn in one's own Romani language reinforces the problems, and many individuals do not consider it worthwhile to have a literary and standard language.

Speakers of the language dialects use conversational Romani čhib automatically, just as they have learned it in their communities, and they do not pay attention to the pronunciation of certain sounds, stress, forms, or to syntactic or other grammar relationships. Instead, they compensate for these shortcomings by mime and gestures, and by switching to another language, the language of the majority community in general. If misunderstandings occur, the problem is compensated for because the interlocutor is present in the conversation. With education and the development of language and culture, one can surmise that both literary and colloquial languages among Roma will gradually converge. In order to achieve effective communication, and for the literary language to successfully fulfill its mission, Roma will need to uphold certain standards, at least in certain geographical areas. This is the goal that has been set out for Romani language education and use in the Balkans, which fits suitably within the period of reform and creativity mentioned earlier. Despite the European Parliament and other European bodies call for practical measures on member states for *“increasing the number of Roma teachers and ensuring the protection of the language and identity of Roma children by making education available in their own language”*, (Matras 2013, 19), despite increased number of translations, folklore collections, and scholarly studies, the educational situation has not improved (Friedman, 2003, Matras 2013). There is no interest by authorities to improve the situation and also no sufficient communication with the Romani community (Halwachs et.all 2013).

b. Romani čhib and its identity

When it comes to the relationship between language and identity, the terminological phrases of language/linguistic identity should be clearly distinguished from the identity of the language [...] The first relates to the speakers [...] and means language in identity[...] and basically boils down to ethnic origin incarnate in their native language, [...] while the other concerns the very language, compared to their identity, which would be the identity in the language. (Bugarski 2010, 20-21)

Language is one of the main factors of identity for people and their culture. When Romani migration moved from India, through Anatolia, and onward towards Europe, other words from other languages were adapted and incorporated into the vocabulary. Tracking these words has helped to create a map of early Romani migration and to reconstruct the routes that were taken while families and communities moved.

The presence of many words adopted from Persian (for example *baxt* ‘luck’) and some from Kurdish (*vurdon* ‘wagon’) show that the migration must have passed through Iran; Armenian and Greek words (such as *kočak* ‘button’ and *zumi* ‘soup’) show passage through what is now Turkey; Slavic and Romanian words (*dosta* ‘enough’ and *raxuni* ‘smock’) indicate a presence in the Balkans (Hancock 2002/2005/2007, 9).

The Romani language matrix, with its Indo-European origins, binds multiple populations of millions of people in many areas of Europe and beyond, and this community has maintained its identity globally despite influences from other languages such as Greek, Romanian, Slavic and others.

Languages differ according to their area of distribution. The Romani čhib has its own language practice in the wider geographical area, but it will only show its full literary-aesthetic and conceptual potential once it evolves culturally. Today, the Romani language is one which goes beyond national boundaries, and it testifies to the unusual, nomadic culture that has been inherited from the past. However it is alive and evolves in conditions of modern civilization, which is very characteristic of the evolution of European civilization as well. The Romani čhib has existed for over 1,000 years and continues to exist even today, despite the fact that there are no governmental institutions to protect, study and validate it. For it to expand, the Romani language and its language identity will need to be protected by state and government bodies and international institutions, as well as by support of Romani communities.

c. The problem of standardization

The linguistic emancipation of the Roma worldwide has been grown rapidly but much more advancing in the Balkans where Romani speakers mostly live. They have become aware of the need for standardization of the language by themselves, in the context of their own lives, their increased education, development of writing and publishing in Romani. Publishing in Romani is mostly possible just in the frame of Romani non-governmental organizations. Romani speakers and writers often accept the endeavour with great enthusiasm, but uncertainty because of the use of different Romani script/s and orthography and for them preferred Romani dialect/s very often goes into disagreement and disunity. Their disunity creates a very good space for the linguists manipulation which as a power instrument toward Romani authors/writers gives an opportunity to be published and largely distributed. With other words, publishing opportunity convinces Romani authors/writers to follow powerful linguist/s scripts and orthography. In that way there have been established many groups of followers who are gathering around different linguists who with their disagreement bring in a doubt not just the Romani writers but also the official support so that systematic and methodological preparation for implementation of proposed version/s of standardization tends to be weak.

The most significant steps with regard to the standardization of the Romani language were taken with: (i) Resolution 7/1990 of the International Romani Union, which was adopted in Warsaw and signed by seventeen linguists from around the world⁴⁶ and (ii) the Declaration of General Principles of Codification of the Romani language, which transpired in Skopje in 1992, and which was drafted by Šaip Jusuf, Victor A. Friedman and Donald Kenrick (Demir and Durmiš 2012; 496-497).

There have been other movements calling for standardization at the international level, as for example the team headed by Marcel Courthiade and Rajko Djurić while at the Fourth International Congress of Roma in Poland (Zatreanu and Halwachs 2003, 10).⁴⁷ Up to now, however, the global Romani community at large has not been accepting of its proposals for various reasons, including the impracticability of implementing a linguistic International

⁴⁶ (Demir and Durmiš 2012, 11); The linguists-participants who signed the Resolution 7/1990 on 7.04.1990 are: ing. Sait Balić, dr. Rajko Djurić, prof. Georgi Demeter, prof. Šaip Jusuf, Mozes Heinschink, Andrej B. Lewkowicz, pr. Ignacy Danka, prof. Rene Gsell, Leksa Manuš, A. Joshi, Iliaz Šabani, S.K. Thakar, Marcel Courthiade, Ian Hancock, Daroczi Agnes, prof. Tadeusz Pobożiak and prof. Lew Czerenkov. UNESCO member participant: Viktor Koptilow. (Courthiade *et al.* 2009)

⁴⁷ See Annex VI “Decizia Romane čhibaki” with its English translation.

Phonetic Alphabet-based, supra-dialectal system of orthography as the international alphabet for Romani everywhere. There continues to be constant debate by researchers and scientists on this subject.

The use of the Design-Romani⁴⁸ by Courthiade after its recognition as the official Romani standard in the context of the Fourth Romani World Congress in April 1990 in Warsaw has shown its mobilising-rallying function. In the years after, the proponents of the decision have used the conventions defining the criteria for the implementation of a written language set by the Warsaw decision and also the neologisms in internal papers as well as in publicly obtainable publications, such as the Rromani Uniaquoro Lil, the newspaper of the Romani Union which is published irregularly (Zatreanu and Halwachs 2003, 13).

At the same time, an increasing sense of ethnocentrism associated with using certain Romani dialects has contributed to creating obstacles in the process of standardization, a fact that is noticeable when observing various language initiatives. Generally speaking, however, initiatives for standardization of the Romani language carried out in 1990, 1992, and in 2012, have paid more attention to Romani language planning, especially in terms of corpus planning, including graphitization, standardization and modernization. Corpus planning⁴⁹ brings the problem of standardization and modernization of literary Romani, as well as terminology and translation, to the fore.

Corpus planning in the context of the Charter (CE 1998) is mainly related to translation and terminological activities (i) supporting the role of the language in the media and the courts and (ii) aiming at the maintenance and development of administrative, commercial-economic, social, technical or legal terminology (cf. Art. 9 and 12). These measures directed at the training of minority language teachers and the availability of minority language education also imply (a concern for) corpus planning issues.” (Darquennes 2011, 551)

⁴⁸ “Increasing the prestige of the language by the adoption of lexemes from high-prestige languages applying the integration morphology represents one of the global strategies for the expansion of Romani. Another strategy applies the derivation and composition morphology. See two examples from the design Romani by Courthiade: Instead of using *internacionalo* 'international' the word *maškarthemutno* is used. This lexeme consists of *maškar* 'between' and the adjective *themutno* deriving from *them* 'country, state' and as a consequence it is to be considered a loan translation. In the meantime this positive example for expansion from the substance of the language starts to assert itself on an international level – *maškarthemutne*. *Xurdelin* 'kindergarten, nursery school' which similarly has been created from the substance of the language, on the other hand, is an unfortunate neologism. The plural *xurde* used as a noun of the adjective *xurdo* 'tiny' is often used for 'small change, coins', sometimes for 'children'. The derivation suffix *-lin* makes fruit trees from fruits, such as *phabalin* 'apple tree' from *phaba* 'apple'. The question whether 'small change tree' or 'children tree' has asserted itself is easily answered: *Xurdelin* in which meaning it might have, is only used, if at all, by real hardliners of this design-project.” (Zatreanu and Halwachs 2003, 12).

⁴⁹“Corpus planning goals, according to the policy planning approach, are a codified variety with a consistent writing system, a grammar and a dictionary. Status planning claims an official or rather formal status which allows the use of the codified variety in public domains, first of all in the media and in education. Functionally such initiatives target language revival, maintenance, and/or reacquisition and – with respect to corpus planning – they primarily aim at modernisation.” (Halwachs 2011, 8)

Corpus planning, however, omits the problem of status planning which is mostly a question of powerful majority politics. Majority language/s are nationally represented and respected while minority languages and their function/s in society should be brought to an equal level of respect. This is an especially difficult and sensitive topic currently in the Balkans, where the post-1990s period is characterized by languages being associated with ethnicities, with new national boundaries (countries of former Yugoslavia), religion, etc.

Majority and dominant politics of diverse countries are not the only ones responsible for the planning of the Romani čhib; Romani linguists are as well even though they have the status of the dominant Romani elite. Equally problematic is the struggle for domination by individual dialects, where some claim that their dialects are the only ones deemed representative and standard.

Another type of planning is acquisition planning⁵⁰, which refers to how use of the Romani čhib and its continuity in the family and Romani community is interrupted, and where priority is given to focusing on dialectal differences and on the cultural (traditional and customs) differences that separate them instead of bringing them together to increase the number of Romani čhib users.

Actually, codification, normalization and standardization processes, all part of the usual initiatives in language planning, are still underway (Courthiade and Reymiers 2005; Hancock 1995; Matras 2002; Karanth 2010). A literary Romani language does not yet exist due to the problem of standardization⁵¹, and authors and writers tend not to write in a literary Romani language any more but in a dialect of the language.

There is an important argument to be made for standardizing the Romani čhib. Most significantly, it would help to “[...] strengthen the identity of Roma, encourage[e] their integration and [serve as] an efficient means of protection against assimilation. [In terms of policy-making] [t]his process could be implemented in accordance with the rights and freedoms of Roma in Europe, particularly within the context of the European Charter on the Protection of

⁵⁰“Formal status and acquisition planning objectives, the official use of a Romani variety in education, the media, and other public domains are subject to political conditions or rather to the attitude of the majority towards minorities, in particular Roma.” (Halwachs 2011, 11)

⁵¹ Many literary languages accommodate dialect variation, notably English. The attempt to impose an imitation of the Academie française on the Romani people would probably fail. It is important to note that arguments for and against standardisation can be made, and that it is a contested issue in the Romani context. Successful literary writers can play a role in standardising usage of the language.

Regional and Minority Languages, which has been ratified by many European countries” (Djurić 2012, 39).⁵²

[...] discussion under the heading “Standardisation and Codification” has a focus on language planning and tries to demonstrate that Romani cannot be developed on the basis of the experience of emancipation. Regarding the still controversial discussion about standardisation, it has to be stressed that any initiative for the promotion of the Romani language has to be perceived as a major contribution to the emancipation of Roma in public life and education. Any improvement in the status of Romani through its expansion into formal public domains of usage is highly welcome. Such initiatives are fully in line with the Council of Europe's strategy to support the Roma in their efforts to integrate into society on an equal basis (Halwachs et al. 2013, 2).

The Romani language has undergone some standardization in other ways, mainly through dictionaries that have already been published, particularly those which include an organized section of the principles and recommendations for grammar in a clear, synoptic way. Although this is an important step, it is vital to ensure that every individual Rom realizes, as do individuals of other nations and languages, that use of a literary language means that certain phonetics, scripts, words and grammatical relationships cannot be used at will, because then no effective communication will ensue. It is also important to point out that translation plays a necessarily active role in the creation of a formal literary Romani language.

Formal written Romani, above all, has symbolic functions with only marginal communicative ones. The overwhelming majority of texts are translations from majority languages into Romani. Different Romani dialect translations of Bible⁵³, official national reports and documents are provided with explicit purposes. Their main purpose is to highlight the ability of Romani to function in these contexts, to satisfy requirements for translation in minority languages, to satisfy requirements given by high level European officials to support the struggle for socio-cultural equality of the Roma, to make visible and to symbolize the will, need or demand for the sociopolitical integration of the Roma, etc. (Ibid.) These translations in Romani do not have effects just on the majorities but also on the Roma. In translation is demonstrated the

⁵² Standardization is a problematic issue because it can be argued that standardization initiatives also have the effect of marginalizing vernaculars.

⁵³ “The oldest printed Bible translation in a Gypsy language is the translation of the Gospel of Luke into Caló. This translation was published in 1837. [T]ranslations of the Act of the Apostles into Czech Romani (1936); translations of the Gospel John into Lettish Romani (1933), into Sinto (1930), Finnish Romani (1971) and Slovak Romani (1997) [...]” (Bakker and Kiuchukov 2000, 98).

value of Romani čhib which ‘consequently strengthens the identification with their own language and culture’ (Zatreanu and Halwachs 2003, 13).

2.2. Romani dialects

The importance of plurality is rooted in the fact that both Romani identity and Romani as a language of socialization are linked to local and regional varieties or dialects. (*Ibid.*)

The languages and nations constituting the environment in which Roma live have strongly influenced the Romani čhib which has been transformed and has developed in relation to the languages used by Roma during extended stays in different areas. Distinguishing a ‘language’ from a ‘dialect’ is a very difficult theoretical issue in linguistics, especially when dialects belong to the same language and despite not being understandable to one another (Crystal 2010) as in same cases of Romani čhib.

Significant changes are primarily reflected in the creation of new words. Such a large number of foreign words have been incorporated into the Romani, that now it is very difficult to determine which are of Romani and non-Romani origins. Because Romani čhib is split into a number of dialects⁵⁴, due to the time that has elapsed from when the dialects were closer in contact with one another, the neologisms and loanwords from other languages pose an obstacle for comprehension between various groups of Roma⁵⁵, especially in certain subject domains and in more nuanced or sophisticated styles of writing. Some linguists have proposed a special terminology for these levels of grammar and vocabulary in Romani, whereby the earliest level (or ‘core’) can be classified as “thematic” and later accretions, grammatical transformations and vocabulary are referred to as “athematic”.

Thematic vocabulary is common to all Romani dialects, and it is the athematic loanwords from other languages that make one dialect different from another. As a dialect loses more and more of its original thematic vocabulary and replaces it with foreign adoptions, so it becomes less and less easily understood by speakers of other dialects. (Hancock 2002/2005/2007, 150)

⁵⁴ Opinions on the number vary from 60 to 80 dialects. (Folaron 2011)

⁵⁵ Different obstacles emerge depending on the geographical area where Roma live, their religions, their economic and social status, and ways of life. In the context of my region, Roma have migrated from the Balkans, and there is the presence of the Muslim Roma population. Other researchers note that modern Internet Romani and church Romani are showing evidence of a convergent Romani that is synonym rich (for example, Kompetri/Ordinatori) precisely because it does not discard alternatives from different dialects, nais/perikerav [I thank]; irisaripe/atweto [answer]; džuvdipe/trajo [life], vačaripe/duma [speech, talk]!

Matras (2002) notes that these terms are inspired by Indo-Aryan linguistics. However, they have special significance for Romani, especially in terms of reconstructing the historical trajectory of the language, and its use in current language learning. It is also interesting to note the metalinguistic differences that arise between different intellectual traditions in different languages when speaking about Romani language research.

[...] 'thematic status' pertains to the split in the morphological treatment of pre-European vocabulary and European loans. The morphological patterns that apply to pre-European vocabulary and to some early European loans have been labelled 'thematic'. The thematic grammatical formants are mainly of Indo-Aryan stock. By contrast, subsequent loans receive so-called 'athematic' morphology, largely borrowed from Greek as well as from later contact languages. This terminology appears by now to be well-established at least in recent Anglophone works on Romani linguistics [...], while most German-language publications seem to avoid the term, referring instead simply to morphological distinctions between 'inherited' and 'borrowed' vocabulary (Matras 2002, 73).

Rajko Djurić⁵⁶, in his *Standardization of the Romani language*, mentions that Romani dialects in the Balkans and former Yugoslavia [Slovenia, Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbia, Kosovo, Montenegro and Macedonia] contain incomparably more identical, similar and common elements, than those that are mutually different [...] (Djurić 2012, 39). This analysis does not differ from that of Yaron Matras in *The Languages and Linguistics in Europe* who states that

Once speakers adjust to a monolingual mode of discourse⁵⁷, it is generally possible for Romani speakers east of the Great Divide (from Greece to the Baltics) to understand one another, while the (much smaller) population of speakers to the west of the Great Divide speak dialects that are more fragmented (Matras 2011, 268).

The close similarities between the Slovenian, Croatian, Bosnian, Serbian, Montenegrin, and Macedonian languages themselves have helped maintain these common elements in the Romani dialects influenced by them. The common elements are rooted in Slavic loanwords, a

⁵⁶ See Annex I for further information.

⁵⁷ Typical isoglosses that divide the Romani-speaking landscape pertain to the status of prothetic segments (*j-ov*, *v-ov*, vs. *ov* 'he', *a-sa*, vs. *sa-* 'to laugh'), palatalisation and affrication (*tikno* vs. *cikno* 'small', *g* vs. *dži* 'soul', *geljas* vs. *gejas* 'gone'), the distribution of a set of lexical variables, and reduction and analogical formations within morphological paradigms. Yaron Matras, *Romani*, In *The Languages and Linguistics of Europe*, A Comprehensive Guide, eds. Bernd Kortman and Johan van der Auwera (Göttingen: Walter de Gruyter GmbH&Co.KG. Berlin/Boston, 2011), 268.

very important fact which must be taken into account when analysing translation practices and phenomena in this region.

Dialectal classification for Romani has been portrayed through various typologies, and, as stated in Matras (2005, 9), most “[...] ha[ve] [their] roots in Miklosich’s (1872-1880) comparative survey and historical discussion” which “was based on a reconstruction of the migration routes of the Romani groups that had left the southern Balkans.” Chronologically, after Franz Miklošič⁵⁸, the second most influential classification is Gilliat-Smith’s (1915) distinction between Vlax [Vlach] and Non-Vlax dialects (Matras 2002, 219), which was used as a basis for Kochanowski’s (1963-4) and others’ work. The distinction principally refers to the groups of dialects that emerged historically under a greater influence from the Romanian language. More recently, Bakker’s (1999) four-way classification has also been cited and used often: Balkan (or Southern), Vlax (or Danubian), Northern, and Central (*Ibid.*, 221-222). Matras⁵⁹ (2002), pinpointing the historical centre of Romani population diffusion as having taken place in the Balkans, further divides the "Balkan" group into two sub-groups, i.e. the “default” Balkan dialect – Southern Balkan I – and a distinct sub-group called Southern Balkan II in Boretzky’s (1999) terminology, with the latter comprising the Drindari, Bugurdži and Kalajdži dialects (Matras 2005b); the “Vlax” into Southern and Northern Vlax dialects; and the “Central” group into Northern and Southern Central (Matras 2002, 6-9). Finally, Pereltsvaig (2012, 36) notes five major dialect groups: Balkan, Baltic, Carpathian, Sinte, and Vlax.

Romani dialects are not all equally preserved.⁶⁰ The Balkans represents a complex historical linguistic situation. Matras (2002) expounds on this situation in some detail:

For the period that follows Early Romani and the decline of Greek as the principal contact language, it is necessary to distinguish prolonged and intense impact of respective contact languages on individual dialects from short-term impact. With the dispersion of the dialects in the 14th to 15th centuries, migrant communities became exposed to additional contact languages and in many cases to successive contact influences. Long-term and intense contacts emerged during the period of settlement that followed in the 16th to 17th centuries. Typical for this period is the formation of group-specific identities in individual Romani communities. These are often

⁵⁸ See Annex I for further information.

⁵⁹ See Annex I for further information.

⁶⁰ Jean-Paul Clebert, who wrote *Cigani* (1967), has spoken of the diverse states (i.e. vibrant or dying) of different Romani dialects, but he is not considered to be an academic source.

reflected through the religious affiliation, the patterns of occupations, and the identification with a particular territory or nation, all of which may be flagged through the individual group names.

The principal languages that influenced Romani dialect groups during this period are Turkish (on Muslim dialects of the Balkans, later also Southern Vlax), Romanian (on early Vlax), Southern Slavic (on dialects of the Balkans, later also Southern Vlax), German (on the Sinti group), and Western Slavic (on the Northern Central and the Northeastern dialects), as well as other languages in individual regions (Matras 2002, 119).

The situation is not simple. The Turkish language, for example, has had a significant impact on a number of the Arli dialects and Vlax dialects, especially on Gurbeti (my native Romani dialect from Bosnia and Herzegovina)⁶¹, and in particular on the part of the Gurbeti population that has been, sporadically and indirectly but still actively, in contact with the language, as indeed all majority languages of the countries where Roma live. The influence of Turkish is important, and through it Persian and Arabic, primarily at the level of the lexicon, and it is most prominently felt among Roma of the Muslim faith. Roma in Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbia, and some in Montenegro, Kosovo and Macedonia speak a basic Vlax dialect, with significant traces of words in Turkish, which is further influenced by the local languages such as Bosnian, Serbian, Croatian, and Montenegrin.

The group of dialects used mostly in Bosnia and Herzegovina has been termed “Westgurbeti” by Rade Uhlik, a famous Bosnian Romologist⁶² who thoroughly described this group and created an extensive dictionary on Serbocroatian-English-Romani (Uhlik 1983). In this sense, the work on the codification of modern Westgurbeti (Tahirović-Sijerčić 2010a and 2011/2013) is a contribution to the process of codification and standardization of general Romani (Djurić 2012), which is now largely developed on the basis of Vlax dialect speech. Still, it is less represented in contemporary writing practice, namely due to the relative delay in the emancipation of Roma⁶³ in these areas. The Eastgurbeti dialect has made the transition to the speech used by Roma in Romania and Bulgaria, as well as the countries of Central and Eastern Europe. There has been a period of intense activity in the domains of literary production and education. Among the books published in the dialects are the translation of the *New Testament* in

⁶¹ The Gurbeti dialect is usually divided into three groups: southern, eastern and western.

⁶² See Annex I for further information.

⁶³ The “emancipation of Roma” is used here to refer to the advancement of Roma rights in education, culture, etc.

Novi Sad in Serbia, by Romani researcher and author Trifun Dimić, of *Ilmihal* in Sarajevo in Bosnia and Herzegovina, by Bosnian Romani author Hedina Tahirović-Sijerčić, and the *Qur'an* in Sarajevo in Bosnia and Herzegovina, by Romani author from Macedonia, Muharem Serbezovski.

The demographic and geographic picture of the Roma world in this part of the Balkans and Europe has only recently been fully updated. The speech of Balkan Roma has undergone significant change and been exposed to large-scale migration processes, with the dialects expanding throughout Europe and into the USA, Australia and other countries overseas. Notwithstanding, attempts to classify Romani dialects and their speech components are not always clear and fully explained. At least part of the problem arises from imprecision with the term itself, with Roma themselves not entirely understanding what comprises a specific dialect. This is the point, I believe, where translation studies can enlighten the diverse translation processes experienced within Romani speech and writer communities. I will discuss this further in my chapter on translation.

2.3. Neologisms and loanwords

Languages change, and some of them are threatened and even disappear, because their communities switch to other, larger or other major world languages. Some languages spoken in small or large areas, whether related or unrelated to each other, can take on some common traits. One such linguistic alliance area is the Balkan federation⁶⁴. There are several languages in it: Greek, Albanian, some Serbian, Bulgarian, Macedonian, Romanian and, in the opinion of some linguists, Romani and Turkish. In my area of investigation, the dialects that are most widely written in the Balkans are Gurbeti, Serbian Kalderash and Arli.

The fact that the Romani language differs from one speech community to another, and from dialect to dialect, introduces another important variable for standardization and the creation of a literary language: neologisms and loanwords. Neologisms typically refer to the invention of

⁶⁴ „The Balkan Slavic language area forms the south-eastern part of the South Slavic dialect continuum. This area consists of the Bulgarian and Macedonian languages and the south-eastern dialects of Serbian (the Torlak or Prizren-Timok dialects). As all the Balkan Slavic dialects are part of the Balkan linguistic area, the external boundaries of the Balkan Slavic area can be defined in terms of certain structural features, which are referred to as Balkanisms. The important Balkanisms in Balkan Slavic are the loss of the infinitive, the loss of case declension, and the use of enclitic definite articles. In addition to the Balkan Slavic languages, the Balkan linguistic area encompasses the Balkan Romance languages, Greek, Albanian, and the Vlax and Balkan dialects of Romani. (Asenova 2002; Lindstedt 2000)“ (Lindstedt, Jouko (2016)

new words, and loanwords to lexical borrowing whereby words are adopted from one language into another. For both, in the Romani context, the coining of new words and adoption of words from non-Romani languages, are intertwined with the historical development of the Romani čhib itself. Influences from the phonological systems of the languages with which Romani comes into contact, and from the internal laws governing actual Romani speech condition and facilitate the introduction of new words into the language. The schemas of periodization used to categorize the main stages of Romani language development, therefore, are useful, especially when seeking to understand how communication takes place and the degree to which different terminology has an impact on expression in the language. As mentioned earlier, Rajko Djurić (2005, 7-8) and Demir and Durmiš (2012, 23-25) propose using Prescientific, Scientific and Period of reform and creativity, as historical markers for periodization. Another common frame of reference used (by both Romaninet (2013) and the Romani linguistics and Romani Language project (Romani Project) is: Proto-Romani (pre-European), Early Romani (Byzantine period) and Modern Romani dialects (from the 14th-15th century onwards). According to this periodization scheme, proto-Romani would have evolved – between the 5th and 10th centuries – into a typical New Indian language, which had five vowels and about twenty seven consonants. Since 2004 Hancock, as reflected in his article “On Romani origins and identity”, opposes this view, claiming that for “Romani čhib [...] reconstructing a proto-Romani as a discrete *pre*-Byzantine Indian language is not possible [...]” (2006)⁶⁵.

By the end of the Early Romani phase, the phonetics would have changed and been influenced by contact with other languages (such as Greek, Persian, Kurdish, Ossetian, Armenian and some Caucasian languages). Particularly noticeable was the impact of the Greek language, found at all levels of the language in all Romani dialects, including those in the outermost edges of Europe (Spain, Wales, Scandinavia, the Baltics, etc.). Greek – the source of many words in the Romani language – also introduced the similarity of grammatical endings and structural and syntactic patterns, loss of the infinitive, etc. Indeed, the Romani language is often said to be “A Balkanized Indian language” (Lee 2008, 22)⁶⁶. During the Modern Romani phase, after an

⁶⁵ Some linguists prefer to refer to this stage as ‘pre-Romani’ rather than ‘proto-Romani’ since the word ‘proto-’ can imply a larger degree of linguistic consolidation than might have been the case at the time. (*Ibid.*)

⁶⁶ Ronald Lee states: “Romani has been described as a ‘Balkanized –Indian language’ and while there is a common core of early Balkan borrowings from various languages that appear in the diverse recorded Romani dialects from Wales to eastern Russia, there are also batteries of words picked up by localized groups which remained or were forced to remain, in specific linguistic areas and now, by emigration, in the Americas. Kalderash is an example of

extended stay in Greek-speaking areas and previous contact with Iranian languages and the Armenian language (probably on the eastern border of the Byzantine Empire during the 10th to 11th centuries⁶⁷) there was a new mass migration of Roma towards the area where mostly Slavic languages are spoken, as well as Romanian and Albanian. After the migration of some of these Romani groups, they continued to travel to and settle throughout all of Europe from the mid-14th century. During this phase, speech patterns were formed similar to those found today, with different phonetics in the diverse speech communities.

Regardless of the periodization markers used, all dialects have been influenced by contact with other languages since the departure from India. Historical periodization helps contextualize the multiple layers of linguistic variation that have survived until today in myriad forms and dialects. Loanwords of non-Romani words in the Romani language is an important issue which is tightly bound with migration and the language politics of majority countries where Roma live, especially on the Balkan Peninsula. Loanwords in the various Romani speech communities of the Balkans are of special interest to researchers for several reasons. As underscored by W.G. Lockwood (1985, 91-99)

*[...] the Balkans constitute a laboratory par excellence for Gypsy⁶⁸ studies,
[...] Balkan Gypsies constitute in a number of different respects [...] the most important Gypsy community in the world,
[...] Balkan Gypsies show a comparatively high degree of cultural heterogeneity,
[...] Roma from six Balkan countries represent 60% of all Roma in the world and they speak the Romani language.*

With respect to neologisms and loan words, Hancock (2010, 113) notes that

While international languages such as English and French may be logically the ideal source for coining neologisms, Romani speakers for the most part come into contact with East European (especially Slavic) languages.

one of these [...].” (Lee 2011, 11) See also Kyuchukov and Villiers (2009) who write “[...] Romani is a Balkanized New Indian Language.”

⁶⁷ This schema of periodization assumes the older theories of earlier departures.

⁶⁸ I italicize the word ‘Gypsy’ because I prefer to use the word Rom (singular masculine), Romni (singular feminine), Roma (plural), Romani/o,e (adjective). The word ‘Gypsy’ is offensive name for a Romani person.

2.4. Contact languages – a mixed Romani čhib

Sociolinguistically speaking, problems arise in everyday situations where Roma interacting with others in majority societies end up speaking a mixed language. When using their language, they use cases and genders in a grammatically incorrect way. Communicating in majority language/s Roma create new Romani words, loanwords, as a part of their native language adding suffixes specific for the dialects they speak. An example of poetry written by the first Romani poet Rasim Sejdić⁶⁹ (Sejdić 2012, 408) from Bosnia and Herzegovina in Gurbeti dialect illustrates this point well.

<u>Gazisarde</u>⁷⁰ romengi <u>violina</u> Rasim Sejdić	Treaded on Romani violin My translation
<u>Gazisarde</u> romengi <u>violina</u> ačile (<i>sic</i>) <u>ognjišta</u> romane e jag o <u>dim</u> ando <u>oblako</u> vazdinjalo.	Treaded on Romani violin remained Romani hearth a fire a smoke in the sky raised.
Idžarde e Romen čavoren (<i>sic</i>) <u>restavisarde</u> pe datar e romnjen pe romendar idžarde e Romen.	They took Roma children taken away from mothers women from men they took Roma.
Jasenovco perdo Roma pangle (<i>sic</i>) pala <u>betonske stubujra</u> pale <u>latsujra</u> pe pme pe va ande <u>blato</u> džike čang.	Jasenovac full of Roma imprisoned behind the cement pillars with chains on legs and hands in mud knee-high.
Ačile (<i>sic</i>) ando Jasenovco lenge kokala te <u>prinčin</u> , o nemanušengim <u>djelima</u>	They remained in Jasenovac their bones to tell, about unhuman works

⁶⁹ See Annex I for further information.

⁷⁰ All words in italics and underlined are Slavic words or derivates from Slavic in the Romani language.

<u>zora vedro osvanisarda</u> i Romen o kam (<i>sic</i>) pre tatarda.	dawn clearly woke up The sun the Roma warmed up.
--	---

In this poem it is remarkable that the poet uses 57 words in his poem in Romani but out of these 57 there are 17 loanwords from the Bosnian language. The meaning of words used in Bosnian and the meanings of words coined from Bosnian language into Romani such as ‘zora vedro osvanisarda’ are used properly. My observation is that the poet might not know these words in Romani, and so he uses the words in Bosnian. These words have the same meaning in the Serbian, Croatian and Montenegrin languages, ‘zora vedro osvani(sarda)’. For the verb ‘je osvanula’ he added the Romani suffix ‘sarda’, and coined the Romani word ‘osvanisarda’ creating past tense.

I hypothesize that in order for other Roma, for ex. from the U.K., the Netherlands, Belgium, France, Italy, the Americas etc., to understand the poems written in Romani by Roma writers from the Western Balkans, translation is needed. It is necessary that a translator be a speaker and reader of Slavic languages and that his or her knowledge of both cultures be at a high level. Roma from other areas (such as those mentioned above) and Roma who are linguistically alert to the use of Romani words, would write the line ‘zora vedro osvanisarda’ as ‘šukar teharin vazdindja’ or in another way, depending on their dialect (see 2.1.1 *Romani Dialects*; see also Halwachs *et al.* 2013).

The more usual type of contact historically [...] involves direct social contact between speakers, since languages and their speakers do not exist in isolation but rather in social settings. [...] Speakers of languages are continually coming into contact with speakers of other languages, creating a variety of contact situations, each with a potentially different result. Such contact may be caused by trade, conquest, migration, or other factors. Contact situations can be described in terms of their influence on the linguistic systems, the social relationships of the speakers in contact, and the linguistic outcome of the contact. [...] [T]he linguistic systems involved are often influenced by borrowing, [...which] can be lexical [...] or structural. (Mihalicek & Wilson 2011, 486)

The ‘contact language effect’ in literary writing is very important to mention in Romani creative work, especially given the fact that Romani language literacy among Roma and literary writing in Romani are relatively recent phenomena. Romani language dialects already contain an important stratum of lexical and syntactic elements borrowed from other languages with which they are closest in contact (Matras 1995; 2002). And as noted by Liegeois,

[...] at different stages and different times the Romani language has spread and continues to branch out into a multitude of local varieties. These variants are different more by their degree of forgetfulness by one who speaks the language, but not for its intrinsic differences. (2009, 46-47)

The hybridization of the Romani language could be attributed to the unequal relations of power it has had with respect to different majority societies as Roma have moved along migration routes. Romani language hybridity, as manifest in the incorporation of loanwords and neologisms and their changes, reflects forces that are non-linguistic. As observed by Sherry Simon: “[...] a defense of the hybrid does not ignore the political forces that continue to marginalize and exclude certain populations” (Simon 2011, 52). In other words, the continued practice of Romani language speakers to use loanwords and neologisms also reflects the power imbalance that exists between Romani and majority societies. Neologisms and loanwords coined from the Slavic languages influence Romani čhib internationally, to such an extent that new generations that were born in migration and in diaspora no longer know if the word is of Romani origin or not.

2.5 Romani language in a literary context

Language, literature and translation are all central to the survival of the Romani language, and critical for expressing Romani identity in our increasingly globalized world.

The history of Romani linguistics and literature has been written thus far on the basis of compilations of literary and non-literary materials, research and doctoral dissertations mostly by non-Roma⁷¹ who have accompanied Roma people, studied the Romani čhib, and written down

⁷¹ Two of the earliest most important works in the area of Romani language studies are *Die Zigeuner in Europa und Asien* [Gypsies in Europe and Asia] (Pott 1844-1845) and *Ueber die Mundarten und die Wanderung der Zigeuner Europa's* [About the arts of oral expression and migrations of European Gypsies] (Miklošič 1872-1880). Since then many other linguistic works have been written as referred to in my section on language.

information about Romani traditions, customs and culture. In the context of Roma, researchers and social scientists have been overwhelmingly non-Roma because Roma did not have their own researchers until the year 1969 when two Roma scholars graduated in linguistic studies: one of them was Vanja de Gila Jan Kochanowski from France, and the other was Ian Hancock from Great Britain. Some of their publications were published during that time in the then most famous journal of “The Gypsy Lore Society” in Great Britain. Tihomir Đorđević⁷², the first Serbian Romologist, also wrote for this journal, as well as the linguist and Romologist from Bosnia and Herzegovina, Rade Uhlik.

a. Romani literary production written by Roma in Romani čhib and non-Romani language/s – a dilemma of categories

In my opinion Romani literary production i.e. Romani Literature has two categories: Literature about Roma (predominantly written by non-Roma), and Literature by Roma written in Romani or in a non-Romani language.

Use of the Romani language is fundamental for the creation of a history of Romani literary works, and serves as a way by which to orient the documenting of Romani literary creativity.⁷³ The literature of Romani people first became a historical fact only in the 20th century (Djurić 2010, 6), back in the year 1950, when the first handwritten Romani pieces were published in the Serbian language. Until then, Romani expression was primarily oral, and related to Roma folklore. Slobodan Berberski (1919 –1989) published the first book of poems titled *Za kišom biće duga* (After the rain the rainbow shall come) in 1950, and two years after that came the book of poems called *Proleće i oči* (The spring and the eyes). Even though Berberski did speak the Romani čhib as his mother tongue, he wrote in the Serbian language, the language of the majority society. After World War II, when political conditions allowed for the affirmation of national minorities, it was possible to create and publish individual works that aligned more suitably with the former communist states and the state ideology of better presenting inter-ethnic and social relations in the multicultural socialist society of that time.

⁷² See Annex I for further information.

⁷³ Launch of the first Romani publication – newspaper in the Balkans in 1935 in Belgrad was called *Romano Lil – Romani newspaper*. The newspaper was published twice in bilingual format. In this newspaper, the first journalistic texts in Romani language in the Balkans were published. The owner and publisher Svetozar Simić was a law student at the time.

There are other challenges to face when considering the specific circumstances associated with the emergence of a written, printed Romani literary tradition, i.e. the roots of a literate literary tradition where upon a genuine literary translation tradition can be based. The popular genre of poetry, for instance, was essentially oral. The first collection of poems in Romani language in this area, under the name “Rom rodel than talav kham [Roma man seeks his place under the Sun]”, was published by Rajko Djurić back in the year 1969 in Belgrade. This book is about 40 pages long and contains 34 poems printed in cyrillic letters, published by the “Servis za grafičke delatnosti Saveza KUD Beograda” (Acković 2003, 15).

Poems have been published in newspapers, magazines, journals and anthologies, and as sample excerpts of literature in Romani language textbooks as well. While the vast majority of Romani writers tend to focus on poetry, all other genres have likewise been used, including drama, theatre, short stories, and novels. Although the literary production is not as concentrated and apparently prolific when compared to other ethnolinguistic groups⁷⁴, Roma writers and authors worldwide write in all genres, in multiple languages and dialects, both with and without translation into and from other local, regional and world languages.⁷⁵

In the context of the former Yugoslavia countries, Serbia stands out in production with the following Romani authors⁷⁶⁷⁷: Rajko Djurić, Alija Krasnići (b. Kosovo), Mehmed-Meho Saćip* (b. Kosovo), Jovan Nikolić, Trifun Dimić, Bajram Haliti (b. Kosovo), Slobodan Berberski and others. In Macedonia there are such authors as Šaip Jusuf, Muharem Serbezovski, Ljatif Demir,

⁷⁴ “The main reason why the written works by Romani authors have been generally ‘invisible’ and unknown to the [non-Roma] is simply that nobody expected them to be there at all. The use of writing for literary purposes, in fact, is not in accordance with the popular image of the ‘Gypsies’ as wild, primitive and therefore uneducated.” (Toninato 2004, 161-162)

⁷⁵ I concentrate here on the Romani writers in the Balkans, but others are known in other languages and countries outside of former Yugoslavia. In France, for example, Matéo Maximoff (1917-1999) wrote a number of novels in French and his books have been translated into fourteen languages; *The Ursitory* (1946), *The Price of Freedom* (1955), *Savina* (1957), *Vinguerka* (1987), *Angels of Destiny* (1999), etc. Maximoff was an Evangelical pastor of Romani origin.

⁷⁶ “[R]ise of a Romani intelligentsia, whose members are particularly active in promoting the diffusion of a common language, *romanes*, and the fostering of Romani identity. These intellectuals no longer perceive writing as a sort of ‘menace’ towards their own cultural heritage or as a means of communication for the exclusive use of the [non-Roma]. They seem to insist particularly on the constructive side of writing, instead of dwelling on its external use for assimilation purposes. It is as if, after being for centuries the silent target of innumerable representations, the frozen image of the ‘Gypsy’ was finally given voice in order to uncover the inconsistencies of literary clichés and to challenge misleading representations of Romani identity.” (Toninato 2004, 142)

⁷⁷ See Annex I for further information. The names indicated with an asterisk (*) denote the authors who are analysed in Chapter 4, where detailed information about them is included. In my work I mention just those who are the most well-known in the Balkans.

Akile Eminova and Neđo Osman*. Among the poets in Bosnia and Herzegovina there are Rasim Sejdić*, Šemso Avdić, Hedina Tahirović Sijerčić* and Marko Aladin Sejdić. In Montenegro there is Ruždija Russo Sejdović*; in Kosovo, there is Kujtim Paćaku; and in Slovenia, Jožek Horvat Muc. All of these authors write in their own Romani dialects and self-translate their work into the majority languages of the countries where they lived the longest or live in, according to the quality and scope of their education. All of them are multilingual and they mostly translate their work multilingually. It is very often difficult to define and recognize what their source and target languages actually are. In order to create and define adequately the category of Romani literature it is necessary to keep in mind the challenges and special characteristics of the Romani language and literary expression.

b. Romani literary production – and the inclusion of Romani women writers

Academics have published what they learned and knew about Roma, and this information has contributed to the body of knowledge (at times erroneous) on Roma in general. However, what is often less known is the fact that actual traditions and language have often been kept alive within communities by Romani women. Their contribution is still too often neglected in the literature. They have been the bearers of tradition despite the patriarchal foundation and support for the patriarchal ways of life. Traditionally, the role of women is to transfer the cultural heritage (the father's legacy) and to serve as the symbolic center of the family and community, in one word take on the personification of continuity and stability (Moranjak Bamburić 2006, 13). From this perspective, Romani women are in many ways no exception from other women elsewhere.

Specifically, in terms of the preservation of Romani culture, Roma women are known historically to have created and left symbols (signs) while travelling⁷⁸; they also sang and told stories, and transferred and maintained ancient Romani songs and stories that recount “[...] myths and legends, fairy tales and folk tales and poetry of Roma, [all of which] constitute the main content of Romani folk literature. (*my translation*, Djurić 2010, 25)” Through these actions, they have helped preserve Romani culture, tradition and customs, the Romani language and

⁷⁸Romani people used symbols purposefully in order to protect and inform themselves and other Romani groups about the good and bad of certain societies they encountered, making economic goods for survival. To create their signs and symbols Roma used leaves, feathers, certain types of wood, metal, furniture, fabric, glass, leather etc. and in these symbols it was clearly seen that the particular material with which to create the symbol did not matter; rather, what was important was what was symbolized. As Clébert (1967, 233-234) states, these signs are generally very simple hieroglyphics, but they are kept confidential within the tribes.

Romani identity. By extension, they continue to play a vital role in the 20th and 21st centuries as writers.

Traditionally, Roma women also respect Romanipe⁷⁹ and the Romani kris⁸⁰, which refers in Romani to the traditional Romani court; they are aware and tacitly agree with the “patriarchal naturalization of female gender roles” (Moranjak Bamburić 2006). In so doing, they have kept quiet, kept to themselves, and suffered the limitations of behavior codes, which have been always upheld (and enforced) by men within the hierarchy of the family⁸¹. Even while acting as guardians of the folk treasure, Romani women have been characteristically silent, obscured by tradition and the patriarchal establishment. As such, they have been complicit in allowing Romani men to dominate (and thereby genderize) the historical framework of Romani folk creativity.

The cases of Gina Ranjičić and the self-taught poet Bronislawa Wajs Papsza are enlightening and illustrative. They broke the mold of oral culture through writing poetry and singing in Poland. Other Roma women such as Katarina Taikon in Sweden, Ceija Stojka in Austria, and Philomena Franz in Germany, are equally important. Through their written songs and stories, they could be considered as the mothers of Roma literary expression in the countries where they lived and wrote. In the case of these Romani women authors, each one of them fought for her literacy. Through their works they have dealt with Romani life and the suffering associated with it. Through their gender, they highlight the specific problems faced by Romani women in the areas of tradition, culture, customs and language.

The preservation of Romani cultural legacy in modern times by Roma women is, interestingly enough, somewhat accounted for by the act of translation, where the original is ensured – as Walter Benjamin would say – by its ‘afterlife’,

⁷⁹ Romanipe(*n*) /Romanipe(*n*) is the common denominator of all that is considered or believed to make up the essential characteristics of all Romani people around the world. The term is derived from the name of Roma/Roma. It refers to the feeling of belonging to the same people, to the same history, culture, and habits despite the differences that are specific to sub-groups. (Hedina Tahirović-Sijerčić, 2017, „Romani Identity“. In *A Romani Women's Anthology: Spectrum of the Blue Water*, Tahirović-Sijerčić, Hedina and Cynthia Levine-Rasky eds., Inanna Publications and Education Inc.: Toronto, Canada, 2017, 18.)

⁸⁰ The laws created by the “respectable” members of the group, the men, are accepted and governed by the Romani kris. Men’s powers determine the level of integration of the group, and its hierarchy and solidarity with other Roma and non-Roma. The institution of the kris enhances men’s status and provides opportunities for jobs and other activities within Romani and non-Romani society. (Hedina Tahirović-Sijerčić, 2017, 25)

⁸¹ The Romani court, or *Romani kris* in the Romani language, and traditional laws are what condemned Papsza, the Romani poetess from Poland, to lifelong death because of her secret agreement with a *gadjo man*.

For a translation comes later than the original, and since the important works of world literature never find their chosen translators at the time of their origin, their translation marks their stag of continues life. The idea of life and afterlife in works of art should be regarded with an entirely unmetaphorical objectivity. [...] The concept of life is given its due only if everything that has a history of its own, and is not merely the setting for history, is credited with life. (Benjamin 2000)

Romani author Gina Ranjičić, who wrote songs in her Romani mother tongue was published half a century later in Swedish translation by the Romani author Katarina Taikon. Her poetry has also appeared in German, and more recently in translation by Moma Dimić (Taikon 2006) in Serbia, the country where Gina Ranjičić was born. The contradictions between tradition and cultural discourse, on the one hand, and actual reality, on the other hand, have triggered many questions, among them questions regarding gender identity in the Romani community and in Romani literary expression as well as the nature of women's writing overall. They question how women in general write and who their real literary ancestors are. Can Gina Ranjičić, Bronislawa Wajs Papusza, Ceija Stojka, Katarina Taikon be considered as the literary ancestors of literature by Roma or as the literary founders of Romani women's literature? (Tahirović-Sijerčić 2016)

One answer to this question has been given by the Roma writer and romologist Rajko Djurić, who speaks of the life stories and trajectories of Roma poets as being “marked with poetic symbols” (Djurić 2010, 88). He notes: “These poetic symbols are appropriated, perhaps, for the life of Gina Ranjičić (1830–1891), a Romani woman, who could be considered as a pioneer of poetry and lyrics of Roma in Serbia” (*Ibid.*, 88). Djurić also says: “The literature of Roma in Poland bears the stamp of life and creativity of Bronislawa Wajs Papusza (1908 ? - 1987)” (*Ibid.*, 126). In reference to the literature of Roma in Sweden and Finland, he points out that: “The literature of Roma in Sweden is most frequently related to the name Katarina Taikon (1932 - 1995), whose autobiographical novel *Katica* celebrated her and the literature of Roma.” (*Ibid.*, 140) In the former Yugoslavia the literary Romani “mother” is often associated with the poet Gina Ranjičić, who recorded Romani folk poetry in her native Romani Kalderash dialect during the mid-19th century. The role of Romani women and their writing to preserve the Romani language, tradition, culture, history and identity is very important, but further research and investigation could bring them into the realm of historical fact, and serve to contest that Romani literature has its roots at least as deeply entrenched in the literary vanguard of the “mothers” as it

has in the literary vanguard of the “fathers”. The traditions, customs, habits and folk poetry can be found in the modern poetry written by some Romani women authors who are part of the current generation writing in contemporary times.

c. Romani literary production – its origins in orality

In addition to the published books which have collected and recorded transcribed folk or artistic prose and poetry, there are books about Roma that are more ethnographic and historiographical in nature. Some of them are unknown to many, but they exist.

[...] the first book about Roma in the Serbian language was printed in 1803. Anyway, this year, says Bozidar Kovaček, were printed sixteen books in Serbian and among them "Stemografija, sireč opisanije načalnogo proishoždeenija Ciganov madjarski s nekimi pripovedkami" composed by Peter Asi-Markovic (Baja, 1770 Buda, 1844), a nobleman, a lawyer, a senior government official, a very respected member of the Serbian parishes in Budim. (my translation, Aleksandrović 2012)

There are no detailed research studies and comparative analyses of language, culture, customs, religion or national identities of Roma people worldwide. This would be essential for putting forth comprehensive and dignified scientific claims, but has not been done, allowing for the mass generalizations to continue. However, many stories called *purane paramiče*⁸² have been written and transcribed, edited, translated and published (Tahirović-Sijerčić 2009). The multi-dialectal *purane paramiče* that have been recorded and the absence of a standard literary language likewise illustrate well the problem of classifying writers within a category of “Romani literature”.

[...] There was a very attractive way to learn, to educate, and this all consisted of singing romance and telling stories. Stories that are known to me, or rather, ones that circulated in our families, do not have anything specifically Jewish, or Sephardic. Most of the story is of Arab origin, customized for the Jew. (Papo 2005, 169)

⁸² “The myth originated from the ancient Greek language (mythos) and refers to the story of the life of the Gods and supernatural divine beings who descend to Earth, live and work as men, often mingle with them and together perform a variety of strange, unexplained or heroic feats. The Romani term for this kind of story, i.e. myth, is “*purane paramiča*” or old stories.” (Djurić 2010, 25)

Romani people have their own original motifs which have been preserved up to the present day. They include the legend of Prince Peng, of Beng (devil), the Pharaoh's kingdom, of God (Devel or Del), and stories whose heroes are various little monkeys, ghosts, tramps and many other negative characters. Humour in Roma stories is expressed predominantly as three main types, namely *dilo* (dumb), *xalo* (bold) and *phuri* (old). The themes found in Romani literature, especially in stories, are varied. They are about tradition, beliefs, love, family, traditional crafts, habits, about nomadism, special historical events, the Romani holocaust, about their awareness of the gap between the Roma and non-Roma. In this literature, stories can be found which may prove to be confusing or surprising to non-Romani readers. Stories that are spoken among Roma are “normal talking stories” for Roma, but can sometimes seem disgusting for non-Roma. The stories are often so long that the narrator forgets to tell their end. These stories vary from narrator to narrator. Everyone adds something of his or her own and invents, and when the stories are horrific, the narrators telling them are so credible that they themselves can be frightened. Some of the more frightening characters are those known as the *bahvalja* – spirits named Karankoči-Koči, čoxane-witches, javišta, and other scary spirits.

In the context of Romani folktales, myths and legends, the romologist Rade Uhlik (1984, 1-10) states:

All the Roma are not equally nice and smooth when narrating a story, just as not all Jews are great traders. They love to «run the story” and to speak them slowly, untie them gingerly, because, according to oriental custom, they are never in a hurry. Moreover, stories in translation can seem dull and dry and lose their shine. From them immediately emerges the spirit of the Romani language, the language of the former Indian jungle.

The dryness or dullness referred to here by Uhlik can be puzzling for non-Roma. Reflecting on this lack of luster, it bears repeating that Roma only use the storytelling language in a certain way within their Romani communities, thus conferring on their stories an immediate spirit of the Romani čhib, readily understood within the context of their culture, traditions, and customs. Roma will only use the language in a straightforward way in their stories and maintain the Romani čhib spirit for clarity of culture, tradition, and customs when they are among themselves. Moreover, the language, and the various synonyms and homonyms used, can be considered as vulgar expression when translated into another non-Romani language.

Based on my personal experience, the spoken Romani čhib is a ‘tool’ like other languages, and one that brings Romani people around the world together and gives them the ability to communicate and understand each other if there is good will and a desire to do so, despite the dialects and barring any serious problem. The identity of Roma men and women, or of Roma people in general, characterized by the value of the Romani čhib regardless of the dialect that was used for creating Roma literature, is an area where there are numerous latent battles being waged, especially “between the dominant discourse of power and the more subversive aspirations of marginalized social groups” (Zdenko Lešić *et al.* 2006, 514).

Folk songs and traditional stories have been transferred into the public sphere and among non-Roma researchers by Roma men, sometimes belonging to one and the same group. Often they were those who were entitled to the right of speech outside the Romani community, i.e. those more dominant and powerful. One example identified is the case of Redžo Osmanović from Prijedor (Bosnia and Herzegovina), a Romani poet and prose teller who was mentioned by the romologist Rade Uhlik, who had in the time frame of nearly half a century, recorded hundreds of Romani poems and stories.

“In the materials I’ve collected from various Roma people, there are approximately eight hundred poems sung by an old folk poet named Redžo Osmanović from Prijedor. Anyhow, Uhlik added, “the number of talented storytellers among Roma people is quite large, and among them there are some special people such as: Redžo Osmanović, Bajro Hamidović, Halil Salkanović, Ibrahim Ganija, Halil Bejtula, and others. Romani treasure of poems, fables and stories is vast. They are said to be the masters of storytelling and that they really can do ‘paramičendje paramiča’, or storytelling. Redžo Osmanović for example, speaks in such a picturesque and vivid way, that one could conclude that he’d watched a movie, rather than listened to Redžo’s stories” (Uhlik,1984)

But many have not been accorded any recognition whatsoever, and it is necessary to question why some excellent and well-known storytellers and poets have been excluded from the public sphere, from the canon of their national literature, and from the canon of European literature (Toninato 2014, 114). Why have certain researchers not been made aware of them, or have they turned a blind eye? Why have they searched exclusively for stereotypical and visibly nomad Roma from certain nomadic groups? Why have they not asked other, more assimilated Romani groups or individual story-tellers to transmit their stories, and why have they not been of interest to them? Further complicating the situation is the lack of consensus by historical linguists

as to which groups comprise the category of Roma, and the degree of infiltration of a majority society's language into the local Romani culture (in Spain, for example).

More recently the old stories/ *purane paramiča* have been narrated, beginning in the early 20th century, by Romani women and men writers wishing to retain symbolically what was brought away from India in the form of myths⁸³ and legends⁸⁴. They narrate accounts on the origin of human beings and of Roma, about the earth, world, fire, musicians, bearkeepers, family tales and stories, spells, riddles and proverbs. The inclusion of Romani traditional and oral poetry in their work, and the topics of God (*Devel*), love, sadness, the devil (*beng*), death, nature and “life in prison”⁸⁵ are frequent. Equally important are songs, whereby Roma have expressed their prayers and hopes, passion and love, joy and sorrow, thoughts of life and death. Oral culture is inherent to Romani expression, and goes hand-in-hand with memory⁸⁶ and oblivion⁸⁷, and consequently remembrance. Romani traditional songs have been integrated into modern Romani songs, which have become part of various musical traditions, from which they also subsequently derive. They have been and remain an instrument for the promotion of Romani culture. But without knowing Romani culture and Romanipe it is neither possible to neither comprehend the Romani tradition nor understand their work, and the culture, it bears repeating, has been significantly affected by migration and violent changes. However, despite this fact, the spirit of

⁸³ “Once upon a time, God decided to create a man. He knew that since He had already made the sun and the moon, He would now be able to make a man too. God took some mud and made a clay statue of a man. When He was satisfied, He placed it in the oven to bake it. He thought that baking the statue would take a few hours, and when He became bored with waiting, He went for a walk to pass the time. Since the weather was beautiful, God forgot about the statue. By the time He remembered, He came back to find that the statue had baked to a black colour. Though the statue had baked longer than intended, God breathed life into it, and this first man became the ancestor of dark skinned people. Then God decided to create another man. He placed the finished statue in the oven to bake. This time, God stayed near the oven because He did not want to bake the clay statue too long. In His impatience, God removed this statue too soon, and it had baked to a white colour. Though the statue had baked less than intended, God breathed life into it, and this second man became the ancestor of light skinned people. God tried for a third time, and formed a man out of clay. He placed the finished statue in the oven. This time He was very careful. He did not go for a walk and stayed close to the oven, but He was patient and careful not to remove the statue too early either. God’s patience paid off, for when He removed the clay figure from the oven, He saw a beautiful brown man. He was well pleased, and He breathed life into the statue, this time adding with his breath all his life experience and emotions. God then decided that this man would become the ancestor of the Roma.” (Tahirović-Siječić 2009, 17-19)

⁸⁴“Romano princo Penga/Romani princ Penga” in Tahirović-Siječić 2009a

⁸⁵“Life in a prison” because of the constant persecution and contempt for Roma. Roma have lived for centuries in almost near death. They left their traces in prisons and cafes, wherever the accident and evil hiding [was], following the fate of a black man and people who were seeking deliverance and salvation. (Djurić and Kajtazi 2011, 48)

⁸⁶The word “remembrance” in the Romani language implies a “human consciousness of themselves in the real world”. (Đurić and Miletić 2008, 162)

⁸⁷The word “oblivion” has etymological origins in the Old Indian words that mean “re-death”. The Romani proverb “Bistardo e manušestar taj e Devlestar!” – “Forgotten both by man and by God!” – means it is the most horrible fate that a person can experience. (Djurić and Miletić 2008, 162-163)

cultural values borne from distant India is recognizable to this day; language, orality, beliefs, matriarchal form of respect to female deity such as the cult of Sara la Kali and fertility feast (Acković 2012b, 7).

“If for the Roma their language is their homeland, then Romani poetry is the capital of the Roma” (Djurić 2010, 163).

Through poetry and song, Roma tried to hide their feelings, and to express the sadness and joy of those who were scorned and forced to perpetual exile. The songs were composed using the sounds associated with “Gypsy” music⁸⁸. When certain songs have been accepted by non-Roma, they are sometimes translated and released in other languages.⁸⁹ Songs and poetry have always accompanied Roma. They were sung beside the cradle, next to the fire, at celebrations, at weddings, and at the cemetery. They express the spirit of the Roma people, as underscored by this Romani proverb: “Rrom bi giljako si sar kham bi strafinako.” [Rom without song is like sun without shining.] (*my translation*, Djurić 2010, 38).

The folk literature preferred, appreciated and loved by Romani communities are most represented by fairy tales, myths, legends and short stories. Roma folk tales demonstrate abundant verbal creativity that has been passed on from the people and tribes of the Middle and Far East, and they are often imbued with magic, myth and legend (Vukanović 1983, 336).

In Romani folklore there are definite constants such as particular genres, certain themes and motifs, favourite types of heroes, characters, etc. Traditionally among Roma there were professional narrators of folk stories called *paramičaroli*⁹⁰, and they narrated in their Romani neighborhoods. With their storytelling activities prevalent mainly during the wintertime, they sat in certain houses where people would come, gather and listen around the fire. Some of these stories were apocryphal and imaginary, called *hatam* and *hatam beči*. There were also stories that told of God, divine beings and their lives, known as *Develikane paramiča*.⁹¹ According to Rade Uhlik and Branko Radičević (1982), Romani oral and folk poetry is poetry that speaks of prison and travel, kidnapping and horse theft, the grieving of old boilermakers and tinsmiths, and

⁸⁸ The power of Romani songs has contributed to Roma stereotyping as well.

⁸⁹ The popular song *Djelem, djelem* / I went, I went, is an example. The content of this song has been modified and resulted in the internationally recognizable anthem of Romani people adopted in London in 1971 during the First International Congress of the Roma.

⁹⁰ In the Romani language, ‘narrator’ is translated as *paramičaro* (a man narrator) and *paramičari* (a woman narrator).

⁹¹ “‘Hata’, ‘hatam’ is a Romani word for the stories that fit the concepts of fairy tales. This term comes from the Old Indian word ‘katha’, ‘kathanaka’ for fairy tale. ‘Develikane paramiča’ are stories that tell of God, divine beings and their lives. ‘Devel’ in Romani means ‘God’. (Djurić 2010, 25, 36)

confusion in the eyes of the world. It includes frankly foul-mouthed, childish talks of women offended and embarrassed, talk of freedom, and the tragedy of a nation whose roads to a great return are lost.

The life pervading the songs of Roma is not only an enticement to a story, but is felt at a metaphysical level, as a truth to be reached. Songs materialize as truth and contain cognitive power. The song is a collaborative, joint achievement, between singer/narrator and interlocutor. Every truth expressed in song is meaningful to others, and perceived in turn as their own truth. Romani songs and Romani truth became the truth and songs of the collective. The truths amass through the number of life ordeals through which the persons have passed, condensed into reality. Numerous temptations are likewise reflected. From truth to truth, and between truths, there are certain gradations. Some remain on the surface of the experiential, almost as a joke, and some encroach deeply into the very core of life's maze and the human condition.

Poem (documented by Marija Aleksandrović 2012, 198-199)	<i>My translation</i>
<p><i>Phirav mange korkoro, Kaj sem devla čororo. Phirav mange korkoro, Kaj sem devla čororo. Kaj sem devla čororo, Najma dadoro. Kaj sem devla čororo, Najma dadoro. Ej, kaj sem čororo, Ej, najma dadoro. Te avelma mungro dad, Te me dikhav leske vas. Te avelma mugro dad, Te me dikhav leske vas Te zagrlil vi vo man. Thaj bahtalo te avav Te zagrlil viv o man, Thaj bahtalo te avav.</i></p>	<p>I wander alone, I am poor, Good I wander alone, I am poor, Good, I am poor, Good, I do not have father. I am poor, Good, I do not have father. Ej, I am poor, Ej, I do not have father. If I had a father, his hands to see. If I had a father, his hands to see, with them to hug me, I would be happy. With them to hug me, I would be happy.</p>

What dominates in the life of Roma is suffering. It becomes the general formulation for life, and when translated into song, it reaches the zenith of existential distress. At that point the song has its most expressive formulation in crying and longing. The crying and longing are the main pillars of Roma poetry poetics. It is the only possible means of expression when there is nothing left to feed the children, or when a woman runs away from her husband leaving him with children and he feels incapable of organizing life, or the persecution by the police. The persistent sequence of crying and longing leads some to believe that “[...] the verbal creativity of the Roma is not characterized by a wide imagination” (Vujanović 2013). On the contrary, the Roma imagination possesses the power of ritual, and connects life and song. Imagination is the general spiritual condition of Roma, and in some songs it is possible to hear the cry in fear of death and from prison, from women, beautiful girls, horses and fire (Tahirović-Sijerčić 2016).

One among many other examples is the folk song already mentioned *Phirav mange korkoro* [I wander alone] documented in 2012 by Marija Aleksandrović (2012, 198-199).

The stories and poems or songs narrated by the *paramičaro/i* or *hatamdžija/jka*⁹² or sung by the *gilavutno/i*⁹³ take place in front of both small and large gatherings, and have always been adjusted to the taste of a particular audience. In addition to song, Romani oral literature can include dance. The combination of songs and dance created and used in some areas have led to primitive forms of acting and theatre. A continuous negotiation of elements has characterized the dynamics of Romani oral expression, based on collective understanding and ‘equalization’ mechanisms, and in conjunction with the changing socio-economic status of communities and even religion, with paganism, Islam and various denominations of Christianity being adhered to. These dynamics can affect the manners in which Romani poetry is understood and interpreted by readers outside the Romani community.

The question of documenting and translating oral literature in a written form is particularly complex for Roma due to the cultural and linguistic differences among them and among the non-Roma who first published the work of Roma. The meanings of the translation may be different depending on the tribal groups, subgroups, religious groups or some local small groups and even families, and this opinion is underscored by Jean-Paul Clébert in his book *The Gypsies*: “Each Gypsy tribe has in fact its mark by which it differs from other tribes” (*my*

⁹² *Hatamdžija* refers to a man who speaks invited stories, and *hatamdžijka* to a woman who speaks invited stories.

⁹³ The translation of ‘singer’ in the Romani language is *gilavno* (a man singer) and *gilavni* (a woman singer).

translation, Clébert 1967, 232). Romani symbolism and its use in translation provides evidence as to the encounters by Roma with people of different languages, religions, customs and different cultures. They also provide evidence of some historical events, historical places, personalities and other things that have marked the life of the Roma community or their groups and/or families.

Roma as carriers of oral folk literature do not necessarily try to find new ways of expression; rather, they use common elements found in the first original narrative. They use constant epithets and stable numbers such as 7, 9, 12 and 40, the usual comparisons, symbolic names, hyperbole and contrasts.⁹⁴ The hyperbole and contrasts are found very often in a variety of short stories and poems, and they are without detailed description. They are used only to express lines that can be enhanced through these devices. Individual expression is not conventional and is only very slowly being incorporated as a new craft. This continuity with tradition is characteristic of Roma; it is a practice which resonates with other minority ethnic groups and their contribution to cultural survival (Toninato 2014, 117). The collective character is the only thread that binds them; the *paramičaro/i* do not feel as individuals, but rather as member of a collective group. What separates the *paramičaro/i* from the rest of the group is the power of storytelling and use of a language that is not an everyday spoken language. It is constructed as a specific language which contains the archaic words, gestures, facial expressions, imitating heroes, syntax and morphological forms with which it achieves a special uniqueness (Djurić 2010, 37). One and the same motives often receive different names, faces and places of events or actions in its different ends. Thus, despite the constants alluded to earlier, essential is the fact that a storyteller or singer will never recount the same story and song repeated in exactly the same form twice. Its transmission from generation to generation by different narrators confers an anachronistic character to the stories and songs. And, despite the preference for collective over individual mentioned earlier, each narrator conveys and highlights his or her own individual traits, for it is very important to reflect their talents (the power of telling a story or a beautiful singing voice in singing) in addition to conveying the significance of the narrated events and feelings.

⁹⁴ Information according to Ljatif Demir's investigation of traditional Roma literature. (Demir 2013)

d. Romani literary production – on the question of ‘mother tongue’, ‘native language’ and translation

The speech used by the community is very important to Romani translators and “[...] even such a category as grammatical gender, often cited as merely formal, plays a great role in the mythological attitudes of a speech community” (Jakobson 1959). In Romani, nouns do not have a neuter form and are expressed in two genders: masculine and feminine. For example, Roma speakers who speak Slavic and Albanian languages but do not have a good level of formal education will drop their neuter and only use masculine and feminine. In the way while Roma speakers communicate it is clear to others that their original language is neither Slavic nor Albanian, but Romani. The translator has to know how to deal with this problem and how to work with the speech as it is actually used by the community.

Not only is Romani literary writing and translation heterogeneous, multilingual and multicultural in its aesthetics and artistic expression; it is also subject to the tangible realities, boundaries and complex historical contexts that inspire its birth and growth.

The question that is very important to investigate from a translation perspective is how Roma writers write. Is the Romani mother tongue a source language? What is/are the target language/s in translation? When does ‘real translation’ start and end? Beyond literary and artistic expression, how much translation is involved in their everyday lives? We could argue that translation is a vibrant cultural practice not only within the Romani communities settled in Western Balkans but also within the broader, global ‘Romani community’ worldwide. Historical specificities, as we have seen, bear this out, and characterize the community in general.

The rising level of education that ensued in the Balkans after World War II encouraged development in the domain of the art of poetry. Poets found inspiration in their own experiences and in the experience of being Roma. Unlike the folk tradition where the tragic situation of the Roma people is seen through the prism of individual cases which are grouped collectively in the form of a cry (Vukanović 1983, 156)⁹⁵, the phenomenon of the new poets hinges on a poetic statement that would replace the poetic expression of the *cry* with one of *accusation* (Vujanović 2013). Inspiration for the new authors has been found in the unrest that has followed Roma historically. Roma have had to flee from those who do not offer anything positive or good

⁹⁵ My translation: I do not have father/ I walk alone, Why I am poor, Good,/ I do not have father!/When my father would come,/to see his hands,/to hug me,/ I would be the most happy./ Ej, ej, why I am poor, I do not have father!/

for their existence and livelihood, especially for future generations and especially when there is/was war.

CHAPTER III – CRITICAL APPROACHES TO ROMANI WRITING IN TRANSLATION

This dissertation creates, for the first time, and in the area of Balkans historiography, an analysis of Romani literature (poetry) selected from a corpus of writing I have gathered from Romani authors in the Balkans. The fact that Romani literary production is still young and in an early stage of development warrants their inclusion, in order to observe how the literary and literary translation traditions actually are emerging and developing. All conventional genres – poetry, novel, short story, drama – are included, although poetry is predominant⁹⁶, since this is the genre most widely adopted. It identifies the language pair/s⁹⁷ they use in their writing and translation, and highlights the Romani literary heritage through the concept of translation.

My research is quantitative in that it is composed of statistical data on the publications I have gathered, and qualitative in that it is composed of a standardised questionnaire and author's analyses used for the chapter on analysis. The underlying assumption for my project supports my conviction that it is important to investigate Romani literary production as voices to be heard from within Romani communities. The methodology is guided by the goal to be “Romani-focused”.

3.1. Defining the corpus

To find the way how to typify or/and to define a corpus of Romani written, translated and published work, it was necessary to introduce the meaning and definition of the corpus.

A corpus originally consisted of any collection of writing by an author and was identified as hard-copy texts. Later, because of the use of computers, the corpus started to be a collection of texts in an electronic form.

In recent years, according to Baker (1995) this definition changed in three ways:

(i) corpus now means primarily a collection of text held in machine-readable form and capable of being analysed automatically or semi-automatically in a variety of ways; (ii) a corpus is no longer restricted to 'writings' but includes spoken as well as written text, and (iii) a corpus may include a large number of texts from a variety of sources, by many writers and speakers and on a multitude of topics. What is important is that it is put together for a particular purpose and according

⁹⁶ Periodicals and newspapers containing published poetry or excerpts have not been sampled.

⁹⁷ See Annex III – List of poets and language pairs

to explicit design criteria in order to ensure that it is representative of a given area or sample of language it aims to account for. (Baker 1995, 225)

In 1995 Baker introduced three main types of corpora for translation research and pedagogy; comparable corpora where two collections of text are in the same language as an original and as a translation; parallel corpora where original A and translated B texts are in different languages; and multilingual corpora where involved comparable texts in more than two languages “built up either in the same or different institutions on the basis of similar design criteria” (Fernandez 2006, 87).

The term comparable corpus is not applicable to my corpus because the texts in my corpus are written in a bilingual and/or multilingual way. The term parallel corpus could be partly applied to define my corpus because of its advantage to be used as a “consultation resource for translation equivalence“ (Candel-Mora and Vargas-Sierra (2013, 320). The original, source language texts in Romani are the language A, and their translated versions are in a language B [Serbo-Croatian (Bosnian, Croatian, Montenegrin and Serbian), Turkish, Italian, English, French, German, Swedish, Bulgarian, Albanian, Arabic, Macedonian, Montenegrin, Romanian and Slovenian]. Since Romani čhib is the original, source language A, the question is: how could we typify their translated versions in language B if their self-translation/s, as always published in one textbook with the original, are mostly compatible and are complementing each other, i.e. with the original language A. So far, we can treat that corpus as a compatible complementary corpus. Also, the fact is that my corpus, because of the languages involved in self-translation, can be also considered multilingual.

Laviosa (2010), who built on Baker's work and modified the term corpus with specific criteria of types i.e. six sets of contrastive parameters⁹⁸, states that „[b]ilingual and multilingual corpora consist of texts produced in two or more than two languages respectively“ (2010, 80). Also, Kenny (1998/2009/2011) noted that bilingual or multilingual corpora “contain texts in two or more languages” (1998/2009/2011, 60). Because all these definitions do not seem to be complete to define the Romani corpus in this work, it brings me to my point to define my corpus as a multilingual, compatible, complementary corpus. Another significant point for my Romani corpus, is that

⁹⁸ sample or monitor; synchronic or diachronic; general (or reference) or specialized; monolingual, bilingual, multilingual; written, spoken, mixed (written and spoken) or multi-modal; and annotated or non-annotated. (Laviosa 2010, 80-81)

“[i]n modern linguistics a corpus is a collection of authentic texts held in electronic form and assembled according to specific design criteria. These principles determine the physiognomy of a particular corpus type.” (Laviosa 2010, 80)

Based on this definition of corpus by Laviosa, my concern was if we can even treat the Romani collection as a corpus. If we think about Romani texts i.e. literature that has just started to be written, developed and published mostly in hard-copies and has just started appearing in electronic form, such as the one in this work, the following questions arise: Can we consider multilingual, compatible, complementary Romani corpus, as I have already defined above, as a corpus? Or, should we maybe consider the corpus I use in my work, according to Laviosa (2010, 80) as a sample (or finite) corpus which “is of finite size and contains abridged or full texts that have been gathered so as to represent, as far as possible, a language or language variety,” or as “[a] monitor (or open) corpus which is constantly supplemented with fresh textual material and keeps increasing in size?” (Ibid.)

Since the corpus of Romani texts is not finite and develops constantly, and since it does not represent a language or a language variety, but languages and Romani language varieties and since it does not include other countries, genres, geographical areas i.e. countries, and other types of translation we cannot take a sample (or finite) corpus for representation and definition because it would lead us to a generalization of the Romani corpus. The corpus I chose for the analysis in my work is a finite or a sample corpus as an example that takes into account self-translated poetry by the poets from former Yugoslavia who use different dialects in Romani writing with Serbo-Croatian self-translation. It leads the way as an entry and a stepping stone to the creation of a Romani corpus. If we consider presented collection as a monitor (or open) corpus which is constantly being supplemented and keeps increasing in size, it would be just partly applicable because all the specific characteristics such as bilinguality/multilinguality and self-translation will be ignored.

With all these concerns and respecting all these corpus definitions which can be just partly applicable to my corpus, I found a way to get out of this dilemma by referring to Toninato (2004) who stated that “the structure of the body of Romani literature [...] is transnational and multilingual almost ‘by definition’, given the ‘diasporic’ location of its authors” (2004, 113). Although the confines of her corpus are the Italian Roma, poetry by female Romani authors, language, translation, identity, stereotypical representation, migration, culture, Romani intelligenza and elite, she writes about the issues that are applicable to all Roma. In my opinion, it

leads rather to more generalizations than when investigating differences and different approaches in writing and translation. Following Toninato's work (2014) and the fact that "Romani literature today is characterised by a highly varied corpus", with a wide variety of genres"⁹⁹ (2014, 71), made me think about Toninato's four categories of Romani texts: poetic texts written and published exclusively in non-Romani languages, multilingual literary collections by Romani authors published in both major and minority languages, multilingual literary collection by both Romani and non-Romani authors, and texts written and published exclusively in Romani languages (Toninato 2014, 72). As Toninato's category of "multilingual literary collections by Romani authors published in both major and minority languages" (Ibid.) is applicable to my corpus selection, I decided to define my corpus as multilingual, compatible, complementary corpus.

The Romani corpus in this work being multilingual, one includes comparable texts in more than two languages according to similar criteria where by the original and self-translation/s compound and complement each other.

Procedure of selection

Except rarely, Romani literary works can hardly be found in book stores. Romani writers publish mostly with local Romani NGOs or some small organizations. The only way to obtain their literary work has been by attending some conferences or meetings within Romani international and regional events. Gathering the works by Romani poets and writers over a thirty five-year period and collecting it in my own library was possible just because of my activism and my professional work that involved different Romani and non-Romani individuals, organizations and institutions who worked in the field.

In terms of building the corpus for the thesis, I proceeded in four steps.

Firstly, I collected anthologies and Romani language-learning materials that mention Romani works of literary expression and literature produced outside and in the Balkans.

Secondly, I created a multilingual corpus which includes Romani male and female writers and their works of literary production that occurred in the context of the Balkans,¹⁰⁰ i.e. Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Greece, Kosovo, Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia,

⁹⁹ ranging from transcriptions of oral narrative and autobiographical accounts and memoirs to novels, short stories, drama, plays and poetry collections (Toninato 2014, 71)

¹⁰⁰ Information provided in Annex IV: Romani literary works/my corpus

Romania, Slovenia and Turkey. It is in this geographical area that the most known Romani published poets and writers live and write. They mostly write in Romani and self-translate their work into the official national languages of the states they live in. Although this corpus contains works dating back to 1978, most of it contains works written and published in the early 21st century. While doing research for the purpose of my PhD thesis, I found that there is no known written work by Romani authors from Albania and Turkey.

Thirdly, I selected for the corpus Romani poets/writers and self-translators from former Yugoslavia. This selection was created because of my knowledge of Serbo-Croatian and Romani language dialects. It is important to mention the enormous challenge of cross-checking bibliographic data and validating multilingual transcriptions because of the problem of the war and lost materials in the region of former Yugoslavia. The information about the poets and writers found in different publications and sources sometimes differed. Therefore, I proceeded to contact the poets personally in order to get the information I needed for my work.¹⁰¹

Fourthly, sampling was the next process after finalizing my selection of the poets and writers for the analysis. The poets selected for the dissertation are from Montenegro, Macedonia, Kosovo and Bosnia and Herzegovina, who speak Romani, Serbo-Croatian¹⁰², English, German and Turkish. Concerning the poets and self-translators from former Yugoslavia, I contacted them personally and through their and my own networks of relationships. The languages facilitated my approach to the poets and writers for consultation and for the correspondence needed for my work.¹⁰³

Variables that inform my sampling include different features which structure my corpus. These variables are languages, dialects, self-translation, genre, geographical region, migration and gender. My final corpus includes four poets: Ruždija-Ruso Sejdović from Montenegro who migrated to Germany, Mehmed-Meho Saćip from Kosovo who was internally displaced in Subotica (Serbia), Nedjo Osman from Macedonia who migrated to Germany, and myself, Hedina Tahirović-Sijerčić from Bosnia and Herzegovina who migrated to Germany, then to Canada, coming back to Germany, and returning to the country of origin, Bosnia and Herzegovina. This selection of poets was made for many reasons: their work is published in bilingual and/or

¹⁰¹ In gathering information on Romani radio and television programs, not all editors of Romani programs were available to answer the question about Romani programs they used to work for.

¹⁰² Today Bosnian, Montenegrin and Serbian.

¹⁰³ I live also in the Balkans (Bosnia and Herzegovina). I know the poets/writers personally and I am also a poet and writer myself.

multilingual editions; they self-translate their work; they are from different countries in former Yugoslavia; they have common Serbo-Croatian¹⁰⁴ language as their official national language and as the language they were educated in; they all have their own migration history and experience; and all the poets/writers work/ed for the radio and produce/d a Romani radio program. The historical framework of their writing encompasses the past 35 years (from 1980s-present).

3.2. Relevance of personal background

Being involved into and Romani Studies working on different issues on Roma representing and self-representing the community, the relevance of personal background is of enormous importance because the voice of community is given by an insider. It is easily possible to acknowledge this work as being a work which can influence decolonizing the mind and knowledge¹⁰⁵ (Denzin, Lincoln and Smith 2008), and the work which will be very soon on its path to open up discussion and critique with non-Romani and also Romani academic voices. Awareness of my belonging to a minority Romani language speaker community on the one hand, and on the other hand belonging to multilingual majority speaker communities, to Serbocroatian¹⁰⁶ (Bosnian, Serbian, Croatian, Montenegrin), Russian, German and English, as well as awareness of my personal and professional identity awoke in my self-consciousness the value of my identity, morality, my general educational background, lived experience, and also my knowing and knowledge of others. Since I decided to use my own experiences, which are very close to experiences of the analysed poets, the question of how to most appropriately describe my work and my works involvement in my dissertation was a serious concern. The question about subjectivity and its reflection on Romani community brought me to the ethnographic approach I

¹⁰⁴ Serbo-Croatian, which is used by older generations; and nowadays national divided names of languages Bosnian, Serbian, Montenegrin, and Croatian.

¹⁰⁵ „The work must represent indigenous persons honestly, without distortion or stereotype, and the research should honour indigenous knowledge, customs, and rituals. It should not be judged in terms of neocolonial paradigms. [...] [R]esearchers should be accountable to indigenous persons. They, not Western scholars, should have first access to research findings and control over the distribution of knowledge.“ (Denzin 2008, 2)

¹⁰⁶ Serbocroatian is used here to refer to the language as it was denominated at the time of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia from 1945 to 1992. It is still referred to as such by some writers of the older generation. Since 1992, the languages that once constituted Serbocroatian have been reconceptualised as separate languages along national lines, i.e. Serbian, Croatian, Bosnian, and Montenegrin. Publications prior to this date would have used the term Serbocroatian, and will be noted here as such.

was searching for when attempting to properly define my work. As Peter Flynn (2010) stated, an ethnography of translation is not possible to explain without knowing what ethnography is.

From one point of view, that of the textbook, doing ethnography is establishing rapport, selecting informants, transcribing texts, taking genealogies, mapping fields, keeping a diary, and so on. But it is not these things, techniques and received procedures that define the enterprise. What defines it is the kind of intellectual effort it is: an elaborate venture in, to borrow a notion from Gilbert Ryle, "thick description". (Geertz 1973:6) (In Flynn 2010, 117).

I realized that it is not just about collecting data, description of translation done at a certain time and place, the languages which cannot be separated from its users, and reflexivity involved, but it is about the ethnographer who meets participants and their knowledge in the research. In ethnography in a Translation Studies context, the ethnographer wants to provide knowledge about so-called unknown others. In his/her relation with the Translation Studies he/she focuses on translation and how translation frames intellectual effort in translated reality. This reality is the culture in which the translator informs about the proper meaning, knowledge about the unknown others' ways of thinking, ways of knowing and living which should be understandable to the target readership. A translated text is not just a reflection of cultural differences nor a reflection of translator's subjectivity, but it is a reflection of relations in mediation between cultures and groups in the process of translation. There is always a present concern that target culture can be understood wrongly by target readership because of the translator's limited knowledge of both cultures and both languages.

Since ethnography in the Translation Studies context

has been part of the ethnographic exercise from the outset both as a practice and as a metaphor (Sturge 2007), as doing ethnography means researching communities and groups who speak other languages than those spoken by community the researcher is reporting to[,] (Flynn 2010, 116)

the issue of my subjectivity and my involvement in the analyses and self-analyses in my dissertation would need a support of an auto(ethnography) as a research method that reflects critically personal and professional creative experiences with their relevance for the personal background.

Autoethnography describes and systematically analyses personal experience, different cultural experiences, acknowledges subjectivity, emotion and the researcher's influence on research, as a way to reach a broad cultural, social and political understanding. Many scholars turned to autoethnography because they expected a positive response to the critique of canonical ideas on how research should be done. (Ellis, Adams and Bochner 2011). This critique does not only involve 'analytic' method (Anderson 2006) presenting the true of the social world which is under investigation, giving attention to objective writing and analysis, but also goes beyond the social world and creates generalization. This method supports the silence of the researcher's self while doing his/her research in a way that limits a researcher's influence on research and does not acknowledge a researcher's emotionality. It can also reduce publishing opportunities for those who do 'evocative or emotional' research (Ellis and Bochner 2006) which is grounded in personal experience and emotions.

Because of the involvement of myself as a researcher' and involvement of research participants' personal experiences and emotions, evocative or emotional research is very important for my work. It gives me the possibility to write in the first-person style, and see myself also as the object of research. My narrative is evocative and through biographies, poems, self-translations and self-analysis brings out details of the private lives of myself and of the participants in the research. In this narrative, our life experiences meet and connect with each other. Evocative research calls the readers into dialogue and awakens empathy and liveliness within the Romani and non-Romani readership. It also has the possibility to produce a deeper understanding of Roma poets in their writing, especially in writing poetry which is analysed in this work, and it opens a new ways of knowing and knowledge for the non-Romani readers. Accordingly, evocative or emotional research influences readers regarding the issues of identity, and those experiences that are always in silence. It brings representations that deepen sympathy, empathy for and understandings of the people who are different. (Ellis and Bochner 2000).

In these ways, I recognized my ways and started to produce evocative research in the Romani context grounded in personal and community members' experiences. Through this work our silenced voices might turn into a loud voice, into self-representation in the hope of moving other people to show empathy and understand Romani people. Our poetry and self-translations

are at the same time our self-narratives¹⁰⁷ which involve ourselves within social spaces. As an autoethnography promotes these forms it gives us the possibility to act as the analytic and the evocative autoethnographers. As an analytic autoethnographer, I “focus on developing theoretical explanations of broader social phenomena, whereas [as an evocative autoethnographer I] focus on narrative presentations that open up conversation and evoke emotional responses” (Ellingson and Ellis 2008, 445). Our poetry and self-translations are turned into narratives or self-narratives, and can refer to “the ethnography of personal cultural experience and to autobiographical writing that has ethnographic interests” (Alexander 2006, xx). Also, they can refer to autobiographic reflections on ethnographic observations and an analysis of personally lived experience of each participant in this work. Each self-translation is a reflection of written poetry in which reflexivity and self-reflexivity give possibility to the researcher for a social and cultural critique. In such a way, ethnography and autoethnography complement each other. Through the self-reflexivity of a researcher and as a writer it is possible to ask ourselves on questions how and in which ways we produce our knowledge, what is the notion of periphery and centre, what is our position in culture (Alsop 2002). Methodology and critiques are lacking in the Romani context, but this work should be the first created social and translation space in which these critiques can awaken.

I am also aware of the facts that create weaknesses and remarkable concerns in the use of an autoethnographic research method. The value of individual truth varies depending on individuals' lives and their life experiences, and questions the value of subjectivity and objectivity in the research. In a work i.e. research where personal experience is involved, self-consciousness and morality come with a lot of fears, doubts and emotional pain. But this is something that inspires researchers in autoethnography because they found the way to express years long silenced voices. These silenced voices share the same fate with Romani voices. Also, problems that appear could be a result of individual's subjectivity in relation to readership and readers' different understanding and interpretation of research and researchers do not have any control over it (Ellis and Bochner 2000, 737-738). This problem is relevant in my case i.e. in this work and its understanding of individuals' interpretations which differs and depend on Romani and non-Romani readership. My fear is a possible generalization of both. In the case of Romani

¹⁰⁷"The term *narrative* carries many meanings and is used in a variety of ways by different disciplines, often synonymously with *story* (...) the narrative scholar (pays) analytic attention to how the facts got assembled that way. For whom was this story constructed, how was it made and for what purpose? What cultural discourses does it draw on—take for granted? What does it accomplish?" (RIESSMAN & SPEEDY, 2007, pp.428-429)

readers, it is because of common differences among Romani groups and their dialects, customs, habits and expressions. A Romani individual can interpret and understand my work in favour of a certain group that she/he belongs to. That means, it can be with sympathy or empathy, but also with antipathy. In the case of non-Romani readership, interpretation and understanding can be based on historical prejudices and stereotypes against Roma and deepen already present misunderstandings, but also it can cause empathy and sympathy. In both cases, I count on the changes and acceptance of knowledge which has been built through personal experiences of the participants and myself.

Despite its advantages and weaknesses, autoethnography has served and recognizes the importance of the relevance of personal background. As an autoethnographer, I am aware that I write down ‘the experience of a historical moment’ (Denzin 2003, 234)

[t]he autoethnographer functions as a universal singular; a single instance of a more universal social experience. [...] That [e]very person is like every other person, but like no other person [,] that [t]he autoethnographer inscribes the experiences of a historical moment, universalizing these experiences in their singular effects on a particular life[,] (Ibid.)

and that writing of these experiences refers to this particular historical moment within this work. Let us consider the following questions: how do I feel while writing, self-translating, translating and analysing myself and the other; how do the participants feel in this research while writing, self-translating, being analysed, analysing and self-analysing; how to deal with subjectivity and objectivity; who will read the work by a Romani researcher; how will readers interpret it if they read it; how do the links between society and culture work? Can the answers to these questions be found in ethnography and autoethnography, in reflexivity and self-reflexivity?

3.3 Self-reflexivity as a method

Critique and its reflections on ethnographic work point to the “contextualization of translation and rethinking about the translator as social and ethical agent which led to a self-reflexive turn in TS” (Hermans in Munday 2009, 94). The issue of the relation between subject and object, in which the subject can perceive the object precisely "through sensory perception and by way of experience and evidence“[.] ”the dichotomy of subjectivism-objectivism, in spite of acknowledging the possibility of discrepancies between the ‘real’ qualities of a given object and its perception by an individual” (Dizdar 2012, 57)), has led to inconsistencies in empirical and

experimental research in Translation Studies. (Ibid.). Different personal experiences within different cultures as shaped in certain historical periods of time have enabled us to acquire forms of intercultural knowledge. This knowledge, which was previously not known or which was believed not so important to be known came out through self-reflexivity and reflexivity.

Reflexivity is a tool to produce more science, not less. It is not designed to discourage scientific ambition but to help make it more realistic. By helping the progress of science and thus the growth of knowledge about the social world, reflexivity makes possible a more responsible politics, both inside and outside of academia. (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, 194)

“In recent years critical approaches from other disciplines such as philosophy, ethnology or sociology have helped to reshape Translation Studies and theories.” (Dizdar 2012, 5)

The reception of anti-essentialist approaches from philosophy, most prominently deconstruction, and sociology (sociology of translation), where the Bourdieusian approach has been influential, has foregrounded the importance of reflexivity in Translation Studies. Approaches from ethnology and anthropology have also helped to question the observer's role in translation research. (Dizdar 2012, 6)

The question of representation opened up the discussion on the practice of ethnography as a discipline, ”and was critical of the traditional idea of the ethnographer’s account of another people as an unproblematic ‘translation of culture’“ (Hermans in Munday 2009, 103).

Also, Cronin in *Translation and Globalization* (2003), in referring to minority languages under pressure from powerful languages, sees the danger of their dying at lexical and syntactic levels in the way that over time they turn to the mirror-images and imitation of dominant language/s, and that because of constant translation they cannot be more translated because there is nothing left to be translated (2003, 141). Cronin prefers a translation of reflexion rather than translation of reflection. Cronin defines *reflection* as „the imbibing of a dominant language that produces the numerous calques that inform languages from Japanese to German to Irish“ (Ibid.). *Reflexion* for Cronin refers to a second-degree reflection or meta-reflection which should be of interest to translation studies researchers and their criticism of what ”a language absorbs and what allows it to expand and what causes it to retract, to lose the synchronic and diachronic range of its expressive resources.“ (Ibid.)

The translation of reflexion through the perspective of minority languages has its relevance for my research. Romani čhib absorbs the form, syntax and lexis of dominant languages, and also its translation is a mirror, and in many cases also an imitation, of dominant

language/s form, syntax and lexics. A fear of Romani čhib dying and consequently of its translation lead to "translation –as –assimilation" and „translation –as-diversification“ (2003, 142). Speakers can be assimilated through self-translation into dominant language, or they can also keep and develop their language through translation offices and go against and prevent incorporation. (Ibid.) Also, speakers and writers of Romani čhib have been assimilated through self-translation into dominant languages as is the case with this research. Since Romani speakers and writers do not have translation offices yet, they use different dictionaries (see the chapter on language) of different Romani dialects to try to preserve Romani čhib and its translation through intra-dialect exchange.

According to Tymoczko (2007/2010/2014)

[u]sing superordinate concepts of representation, transmission, and transculturation as frameworks for evaluating and interpreting our own translations and our own imperatives about translation fosters self-reflexivity. (2007/2010/2014, 139)

This is very important "in translation studies where differences and otherness are at the heart of the inquiry" (Ibid.). The absence of a critical, self-reflexive activity, as stated by Cronin (2003), can cause consequences if there is

[...] absence of commentary on linguistic transformations conceals otherness and minority-to-major language translation but leaves minority language vulnerable to extensive interference in majority-to-minor language translation. Secondly, the lack of reflexion is not simply a question of language shift but also related to the way in which major-language culture is informed by minority language in translation [...], and how and in what way the minority language is being altered by translation process. Thirdly, translation theory itself remains hostage to the perception and interests of major languages. (2003,148- 9)

These consequences are notable within Romani čhib which is influenced by a large amount of interference in majority–to-minor language translation. The problem of reflexion appears because of the already translated information in majority language/s which stereotypically prejudiced views of Romani čhib and culture mostly. The fact is also that translation theory is mostly dominated by the English language and slightly less by other dominant national languages, which completely excludes and limits Romani readers.

Many similarities and differences between myself and participants in my research influenced how I positioned myself within my research and led me into the status of being at the same time an insider and an outsider. I am also the researcher who, for the purpose of my own

research, is at the same time aware of the use of autobiography and the biographies of the research participants to describe and analyse one's research. Stanley's (1990) concept of 'intellectual autobiography' involves an analytical and descriptive concern with specifics about the way we come to the point that we understand the process that we undergo "by locating acts of understanding in an explication of the grounded contexts these are located in and arise from" (1990, 62). I am also both at home and away, someone who is studying and presenting my own culture "with a re-defined version of itself changes our language, widens our horizon and makes us an outsider to those we re-visit" (Alsop 2002,[49]).

I found myself as an outsider who re-visits, and at the same time as an auto-ethnographer for whom the use of self-reflexivity was the one possible way to look closer "at one's own longings and belongings" (Alsop 2002, [2]). Sharing my longings and belongings with my community, sharing our social space, "connecting the personal and the cultural" (Ibid.), I also have the possibility to look from a distance at these familiarities, and the ability to change others' perceptions and attitudes about Roma and Romani writing. This change is the advantage which autoethnography and its tool self-reflexivity allow me to do. As Holman Jones (2005) observes in the *Handbook of critical and Indigenous methodologies*, autoethnography is

a balancing act. Autoethnography writes a world in a state of flux and movement-between story and context, writer and reader, crisis and denouement. It creates charged moments of clarity, connection, and change. (Holman Jones 2005, 764) in (Denzin, Lincoln and Smith 2008, 360)

In writing an autoethnography of the research process I am participating in self-reflexivity by interrelating my struggles for power as an academic who researches, constructs and deconstructs, positions and repositions my own experiences in Romani research through a Romani lens. Representing Romani epistemology that is informed collectively by Romani people through their beliefs and practices, an epistemology "represents ways of knowing, being and doing that are so much an individual knowledge process as they are collective" (Summers 2013, 1), Romani "experience of lived realities (Brant-Castellano 2000; Martin and Mirraboopa 2003; Wilson 2001)" (Ibid.). As a way of getting out of my struggles, I contribute to my narrative, i.e. my research, that reflects my knowledge i.e. the knowledge of a Romni (Romani woman) who is a researcher in the academic community. In researching my own community, I refer to

Indigenous¹⁰⁸ ethnography as well as Native¹⁰⁹ ethnography when referring to someone who has an economic relationship based on subordination. Indigenous and Native ethnography bring together my own community worldwide and our knowledge through an ongoing dialogue.

My work is built as a space narrative through a chain of many dialogues between me and participants in the dissertation, between me and my supervisor, between me and the literature involved into this work, between me and contacts important for the dissertation, between my participants and monologues given in my and in their self-translations and self-analysis. Reflexivity and self-reflexivity through dialogues and monologues raised questions about validity and self-validity, representation and self-representation, consciousness and self-consciousness, and critique and self-critique such as questions of different personal experiences in certain historical periods and certain social spaces. In that dialogue it is possible to find belongings of myself and belongings of the participants/poets I analyse in my work. It is also possible to find connections between subjectivity and objectivity, connections between autoethnography and ethnography, and connections between self-reflexivity, reflexivity, autobiography and biography.

3.4 Importance of self-translators

Biographical approaches are used with people who speak and write many languages and where research awakens debate issues of referentiality in the relation that texts make with social reality (Temple 2006, 7). Biographical approach tries to understand experiences of changing, and views of individuals in their daily lives, which is important to them, how to provide interpretations about their past, present and future. The importance of biographical data and the biographies of self-translators is possible to understand if we provide the answers to the questions: why the poet self-translates, what is the motive for his/her writing, and how historical, social and political situations affect the motive of his/her writing.

Self-translators, according to Hokenson in Cordingley (2013, 44), need to be placed "as a singular figure in the historical interchanges between languages and between social milieus", and

¹⁰⁸"Indigenous ethnography may be conducted by anyone researching their own community". (Denzin, Lincoln, Smith 2008, 351)

¹⁰⁹"Native ethnography „can be distinguished from indigenous ethnography in that native ethnographers are those who have their origins in non-European or non-western cultures and who share a history of colonialism, or an economic relationship based upon subordination. (Tedlock, 2000, 466)" (Denzin, Lincoln, Smith 2008, 351).

their bilingual texts “tend to spring directly from more personal and immediate motives some unique but most largely shared among them.” (Ibid.). In the case of Romani self-translators, they experience the different status of their language i.e. Romani čhib in many ways (see chapter on language), and of their social and political status, which creates their different motivations for self-translation. Their motivation is influenced by different biographies, life stories, their literary history and history of self-translation, their life history which is always linked to the spaces where they live.

The life history, a particularly favoured form of ethnographic data in recent years, is a special case of following the plot. [...] Life histories reveal juxtapositions of social contexts through a succession of narrated individual experiences that may be obscured in the structural study of processes as such. They are potential guides to the delineation of ethnographic spaces within systems shaped by categorical distinctions that may make these spaces otherwise invisible. These spaces are not necessarily subaltern spaces (although they may be most clearly revealed in subaltern life histories), but they are shaped by unexpected or novel associations among sites and social contexts suggested by life history accounts. (Marcus 1998, 94)

For Roma, these spaces are linked with their “subaltern life histories” (Ibid.) where, because of that, different versions of biographies, different life stories are found in different sources. To get the exact biographical data, authors, i.e. self-translators, were asked to prove it for validation and cross-validation. At that moment of approval, biographies turned for them into their autobiographies as complementing each other, but still, at the same time, remain biographies for the purpose of my work.

A problem in biographical research occurs because of the different use of the terms which form the biographical method such as life, self, experience, ethnography, autoethnography, narrative, history, writing presence, difference, biography and autobiography (Denzin 1989, 27), and because of their interchangeable use. A life story is the story that a person chooses to tell about the past life that she/he lived. It is complete and honest as possible about the things that arise from remembering and what the teller likes the others to know about it. Also, it is important to mention oral history/life stories which “encourages us to rethink dominant research practice from a mode of knowing *about* to knowing *with* [.]” (High, 2016), and oral history research ethics that includes obtaining informed consent i.e. a participant's agreement to participate, mitigation of harm i.e. deep emotional pain to participant/s and researcher, and the right to withdraw i.e. a participant can ask to end the recording of an interview and ask to destroy the

interview. Dialogue and collaboration in the process must be covered by trust and shared decision making.

A life history is a complete narrative of experience of the whole life of a person, where very important details are highlighted. In this work, life story and life history are intertwined with biography and autobiography, with authors' poems and their self-translations.

The term biographical research in this work will denote all the work and material used to understand self-translators' individual experiences and lives. Biographical research supports a view of individuals such as the view of self-translators who are creators of meanings, and who act in the way that enables their social existence, such as the way the Romani self-translators found their own way of social existence. Also, knowing the poets' and/or at the same time self-translators' biographies (see Chapter IV) I could consult them for the biographical and autobiographical documents and books, and keep them in dialogue through which I got a clear and exact reception of their expression and meaning.

A biographical approach takes on the issues of representation and language and it is very rare in the debate between biographical sociologists and translation scholars. An important issue is the language and research with people whose first language is not English. (Temple 2006, 9) "The language issue is seen as a technical concern rather than an issue of voice and representation" (Ibid.). Biographical research reflects translation research, and the tendency of this approach is to collect and interpret the lives of others as a part of human understanding (Ibid.).

This understanding in case of Romani self-translators is of interest to me not just because of different tribes' and groups' voices and representation, their experience and knowledge, but also because of Romani dialect differences that are used in writing, translation, self-translation, and in the analysis and self-analysis that lead to a better understanding.

3.5 Linguistic – literary analysis

In order to carry out my analysis more effectively, as I already mentioned, I limit the scope of my research and focus on the Western Balkan countries of former Yugoslavia, not only because of my fluency in the regional language(s) but also because of my knowledge of Romani dialects in the region. The most appropriate language pair for my thesis is Romani in its 4 dialects, Gurbeti

(Xoraxano) from Montenegro, Arli from Kosovo, a combination of Arli (Kovački - Bugurdjijski) and Gurbeti (Djambaski) from Macedonia, and Gurbeti from Bosnia and Herzegovina, spoken in the region of former Yugoslavia as a source language, and Serbocroatian as the target language. The analysis also includes German and English target texts. The Turkish target text will not be analysed because I do not know Turkish. The English translations are my own and are provided to orient English-language readers as to the subject matter and poetic form.

In the analyses of the Romani poets and their poems, each section follows a similar format. The format I use for the chapter referring to my analysis contains the poets' biographical information and literary production, poems introduced in the original and self-translated versions along with their English translation i.e. both the original and self-translated versions, analysis of each version of the poems i.e. of the original and self-translation/s based on the literal translation in English, the poets' own self-analysis and comments that follow these self-analyses (see chapter IV). I faced the problem of formulating adequate terminology in the process; terms such as source text, target text, original language, second language, and self-translation were a source of confusion. I was also unsure of the proper way of labelling them. The process of translation flows between two different languages, which causes a change of the original written text as a source text (ST) in the source language (SL) into a written text as the target text (TT) in the target language (TL). Therefore, the authors' original, written text was translated by translator/s who must be very proficient in both languages, but not necessarily so much familiar with the SL culture. Categories such ST, SL, TT, TL are problematic in my case because the ST is written by the author who self-translates his/her own work into TT, who is a speaker of both or more languages, and who is at the same time, very familiar with his/her own culture and its differences and with the TL culture and its differences.

The texts written by authors are original versions in Romani dialects and the self-translated texts are versions in Serbocroatian that can be also treated as the second created work or as recreated work. These two versions complement each other and are in a dialogue. Because of the characteristics of the Romani language and their contact languages and the role of the second language/s, and also because of Romani bilingualism and/or multilingualism, the way that seemed the most appropriate in my analysis was to label the versions as AL1 (the language in which the poem was first written), AL2/AL3/AL4 (as subsequent self-translation(s)), NAL1/NAL2/NAL3/NAL4 as a non-author's language, i.e. a translation not done by the author and, in

this case, an English translation of the original and of each self-translation as to the subject matter and poetic form.¹¹⁰

The analyses are performed on the AL versions, i.e. the original version and the self-translated version in order to show the categories that have helped me to investigate how TT functions in relation to the ST, considering two general translation strategies either direct and oblique, and the seven translation methods or procedures proposed by Vinay's and Darbelnet (1973). As stated by Munday (2012), Vinay and Darbelnet's translation strategy is the "orientation of the translator [...]" and procedures are specific techniques or methods which are used "by a translator at a certain point in a text" (2012, 57), on the basis of the appropriate translation procedure chosen by the translator.

Choosing the direct translation strategy, which mostly looks like word-for-word quotation of the original message in the target language, I was aware of its three translation procedures: borrowing, calque and literal translation. Also, choosing the oblique translation strategy which is used when a literal translation is unacceptable because of the lack of equivalence between the original version and the self-translation version, in which the translator develops and presents in detail a brief statement of the main points of the content of the original message, I was aware of its four translation procedures: transposition, modulation, equivalence and adaptation.

Even though Vinay and Darbelnet's model works with isolated language units where the difference between categories that affect the whole text is not shown, it benefited my work by helping me to find the differences and similarities in language systems and grammar in AL versions, to show similarities and differences in the semantics of the terms and writing styles, to compare them in the original version and in the self-translation versions, and to point out the issue of equivalence, and faithfulness in the analysis of this work. Later on, this model helped me to investigate how the AL versions i.e. original Romani and self-translated Serbocroatian versions complement each other according to their common stylistic forms and grammatical structures.

Nevertheless, being aware of the model's disadvantages because of its focus on translation result rather than on translation process, and because of the criticism for being just a "comparison between English and French at all levels of words, phrases, and sentences taken out

¹¹⁰The poems are provided in their original formats in the Appendix II. In this chapter they have been formatted within tables for easier reference.

of context” (Waliński 2015, 64), this model can be regarded as a model that the other translation strategies and procedures relied on later, such as by Newmark (1981, 1988) and Schreiber (1993, 1998).

The direct translation strategy literal procedure i.e. word-for-word as the most used translation procedure in my analysis causes problems related to incompleteness in understanding and meanings of the texts. This turned my attention to the use of oblique strategy procedures that allows us to investigate text solutions and sense or meaning making. Therefore, I applied the sense-for-sense or free translation procedure and its focus on capturing the sense of the source text i.e. of the original Romani and self-translated versions in its extension. According to Munday (2012)

[t]he distinctions between “‘word-for-word’ (i.e. ‘literal’) and ‘sense-for-sense’ (i.e. ‘free’) translation can be seen “back to Cicero (106-43 BCE) and St Jerome (347-420 CE). [...]Although some scholars (e.g. Vermeer 1994: 7) argue that these terms have been misinterpreted, Jerome’s statement is now usually taken to refer to what came to be known as ‘literal’ (word-for-word) and ‘free’ (sense-for-sense) translation. Jerome rejected the word-for-word approach because, by following so closely the form of the ST, it produced an absurd translation, cloaking the sense of the original. The sense-for-sense approach, on the other hand, allowed the sense or content of the ST to be translated. In these poles can be seen the origin of both the ‘literal vs. free’ and ‘form vs. content’ debate that has continued until modern times. (Munday 2012, 30).

Using a sense-for-sense translation procedure, led to flowing translated texts which transmit the meaning of both, the original version AL1 and self-translated AL2/AL3... version/s without distorting the target English language meaning (NAL3 version).

Romani AL1	Word-for-word of AL1 English NAL1	Serbocroatian AL2	Word-for-word of AL2 English NAL2	Sense-for-sense of AL1 and AL2 English NAL3
Kate si o mursh Vov anel o dukhado brsh.	There is a man He brings painful year.	Vidim muškarca kako stoji I godinu bolnu ti kroji.	I see a man standing And a year painful to you tailors.	There is a guy He makes you cry.

The examples of Viney’s and Darbelnet’s direct translation procedures “as tool of textual analysis that represents a process of searching for notable semantic and formal relations arising between the original and the target text” (Vinay and Darbelnet in Venuti, 2000, 28) that I provide below illustrate my approach to the analysis, and provide an answer on the question of how the target text (TT) functions in relation to the source text (ST), or rather to provide an answer to the question of how a self-translation version functions in relation to the Romani version.

In applying the direct strategy first procedure, by borrowing we take a word from the source language (SL) and keep this word in the target language (TL). According to Viney and Darbelnet in Shutetleworth and Cowie (2014), this procedure is the simplest type of translation because it “involves the transfer of an SL word into TT without it being modified in any way.” (Ibid.)

In my work, there is no borrowing from the original Romani version AL1 into self-translated versions AL2, AL3... In the case where the Serbocroatian language is the original version AL1 and Romani čhib i.e. a self-translated version AL2, borrowing is present in the poem CV6 in the first stanza (the words *kazane*, *kotlove*).

Serbocroatian	Romani	English
Kucao sam kazane i kotlove od bakra.	Cherdem xarkumache sheja, kazane thaj kotlove .	<i>I tapped cauldrons and copperboilers.</i>

The second procedure of direct strategy is a calque, the term which is used when an expression from the SL is transferred literally into the TL “to produce a TL equivalent” (Ibid.).

An example of a calque in translation in the poem *Drabarni/Gatara/Fortune-Teller* can be found in the first stanza. In the Bosnian translation the word *phendam* is lent from Romani and it is synonymous to the word *vacharav* in Romani. I do not generalize it, but this example, as the only one in my work, should be used as a stepping stone for its investigation within other poems and works.

Romani	Bosnian	English
Ando fildzano me dikhav Tuche baxt the vacharav .	U fildžan ti gledam Sreću da ti phendam .	From inside this cup I will tell of your luck.

The third translation procedure of direct strategy is a literal, or word by/for word procedure. It is only used when an SL word or text is translated into a TL word or text without paying attention to the style, but with a great focus on grammar and idioms used in the way that does not alter the meaning in the TL. The “translators’ task is limited to observing the adherence to the linguistic servitudes of the TL” (Viney and Darbelney in Venuti 2000, 80).

As already written, the literal translation procedure i.e. word-for-word translation, is the most applied procedure in the analysis chapter of this work. This translation procedure is the most common procedure when translating “between two languages of the same family [...], and even more so when they also share the same culture.” (Vinay and Darbelnet in Venuti, 2000, 86). Even though Romani čhib and Serbocroatian do not belong to the same language family, I am convinced of the necessity of using literal translation because of the specificities of Romani čhib and its use of grammar, morphological and orthographic forms from the Serbocroatian language. At that point, Romani depends and relies on Serbocroatian as a TL. Because of that and because of the natural bilingualism and multilingualism of Romani poets that are analysed in this work (see chapter on language), “translation does not involve any specific stylistic procedure” (Vinay and Darbelnet in Venuti 2000, 87), but involves grammar. While comparing both, Romani as SL, i.e. AL1 version, and Serbocroatian as TL and as self-translation i.e. AL2, AL3... versions in literary, it became obvious that Romani čhib uses the Serbocroatian language structure as a common language structure in writing and translating i.e. self-translating. In my work, Serbocroatian is the closest contact language to Romani as well as the closest contact culture among the culture/s of former Yugoslavia; influences of both on Romani are notable.

Romani AL 1	Word-by-word from Romani AL1 to English NAL 1	Serbocroatian AL2	Word-by-word from Serbocroatian AL2 to English NAL 2
O anav lakro cahra/ Adžahar pendjardi/ Dajekh drom tu da dikhela/ Lakri jag thaj lakro thuv//	Her name is tent// Everywhere known Once upon a time you saw/ Her fire and her smoke//	Ime joj je čerga/ Celom svetu znana/ I ti si nekada video/ Dim i vatru čerge//	Her name is tent// Known to all the world/ And you sometimes saw / Smoke and fire of the tent //

Even though they share a common linguistic structure, the differences in culture/s, habits and customs are considerable, which creates a problem of understanding. These differences can bring about another meaning and consequently another inadequate understanding, such as in this example:

Romani ST (original version AL1)	English TT (word-for-word)
Thov talo fildzano sumnakuni angurusti Ka cherel tut abijavehchi luludji.	Put under the cup a golden ring It will make for you a wedding flower.

Serbocroatian TT (self-translation AL2)	English TT (word-for-word)
Ispod fildžana zlatni prsten stavi Svadbeni cvijet biće ti u glavi.	Under the small cup golden ring put Wedding flower will be in your head.

Since I found a literal translation procedure unacceptable because of the lack of fidelity and the lack of complete understanding of the meaning, I followed the advice of Viney and Darbelnet in Venuti (2000, 87) “to turn to the methods of oblique translation“ and decided as stated out by Ni (2009)

[d]irect and oblique translation in some degree are correspondent to literal and free translation respectively, one of the difference for their [Viney and Darbelnet's] theory from the theories in 'pre-linguistic period' (Newmark, 1981,p.4) is that Viney and Darbelnet use detailed categories to substitute for macro-level's literal and free. (2009, 78).

Transposition, the first translation procedure in an oblique strategy “involves replacing one word class with another without changing the meaning of the message. Transposition is an intentional and often unavoidable grammatical change that occurs in translation from SL into TL, and it can be obligatory or optional.” (2000, 88).

Romani	Serbocroatian	Grammar change
E gindese <i>del phaka</i>	I poželi <i>nešto</i>	Noun – verb, <i>verb - pronoun</i>
Bariljum bugjake	Moje rastanje postao je rad	Verb – noun
Lakri majšukar amalin i čar, i len hem dajekh bar	Njene su najljepše drugarice Poljane reke kamenje	Singular - plural

Modulation is the way in which translator finds naturalness in a translation, i.e. self-translation, without missing any meaning and exactness from the ST.

Vinay and Darbelnet in Venuti (2000) explain equivalence as cultural and as something that readers of the target culture recognize in idiomatic expressions, although literal translation can leave these readers in confusion. (2000, 90). Viney and Darbelnet's understanding of equivalence “should not be confused with the more common theoretical use“ (Munday 2012) where it refers to a relationship between ST and TT, which makes it possible to produce translation. The notion of equivalence that was introduced to translation theories in the 1960s and 1970s and points to the ST and TT which share some kind and degree of ‘sameness,’ which creates different kinds of equivalence (Panou 2013, 2). These different kinds and degrees of equivalence led to criticisms and debates about their analysis.

Since my work has its focus on self-translation, I will refer to Hokenson and Munson (2007, 9) who state that the terms 'equality', 'commensurability' and 'equivalence' are nowhere as problematic as in self-translation. The problem can be identified in the relation with publishers and literary critics who might forget that in the case of self-translation a writer is at the same time in the SL and in the TL, in the SL culture and in the TL culture, or rather that one hand writes an SL text and in the TL text. Also, the problem is in the terminology used to label SL and TL because the texts are considered as versions and/or as an original and a self-translation. Self-translator acts in a way that he/she decides to, in a way that he/she understands the issue of fidelity and adequacy. The next problem appears because his/her self-translation can be considered as the second creative work but not as translation, or even as a recreation of the first text.

In the analysis in my work, since self-translators are able to write in two or more languages and each language fits appropriately in the cultures they live in and with, I decided to rely mostly on fidelity and adequacy, with an extension to formal and dynamic equivalence.

These terms are coined by Eugene Nida who avoided old terms: literal, free and faithful translation. “Formal equivalence focuses attention on the message itself, in both form and content” [...] and the dynamic one, based on ‘the principle of equivalent effect’, where ‘the relationship between receptor and message should be substantially the same as that which existed between the original receptor and the message’. (Nida 1964a:159)” (in Munday 2012, 47-8).

Nida (in Venuti 2000, 154) claims that content and form mutually affect each other but priority is given to the different nature of the message, where in some messages the content is of primary consideration and in other messages the form. In other words, dynamic equivalence searching for the nearest natural equivalence to the SL message. (Shabnam 2013, 1). Nida states that translation consists of “reproducing in the receptor language the natural equivalent of the source language message, first in terms of meaning and second in terms of style.” (in Venuti 2000, 127). According to Nida, the content of poetry is limited and reflected by its form, where attention is given to “formal elements than one normally finds in prose (in Venuti 2000, 154), and therefore the form of a poem translated into the form of prose would be inappropriate correspondence to the original. Also, in some cases such as in the case of the Old Testament of the Bible, which was written in the poem form, the content is more important than the form and the message has priority.

Malmkjaer uses Nida’s terms as a basis for her discussion and says that the attribute of formal equivalence which can be seen in form and content pays attention to the translation which is concerned with correspondence of poetry to poetry (Malmkjaer 2005, 30). This is important for my work since there is also concerned correspondence of poetry to poetry, and of self-translation and translation. At the same time, dynamic equivalence applies to the translation in which the naturalness of expression is complete, the receptor’s i.e. self-translator’s way of behaviour is in relation to his/her own culture, and in relation to translators translating SL and ST they do not belong to. It has to be mentioned that a translator does not insist that he/she understands cultural patterns of the source-language to comprehend the message (Ibid.), but self-translators in my work do understand because they live bilingual and bicultural and/or multilingual and multicultural life. The understanding of cultural patterns of the source-language is not a concern of a self-translator in my analysis because they live and they are educated in the culture of source-language. The awareness of inseparability of their original and self-translation, of their and source-language culture has been a conscious, natural way in approaching writing of the Romani poetry.

Adaptation is “a special kind of equivalence, a situational equivalence” (Vinay and Darbelnet in Venuti 2000, 91). Adaption and equivalence are more typical for a metaphorical and fictitious literary text. It refers to the cases where SL message is unknown in the TL culture, and because of that translator creates a new situation which can be treated as an equivalent. (Ibid.) The focus of translator and his/her goal when adapting is to have the same effect on the TL readers, where SL cultural meaning is replaced by another term in the target culture as shown in this example¹¹¹:

Romani	Serbocroatian	English
Pe sinija ačhile	Na sofri nam ostaše	On our dining table there are

Since language is inseparable from culture, and visa versa, not just linguistics but also cultural differences have set a lot of challenges in literary translation. These challenges appeared in relation to literary texts’ and literary translation characteristics. According to Jones (2009 in Baker and Saldanha eds. 2009) literary texts:

[...]have a written base-form, though they may also be spoken; they enjoy canonicity (high social prestige); they fulfil an affective/aesthetic rather than transactional or informational function, aiming to provoke emotions and/or entertain rather than influence or inform; they have no real-world truth-value – i.e. they are judged as fictional, whether fact-based or not; they feature words, images, etc., with ambiguous and/or indeterminable meanings; they are characterized by ‘poetic’ language use (where language form is important in its own right, as with word-play or rhyme) and heteroglossia (i.e. they contain more than one ‘voice’ – as with, say, the many characters in the Chinese classic Shui Hu Zhuan / Water Margins Epic); and they may draw on minoritized styles – styles outside the dominant standard, for example slang or archaism. (2009: 152)

In other words, literary texts are in a written form, canonical, they have aesthetic function, they focus on emotion, they have feature words with indefinable meanings, they have poetic language use, and heteroglossia.

¹¹¹ For detailed explanation about the sinija and sofra see chapter on analysis (Chapter IV).

Traditionally, literary translation studies have focused on source-target text relation where the attention has been given to debates about equivalence and communicative purpose, concern about style which defines the writer's cultural space-time, his/her use of non-standard styles such as archaism, dialect, and the use of other style were possible for the writer to encode his/her viewpoint on the content of a text, to label different voices, and structure of the text (2009, 153). Literary translation characteristics are

expressive, connotative, symbolic, focusing on both form and content, subjective, allowing multiple interpretation, timeless and universal, use devices to raise communicative effect, [has] tendency to deviate from the language norms (Belhaag 1997, 20)[,] must reflect all the literary features of the source text as sound effects, morphophonemic selection of words, figures of speech...etc. (Riffaterre 1992, 204-205).” (Hassan 2011, 2-3).

These characteristics could be seen in literary translation in which literary translators deal with different literary genres being aware of their linguistic, pragmatic and cultural elements, and their differences from the target culture and the target readership.

According to Janes, literary translation can be seen as “a communication process” where two TS approaches are data-driven and theory-driven. Data-driven approach treats translation as behaviour and it is informed by translator's reports and their experiences in practice, interviews, and as cognitive-pragmatic where the analysis is “informed by literary cognitive stylistic and the pragmatics of translation”. (Jones in Baker and Saldanha eds. 2009, 154).

In literary translation both content and form are important in transference of the spirit of the original text and the writers' style. Since my work analyses poems in self-translation there have been raised questions such as: is the literary self-translation literal or/and free; how self-translators use the wording in their original texts and how in their self-translated texts; does the style, content and form of the original follows the style, content and form of their self-translation; is self-translation faithful and adequate; what devices are used by self-translators in their writing and self-translations, etc. Thinking about these questions makes me think about an appropriate way I should apply for my analysis. At this point, I have to say that literary analysis/criticism on Romani poetry and Romani translation and self-translation has not been done yet.

Both data-driven and theory-driven approaches are applicable to my analysis and both complement each other. My literary analysis is informed by myself through my experience as a poet, self-translator and translator, through the participants and their poems and self-translations,

through their experiences, through their self-analysis that they provided according to the questionnaire I sent them (see the questionnaire in the annex), through the interaction among different dialects of Romani that are used in poems, and different versions of Serbocroatian that translation is based on. Because self-translators decide by themselves which forms, and in which ways they use their creativity, I decided slightly to interconnect the issues which are common for the textual analysis of a poem, such as form, rhythm, rhyme, metre, verse, stanza, effects, image, symbols, tone, content, sound, etc., with social, and cultural, and with the issue of readership, to better present the reality of literary self-translation, along with the issue of identity in the original Romani version and in the Serbocroatian self-translation.

Analysing poems and their self-translations I am aware that I have used an introspective analysis that is based on empirical evidence, which helped in direct and indirect way to collect the knowledge, consequently raised the issue of literary critics in Romani context, and within this work it can be treated as beginning of Romani literary criticism.

After I analysed the poems and their self-translations, I now want to provide some initial observations. Firstly, most Romani poets in the Balkans (and perhaps elsewhere) publish their poetry in bilingual and/or multilingual versions, which reflect the linguistic status and experience of the authors. Second, many if not most poets self-translate, or carry out some version of self-translation. Third, the 'source' and 'target' texts (problematic terms in this case) of the self-translating poet are complementary. Both or multiple versions of the same self-translated poem seem to be written either with the intention of being read together, or completing one another. This complementarity has been produced by the lack of understanding of different Romani dialects that the authors write in. While writing they consult the dictionaries and terminology of other dialects, and also create own derivatives which cause the problems even to the readers of the same dialect group. The language/dialects that readers and speakers use is very much influenced by the contact Serbocroatian language, and this influence depends on the level of readers'/speakers' education. In the way the languages are complementing and compound each other the possible misunderstandings which can be produced by readership can be escaped. Also, creating Romani and non-Romani readership might be of advantages for Romani poetry in self-translation, and for promoting Romani čhib. According to the authors and self-translators' answers on the questions I asked, which are provided in the annex of this work, and according to my experience as a Romani author and self-translator, it means that the original and self-

translated versions are written mostly simultaneously. Self-translators' consciousness about all differences of Romani dialects and the publishing situation in Romani minority language, made them aware of a need to create their work bilingually and/or multilingually. The specifics of Romani literature, which is mostly multilingual, and mostly self-translated motivated me to create a new category of Romani corpus as multilingual, compatible complementary corpus.

The model of my analysis is multi-oriented and multi-part:

- a) I critique poets' poems according to Vinay and Darbelnet's translation strategies and procedures, and I do literary analysis according to combined data-driven and theory-driven literary translation approaches applied to literary self-translation involving text analysis strategies (literal and free);
- b) I critique my own poems using Vinay and Darbelnet's translation strategies and procedures, I do literary analysis according to combined data-driven and theory-driven literary translation approaches applied on literary self-translation involving the introspective analysis based on empirical evidence, self-reflexivity, and text analysis strategies (literal and free);
- c) I ask poets to self-analyse i.e. self-critique their work according to the questions which can be found in the annex of this work;
- d) I asked one poet to analyze and critique my two poems according to the questions which have been already mentioned in this work.

To corroborate my thinking about the differences in analysis that can influence different understanding of readers, I asked the poets to analyse their poems so that their self-translated poems follow their self-analysis of the work.

While the poets were working on their self-analyses, my reflection on the word “self,” in “self-translation,” “self-knowledge,” and “self-analysis,” in relation to my work and in relation to the other and self, enhanced the question on “self-reflexivity,” and on the reason to include my poems in my work. My first poem was written in Romani and self-translated into Bosnian and English; and the second was first written in Bosnian and self-translated into Romani and then English. Asking poet Ruždija Ruso Sejdović to analyse my poems and self-translations, which he accepted with pleasure, I had an intention to reach not just subjective but also an objective view on my work. I asked the questions such as: what do you think about my poems and my poetic expression; what elements are used in the writing strategy; what are the motives of the poems and how can you designate the motives in my writing; how do you know that poems are about Roma;

what do you think about difference/s of my writing regarding the other Romani poets; what extend are traditional and cultural elements present in my poems; do readers understand the context of the original Romani and the context of self-translation separately; what readership is moved by bilingual poems Romani or non-Romani. Sejdović answers provided in the analysis of my poems led me to point out the following questions: what challenges are there while self-translating from Romani into an official national language, and what are the challenges while translating from an official national language into Romani; what differences are we aware of; what is validity of this work and how to reach acknowledgment because of involved subjectivity.

My thoughts were if the poets/writers are self-analysing their self-translation, and if I analyse the other, and the other poet my poems, would it not be possible, along those lines, to create a foundation for an early Romani literary criticism, which is currently lacking? Would it not awaken the interest and need for TS in the context of Romani studies?

3.6 Proposal of typology of critique

After defining my corpus as a multilingual compatible complementary corpus which includes four poets i.e. self-translators, I proceeded to explain the importance of personal background and the way how I came to the use of ethnography and autoethnography as methods in my work. Self-representing languages and knowledge of cultures was possible by combining autoethnography and ethnography, using their tools reflexivity and self-reflexivity in research and practice. At the same time, it is very important to focus on personal experiences, biographies, autobiographies, consciousness, self-consciousness, and morality. All of that is a proof of decolonizing the knowledge in Romani context. It raises the question on memory, oral history and history. This is an experimental model of research which evaluates self-translators' work and their use of the literary and linguistic expression with the announcement of cultural specificities and differences. Through this model it is possible just to evaluate presented knowledge. The users and readers of this narrative should accept this limitation, knowing the fact that a single autoethnographic narrative analysis such as this one cannot lead to generalization, but can be used as inspiration for understanding future research. This work opens new views for readers through personal sense and empathy. As this work can be treated as a single case which cannot be used for the generalization of facts, and as a stepping stone for raising empathy for

researches in the frame of Romani context, future research can deal with works of more poets, writers, self-translators and translators from different geographic areas.

The analysis of the poems and their self-translation is done mostly through the word-for-word Vinay's and Darbelnet's translation procedure, which allows the analysis of the compatibility of the original and the self-translation versions. Literary expressions of original versions are very close to literary expression in self-translation. The linguistic issue is very common since the Romani uses the grammatical structure of Serbocroatian, possessing the knowledge which is linked to the reception and experience of living with and between different cultures. Since autoethnography analyses a researcher's experience of participating in research through self-reflection, self-observation, inner-perception, introspection (Polkinghorne 2005, 138), self-analysis could be considered as a part of it. Self-analysis of self-translators through reflexivity and self-reflexivity opens a possibility for new insights and actions – for transformation and for change. Hence, “as a vehicle for reflexivity”, autoethnography is a way to upgrade the process of critical consciousness within researchers and practitioners (Mcilveen 2008, 6).

Can we consider this space, within this work, as a critical space?

Hoping that this work be a step forward in creating the Romani critical space out of foundation on circumstances and condition which is built in desparate betweenness, understanding through self-representativeness will bring us and our knowledge closer. Mcilveen notes:

Perhaps story is the soul of empathy — genuine understanding, a shared humanity that reaches across, touches; and in feeling with the other, we become our own self — the human intertextuality of existence (Mcilveen 2008, 7).

CHAPTER IV – CRITICAL TRANSLATION ANALYSES OF ROMANI POETRY

As mentioned in the methodology chapter, versions in this work are labelled as AL1/AL2/AL3/AL4 as author languages i.e. the original version AL1 and the self-translated versions AL2/AL3/AL4, while NAL1/NAL2/NAL3/NAL4 as non-author language versions i.e. my English translation of AL1/AL2/AL3/AL4 versions aimed at English-language readers in order to enable them to grasp the subject matter and poetic form.

In this work, the poets' use of language reflects the challenges that accompany a writer when language is not yet standardized, and furthermore how writers can cope with ambiguities seemingly inherent in the Romani language by self-translating into the majority society languages. These kinds of challenges *must* be taken into account when reading, interpreting, and critiquing Romani writers' work. It is the first level for determining whether or not the Romani writers' their respective languages is either a reflection of multilingual linguistic realities and non-standardized dialects *or* a specific literary strategy that 'plays' with the multilingual language and dialect options that are open to the writer, or perhaps even a mixture of both. The Romani writers have recourses and they exploit the actual linguistic conditions of the language in their writing and self-translation, analysis and self-analysis, reflexivity and self-reflexivity, at the place where they meet in their dialogues and monologues, in a search for knowledge and self-knowledge at the same time creating own literary critics.

In my work I will analyse poems by Romani authors who have many things in common: they write in Romani čhib and self-translate, they are from the region of former Yugoslavia, they are/were working for radio and TV programmes in Romani čhib, and left their homes because of war: Ruždija Ruso Sejdović, Mehmed Meho Saćip, Nedjo Osman, and Hedina Tahirović-Sijerčić.

4.1 RUŽDIJA RUSO SEJDOVIĆ

a. Biographical information and literary production

Ruždija Ruso Sejdović is originally from Montenegro. He was born in 1966 in a Romani community in Ubli near Titograd (known today as Podgorica). Now living and working in Cologne, Germany, he writes poetry, short prose and drama in both Romani and Serbian. In addition to his activities as a writer, he works as a translator from and into the Romani and Serbian languages. In 2015 and 2016 his poems were prized at the International Competition for the best poetry in the region of former Yugoslavia.¹¹² While still a student in high school in Belgrade, he studied art and design as extracurricular courses. After completing high school he was an intern in the Navy on the island of Vis in Croatia. In 1987 he left Yugoslavia for Italy where, as scholarship recipient at a translation foundation, he worked on translating the Bible into the Romani language.

Many of Sejdović's first works (literary writings and translations) were published in diverse journals throughout Yugoslavia. From 1981 to 1989, these areas were located principally in Cetinje and Osijek, where the following publications emerged:

- *Omladinski Pokret* (Cetinje: 1981, 1983, 1985) [Youth Movement]¹¹³
- *Krlo e Romengo- Glas Roma* (1983) [The Voice of Roma]
- *Khamutno dive* (1987) [Sunny Day]
- *Književna revija* (Osijek: 1989) [Literary Review]

From 1982-1983 he was member of the Romani radio program *Ašunen Rromalen!*¹¹⁴ (broadcast from Studio B in Belgrade) working as an editor for the column "Poetry Corner". The

¹¹² Journal Avlija, Rožaje 2015, Poem: *Svedok* [Witness] <https://www.avlija.me/poezija/ruzdija-ruso-sejdovic-svedok-druga-nagrada-casopisa-avlija-za-najbolju-pjesmu-regionu-za-2014-godinu> (Retrieved 11.2016) Journal Avlija, Rožaje 2016, Poem: *Sweet, Bitter, Love and kučka jagnjad* [Sweet, Bitter and Love and bitch labms] <https://www.cdm.me/kultura/casopis-avlija-nagradio-najbolje-pjesme-i-price/?page=0%2C2> (Retrieved 10.2017)

¹¹³My translations into English of the titles are included in brackets throughout this chapter.

¹¹⁴The bilingual Serbian / Romani radio program *Ašunen Rromalen!* was initiated in 1981 and produced at Studio B in Belgrade. Content was provided in collaboration with Behljlulj Beki Galjuš, Aliriza Aguši, and Orhan Galjuš, and edited by Dragoljub Acković. The program was delivered in the 'mosaic' format, and included such columns as news, culture, sports, interviews, language courses, poetry corner, children's matters, etc. It is important to note that this program followed an earlier model produced in Tetovo (Macedonia) edited by Remzi Mersimi. Other Romani radio programs elsewhere would follow the same model, i.e. in Gnjilane (Kosovo) in 1983 edited by Mehmed-Meho Saćip, in Priština (Kosovo) in 1986 edited by Ali Krasnići, in Sarajevo (Bosnia and Hercegovina) in 1986 edited by Hedina Tahirović Sijerčić, and in Prizren (Kosovo) in 1986 edited by Kujtim Pačaku. See also the bilingual publication *AshunenRromalen/ Listen People* by Dragoljub Acković (translation from Serbian by Vesna Alnšpiler),

chief-editor of the program was Dragoljub Acković. Sejdović was also a member of the Montenegrin artistic association from 1985, and received third prize for his poem at the festival of young poets (published in the collection *Majska rukovanja*) in Titograd (Podgorica) in 1986.

Various texts authored by Sejdović were selected for inclusion in collective works and anthologies published in Titograd/Podgorica and Osijek from 1986-1989, and in Italy, France, Serbia, Bosnia, and Croatia after the break-up of Yugoslavia.

- *Majska rukovanja* (Titograd-Podgorica:1986) [poetry collection]
- *Romani fonetika thaj lekhipa/Fonetika i pravopis romskog jezika* by Marcel Courtiade (Titograd-Podgorica: 1986) [Romani Phonetics and Writing Rules]
- *Novije pjesništvo u Crnoj Gori* (Osijek: 1989) [New Montenegrin Poetry]
- *Zingari ieri e oggi- La storia, la cultura, la letteratura*, Rom Centro Studi Zingari, 1993 [Roma Yesterday and Today]
- *Romani Poezija - Romska poezija* (Niš: 1999) [Romani Poetry]
- *Anthologie Critique des Auteurs Dramatiques Europeens (1945-2000)* by Michel Corvin (Editions Theatrales, 2007) [Critical Anthology of European Dramatists (1945-2000)]
- *Gradske priče* (Beograd: 2010) [City Stories]
- *Antologija romske poezije* (Sarajevo: Sarajevske sveske 39/40, 2012) [Anthology of Romani Poetry]
- *Antologija e Rromane poezijaçi/Antologija romske poezije* (Zagreb: Romska udruga romski putevi, 2012) [Anthology of Romani Poetry]

In 1988, the publication of his poetry book *Svjetlost u ponoć – E jak an-e jrat* [Light at Midnight] (Titograd/Podgorica) in bilingual edition earned the distinction of being the first work published in Romani and Serbocroatian in Montenegro. In 2012, a second edition of the book was published in Romani and Serbian.

In Germany (Köln), Sejdović would launch a multilingual journal in Romani, German and Serbian called *Romano lil – Romablatt* [Romani Newspaper], for which he was member of the

published by Rrominterpress, Radio B92 in Belgrade in 1996. (A reminder that not all the editors of these programs were available to reply to questions on the Romani programs they used to work for.)

editorial board from 1989 to 1991. Likewise in Köln he would found a small literary group called Jekh Čhib [One Language] in 1993/1994, and the literary group Romano Pero [Romani Quill] in 1998 along with Steva Stojko, Hanci Briher and Aladin-Marko Sejdić. With Stojko, Briher and Sejdić, he would co-author the poetry book *Kali čirikli – Der Schwarze Vogel* [Black Bird] (Köln: 1998).

The journal *Romano Nevipe* [Romani News] (1997) and other journals served as venues for publishing many of his works, including those published in German:

- *Kali čirikli – Der schwarze Vogel* [Black Bird]
- *Skizzen meiner Seins – Me trajohke draba* [Sketches of my Being]
- *Namenlos – Bi anavehko* [Nameless]
- *Märchen – Duj phral thaj o thagar* [Legends: Two Brothers and a King]
- *Roma Mutter – Romani dej* [Romani Mother]
- *Eine glückliche Quitte – E baxtali dunja* [Lucky Quince]
- *Ein Rom und drei Städte – Jekh Rrom, trin forujra* [One Rom and Three Cities]

His poems and stories have also been published in Sarajevo in the journal *Sic! – časopis za po-etička istraživanja i djelovanja* [Journal for po-ethical research and action]¹¹⁵.

In a like manner but to a lesser extent, Sejdović has been active in the domain of drama and theatre, co-authoring two plays with Nedjo Osman, actor and poet from Macedonia. The first play –originally written in Serbocroatian and Romani—was entitled *Jerma posle smrti/Jerma nach dem Tod* [Jerma After Death]. It was performed in Romani and in German at the Theater Freie Kammerspiele in 1997 by the Romani theatre troupe Exit. The production was directed by Nedjo Osman. The second drama –*Kosovo Karussell*—is a tragicomedy which was co-authored in Serbian and Romani with the Romani Serbian poet Jovan Nikolić in 1999. Co-produced with the Ruhrfestspielen Recklinghausen and Expo 2000 in Hannover, Germany, it was performed by the Romani theatre troupe Phralipe of Mülheim a.d. Ruhr, Germany under the direction of Rahim Burhan with the title *Kosovo mon amour*. The play has been translated into English and into French. Extracts of the French translation (*Kosovaqo karuseli/ Kosovo mon amour*) by Marcel

¹¹⁵ My translation. The journal's website can be consulted here: <http://www.sic.ba/>. The word “po-ethical” was created to refer to an ethics of poetry.

Courthiade were published by the Cahier de la Maison Antoine-Vitez De l'Adriatique à la mer Noire, and read both at the Petit Odéon Théâtre de l'Europe and Cité internationale universitaire de Paris, in 2001 and 2002 respectively.

Sejdović's latest work includes a bilingual collection of short stories in prose in both Romani and Montenegrin titled *Eremit* (Podgorica, Montenegro: 2011). His *Eremit* was translated in German by Melitta Depner (Berlin, Germany: 2017). He has also authored and translated poems and stories which have been published in the journal *KOD – journal for culture, literature and science* (Centar za očuvanje i razvoj kulture manjina Crne Gore, or CEKUM)¹¹⁶, established in 2011 and publishing work in Serbian, Romani, Albanian, and Croatian¹¹⁷:

- tale *Lord Bajron thaj e kajve/Bajron i kotlovi* [Lord Byron and Cauldrons] (2011) in Romani and Serbian, with translation into Albanian by Anton Gojçaj
- tale *Pripovest: Oko pradedovo* [Tale: Grandfather's Eye] (Nov 2012) in Serbian
- story *Daleko bilo* [God forbid!] (Apr 2013) in Serbian
- translation from Serbian into Romani of the short story *Demko* authored by Ćamil Sijarić (Aug 2013)
- translation from Serbian into Romani of some poetry excerpts authored by Mladen Lompar (Mar 2014)
- translation from Romani into Serbian of the poem *Čija sramota* [Whose Shame] authored by Selam Pato¹¹⁸
- translation from Serbian into Romani of the prose *Životna uloga* [Life Role] by Zuvdija Hodžić (2016, 57-62)

Two of Ruždija-Ruso Sejdović's poems were chosen for analysis: "Phiripe – Putovanja [Traveling]" (Ruždija-Ruso 1988), and "Autoportreti – Autoportret [Self-Portrait]" (Ruždija-Ruso 2012). As noted in my previous chapter, language names and politics are interwoven within

¹¹⁶Center for Protection and Development of Minority Cultures in Montenegro – my translation.

¹¹⁷ Information found by searching for "Sejdović, Ruždija-Ruso" on <http://vbcg.vbcg.me/>, but the link does not seem to work anymore (originally <http://vbcg.vbcg.me/scripts/cobiss?ukaz=DISP&id=1033445230760812&rec=-19031056&sid=0&fmt=11>).

¹¹⁸References for publications 2012-2014 are not yet provided in online catalogues. Publication from 2011 consulted at http://www.nbcg-digitalnabibliografija.me/bibliografija_tekuca/clanci_2012/zapisi133.html#3960. Information provided by author in email correspondence in the period from 2014 - 2017.

historical events in Yugoslavia. Serbocroatian is used here to refer to the language as it was denominated at the time of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia from 1945 to 1992. It is still referred to as such by some writers of the older generation. Since 1992, the languages that once constituted Serbocroatian have been reconceptualised as separate languages along national lines, i.e. Serbian, Croatian, Bosnian, and Montenegrin. Publications prior to this date would have used the term Serbocroatian, and will be noted here as such.

b. Analyses of Poem “Phiripe – Putovanja”

The first poem, written in 1988, was published in its original Gurbeti Romani¹¹⁹ alongside the poet’s self-translation in Serbocroatian. The poem was included in *Svjetlost u Ponoć -E jak an-e jrat*, the first book of poetry published by Ruždija-Ruso Sejdović. The final version of English translation (NAL3) has relied on both, on the Romani (AL1) and Serbocroatian (AL2) versions.

Phiripe	Putovanja	Travelling
Gurbeti Romani (AL1)	Serbocroatian (AL2)	English (NAL3)
1.Zurarrdam amare zeja po bršind/ thaj xalam/ šel metre drom./ Pe amari sinija/ maladol e jag./ e gili./ O čhavro maladol.//	1.Kalili smo leđa na kiši/ i pojeli/ stotinu metara puta./ Na našoj se sofri nađe/ i oganj/ i pjesma./ Dijete se nađe.//	1.We forged our backs on the rain and ate hundreds of meters of road. On our dining table there are both a flame and a song. A child can be found.
2.Tala o nango del/ Irisavah/ maškar e manuša.//	2.Pod vedrim se nebom/ vraćamo/ među ljude.//	2.Under a clear sky we return among people.
3.Pe sinija ačhile/		3.On our dining table remained

¹¹⁹In my personal correspondence with him, the author Ruždija-Ruso Sejdović refers to the Romani dialect he used as the “Xoraxano dialect as classified by Rade Uhlik”. Please see my chapter on the Romani language. Also, “Gurbet Romani belongs to the Vlax dialect group, more specifically the Southern Vlax group. Gurbet-type varieties are mostly spoken in the southwest of the Balkans (The Republic of Serbia and Montenegro, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Macedonia, Albania). Names also used to refer to this dialect are Džambazi (mostly for Gurbet varieties in Macedonia) and Das.” (Anon. “Romani Dialects” on the ROMLEX website)

amare jakha/ thaj amari čhib.//	3.Na sofri nam ostaše/ i oči/ i jezik.//	both our eyes and our language.
------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------

The English translation has relied on the Romani and Serbocroatian version.

Version AL1 (Gurbeti Romani)

Phiripe	Setting forth
Gurbeti Romani (AL1)	English (NAL1)
1.Zurardam amare zeja po bršind/ thaj xalam/ šel metre drom./ Pe amari sinija/ maladol e jag,/ e gili./ O čavro maladol.//	1.We made stronger our backs on the rain/ and we ate/ hundred meters of road./ On our low round dining table/ is to be met fire,/ song./ Child is to be met.//
2.Tala o nango del/ irisavah/ maškar e manuša.//	2.Under naked sky/ we return/ between people.//
3.Pe sinija ačhile/ amare jakha/ thaj amari čhib.//	3.On low round dining table stayed/ our eyes/ and our language (tongue).//

The English literal translation has relied on the Romani version.

This first poem was published in 1988. The Romani language (AL1) used in the poem is understandable in its clear Gurbeti dialect. The Latin-based orthography with diacritics (for example, č, š, ž, etc.) used in the poem is one commonly used in the Western Balkan region and by the Western Balkan Roma writers and readers who have migrated to countries outside the

Balkans. The lexicon and semantics of the words in the poem are comprehensible not only for Gurbeti readers but also for readers of mutually intelligible Romani dialects such as Arli, Kalderaš, and Lovari (see Chapter II on Romani language).

In this case, its translation into Serbocroatian and English does not imply any changes in terms of syntax. Thus, for example, Romani noun phrases or clauses are directly translated into these two languages, without a need to change the type of construction. In the same way, no changes of Romani parts of speech occurred in their translation into Serbocroatian and English.

The poet uses the language in a very clear and ‘clean’ way, with his Romani expression full of symbolism. The symbolism is created around specific language elements: for example noun, *sinija*, which means a low, round dining table, and *nango del*, which literally means ‘naked sky’. These two words symbolize family and pleasure symbiotically, and a clear sky with no stars, clouds, moon, or sun. While a first reading of the poem initially can yield an interpretation that reflects a romantic view of the Romani way of life, there are actually multiple interpretations and analyses which can be generated on successive readings. The multiplicity of ideas and meanings is made possible by the ‘properties’ of the Romani language and the structuring of the words in the form of a poem, i.e. in three stanzas. The poem is also characterized by multiple visual images that are constructed after the reading of each sentence.

The first stanza speaks about the Romani history of movement, about traveling through time and being on the road. The clause *zurardam amare zeja po bršind* indirectly mean to be toughened or strengthened by blows and suffering, with the direct, literal meaning read as ‘we strengthened our backs on the rain’. Personification is also used. The verb phrases *thaj xalam šel metre drom* literally mean that they ‘ate hundreds of meters of road’, which functions metaphorically to indirectly mean that they traveled a lot. The words *Pe amari sinija maladol e jag, e gili* are significant. The phrase connotes that despite a very hard life, the [extended] family used to feel united, in a space with their own fire [and hearth] chosen by themselves, united in song bound to love. They express a fervent desire for self-preservation, a wish to continue from generation to generation, recognizable and palpable through use of the words *O čhavro maladol*.

The second stanza continues to make use of metaphor and symbolic expression, notably in the clause *Tala o nango del/ irisavah/maškar e manuša*. A direct, literal translation yields ‘under the naked sky/ we came back/ among people’. The indirect meaning refers to the halting of the life of travelling, and having to come back to live in the same place as before, among

people. However, although they are once again among people, in society, they are really without anything. They have been emptied, devoided...

Finally, in the third stanza the poet once again uses personification and metaphor. The direct, literal meaning of the clause *Pe sinija ačhile amare jakha thaj amari čhib* denotes that eyes and language have been left on the *sinija* ('low, dining table'). Whereas the use of *sinija* in the stanza once evoked familiar warmth, it now indirectly connotes feelings of sadness due to the current situation. They do not feel as among people, and there is no love or song. They have only a memory of the previous *sinija*. In times past, their happiness and love were expressed with open eyes and with the languages they spoke, all of which has now been replaced with sad nostalgia.

It is very important to read the poet's 'original' and 'translation', his first and second language versions in the act of self-translation. The two versions complement each other and together confer a more complete meaning to the poem. Meaning is constructed between the readings of the two language versions, one against the other, both of which together reflect – mostly through symbolism – what the poet is trying to convey.

Version AL2 (Serbocroatian)

Putovanja	Travelling
Serbocroatian (AL2)	English (NAL2)
1.Kalili smo leđa na kiši/ i pojeli/ stotinu metara puta./ Na našoj se sofri nađe/ i oganj/ i pjesma./ Dijete se nađe.// 2.Pod vedrim se nebom/ vraćamo/ među ljude.// 3.Na sofri nam ostaše/ i oči/ i jezik.//	1.We forged our backs on the rain/ and ate/ hundreds meters of road./ On our low round table with food on is to be found/ and fire/ and song./ Child is to be found.// 2.Under clear sky we/ came back/ among people.// 3.On our low round table with food on stayed/ our eyes/ and language (tongue).//

The English literal translation has relied on the Serbocroatian version.

The translation language (AL2) for this poem is Serbocroatian. As in the AL1 ('source') text, the AL2 ('target') text likewise generates multiple meanings and ideas, organized through visual pictures and symbols. The same poet re-creates the Romani symbolism of the AL1 poem through words common and familiar to him in the language he was educated in, i.e. Serbocroatian. The strategy would seem to function on two levels: firstly, it reflects the Serbocroatian reality experienced by the poet (through the language learned at school and used in the majority society in which he lived/s) and secondly, it expresses a desire to maintain a connection with his Romani past, by his choice to write in Romani.

The manner in which the poet chooses to express his double reality through self-translation cannot be evaluated according to the 'conventional' criteria used to assess quality between source and target language texts. In this case, creativity and linguistic mastery come into play in different ways. The writing and self-translating strategies used should be analyzed as choices the poet has made (at times more deliberately than others), and not necessarily in terms of whether the second version is a 'correct translation' of the first. Reading the two versions written and translated in relation to each other implies a different set of evaluative criteria for the critic and translator into a third or fourth language. In the case of this poem, it is possible to see some of this 'relating' reflected in the transfer of *sinija* to *sofra*. *Sinija* as the low, wooden, round table and without food i.e. empty, and all its associated connotations has been converted to one of the usual daily dining table¹²⁰ with food on it. Many Roma and non-Roma in the Balkans¹²¹ do use the two words as synonyms. But they evoke different kinds of imagery and feelings in the context of the poem, and both words reflect aspects of the the poet's lifestyles reality in which both cultures and languages meet.

There is obvious commonality and comfort of a shared language, much like the shared meal and the locus of a table as a protected gathering place, as shared cultural space. Poet as self-translator, according to his knowledge of original text, allowed himself shifts in the translation which might not be acceptable by other translators, and produced "a complementary literary text

¹²⁰ Although the *sofreh* table may be known in English to some readers in the context of more elaborate events (such as Persian weddings), 'sofra' here is used to connote a normal dining table laid out with food.

¹²¹ [T]he Oriental aspects of cultural and linguistic heritage, as revealed mainly in the large number of Turkisms (many of these originally deriving from Arabic or Persian). (Bugarski 2012, 231)

which does not simply echo the original, but has its own echo and effect in the target language and culture” (Attar 2005, 139).

The last stanza could in fact be interpreted a couple of ways. On the one hand, reading in conjunction with the same stanza in Romani yields a feeling that the gaze remains fixed on the table with the impossibility of eating. Hunger remains. On the other hand, a reading of the poem solely in Serbocroatian could sidestep this symbolic meaning (including the transfer from *sinija* to *sofra*), and readers could interpret that the people are simply waiting to eat. The implied meanings associated with the word *jezik* [language] would not be understood because used as homonym; as language and as tongue - a part of body.¹²² The poet would hope that readers of the poem would try to seek out its meaning in relation to the rest of the poem. His intention and willingness to open a dialog with non-Roma and move in the direction of trying to understand Roma rather than the other way around.

When asked if he would be willing to provide a self-analysis of his poem and self-translation, Ruždija-Ruso Sejdović as also other poets involved in this work, agreed to do so. The author’s original responses are provided in full below. He writes in a multilingual mix of Serbocroatian, Serbian and Montenegrin, alongside his native Romani Gurbeti dialect. The English translation is mine.

Version AL1 and AL2 (Poet’s own self-analysis of poem “Phiripe – Putovanja”)

Date: 20.05.2015. Ruždija-Ruso Sejdović	
<p>Pisajući ovu pjesmu "adresara" sam zamišljao većinski narod, koji je u to vrijeme pa i danas pun predrasuda o Romima, o narodu kojemu pripadam. Zato sam je i preveo na tadašnjem srpskohrvatskom jeziku da bih poetičnost tajanstvenog naroda kojemu pripadam otkrio, i da bih ponudio znatiželju kod većinskog naroda za stvarnim osećanjima Roma.</p>	<p>While writing this “address book” poem, I imagined majority society people who then and now still have plenty of prejudice against Roma, against the people to whom I belong. This is why I translated the poems into Serbocroatian of that time, just to discover the poetic expression I have for them, the mysterious people I belong to. I offer the poems to them [majority society] this way so that they can satisfy their</p>

¹²² In Romani word *čhib* has the same meanings as in Serbocroatian word *jezik*.

	curiosity for the real feelings of Roma.
Romi su prema ovu [sic] postmodernistički napisanu poeziju u početku sa nevjericom reagovali, ali poslije mojih brojnih i iscrpnih objašnjenja shvatili su da se radi o objašnjenju osjećanja koje i oni sami nose sa sobom, ali koje najviše i najlakše znaju kroz pjevanje da iskažu. Ja kao pjesnik mojih stihova, nijesam imao nikakvih problema da ih prevedem na srpskohrvatskom jeziku zato što vrlo dobro obadva jezika poznajem.	In the beginning Roma people reacted with disbelief ¹²³ to this ‘postmodern’ poetry, but after numerous and detailed explanations they realized that these feelings they carry within themselves too. The easiest way has always been to express them through song. As a poet of my verses, I have never had any problems translating into Serbo-Croatian because I know both languages [Romani and Serbo-Croatian] very well.
Mogu reći da su zbog toga da su obadvije verzije zapravo dva pjevanja na dva jezika sa istom tematikom i svojim ličnim atributima pjesničke jačine, a u spomenutim stihovima na obadva jezika da se osjetiti jačina metaforičnosti.	For this reason I can say that both versions in this poem are two interpretations. They have the same thematics and personal attributes of poetic strength. In these verses in both languages one feels the strength of the metaphors.

¹²³Some groups of Roma, including the one the poet’s family belongs to, do not believe in the written word or in Roma who write.

<p>Lično smatram da je nebitno porijeklo jednog prevodioca, ali je vrlo bitno poznavanje obadva jezika sa kojima radi, i poznavanje osobenost poetike ako se o poeziji radi. Prevodjenje poezije nije isto što i prevodjenje proznog teksta, poezija traži mnogo dublje analize metaforičnih i drugih poetskih elemenata, jezičke sintakse, otuda imamo slučaj da sam mnoge svoje stihove zapravo prepevao radi očuvanja poetske jačine u prevodu.</p>	<p>I personally think that the origin of the translator is irrelevant. However, it is very important to understand the two languages one is working in, and to have knowledge of poetic peculiarities as well. Translating poetry is not the same as translating prose text; poetry seeks much deeper analysis of metaphoric and other poetic elements and language syntax. And so many of my poems I have translated and rendered in another version by myself, because of the need to preserve the poetic force in the translation.</p>
--	---

Romani people are historically faced with constant prejudices against, and the way against themselves. Sejdović sees the way to overcome it and to fight in using the language of majority, Serbocroatian, through his self-translation. Self-representing his self-translation, he is self-conscious about his knowledge of the Serbocroatian language. Living in the same space with many cultures where most cultural elements are shared between all people, he expects the majority society to discover his poetic expression and understand real feelings of Roma. However, understanding of reality and truth is different although is “constructed and shaped through interaction between people and the environment they live” (Silverman 2000) and influenced by the socio-cultural background. He hopes for a change, for togetherness. Even though he came closer using their majority language, he does not feel and does not see the change. His self-perception of his poem is the poem of two interpretations; one has an impact on Romani readers and the other on the non-Romani. He is in discourse with himself and claims that he rather translates poems by himself to better preserve the poetic force in translation, even though he thinks that the translator’s originality is not important. Authors’ reflections and thoughts give us important information about his personal, individual motifs and the way of choosing how to cross the linguistic border. His choice is in self-translation as a possible foundation for the future critics which is missing.

c. Analyses of Poem “Autoportreti – Autoportret”

The second poem is written in Romani and self-translated into Serbian. The poem was included in the republished book of poetry *Svjetlost u Ponoć/E jak an-e jrat*, which includes new creations along with some of the poems published in the first book.

Autoportreti	Autoportret	Self-Portrait
Mix Romani dialects (AL1)	Serbian (AL2)	English (NAL3)
<p>1.Paso me zuvdimasqo, fiza me isanosqi. Izravne vastesa kerdo biramime tasvir, kalãrri ćarrli strafin devlesqi, xoxavno kolorit!</p> <p>2.An-o maškar ćhelavni ćakra, izravni aura dukhavesqi.</p> <p>3.Varindě o vast bilal bizorale mosta kerel, kleja ćhamenqe, me kokalenge umblavel, xale narie trujarel...</p> <p>4.Drabarrno than, haćaripe artistikane bireslimasqo thaj phukavipe e palalimasqo.</p>	<p>1.Otisak mog života, konturamoje pojave. Nesigumom rukom razvućen neuramljen crtež, potamnjava usahla vedrina neba lažni kolorit!</p> <p>2.U sredini treperava ćakra, drhtava aura paćenika.</p> <p>3.Negde se stapa ruka nemoćni lik stvara, nakite obrazu, kostima svojim kaći, izlizane djelove izobličava...</p> <p>4.Zagrižen prostor, predosjećanje umjetnikove naivnosti i nevjerstvo pozadine.</p>	<p>1.Imprint of my life, contour of my appearance. With unsure hand stretched is the unframed drawing, darkened dried clarity of the sky false colour!</p> <p>2.In the middle a trembling chakra, the trembling aura of the suffering one.</p> <p>3.Somewhere a hand merges to create a powerless likeness, hangs jewels to the cheek, with its bones , disfigures shabby pieces.</p> <p>4.Bitten space,</p>

<p>5.Darano zeno, manuš¹²⁴, bipinzarrede godāqo...</p>	<p>5.Uplašena pojava, čovjek, stanje nepoznate svijesti...</p>	<p>intuition of artist's naivete and disloyalty of the background. 5.Scared appearance, Human being state of unknown consciousness...</p>
---	--	--

The English translation has relied on the Romani and Serbian versions.

Version AL1 (Mix Romani Dialects)

Autoportreti	Self-Portrait
Mix Romani dialects (AL1)	English (NAL1)
<p>1.Paso me zuvdimasqo, fiza me isanosqi. Izravne vastesa kerdo biramime tasvir, kalārrdi čarrli strafin devlesqi, xoxavno kolorit!</p> <p>2.An-o maškar čhelavni čakra, izravni aura dukhavesqi.</p> <p>3.Varindě o vast bilal bizorale mosta kerel, kleja čamenqe,</p>	<p>1.Trace of my life, contour of my being. With straighten hand done without frame drawing, black dry Goddess shine false colour!</p> <p>2.In the middle dancing chakra, straighten aura of the sad person.</p> <p>3.Somewhere a hand merges powerless likeness makes, jewels to the cheek,</p>

¹²⁴For the sake of translation I would mention that the meaning of the word *manuš* (man) in Romani and *čovjek* in Serbian is rendered as "human being" in English.

me kokalenge umblavel, xale narie trujarel...	my bones hangs, eaten edges wraps...
4.Drabarno than, haćaripe artistikane bireslimasqo thaj phukavipe e palalimasqo.	4.Bewitched place, (healing place) understanding (feeling) failure of artist and slander of these who are in the background.
5.Darano zeno, manuś, bipinzarrde godăqo...	5.Scared person, man, unknown thought (of unknown thought)...

The English literal translation has relied on the Romani version.

Use of the Romani language in the poem *Autoportreti / Autoportret* published in 2012 differs notably from its use in the earlier poem *Phiravipe/Putovanja* published in 1988. The words are presented in a mixture of dialects. There are old words used by specific Gurbeti groups in Montenegro which other Gurbeti groups (such as my Bosnian group) would not know and not understand without translation. The use of words and their semantics are also rendered more difficult for comprehension because of the orthography used. In the first poem the poet used the system of orthography most frequently used in the region of the former Yugoslavia, and which continues to be used because of the Serbian, Bosnian, Croatian, and Montenegrin languages. In the second poem, the poet opts for the inter-dialectal meta-phonological unification system of orthography created by the team led by Marcel Courthiade.¹²⁵

The choice of which system of orthography and alphabet to use when writing in Romani is always linked to individual attitudes and ideas about language and language politics. Often, it has political implications. When asked about the reason for using this model for his poem, Ruždija-Ruso Sejdović replied:

¹²⁵See my chapter on Romani language. Prior to the widespread use of computers and internet, Romani linguistics was largely the domain of a few specialized linguists. In 1990, the International Romani Union [IRU] adopted use of Courthiade's model as the "official alphabet". (Matras 2004, 252).

*We Roma from the Balkans learned to use extensively the orthography based on Serbocroatian, but the use and distribution is not uniform due to the divergence in dialects. When we use this [orthography], we are doing a great injustice to the other Roma groups such as Lovari or Kalderaš from Russia, Ukraine, Belarus, Hungary, Romania...*¹²⁶

The poem uses both the Gurbeti and Arli Romani dialects. It mixes within the poem some old Romani words used by members of certain groups but which are not used by others in their speech. Examples of these words are *fiza* and *isanoski* in the first stanza, and *varindě*, *mosta*, and *nariě* in the third stanza. In these instances, understanding the poem without the poet's self-translation in Serbian would be difficult, if not impossible, even for those whose knowledge of Romani, and its diverse dialects and orthography systems is very good. Romani dialect differences are one reason why Romani authors may feel compelled to self-translate when or after writing their poems in Romani. When asked for more information about the origin of these particular Romani words in the poem, Ruždija-Ruso Sejdović replied that the words are still in use by some Romani groups in Montenegro¹²⁷, and he sent a description¹²⁸ of them and their meanings:

Translated in the poem as:

Romani	Serbian	English
fiza	linija, kontura	lines, contours
varindě	negde	somewhere
nariě	ivica	shabby pieces
mosta ¹²⁹	lik	likeness

Translation of words according to its semantic equivalence:

¹²⁶My translation. Ruždija-Ruso Sejdović, email correspondence on 30.07.2014.

¹²⁷Some of these groups are traditionally Čergaši (non-settled, nomadic) and only recently settled. Also, some groups (Bosnian Čergaši or Čergari, Serbian Kalderaši and Čergari) are still referred to by this name, due to family or group history, even though they may have been settled for some time. According to Thomas Acton, Professor of Romani Studies at the University of Greenwich, since 1989 these groups live in U.K. and they identify themselves as "Bosnian Chergashe". See Acton 2008, 6-7. Furthermore, Horton and Grayson (2008) stated that "Bosnian and Serbian Gypsies (Serbaya Kalderash) found themselves in the U.K. in 1992, traveling and selling carpets. The wars in the former Yugoslavia meant that family members joined them."

¹²⁸Ruždija-Ruso Sejdović, email correspondence on 20.12.2014.

¹²⁹*Mosta* is used by Roma in Kosovo, in Prizren. *Misura*, a synonym, is also used in the Lovari dialect.

Romani	Serbian	English
fiza	linija, kontura	lines, contours
varindě	negde	somewhere
nariă	ivica	edge
mosta ¹³⁰	lik	face

Future work in Romani translation would benefit from incorporation of these words and definitions in a comprehensive dictionary that could be used by writers and translators.

In this poem, there are two instances of rhyme being used. The first is found in the third stanza of the Romani language version: *me kolalenge umblavel, xale narie trujarel*. Here the poet rhymes on the third person singular conjugation of the verbs: *umblavel*; *trujarel*. The second is found in the fourth stanza of the Romani language version: *artistikane bireslimasqo thaj phukavipe e palalimasqo*. In this instance the poet rhymes on the declination [genitive case] of the noun [third person singular], i.e. *palalimasqo* and on the declination [genitive case] of the adjective [modifying third person singular noun], i.e. *bireslimasqo*.

As in the case of the poem previously analyzed, this poem also makes use of personification and metaphor. In the first stanza, for example, we find the noun phrase: *Paso me zuvdimasqo*, self-translated into Serbian as *Otisak mog života*, whose literal translation into English would be ‘Imprint of my life’. Here the poet works with the image of a body on which the marks of life have been left. The word denotes a physical mark, but in reality connotes a mark that functions at many levels of human existence: psychological, emotional, etc. A second instance of the poet using personification and metaphor in the poem is found in the author’s second language version (Serbian), i.e. his self-translation.

The Romani noun phrase *Drabarno than*, self-translated as *Zagrižen prostor* in Serbian (‘bitten space’ in English), and the Romani phrase *thaj phukavipe e palalimasqo*, self-translated as *i nevjerstvo pozadine* in Serbian (‘disloyalty in the background’ in English) refer in the Romani poem to the social space in which the poet as a Rom lives. It is combined with the image of a society which always appears to follow him and investigate what he does. The poet implies a great sense of irony in juxtaposing the so-called equal freedom and free artistic life with the background of disloyalty and mistrust. The tone applied in the poem by the poet is one of feeling

¹³⁰*Mosta* is used by Roma in Kosovo, in Prizren. *Misura*, a synonym, is also used in the Lovari dialect.

ill-at-ease, and not well. He is on edge and in fear, given the potential disloyalty that lurks in the background. He is not sure how others can react. Fear pervades his mind, leading him to a depression which invades his being. Dissatisfaction with his own life awakens the poet as artist, his 'second being', and he watches himself in the mirror. He observes his own life with disappointment and a sense of irony, all of which is embodied in the self-portrait. He tries to beautify himself, but it is impossible. Because of his fear ('scared appearance'), his hand is unsure and unsteady. The colour emerges false, and his face appears weak and his cheekbones distorted, against a backdrop of 'bitten space' and background of disloyalty. His naivety as artist transports him to this frightened appearance, creating a state of confusion and depression.

Just like with the previous poem, no lexical or syntactic changes occurred in the translation process, except when it comes to the word order in one stanza, where, due to the English rule according to which verb always precedes the object, a slight adaptation was made. It is necessary to mention here that due to the cases in Serbian, word order is not as fixed as in English, which means that an object may appear before the verb.

Although English syntax is different from Romani or Serbian, it is worth mentioning that in poetry syntactic elements are not as diverse as in fiction, which enabled direct transfer of constructions from one language to another.

A particular feature of Romani poetry is the verse yielding to multiple constructions of different meanings and ideas, thus creating different visual imagery and symbolic networks in the minds of readers. One reason for this may well be found in the language's lack of extensive literary use in poetry writing. Poets educated in the languages of the majority society they live in will tend to gravitate towards the literary vocabulary of those languages. Less frequently used Romani words can sometimes have multiple meanings attributed to them due to their lack of use and poetic 'play'. Poets may end up completing the meaning through the Romani word's 'counterpart' in the other language. In that way, the penchant for creating meaning has varying implications mostly for non-Romani readers with intention to cherish, spread and promote understanding of Romani culture.

Analysis of Version AL2 (Serbian)

Autoportret	Self-Portrait
Serbian (AL2)	English (NAL2)
<p>1.Otisak mog života, kontura moje pojave. Nesigurnom rukom razvučen neuramljen crtež, potamnijela usahla vedrina neba lažni kolorit!</p> <p>2.U sredini treperava čakra, drhtava aura paćenika.</p> <p>3.Negde se stapa ruka nemoćni lik stvara, nakite obrazu, kostima svojim kači, izlizane djelove izobličava...</p> <p>4.Zagrižen prostor, predosjećanje umjetnikove naivnosti i nevjerstvo pozadine.</p> <p>5.Uplašena pojava, čovjek, stanje nepoznate svijesti...</p>	<p>1.Trace of my life, contour of my appearance. With unsure hand stretched unframed drawing, darkened withered serenity of the sky false colour!</p> <p>2.In the middle flickering chakra, trembling aura of the wretch (pariah?).</p> <p>3.Somewhere merges a hand powerless image creates, jewels to the cheek, with own bones hangs, frayed pieces disfigures...</p> <p>4.Bitten space, intuition of artist's naivty and disloyalty (betrayal) of background.</p> <p>5.Scared appearance, man, condition of unknown consciousness...</p>

The English literal translation has relied on the Serbian version.

There are several interesting points to be made about the poet's self-translation of this poem into Serbian. Some relate to larger issues that potentially have ramifications for translators.

The first point worthy of note is the mix between Ekavian and Ikavian features of the once unified Serbocroatian language. As summarized cogently by Ranko Bugarski (2012):

There are two major traditional divisions, the first being into three macrodialects, named after the pronoun meaning 'what': Štokavian (što), Kajkavian (kaj) and Čakavian (ča). [...] The second division, mostly remaining on Štokavian ground, is based on the reflex of the Proto-Slavic front vowel /ě/, called jat. In some dialects this developed into /e/ (Ekavian [...]); in others, into /ije/ (Ijekavian) [...]; and in yet others, into /i/ (Ikavian) [...]. (p. 223)

The two dualities of Ekavian vs. Ijekavian pronunciation and of Cyrillic vs. Latin ['Roman'] script, while not clear-cut, figured as the most salient markers of disunity within Serbocroatian. (p. 225)

The divisions are likewise expounded on in Ronelle Alexander (2006)¹³¹:

There are three major dialects [...]. Indeed, if one follows the general linguistic criterion of mutual intelligibility, these three dialects would qualify much more readily as different languages than do standard Serbian, Croatian, and Bosnian (at least in their current state). The[y] [...] are štokavian, čakavian and kajkavian. [388]

*The historical development of the old Slavic letter called jat' is the source of the single most readily perceptible pronunciation difference among štokavian speakers [...]. Through the course of the centuries, its pronunciation was altered to different forms in different areas. Within the South Slavic regions, it developed either in **i**, **e**, or a complex of **je** or **ije**. Speakers who pronounce it as **i** belong to the ikavian dialect, while those who pronounce it as **e** belong to the ekavian dialect. Those who pronounce it sometimes as **je** and sometimes as **ije** belong to a dialect which is usually called ijekavian, though sometimes one hears the term jekavian. [391]*

[...][R]esidents of Belgrade and Novi Sad value ekavian pronunciation very highly, since they associate it so closely with their own cultural and historic

¹³¹ Alexander also states: "[...] features which marked each of the three [Bosnian, Croatian, Serbian] as separate from one another have taken on much greater significance: most differences that were once possible variants have become the prescribed norm, and many features that once were perceived as local color are now strongly imbued with national significance." (2006)

traditions. Residents of Sarajevo and other Bosnian cities value ijekavian pronunciation very highly, for similar reasons. The strength of the emotional identification with these two pronunciations became starkly evident during the 1990s when government officials attempted (with clearly nationalistic design) to impose ekavian on an ijekavian-speaking population [...]. [394]. Emotions concerning ekavian and ijekavian have increased in intensity since the breakup of Yugoslavia [...] [395]¹³²

In other words, regardless of whether or not Ruždija-Ruso Sejdović deliberately has a strategy in mind with regard to choosing or alternating between use of Ikavian, Ekavian, or Ijekavian (Jekavian) in his self-translation into Serbian, the fact is that the poem contains manifestations of two types in particular: Ekavian (1), Ijekavian (5), and one instance of a hybrid of both. In the third stanza of the Serbian AL2, the word *Negde* is clearly Ekavian. The word *djelove*, however, appears as a ‘hybrid’ between Ekavian and Ijekavian. (It would be *delove* if Ekavian and *dijelove* if Ijekavian.) The poet uses Ijekavian in the fourth stanza for *predosjećanje*, *umjetnikove*, and *nevjerstvo*, and in the fifth stanza for *čovjek* and *svijesti*. Therefore, the Ijekavian feature/dialect prevails in the poet’s self-translation.

When asked about the reason for mixing the two dialects (my assumption had been that there was a mistake in rewriting or typing in Serbian when preparing the manuscript for publishing, given that the publisher or author chose Serbian as the language for publication)¹³³, Ruždija-Ruso Sejdović responded that he consciously uses both Ekavian and Jekavian, but considers the poem to be Serbian. Acknowledging that the question was interesting, he remarked that linguistically speaking Serbian, Croatian, Bosnian, and Montenegrin are at least more than 50% similar, and that he gladly uses both dialectal forms just because, as he said, “Poetry allows this.” The reasoning for mixing the dialects can also be understood as a form of resistance to exclusionist nationalists language policies and again, ironically be duty of the poet to put language and its use into question.

¹³²Alexander likewise notes: “Although there are a number of regional ‘accents’, the most notable pronunciation difference is also reproduced in the spelling. This difference concerns a frequently occurring sound which in the ‘ekavian’ pronunciation is spoken (and written) as e, but which in the ‘ijekavian’ pronunciation is spoken (and written) either as je or ije. Standard Bosnian and Croatian use only ijekavian pronunciation, while Serbian uses ekavian predominantly but not exclusively: Montenegrins and Bosnian Serbs all use ijekavian, as do some speakers in the southern and western parts of Serbia proper. [...] Both these differences are of the ‘either-or’ sort. On any one occasion, a person writes in either one alphabet or the other; and any one speaker uses either ekavian or ijekavian pronunciation consistently.”

¹³³It would be interesting to conduct a study at some point to determine the language policies in place or practiced for publications in each of the former Yugoslav countries – both with regard to original works and to translations.

In this case, however, the poet did not create a rhyme scheme in the self-translation. The two instances of rhyme in the Romani language version of the poem (*umblavel/trujarel* and *palalimasqo/bireslimasqo*) were not able to be transferred into the Serbian language version. Nevertheless, the poet did successfully transfer another, different, poetic functionality, by reformulating (translation technique) a phrase imbued with symbolic value – even though, interestingly enough, the symbolism created another set of associations. In the fourth stanza of AL2, for example, we find the noun phrase *drabarno than* (literally ‘enchanted space’) in Romani being reformulated as *zagrižen prostor* (literally ‘bitten space’) in Serbian. The space referred to takes on the connotation of having been bit into, like an apple. Even while the two images are visually dissimilar, the two metaphors combined (AL1 and AL2) reveal the symbolic meaning the poet wishes to convey. It expresses the bitterness of life, and is possible to feel only when the two language versions are read as complementary to each other. The ‘source text’ (AL1) without the ‘target text’ (AL2) would not yield the same understanding. Nor would the ‘target text’ do the same without the ‘source text’ to complement it. By self-translating *drabarno than* as *zagrižen prostor*, the poet opens himself up to expanding the realm of possibilities for creation, and can use two metaphorical images – not just one- to give full meaning to what he wants to say. He does this by virtue of the elasticity the Romani language can offer him.

Ruždija-Ruso Sejdović’s poetry indirectly reflects meanings and ideas that are generated through imagery. The imagery put forth invites us to construct myriad multiple images and meanings of our own. His poetry is coloured with old Romani words which are symbols of the wish to preserve the Romani language and identity. Through his use of symbols and metaphors he evokes our senses and emotions. It is by reading his ‘source’ (AL1) text stereoscopically with his ‘target’ self-translation (AL2) that we are able to create a complete meaning, and the completeness of the poem.

Poet’s own self-analysis of the poem is followed by a comment.

Version AL1 and AL2 (Poet’s own self-analysis of poem “Autoportreti – Autoportret”)

Date: 29.05.2015. Ruždija Ruso Sejdović	
Pored literature, nastojim i likovnim izražajem da odslikam trenutnu situaciju	In addition to my literary writing, I try also with my artistic expression to mirror the

<p>zbivanja oko mene, a u tom arealu su svakako i moja sabraća Romi. Stihovi pod naslovom <i>Autoportret</i> nastali su kao potreba za simbiozom dve težnje i žudnje mog umjetničkog karaktera: likovnog i literarnog. Rezultat te težnje su stihovi koji daju <i>upustvo za crtanje mog portreta</i>.</p> <p>Konkretno stihovima "crtam" svoj duhovni portret, koji je ipak samo jedan deo ljudske duhovnosti, zapravo univerzalna opomena da je čovjek stanje nepoznate svijesti, bez obzira kojoj naciji pripada ili se pripadnikom oseća.</p>	<p>current situation of what is happening around me, and in that space are definitely my brothers the Roma. The verses titled <i>Self-portrait</i> were created because of the need for symbiosis between the two aspirations and desires of my artistic nature: painting and literary expression. The results are the verses that give instructions for drawing my portrait. In particular, with these verses I 'draw' my self-portrait. But the portrait is only one aspect of human spirituality, and reminds us that a human being does not know himself fully, regardless of the nation he belongs to.</p>
<p><i>Otisak, mog života, kontura moje pojave.</i></p> <p>Okvir ili kontura jedne osobe, po meni, čine tragovi njegovog delovanja, ono šta čovek čini i kako čini, uvek ostavlja trag, a to uobličava i karakteriše jednu pojavu,</p>	<p><i>Mark, of my life, contour of my appearance.</i></p> <p>The frame or contour of a person, in my opinion, is a mark of his activity, of what a human being (man) is doing. What and how he is doing always leaves a mark, which shapes and characterizes one's appearance,</p>
<p><i>Nesigurnom rukom razvučen neuramljen crtež,</i></p> <p>svakako, areal odakle potičem kao Rom ima jednu konotaciju nesigurnosti, neizvesnosti, nešto što se teško uklapa u konvencionalno ograničavanje. Nedostatak te karakteristike, svakako je i nepripadnost okolini, ili barem osećaj nepripadnosti, otuda se osećam kao</p>	<p><i>With unsure hand stretched is the unframed drawing,</i></p> <p>Anyhow, the space from which I originate as a Rom has a connotation of insecurity, of uncertainty, of something difficult to fit into a conventional framework. It is a feeling of not belonging to one's surroundings, or at least the feeling of not belonging. So I feel as</p>

<p>neuramljen ali ipak crtež, nešto što treba ili može da se nadogradi i dalje obradjuje, uči...</p>	<p>if I am without a frame, still a drawing, something that should or could continue to be built, processed further, still learned...</p>
<p><i>potamnijela</i> <i>usahla vedrina neba</i> <i>lažni kolorit!</i></p> <p>Dva antipoda jednog života, mog života kao Roma, jeste subverzija konflikta unutrašnjeg i spoljašnjeg svijeta. Za one koji me gledaju spolja (većinsko stanovništvo) primarna je želja da primete neki kolorit, temperamentnost ili muzikalnost mog romskog života, sloboda naizgled, međutim, za mene iznutra, nošenog vetrovima progona i diskriminacije, ograničenog, takav kolorit je nestvaran. Ovde saosećam sa kolektivitetom.</p>	<p><i>darkened</i> <i>dried clarity of sky</i> <i>false colour!</i></p> <p>Two antipodes of one's life, my life as a Rom, is a subversion of the conflict between inner and outer worlds. For those who look at me from the outside (majority society), their primary wish is to perceive some colour, temperament or the musicality of my Romani life, my apparent freedom. However, inside me I am restricted, carried by the winds of persecution and discrimination, my colour as they perceive it is not real to me. Here I empathize with the collective.</p>
<p><i>U sredini treperava čakra,</i> <i>drhtava aura paćenika.</i></p> <p>Mistika indijskog porijekla Roma, titra i dalje i do dan danas u njima, kao nepoznanica i tajna. To osećam u sebi, treperavost jedne filozofije koja ne može da usahne, jer je sastavni dio paćeništva. Fundament teološke definicije vjere zapravo je paćeništvo. Sve svetske koncesije patnju i mučeništvo usredsređuju vjeri. Filozofija opstanka je paćeničko iskušenje. To određuje i auru jednog bića, pa i mojeg...</p>	<p><i>In the middle a trembling chakra</i> <i>The trembling aura of the one who suffers.</i></p> <p>The mysticism of the Roma's Indian origin flickers and continues to this day in them (in Roma) as a mystery and secret. I feel it in myself, shimmering of a philosophy which cannot wither because it is an integral part of suffering. Fundamental to the theological definition of faith is, actually, suffering. All world religions link faith to suffering and martyrdom. The philosophy of survival is an agonizing ordeal. It dictates the aura of being,</p>

	and of my being...
<p><i>Negde se stapa ruka nemoćni lik stvara, nakite obrazu, kostima svojim kači, izlizane djelove izobličava...</i></p> <p>Vizuelna nadogradnja mog lika, uljepšavanje i maskarada jednog izgleda koji ipak od izlizanosti ka izobličavanju teži...</p>	<p><i>Somewhere a hand merges to create a powerless likeness, hangs jewels to the cheek, with its bones, disfigures shabby pieces.</i></p> <p>The visual upgrade of my face, beautification and masquerade of one's look which from the shabbiness towards distortion tends...</p>
<p><i>Zagrižen prostor, predosjećanje umjetnikove naivnosti i nevjerstvo pozadine.</i></p> <p>Iz mog unutrašnjeg bića, zbog treperavosti sačuvane čakre, izbija znanje da je ipak prostor zagrižen oko mene, i taj predosećaj se širi do nevjerstva. Vjera ili nevjera, poverenje ili nepoverenje između čovjeka i okoline, između jednog Roma i okoline, zaista je literarna tema koja mene kao pisca veoma proziva, i to se verujem da i u mojim očima primetiti i na mom licu, ipak ja sam samo...</p>	<p><i>Bitten space, intuition an artist's naiveté and disloyalty of the background.</i></p> <p>Because of the chakra preserved within, out of my inner being emerges knowledge from the bitten space, an intuition of betrayal. Faith, lack of belief, trust or distrust, between a human and his surroundings, between a Rom and the surroundings. They are really the literary topics that call me as a writer. I believe it can be seen in my eyes and on my face, though I am just...</p>
<p><i>Uplašena pojava, čovjek, stanje nepoznate svijesti...</i></p> <p>Strah je kod Roma sinonim trajanja, žive u strahu, umiru od straha...</p> <p>I to je najveća nepoznanica, nešto što je</p>	<p><i>Scared appearance, human state of unknown consciousness.</i></p> <p>For Roma, fear is synonymous with endurance. They live in fear, die in fear ...</p> <p>And this is the biggest mystery, something</p>

sastavni elemenat mene kao čovjeka, i moje nepoznate svijesti.	that is an integral element of me as a man, and my strange consciousness.
--	---

Through this self-analysis we see how poet's poetic language reflects the language he uses when writing, and vice versa. He expresses the wish that readers read him not just as a poet, but also as a conduit for thinking differently about Roma and Romani poetry. Reflexivity in poet's work offers a critical approach to the social situation which is also created through his own involvement and experience. His reality of seeking to understand the world in which he lives develops his subjective meaning in which he creates his own way of expression. It is necessary to highlight the powerful effect of languages which creates his multiple identities as a writer, poet and painter. At the same time he feels deeply his belonging to the Romani nationality which is not framed. Who is going to give a frame to his portrait? He is feeling at the same time as an insider and an outsider in this society, but reality is that he rather lives with the own community.

The poet's personal story written in a form of poem involves reflection. He speaks about suffering, philosophy of survival, life in fear and death in fear as a fear of the past and fear of the future and it produces painful moments. "It is both a historical and political process that places people of color in control of their story" (Denzin, Lincoln and Smith 2008, 94). Sejdović's story in a poem is a "path/history" (Ibid.) of himself. Faith, belief, trust and distrust are also his literary topics that lead him to writing.

4.2 MEHMED-MEHO SAĆIP

a. Biographical information and literary production

Mehmed-Meho Saćip was born on the 4th of September in 1944 in Gnjilane, Kosovo.¹³⁴ He lived and was raised on Ivo Lola Ribar Street in the Masaručka Mahala, one of four Romani mahalas (neighbourhoods) that existed in the town. Out of 33 children of Romani origin, he was the only one to pass the exams given at the Textile Technical School. However, due to lack of material means, he was unable to continue his education at university.

As with many other Romani children, Saćip had musical talent. Ten years after finishing school he began to play music and to perform in well-known restaurants throughout the entire country of Yugoslavia. He played many instruments, sang, composed, and recorded records and cassette tapes.

After working for a time as a musician he started to work as a journalist. In 1978 he began his career as a reporter and photojournalist at the information centre of a textile firm. In 1983 he became the first radio journalist to work for Radio Gnjilane, in charge of editing the Romani program. He was also involved in the social-political life of Gnjilane and in the province of Kosmet (Kosovo).

He debuted as a writer by writing poetry for children, and wrote several songs collected under the title *Loli phabaj* [Red Apple] during the 1980s¹³⁵. In 1984 a small book of poetry containing 18 poems and entitled *Bučarne vaste* was produced in the Romani language by the publisher Književna sekcija's literary division "Čajupi" in Gnjilane. The next poetry book *Pomeranje sofre/Sofrako miškuipe* [Displaced Sofreh Table]¹³⁶ was published in 1995 by Novi Svet in Priština. That same year the book was promoted at the Belgrade Book Fair, where Saćip won a special prize to attend a book fair in Italy. In 1998, the book of poetry *Mirikle* [Necklace]

¹³⁴All of the biographical and literary production information was culled first from the *Antologija romske poezije* (Sarajevo: Sarajevske sveske 39/40, 2012) and the *Antologija e Rromane poezijaći/Antologija romske poezije* (Zagreb: Romska udruga Romski putevi, 2012), and then cross-checked for verification and corrected through my email correspondence with the author on 17 May 2014 and 29 July 2014.

¹³⁵ In the *Antologija romske poezije* (Sarajevo: Sarajevske sveske 39/40, 2012), the date of publication for *Loli phabaj* is listed as 1986. In the *Antologija e Rromane poezijaći /Antologija romske poezije* (Zagreb: Romska udruga Romski putevi, 2012), the date for the same work is listed as 1982. The author wrote in the 1980s.

¹³⁶ In the *Antologija romske poezije* (Sarajevo: Sarajevske sveske 39/40, 2012), the publication date given for *Sofrako Miškope* is 1994. The date given by the author is 1995, which was cross-checked at <http://www.katalog.kgz.hr/pagesResults/rezultati.aspx?&searchById=40&spid0=10&spv0=Sa%C4%87ip%2c+Mehmed&xm0=1>, where it was also indicated as 1995. The *Antologija e Rromane poezijaći/Antologija romske poezije* (Zagreb:Romska udruga Romski putevi, 2012) say in their entry on Saćip that he was published in the *Antologija romske poezije* in 1999 but there is no data on this in the Sarajevo anthology listed above, nor by the author.

was co-published by Radio Gnjilane, Centar za kulturu “Zarije R. Popović” and Narodna biblioteka “Janko Veselinović”.

In 2004 his poetry book *Kalendar* was published by the Kulturni centar Romi in Subotica, Serbia. In 2013 he received the prestigious Ferenc Sztojka¹³⁷ Award for his lifelong work in poetry and Romani language creativity. The award was presented to him in Zagreb on the “World Day of the Rromani language” which is organized every year on the 5th of November.¹³⁸ Saćip’s poems have been published in several anthologies, including:

- poetry collection *Jaga/Vatre* [Fires] (Balić, Sait [redakcioni odbor *et al.*]; Bujanovac: XI Smotra kulturnih dostignuća Roma SR Srbije, 1984)
- *Antologija romske poezije* (Sarajevo: Sarajevske sveske 39/40, 2012)
- *Antologija e Rromane poezijaći/Antologija romske poezije* (Zagreb:Romska udruga Rromski putevi, 2012)

He has also authored the following works:

- poetry book *Bučarne vasta* [Diligent Hands] (Gnjilane: Književna sekcija Čajupi, 1984)
- poetry book *Sofrako miškuipe/Pomeranje sofre* [Displaced Sofreh Table], adaptation with assistance by Blagoje Savić and published in Romani and Serbian (in both Latin and Cyrillic alphabets) (Priština: Novi Svet, 1995)¹³⁹
- poetry book *Mirikle* published in Romani (Gnjilane: Radio Gnjilane, Centar culture “Zarije R. Popović”, Narodna biblioteka “Janko Veselinović”, 1998)
- poetry book *Kalendar*, published in Romani and Serbian (Subotica: Kulturni centar Roma, 2004)

¹³⁷ Ferenc Sztojka was the first Romani lexicographer. He was a native speaker of Lovari dialect. Sztojka, F. (1890) *O császári és magyar királyi Fensége József Főherczeg. Magyar ésczigány nyelv gyök-szótára*, Paks (Second edition of a work originally published in 1886, by, Kalocsa).

¹³⁸The World Day of the Rromani Language was first celebrated on November 5th, 2009. The date was chosen to commemorate the day in 2008 when Veljko Kajtazi’s Romani-Croatian and Croatian-Romani Dictionary was published. Both the *Ferenc Sztojka* (the first Romani lexicographer who published the first international dictionary with 13,000 Romani words) and *Šaip Jusuf* (author of one of the first Romani grammars) awards are given to deserving individuals every year in Zagreb. The Ferenc Sztojka and the Šaip Jusuf awards for life-long work are given to these who are working on the issue for the development of Romani language.

¹³⁹Data on all works in this section was cross-checked at the Katalog Knjižnica Grada Zagreba online <http://www.katalog.kgz.hr/pagesResults/rezultati.aspx?&searchById=40&spid0=10&spv0=Sa%C4%87ip%2c+Mehmed&xm0=1>. Only *Bučarne vasta* did not appear. The others were correct.

Mehmed-Meho Saćip died on 23.11.2015 in Subotica, Serbia.

b. Analyses of Poem “Cahra – Čerga”

Selection of the poem is based on my question to the poet about the most favourite poem he would like to contribute for the analysis in my work. Mehmed-Meho Saćip opted for the poem “Cahra” [Romani Tent]. The poem was first published only in the Romani language (Kosovo Arli dialect¹⁴⁰), in a poetry collection entitled *Bučarne vasta*, in 1984 (Saćip 1984). Later the same year it was published in a bilingual edition (Romani/Serbian) of poems entitled *Jaga/Vatre* (Balić 1984). The poem is delayed self-translation by the poet.

Cahra	Čerga	Romani Tent
Kosovo Arli Romani (AL1)	Serbian (AL2)	English (NAL3)
1. Avdive akate tajsa avre thaneste Avdive dikheala tajsa nanetani Lakri majšukar amalin i čar, i len hem dajekh bar	1. Danas je ovde sutra tamo Danas je vidiš sutra ne Njene su najlepše drugarice Poljane reke kamenje	1. Today here tomorrow there Today you see her tomorrow you don't Her most beautiful friends are meadows rivers stones
2. O anav lakro cahra Adžahar pendjardi Dajekh drom tu da dikhela Lakri jag thaj lakro thuv	2. Ime joj je čerga Celom svetu znana I ti si nekada video Dim i vatru čerge	2. Her name is tent Known to all the world And you saw sometimes Smoke and fire of the tent
3. Ko trin kašta o kotlo čhivdo So pherdžape pani Andro pani thaj savena	3. O verigama kotlić pun vode U njemu bilje svakojako Za sirotinjsku večeru	3. Onto the pothook is put the kettle Full of water In it, all sorts of herbs For a poor person's

¹⁴⁰ “Arli Romani varieties belong to the Balkan group, more specifically the Southern Balkan group. The Arli Romani varieties cluster is rather complex and data on individual varieties spoken in different regions is yet sparse. Arli varieties are spoken in the southern part of the Republic of Serbia and Montenegro, in Kosovo, in Macedonia, and in the northern part of Greece.” (ROMLEX: <http://romani.uni-graz.at/romlex/dialects.xml>, and see Matras 2002)

čarja Čerdžola jek čorba sani 4.O čhavore uzali jag bešen Grastenge da delape pani A sa odova i čerga i romani	4.Okolo vatre posedala deca Na reci se konji poje Sve je to oko čerge moje.	supper 4.Around the fire are seated children At the river horses drink water All of this is around my tent.
--	--	---

The English translation has relied on the Romani and Serbian versions.

Version AL1 (Kosovo Arli Romani)

Cahra	Romani Tent
Kosovo Arli Romani (AL1)	English (NAL1)
1.Avdive akate tajsa avre thaneste Avdive dikheala tajsa nanetani Lakri majšukar amalin i čar, i len hem dajekh bar	1.Today here tomorrow on other place Today you see her tomorrow is no place Her most beautiful friend Meadow, river and one stone
2.O anav lakro cahra Adžahar pendjardi Dajekh drom tu da dikhela Lakri jag thaj lakro thuv	2. Her name is tent Everywhere known Once time you saw Her fire and her smoke
3.Ko trin kašta o kotlo čhivdo So pherdžape pani Andro pani thaj savena čarja Čerdžola jek čorba sani	3.On three woods the kettle is put Full of water In water all sorts of herbs It is made one soup thin

4.O čhavore uzali jag bešen Grastenge da delape pani A sa odova i čerga i romani	4.Children next to the fire seat To horses give water All of this is tent Romani.
--	---

The English literal translation has relied on the Romani version.

In terms of basic structure, the poem is written in four stanzas – three of which have four lines and one (the last), three. The poet makes ample use of visual imagery throughout the whole poem. He chooses his words and constructs the images as if he were managing a camera, starting from afar and gradually zooming in with his lens to bring the reader closer and finally into the picture. When creating his first image, he begins with words that are associated with cooler meanings: nouns *čar* (meadow), *len* (river), and *bar* (stone). For his second image, the distance is shortened, with the nouns like *jag* (fire) and *thuv* (smoke) bringing the reader closer to more warmth. The third image depicts the *kotlo* (kettle) and *čorba* (soup), which connote even warmer associations, gradually progressing to the fourth image which seems snapped like a picture, in close proximity. The poet brings the reader around the fire, *čhavore* (children) around the *jag*, with the *grastenge* (horses) and *i čerga i romani* (Romani tent) completing the picture. Using symbols (and therefore nouns) that are typically associated with the nomadic Romani way of life, the poet at the same time projects a stereotypical picture of a Romani tent. By self-translating into the majority society language, the dialogic relationship between Romani and the other language created by the Romani writer can transform stereotypical representations (such as the Romani tent) into a type of literary device which is also able to cultivate additional meaning(s).

A few examples help make these points. In the first line of the first stanza in the Romani version, Saćip writes the Romani noun *thaneste*, which is the locative case of the word *than* – meaning ‘place’ in all of the major Romani dialects¹⁴¹. In the second line of the same stanza, he writes *nanetani*, as declined noun or/and as declined pronoun in genitive case. There are a few observations to be made here. First of all, the poet has not included the letter ‘h’ [as in noun *than*] in the writing of *nanetani*. Nor has he separated the negative particle *nane*¹⁴² from the word as would have been preferable for him to do according to grammar and orthography rules that are

¹⁴¹According to the dictionaries that have been published.

¹⁴²Another way to designate the negative particle is *naj*, in the Gurbeti and Kalderaš dialects.

being used by many authors who write in Romani. If the word in the poem is pronounced orally, then interlocutors would have no problem recognizing and understanding it, but not all Romani groups (some Gurbeti, Kalderashi or Lovari, for example) would understand the word as it is written. It could, however, be grasped in its written form if it were spelled as *nane thani* or *nane than*. As we'll see in the AL2 analysis, the self-translated poem resolves this 'dilemma'. He uses this form as is to be used in Kosovo local speech. In that way he hopes to appoint as many as possible Arli readers i.e. audience raising consciousness of intralingual specificities of Romani and at the same time raising consciousness of Romani self intraethnic Arli identity.

Another example can be found in the third and fourth lines of the first stanza. Noun *amalin* (literally 'female friend') is clearly singular in the Romani, and in the context of the poem implies a relationship to *čar*, *len*, and *bar* – designated in the singular here - without explicitly using the verb 'to be'¹⁴³ form *si*. By retaining the singular number (rather than plural), the poet makes the relationship expressed more tangible, more 'specific'. It is worth noting that in Romani, the singular forms of the nouns *čar*, *len*, and *bar* are used normally to designate concrete singularity, i.e. a specific meadow, river, stone – and not abstractly in reference to the overall category. It should also be mentioned that the *si* form [conjugation] of the verb "to be" can be used for both singular and plural, i.e. 'is' and 'are'. As we'll see, analysis of the self-translated poem (AL2) reveals how the poet selected one of several options available to him for 'rendering' the Romani words through translation into his majority society language.

While it is difficult to determine the exact reasons why and when the poet uses the language as he does, it is important to point out in the analyses those areas where certain instances potentially reflect the existence of a kind of 'translingual territory', i.e. where communication "[i]s not restricted to predefined meanings of individual languages, but [to] the [writer's] ability to merge different language resources in situated interactions for new meaning construction" (Canagarajah 2013). This territory can cover a wide range of situations, including those similar to the ones noted above, as well as relatively transparent instances of loan words being incorporated into the text. For example, the noun *čorba* used in the Romani version actually means 'soup' in Serbian and in the other local languages of former Yugoslavia. Although the poet's mother tongue Romani is very good, he uses this word rather than the Romani noun *zumi*.

¹⁴³Note that Romani verbs do not have infinitive forms.

Thinking about readers of the poem it is important to mention that literacy level of Romani groups is very low because of their every day survival situation which takes precedence over literacy acquisition. The written text in Romani does not exist to the extent to form a wide Romani readership (Toninato 2014, 89). Poems in Romani with its self-translations address mostly non-Romani readers (Toninato 2004, 199).

Version AL2 (Serbian)

Čerga	Romani Tent
Serbian (AL2)	English (NAL2)
1.Danas je ovde sutra tamo Danas je vidiš sutra ne Njene su najlepše drugarice Poljane reke kamenje	1.Today is here tomorrow there Today you see her tomorrow no Her most beautiful friends Meadows rivers stones
2.Ime joj je čerga Celom svetu znana I ti si nekada video Dim i vatru čerge	2.Her name is tent Known to all the world And you sometimes saw Smoke and fire of the tent
3.O verigama kotlić pun vode U njemu bilje svakojako Za sirotinjsku večeru	3.Onto the pothook is kettle Full of water In it, all herbs For poor supper
4.Okolo vatre posedala deca Na reci se konji poje Sve je to oko čerge moje.	4.Around the fire sit children At the river horses drink All of this is around my tent.

The English literal translation has relied on the Serbian version.

Visually, in terms of its layout and structure, the poet's self-translation in Serbian (AL2) mirrors the Romani version (AL1). Likewise, the images consecutively build on one another as the visual gaze of the reader approximates (like a camera) the fire and its warmth. This technique is retained in the poet's self-translation. However, there are also slight shifts. The first two lines of the first stanza in Serbian (AL2) clarify any instance of misinterpretation or ambiguity in the same two lines of the Romani version (AL1). The words *sutra tamo* and *sutra ne* (literally 'tomorrow there' and 'tomorrow no', respectively) are used correctly and clearly, in standard Serbocroatian. Later in the same stanza, the last two lines transform the singularity of the verses in the original Romani into the plural in the Serbian self-translation. 'Friend' becomes 'friends', and the nouns meadows (*poljane*), rivers (*reke*), and stones (*kamenje*) become broader, more abstract categories, in line with usage and grammar in Serbian. In other words, singular forms of the words would not be used in Serbian or Serbocroatian. There is no ambiguity, and the grammatical correspondence is clear. Furthermore, the use of the plural implies movement, as only in moving do the meadow, river, and stone multiply and transform into the plural. The Serbian version reflects this movement, which is a movement of bringing multiple views of friends, objects, and places.

While the stanza's translation, i.e. transformation from its expression in Romani to its expression in Serbian, may not have been conceived by the poet in terms of a particular, specific translation strategy, the *results* of his translation practice have implications on the reception of the poem by the two language publics; less often on Romani bilingual readers, and more usually on monolingual non-Romani readers. This is apparent if they are read separately, as autonomous entities. For example, using the singular in Romani to designate the objects of nature in the poem has the effect of personalizing them, in addition to their personification. It could thus also reflect a personal case of memory. It is easy to imagine that the poet has subconsciously envisioned or remembered a specific place where the *cahra* once was placed. The image conjured in Romani is one of nostalgia. The meadow, river, and stone seem to point to a specific time and place when and where the tent was set up. This sense of nostalgia is not transmitted in the Serbian self-translation. And, while the prescribed usage of the nouns in Serbian calls for the plural to be used (respected in the poetry), the usage of the nouns in Romani is used in the singular, even though speakers normally use them in the plural. The Romani version is more individual, personal whereas the Serbian is more collective universal.

Like the Romani version, the Serbian version reflects ample use of personification, metaphor, and the figurative use of words to create mood and tone in the poem. The *čerga*, or *cahra*, is introduced as human-like, as female. She moves constantly and daily from one place to another. Her image connotes an expression of instability in her existence. She is adorned by the presence of her beautiful friend(s): meadow(s), river(s), and stone(s), personified with human-like qualities. The poet alternates between the nostalgia of the *cahra* implied in the Romani version, and the romanticized, voyeuristic image projected by the *čerga* in the Serbian version. But in both versions the poet draws on stereotypical images of Roma to subtly and ironically subvert the picture. The imagery of fire and smoke is one way he accomplishes this. The last two lines of the second stanza remind the reader that Romani visibility can be perceived only partially through the fire and smoke of the stereotypical picture created by non-Romani communities watching from the outside.

The poet brings the reader in closer to the *čerga/cahra* through stanzas three and four and simultaneously increases the clarity of the image.

The focus of the third stanza is on food. He makes use of the Serbian word *čorba* ('soup') in the Romani version of the poem, and opts for the noun phrase *sirotinjsku večeru* ('poor person's supper') in the Serbian version. The implication is that the Roma can be satisfied with just a little, with just enough to survive – or, that even while poor they were at least able to eat once a day. The fourth stanza rounds out the picture with a focus on children and on horses. The *grasta* of the Romani version drink the water that has been given to them by human beings, but of the Serbian version *konji* drink on their own in the waters of the river. Most notably, at the end, the poet uses the Serbian noun *čerga* for *cahra*, in both versions, and states that all that is *čerga* is Romani (in the Romani version) and all that is around his *čerga* is his, i.e. belongs to him (in the Serbian version). Through the slight shifts from one language version to the next, the poet slightly shifts position and point of view, addressing his slightly different but interrelated, by virtue of history-audiences. His point of view is to indicate Romani position in the society, a previously marginalized space which was intended just for Roma, for their horses, for their *čerga* - a separated Romani space. Despite separation and marginalization poet as bilingual/multilingual and self-translator is able to get out of limited Romani space, and create a new one. For him these spaces are different but interrelated. Even though he contributes to creation of a national consciousness and national literature, in relationship between the cultures, between languages,

čerga remains only his. His ethnic, cultural and language identity, presented in this stereotypical way, remains attractive to gather non-Romani audience but also Romani.

The English version does not depart from the Romani and Serbian versions in terms of syntax, probably because of the reason we mentioned before – the simplicity of forms used in poetry. Poet’s own self-analysis of poem is followed by a comment.

Version AL1 and AL2 (Poet’s own self-analysis of poem “Cahra – Čerga”)

Correspondence with author on 12.05.2015 and 29.07.2015	
<p>Mi koji pišemo na romskom jeziku često smo primorani da imamo i adekvatan prevod odnosno prepev što zbog samih [R]oma koji slabo poznaju dialekte takodje zbog ne-[R]oma kako bi poezija bila dostupnija i razumljivija odnosno čitanija.</p>	<p>We who write in the Romani language are often forced to have a proper translation recast of the poem, for ourselves, Roma, who have poor knowledge of the dialects. The translation is done also so that non-Roma can have more access to our poetry and understand it when reading.</p>
<p>Dosta često, i sam romski pesnik pokušava da vrši prevod što ne mora da znači da će on to najbolje i da učini. Ima pesnika koji pišu na srpskom ili nekom drugom jeziku a da nakon toga vrši prevod na romskom ali zasigurno takav prevod ili prepev ostaje daleko siromašniji u izrazima ili u krajnjem slučaju kao nedorečen. Jest da romski jezik postoji ali je dosta nepoznat i medju samim [R]omima.</p>	<p>Quite often, Romani poets try to translate their own work, but it does not necessarily mean that they can do it in the best way. There are poets who write in Serbian and in other languages first, and then after writing they translate into Romani. In that way, I think, the poem [in Romani] remains far poorer in terms of expressions or the meaning remains incomplete. The upshot is that the Romani language exists but it is [still] quite unknown among Roma.</p>

<p>Svakako da zavisi u mnogome od urbanog dela okoline u kojoj se romi nalaze i same njihove zainteresovanosti za što boljim poznavanjem maternjeg jezika.</p>	<p>Of course, this depends largely on the urban places where Roma live, and depends on the interest they have in improving knowledge of their mother tongue.</p>
--	--

Saćip's self-analysis answers my questions from the questionnaire¹⁴⁴ I provided to each poet. I would rather say this is a dialogue which involves autoethnography and with reflexivity it helps to create personal and collective moral positions about the issue of Romani čhib and translation. Some points of his answers have to be clarified because Saćip gave very short information bearing in mind about my knowledge about the situation. It could be that he forgot that this work would be read by people who do not know anything about Roma and the Romani language and translation problem. As he wrote “[we are forced to have translation for ourselves, Roma]” he was thinking about different Romani dialects (all poets are writing in their own dialects) which are spoken in large Romani community. He also thought about the Roma who do not know to write Romani but speak Romani, he was thinking also about different Romani dialects (all poets write in their own dialects) which are spoken in a large Romani community. He also thought about the Roma who do not speak or write Romani but speak Romani, he also had in mind the Roma who do not speak or write Romani but speak and read majority language, and at the same time had in mind very poor Romani readership. There is also one more point I have to mention that Saćip might have had on his mind but did not write it. It is very hard to create a Romani readership because there are still plenty of Roma who, because of economic reasons and because of their habits and very traditional ways of living, refuse ‘written Romani word’. Knowing it, his words “[who have poor knowledge of dialects]” become understandable. It opens a discussion about ways of translation from Romani into national language and from a national language into Romani. His opinion about poorer and incomplete terms of expression in the way when they are first written in a majority a national language and translated into Romani justifies my point of view that poems written in their original and in their self-translation or translation complement each other when refer to the Romani readers who speak both languages. Non-Romani readers would not recognize this incompleteness such as Romani who do not speak

¹⁴⁴ See annex V.

or write Romani čhib. Logically following his answers we come to the sentence “[The upshot is that the Romani language exists but it is [still] quite unknown among Roma],” confirms the problem of education in and of the Romani čhib.

4.3 NEDJO OSMAN

a. Biographical information and literary production¹⁴⁵

Nedjo Osman was born in 1958 in the capital city of Skopje, Macedonia. He graduated from the Academy for Theatre and Film in Novi Sad, Serbia, and studied under the internationally known actor Rade Šerbedžija. His career as an artist began with the Romani Theatre (troupe) Phralipe [Brotherhood], with which he performed in Macedonia, Germany, and various places in Serbia. Some of these places include the National Theatre in Subotica, the Theater in Novi Sad, and the Yugoslavian Drama Theater in Belgrade. As a member and actor with Theatre Phralipe and other troupes affiliated with the National Theatre of Subotica, he participated in many professional theatre festivals, from Athens to Mexico City. Some of his salient roles with Theater Phralipe were: Leonardo, in *Blood Wedding* (F. G. Lorca); Romeo, in *Romeo and Juliette* (Shakespeare); Othello, in *Othello* (Shakespeare); Creon, in *Oedipus Rex* (Sophocles), and Marat in *Marat/Sade* (P. Weiss), all of which were performed in Romani.

In 1995 with his partner Nada Kokotović he founded the Theatre TKO – International Roma Theatre in Cologne, Germany, where he has worked as a co-founder, artistic director, director and actor. In addition to his involvement with the Theatre TKO, Osman has performed at local German city theatres in Düsseldorf, Saarbrücken, Frankfurt am Main, Nordhausen and Cologne. In 2009 he directed the theatre project *Opera Nomadi*, which he co-authored with Christel Jorges (Theater TKO / Choreodrama - Romano Theater 2009). In 2013, the Theatre TKO Cologne produced the choreodrama *Rukeli* (Theater TKO / Choreodrama - Romano Theater 2013) based on the script “Zigeuner-Boxer [Gypsy-boxer]” written by Rike Reiniger, with Nedjo Osman performing as actor along with Arno Kempf. With his partner Nada Kokotović he has also co-authored other theatre plays and performed in them:

- *Elses und andere Geschichten* [Else and other Stories] in 2013
- *Lolo bašno/Roten Hahn* [Red rooster] in 2014

From 2000-2009 he edited and moderated a program in Romani with Radio Multikulti in Berlin. Since 2002 he has also been editing and moderating a Romani program produced by Deutsche Welle in Bonn (Osman and Đurić 2013).

¹⁴⁵I have written this biographical and bibliographical section based on the information provided to me by the author Nedjo Osman. It was cross-checked with entries on him in two anthologies which provide very basic information: *Antologija romske poezije* (Sarajevo: Sarajevske sveske 39/40, 2012), and *Antologija e Rromane poezijači /Antologija romske poezije* (Zagreb: Romska udruga Romski putevi, 2012).

He has performed in different classical and modern dramas, and received various awards:

- “Golden Laurel Wreath Award” for the role of Leonardo in *Blood wedding* by F.G. Lorca at the MES Festival in Sarajevo in 1991
- “Golden Laurel Wreath Award” for the role of Sebastian in the theater play *Anita Berber* at the Vojvodjanski Susreti [Vojvodina meetings] in 1997
- “Yul Brynner Award” for directing the play *Medea* in Berlin followed by an award as best Romani actor in 2003.¹⁴⁶

His performances include roles in *Othello* (Shakespeare), *The Oresteia-Eumenides* (Aeschylus), *Bluebeard's Castle* (Béla Balázs), *The Lover* (M.Duras), and as Sebastian in *Anita Berber*. Osman is also well-known on German TV and in feature films, with acting roles in:

- Eine Braut kommt selten allein [*A bride rarely comes alone*] (2017)
- Casino Coup (XY) (2014)
 - *Bis zum Ende der Welt* [Until the End of the World] (2013)
 - *Danni Lowinski* (2012)
 - *Die schwarzen Brüder* [Black Brothers] (2012)
 - *Eine Insel namens Udo* [An Island Named Udo] (2011)
 - *Drei gegen Troja* [Three Against Troy](2005) (TV)
 - *Alles Atze* [All Atze] (1 Folge, 2005)
 - *Nicht ohne meinen Anwalt* [Not Without My Lawyer] (1 Folge, 2003)
 - *Die Sturzflieger* [The Swoop](1995)
 - *Srpski rulet* [Serbian Roulette] (1991) (TV)
 - *Trst via Skopje* [Trieste via Skopje](4 Folgen, 1987)

Nedjo Osman is also a poet, and has published his poems in Romani, German, Turkish, Serbian and Macedonian. He discovered his desire to write when he was a child, and has drawn his inspiration from the Romani mahala [Romani neighbourhood or settlement] and his experience of life alongside non-Roma. An important source of creativity for him is the notion of love as a concept of beauty. He is included in many Roma projects in Cologne and in Frankfurt am Main. His poetry book co-authored and edited with Marion Menzel, Ali Erenler and A. Kadir

¹⁴⁶ I have been unable to verify further details on the Yul Brynner award.

Konuk (eds.) is entitled *Dört Dilden Sii /Patrin*¹⁴⁷. It was published in Istanbul by Belge Uluslararası Yayıncılık in 1999. His book of poetry *Gebäre mich nicht/Nemoj me rađati* [Don't give birth to me] was published in Weilerwist by Verlag Landpresse in 2006. Osman also works as a social worker and as a Romani mediator.

b. Analyses of Poem “Ma bijan man - Beni dođurma - Gebäre mich nicht - Nemoj me rađati [Don't Give Birth to Me]”

“*Ja pišem na romskom, kombinaciju dijalekata: kovački (bugurdjiski) arlijski i djambaski dijalekt* [I write in Romani, in a combination of dialects]”, writes Nedjo Osman¹⁴⁸, “[the Kovach (Bugurdji) Arli and Djambasi dialects]”.

As noted in the line above, Osman writes his poems first in his mother tongue Romani. As an author and self-translator, however, he also writes in Macedonian, Turkish, Serbian and German. In order to make sure the grammar is correct in the multiple language versions of his poetry in self-translation¹⁴⁹, he always sends his poems to professional proofreaders after self-translating, in order to finalize them for publishing. Self-translated Turkish version of his poem *Ma bijan man/Beni dogurma/Gebäre mich nicht* (Osman *et al.* 1999, 14-16) was proofread by Ali Erenler. His self-translation in German was proofread by Mirjana and Klaus Wittman. According to the poet, self-translation versions in Turkish and German arose consecutively. The self-translated Serbian version arose delayed and was not proofread, but it was sent to me for analysis in the dissertation¹⁵⁰, and the English translation is mine. Self-translation versions are analysed in the chronology of their creation. Analysis of the poem is based on my knowledge of Romani, Serbian, German and English; the Turkish translation has not been considered here.

The poem is entitled “Don't Give Birth to Me”, and through it Nedjo Osman speaks to his readers in general. He uses no diacritical marks, and makes use of punctuation and upper case letters to create a visual effect. The poem is written in one stanza, but there are nine (9) complete meanings – in the form of sentences – presented as visual pictures. The sentences follow no particular rhyming scheme but are broken into lines, thus establishing a poetic structure visually.

¹⁴⁷In Romani, the word *patrin* has different meanings: leaf (on a tree), leaf/sheet of paper, page, flake (snowflake); see Lee 2011, 228.

¹⁴⁸In our email correspondence dated 4 May 2014.

¹⁴⁹In our email correspondence in May and July 2014.

¹⁵⁰In our email correspondence dated 22 July 2014.

Ma bijan man	Beni doğurma	Gebäre mich nicht	Nemoj me rađati	Don't give birth to me
Mix Romani Dialects (AL1)	Turkish (AL2)	German (AL3)	Serbian (AL4)	English (NAL4)
<p>1: Okole plajeste mo dat// cinelsine pus // javere grastenge.</p> <p>2: Okole cergate mi daj// bijanel sine // djikana o kam takarel i puf.</p> <p>3: Te djanav sine trin lafija// anglal te bijangljovav // ka vakeravav sine // ma bijan man.</p> <p>4: Uljum paripnaske // bariljum bugjake // puriljum// hem nasavgiljum.</p> <p>5: Te muljum// civen pani i lulugjenge // muken i car the bajrol</p>	<p>O bilinen tepede arpa biçiyordu babam // başkalarinin atlari için // doğurmuştu annem // toprağı yakarken güneş doğmadan önce // iki sözcük bilseydim sadece // derdim ki // beni doğurma // dert çekmek için yaratildim // çalışmak için büyüdüm // yaşlandım lime lime ölürsem // çiçekleri sulayın // birakin çimen büyüsün // ölürsem birakin</p>	<p>1: Auf jenem Hügel// mähte der Vater Korn // Für die Pferde anderer // In jenem Lager</p> <p>2: Kam die Mutter nieder // während die Sonne auf die Erde brannte</p> <p>3: Hätte ich vor meiner Geburt // Nur drei Worte gewusst // hätte ich gesagt // Gebäre mich nicht // 4: Für's Leid bin ich geschaffen // Für die Fron grossgezogen // Altgeworden und verbraucht // 5: Wenn ich sterbe // Gebt den</p>	<p>1: Na onoj njivi // gde konji prolaze // tata mi žito za njih žanje. // Dok sunce sija // 2: a majka mi rađa u toj čergi // ispod koje zemlja peče</p> <p>3: Te tri reči da sam ih samo // prije mog rođenja znao // rekao bih</p> <p>4: Ne rađaj me Moja bit postala je breme // moje ristanje postao je rad // tako ostarih // i razboleh se</p> <p>5: Ako umrem//zalište cveće vodom // pustite nek trava</p>	<p>1: On this field // where the horses were passing // my father gathered hay // for other people's horses, // 2: and my mother was giving birth in a tent // while the sun scorched the earth. // 3: If I knew just three words // Before I was born // I would say Don't give birth to me 4: My existence turned // into a burden // growing up turned into work // I got old // I got sick.</p>

6: Te muljum 7: E grasten muken te prastan// o cerenja me cirikle te araken // galbane mace oleske te den 8: The muljum // asvin ma muken // muken man korkoro// mo suno ma cinaven 9: Te muljum // mandar kanci ma vakeren.	koşsun atlar // kuşlarima yildizlar baksin // o altin baliklar yesin // ben öldüğümde // akmasin gözyaşlarınız // düşümü bölmeyin // bendeği ağırlığı alin // ölürsem // benden sözetmeyin.	Blumen Wasser // lasst das Gras wachsen // 6: Wenn ich sterbe 7: lasst die Pferde laufen // Die Sterne sollen meine Taube hüten // Goldene Fische soll sie bekommen // 8: Wenn ich sterbe // Vergießt keine Träne // Unterbrecht nicht meinen Traum // Erzählt nicht von mir. // 9 Wenn ich sterbe.	raste // 6: Ako umrem 7: konje odvežite // i pustite neka jure //moju pticu zvjezde neka čuvaju // nek joj zlatne ribice poklone // 8: Ako umrem // nemojte suze liti //pustite me samog // ne prekidajte mi san 9: Ako umrem //o meni nemojte ni reč reći	5: When I die //pour water on the flowers //let the grass grow 6: When I die // 7: release the horses // let the horses run // may the stars protect my birds // may they feed them golden fish // 8: When I die // shed no tear // leave me alone (do not disturb me) // do not break my dream. 9: When I die //Do not speak about me.
--	---	--	---	---

The English translation has relied on the Romani, German and Serbian versions.

Analysis of Version AL1 (Romani, mixed dialect)

Ma bijan man	Don't give birth to me
Mix Romani Dialects (AL1)	English (NAL1)
1: Okole plajeste mo dat// cinelsine pus // javere grastenge.	1: On this field my father //cut hay// for other horses.
2: Okole cergate mi daj// bijanel sine //	2: In this tent my mother// was giving birth//

<p>djikana o kam takarel i puf.</p> <p>3:Te djanav sine trin lafija// anglal te bijangljovav // ka vakeravav sine // ma bijan man.</p> <p>4:Uljum paripnaske // bariljum bugjake //puriljum// hem nasavgiljum.</p> <p>5:Te muljum// civen pani i lulugjenge //muken i car the bajrol</p> <p>6:Te muljum</p> <p>7:E grasten muken te prastan// o cerenja me cirikle te araken // galbane mace oleske te den</p> <p>8:The muljum //asvin ma muken //muken man korkoro// mo suno ma cinaven</p> <p>9:Te muljum //mandar kanci ma vakeren.</p>	<p>while the sun scorched the earth.</p> <p>3: If I knew three words //before I was born // I would say// don't give birth to me.</p> <p>4: I parted because of pain, burden // I grew working// I got old // and I got sick.</p> <p>5: When I die //pour water on the flowers //let the grass grow //</p> <p>6: When I die</p> <p>7: horses let to run // the stars my birds to protect // golden fish them to give</p> <p>8: When I die // do not cry // leave me alone // my dream do not cut</p> <p>9: When I die //do not speak about me.</p>
---	---

The English literal translation has relied on the Romani version.

From the start, the title of the poem reveals a tone of frustration and pain: *Ma bijan man/Beni dogurma/Gebäre mich nicht/[Don't give birth to me]*. The clause *ma bijan man* reflects the poet's depression and remorse at being born and alive. There is no doubt that he is bitter at the life he is living. His inner pain is so powerful that he would prefer to die. The title immediately introduces a sense of bitterness, one that accompanies the poet's memories and occupies his entire being. He remembers his father (*dat*) and his mother (*daj*), and the hard life they lived, which has its extension by projecting onto his own life. This autobiographical poem is created by poet's own experience, by own dreary memories in which his heavy, unforgettable sadness is located. These memories inside are profoundly bitter, although they contrast with his appearantly successful life. Life, successful or not, does not erase memories. Memories remain permanent if a human being remains mentally healthy. The advantage of the poet in this case is that he is sharing his memories while creating the poem with three different language versions of self-translation and at the same time gathering and creating his readership.

The first sentence, “*Okole plajeste mo dat/cinelsine pus/javere grastenge,*” presents the initial sequence of words that will create the visual picture of the poem’s backdrop: mountain (*plajin*); father (*dat*); who is cutting hay only (*cinelsine pus*); for the other people’s horses (*javere grastenge*).

The second sentence, “*Okole cergate mi daj/bijanel sine/djikana o kam takarel i puf,*” sets the dramatic tone more concretely in place. The image of the tent (*cergate*) is ‘seen’, in which his mother (*daj*) gives birth (*bijanel sine*) while the sun (*kam*) shines very strongly, intensely heating (*takarel*) the earth (*puf*). Visual imagination gives way to imagination of sound, and we sense that we can hear a mother’s maternity cries as she gives birth to her child within the tent.

In the third sentence, the poet reveals the direct meaning of the poem: “*Te djanav sine trin lafija/anglal te bijangljovav/ka varkeravav sine/ma bijan man* [If I knew these three words/ before I was born/ I would say /Don’t give birth to me]”.¹⁵¹ The depressed mood of the poet is reflected in the very sad tone of these simply and powerfully stated words.

A fight for survival and existence as the only purpose of poet’s life is shown in the fourth sentence. Working hard, he had not realized how time had passed, life had passed, all of which brought him to a state of sickness. His subjectivity allows him to dramatize emotions and create relationship with own community as surgeon “of the heart and souls of a community” (Ngugi wa Thiong’o, 1987: ix).

The fifth, sixth, seventh and eighth sentences are a call to readers in community to heed his wishes of what to do and how to proceed after he dies. *Lulugjenge* (flowers); [*č*]ar (grass); *grasten* (horses); [*č*]erenja (stars); and [*č*]irikle (birds) were imprisoned in life with him, caught within his depression and bitterness. As asking the readers to take care of them he is also asking them, at the same time but indirectly, to take care about him too. It is in contrast what he is telling in the ninth, and last, sentence which ends with the words: *Te muljum/mandar kanci ma vakeren* [When I die / Do not speak about me]. Poet exaggerates in his self-tragedy. If the readers fulfil his testament i.e. his will, and if they are freeing his flowers, grass, stars which also belong to them i.e. to community, he knows he has reached the own Romani people as audience/readers. This freeing is at the same time also his release as a Roma man and as an author.

¹⁵¹ Here the poet refers to the three words in the Romani version: *ma bijan man*. The translations are not always three words, but can be considered as three small units.

Rhythm and rhyme are present in the poem as of the fourth sentence, where the poet creates repetition on the ending “um” (indicative of a 1st person singular verb conjugation): *uljum, bariljum, puriljum, and hem nasavgiljum*. The consonance plays on the consonant sounds at the end of the verbs, and gives a musical scheme to the poem. The same poetic musical device is deployed in the lines to confer a very strong tone, again by using verbal forms: *te prastan, te araken, te den, ma muken, hinaven, ma vakeren*. The repeated lines *Te muljum, the muljum* give dramatic tone and meaning to the poem.

Finally, a word on the use of the various Romani dialects in the poem is in order. The poet writes certain words *-dat, kam, puf, bugjake, lulugjenge, mace-* in ways that are not generally used in the written form by other Romani groups. They may be characteristic of his mix of “Kovach (Bugurdji) Arli and Djambasi dialects”. However, according to most Romani writers and to dictionaries that have been published (see chapter on Language) these words should be written as *dad, kham, phuv, butjake/butiake/bućake, luludjenge* and *mačhe*. In this case, we could speculate that either Osman does not know how to write in the Romani used by most writers in the region (and beyond), or that he intentionally writes in this “combination of dialects” as a way of expressing his position about the process of standardisation in Poland, and its decision about the use of the written Romani čhib. In this case letters or sounds are less important than the words and language which dictate the meaning of the poem. Also, it is inseparable to mention poet’s pride about his intraethnic Romani identity (as Kovach (Burgudji), Arli and Djambas) and his beliefs of its values and benefits as such.

His poem has an attractive effect not just to the audience i.e. readers of the mix dialect group, but also to the audience i.e. readers of Kovach (Bugurdji) group, to the readers i.e. audience of Arli group and also to readers i.e. audience of Djambas group as well. In that way his intended effect to gather and attract as much as possible of Romani readership is fulfilled. The effect to avoke the readers suspense and interes the poet has met in his choice to write about very common, traditional theme while incorporating self-tragedy. Bringing himself and self-tragedy at the front to readers i.e. audience increases dramatic effect which raised the readers’ interest and intense emotions. It has developed the effect of self-counciousness especially while in oral presentation, what is a great advantage of the poet who is in this case also professional actor, and the effect of great emotional or physical disturbance prevails.

Version AL3 (German)

Gebäre mich nicht	Don't give birth to me
German (AL3)	English (NAL2)
<p>1:Auf jenem Hügel// mähte der Vater Korn // Für die Pferde anderer //in jenem Lager////</p> <p>2:Kam die Mutter nieder // während die Sonne auf die Erde brannte</p> <p>3:Hätte ich vor meiner Geburt // Nur drei Worte gewusst // hätte ich gesagt // Gebäre mich nicht</p> <p>4:Für's Leid bin ich geschaffen // Für die Fron grossgezogen //Altgeworden und verbraucht</p> <p>5:Wenn ich sterbe // Gebt den Blumen Wasser // lasst das Gras wachsen</p> <p>6:Wenn ich sterbe</p> <p>7:lasst die Pferde laufen // Die Sterne sollen meine Taube hüten // Goldene Fische soll sie bekommen</p> <p>8:Wenn ich sterbe //Vergießt keine Träne // //Unterbrecht nicht meinen Traum //Erzählt nicht von mir. //</p> <p>9:Wenn ich sterbe.</p>	<p>1:<i>On an ordained field //made father grain// for the horses for other people// in that camp////</i></p> <p>2: and my mother was giving birth // while the sun scorched the earth</p> <p>3:If I before my birth // just three words knew//I would had said// don't give birth to me</p> <p>4: For suffering I was created // raised for work // old became and used</p> <p>5: When I die //pour water on the flowers //let the grass grow</p> <p>6: When I die</p> <p>7:let the horses run // the stars should my dove beware // golden fish should they get</p> <p>8: When I die // shed no tears // do not break my dreams//Do not speak about me.//</p> <p>9: When I die.</p>

The English literal translation has relied on the German version.

The German self-translation of the poem is written in two stanzas. What is readily apparent is that the words and lines are not structured like the Romani poem. In the German version there are 25 lines, as opposed to 27 in the Romani version. In the German, the punctuation mark [.] is placed twice at the very end of the poem; *Erzählt nicht von mir. Wenn ich sterbe.*[Do not speak about me. When I die.] Some visual images and meanings are also transformed. In one instance, there is inversion. Even though line 25 of the printed, published

German version ends with the clause *Wenn ich sterbe* [When I die], the actual line-by-line correspondence between all the language versions means that the last sentence should read *Erzählt nicht von mir.* [Do not speak about me.] The structure of the German version is changed because of the seeking equivalent effect of tragedy that should be the same and equal strong as in original Romani version. The target German readers should experience this tragedy in their language structure and culture to meet an understanding. The question of equivalence comes into consideration as responsibility of the translator bound in issues from scopos (Flynn 2005, 32).

It is often maintained that a translation, however different from a source-text surface structure, should have the “same” or nearly the same “effect” on the target-culture recipients. The process, culture and scopos concepts “dethrone” not only such ideas as fidelity and equivalence, but consequently also that of effect. “Effect” is one of those scientifically incomparable and therefore interculturally unmeasurable concepts which have hitherto blurred the idea of translating. (Vermeer 1998: 52)

The first stanza contains four lines: *Auf jenem Hügel/ mähte der Vater Korn/ Für die Pferde anderer / and in jenem Lager.* Whereas the Romani version sets the scene on a mountain (*plajin*), the self-translated German version sets the backdrop on a hill (*Hügel*). In the second line, the father is no longer gathering hay (*pus*), as in the Romani version; rather, he is harvesting grain (*mähte der Vater Korn*) for other people’s horses in the camp (*Für die Pferde anderer / in jenem Lager*).

The second stanza starts with the lines *Kam die Mutter nieder* and *während die Sonne auf die Erde brannte*. Both acts – the mother giving birth and the sun scorching the earth - are reflected in all languages. The mother gives birth in the Romani, German and Serbian versions.

While most of the German poem adequately transfers the imagery and meaning we saw in the Romani version, there are instances where some words express more power in German than in Romani. This is evident, for example, in the lines *Für’s Leid bin ich geschaffen/ Für die Fron grossgezogen/ and Altgeworden und verbraucht* (*Uljum paripnaske/bariljum bugjake/ puriljum/ and hem nasavgiljum*). The first line, which could be translated as “For sorrow I am made” in English, is ‘equivalent in weight’ in German to the Romani. However, the other two are more precise and carry more weight in German, which imports connotations of ‘working like a slave’ until one is utterly spent. The lack of Romani vocabulary and the use of simpler words in Romani result in a certain lack of semantic clarity in the Romani version of the poem (especially

noticeable if the version were to be published alone), but subsequently is compensated for at some points by the German in the self-translation.

The self-translation in German is also used by the poet to portray aspects of his personality or life, and to express feelings that may not have otherwise been expressed. An interesting example of this could be found in the transformation of the noun [č]irikle in Romani to the word *Taube* in German. In the first case, the word refers to “birds” in general, preferably in relation to small birds, and used here in the plural. However, in German, the word is used in the singular and refers specifically to “dove”, a symbol for peace. The poet is searching for peace in his inner self. The poem could ‘stand alone’ in its German version as an autonomous entity, because of the clarity and precision of grammar and vocabulary conveyed by using the German language. But in fact this ‘stand alone’ is applicable to German readers, but not for bilingual/multilingual ‘Romani – German’ readers. Bilingual/multilingual Romani readers, in depend which dialect the readers speak, would need the Romani original version as complementary to German in order to get a complete understanding of the poem. Or, in other words, for the Romani readers to whom the closest majority language and culture is German, would accept this poem in consulting both, Romani and German versions.

Version AL4 (Serbian)

Nemoj me rađati	Don't give birth to me
Serbian (AL4)	English (NAL3)
<p>1:Na onoj njivi // gde konji prolaze // tata mi žito za njih žanje.// Dok sunce sija //</p> <p>2:a majka mi rađa u toj čergi // ispod koje zemlja peče</p> <p>3:Te tri reči da sam ih samo // prije mog rođenja znao // rekao bih</p> <p>4:Ne rađaj me</p> <p>Moja bit postala je breme // moje rastanje postao je rad // tako ostarih //i razboleh se</p>	<p>1:On that field //where the horses were passing // my father reap grain for them//Until the sun shining / 2: and my mother was giving birth in a tent // under which the earth burns</p> <p>3: These three words if I just// before I was born knew// I would say</p> <p>4: Don't give birth to me</p> <p>My existence turned into a burden // my growing up turned into work // in that way I</p>

<p>5:Ako umrem//zaližite cveće vodom //pustite nek trava raste</p> <p>6: Ako umrem</p> <p>7:konje odvežite // i pustite neka jure //moju pticu zvijezde neka čuvaju // nek joj zlatne ribice poklone</p> <p>8: Ako umrem // nemojte suze liti //pustite me samog // ne prekidajte mi san</p> <p>9:Ako umrem //o meni nemojte ni reč reći</p>	<p>got old //and I got sick</p> <p>5: When I die //pour water on the flowers //let the grass grow</p> <p>6: When I die</p> <p>7: horses untie// and let them run // my bird may the stars protect // may they golden fish give them as present</p> <p>8: When I die // shed no tear // leave me alone// do not tear my dream.</p> <p>9:When I die //about me do not any word tell</p>
---	--

The English literal translation has relied on the Serbian version.

The Serbian self-translation of the poem is written in five stanzas. It is interesting to point out the differences that emerge when comparing this third self-translation (i.e. AL4) to the the second self-translation (AL3) and ‘original’ (AL1). Just as the visual imagery changed between the Romani and German versions, so it also does in the Serbian version. In the first stanza, for example, the poet’s father is in a field (*Na onoj njivi*) where horses are passing by (*konji prolaze*), and the father is harvesting the grain for other people (*žito za njih žanje*). This image creates a picture that is different from the ones presented in the other languages. It is also worth noting that the image of the bird in Serbian has been retained in the singular (*pticu*), but not as a dove.

Rhythm and rhyme are likewise dealt with differently at times. While rhyme is present in the Romani language version, it is not replicated in the German and Serbian self-translations. There is, however, a certain rhythm that has been achieved by repeating one of the lines four times, and this repetition occurs in all three language versions in the clause: *Te muljum* (Romani), *When ich sterbe* (German), and *Ako umrem* (Serbian). Poetic structure is achieved differently, in part by the visual creation of stanzas: one stanza in Romani; two stanzas in German; and five in Serbian. All of them were decided on by the poet. The poet uses no literary devices like personification, metaphor, or simile – neither in the Romani version, nor in the self-translations. But, as noted earlier, the visual imagery created by the words differs when we compare AL1, AL3 and AL4. The differences in self-translation are summarized in the table below:

Romani	German	Serbian
1 stanza	2 stanzas	5 stanzas
mountain – no horses	hill – no horses	field – horses are passing
father cuts hay for other people's horses	father harvest grain in that camp for other people's horses	father harvests grain for others
I was raised on work	for toil raised	my growing up turned into work
I got old and sick	become old and consumed	
Birds	dove	bird

AL Versions ("Ma bijan man - Beni doğurma - Gebäre mich nicht - Nemoj me rađati - Don't Give Birth to Me")

As already mentioned, I sent out a questionnaire to the poets whose poetry I have analyzed. My intention was to know more about the details of their work procedures, their motivation, inspiration and reasons for self-translating. Below is an excerpt received from the poet Nedjo Osman:

<p><i>H: Koji je motiv tvojih pjesama?</i></p> <p><i>N: Tragično osećanje života, istina i ljubav.</i></p> <p><i>H: Šta si želio reći i poručiti u svojim pjesmama; na šta ukazati?</i></p> <p><i>N: O sudbini Roma, o gorkom isustvu i o nadi koja se zove ljubav.</i></p> <p><i>H: Da li si imao problema kod prijevoda i koji su to problemi?</i></p>	<p>H: What is the motive of your poems?</p> <p>N: The tragic sense of life, truth and love.</p> <p>H: What did you want to say and to tell in your poems; what do you want to point out or emphasize?</p> <p>N: About the fate of Roma, about the bitter experience and about the hope that is named love.</p> <p>H: Did you have problems while</p>
--	--

<p><i>N: Nisam imao.</i></p> <p><i>H: Da li misliš da pjesme pisane na romskom jeziku mogu prevoditi samo Romi i zašto?</i></p> <p><i>N: Pjesme na romski jezik mogu prevoditi samo oni koji znaju dobro romski, i oni koji imaju dobar osećaj za poeziju.</i></p> <p><i>H: Da li misliš da pjesme koje Romi pišu na većinskim jezicima mogu samo oni prevesti na romski?</i></p> <p><i>N: Samo oni koji znaju dobro romski.</i></p> <p><i>H: Da li si prevodio nekad pjesme svojih kolega Roma na romski ili na neki od većinskih jezika? Kakvo je tvoje iskustvo po tom pitanju?</i></p> <p><i>N: Jesam, preveo sam pesme od Rajka Djurića i Jovana Nikolića sa srpskog na romski jezik. Oni su dva razlicita pjesnika po sadržaju i načinu izražavanja, ali prevodjenje mi je činilo zadovoljstvo jer oboje cenim kao pjesnike.</i></p>	<p>translating and what were these problems?</p> <p>N: I did not have.</p> <p>H: Do you think that the poems written in Romani can be translated only by Roma and why?</p> <p>N: The poems in Romani could only be translated by those who know good Romani, and who have a good sense for poetry.</p> <p>H: Do you think that the poems that Roma write in majority languages can be translated in Romani only by Roma themselves?</p> <p>N: Just those who know good Romani.</p> <p>H: Have you ever translated poems written by your other Roma colleagues in Romani or in a majority language? What is your experience according to this question?</p> <p>N: Yes, I've translated poems by Rajko Djurić and Jovan Nikolić from Serbian to Romani. They are two different poets in content and in the way they express themselves. I was satisfied to translate because I appreciate both as poets.</p>
--	--

According to Nedjo Osman, it is possible to achieve a good translation or self-translated poem into and out of Romani only if the person knows Romani very well and has a keen sense of

poetry and poetic expression. In my opinion, it is not only necessary to have a very good command of spoken and written Romani, but also a mastery of the other languages being translated and self-translated. These other languages may have an impact on the meaning and expression of the poem, in single, double, or multiple versions. It is also vital to have knowledge of the diverse Romani cultural differences and traditions. Beside that, as stated earlier, both Romani and non-Romani readers should be taken into consideration as readership. Non-Romani readers would accept poem in their self-translated forms as an original poem i.e. as a creative work, but they would not pay attention to the Romani version except in cases when their interest is awakened by a certain word and its meaning in Romani. The situation is different with Romani readers. They would need, if they are not from the same dialect as the poet is, a complementary version of the language and culture that is mentally and physically closest to their living, educational and cultural conditions.

4.4 HEDINA TAHIROVIĆ-SIJERČIĆ

a. Biographical information and literary production

Hedina Tahirović-Sijerčić was born on 11 November 1960 in Sarajevo's Romani mahala Gorica, in Bosnia and Herzegovina. She received her journalism diploma from the 4-year program at University of Sarajevo in 1985. In 1990 she graduated from the University of Tuzla (BiH) with a Teacher's diploma in elementary education. While living in Canada, in 2000 she obtained her Certificate of Qualification from the Ontario College of Teachers. In 2012 she obtained her Magister diploma from the Center for Interdisciplinary Postdiploma Studies – Gender Studies at the University in Sarajevo (BiH). Her magister thesis title “Rodni Identiteti u književnosti romskih autorica na prostorima bivše Jugoslavije [Gender identity in literature of Romani women authors in former Yugoslavia]” was published in 2016 with the Federal Ministry for Education and Science in Mostar, Bosnia and Herzegovina. In 2017 she co-edited with Cynthia Levine-Rasky *The Romani Women's Anthology: Spectrum of the Blue Water* published by Inanna Publications and Education Inc. in Toronto, Canada.

Since January 2014 Tahirović-Sijerčić has been a Member of the Committee of Experts of the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages for Bosnia and Herzegovina at the Council of Europe in Strasbourg, France. From June 2011 to October 2013 she was coordinator for Roma in BiH at the Ministry of Human Rights and Refugees (MHRR) in Sarajevo. From January 2012 to June 2014 she taught classes on Romani Language, Literature and Culture at the University of Zagreb, Croatia. While living in Toronto, she was active at the newly created Roma Community and Advocacy Centre (now Roma Cultural Centre) and coeditor-in-chief of the magazine *Romano Lil*. From 1985-1992 she worked as editor-in-chief, announcer, moderator, producer, writer, translator, editor and reporter for the radio and TV programs *Lačno djive*, *Romalen (Have a good day, Roma/people)* and *Malavipe (Meetings)* in Sarajevo. Hedina writes and speaks Bosnian (Serbian, Croatian, Montenegrin), Romani, English and German.

Some of her published work as an author includes several academic papers, two dictionaries: *Gurbeti-English/English-Gurbeti* (2011/2013); and *Bosansko-romski i romsko-bosanski rječnik / Bosnaki-Rromani thaj Rromani-Bosnaki alavari* [Bosnian-Romani/Romani-Bosnian Dictionary] (2010) and an autobiographical novella, *Rom like Thunder*, part of which was published first in English (2011) and then fully in Bosnian as *Rom k'o grom* (2012). A series of illustrated bilingual (English and Romani) stories for children published in Canada by Magoria

Books include: *Fish/Macho* (2011); *Karankochi-Kochi* (2010); *Shtar Phrala / Four Brothers* (2010); *How God made the Roma* (2009); *An unusual family* (2009); and *Romani prince Penga* (2009). She has published and self-translated folk tales, poetry, stories, and legends in Romani, Bosnian, and English:

- *Čuj, osjeti bol! / Ashun, hachar Dukh!*(Collection of poems) in Bosnian and Romani, KNS Sarajevo, BiH, 2010
- *Romani Stories and Legends of the Gurbeti Roma* (for adults), in English and Romani, Magoria Books, Canada, 2009
- *Stare romske bajke i priče* (Old Romani legends and folktales) in Bosnian and Romani, The Bosnian Word, BiH, 2008
- *Dukh-Pain*, poetry book, in Romani and English, Magoria Books, Canada, 2008
- *Romany Legends*, in English and German, Turnshare, London, Great Britain, 2004

In addition to multiple co-authored literary publications, she has worked with media and art. In 2011, the collective sound installation “Canada without shadows/Canada bizo učhalipe” was exhibited at the Romani pavilion of the Venice biennale (La Biennale di Venezia) in Italy. The exhibit was later shown at the National Museum of Contemporary Art in Bucharest, Romania in 2013. Before the war in Bosnia, she was editor-in-chief of two documentary films, *Adjive Romen* (Roma Today) and *Karankoci-Koci*, produced for Sarajevo TV in Bosnia and Herzegovina (1989).

Tahirović-Sijerčić is also active as lecturer, trainer, chairperson, organizer of events, editor, etc., and has had many years of Romani translation experience in various domains. These include having translated recent official documents such as the Guide to Parliament (2009), the Revised National Action Plan for Educational Needs for Roma in BiH (2010), and the Revised Action Plan of BiH for Addressing Roma Issues in the Field of Employment, Housing, and Healthcare. She has also translated theatrical pieces and films. In 2011, she served as reviewer of the book *Pravopis romskoga jezika (o čačolekhavno e rromane čhibako)* [Orthography of the Romani Language] authored by Rajko Djurić, and published by the "Michael Palov" College of Professional Studies for Educators (Visoka škola strukovnih studija za vaspitače “Mihailo Palov”) in Vrsac, Serbia.

Her work has been acknowledged in several venues. In 2012 she received the Ferenc Sztojka Award for her lifelong work in poetry and Romani language creativity. The award was presented to her on the “World Day of the Rromani language”. In 2011 she received the prestigious Freedom Award (*Nagrada Sloboda*) from the International Centre for Peace in Sarajevo for the promotion and affirmation of human rights in BiH and the world. In 2010 she was recognized for her literary work when she was awarded the prize for “literary creation and best literary creative expression” from the cultural centre KNS in Sarajevo, and the international “Golden Pen of Papusza” poetry prize from the Ethnographical Museum in Tarnow, Poland. And in 2009, she received the prize for “best promoted work” at the 21st Sarajevo Book Fair in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

b. Analyses of Poem “Drabarni –Gatara”

Included within the corpus of Romani literature in the Balkans are her poems and self-translations, i.e. authored by Hedina Tahirović-Sijerčić, which I will proceed to analyze here. Two poems have been selected from this corpus; one makes use of rhyme and was written first in Romani and then translated into Bosnian; the other is written in prosaic style and was written first in Bosnian and then translated into Romani.

The fact that the “total number of pre-European lexical roots found in all dialects of Romani put together is estimated at around 800” (Matras 2002, 21), at this point invited me to arise the questions for Romani poets, writers and translators and myself: If you translate from a Romani čhib which contains between 800-1400¹⁵² lexical roots into a language of exp. 50.000 roots, and you wish to be as precise as possible in your translation, what will happen? How to translate from a language of exp. 50.000 lexical roots into Romani of 800-1400? How write and create a poem and at the same way think about translation and self-translation? What kind and which words to use and be able to transfer the same meaning into self-translation?

These questions are of crucial importance to Romani poets and writers, their writing and especially their translations and self-translations.

¹⁵² The question on how many words Romani contains was answered through a Romani scholar Ronald Lee by Romani scholar Ian Hancock. *There are as many as you want there to be. I suspect she means roots, and the way I'd address that is add up all of the ones acquired before the Nakhipe, e.g. up to and including Byzantine Greek. My estimate is about 1400. We can't include those acquired on the European side, because they were picked up differently from place to place. There are about 800 that are Indian/Dardic, more than there are Anglo-Saxon roots in modern English.* (Email correspondence on 8.02.2016. between Ronald Lee, Ian Hancock and Hedina Sijerčić.)

The first poem for analysis is entitled *Drabarni/Gatara/Fortune-Teller* (Tahirović-Sijerčić 2008, 24-25) and the second is entitled *CV 6* (Tahirović-Sijerčić 2010, 25-28), in all language versions.

My first language is Serbocroatian, now Bosnian. I am a Romani woman (*Romni*) of Bosnian and Herzegovinian nationality. I was born in a Romani *mahala* but grew up speaking Serbocroatian, as did many other Roma in my neighbourhood and in Bosnia and Herzegovina in general. At school, I studied Serbocroatian, Bosnian, Russian, and German. At the age of 25, I began to study Romani, involving revival of the passive Romani language knowledge which was spoken in my family and in my neighbourhood, due to the need for Romani language radio and TV programs at Radio-Television Sarajevo. I began to study English at age 37. I am multilingual.

I wrote the poem *Drabarni* first in Romani, in my Gurbeti dialect, rather than in Bosnian. At the time I was preoccupied with survival, for myself and for my family, because of the war in Bosnia. While reflecting on my situation, it came to mind how clever our *Romnja*, women, can be when they need to survive. Thinking about it brought a smile to my face, and a better mood, which I was sorely in need of. I constructed a visual image in my mind, and saw one of my good friends, a Romni who earned her livelihood as a fortune-teller. In my vision, I could see her face and body, and then I made eye contact. Feeling overjoyed ‘to be’ with someone who was one of my own, I became happy, thinking of how she tells fortunes, and I wrote this poem.

Drabarni	Gatara	Fortune-Teller
Gurbeti Romani (AL1)	Bosnian (AL2)	English (NAL3) ¹⁵³
1.Ando fildzano me dikhav Tuche baxt te vacharav.	1.U fildžan ti gledam Sreću da ti phendam.	1.From inside this cup I will tell of your luck.
2.Na dikh man dukhalo Naj si sa dzungalo.	2.Ne gledaj me tako tužno Nije baš sve ružno.	2.Don't look at me so sad Things aren't so bad.
3.Hi man o choxanipe	3.Imam čudnu moć	3.I have some magic

¹⁵³ I have reproduced the English self-translation version (AL3) that has already been published. The translation strategy, as discussed in methodology chapter, has prioritized form (i.e. the rhyme scheme) over content. For the purpose of analysis this version is denominated into NAL1, NAL2 and NAL3 version.

Me dikhav e dukhalipe.	Trebaće ti pomoć.	I see something tragic.
4.Kate si o mursh Vov anel e dukhado brsh.	4.Vidim muškarca kako stoji I godinu bolnu ti kroji.	4.There is a guy He makes you cry.
5.Na dikh man dukhalo Naj si sa dzungalo.	5.Ne gledaj me tako tužno Nije baš sve ružno.	5.Don't look so sad It isn't so bad.
6.Thov talo fildzano cira love Ka cherel pala nevo patave.	6.Ispod fildžana malo para stavi I nova ljubav će da se pojavi.	6.Under the cup, just put some money And it will work to bring a new honey.
7.Ka peres ande kamlimata Vov ka avel sar ande phandimata.	7.Ti ćeš ga voljeti A on će ti rob biti.	7.You will fall in love He will be your slave.
8.Thov talo fildzano sumnakuni angurusti Ka cherel tut abijavehchi luludji.	8.Ispod fildžana zlatni prsten stavi Svadbeni cvijet biće ti u glavi.	8.Under the cup, put your golden ring And you will marry him in the spring.
9.Dikhav e vordon, e kuna, e chavoro Kali khanji, aver Rromni thaj murshoro.	9.Vidim kočiju, bešiku i dijete, Crnu kokoš, drugu ženu i muškarca Moj, lijepi cvijete!	9.I see a pram, a cradle, a toy A crow, another woman, and a boy.
10.Hi man o choxanipe Me dikhav dukhalipe.	10.Imam čudnu moć Trebaće ti pomoć.	10.I have some magic I see something tragic.
11.Na dikh man dukhalo Naj si sa dzungalo.	11.Ne gledaj me tako tužno Nije baš sve ružno.	11.Don't look so sad It isn't so bad.
		12.Put your necklace under

<p>12.Thov talo fildzano sumnakuni merikli Ka akharel tut Rromani chirikli.</p> <p>13.Phajrar o naj prdal pe kurva Chichind e jakha E gindese del phaka.</p> <p>14.Dikhav e dzukel, e prno, e chavorro Gova dzangljol-pe jekhethane, gugloro.</p>	<p>12.Ispod fildžana zlatni lanac stavi Romska ptica pomoće ti glavi.</p> <p>13.Pritisni prstom preko kurve, Zavori oči I poželi nešto.</p> <p>14.Vidim psa, stopalo, dijete Ovo ti znači: sretno i zajedno, moj cvijete!</p>	<p>the cup And a Romani bird will protect your luck.</p> <p>13.Press your fingers on the bitch And things will go without a hitch All will work out as you wish.</p> <p>14.I see a foot, a dog, a boy Now you'll be reunited in joy.</p>
---	---	--

The English translation has relied on the Romani and Bosnian versions.

Version AL1 (Gurbeti Romani)

Drabarni	Fortune-Teller
Gurbeti Romani (AL1)	English (NAL1)
<p>1.Ando fildzano me dikhav Tuche baxt te vacharav.</p> <p>2.Na dikh man dukhalo Naj si sa dzungalo.</p> <p>3.Hi man o choxanipe Me dikhav e dukhalipe.</p>	<p>1.In the cup I look To you the luck to say.</p> <p>2.Don't look at me sad It isn't all bad.</p> <p>3.I have magic I see tragic.</p>

<p>4.Kate si o mursh Vov anel e dukhado brsh.</p>	<p>4.There is a man He brings painful year.</p>
<p>5.Na dikh man dukhalo Naj si sa dzungalo.</p>	<p>5.Don't look at me sad It isn't all bad.</p>
<p>6.Thov talo fildzano cira love Ka cherel pala nevo patave.</p>	<p>6.Put under the little cup a little bit of money It will work for new bed.</p>
<p>7.Ka peres ande kamlimata Vov ka avel sar ande phandimata.</p>	<p>7.You will fall in love He will be like in the prison.</p>
<p>8.Thov talo fildzano sumnakuni angurusti Ka cherel tut abijavehchi luludji.</p>	<p>8.Put under the cup golden ring It will make for you wedding flower.</p>
<p>9.Dikhav e vordon, e kuna, e chavoro Kali khanji, aver Rromni thaj murshoro.</p>	<p>9.I see a pram, a cradle, a small child A black crow, another woman and a boy.</p>
<p>10.Hi man o choxanipe Me dikhav dukhalipe.</p>	<p>10.I have some magic I see tragic.</p>
<p>11.Na dikh man dukhalo Naj si sa dzungalo.</p>	<p>11.Don't look at me sad It isn't all bad.</p>
<p>12.Thov talo fildzano sumnakuni merikli Ka akharel tut Rromani chirikli.</p>	<p>12.Put under the small cup your necklace It will protect you Rromani bird.</p>
<p>13.Phajrrar o naj prdal pe kurva Chichind e jakha E gindese del phaka.</p>	<p>13.Press finger on the bitch Close your eyes To your mind give the wings.</p>

14.Dikhav e dzukel, e prno, e chavorro	14.I see a dog, a foot, a small child
Gova dzangljol-pe jekhethane, gugloro.	It means together, in sweetness .

The English literal translation has relied on the Romani version.

This poem was written in 1998. It has 14 stanzas, all of which are written in rhyme. Because I was living in Canada at the time, the Romani orthography of the poem is based on the English system¹⁵⁴. Thus, *sh, ch, dz, zh* are used to designate some sounds, rather than *š, ć, č, dž, ž*, which is the orthography I now use and which I used before going to Canada. It is also worth noting that when a word in Gurbeti Romani is not available to me, I will try first to see if the word exists in Arli Romani or in another dialect. In this way I try to avoid using the majority contact language as much as possible. Words which create the rhymes are culturally and emotionally coloured with the specific expressions used by Romani fortune tellers of the Gurbeti origin. They produce symbols of the words (exp. vordon, kuna, chavoro, khanji, Rromni, murshoro) and this style of speech is also used in their everyday communication. Creating life story, in the poem vordon symbolizes home, kuna a child which is on the way (the pregnancy is possible), chavoro means a boy. This luck interrupts an appearance of kali khanji which symbolizes infelicity, Rromni as a trouble because she is not the only one to her love, and murshoro symbolizes existence of a small boy that her love has with the other woman.

Ka cherel pala nevo patave.
 Von ka avel sar ande phandimata.
 Ka cherel tut abijavehchi luludji.
 Ka akharel tut Rromani chirikli.
 E gindese del phaka.

Very interesting in the case of Čergaš Gurbeti, and their fortune tellers also, is that they very much love to use the diminutive words, as in the poem used **chavoro**¹⁵⁵, **murshoro**, **gugloro**. Diminutives in Romani are built adding the suffix “ro” and “rro”.¹⁵⁶ In the way they

¹⁵⁴ See Chapter II on the Romani language.

¹⁵⁵ In the poem I used both versions of diminutive chavoro and chavorro.

¹⁵⁶ In everyday communication speakers also use diminutives adding suffixes from the contact language (Serbocroatian) which diminutive has also endings “ići”/“ića” creating own specific diminutives (patavici,

communicate I could easily recognize if they are fortune tellers or not, and if the fortune-telling is their occupation.

Fortune-telling – the theme of the poem – is one of the many traditional occupations¹⁵⁷ that Romani people have used for making their living. The poem follows the rhythm of the steps enacted by the fortune-teller as she proceeds to tell the woman-client her fortune. The first stanzas reflect the phase of inviting and enticing the passerby to stop and have her fortune read. Later, the coffee cup becomes the object which helps her to get some money, a golden ring, and a necklace. The process of fortune-telling ends with the teller pressing her finger into the dry coffee grounds¹⁵⁸ in the cup so that a visible fingerprint remains. Repeating the pressing of finger creates another fingerprint, a new symbol.

By using the first person and second person singular, ‘Me/I’ and ‘Tu/you’, the poem establishes a direct connection with the reader. The reader becomes an implied character, one whose fortune is being told. There is a mirror effect between the voice of the poet and the voice of the character of the fortune-teller (‘Me/I’) whose acts and words are being presented by the poet. The strategy of looking into the cup and telling a fortune is integrated as a literary device within the poem. In so doing, it serves to create a story, and to invite the reader to perhaps implicate him or herself in the story, or at the very least to enjoy its telling.

The rhyme carries out some important functions in this poem. It sets and maintains the tone of the poem as light-hearted and happy. It keeps the rhythm and beat of the poem intact, and in fact serves as a kind of storytelling technique by its pacing mechanism. The story is kept going not only by the sequence of events, symbolized by the diverse images perceived by the fortune-teller in the coffee grounds, and the placing of the items of worth by the woman under the cup, but also by the deliberate continual beat of the rhyme. The beat of the rhyme is made through the words: *dikhav-vacharav*, *dukhalo-dzungalo*, *choxanipe-dukhalipe*, *mursh-brsh*, *love-patave*, *kamlimata-phandimata*, *angrusti-luludji*, *chavoro-murshoro*, *merikli-chirikli*, *jakha-phaka*, *chavorro-gugloro*.

chirikli*ca*, etc.). According to the way they use deminutives it is possible, beside other language specificities, recognize identity of the Romani speaker.

¹⁵⁷Musicians, black-smiths, animal trainers, coppersmiths, horse dealers etc.

¹⁵⁸The dry coffee grounds are known as *toz* in Bosnian, Croatian, and Serbian.

Version AL2 (Bosnian)

Gatara	Fortune-Teller
Bosnian (AL2)	English (NAL2)
1.U fildžan ti gledam Sreću da ti phendam.	1.In small cup I look for you Luck to tell you.
2.Ne gledaj me tako tužno Nije baš sve ružno.	2.Don't look at me so sad It is not all ugly.
3.Imam čudnu moć Trebaće ti pomoć.	3.I have strange power You will need help.
4.Vidim muškarca kako stoji I godinu bolnu ti kroji.	4.I see a man standing And a year painful to you tailors.
5.Ne gledaj me tako tužno Nije baš sve ružno.	5.Don't look at me so sad It isn't all bad.
6.Ispod fildžana malo para stavi I nova ljubav će da se pojavi.	6.Under the small cup little bit money put And new love will appear.
7.Ti ćeš ga voljeti A on će ti rob biti.	7.You will love him And he will be your slave.
8.Ispod fildžana zlatni prsten stavi Svadbeni cvijet biće ti u glavi.	8.Under the small cup golden ring put Wedding flower will be in your head.
9.Vidim kočiju, bešiku i dijete, Crnu kokoš, drugu ženu i muškarca Moj lijepi cvijete!	9.I see a pram, a cradle and child, A crow, another woman, and a man. My beautiful flower!

10.Imam čudnu moć Trebaće ti pomoć.	10.I have strange power You will need help.
11.Ne gledaj me tako tužno Nije baš sve ružno.	11.Don't look at me so sad It isn't all ugly.
12.Ispod fildžana zlatni lanac stavi Romska ptica pomoće ti glavi.	12. Under the small cup golden necklace put Romani bird will help to your head.
13.Pritisni prstom preko kurve, Zavori oči I poželi nešto.	13.Press your finger over bitch, Close eyes And wish something.
14.Vidim psa, stopalo, dijete Ovo ti znači: sretno i zajedno, moj cvijete!	14.I see a dog, a foot, a child This means: lucky and together, my flower!

The English literal translation has relied on the Bosnian version.

The self-translation into Bosnian (and English) also contains 14 stanzas. The 13th stanza is the only stanza in Bosnian which contains no rhyme. Likewise in the English self-translation, the rhyme for this stanza is only just partially met.¹⁵⁹ In self-translating this poem, the struggle was to retain as much of the meaning as possible from the Romani version but also to give equal emphasis to the rhyme and beat of the story being told. While analysing this poem, again, came to my mind the other occasional translations of this stanza but in not one I met the rhyme, but the meaning.¹⁶⁰

In the Bosnian self-translation a word-by-word strategy was often preferable so that the exact meaning of the original in Romani would not be lost. This meant working with different translation options and strategies, some of which are unique due to Romani being a contact language. For example, in both the Romani and Bosnian versions of the 13th stanza, the noun

¹⁵⁹ Occasional reference is made here to the English translation of this poem, which has already been published.

¹⁶⁰ Preko kurve prst otisni,/Sklopi oči/I na želju pomisli. Or Otisni prst preko kurve/Zaklopi oči/I pomisli na želju.

kurva ('bitch') has the same use and meaning. There are other words in Romani that could have been used for this meaning. However, this word was selected because of its frequent use among Roma, and for the fact that it is used in all the other languages within former Yugoslavia. Also the noun in Romani *fildzano* is in Bosnian *fildžan* ('coffee cup') and in Romani I am not aware of the other word used for this meaning.

In another case, it is a matter of rhyme. In the first stanza of the poem, rhyme is achieved in the Romani version by using the words *dikhav* and *vacharav*. The Bosnian version uses the verbs *gledam* and *phendam*. *Phenav* (speak), conjugated here as *phendam*, is a Romani verb. Here, the fact that semantically the lines *U fildžan ti gledam // Sreću da ti* could be understood without ending with *phendam* allows for the possibility of the Romani verb, rather than Bosnian verb, to be used. Advantage of this borrowing from AL1 to AL2 is in the fact that the word itself has a chance of being understood by speakers of the local languages (Bosnian, Croatian, Serbian, Montenegrin). Furthermore, the verb is conjugated according to Bosnian verb endings (in the first person). This type of possibility, i.e. using Romani words that would be understood by local language readers of the Bosnian language poem, constitutes one option or strategy that a Romani self-translator can use. It helps confer a certain Romani quality to the translated poem. In this particular case it is interesting to note how the Romani verb *phenav-* is used in connection with the speaker, the implied narrator, i.e. the Romani fortune-teller.

Versions AL1, AL2 and AL3 (English) "Drabarni/Gatara/Fortune-teller"

Taking advantage of being a self-translator and possibility to create my poem in translation, in the third stanza *Hi man o choxanipe/Me dikhav e dukhalipe*. I changed the wording of the Romani clause *Me dikhav e dukhalipe* [word-by-word translation in Bosnian should be *Ja vidim tugu* and in English 'I see sorrow']. If I used word-by-word translation I would not reach the rhyme in Bosnian. So, I used wording "Trebaće ti pomoć" [You will need a help] which also refers to the need to help somebody in sorrow and problems. English translation is "I see something tragic" instead of word-by-word translation "I see sorrow". These changes are made because of creating rhyme in self-translation but at the same time it is worded in that way that the meaning of the poem and of the source text is not lost.

Imam čudnu moć/ Trebaće ti pomoć.
I have some magic/I see something tragic.

The same problems occurred also in self translation of the other stanzas.

Problem that I faced with translation is that the first lines of the stanzas were possible to translate using the strategy word-by-word from Romani. In the second lines in translation in Bosnian I created the poem in the way that the meaning of the source text remains, and that also culturally much with the meaning in Romani. Difficulties I faced in translation from Romani into Bosnian was caused, firstly, because of unequal fond of vocabulary of Romani and Bosnian (see methodology and theory chapter) and secondly, I had to be very creative and knowledgeable in Bosnian to translate my poem in Bosnian in order to find in Bosnian the most appropriate meaning of the Romani words and expressions in poem which was written in a simple spoken Romani at the same time thinking that the process of translating will “bring the target text into line with a particular model and hence a particular correctness notion, and in so doing secure social acceptance, even acclaim” (Hermans 1991, 166). Bringing together theoretical and practical experiences in translation what was also the point of the scholars of Manipulation School or Group¹⁶¹, the assertion that “all translation implies a degree of manipulation of the source text for a certain purpose” (Hermans 1985, 11) convinced me also in the case of Romani translation.

The fourth stanza in Romani: *Kate si o mursh/Vov anel e dukhado brsh* in Bosnian translation

Vidim muškarca kako stoji/I godinu bolnu ti kroji.

There is a guy/He makes you cry.

¹⁶¹ “A term used by some to refer to the group of scholars associated with a particular approach to the study of translated literature. First coined as a word-play (Lambert 1991, 33), it is now used almost as a nickname; however, the school’s own preferred terms are either TRANSLATION STUDIES or the Low Countries group, although this latter term is misleading to the extent that the group includes scholars from countries other than Belgium and the Netherlands, most notably former Czechoslovakia and Israel.[...] Their basic approach thus contrasts with that of the SCIENCE OF TRANSLATION, firstly since their starting-point is “not intended equivalence but admitted manipulation” (Snell-Hornby 1988/1995:22), and secondly because of their concentration on literary rather than technical translation. The group’s most important texts include Even-Zohar (1990), Hermans (1985), Holmes et al. (1978), Holmes (1988), van Leuven-Zwart & Naaijken (1991) and Toury (1980 & 1995), while their most important contributions to the discipline are probably the use of a TARGET TEXTORIENTED approach, and the notions of NORMS, REWRITING and the literary POLYSYSTEM. Their basic approach thus contrasts with that of the SCIENCE OF TRANSLATION, firstly since their starting-point is “not intended equivalence but admitted manipulation” (Snell-Hornby 1988/1995:22), and secondly because of their concentration on literary rather than technical translation. The group’s most important texts include Even-Zohar (1990), Hermans (1985), Holmes et al. (1978), Holmes (1988), van Leuven-Zwart & Naaijken (1991) and Toury (1980 & 1995), while their most important contributions to the discipline are probably the use of a TARGET TEXTORIENTED approach, and the notions of NORMS, REWRITING and the literary POLYSYSTEM.” (Shuttleworth and Cowie 2014).

was not possible to translate by the word-by-word strategy in Bosnian because this strategy brings out the words without any poetic meaning: “Ovdje je muškarac/on donosi bolnu godinu [There is a man/he brings painful year].” Reading translation in that way the Romani source poem would not be understood and the meaning in Romani would be vulgarized in translation. Therefore, I used my combined knowledge of both languages and created translation from Romani into proper Bosnian not losing the exact meaning of myself and not losing the rhyme with the lines:

Vidim muškarca kako stoji/I godinu bolnu ti kroji.

Of course, English word-by-word translation, “There is a man/he brings painful year.” would work in the same way like Bosnian and I used, for myself, the most appropriate words to describe this lines, but again taking care of meaning of the source text and rhyme:

There is a guy/He makes you cry.

Following Manipulation Group scholars and claim that

[t]he discipline generally, but the descriptive school in particular, urgently needs to take account of developments in some of the more vigorous intellectual and social movements of our time, including gender studies, post-structuralism, postcolonial and cultural studies, and the new interdisciplinarity of human sciences. (Hermans 1999, 159–60)

brought me to Lefevre and his definition of translation as “type of rewriting which is able to project the image of an author and/or those works beyond the boundaries of their culture of origin” (Lefevre 1992a, 9). Thinking about the Romani culture beyond the Romani boundaries I translated my poem *Drabarni/Gatara/Fortune-teller*. The symbols used in Romani to describe situations while fortune-telling also use the Bosnian non-Romani women and men who are fortune-telling and their meaning is the same (cradle, woman, man, boy, crow, dog, foot, bird etc.)

While translating into Bosnian I tried also to use the Bosnian language so that the Romani readers reading Bosnian version could easily understand the meaning in Romani they do not know or they forgot, and also that Bosnian readers comparing the Romani text with Bosnian could have an easy approach if decide to learn Romani. The same thoughts were in my mind while

translating into English. As I mentioned in previous text, Romani is very rich with the loanwords and neologisms of the contact languages. I used different Romani dictionaries to avoid it, and I used when needed the Romani vocabulary in other dialects spoken in region of the Western Balkans.

c. Analyses of Poem “CV 6 – CV 6”

The poem *CV6* (Tahirović-Sijerčić 2010) represents a different case than those previously analyzed in this chapter. Whereas the poems by Ruždija-Ruso Sejdović, Nedjo Osman, Mehmed-Meho Saćip, and previous one by Hedina Tahirović-Sijerčić, were all examples of poems that were written in Romani and self-translated into second and third languages, this poem is an example of the reverse direction: into Romani. The reason why I chose reverse direction was because many of my poems I wrote first in Bosnian and then self-translated into Romani, following a natural way of the written reception of the languages I have been using in my writing.

CV6 was inspired while I was reading the book *Zovem se Crveno* by Orhan Pamuk¹⁶², which was translated from Turkish into Serbian by Ivan Panović. My reflections on the soul and the complexity of conception led me to the idea of thinking about Roma and their soul’s mystic traveling into the other world after physical death. Where might they be buried? Where could their souls find peace? The destiny of many Roma to never find their place in life inspired me to think about their place once their physical beings have been converted into souls only. On a personal level, I am satisfied and pleased that through this poem I was able to speak about this problem of my people, and to give voice so that one of these unfortunate souls could speak out, and hopefully find its peace.

CV 6	CV 6	CV 6
Bosnian (AL1)	Gurbeti Romani (AL2)	English (NAL3)
<i>Ime mi je bilo Mehmed. Rodio sam se i živio sam u Bosni. Kucao sam kazane i kotlove od bakra. Bio sam ostario.</i>	<i>Mo anav sasa Mehmed. Bijandilem thaj dzivisardem ande Bosna. Cherdem xarkumache sheja, kazane thaj kotlove.</i>	My name was Mehmed. I was born and I lived in Bosnia. I tapped cauldrons and copperboilers. I was

¹⁶² Orhan Pamuk is a Nobel Prize-winning Turkish novelist. The novel *Benim Adım Kırmızı* (My Name is Red) was published in 1998.

<i>Bilo mi je pedeset i pet godina.</i>	<i>Phurisardem. Seha man pinda thaj pandz brsh.</i>	getting old. I was fifty-five years.
<i>Umro sam.</i>	<i>Mulisardem.</i>	I died.
<i>Htjeli su da me sahrane a oni su branili. Nema mjesta na njihovom groblju. U njihovoj crnoj zemlji. Tijelo mi se počelo raspadati. Nakon 15 dana su odobrili komad crne zemlje. Iz higijenskih razloga. Daleko od čerge. Na mjestu gdje me niko neće naći. Na mjestu gdje mi niko neće doći.</i>	<i>Amare mangle te praxosaren man, von na dije. Nane o than pe lengi limori. Ande lengi kali phuv. Mrno trupo astarda te rispisarel. Athoska 15 djive von dije mandje kotor kale phuvjako. Dure e cahretar. Pe thaneste kaj khonik nashti te rodel man. Pe thaneste kaj knonik nashti te dikhel man.</i>	They tried to buryme, but it wasn't allowed. There is no place in their cemetery. In their black earth. My body began to crumble. After 15 days they allowed me a piece of black earth. For hygienic reasons. Far away from the tent. In a place where no one will find me. At the place where no one will visit me.
<i>Tijelo mi se rasulo i spojilo sa zemljom.</i>	<i>Mrno trupo raspisarda thaj pharuvda ande kali phuv.</i>	My body scattered and merged with the earth.
<i>Sada se zovem Duša. Letim spektrom plavih nijansi nebeskog prostranstva.</i>	<i>Akana akharav Odji. Ujrav pe plavo delesko duripeste.</i>	Now, my name is Soul. I fly on the range of the blue shades of sky.
<i>Tražim mir.</i>	<i>Rodav miro.</i>	I seek peace.
<i>Na oblacima jašem. Mijenjam oblake kao umorne konje. Kiša me umiva. Vjetar me razgovara. Munja me snagom napaja. Letim spektrom plavih nijansi nebeskog prostranstva.</i>	<i>Iklav po nuvera. Paruvav nuvera sar chindile grasta. Brshind thovel mo muj. Bahval vahcarel mansa. Devlehchi jag del mandje zuralipe. Ujrav pe plavo delesko duripeste. Paruvav nuvera sar chindile grasta. Kham chere</i>	I ride on the clouds. I exchange the clouds as I would tired horses. Rain washes my face. Wind talks

<p><i>Mijenjam oblake kao umorne konje. Sunce mi gradi zlaćanu stazu ka Indiji.</i></p> <p><i>Ispod oblaka se nazire Indija.</i></p> <p><i>Drhtim. Sjahao sam u dolinu Ganga. Konj se vratio spektru plavih nijansi neba.</i></p> <p><i>Ja se vratio spektru plavih nijansi vode.</i></p>	<p><i>mandje sumnakuno drom koring Indija. Talo nuvera mothovel pes Indija.</i></p> <p><i>Izdrav. Huljardem ande Gangeski xar. Grast boldisarada e plave delese.</i></p> <p><i>Me boldisardem e plave pajese.</i></p>	<p>to me. Lightning charges me with power. I fly on the range of the blue shades of sky. I exchange the clouds as tired horses. The sun builds for me a golden path to India. Below the clouds is the silhouette of India.</p> <p>I'm shivering. I dismounted in the valley of the Ganges. The horse returned to the spectrum of the blue sky. I returned to the spectrum of the blue water.</p>
---	---	--

The English translation has relied on the Bosnian and Romani versions.

Version AL1 (Bosnian)

CV 6	CV 6
Bosnian (AL1)	English (NAL1)
<p><i>Ime mi je bilo Mehmed. Rodio sam se i živio sam u Bosni. Kucao sam kazane i kotlove od bakra. Bio sam ostario. Bilo mi je pedeset i pet godina.</i></p> <p><i>Umro sam.</i></p> <p><i>Htjeli su da me sahrane a oni su branili. Nema mjesta na njihovom groblju. U njihovoj crnoj</i></p>	<p>My name was Mehmed. I was born and I lived in Bosnia. I tapped cauldrons and copperboilers. I was getting old. I was fifty-five years.</p> <p>I died.</p> <p>They tried to bury me, but it wasn't allowed. There is no place on their cemetery. On their</p>

<p><i>zemlji. Tijelo mi se počelo raspadati. Nakon 15 dana su odobrili komad crne zemlje. Iz higijenskih razloga. Daleko od čerge. Na mjestu gdje me niko neće naći. Na mjestu gdje mi niko neće doći.</i></p>	<p>black earth. My body began to crumble. After 15 days they allowed me a piece of black earth. For hygienic reasons. Far away from the tent. In a place where no one will find me. At the place where no one will visit me.</p>
<p><i>Tijelo mi se rasulo i spojilo sa zemljom.</i></p>	<p>My body scattered and merged with the earth.</p>
<p><i>Sada se zovem Duša. Letim spektrom plavih nijansi nebeskog prostranstva.</i></p>	<p>Now, my name is Soul. I fly on the range of the blue shades of sky.</p>
<p><i>Tražim mir.</i></p>	<p>I seek peace.</p>
<p><i>Na oblacima jašem. Mijenjam oblake kao umorne konje. Kiša me umiva. Vjetar me razgovara. Munja me snagom napaja. Letim spektrom plavih nijansi nebeskog prostranstva. Mijenjam oblake kao umorne konje. Sunce mi gradi zlaćanu stazu ka Indiji. Ispod oblaka se nazire Indija.</i></p>	<p>I ride on the clouds. I exchange the clouds as tired horses. Rain washes my face. Wind talks to me. Lightning charges me with power. I fly on the range of the blue shades of sky. I exchange the clouds as tired horses. The sun builds for me a golden path to India. Below the clouds is the silhouette of India.</p>
<p><i>Drhtim. Sjahao sam u dolinu Ganga. Konj se vratio spektru plavih nijansi neba. Ja se vratio spektru plavih nijansi vode.</i></p>	<p>I'm shivering. I dismounted in the valley of the Ganges. The horse returned to the spectrum of the blue sky. I returned to the spectrum of the blue water.</p>

The English literal translation has relied on the Bosnian version.

The construction of the meaning and ideas is contained in 32 sentences. There is clarity of meaning and expression in the original Bosnian language, in particular due to the short sentences that speak directly to the readers. Each sentence encapsulates its own rhythm, and is meant to

pause naturally for those who read and listen, to give them a moment to ponder the meaning of the line. My intention was to draw attention, clearly and concisely, to the problem that some of my people still suffer.

While writing this ‘prose-poem’ my intention was to create semantically very simple and short sentences in simple words, which are possible easily to translate in Romani. Directness in narration echoes very strong emotions. These emotions were possible to translate and not to lose the power and the rhythm. The soul confession of a Rom Mehmed turned into a silent scream for the fate of my people. In the poem are presented the following problems: rapid aging, short life, early dying;

Bio sam ostario. Bilo mi je pedeset i pet godina. Umro sam.
I was getting old. I was fifty-five years. I died.

identity, human rights, funeral, segregation, fear of estrangement from own people;

Hijeli su da me sahrane a oni su branili. Nema mjesta na njihovom groblju. [...] Daleko od čerge.

They tried to bury me, but it wasn’t allowed. There is no place in their cemetery. [...] Far away from the tent.

change of identity through personal name, search for peace, return to origin;

Sad se zovem Duša. [...]Tražim mir. [...]Ja se vratio spektru plavih nijansi vode.

Now, my name is Soul. [...] I seek peace. [...] I returned to the spectrum of the blue water.

Version AL2 (Gurbeti Romani)

CV 6	CV 6
Gurbeti Romani (AL2)	English (NAL3)
<i>Mo anav sasa Mehmed. Bijandilem thaj dzivisardem ande Bosna. Cherdem xarkumache sheja, kazane thaj kotlove. Phurisardem. Seha man pinda thaj pandz brsh.</i>	My name was Mehmed. I was born and I lived in Bosnia. I tapped cauldrons and copper boilers. I was old. I was fifty-five years.
<i>Mulisardem.</i>	I died.
<i>Amare mangle te praxosaren man, von na dije.</i>	Ours tried to bury me, they didn’t allowed.

<p><i>Nane o than pe lengi limori. Ande lengi kali phuv. Mrno trupo astarda te rispisarel. Athoska 15 djive von dije mandje kotor kale phuvjako. Dure e cahretar. Pe thaneste kaj khonik nashti te rodel man. Pe thaneste kaj knonik nashti te dikhel man.</i></p>	<p>No place in their cemetery. In their black earth. My body began to crumble. After 15 days they allowed me a piece of black earth. Far away from the tent. In a place where no one will search for me. At the place where no one will see me.</p>
<p><i>Mrno trupo raspisarda thaj pharuvda ande kali phuv.</i></p>	<p>My body scattered and merged in the black earth.</p>
<p><i>Akana akharav Odji. Ujrav pe plavo delesko duripeste.</i></p>	<p>Now, my name is Soul. I fly on the blue sky's range.</p>
<p><i>Rodav miro.</i></p>	<p>I seek peace.</p>
<p><i>Iklav po nuvera. Paruvav nuvera sar chindile grasta. Brshind thovel mo muj. Bahval vahcarel mansa. Devlehchi jag del mandje zuralipe. Ujrav pe plavo delesko duripeste. Paruvav nuvera sar chindile grasta. Kham cherel mandje sumnakuno drom koring Indija. Talo nuvera mothovel pes Indija.</i></p>	<p>I ride on the clouds. I exchange the clouds as tired horses. Rain washes my face. Wind talks to me. God's fire gives me power. I fly on the blue sky's range. I exchange the clouds as tired horses. The sun builds for me a golden path toward India. Below the clouds displays India.</p>
<p><i>Izdrav. Huljardem ande Gangeski xar. Grast boldisarada e plave delese. Me boldisardem e plave pajese.</i></p>	<p>I'm shivering. I dismounted in the valley of the Ganges. The horse returned to the blue sky. I returned to the blue water.</p>

The English literal translation has relied on the Romani version.

Self-translating this 'prose-poem' into Romani was not difficult at all due to the directness and clarity of the original Bosnian. However, I reflected most on language with regard to certain

vocabulary. For example, I decided to use the words *kazane i kotlove od bakra* in Romani self-translation as loanwords (*xarkumache sheja, kazane thaj kotlove*) not because I do not know these words but because they would resonate in certain ways. For Roma reading or listening to the poem, these words were used more concretely to invite them to stop and think. They were used provocatively, to provoke a reaction so they might approach me to ask why I did not use the Romani words, i.e. *xarkumache kajve thaj kajvice*. Through the Romani translation, I hoped to awaken Roma readers or interlocutors, so they might start to think about their own language. At the same time I wished for non-Romani speakers looking at the Romani translation to be aware that we use the same language and that we have share some things in common. Finally, I felt that by self-translating this poem I would render the original Bosnian ‘compatible’ with the Romani, not due to an incomplete expression of meaning but for those who might wish to compare the two languages and in so doing, learn Romani.

The Romani self-translation was bound in 31 sentences, with each sentence consecutively creating the life story of a Rom. In the second self-translation in English, the version reached a total of 32 sentences. Because of the clarity in both languages, each poem can be read and understood independently and could even be published separately.

Versions AL1 and AL2 (“CV 6 – CV 6”)

In reading this ‘prose-poem’, readers can visually build the pictures and imagery depicted in the poem. The accompanying rhythm is expressed through the use of the short sentences. The life story of Mehmed’s soul brings the reader quickly to the story of his past, recounted in only four sentences of the first ‘paragraph – stanza’. The story is built on one short sentence from the verb conjugation *Mulisardem* [I died.], and from there Mehmed’s soul starts his journey and story with the problem of entombment. The Romani self-translation “*Amare mangle te praxosaren man, von na dije.*” differs from its English counterpart in the use of of the pronoun “our” [*Amare*] which has the effect of bringing belongings and identity to those who are Ours, and who could take care of the funeral arrangements. In the English version I use the pronoun “they” to make readers think about who should take care about the Roma’s funeral. In the Bosnian original, there is no use of pronoun, but the verb conjugation – the second person plural in the past tense - lets readers pursue a similar line of questioning: who tried to bury him, or Roma, or the others?

Mehmed's body turns into a Soul, which is announced in the sentence constructed from the verb and noun (predicate and subject) *Rodav miro* [I seek my peace], or *Tražim mir* in Bosnian. The noun *miro* in Romani is a loanword from Bosnian [*mir*] which is a word used by all Roma in the region of former Yugoslavia and is used as a loanword in many Romani groups as their own word. The Romani word does not exactly exist but it is possible to create it by using other Romani words like *lačhipe* [goodness, kindness]. The same situation occurs with regard to the word *plavo* [blue] which can be used in Romani as a loanword from the regional languages [*modro*] or by using the word in Romani [*vunetipe*] (Uhlik 1983, 256) which means blue and blueness. However, in this case Roma would not understand to which colour the word refers, or even if the word is used in reference to any colour at all.

After the words *Rodav miro* [I seek my peace], the “prose-poem” starts to build a series of personifications and metaphors throughout the following nine sentences, creating visual images that can be seen and found only in legends. In returning to the old legends of his own people, his soul is searching for its origin. Assisted with this imagery [*nuvera, brshind, bahval, devlehchi jag, kham*] the soul is finally able to reach India, and it finds its peace in the spectrum of the blue water of the Ganges [*ande Gangeski xar, e plave pajeste*]. The symbolism of the water, and especially the specific waters of the Ganges, means that the soul has found its peace in its identity with his own people. The tone of this “prose-poem” is one of disappointment, nonetheless, sad and nostalgic. The search for being accepted as a human being in many cases leaves many souls in a state of eternal wandering.

Versions AL1 and AL2 (A Romani Poet-Literary Critic's overall analysis of the poems “Drabarni-Gatara” and “CV 6-CV 6”)

Correspondence on 4.08.2015 with Romani author Ruždija-Ruso Sejdović in the role of literary critic	
<i>Pjesnički izraz ti je veoma disciplinovan i poetika ima mirni tok, naizgled, ali dubljom analizom postavljaš određene zamke iz oblasti mističnog i, da budem smio, iz teozofskog. Ovo se osobito odnosi na tvoju poeziju u prozi pod naslovom CV-6. Ono što je skrito između</i>	Your poetic expression is very disciplined and has a regular flow, but it seems, upon deeper analysis that you put certain traps from the field of mysticism and, if I may be so bold, from Theosophy. This applies particularly to your poetry in prose entitled CV-6. What is hidden in the short

<p><i>kratkih stihova, u poetskoj prozi lebdi iznad teksta kao nešto što se samo da naslutiti, kao očekivana kiša iz vedrog neba. Upravo taj dodir između mistike i realnosti kompenzuje energetska stvarnost kreativnosti koju želiš da oživiš kroz riječ, bez obzira da li je ukomponovana u okvire stihovnog konstrukta ili je zalepršana u proznoj slobodi.</i></p>	<p>verses is poetic prose hovering over the text like something that can only be as anticipated, as expected as rain out of the blue sky. This fine line between mysticism and reality collects the energy of creativity that you want to give life to through the word, whether or not it gets incorporated into the framework of a poetic construct or it flutters about in the freedom of prose.</p>
<p><i>Posebnost romskog prevoda jeste što ima sopstvenu strukturu i ritam prenosa misli sa bosanskog, a zbog svojstvene problematike izražajne suženosti, nemoguće je ostvariti direktan prevod, a da se misao i ideja ne razvije na neki novi uzbudljiviji ili precizniji, a da kažem nekada i suženiji način. Upravo ta čistoća misli koja je uslovljena nedostatkom kapaciteta romskog jezika generalno, stvara novu idejnost u poetici prevodjenja ideje. Zato se oseća dvostruko pjevanja tvoje poetike na dva jezika, paralelno egzistirajuća.</i></p>	<p>The specificity of the Romani translation is that it has its own structure and rhythm from the transfer of thoughts from Bosnian. Because of the general problematic of the narrow capability of expression in Romani, it is impossible to carry out direct translation. But the thought and idea transferred in translation emerge as something new, exciting and precise. This opens up the possibility of a new poetics of translation, [i.e. whether in the direction of funneling words (in thought, spoken, or written word) from a majority language into a narrower recipient like Romani, or in the opposite direction, of opening up to the potential of more words to express oneself]. This ‘pure thought’, which is conditioned by the lack of capacity of the Romani language in general, creates a new imaginative approach to the poetics of translating ideas. Because of that, it feels like a double song, a rewriting, like versions of your poetics in two languages existing in parallel fashion.</p>
<p><i>Strategija pisanja poezije jeste ubedljiv monolog, iz kojeg se naslućuje reakcija i</i></p>	<p>The strategy of writing poetry is a convincing monologue, in which a reaction and also</p>

<p><i>emocija osobe sa kojom bi mogao svakog trena da nastane dijalog. Očekivanje tog neostvarenog dijaloga, samo jača monolog, tj. strategiju oživljavanja ideje o konstruisanju jedne poetske misli drži u sigurnosti.</i></p>	<p>emotion can be deduced about a person (someone else) with whom a dialogue could begin at any moment. The expectation of that unrealized dialogue just strengthens the monologue, i.e. strengthens the strategy of keeping the idea alive for constructing a poetic thought, and for reining it in safely.</p>
<p><i>Stil kojim pišeš je klasični ako je u upotrebi rimovanje, i to je jedan od najtežih stilova sricanja misaonosti kroz poetičko pjevanje. Sigurno da su u početku većina pisaca imali dodira sa rimom ili sa šablonskom diciplinom konstruisanja pesme. Međutim, kod tebe se naslućuje rimovanje čak i u onim pesmama u kojima ne koristiš taj stil što samo ukazuje na veoma brižljivo pisanje, i veliki trud koji činiš, dajući "sve od sebe" da ti pesma bude "u redu".</i></p>	<p>The style of your writing is classical when you use rhyme, and it's one of the hardest styles for creating thought through poetic rewriting. Certainly in the beginning most writers have contact with rhyme or with models for constructing poems. However, in your poems, one can anticipate the rhyme even when you don't use it. There is diligence and perseverance reflected in the writing. You give all of yourself to get the poem right.</p>
<p><i>Tvoja poetika zapravo živi od kulturoloških primesa. Etno elementi su neraskidivi antipodi tvog pisanja, bez obzira da li je to proza ili poezija. U tome tradiciju upotrebljavaš kao dodatni element koji se skoro uvek menja, zapravo ti si pisac koji želiš tradiciju da promeniš, čak i ako je spomeneš u svojim stihovima.</i></p>	<p>Your poetics actually live from a cultural admixture. The ethnoelements [i.e. segments from Romani tradition] are inseparable antipodes of your writing, regardless of whether it is prose or poetry. In this you use tradition as an extra element that is almost always changing. In fact you're a writer who likes to change tradition, even if you speak of it [tradition] in your verses.</p>

<p><i>Motivacija za pisanjem jednog poetsko gatarskog monologa je iskonska gatarka koja se u tebi opet probudila. I progovorila je, na način koji je tipičan lokalnoj komunikaciji jedne gatarke. Gatanje je fenomen koji je mističan i kod samih Roma, i često se vezuje za neka osećanja koja su nepoznanica konvencionalnom svatanju ljudske mašinerije i razuma, trajanja i opstanaka.</i></p>	<p>The motivation for writing a poetics of a fortune-teller monologue is that the primordial fortune-teller has awoken in you. And she has begun to speak, in a way that is typical for the local communication of a fortune-teller. Fortune-telling is a phenomenon that is mystical for Roma themselves, and it is very often linked to some emotions which are unknown to the conventional understanding of human thought, lasting and surviving.</p>
--	--

Ruždija Ruso Sejđović, who is at the same time a participant, a reader and a critic awoke not just mine but also his consciousness about connection of the personal, cultural. He recognized the use of the elements of tradition in my writing as my desire and intention to change. I see different ways of reading, not with the intention to be received as knowledge and not in a way to be received passively in myself as a possible autoethnographer who rather “want[s] readers to feel, care and desire” (Bochner and Ellis 1996: 24). The change will be possible if our autobiographies, biographies, poems, self-translations, analysis and self-analysis meet you through their reflexivity.

CONCLUSION

As the previous analysis showed, Romani poets in this work write in different Romani dialects: Gurbeti (Xoraxano) from Montenegro, Arli from Kosovo, combination of Arli (Kovački - Bugurdjiski) and Gurbeti (Djambaski) from Macedonia, and Gurbeti from Bosnia and Herzegovina. All poets use the Latin writing system and different orthography. Use of different orthography is the product of the unfinished process of standardisation of the Romani language, and also as a product of different feelings of the writers and poets about their identity, possible readers, publishers etc. Also, I have to mention a possible influence on the poets of their clustering around the linguists who promote Romani language and who might have influence on publishing houses in order to manipulate their use of orthography.

It is not just the problem of the use of different writing systems and different orthography but also the use of mixed dialects that influence the Romani poets and writers. Also, the use of loanwords taken from majority languages is remarkable¹⁶³. The examples of different writing systems, different use of orthography, as well as the use of loanwords show the differences of the writing level of the poets. This level is different and changable, or better to say they differ in development, and it depends on cultural and educational development of the writer, development and power of the linguistical movement and interference of politics in the Romani language in the country/countries they live/lived. All of that is remarkable and visible in roaming of writer's – translator's writing in their search for an appropriate standard. Their dilemma is linked not just to linguists but also to the problem of readership and publishing.

As shown in chapter II, the use of loanwords and neologisms from majority languages in Romani has made Romani communication and writing dependant on other languages and this dependence is more than obvious.¹⁶⁴

¹⁶³ In my analysis the case of Serbian, Bosnian, Montenegrin and Croatian.

¹⁶⁴ Once, I talked to Meli Depner, a translator from Germany, who translates Romani poets into German. While contacting me and consulting about some words she needed to translate from Romani I was realized that the words about whose meaning she asked me were loanwords from Serbian and found in Romani poems she translated. These words are nowadays rarely used in Serbian but Roma still use them in Romani; like *šifonjer* which means *chiffonier*. After many consultations she asked me how to study Romani which is spoken in former Yugoslavia, and my answer was that she should first learn one of the majority languages Serbian, Bosnian, Croatian or Montenegrin.

There are considerable differences in self-translation and translation strategies when self-translating from an official majority language into Romani, and when self-translating from Romani as a minority language into a majority language. Self-translation into Romani, in my opinion, is easier because the majority language which is used as the source language, i.e. original version is taught in schools and the poets are educated in it. The poet who is educated well and who acquired a very good knowledge of the official majority language, i.e. Serbocroatian, and who has a good knowledge of Romani, is able to self-translate into Romani without big problems despite considerably smaller number of words than in Serbocroatian has. The self-translators' problems are: the level of education, the use of the Romani dialect/s, and the use of homonyms. The use of homonyms opens a question of the readership and reception. Self-translation from Romani into Serbocroatian might cause problems because of a limited knowledge of Serbocroatian, inadequate knowledge of the source culture and inadequate use of equivalent meanings in both languages.

Because of the lack of education in Romani and also a lack of understanding of the problems in standardisation of Romani, in many cases the complete meaning is reached just when the Romani version is read simultaneously with the self-translation in majority language/s.

My analysis shows that it is more than obvious that the writers i.e. self-translators used translational tools while writing and self-translating. They used Romani and the contact language/s dictionaries. Contact language/s vocabulary in writer's use was rarely, but as I explained in chapter I, dependence of languages is more than obvious and depends on readership (Romani and non-Romani). In case of Romani readers, while reading one language version the feeling of an incomplete poem occurs unless the other version is read, no matter whether it is the case of source or target language. This incompleteness of the poem's meaning while reading just in Romani or just in Serbocroatian makes us read the poem in the second language i.e. the self-translation in order to complete the meaning. This meaning in some cases is more complete just while reading the second version in self-translation. To Romani poets it is almost impossible to publish such a work just in one language version.

In case of non-Romani readers, each self-translation can be considered as an original creative work. But, there is a problem of the perception of the meaning, of literary expression, of understanding of Romani culture, which causes invisibility and absence of critiques in the national literary canon. The question which comes to my mind is what would happen if the poem

is translated by another writer or translator i.e. if it was not a self-translation? Is it enough just to be another Romani speaker? What interferences in the case of translation might occur? My opinion is that it is not enough. To understand the exact meaning of the poem in translation it is necessary to be someone who is of the same language/dialect and cultural background, and of the same position in the society/ies.

Invisible writers and translators

Romani writers i.e. self-translators are constantly searching for their own identity and for their own literary space, a place in the national canons of majority nations in whose countries they live. They are just existing for themselves, but are invisible to others as stated by Toninato (2004, 161-62)

[t]he main reason why the written works by Romani authors have been generally 'invisible' and unknown to the Gage is simply that nobody expected them to be there at all. The use of writing for literary purposes, in fact, is not in accordance with the popular image of the 'Gypsies' as wild, primitive and therefore uneducated.

The relationship between nationalism and literature is another important dimension. It is an issue that implicates anyone who is professionally engaged in the sociological problems of culture, art, literature and who is living in the midst of the historical walls of the Balkans. Nationalism and literature are connected. National consciousness and nationalist action in a literary work are the presumed historical responsibility of the author. In the Balkans, cultural life is permeated with politics in romantic, neo-romantic or pseudo-romantic fervor, with public engagement synonymous with political nationalism. Romani literary image thus not only speaks of culture and customs; it is also about the history and politics in which the works are created.

To bring Romani writers and self-translators into categories linked to any national canon is impossible. Also to bring them into categorie such as bilingual is not even just enough: writing in one Romani dialect but understanding one or more other dialects and writing for the readers of all of these dialects, with a self-translation into a majority lanaguage which could be understood in the region where readers speak more then four different national languages, again brings the question of multilingualism. To categorize Romani writers as multilingual self-translators

according to the mentioned definitions of multilingualism (see chapter I) is not enough. But what about the fact that the self-translation is a habit of Romani poets?

In their written expression they use not just traditional Romani symbols, but they use in a direct and an indirect way expressions which reflect and speak of an unequal treatment of the Romani people in society i.e. their real place in society. Romani poets and translators cannot really fulfil their cultural but also social responsibilities toward their own people.

The image of Romani culture, as depicted by non-Roma writers and authors, is too often fixed, backward and romantic. Even while academic discussions assist in the deconstruction of the national (or nationalistic) nature of the literary canon, the literary market in reality still tends to mobilize around 'old' ways bound by stereotypes and prejudices, false romanticism and kitsch. Common to them all is the relationship between literature and the nation. Despite the fact that world literature talks about a better understanding among nations and of unknown nations, and examines the coherence of the nation as such, a writer, it seems, can only become internationally known through his or her national origin. This situation is problematic for Roma, and poses a real dilemma. How can they become internationally known as authors through their national origin? In what language of power can they be, if they could be, allowed to be published?

In my dissertation self-translation is a process that creates testimony on Romani čhib differences and differences on the majority languages in the Western Balkans, which bring the self between languages and creates their translingual experience. The fact that further language acquisition occurs through translation and self-translation raises also the question of historical relation between languages and multicultural society.

As explained in chapter I - Translation studies and Romani writing- the categories of Romani bilingual and/or multilingual self-translation overlap and again spill into the next category of translingual. Also, power dynamics between languages with unequal cultural value brings a translingual subject in the position to express its own difference and its own cultural otherness.

There is no the concept in which I could really place the Romani literature.

The time and circumstances of the creation of Romani literary work on the one hand and the structure of their writing and style on the other, create both a place and importance in the history of the European literature or the history of the literature of European nations. Can Romani literary work be considered a part of European literature? Do Roma belong to European nations? Is the Romani identity a European identity? How much of European identity has influenced the

writing of Romani literature? How can the key concepts and frameworks of translation studies enlighten us on the characteristics of Romani literature? All of these questions need to be addressed, discussed and answered, and for this it is necessary to create an urgent dialogue between Romani studies and Translation studies. I expect the readers to be other scholars of Romani poetry and translation in general.

Romani literature is everywhere but not really placed where it should be and always invisible, exactly like the Romani people are.

If we realize that universal humanity expresses itself in literature, we shall be able to discern what is worth viewing in the latter. (Tagore 2001, 148)

Thinking about future of translation in the Romani context

Being aware of the advantages of the autobiographical method and reflexivity as necessary in this work, I decided to take this moment and space and place the problem of translation and self-translation in the Romani context in a dialogue with Romani scholar Ronald Lee, who is also an experienced translator. I also decided to take the responsibility to publish our correspondence,¹⁶⁵ for which I got Lee's permission, to go a step forward and record it, wishing it to be a part of the Romani history of translation. Using that possibility, my intention is, as always, visibility and the use of Romani čhib in everyday communication today.

<p>Hedina Sijerčić - Romani</p> <p>Ande mi disertacija mangav te pučav sar šaj te traden thaj te čeren tradipe te si kate in Romani 1400 svaturja thaj ande gadjikani buteder? Sar te čeren ekvivalencija ande tradipe/tradimata? Džanav kaj kate naj ma atveto, odolese so amen trubuj baro rodipe pala gova.</p>	<p>Hedina Sijerčić – English</p> <p>I would like to ask, for the purpose of my dissertation, how can we do translation if there are 1400 Romani words and many more non-Romani? How can we reach equivalency in translation? I know there is no answer yet, because we need an extensive research about it.</p>
--	---

<p>Ronald Lee – Romani/English</p> <p>Si dui droma te puruvas/tolmachis Romanes ande akanipeski gadjikani shib</p>	<p>Ronald Lee – English</p> <p>There are two ways to translate Romani in present non-Romani language</p>
--	---

¹⁶⁵ Email correspondence on 9.02.2016 between Hedina Sijerčić and Ronald Lee.

<p>1) Shai uzis/xramos neologismurja, I need some new aps for my computer. Trobul ma neve programurja vash muri komputeri and the neologisms from the battery of common root words across the European-language spectrum (which will include the Americas because the languages came from Europe). examples like sociologija, medesina, antropologija, kombinacija, heterogenitate, digitalno, etc.</p> <p>2) through incoining of existing Romani words. Pediatrician - shavorengo doftoro, intensive care - intensivno sama</p> <p>3) By reintroducing old core vocabulary (thematic words) that exist in some dialects but not in others for for example. rukh, tree, len, stream, dud, light, sherutno with a slash as follows Shindjas tele o baro kasht/rukh.</p> <p>4) By rephrasing the sentence that needs to be translated to fit Romanes. For example. We have insufficient funds to cover the cost of the new equipment needed for the auditorium - Nai amen dosta love te pochinel vash le neve aparati kaj trobul i auditorija</p>	<p>1) You can write neologisms, I need some new aps for my computer. I need new programs for my computer and the neologisms from the battery of common root words across the European-language spectrum (which will include the Americas because the languages came from Europe). examples like sociology, medicine, anthropology, combination, heterogeneity, digital, etc.</p> <p>2) through incoining of the existing Romani words. Pediatrician - pediatrician, intensive care – intensive care</p> <p>3) By reintroducing old core vocabulary (thematic words) that exist in some dialects but not in others for example. tree, stream, , light, mainly with a slash as follows We sit under the big tree.</p> <p>4) By rephrasing the sentence that needs to be translated to fit Romanes. For example. We have insufficient funds to cover the cost of the new equipment needed for the auditorium – We don't have enough money to buy a new appliances which we need for auditorium</p>
---	--

It could be seen that neologisms and loanwords play an important role in Romani people's bilingualism/multilingualism when considering both translation and self-translation. Correspondence started in my Gurbeti, including three Kalderash words (atweto, svaturja, tradimata). Even though I am aware of Lee's knowledge of these words in Gurbeti (as irisaripe, alavurja, tradipe), I used the Kalderash words for our better understanding, and because I liked to get his sympathy letting him know about my knowledge of Kalderash. Also, his point about reintroducing the old core vocabulary was applied in this question.

The reason for publishing this correspondence was to confirm my assertion that Roma mostly write prose in non-Romani languages. Everyday communication vocabulary as well as spoken and written correspondence do not allow professional communication and translation

because of the missing terminology. Lee's proposal could be taken into consideration for the future investigation in the field of translation in the Romani context, which would encourage development and creation of the new translational tools.

The future of Romani čhib

More and more educated and literate Roma are connected and use computers, the Internet, mobile devices and various types of social media. Globalization and the interconnectivity through computers and social networks that results underscore the unique condition of the Romani language use. Speakers of different dialects attempt to communicate across national and dialectal boundaries using the writing scripts they were educated in. Adaption of concepts and vocabulary may be planned or spontaneous, and specific problems due to Romani bilingualism and multilingualism arise. If localization of a user interface or website is planned, according to the conventional definition, it involves "taking a product and making it linguistically and culturally appropriate to the target locale (country/region and language) where it will be used and sold" (Munday 2008, 191). In this regard, clearly established dialects with standardized scripts would need to be used to plan for localization. Since this is not the case for Romani, a more spontaneous localization often arises whereby adaptations are proposed or used in order to carry out communication.

In some cases, the global lingua franca English is used, acting as a kind of interlingual support bridge. In these cases, the purpose is clearly a functional one. To illustrate, one example is found in the use of the word *narod* ('folk'). It is Slavic rather than international but it is used instead of the original *them* by 80% or more Roma in migration (around the world). The word has been socially preferred rather than academically prescribed, and hence merits description. It is also an example of how a Romani neologism emerged under the influence of a local/regional territory where Slavic languages are used. As noted by Munday (2008, 191-92) and Pym (2004a, 65) in the context of internationalization in relation to the concept of equivalence:

Transnational equivalence [...] is traditionally concerned with large-scale complex social entities (and) cannot help but engage in the complexity and overlaps of culture.

In other words, whether localization or digital translation is planned for or spontaneously arises in the Romani digital context, it consistently reflects the dynamics of adaptation needed and

used for communication among diverse dialect groups who are fluent in other national languages as well. The equivalence is a functional one and is also under attack for involving a “subjective judgement from the translator or analyst” (Munday 2012, 68). The loan words, loan translations, and neologisms all tie in with questions of identity, related to migration, culture, language, and loss of one’s ethnic language, but “where there is deficiency” such as is in Romani, “terminology may be qualified and amplified” (Jakobson 2004, 115)

In that way invention and creation of a new terminology and new meanings in language lead to the phenomena of translanguaging and translingualism. Adapting different names or meanings, Romani čhib users signify a new identity of language between languages. Their new meanings, subjectivities and new translingual self creations are developed (Garcia and Wei 2014) and an adequate way to transfer it through translation is, in my opinion, ‘just’ in self-translation.

REFERENCES

- Acković, Dragoljub (1996). *Ašunen Romalen/Listen people*. Beograd: Rromniterpress & Radio B92.
- Acković, Dragoljub (2001). *Nacija smo a ne Cigani*. Beograd: Rromniterpress.
- Acković, Dragoljub (2003). *Bi kheresko bi limoresko - Bez doma baz groba*. [Without home without grave]. Smederevo: Arka.
- Acković, Dragoljub (2012). "Ogled o proučavanju romskog jezika" in *Standardizacija romskog jezika*, Djurić, Rajko. Sarajevo: Romski informativni centar "Kali Sara".
- Acković, Dragoljub (2012b). *Tradicionalna nematerijalna kulturna baština Roma*. [Traditional intangible cultural heritage of Roma]. Beograd: Rominterpres.
- Acković, Dragoljub, ed. (2012a). "Antologija romske poezije" [Anthology of Romani poetry] in *Sarajevske sveske* [Sarajevo notebooks]. Sarajevo: Sarajevske sveske, pp. 39-40.
- Acton, Thomas (2008). "History and Background: The Gajo problem: By way of background" in *Roma New Migrants: Local Research in the U.K and European Context*. Marion Horton and John Grayson, eds., AdEd Knowledge Company LLP and BBEMI, pp. 5-7.
Retrieved from
http://www.redtoothcreativesolutions.com/aded/docs/Roma_Conference_Report.pdf
- Acton, Thomas and Morgan Dalphinis, eds. (2000). *Language, Blacks and Gypsies: Languages Without a Written Tradition and Their Role in Education*. London: Whiting and Birch.
- Acton, Thomas, ed. (1988). *Scholarship and the Gypsy Struggle*, Commitment in Romani studies. Hertfordshire: University of Hertfordshire Press.
- Aleksandrović, Marija (2012). *Bacila sam jabuku u peć*. [I threw an apple in the oven]. Novi Sad: Zavod za kulturu Vojvodine.
- Alexander, B. K. (2005). "Performance ethnography: The reenacting and inciting of Culture." In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc, 411-42
- Alexander, B. K. (2006). *Performing black masculinity : Race, culture, and queer identity*. Lanham, MD: Rowman Altamira.
- Alexander, Ronelle (2006). *Bosnian, Croatian, Serbian, a Grammar With Sociolinguistic Commentary*, Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Alsop, Christiane K. (2001). Power, anxiety and the research process. Reflections on my research experiences in midstream and where to go from here. In Christiane K. Alsop (Ed.), *Grenzgängerin. Bridges between disciplines. Festschrift fuer Irmgard Staeuble Kröningen*: Asanger, 173-192.
- Alsop, Christiane K. (2002, September). „Home and Away: Self-Reflexive Auto-/Ethnography“ [55 paragraphs]. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative*

Social Research [On-line Journal], 3(3). Available at: <http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs/fqs-eng.htm> [2016-02-05].

Anderson, L. (2006). 'Analytic autoethnography' *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 35: 4, 373-95

Angelelli, Claudia V. and Brian James Baer, eds. (2016). *Researching translation and interpreting*. London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group. (pdf-book)

Anon. (2011). "Roma: binding EU standards to integrate Europe's largest minority" on the *European Parliament News Website* Retrieved 10.2017.
<http://www.europarl.europa.eu/news/en/news-room/content/20110309IPR15166/html/Roma-binding-EU-standards-to-integrate-Europe%27s-largest-minority>. Press Release Ref. 20110309IPR15166

Anon. "Nedjo Osman" on the *Internet Movie Database (IMDB)* website. Retrieved on 07.2014 from <http://www.imdb.com/name/nm0652063/>

Anon. "Papusza" in *The Orlando Sentinel* website. Retrieved 12.2011 from http://articles.orlandosentinel.com/1987-02-19/news/0110120280_1_gypsy-polish-translation-papusza

Anon. "Rezultati pretraživanja – 'Saćip, Mehmed'" in *Katalog Knjižnica grada Zagreba* website. Retrieved 07.2014 from <http://www.katalog.kgz.hr/pagesResults/rezultati.aspx?&searchById=40&spid0=10&spv0=Sa%C4%87ip%2c+Mehmed&xm0=1>

Anon. Council of Europe *Plurilingual and Pluricultural Competence* Report 2009. Retrieved 11. 2013 from https://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/Source/SourcePublications/CompetencePlurilingue09web_en.pdf

Anon. "Romani Dialects" on the *ROMLEX* website. Retrieved 06.2014 from <http://romani.uni-graz.at/romlex/dialects.xml>

Anon. "Sejdović, Ruždija-Ruso" in *zapisi 133* website. Retrieved on 07.2014 from http://www.nbcg-digitalnabibliografija.me/bibliografija_tekuca/clanci_2012/zapisi133.html#3960;
Retrieved on 11.2016 from <https://www.avlija.me/poezija/ruzdija-ruso-sejdovic-svedok-druga-nagrada-casopisa-avlija-za-najbolju-pjesmu-regionu-za-2014-godinu> ; Retrieved on 10. 2017 from <https://www.cdm.me/kultura/casopis-avlija-nagradio-najbolje-pjesme-i-price/?page=0%2C2>

Anon. The copy of text in Museum of Romani culture in Belgrade, online sources websites. Retrieved on 02.2017 from <https://archive.org/details/fyrstbokeintrod01boorgoog> and <http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k930027/f118.image.r=.langEN>

- Appadurai, Arjun (1996). *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Public Worlds, Volume 1. Series Editors Dilip Gaonkar and Benjamin Lee. Minneapolis, London: University of Minnesota Press.
- Appel, René and Pieter Muysken (2005). *Language Contact and Bilingualism*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, Amsterdam Academic Archive.
- Aronin, Larissa and Britta Hufeisen, eds. (2006) *Volume 6. The Exploration of Multilingualism. Development of research on L3, multilingualism and multiple language acquisition*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Asad, Talal. (1986) "The Concept of Cultural Translation in British Social Anthropology". In James Clifford and George E. Marcus (eds) *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. University of California Press, 141-64.
- Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin (1998). *Key Concept in Post-Colonial Studies*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Attar, Samar (2005). "Translating the Exiled Self: Reflection on Translation and Censorship." In *Intercultural Communication Studies XIV: 4 2005*, 139-148. Retrieved November 2015 <http://web.uri.edu/iaics/files/10-Samar-Attar.pdf>
- Backus, Ad. (2013). "Turkish as an Immigrant Language in Europe" in *The Handbook of Bilingualism and Multilingualism*. 2nd Edition. Bhatia K. Tej and William C. Ritchie, eds. "Blackwell Handbooks in Linguistics" Series. Malden/Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, pp. 770-790.
- Baer, Brian James and Geoffrey S. Koby, eds. (2003). *Beyond the Ivory Tower: Rethinking translation pedagogy*. American Translators Association, Scholarly Monograph Series, Volume XII. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Baer, Brian James, ed. (2011) *Contexts, Subtexts and Pretexts. Literary Translation in Eastern Europe and Russia*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Baker, Mona (1995). "Corpora in Translation Studies. An Overview and Suggestions for Future Research". *Target*, 7(2), 223-243.
- Baker, Mona (1993). "Corpus linguistics and Translation Studies: Implications and applications." In *Text and Technology: In Honor of John Sinclair*, Mona Baker, Gill Francis & Elena Tognini-Bonelli (eds), 233–250. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Baker, Mona and Gabriela Saldanha eds. (1998/2009/2011). *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail Mikhailovich (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four Essays by M. M. Bakhtin*. Holquist Michael, eds. Austin and London: University of Texas Press.
- Bakker, Peter and Khristo Kiuchukov, eds. (2000). *What is the Romani language?* Hartfield: Centre de recherches tsiganes. University of Hertfordshire Press.

- Bakker, Peter (1999). The Northern branch of Romani: mixed and non-mixed varieties. In: *Die Sprache der Roma. Perspektiven der Romani-Forschung in Österreich im interdisziplinären und internationalen Kontext* ed. By Dieter Halwachs and Florian Menz. Klagenfurt: Drava 172-209.
- Balić, Sait [redakcioni odbor *et al.*] (1984). *Jaga/Vatre* [Fire]. Bujanovac: XI Smotra kulturnih dostignuća Roma SR Srbije.
- Bassetti, Benedetta (2013). "Bilingualism and Writing Systems" in *The Handbook of Bilingualism and Multilingualism. 2nd Edition*. "Blackwell Handbooks in Linguistics" Series. Bhatia K. Tej and William C. Ritchie, eds. Malden/Oxford: Blackwell Publishing in the series, pp. 649-670.
- Bassnet, Susan (1998). "When is a Translation Not a Translation?" in Bassnet, Susan and Lefevere, André. *Constructiong Cultures. Essays on Literary Translation*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, pp. 25-40.
- Bassnet, Susan (2002/2005). *Translation Studies*. London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group.
- Bassnet, Susan and André Lefevere (1998). *Constructiong Cultures. Essays on Literary Translation*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Bassnet, Susan and Harish Trivedi, eds. (1999/2002). *Postcolonial Translation. Theory and Practice*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Bassnett, Susan and André Lefevere, eds. (1990) *Translation, History and Culture*. London and New York: Pinter.
- Bauman, Richard and Charls L. Briggs (1990). Poetic and Performance as Critical Perspective on Language. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, Vol. 19, 59-88. Retrieved on 19.01.2016 from http://anthro.vancouver.wsu.edu/media/Course_files/anth-490-edward-h-hagen/bauman-and-briggs-1990-poetics-and-performance-as-critical-perspectives-on-language-and-social-life.pdf
- Benjamin, Walter (2000) [1968, 1923] "The Task of the Translator." Transl. Harry Zohn. in Lawrence Venuti (ed.) *The Translation Studies Reader*. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 15–25. Retrieved in 2004, in Taylor and Francis e-Library.
- Bermann, Sandra and Michael Wood, eds. (2005). *Nation, Language, and the Ethics of Translation*. Translation, Transnation. Series Editor: Apter, Emily. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- Besemeres, Mary (2002). *Translating One's Self: Language and Selfhood in Cross-Cultural Autobiography*. European Connections Series. P. Collier ed. Vol. 3. Oxford, Bern, Berlin, Bruxelles, Frankfurt am Main, New York, Wien: Peter Lang.
- Beylard-Ozeroff, Ann, Jana Králová and Barbara Moser-Mercer (1998). *Translators' strategies and creativity. Selected Papers from the 9th International Conference on Translation and Interpreting, Prague, September 1995*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

- Bhabha, Homi (1994). *The Location of Culture*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Bhatia, K. Tej and William C. Ritchie, eds. (2013). *The Handbook of Bilingualism and Multilingualism*. 2nd Edition. "Blackwell Handbooks in Linguistics" Series. Malden/Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Bhatia, K. Tej and William C. Ritchie eds. (2004/2006). *The Handbook of Bilingualism*. Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Bialystok, Ellen (2013). "The Impact of Bilingualism on Language and Literacy Development" in *The Handbook of Bilingualism and Multilingualism*. 2nd Edition. "Blackwell Handbooks in Linguistics" Series. Bhatia K. Tej and William C. Ritchie, eds. Malden/Oxford: Blackwell Publishing in the series, 624-648.
- Blackledge, Adrian (2005). *Discourse and Power in a Multilingual World*. Amsterdam /Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Bogue, Ronald (1989). *Deleuze and Guattari*. London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group.
- Boretzky, Norbert (1999). "Grammatical interference in Romani: Loan formations for foreign categories". *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 46:3-4. 169-200.
- Borrow, George (1841). *The Zincali, or an account of the Gypsies of Spain*. Republished in London in 1924.
- Borrow, George (1851). *Lavengro: scholar, Gipsy, priest*. Republished in London in 1910.
- Borrow, George (1874). *Romano Lavo-Lil* [Word book of the Romany or English Gypsy language]. Republished in London in 1910.
- Bourdieu Pierre, J. Richardson, eds. (1986) "The forms of capital" in *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*. Westport CT: Greenwood, 241–258.
- Bourdieu, Pierre (1977). *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Tr. Richard Nice. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre (1990). *The logic of practice*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre (2008). *Key Concepts*. Edited by Michael Grenfell. Durham: Acumen Publishing Limited. Reprinted 2009/2010.
- Bourdieu, Pierre and Loïc J.D. Wacquant (1992). *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. Cambridge: The University of Chicago, Polity Press.
- Brems, Elke and Sara Ramos Pinto (2013). "Reception and translation." U Handbook of Translation Studies. Yves Gambier and Luc van Doorslaer eds. John Benjamins Publishing Company, 142-147.
- Bugariski, Ranko (2010). *Jezik i identitet*. [Language and identity]. Beograd: Biblioteka XX vek.

- Bugarski, Ranko (2012). "Language, identity and borders in the former Serbocroatian area" in *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*. 33:3, pp. 219-235. Also retrieved 07.2014 from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2012.663376>
- Busmann, Hadumod (1996). *Routledge Dictionary of Language and Linguistics*. Translated and edited by Gregory P. Trauth and Kerstin Kazzazi. London and New York: Routledge.
- Butler, Yuko Goto (2013). "Bilingualism/Multilingualism and Second-Language Acquisition" in *The Handbook of Bilingualism and Multilingualism*. Second Edition. Bhatia K. Tej and William C. Ritchie, eds. "Blackwell Handbooks in Linguistics" Series. Malden/Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, pp. 109-136.
- Cabré, M. Teresa (1999). *Termonology: Theory, methods and applications*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Canagarajah, A. Suresh (2011). "Translanguaging in the classroom: Emerging issues for research and pedagogy" in *Applied Linguistics Review*. vol. 2, pp. 1-28. Cordingley, Antony, eds. (2013) *Self-translation: Brokering Originality in Hybrid Culture*. London, New Delhi, New York, Sydney: Bloomsbury IATIS.
- Canagarajah, A. Suresh (2013). *Translingual Practice: Global Englishes and Cosmopolitan Relations*. New York: Routledge.
- Candel-Mora, Miguel A. and Chelo Vargas-Sierra (2013). „An Analysis of Research Production in Corpus Linguistics Applied to Translation.“ *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 95, 317-324. 5th International Conference on Corpus Linguistics (CILC2013). Elsevier Ltd. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.10.653 Retrieved 8.03.2016 www.sciencedirect.com
- Cenoz, Jasone and Gorter, Durk (2011). "Multilingualism" in *The Routledge Handbook of Applied Linguistics*, James Simpson, eds. London and New York: Routledge Taylor and Francis Group, pp. 401-412.
- Chan, Tak-hung Leo (2016). Reader response and reception theory. In Angelelli, Claudia V. and Brian James Baer, eds. *Researching translation and interpreting*. London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group.
- Chesterman, Andrew (2000). "Shared Ground in Translation Studies: Coda by AC" in *Target* 12:1, 156-157
- Chesterman, Andrew (2013). Personal notes taken during *Lecture at the CETRA Research Summer School*.
- Chimbutane, Feliciano (2012). "The Advantages of Research in Familiar Locales, Viewed from the Perspectives of Researcher and Researched. Reflections on Ethnographic Fieldwork in Mozambique" in *Multilingualism, Discourse and Ethnography*, Gardner, Sheena and Marilyn Martin-Jones, eds. New York/London: Routledge, 288-304.
- Cintas, Diaz Jorge and Gunilla Anderman, eds. (2009). *Audiovisual Translation: Language Transfer on Screen*. Hampshire: Palgrave macmillan.

- Clébert, Jean-Paul (1967). *Cigani*. [Gypsies]. Zagreb: Stvarnost.
- Constantin, Cosmin (2014). “The Autoethnographic method – an alternative in communication”. *Professional Communication and Translation Studies*, 7 (1-2)/ 2014. Feb. 2016
http://cls.upt.ro/files/cls/Publicatii/Proceedings/7-2014/04_PCTS_7_2014_Baias.pdf
- Conway, Kyle (2012). “Cultural translation” in *Handbook of Translation Studies Volume 3*. Yves Gambier & Luc van Doorslaer, eds. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 21-25. Retrieved 09.2013. http://www.academia.edu/2379950/Cultural_Translation.
- Cook, Guy (2011). “Discourse analysis” in *The Routledge Handbook of Applied Linguistics*. Simpson James, eds. New York: Routledge, 431-444.
- Cordingley, Antony, ed. (2013) *Self-translation: Brokering Originality in Hybrid Culture*. London, New Delhi, New York, Sydney: Bloomsbury IATIS.
- Council of Europe (CE) (1998). *The European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages*. Retrieved on 02.2014 from
http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/education/minlang/textcharter/default_en.asp
- Council of Europe (CE) (2015). *The European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages*. Committee of Experts of the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages (ECRML) on 5 November 2015 on the occasion of the International Romani Language Day, <http://www.roma-alliance.org/en/page/182-5th-november--international-day-of-romani-language.html>, Retrieved 11. 2015.
- Council of Europe (CE) (2008). “Education of Roma children in Europe” factsheet available on *Council of Europe website*. Retrieved www.coe.int/education/roma
- Council of Europe (CE) (2008a). “Arrival in Europe” brochure in *Roma Factsheets*, part of the Education of Roma children in Europe project. Retrieved 02.2014 from <http://romafacts.uni-graz.at/index.php/history/early-european-history-first-discrimination/arrival-in-europe>
- Council of Europe (CE) (2014). “Education and Languages, Language Policy” on *Council of Europe website*, under the *Democracy* section. Retrieved 03.2015 from
http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/Division_en.asp
- Courthiade, Marcel (1991). “Les dialects Posa et Mitrip”. *ET* (3):54.
- Courthiade, Marcel (1998). “The dialects structure of the Romani language”. *Interface* 31: 9-14.
- Courthiade, Marcel and Alain Reyniers, eds. (2005). “Langue et culture : approche linguistique” in *Études tsiganes*. vol. 2, no. 22. Paris: Études tsiganes.
- Courthiade, Marcel, Melinda Rezmuves, Lucia Presber and Geoff Husic, eds. (2009) *Morri angluni rromane chibaqi evroputni lavustik*. Budapest: Favorosi Onkormanyzat Cigany Haz -Romano kher, 496-497.
- Cousin, W. John. *Dictionary of English Literature*. The University of Adelaide, last updated in December 2014, e-book. Retrieved April 2015.
<https://ebooks.adelaide.edu.au/c/cousin/john/biog/b.html>

- Cressey, Gill (2012). "Diaspora Youth, Ancestral Languages and English as 'translation' in Multilingual Space" in *Multilingualism, Discourse and Ethnography*. Gardner, Sheena and Marilyn Martin-Jones, eds. New York/London: Routledge, pp. 131-141.
- Cronin, Michael (2003). *Translation and Globalization*. New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group.
- Cronin, Michael (2006). *Translation and Identity*. London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group.
- Crystal, David (2010). *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language*. Third edition. Cambridge: Cambridge U. Press.
- Cynthia Levine-Rasky and Hedina Tahirović-Sijerčić (2017). "Introduction", in *A Romani Women's Anthology: Spectrum of the Blue Water*, Inanna Publications and Education Inc.: Toronto, Canada, pp.1-11.
- D'haen, Theo (2012). *The Routledge Concise History of World Literature*. New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group.
- Darquennes, Jeroen (2011). "Minorities, language politics and language planning in Europe" in *The Languages, and Linguistics of Europe. A Comprehensive Guide*. Bernd Kortman and Johan van der Auwera, eds. Göttingen: Walter de Gruyter GmbH &
- Davies, Maria González (2004). *Multiple Voices in the Translation Classroom: Activities, tasks and projects*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Deleuze, Gilles and Felix Guattari (1987). *A thousand plateaus. Capitalism and schizophrenia*. Minneapolis, London: University of Minnesota Press.
- Demir, Ljatif (2013). *Narodna književnost Roma* [Traditional literature of Roma]. Lecture at the Faculty of Philosophy in Zagreb.
- Demir, Ljatif and Demir, Fatime (2010). *Lavustik: Romani-makedonikani/Makedonikani-Romani./ Rečnik:Romsko-makedonski. Makedonsko-romski*. Skopje: Romski kulturni i edukativni centar "Darhija".
- Demir, Ljatif and Durmiš, Nevsija (2012). *Gramatika romskoga jezika/Gramatika e romane čhibaki* [Grammar of the Romani language]. Zagreb: Udruga za promicanje obrazovanja Roma u RH "Kali Sara".
- Denzin N. K. and Y. S. Lincoln, eds. (2000). *The handbook of qualitative research* 2nd ed. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 733-768.
- Denzin, N. K. (1989). *Interpretive Biography*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Denzin, N.K. (2003). *Performance ethnography: Critical Pedagogy and the politics of culture*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

- Denzin, N. K. (2005). Emancipatory discourses and the ethics and politics of interpretation. In *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research*, 3rd ed., N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln, eds. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc, 933-958.
- Denzin, Norman K., Yvonna S. Lincoln and Linda Tuhiwai Smith, eds. (2008). *Critical-Indigenous Methodologies*. Los Angeles/London/New Delhi/Singapore: SAGE.
- Dinasi, e Adaleta, eds. (2012). *Antologija e Rromane poezijači/Antologija romske poezije* [Anthology of Romani poetry]. Zagreb:Romska udruga romski putevi.
- Dizdar, Delek (2012). "General translation theory." In *Handbook of Translation Studies*, Volume 3, DOI: 10.1075/hts.3.gen2. John Benjamins Publishing Company, 52-58. Retrieved 25.01.2014 from http://www.benjamins.com.mercury.concordia.ca/cgibin/bbr_hts.cgi?cmd=show_article&file=/articles/gen2.html&printview=1
- Djurić, Rajko (1987). *Seobe Roma – Krugovi pakla i venac sreće*. [Migration of Roma-circles of hell and wreath of happiness]. Beograd: Beogradski izdavačko-grafički zavod.
- Djurić, Rajko (2005). *Gramatika e rromane čhibaki / Gramatika romskog jezika* [Grammar of the Romani language]. Beograd: Otkrovenje.
- Djurić, Rajko (2005a). "Predgovor" ["Foreword"] in *Rromanipe(n): O Ku lturnom Identitetu Roma: Promovisanje i Zaštita Kulturnih Prava u Programu Javnog Zastupništva, 2003-2005* [Rromanipe(n): About Cultural Identity of Roma:Promotion and Protection of Cultural Rights in the Programm of Public Representatives, 2003-2005]. Devis, Barbara/Đurić, Rajko/B. Đorđević, Dragoljub, eds. Beograd : Care International u Srbiji i CrnojGori. pp. 11-12.
- Djurić, Rajko (2010). *Istorija romske književnosti*. [History of the Romani literature.] Vršac: Biblioteka Vetrokaz.
- Djurić, Rajko (2011). *Pravopis romskoga jezika/ O čačolekhavno e rromane čhibako* [Spelling of the Romani language]. Vršac: Visoka škola strukovnih studija za obrazovanje vaspitača "Mihailo Palov".
- Djurić, Rajko (2012). *Standardizacija romskog jezika*. [Standardization of the Romani language]. Sarajevo: Romski informativni centar "Kali Sara".
- Djurić, Rajko and Antun Miletić (2008). *Istorija holocausta Roma*. [History of the Holocaust of Roma]. Beograd: Politika.
- Djurić, Rajko and Veljko Kajtazi (2011). *Povijest romske književnosti*. Zagreb: Kali Sara.
- Eagleton, Terry (1983/1996/2008). *Literary Theory: An Introduction*. Great Britain: Blackwell Publishers Ltd. USA: University of Minnesota Press.
- Edwards, John (1994). *Multilingualism*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Edwards, John (2009). *Language and Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Edwards, John (2013). "Bilingualism and Multilingualism: Some Central Concepts" in *The Handbook of Bilingualism and Multilingualism*. Second edition. Bhatia K. Tej and William C. Ritchie, eds. "Blackwell Handbooks in Linguistics" Series. Malden/Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, pp. 5-25.
- Edwards, Viv. *Inclusive education for second language learners: the case of Roma children in Croatia*. Paper prepared for the Open Society Foundation. Retrieved 01.2014 from https://www.academia.edu/183803/Inclusive_education_for_second_language_learners_the_case_of_Roma_children_in_Croatia
- Ellingson, Laura L., & Ellis, Carolyn (2008). "Autoethnography as constructionist project". In J. A. Holstein & J. F. Gubrium (Eds.), *Handbook of constructionist research* (pp. 445-466). New York: Guilford Press.
- Ellis, Carolyn (2004). *The ethnographic I: A methodological novel about autoethnography*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.
- Ellis, Carolyn and Arthur P. Bochner (2000). "Autoethnography, personal narrative, reflexivity" in *Handbook of qualitative research*, 2nd ed. Norman K. Denzin & Yvonna S. Lincoln, eds. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 733-768.
- Ellis, Carolyn and Arthur P. Bochner, eds. (1996). *Composing Ethnography: Alternative Forms of Qualitative Writing*. AltaMira Press.
- Ellis, Carolyn and Arthur P. Bochner (2006). "Analyzing analytic autoethnography: An autopsy." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 35: 4, 429-49.
- Ellis, Carolyn, Tony E. Adams and Arthur P. Bochner (2011). "Autoethnography: An Overview" in *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*. 12:1, Art. 10. Retrieved 01.2015 from <http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1589/3095>
- Elšik, Viktor (1997). "Towards a morphology-based typology of Romani", In *The Typology and Dialectology of Romani* Yaron Matras, Peter Bakker, Hristo Kyuchukov, eds. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Even-Zohar, Itamar (1978). *Papers in Historical Poetics*. Tel Aviv: Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics.
- Even-Zohar, Itamar (1990). "Poetics Today" in *International Journal for Theory and Analysis of Literature and Communication*. 11:1. Retrieved 10.08.2014. <http://www.tau.ac.il/~itamarez/works/books/ez-pss1990.pdf>
- Even-Zohar, Itamar (2000). "The position of translated literature within the literary polysystem" (revised version of 1978 article) in *The Translation Studies Reader*, Lawrence Venuti, ed. London: Routledge, pp. 192-197.
- Federman, R. (1987). *The Writer as Self-Translator*. In Beckett *Translating/Translating Beckett*, A.W. Friedman, et al, eds. 7-16, London: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 14-15 quoted in Attar (2005) *Translating the Exiled Self: Reflections on Translation and Censorship*.

- Ferguson, C.A. (1959). „Diglossia.“ *Word*, vol.15, 325-340. Retrieved on 20.01.2016 from <http://mapage.noos.fr/masdar/Ferguson-Diglossia.pdf>
- Fernandes, Lincoln (2006). „Corpora in Translation Studies: revisiting Baker's typology“. *Fragmentos*, número 30, p. 087/095 Florianópolis/ jan - jun/ 2006. Retrieved 9.02.2016 from <https://periodicos.ufsc.br/index.php/fragmentos/article/viewFile/8217/7690>
- Fish, Stanley (1980). *Is There a Text in This Class? The Authority of Interpretative Communities*. Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, England: Harvard University Press.
- Fishman, A. Joshua (2013). “Language Maintenance, Language Shift, and Reversing Language Shift” in *The Handbook of Bilingualism and Multilingualism. 2nd Edition*. “Blackwell Handbooks in Linguistics” Series. Bhatia K. Tej and William C. Ritchie, eds. Malden/Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 466-494.
- Fitch, B.T. (1988). *Beckett and Babel. An investigation into the status of the bilingual work*. Toronto, Buffalo & London: University of Toronto Press.
- Flynn, Peter (2005). *A Linguistic Ethnography of Literary Translation: Irish Poems and Dutch-Speaking Translators*. Ghent University.
- Flynn, Peter (2010). “Ethnographic Approaches” in *Handbook of Translation Studies. Volume 1*. Gambier, Yves and Luc van Doorslaer, eds. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 116-119.
- Folaron, Deborah (2011). “Is Romani Officially Recognized?” In *Translation Romani*. Retrieved 11.2014 <http://www.translationromani.net/en/romani/language/is-romani-officially-recognized>
- Folaron, Deborah (2011b). *Translation Romani* website. Retrieved 11.2017. <http://www.translationromani.net/en>.
- Friedman, Victor A. (2003). Romani as a minority language, as a standard language, and as a contact language: Comparative legal, sociolinguistic, and structural approaches. In Fraurud, Kari/Hyltenstam, Kenneth, eds. *Multilingualism in Global and Local Perspectives. Selected papers from the 8th Nordic Conference on Bilingualism, November 1-3, 2001, Stockholm-Rinkeby*. Stockholm: Elanders Gotab, 103-134.
- Gambier, Yves and Luc van Doorslaer, eds. (2010). *Handbook of Translation Studies. Volume 1*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Gambier, Yves and Luc van Doorslaer, eds. (2011) *Handbook of Translation Studies. Volume 2*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- García, Ofelia and Colin Baker, eds. (2007). *Bilingual Education: An Introductory Reader*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- García, Ofelia and Li Wei (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Gardner, Sheena and Marilyn Martin-Jones, eds. (2012) *Multilingualism, Discourse and Ethnography*. New York/London: Routledge.
- Gentzler, Edwin (1993/2001). *Contemporary Translation Theories*. New York: Routledge.
- Giampapa, Frances (2012). "Authenticity, Legitimacy and Power. Critical Ethnography and Identity Politics" in *Multilingualism, Discourse and Ethnography*, Gardner, Sheena and Marilyn Martin-Jones, eds. New York/London: Routledge, 95-107.
- Grosman, Meta, Mira Kadrić, Irena Kovačić, Mary Snell-Hornby, eds. (2000/2009). *Translation into Non-Mother Tongues. In Professional Practice and Training*. Studien zur Translation. Volume 8. Tübingen: Stauffenburg Verlag.
- Grutman, Rainer (2000). "The position of translated literature within the literary polysystem" (revised version of 1978 article) in *The Translation Studies Reader*. Venuti, Lawrence, ed. London: Routledge, pp. 192-197.
- Grutman, Rainer (1997). *Des langues qui résonnent. L'hétérolinguisme au XIXe siècle québécois*. Montréal : Fides.
- Grutman, Rainer (2009). "Multilingualism" in *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. Mona Baker and Gabriela Saldanha, eds. London and New York: Routledge. pp. 182-186.
- Grutman, Rainer (2013). "A sociological glance at self-translation and self-translators" in *Self-translation: Brokering Originality in Hybrid Culture*. Antony Cordingley, ed. London, New Delhi, New York, Sydney: Bloomsbury IATIS, pp. 63-80.
- Grutman, Rainer and Trish Van Bolderen (2014). „Self-Translation.“ In *A Companion to Translation Studies*. Eds. Sandra Bermann and Catherine Porter. West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, 323-332.
- Grutman, Rainier (2009a). "Self-translation" in *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. Mona Baker and Gabriela Saldanha, eds. London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group, pp. 257-260.
- Haliti, Bajram (2011). *Srpsko-romski rečnik (sa gramatikom i pravopisnim savetnikom)./Serbikano-Rromano alavari (e gramatikaca thaj e vorgtaxramosaripnasqe sikavipnaca*. Novi Sad: Prometej.
- Halwachs, W. Dieter (2011). "Romani, Language Planning and the Media" in *The RomIdent Working Papers*. No. 2. University of Manchester: [Romani] project. Retrieved 09.2014 from <http://romani.humanities.manchester.ac.uk/virtuallibrary/librarydb//web/files/pdfs/293/Paper2.pdf>
- Halwachs, W. Dieter, Klinge, Simone and Schrammel, Barbara eds. (2013). *Romani, Education, Segregation and the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages*. Graz: Grazer Romani Publikationen/GRP 01/GLM. Also retrieved on 01.2014 http://a.cs.coe.int/team20/cahrom/6th%20CAHROM%20plenary%20meeting/Item%207%20-%20ECRML%20Study%20on%20Romani_education_segregation.pdf

- Hancock, Ian (1995). *A Handbook of Vlax Romani*. Columbus: Slavica Publishers, Inc.
- Hancock, Ian (1997). "The roots of antigypsyism: to the Holocaust and after" in *Confronting the Holocaust: A Mandate for the 21st Century*. G.J. Colijn & Marcia Sachs Littell, eds. Lanham: University Press of America, 19-49. Retrieved 01.2014 from http://www.radoc.net/radoc.php?doc=art_b_history_rootsofprejudice&lang=en&articles=true
- Hancock, Ian (1998). "The struggle for the control of identity" in *Transitions*. 4:4. Retrieved 08.2012 from <http://www.oocities.org/~patrin/identity.htm>
- Hancock, Ian (2002/2005/2007). *We are the Romani people/Ames am e Rromane džene*. Hertfordshire: Centre de Recherches Tsiganes, University of Hertfordshire Press.
- Hancock, Ian (2003). "Language Corpus and Language Politics: The Case of the Standardization of Romani" in *Nation-Building, Ethnicity and Language Politics in Transition Countries*. Farimah Daftary and François Grin, eds. Budapest: Open Society Institute.
- Hancock, Ian (2006). "On Romani Origins and Identity: questions for discussion" in *Gypsies and the problem of identity: contextual, constructed and contested*. A. Marsh and E. Strand, eds. Istanbul: Swedish Research Institute.
- Hancock, Ian (2007). "Our need for internal diplomatic skills" in *Roma Diplomacy*. Nicolae Valery and Hanna Slavik, eds. Brussels: European Roma Information Office.
- Hancock, Ian (2007-2008 a). "Language Corpus and Language Politics: The Case of the Standardization of Romani" on the *RADOC* website. Retrieved 09.04.2011 at http://www.radoc.net/radoc.php?doc=art_c_language_standardization&lang=en&articles=true
- Hancock, Ian (2007-2008). "Issues in the Standardization of the Romani Language: An overview and some recommendations" on the *RADOC* website. Retrieved 09.04.2011. http://www.radoc.net/radoc.php?doc=art_c_language_recommendations&lang=en&articles=true
- Hancock, Ian (2010). *Danger! Educated Gypsy. Selected Essays*. Hertfordshire: University of Hertfordshire Press.
- Hancock, Ian (2010a). "Mind the Doors! The contribution of linguistics" in *All Change! Romani Studies through Romani eyes*. Hertfordshire: University of Hertfordshire Press.
- Hassan, Bahad-eddin Abdulhassan (2011). *Literary Translation: Aspects of Pragmatic Meaning*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Hatim, Basil and Ian Mason (1990). *Discourse and the Translator*. London: Longman.
- Havlásková, Zuzana (2010). *Interference in Students' Translations*, Master's Diploma Thesis, Supervisor: Mgr. Renata Kamenická, Ph. D. Masaryk University, Faculty of Arts: Department of English and American Studies, English-language Translation.
- Hermans, Theo (1991). "Translational Norms and Correct Translations" in *Translation Studies. The State of the Art*. Kitty van Leuven-Zwart and Ton Naaijken, eds. Amsterdam & Atlanta: Rodopi, pp. 155-170.

- Hermans, Theo (1991a). "Translating 'Rhetorijckelijck' or 'Ghetrouwelijck': Dutch Renaissance Approaches to Translation" in *Standing Clear. A Festschrift for Reinder P. Meijer*. Jane Fenoulhet and Theo Hermans, eds. London: Centre for Low Countries Studies, 151-172. Retrieved 12.2014 from http://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/957/1/91_FestschriftRPM.pdf
- Hermans, Theo (1999). *Translation in Systems. Descriptive and Systemic Approaches Explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Hermans, Theo ed. (2006). *Translating others. Volume 1*. London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group. Retrieved on 19.01.2016 (http://samples.sainsburysebooks.co.uk/9781317640455_sample_573079.pdf)
- Hermans, Theo, ed. (1985) *The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation*. Beckenham: Croom Helm.
- Hermans, Theo (2009). "Translation, ethics, politics." In *The Routledge companion to Translation Studies* (revised edition). Munday, Jeremy ed. London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group, 93-106.
- Herrero, Isis and Todd Klaiman (eds.) (2012). *Versatility in Translation Studies: Selected Papers of the CETRA Research Seminar in Translation Studies 2011*. Retrieved 08.2014 <https://www.arts.kuleuven.be/cetra/papers>
- [Heteroglossia]. Retrieved on 11. 09. 2015 from <http://www.reference.com/heteroglossia/>
- High, Steven (2016). *Research ethics*. Concordia University- Centre for Oral History and Digital Storytelling. Retrieved 18.03.2016 <http://storytelling.concordia.ca/toolbox/ethics>
- Hoffman, Eva (1989). *Lost in Translation. A Life in a New Language*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Hokenson, Jan Walsh and Marcella Munson (2007). *The Bilingual Text: History and Theory of Literary Self-Translation*. Manchester, UK and Kinderhook (NY), USA: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Hokenson, Jan (2013). "History and the self-translator." In *Self-translation: Brokering Originality in Hybrid Culture*. Cordingley, Antony, ed. London, New Delhi, New York, Sydney: Bloomsbury IATIS, 39- 61.
- Holman Jones, Stacy (2005). "Autoethnography: Making the personal political" in *Handbook of qualitative research*. Norman K. Denzin & Yvonna S. Lincoln, eds. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 763-791.
- Horton, Marion and John Grayson (2008). "Roma Research – the Context" in *Roma New Migrants: Local Research in the U.K. and European Context*. Marion Horton and John Grayson, eds. AdEd Knowledge Company LLP and BBEMI, pp. 8-10.
- Horvat, Jožek (2008). *Romski jezik = Romani čhib* [Romani language]. Murska Sobota: Zveza Romov Slovenije.

- House, Juliane and Jochen Rehbein, eds. (2004). *Multilingual Communication*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- House, Juliane, ed. (2014) *Translation: A Multidisciplinary Approach*. Palgrave Advances in Language and Linguistics Series. London: Palgrave Macmillan. E-book edition.
- Hrushovski, Benjamin, ed. (1981). *Poetics today: theory and analysis of literature and communication*. With International Editorial Board 1980-1981. Volume 2:4, Summer/Autumn. Cambridge: Schenkman Publishing Company.
- Hung, Eva, ed. (2005). *Translation and Cultural Change: Studies in history, norms and image-projection*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Inghilleri, M. (2003) Habitus, field and discourse: Interpreting as a socially-situated activity, *International Journal of Translation Studies*, 15, 2, 243-268.
- Internet Movie Database (IMDB) (*unknown*). "Nedjo Osman" on the *Internet Movie Database (IMDB)* website. Retrieved on 07.2014 from <http://www.imdb.com/name/nm0652063/>
- Jakobson, Roman (1959). "On linguistic aspects of translation" in Venuti, Lawrence, ed. (2004). *Translation Studies Reader*. Taylor and Francis e-Library.
- Jay-Rayon, Laurence (2008). "Compte rendu : Jan Walsh and Marcella Munson. *The Bilingual Text. History and Theory of Literary Self-Translation*. Manchester, UK and Kinderhook (NY), St. Jerome, 2007, 236 p." in *TTR : traduction, terminologie, rédaction*. 21:2, Association canadienne de traductologie, pp. 256-266
- Jinyu, Liu (2012). "Habitus of Translators as Socialized Individuals: Bourdieu's Account" in *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*. 2:6. Finland: Academy Publisher, pp. 1168-1173.
- Jones, R.Francis (2011). *Poetry Translating as Expert Action. Processes, priorities and networks*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Jones, R. Francis (2009). „Literary translation“. In *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. Baker, Mona and Gabriela Saldanha eds. (1998/2009/2011). London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group, 152-157.
- Juhász, Katalin (2009). Book Reviews "Jan Walsh Hokenson & Marcella Munson: *The Bilingual Text: History and Theory of Literary Self-Translation*" in *Across Languages and Cultures*. 10:1. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, pp. 155-160.
- Jupp, Victor, ed. (2006) *The Sage Dictionary of Social Research Methods*. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: SAGE Publications.
- Karanth, Dileep, ed. (2010) *Danger! Educated Gypsy. Selected Essays*. Ian Hancock, Hertfordshire: University of Hertfordshire Press.
- Kellman G. Steven (2000). "Pourquoi [why] translingual?" in *The Translingual Imagination*. Lincoln/London: University of Nebraska Press, 17-35.

- Kemp, Charlot (2009). "Defining multilingualism" in *The Exploration of Multilingualism. Development of research on L3, multilingualism and multiple language acquisition*. Larissa Aronin and Britta Hufeisen, eds. vol. 6. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Kenesei, Andrea (2010). *Poetry Translation through Reception and Cognition: The Proof of Translation is in the Reading*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Kennedy, X.J. and Dana Gioia (1995). *Literature: An Introduction to Fiction, Poetry, and Drama*, Sixth Edition. New York: HarperCollins, 1790-1818. Retrieved on 20.01.2016 from <http://home.olemiss.edu/~egjbp/spring97/litcrit.html>
- Kenny, Dorothy (1998/2009/2011). "Corpora". In *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. Baker, Mona and Gabriela Saldanha, eds. London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group, 59-62.
- Khalifa, Abdel-Wahab, ed.(2014) *Translators Have Their Say?: Translation and Power of Agency. Representation-Transformation/Representation-Transformation/ Representation-Transformation: Translating Across Cultures and Societies Series*. Berlin-Münster-Wien-Zürich-London: Lit Verlag.
- Klopčič, Vera (2013). "Pota romskega jezika" [Routes of the Romani language] in ŽELE, Andreja, eds. *Družbena funkcijskost jezika: (vidiki, merila, opredelitve)*[Social function of language: aspects, criteria, definitions]. Ljubljana: Znanstvena založba Filozofske fakultete, pp. 213-218.
- Kochanowski, Vania de Gila (1989). "Problems of the common Romany-problems of an international language" in *Jezik i kultura Roma*. Sarajevo: Institut za proučavanje nacionalnih odnosa.
- Kochanowski, Vania de Gila (1963). *Phonologie du tzigane d'Europe (Doctorat en linguistique et dialectologie romani)* in *Gypsy Studies*, 2 volumes 400p.in 40=0, New –Delhi.
- Koller, Werner (1979). *Einführung in die Übersetzungswissenschaft*. Uni-Taschenbücher 819. Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer.
- Kovats, Martin (2003). *The politics of Roma identity: between nationalism and destitution 4*. Retrieved 09.2013 from www.openDemocracy.net
- Krasnići, Alija (2012). *Angluno Rromano-Srbikano Serbikano-Rromano Alavari/ Prvi Romsko-Srpski Srpsko-Romski Rečnik*. Subotica: Rromane Pustika-IP Romske Knjige.
- Kuhiwczak, Piotr and Karin Littau, eds. (2007). *A Companion to Translation Studies*. Topics In Translation 34. Susan Bassnett and Edwin Gentzler, eds. Clevedon, Buffalo, Toronto: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Kumakhova, Zarema (2005). *Joseph Brodsky as Self-translator: Analysis of Lexical Changes in his Self-translation*. Volume 1. Dissertation. Michigan State of University: The Department of Linguistics and Germanic, Slavic, Asian and African Languages.

- Kussmaul, Paul (1995). *Training the Translator*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Kyuchukov, Hristo and Jill de Villiers (2009). "Theory of mind and evidentiality in Romani-Bulgarian bilingual children" in *Psychology of Language and Communication*. 13:2. Retrieved 09.2014 <http://hristokyuchukov.de/resources/ToM+and+Evidentiality.pdf>
- Laviosa, Sara (2010). "Corpora". In *Handbook of Translation Studies. Volume 1*, Gambier, Yves and Luc van Doorslaer, eds. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 80-87.
- Lee, Ronald (2005). *Learn Romani: Das-dúma Rromanes*. Hertfordshire: U. Of Hertfordshire Press.
- Lee, Ronald (2008). "Roma in Europe: 'Gypsy' Myth and Romani Reality-New Evidence for Romani History" in "*Gypsies*" in *European Literature and Culture*. Valentina Glajar and Domnica Radulescu, eds. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Lee, Ronald (2009). "Roma and Education" on *Kopachi.com* website. Retrieved 07.2012 from <http://kopachi.com/articles/roma-and-education-ronald-lee/>
- Lee, Ronald (2010). *Rromano Alavari: Kalderashitska-Inglezitska/Romani Dictionary: Kalderash-English*. Toronto: Magoria Books.
- Lee, Ronald (2011). *Rromano Alavari: Inglezitska-Kalderashitska/ Romani Dictionary: English-Kalderash*. Toronto: Magoria Books.
- Lee, Tong-King (2013). *Translating the Multilingual City. Cross-lingual Practices and Language Ideology*. New Trends in Translation Studies Series. Vol. 8. Dr. Jorge Diaz Cintas, ed.. Oxford, Bern, Berlin, Bruxelles, Frankfurt am Main, New York, Wien: Peter Lang.
- Lefevre, André (1992a). *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Lefevre, André (1998). "Chinese and Western Thinking on Translation" in *Constructing Cultures. Essays on Literary Translation*. Susan Bassnet André Lefevre, eds. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Series, 12-24.
- Lefevre, André, ed. (1992) *Translation/History/Culture. A Sourcebook*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Lennon, Brian (2010). *In Babel's Shadow. Multilingual Literatures. Monolingual States*. Minneapolis/London: University of Minnesota Press.
- Lešić Zdenko, Hanifa Kapidžić-Osmanagić, Marina Katnić-Bakaršić and Tvrtko Kulenović eds. (2006). "Novi historicizam I kulturni materijalizam" in *Suvremena tumačenja književnosti* [New historicism and cultural materialism]. Sarajevo: Sarajevo Publishing.
- Levi, Jirži (1982). *Umjetnost prevođenja*. Sarajevo: Svjetlost. (Preveo Bogdan L. Dabić)
- Liegeois, Jan Paul (2009). *Romi u Evropi*. Zagreb: Ibis grafika.

- Lindstedt, Jouko (2016). „Conflicting Nationalist Discourses in the Balkan Slavic Language Area“. In *The Palgrave Handbook of Slavic Languages, Identities and Borders*. Kamusella, Tomasz & Nomachi, Motoki & Gibson, Catherine, eds. Palgrave Handbooks, 429 – 450.
- Lockwood, William G. (1985) “Balkan Gypsies: An introduction” in *Papers from the 4th and 5th Annual Meetings*. Joanne Grumet, ed. New York: Gypsy Lore Society, North America Chapter.
- Lorde, Audre (1983). *Zami: a new spelling of my name*. Berkley: The Crossing Press.
- Malmkjaer, Kirsten (2005). *Linguistics and Language of Translation*. Edinburg University Press.
- Marcus, George E. (1998). *Ethnography through thick and thin*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Maric, Alina, Virgil Bitu, Vera Klopčič, and Simon Tonelli (2001). *South East Europe regional project to promote employment opportunities for Roma : A Stability Pact Initiative supported by the Austrian government : training workshop for the staff of local employment services working with Roma job seekers : Workshop I - Slovenia (Novo mesto, 3-5 October 2001)*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Marsh, Adrian. 'No Promised Land'. History, Historiography and the Origins of the Gypsies. PhD dissertation. London: University of Greenwich, November 2008.
- Marsh, Adrian (2008). *No Promised Land. History, Historiography and the Origins of the Gypsies*. PhD dissertation. London: University of Greenwich. Retrieved 08.2014 from http://gala.gre.ac.uk/8151/1/Adrian_Marsh_2008.pdf
- Martin-Jones, Marilyn and Kathryn Jones, eds. (2000). *Multilingual Literacies: Reading and writing different worlds*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
- Martin-Jones, Marilyn, Adrian Blackledge and Angela Creese, eds. (2012). *The Routledge Handbook of Multilingualism*. London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group.
- Marushiakova, Elena and Popov, Veselin (2011). *Roma Culture*. Project education of Roma children in Europe. Council of Europe. Retrieved 05.2014 from romafacts.uni-graz.at/images/stories/pdf/c_1.1_culture-ii.pdf
- Matras, Yaron (2002). *Romani: A Linguistic Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Matras, Yaron (2004). *Romani: A Linguistic Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. First published in 2002.
- Matras, Yaron (2004). "Die Sprache der Roma: ein historischer Umriss (The Romani language: An historical overview)." In *Sinti, Roma, Gypsies*, ed. Matras, Y., Winterberg, Hans, Zimmermann, Michael. eds, 231 - 261. Berlin: Metropol.
- Matras, Yaron (2005). *The status of Romani in Europe, Report submitted to the Council of Europe's Language Policy Division*. Manchester: University of Manchester. Retrieved

02.2014, from.

<http://romani.humanities.manchester.ac.uk/downloads/1/statusofromani.pdf>

- Matras, Yaron (2005a). "The full extent of fusion: A test case for connectivity and language contact" in *Kulturelle und sprachliche Kontakte: Prozesse des Wandels in historischen Spannungsfeldern Nordostafrikas/Westasiens. Akten zum 2. Symposium des SFB 295*. Bisang, W., Bierschenk T., Kreikenborn, D., and Verhoeven., eds. Würzburg: Ergon Verlag, 241-255.
- Matras, Yaron (2005b). "The Classification of Romani Dialects: A geographic-historical perspective" in *General and applied Romani linguistics*. Schrammel, Barbara and Halwachs, Dieter W., eds. Munich: Lincom Europa. Retrieved 01.2014.
http://romani.humanities.manchester.ac.uk/downloads/2/Matras_classification.pdf
- Matras, Yaron (2008). "Dialects-i" brochure in *Roma Factsheets*, part of the Manchester Romani Project and of the Council of Europe's Education of Roma children in Europe project. Retrieved 12.2014 from <http://romafacts.uni-graz.at/index.php/language/dialects/dialects-i>
- Matras, Yaron (2009). *Language Contact*. Cambridge University Press.
- Matras, Yaron (2011). "Romani" in *The Language and Linguistics in Europe, A Comprehensive Guide*. Bernd Kortman and John van der Auwera, eds. Göttingen: Walter de Gruyter GmbH&Co.KG. Berlin/Boston.
- Matras, Yaron (2013). Language and the rise of a transnational Romani identity. RomIdent Working Papers. Paper No. 24. Romani Project. University of Manchester.
- Matras, Yaron, ed. (1995). *Romani in Contact*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Matras, Yaron, Kyuchukov, H., and Bakker, P., eds. (1997). *The Typology and Dialectology of Romani*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Maybin, Janet and Karin Tusting (2011). "Linguistic ethnography" in *The Routledge Handbook of Applied Linguistics*. Simpson James, eds. New York: Routledge, 515-528.
- Mcilveen, Peter (2008). Autoethnography as a method for reflexive research and practice in vocational psychology. *Australian Journal of Career Development*, 17(2), 13-20. Retrieved on 15.02.2016 from https://eprints.usq.edu.au/4253/1/McIlveen_2008_AJCD_Autoethnography.pdf
- Meylaerts, Reine (2006). "Heterolingualism in/and translation" in *Target*. 18:1. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 1-15. Retrieved from <http://www.researchschool.org/intranets/MeylaertsHeterolingualismINTRO.pdf>
- Meylaerts, Reine (2010, revised in 2011). "Multilingualism and Translation" in *Handbook of Translation Studies, Volume 1*. Gambier, Yves and Luc van Doorslaer, eds. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. pp. 227-230.
- Meylaerts, Reine (2013). "Multilingualism as a challenge for translation studies" in *The Routledge Handbook of Translation Studies*. Millán, Carmen and Francesca Bartrina, eds. London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group. pp. 519-533.

- Mihalicek, Vedrana and Christin Wilson, eds. (2011) *Language Files: Materials for an Introduction to Language and Linguistics*. 11th edition. Columbus: The Ohio State University Press.
- Miklosich, Franz Xaver (1872-1881), *Über die Mundarten und Wanderungen der Zigeuner Europa's*. Vienna.
- Miklosich, Franz Xaver (1874). *Beiträge zur Kenntnis der Zigeunermundarten*. Vienna
- Millán, Carmen and Francesca Bartrina, eds. (2013). *The Routledge Handbook of Translation Studies*. New York: Routledge.
- Mirga, Andžej and Mruz, Leh (1997). *Roma/Differences and intolerance*. Beograd: AKAPIT.
- Montini, C. (2006). Traduire le bilinguisme: l'exemple de Beckett. *Littérature* 1(141), 101-114.
- Montini, Chiara (2010). "Self-translation" in *Handbook of Translation Studies. Volume 1*. Yves Gambier and Luc van Doorslaer, eds. John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 306-308.
- Moranjak Bamburić, Nirma (2006). "Trauma-Memorijska-Pripovijedanje" [Trauma-Memory-Narration] in *Sarajevske sveske*. Sarajevo: Sarajevske sveske.
- Moyer, G. Melissa (2008). "Research as Practice: Linking Theory, Method, and Data" in *The Blackwell Guide to Research Methods in Bilingualism and Multilingualism*. Wei, Li and Melissa G. Moyer, eds. Malden/Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 18-31.
- Munday, Jeremy ed. (2009). *The Routledge companion to Translation Studies* (revised edition) London and New York : Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group.
- Munday, Jeremy (2008/2012). *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and applications*. London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group. (e-book)
- Muysken, Pieter (2013). "Two Linguistic Systems in Contact: Grammar, Phonology, and Lexicon" in *The Handbook of Bilingualism and Multilingualism. 2nd Edition*. "Blackwell Handbooks in Linguistics" Series. Bhatia K. Tej and William C. Ritchie, eds. Malden/Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 193-215.
- Neumann, Birgit and Ansgar Nünning, eds. (2012). *Traveling Concepts for the Study of Culture*. Walter de Gruyter GmbH and Co. KG, Berlin/Boston.
- Ni, Lili (2009). „For „Translation and Theories.“ In *English Language Teaching, CCSE Journal*, Vol.2, No.2, June 2009, 78-83. Retrieved on 24.03.2016 from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1082361.pdf>
- Nida, Eugene (1964/2000) . „Principles of correspondence.“ In *The Translation Studies Reader*. Venuti, Lawrence ed. (2000). London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group, 126 – 141.
- Niranjana, Tiranjana (1992). *Siting Translation: History, Post-structuralism, and the Colonial Context*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

- Nord, Christiane. (1997) *Translating as a Purposeful Activity: Functional Approaches Explained*. Manchester: St Jerome.
- Nord, Christiane (2013). "Functionalism in Translation Studies." In *The Routledge Handbook of Translation Studies*. Millán, Carmen and Francesca Bartrina, eds. New York: Routledge, 201-212.
- Nykyri, Susanna (2010). *Equivalence and Translation Strategies in Multilingual Thesaurus Construction*. Åbo: Åbo Akademi University Press.
- Ong, Walter J. (1982/2002/2005). *Orality and Literacy. The technologizing of the Word*. London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group.
- Osman, Nedjo (2006). *Gebäre mich nicht: Gedichte*. [Don't give birth to me: Poetry]. Weilerwist: Landpresse.
- Osman, Nedjo and R. Đurić (2013). "Nedo Osman | Program na romskom | DW.DE | 16.10.2013" in *Deutsche Welle.de* website. Retrieved on 07.2014 from <http://www.dw.de/ne%C4%91o-osman/a-5314430>
- Osman, Nedjret Nedjo, Marion Menzel, Ali Erenler, A. Kadir Konuk, eds. (1999). *Dört Dilden Sii /Patrin*. Istanbul: Belge Uluslararası Yayıncılık.
- Otsuji, Emi and Pennycook, Alastair (2010). "Metrolingualism: fixity, fluidity and language in flux". *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 7: 3, 240 — 254, First published on: 24 December 2009 (iFirst) To link to this Article: DOI: 10.1080/14790710903414331
- Pace, Steven (2012). "Writing the self into research: Using grounded theory analytic strategies in autoethnograph" in *TEXT*, Special Issue: Creativity: Cognitive, Social and Cultural Perspectives, eds. Nigel McLoughlin and Donna Lee Brien, April Retrieved 01.2015 from <http://www.textjournal.com.au/speciss/issue13/Pace.pdf>
- Panou, Despoina (2013). „Equivalence in Translation Theories: A Critical Evaluation“. In *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, Vol.3, No.1, pp. 1-6, January 2013. Academy Publisher Manufactured in Finland. doi: 10.4304/tpls.3.1.1-6
- Papo, Laura Bohoreta (2005). *Sefardska žena u Bosni*. [Sephardic woman in Bosnia]. Translation from Jewish-Spanish to Bosnian by prof. Dr. Muhamed Nezirović. Sarajevo: Connectum.
- Paspati, Alexandros Georgios (1861). "Memoir on the language of the Gypsies, as now used in the Turkish Empire" in *Journal of the American Oriental Society*. 7. New Haven.
- Paspati, Alexandros Georgios (1870). *Etudes sur les Tchinghianés ou Bohémiens de l'Empire Ottoman*. Constantinople.
- Pennycook, Alastair and Emi Otsuji (2015). *Metrolingualism. Language in the city*. London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group.

- Pereltsvaig, Asya (2012). *Languages of the World. An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Petrovski, Trajko and Cana Kozum (2008). *Rječnik: Hrvatsko-romski. Romsko-hrvatski./Alavari: Romane-kroatikane. Kroatikane-romane*. Forum Roma Hrvatske; Centar kulture Roma Hrvatske; Udruga Roma Istra-Pula; Zajednica Roma „Romsko jedinstvo“ PGŽ – Rijeka; Udruga žena Romkinja “Bolja budućnost”-Zagreb; Udruga Roma Hrvatske “Zlatna kobra” – Zagreb; Udruga Roma Međimurja; Mreža udruga Roma Hrvatske – Zagreb. Bitola/Zagreb.
- Pisac, Andrea (2012). “Književnost velikih i sociologija malih nacija” in *Etnološka tribina* 35. vol. 42. London: Goldsmiths College, pp. 169-186.
- Pokorn, K. Nike (2013). “Experience through translation - the translated experience: the Turkish presence in Slovene literature and translation” in *Accross Languages and Cultures*. 14:2, Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 167-181.
- Polkinghorne, D. E. (2005). Language and meaning: Data collection in qualitative research. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 52(2), 137-145.
- Popovič, Anton (1976). *A Dictionary for the Analysis of Literary Translation*. Edmonton: University of Alberta.
- Pott, August Friedrich (1846). *Über die Sprache der Zigeuner in Syrien, Zeitschrift für die Wissenschaft der Sprache, 1*. Halle
- Pott, August Friedrich. (1844). *Die Zigeuner in Europa und Asien*. Halle.
- Pratt, Mary Louise (1987). “Linguistic utopias” in *The Linguistics of Writing: Arguments Between Language and Literature*. N. Fabb, D. Attridge, A. Durant and C. MacCabe, eds. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Puhalo, Srđan (2009). *Etnička distanca i (auto)stereotipi građana Bosne i Hercegovine/Ethnic distance and (self) stereotypes of citizens of Bosnia and Herzegovina*. Sarajevo: Freidrich Ebert Stiftung BiH.
- Pym, Anthony (1998). *Method in Translation History*. Manchester: St Jerome.
- Pym, Anthony (2000). *Negotiating the Frontier: Translators and Intercultures in Hispanic History*. London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group.
- Pym, Anthony (2002). *Intercultures and the Interface with Nationalist Culture*. Retrieved 07.2014 from <http://usuaris.tinet.cat/apym/on-line/intercultures/intnation.pdf>
- Pym, Anthony (2004). Retrieved 12.12. 2015. “On the social and the cultural in Translation Studies”. <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.125.8915&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- Pym, Anthony (2004a). *The Moving Text: Localization, translation, and distribution*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamin Publishing Company.
- Pym, Anthony (2008). “On Toury’s laws of how translators translate” in *Beyond Descriptive Translation Studies. Investigations in Homage to Gideon Toury*. Anthony Pym, Miriam

- Shlesinger and Daniel Simeoni, eds. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins, pp. 311-328.
- Pym, Anthony (2009). *Training Translators*. Retrieved 09.2014 http://usuaris.tinet.cat/apym/on-line/training/2009_translator_training.pdf
- Pym, Anthony (2010). *Exploring Translation Theories*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Pym, Anthony (2011). "Translation Research Terms: A Tentative Glossary for Moments of Perplexity and Dispute", Papers on Research Methodology, http://isg.urv.es/publicity/isg/publications/trp_3_2011/pym.pdf (Retrieved May 2014). Print version in Anthony Pym (ed.): Translation Research Projects 3. Tarragona: Intercultural Studies Group, 75-111. Page breaks differ between the two versions.
- Pym, Anthony (2013). "Translation Studies in Europe – reason for it, and problems to work on" in *Target*. 26:2, 185–205. Version 1.0. Retrieved 07.2014 from http://usuaris.tinet.cat/apym/on-line/research_methods/2013_TS_Europe.pdf
- Pym, Anthony Miriam Shlesinger and Daniel Simeoni, eds. (2008). *Beyond Descriptive Translation Studies. Investigations in Homage to Gideon Toury*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Quinn, Edward (2006). *A Dictionary of Literary and Thematic Terms*. Second Edition. New York: Facts On File, Inc. An imprint of Infobase Publishing.
- Râbacov, Ghenadie (2013). "Self-translation as mediation between cultures" In *International Journal of Communication Research*. Volume 3, issue 1 January/March 2013, 66-69.
- Riessman, Catherine Kohler & Speedy, Jane. (2007) "Narrative inquiry in the psychotherapy professions: A critical review". In D. Jean Clandinin (Ed.), *Handbook of narrative inquiry: Mapping a methodology* (pp.426-456). Thousand Oaks, Ca.: Sage.
- Ritchie, C. William and Tej K. Bhatia (2013). "Social and Psychological Factors in Language Mixing" in *The Handbook of Bilingualism and Multilingualism*. Second Edition. Bhatia K. Tej and William C. Ritchie, eds. "Blackwell Handbooks in Linguistics" Series. Malden/Oxford: Blackwell Publishing. pp. 375-390. e-book
- Roberts, Brian (2002). *Biographical Research*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Robinson, Douglas (1997). *Translation and Empire: Postcolonial Theories Explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Robinson, Douglas (2001). *Who Translates? Translator Subjectivities beyond Reason*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Robinson, Douglas (2003). *Performative Linguistics: Speaking and translating as doing things with words*. London: Routledge. (This edition published in the Taylor & Francis e-Library, 2004.)
- Rogers, Henry (2005). *Writing System: A linguistic Approach*. Malden, Oxford, Victoria:Blackwell Publishing.

- Romaine, Suzanne (2013). "The Bilingual and Multilingual Community" in *The Handbook of Bilingualism and Multilingualism. 2nd Edition*. "Blackwell Handbooks in Linguistics" Series. Bhatia K. Tej and William C. Ritchie, eds. Malden/Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 445-465.
- [romani] Project, Universität Graz/ Dieter W. Halwaxhs, Retrieved 25 November 2015
- Romani Project (*unknown*). "History of the Romani Language; Development Phases" on the *Romani Project* website. Retrieved 02.2014 from <http://romani.humanities.manchester.ac.uk/whatis/language/develphases.shtml>
- Romaninet (2010). *A multimedia Romani course for promoting linguistic diversity and improving social dialogue: Report on Romani language*. Retrieved 03.2013 and 01.2014 from http://www.romaninet.com/ROMANINET_Linguistic_report.pdf
- Roubaix, de Lelanie (2012). "Where boundaries blur" in *Versatility in Translation Studies: Selected Papers of the CETRA Research Seminar in Translation Studies 2011*. Isis Herrero and Todd Klaiman, eds. Retrieved 08.2014. <https://www.arts.kuleuven.be/cetra/papers/files/de-roubaix.pdf>.
- Royle, Nicholas (2003). *Jacques Derrida*. Routledge Critical Thinkers Series. London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group, 2003. Retrieved 06.2014 from <http://docs6.chomikuj.pl/1350853183,PL,0,0,Jacques-Derrida-%28Routledge-Critical-Thinkers%29---Nicholas-Royle.pdf>
- Rüdiger, Johann Christian Christoph (1782/1990). *Von der Sprache und Herkunft der Zigeuner aus Indien*. Leipzig 1782/Reprint Hamburg 1990.
- Runnqvist, Elin, Ian Fitzpatrick, Kristof Strijkers, and Albert Costa (2013). "An Appraisal of the Bilingual Language Production System: Quantitatively or Qualitatively Different from Monolinguals?" in *The Handbook of Bilingualism and Multilingualism. 2nd Edition*. "Blackwell Handbooks in Linguistics" Series. Bhatia K. Tej and William C. Ritchie, eds. Malden/Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 244-265.
- Rushdie, Salman (1991). *Imaginary Homelands. Essays and criticism 1981-1991*. New York: Penguin Books and Granta.
- Ruždija-Ruso Sejdović (1988). "Phiripe/Putovanja" in Ruždija-Ruso Sejdović (1988) *Svjetlost u Ponoć -E jak an-e jrat*. Titograd: Sekcija pisaca-radnika Crne Gore Titograd, 34-35, and re-printed in Ruždija-Ruso Sejdović (2012) *Svjetlost u Ponoć /E jak an-e jrat*. Podgorica: Centar za očuvanje i razvoj kulture manjine Crne Gore CEKUM, 138.
- Ruždija-Ruso Sejdović (2012). "Autoportreti/Autoportret" in Ruždija-Ruso Sejdović *Svjetlost u Ponoć /E jak an-e jrat*. Podgorica: Centar za očuvanje i razvoj kulture manjine Crne Gore CEKUM, 54.
- Sachdev, Itesh, Howard Giles, and Anne Pauwels (2013). "Accommodating Multilinguality" in *The Handbook of Bilingualism and Multilingualism. Second Edition*. Bhatia K. Tej and William C. Ritchie, eds. "Blackwell Handbooks in Linguistics" Series. Malden/Oxford: Blackwell Publishing. pp. 391-416.

- Saćip, Mehmed (1995). *Sofrako miškuipe/Pomeranje sofre* [Displaced Sofreh Table], adaptation with assistance by Blagoje Savić. Priština: Novi Svet.
- Saćip, Mehmed (1998). *Mirikle*. Gnjilane: Radio Gnjilane, Centar culture “Zarije R. Popović”, Narodna biblioteka “Janko Veselinović”.
- Saćip, Mehmed (2004). *Kalendar*. Subotica: Kulturni centar Roma, 2004.
- Saćip, Mehmed-Meho (1984). *Bučarne vasta* [Diligent Hands]. Gnjilane: Književna sekcija Čajupi.
- Said, W. Edward (1999). *Orijentalizam*. –Zapadnjačke predodžbe o Orijentu- S engleskog: Rešad Hafizović. Sarajevo: Svjetlost.
- Santoyo, Julio-César (2013). “On mirrors, dynamics and self-translation” in *Self-translation: Brokering Originality in Hybrid Culture*. Antony Cordingley ed. London, New Delhi, New York, Sydney: Bloomsbury IATIS, pp. 27-38.
- Schleiermacher, Friedrich (2012) in *The Translation Studies Reader*, 3rd edition, Lawrence Venuti, ed. Routledge: London and New York, 43-63.
- Schlyter, N. Birgit (2013). “Multilingualism and Language Renewal in Ex-Soviet Central Asia” in *The Handbook of Bilingualism and Multilingualism. 2nd Edition*. “Blackwell Handbooks in Linguistics” Series. Bhatia K. Tej and William C. Ritchie, eds. Malden/Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 871-898.
- Sealey, Alison and Bob Carter (2004). *Applied Linguistics as Social Science*. London and New York: Continuum.
- Sejdić, Rasim (2012). “Gazisarde romane violina.” [Trampled Romani violin] in *Sarajevske sveske*. “Antologija romske poezije” Series. Dragoljub Acković, ed. Sarajevo: Sarajevske sveske, 39/40.
- Sejdović, Ruždija-Ruso (1988). *Svjetlost u Ponoć/-E jak an-e jrat* [Light at midnight]. Titograd: Sekcija pisaca-radnika Crne Gore Titograd.
- Sejdović, Ruždija-Ruso (2012). *Svjetlost u Ponoć /E jak an-e jrat* [Light at midnight]. Podgorica: CEKUM.
- Shabnam, Shakernia (2013). “Study of Nida’s (formal and dynamic equivalence) and Newmark’s (semantic and communicative translation) translating theories on two short stories.” In *Merit Research Journal of Education and Review* (ISSN: 2350-2282) Vol. 2 (1) pp. 001-007, January 2013. Available online <http://www.meritresearchjournals.org/er/index.htm>, Merit Research Journals ©2014.
- Shuttleworth, Mark & Moira Cowie (2014). *Dictionary of Translation Studies*. New York and London: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group. (First published 1997 by St. Jerome Publishing), PDF e-book
- (sic!). (sic!) *Časopis za po-etička istraživanja i djelovanja* website. Retrieved on 07.2014 from <http://www.sic.ba>

- Siegel, Jeff (2013). "Multilingualism, Indigenization, and Creolization" in *The Handbook of Bilingualism and Multilingualism. 2nd Edition*. "Blackwell Handbooks in Linguistics" Series. Bhatia K. Tej and William C. Ritchie, eds. Malden/Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 517-541.
- Siemund, Peter and Noemi Kintana, eds. (2008). *Language Contact and Contact Languages*.
- Silverman, David (2000). *Doing qualitative research: A practical handbook*. London: Sage.
- Simon, Sherry (1996). *Gender in Translation: Cultural Identity and the Politics of Transmission*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Simon, Sherry (2006). *Translating Montreal. Episodes in the Life of a Divided City*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2006. Print.
- Simon, Sherry (2011). "Hybridity and translation" in *Handbook of Translation Studies, Volume 2*. Yves Gambier and Luc Van Doorslaer, eds. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 49-53.
- Simon, Sherry (2012). *Cities in Translation: Intersections of language and memory*. London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group.
- Simon, Sherry and Paul St-Pierre, eds. (2000). *Changing the Terms. Translating in the Postcolonial Era*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.
- Simpson, James, eds. (2011). *The Routledge Handbook of Applied Linguistics*. London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group.
- Skomorokhova, Svetlana (2012). "Arising from the depths" (*Kupala*): A Study of Belarusian Literature in English Translation. A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Translation Studies. University of Warwick, Department of English and Comparative Literary Studies. Retrieved <http://go.warwick.ac.uk/wrap/57199>
- Skomorokhova, Svetlana (2013). "The Belarusian literary landscape and translation 'waves'" in *Translation Studies*. 6:2. London: Routledge Taylor and Francis Group, 183-19. Retrieved 12.2013 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14781700.2013.777515>
- Snell-Hornby, Mary (2006a). "The cultural turn of the 1980s" in *The Turns of Translation Studies* by Mary Snell-Hornby. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 47-68.
- Snell-Hornby, Mary (2006b). "The 'interdisciplines' of the 1980s" in *The Turns of Translation Studies* by Mary Snell-Hornby. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty (1993). "The Politics of Translation." In *Outside in the Teaching Machine*, New York: Routledge 1993, 179-200. In *The Translation Studies Reader*. Lawrence Venuti, ed. New York: Taylor and Francis e-Library, 2004, 397-416.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty (2003). *Death of a Discipline*. The Wellek Library Lectures Series. New York: Columbia University Press.

- St. Clair, Robert N., Walter E. Rodríguez & Carma Nelson, eds. (2005). "Habitus and Communication Theory" in *Intercultural Communication Studies*. XIV:1. Louisville: University of Louisville.
- Stanley, Liz (1990). „Moments of writing: Is there a feminist auto/biography?“ In *Gender and History*, 2/1, 58-67.
- Stecconi, Umbaldo (2010). "What happens if we think that translating is a wave?" in *Translation Studies*. 3:1, Taylor & Francis, pp. 47-60.
- Sturge, Kate (2007). *Representing Others: Translation, Ethnography and the Museum*. Manchester, UK : St. Jerome Pub. ; Kinderhook, NY : InTrans Publications.
- Summers, Krystal (2013). „(Re)Positioning the Indigenous Academic Researcher: A Journey of Critical Reflexive Understanding and Storytelling.“ *International Journal of Critical Indigenous Studies* Volume 6, Number 1, pg. 1-13. Retrieved 19.03.2016 http://www.isrn.qut.edu.au/publications/internationaljournal/documents/volume6_number1_13-Summers.pdf
- Tabouret-Keller, Andrée (2013). "Bilingualism in Europe" in *The Handbook of Bilingualism and Multilingualism. 2nd Edition*. "Blackwell Handbooks in Linguistics" Series. Bhatia K. Tej and William C. Ritchie, eds. Malden/Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 745-769.
- Tagore, Rabindranath (2001). "World Literature" in *Rabindranath Tagore: Selected Writings on Literature and Language*. Sukanta Chaudhuri, ed. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, pp. 138–150.
- Tahirović-Sijerčić, Hedina (2008). *Dukh-Pain*. Toronto: Magoria Books.
- Tahirović-Sijerčić, Hedina (2008a). "Do you hear" in *The European Constitution in Verse*. Reybrouck Van and Vermeersch, eds. Brussel: Passa Porta, 45.
- Tahirović-Sijerčić, Hedina (2008b). "CV" in *The European Constitution in Verse*. Reybrouck Van and Vermeersch, eds. Brussel: Passa Porta, 61.
- Tahirović-Sijerčić, Hedina (2009). *Stare romske bajke i priče/Romane Paramicha* Tuzla: Bosanska riječ.
- Tahirović-Sijerčić, Hedina (2009a). *Romani Stories and Legends of the Gurbeti Roma* (for adults). Toronto: Magoria Books.
- Tahirović-Sijerčić, Hedina, ed. (2009b) *Like Water/Sar o paj*. Chandigarh, India: Kafla Inter-Continental.
- Tahirović-Sijerčić, Hedina (2010). *Čuj, osjeti bol!/Ashun, hachar dukh!* [Listen, feel the pain!]. Sarajevo: KNS.
- Tahirović-Sijerčić, Hedina (2010a). *Bosansko-romski i romsko-bosanski rječnik/ Bosnaki-Romani thaj Rromani-Bosnaki alavari*. Mostar: Federal Ministry of Education and Science of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

- Tahirović-Sijerčić, Hedina (2011/2013). *Romani Dictionary: Gurbeti-English/English-Gurbeti*. Toronto: Magoria Books.
- Tahirović-Sijerčić, Hedina (2012). "Migration and its Implications for the Educational system: The case of the Roma in Bosnia, Germany and Canada." In: *Formal and Informal education for Roma, Different models and experience*, Slovenia: Institut for Ethnic Studies Ljubljana, 2012, 72-83.
- Tahirović-Sijerčić, Hedina (2012b). "Politike identiteta – osvrt na Rome [Identity politics - reference to Roma]" in Kajtazi, V. *Simpozij Svjetski dan romskog jezika* [Symposium International Day of the Romani language]. Zagreb: Udruga za promicanje obrazovanja Roma u Republici Hrvatskoj "Kali Sara", 22-24
- Tahirović-Sijerčić, Hedina (2013a). "Pitanje rodnog identiteta u poeziji autorice Bronislave Wajs Papusze: Narodno stvaranje kod Roma i stereotipi prema Romima [The issue of gender identity in the poetry written by Bronislava Wajs Papsza: Romani Folk Literature and stereotypes towards Roma]" in *Proceedings of World Day of Rromani Language 03.-05. November 2011/2013, Zagreb*. The Association for the Promotion of Education of Roma in Croatia „Kali Sara“, Zagreb, 32-42.
- Tahirović-Sijerčić, Hedina (2014). "Romani Secret Road Symbols: The first written words in Romani or the first translation of Romani" in *Translators Have Their Say?: Translation and Power of Agency*. Khalifa, Abdel-Wahab, ed. Representation-Transformation/Representation-Transformation/Representation-Transformation: Translating Across Cultures and Societies Series. Lit Verlag: Berlin-Münster-Wien-Zürich-London, pp. 65-82.
- Tahirović-Sijerčić, Hedina (2016). *Rodni identiteti u književnosti romskih autorica na prostorima bivše Jugoslavije*. [Gender identity in the literature of Romani women authors in the former Yugoslavia.] Federalno ministarstvo obrazovanja i nauke: Mostar.
- Tahirović-Sijerčić, Hedina and Cynthia Levine-Rasky eds. (2017). *A Romani Women's Anthology: Spectrum of the Blue Water*. Inanna Publications and Education Inc.: Toronto, Canada, 2017.
- Tassiopoulos, Eleftheria (2011). From Translation Research Projects 3, ed. Anthony Pym, Tarragona: Intercultural Studies Group, 2011. pp. 43-52.
http://isg.urv.es/publicity/isg/publications/trp_3_2011/index.htm Received on 29.03.2016 from
http://www.intercultural.urv.cat/media/upload/domain_317/arxiu/TP3/tassiopoulos.pdf
- Taikon, Katarina (2006). *Ciganske pesme* [Romani songs], from Sweden translated by Moma Dimić. Beograd: Rominterpres.
- Temple, Bogusia (2006). „Representation across languages: biographical sociology meets translation and interpretation studies“ *Qualitative Sociology Review*. Volume II, Issue 1 – April 2006, 7-21.

- Temple, Bogusia and Rosalind Edwards (2002). „Interpreters/Translators and Cross-Language Research: Reflexivity and Border Crossings“ In *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, International Institut for Qualitative Methodology (II QM); University of Alberta 2002, 1 (2).
- Theater TKO / Choreodrama - Romano Theater (2009). “‘Opera Nomadi’ Regie: Nedjo Osman” on *Facebook*. Retrived 07.2014 from <https://www.facebook.com/media/set/?set=a.347483781931750.99685.340429039303891&type=3>
- Theater TKO / Choreodrama - Romano Theater (2013). “TKO Romano Theatar Köln- RUKELI” on *Facebook*. Retrived 07.2014 from <https://www.facebook.com/media/set/?set=a.771445639535560.1073741832.340429039303891&type=3>
- Thiong’o, wa Ngugi (1987). *Decolonizing the Mind*. Harare: Zimbabwe Publishing House (Pvt.) Ltd.
- Toninato, Paola (2004). *The Rise of Written Literature among the Roma: A Study of the Role of Writing in the Current Re-Definition of Romani Identity with Specific Reference to the Italian Case*. Doctoral Thesis submitted to the University of Warwick: Centre for Translation and Comparative Cultural Studies, pp. 161-162. Retrieved 12.2014 <http://go.warwick.ac.uk/wrap/1224>
- Toninato, Paola (2009). “The Making of Gypsy Diasporas” in *Translocations: Migration and Social Change*. 5:1. Retrieved 08.2014 from http://www.translocations.ie/docs/v05i01/Vol_5_Issue_1_c.pdf
- Toninato, Paola (2014). *Romani Writing. Literacy, Literature and Identity Politics*. New York and London: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group.
- Toninato, Paola (*unknown*). “Dr Paola Toninato – Italian Studies – University of Warwick” on *University of Warwick* website. Retrieved 11.2017. <http://www2.warwick.ac.uk/fac/arts/modernlanguages/people/toninato>.
- Toury, Gideon (1985). “A Rationale for Descriptive Translation Studies” in *The Manipulation of Literature. Studies in Literary Translation*. Hermans, Theo ed. New York: Routledge, pp. 16-41.
- Toury, Gideon (1995). *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. PDF edition.
- Toury, Gideon (1978/1995a) “The Nature and Role of Norms in Translation” (1978 version revised in 1995) In (2004) *The Translation Studies Reader*. Lawrence Venuti, ed., London/ New York: Routledge, pp. 198–211.
- Toury, Gideon (2012). *Descriptive Translation Studies – and beyond. Revised edition*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.

- Trinh, T. Minh-ha (1991). "No Master Territories" in *When the Moon Waxes Red: Representation, Gender and Cultural Politics*. New York and London: Routledge, 49-53.
- Tulasiewicz, Witold and Anthony Adams (1998). *Teaching the Mother Tongue in a Multilingual Europe*. London and New York: Continuum.
- Tymoczko, Maria (1998). "Computerized Corpora and the Future of Translation Studies" in *Meta*. 43:4, pp. 652-60.
- Tymoczko, Maria (1999). "Post-colonial writing and literary translation" in *Postcolonial Translation. Theory and Practice*. Bassnet, Susan and Harish Trivedi, eds. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 19-40.
- Tymoczko, Maria (2006). "Reconceptualizing Western translation theory. Integrating non-Western thought about translation" in *Translating Others. Vol. 1*. Theo Hermans, ed. Manchester: St. Jerome, pp. 13-32.
- Tymoczko, Maria (2007/2010/2014). *Enlarging translation, empowering translators*. Manchester, England: St. Jerome./ London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group.
- Tyulenev, Sergey (2014). *Translation and Society. An introduction*. New York: Routledge.
- Uhlik, Rade (1983). *Srpskohrvatsko-Romsko-Engleski rječnik/Romengo Alavari* [Serbocroatian-Romani-English Dictionary]. Sarajevo: OOUR Izdavačka djelatnost Svjetlost.
- Uhlik, Rade (1984). *Context of thinking. To Roma - with love*. Manuscript. Copy provided by Romani muzeum in Belgrad.
- Uhlik, Rade and Branko Radičević, eds. (1982) *Ciganska poezija*. Beograd: Vuk Karadžić.
- Venuti, Lawrence (1995/1998). *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Venuti, Lawrence (1998). *The Scandals of Translation: Towards an Ethics of Difference*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Venuti, Lawrence (2004). "Translation, Community, Utopia" in *The Translation Studies Reader. 2nd Edition*, Lawrence Venuti (ed). New York: Routledge [Taylor and Francis e-Library], 482-502.
- Venuti, Lawrence ed. (2000). *The Translation Studies Reader*. London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group.
- Venuti, Lawrence, ed. (1992) *Rethinking Translation: Discourse, Subjectivity, Ideology*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Vermeer, H. (1998). "Starting to Unask What Translatology Is About" in *Target International Journal of Translation Studies* 10/1, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Vermeer, J. Hans (2000). "Skopos and commission in translational action" in *The Translation Studies Reader*. London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group, pp. 221-232.
- Vinay, Jean-Paul and Jean Darbelnet (1958/1996/2000). "A methodology for translation." In *The Translation Studies Reader*. Venuti, Lawrence ed. (2000). London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group, 84-93.
- Vujanović, Vojislav (2013). "Usmena predaja i pjesništvo Roma" in *Književnost*. Retrieved 05.2013 from <http://tacno.net/knjizevnost/vojislav-vujanovic-usmena-predaja-i-pjesnistvo-roma/>
- Vukanović, Tatomir (1983). *Romi (Cigani) u Jugoslaviji*. Vranje: Štamparija Nova Jugoslavija.
- Waliński, Jacek Tadeusz (2015). "Translation procedures." University of Łódź, 55-67. Retrieved from on 23.03.2016.
<http://anglistyka.uni.lodz.pl/userfiles/Walinski%202015%20Translation%20procedures.pdf>
- Weber, Jean-Jacques and Kristine Horner (2012). *Introducing Multilingualism. A social approach*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Wei, Li (2008) "Research Perspectives on Bilingualism and Multilingualism" in *The Blackwell Guide to Research Methods in Bilingualism and Multilingualism*. Li Wei and Melissa G. Moyer, eds. Blackwell Publishing Ltd. pp. 3-17.
- Wei, Li (2013). "Conceptual and Methodological Issues in Bilingualism and Multilingualism Research" in *The Handbook of Bilingualism and Multilingualism*. Second Edition. Bhatia K. Tej and William C. Ritchie, eds. "Blackwell Handbooks in Linguistics" Series. Malden/Oxford: Blackwell Publishing. pp. 26-51.
- Wei, Li (2014). "Translanguaging knowledge and identity in complementary classrooms for multilingual minority ethnic children" in *Classroom Discourse*. 5:2. London and New York: Taylor & Francis, retrieved <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2014.893896>
- Wei, Li and Melissa G. Moyer, eds. (2008) *The Blackwell Guide to Research Methods in Bilingualism and Multilingualism*. Malden, Oxford, Carlton: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Williams, James (2005). *Understanding Poststructuralism*. Understanding Movements in Modern Thought Series, Jack Reynolds, ed. Bucks: Acumen.
- Williams, Jenny (2013). *Theories of Translation*. Palgrave Textbooks in Translating and Interpreting Series. Margaret Rogers, ed.
- Williams, Jenny and Andrew Chesterman, eds. (2002). *The Map. A Beginner's Guide to Doing Research in Translation Studies*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Wilson, Rita (2009). "The Writer's Double: Translation, Writing, and Autobiography." *Romance Studies*, Vol.27 No.3, July, 2009, 186-198. Retrieved 04.2015.
http://www.academia.edu/953906/The_Writers_Double_Translation_Writing_and_Auto_bigraphy

- Wilson, Rita (2011). "Transplanted Subjects: Self-translation Processes in Translingual Narratives" in *Oltreoceano: L'autotraduzione nelle letterature migranti*, vol. 5. Official publication of Oltreoceano - Centro Internazionale Letterature Migranti (CILM). 123-138. Retrieved 08.2014
<http://riviste.forumeditrice.it/oltreoceano/article/download/453/430>
- Wlislocki, von Heinrich (1994). *Zur Ethnographie der Zigeuner in Südosteuropa*. Frankfurt/M. in Hancock, Ian (2010). *Danger Educated Gypsy*, in Djurić, Rajko (2010). *Istorija romske književnosti*, in Djurić, Rajko (1987). *Seobe Roma*, in Demir and Durmiš (2012). *Gramatika romskoga jezika/Gramatika e romane čhibaki*.
- Wolf, Michaela (2000). "The 'Third Space' in Postcolonial Representation." In *Changing the Terms. Translating in the Postcolonial Era*, Sherry Simon and Paul St-Pierre (eds), 127 – 145. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.
- Wolf, Michaela (2010). "Sociology of translation" in *Handbook of Translation Studies, Volume 1*. Yves Gambier and Luc van Doorslaer, eds. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 337-343.
- Wolf, Michaela (2014). "The Sociology in Translation and its "activist turn." In *The Sociological Turn in Translation and Interpreting Studies*. Angelelli, V. Claudia, ed. John Benjamins Publishing Company, 7-21.
- Wolf, Michaela and Alexandra Fukari, eds. (2007). *Constructing a Sociology of Translation*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Young, Robert J.C. (1995). *Colonial Desire. Hybridity in Theory, Culture and Race*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Zabic, Snezana and Paula Kamenish (2006). "A Survey of Bosnian, Croatian, and Serbian Poetry in English Translation in the U.S. and Canada." in *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture*, 8:3, art. 5 Purdue University Press, Retrieved 08.2014
<http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1317&context=clcweb>
- Zatreanu, Mihaela and Halwachs, W. Dieter (2003). *Romani in Europe*. Ministry of Education and Research – Bucharest Romania/ Department of Linguistics at the University of Graz / Austria Retrieved 01.2014 from
http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/education/roma/Source/RomaniEurope_EN.pdf
- Žižek, Slavoj (1987). *The Sublime Object of Ideology*. London: Verso.

Annex I – BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES

Avdić, Šemso (1950 - ..)

Šemso Avdić (born in 1950 in Banja Luka, Bosnia and Herzegovina) has published six books of poetry in Romani and Bosnian languages that have been translated into German, English, French, Spanish and Italian. A collection of his poems was published in 1986 at the Messina Festival of the writers who write in minority languages, and won the third prize in Europe. The title of this poetry book is *Zingari/Cigani* [Gypsies]. Šemso published the following collections: *Zingari Tra Passato e Presente /Cigani izmedju prošlosti i budućnosti* [Gypsies between past and future], *Krvari cigansko srce*, [Gypsy heart bleeds], *Romi od rođenja do smrti* [Roma from born to death] and *Cigani danas i juče /Zingare ieri e oggi* [Gypsies today and yesterday] which published “Centro studio zingari” in Bolzano in Italy in 1993. The sixth book was published in 2011 in Bosnia and Herzegovina under the title *Ciganska sudbina lancima okovana* [Gypsy fate bound with chains]. His memoirs on Romani people from Banja Luka were published in the book titled *Karta u jednom smjeru: Odiseja Roma Banjaluke krajem XX vijeka* [One-way ticket: Odyssey of Roma from Banjaluka at the end of XX century]. The book was published by Grafid d.o.o. Banja Luka in Bosnia and Herzegovina, in 2014.

Berberski, Slobodan (1919 - 1989)

Slobodan Berberski was born on 20 October 1919 in Zrenjanin, where he completed his elementary and high school. He began to study law, but as a member of the Communist Youth, was arrested in 1941. He wrote and published in the Serbian language and some of his published books are: *Za kišom biće duga* [After the rain, a rainbow] (1950); *Proleće i oči* [Spring and eyes] (1952); *Nevreme* [The storm] (1959); *Dnevnik rata* [Diary of War] (1959); *Kote* [There] (1968); *Svakodnevnica* [Everyday Life] (1983); etc. His poetry has been translated into Romani, French, Russian, Hungarian, Romanian, Albanian, and Slovenian languages. Slobodan Berberski is the first president of the World Roma Organization and was elected during the first World Romani Congress, held on 8 April 1971 in London. One street in Belgrade now bears his name. He died in 1989 in Belgrade.

Borde, Andrew (1490? – 1549)

Andrew Borde (**Andrew Boorde**) was Traveller born ca. 1490 near Cuckfield, Sussex, He was an English travel writer and a doctor by profession. His book *Dyetary* was the first English book of domestic medicine. This book followed *Boke of the Introduction of Knowledge*, *The Boke of Berdes* (Beards), *Handbook of Europe* and *Itinerrary of England* (Cousin 2014, e-book)¹⁶⁶. Borde died in April 1549.

Demir, Ljatif (1961 - ..)

Ljatif Demir was born in 1961 in Skopje, Macedonia. In addition to his work on language and linguistics, he is a writer and translator. He has published *Izbrani pesni/ Mahatma -Alusarde gilja- Garcia Lorca* [Selected poems from Garcia Lorca] (Skopje: Studentski zbor, 1996), *Dečije priče* [Children stories], Skopje: Studentski zbor: Skopje, 1996.

Dimić, Trifun (1956 -2001)

Trifun Dimić was born on 29 February 1956 in the small town Gospođinci in Vojvodina, Serbia. He lived in Novi Sad and worked as a consultant for the Cultural and Educational Association of Vojvodina. He died on 13 September 2001 in Novi Sad. He has published this book: *Dolazeći s vašara/Kana avavas ando foro* [Coming from afar] (1979); *Romske kletve, zakletve i blagoslovi* [Roma curses, oaths and blessings] (1984); *Narodna romska poezija* [Romani traditional poetry] (1986); a translation of *Novi Testament* [The New Testament] (1991); a translation of *Pjesma nad pjesmama* [Song of Songs] (1991); *Gilgameš [Gilgamesh]* (adapted to Romani, 1996); *Vreme samoće* [Time of Solitude] (1996), *Tradicijska romska književnost* [Traditional Romani literature] (1997); *Stopala u prašini* [Feet in the dirt] (1998).

More information at <http://riznicasrpska.net/knjizevnost/index.php?topic=414.0>

Djuric, Rajko (1947 - ..)

Rajko Djurić was born on October 3rd 1947 in Malo Orašje, Serbia. He is a Serbian Romani writer and academic. He studied philosophy, physical chemistry and theology at the University of Belgrade's Faculty of Philosophy (1967–1972). In 1986 he obtained a Doctorate of

¹⁶⁶ Cousin, W. John. *Dictionary of English Literature*. The University of Adelaide, last updated in December 2014, e-book. Retrieved April 2015. <https://ebooks.adelaide.edu.au/c/cousin/john/biog/b.html>

Sociology after completing his dissertation on “The Culture of the Roma in S.F.R. Yugoslavia”. In 1991 he moved to Berlin in order to avoid involvement in the Yugoslavian wars. He wrote more than 500 articles and, until leaving Yugoslavia, was the chief redactor for the cultural section of the newspaper Politika in Belgrade. He was President of the International Romani Union and is the General Secretary of the Romani Centre of International PEN. His literary works have been translated into more than five languages. Since 1969 he has published more than 35 books.

In his books of poems, the topics dealt with are about language and speech, and the history of the Roma and Holocaust, in particular man's fear of death. His books have been published in Serbian, German and in the Romani language. Among other things, he is author of the books *Gramatika romskog jezika* [Grammar of the Romani language], *Pravopis romskog jezika* [Spelling of the Romani language] and of the monograph *Romi sveta* [Roma of the world] co-authored with Nebojsa Tomasević. In addition to his work on linguistics, he is a published poet:

Bi kheresko-Bi limoresko / Bez doma bez groba [Without home without grave] in Romani and Serbian (Beograd: Narodna knjiga Slovoljublje, 1979); *Purano svato o dur themestar/ Prastara reč daleki svet* [The ancient word distant world] in Romani and Serbian (Beograd: Narodna knjiga Slovoljublje 1980); *A i U - A thai U* [A and U] in Serbian and Romani (Beograd,1982); *Duša i pepeo pesme* [Soul and ash] in Serbian (Vršac: Biblioteka KOV, 2007); and *Zigeunerische Elegien-Gediche* in Romani und Deutch [Gypsy elegies-Poems in Romani and German], (self-translation) (Hamburg: Helmut Buske Verlag, 1989).

Eminova, Akile (1961 - ..)

Akile Eminova was born in Štip, Macedonia in 1961. She works as a journalist and a freelance writer. Akile writes exclusively in the Macedonian language even though her mother tongue is Romani. Her work: *Amanet*. [Testament] a novel in Macedonian (Štip: Kulturno-prosvjetna Zajednica, 1995); and *Tancot na dušata*. [Dance of the soul] a novel in Macedonian (Štip: Venecija, 2001).

Franz, Philomena (1922 - ..)

Philomena Franz was born in 1922 in Biberachu on Riss in Germany. As a seven year old girl she performed as a folk dancer and singer in a theater group. In 1943 she was sent to Auschwitz and later to concentration camps in Ravensbrück and Oranienburg. She mainly writes Romani stories and organizes literary reading classes in schools and universities and lives in Rösrath near Cologne.

Haliti, Bajram (1955 - ..)

Bajram Haliti was born on 21 May 1955 in Gnjilane, Kosovo. He is a celebrated Romani author who is active in Romani causes. His books have won many awards, including several prizes in the annual “Amico Rom” contest in Italy. His work was included in the 1998 publication of *The Roads of Roma: A PEN Anthology of Gypsy Writers*. Haliti has also published *Poema katar e Mum Tadž Mahal/ Poema o Mum Tadž Mahal* [Poem about Mum Taj Mahal] (Batajnica: Memorijalni centar Roma za holocaust studije Srbije i Crne Gore, 2004) and *Čehrajine sune/ Zvezdani snovi* [Starry dreams] (Zagreb: Udruga “Romski putevi”, 2008).

Hancock, Ian (1942- ..)

Ian Hancock or Yanko le Redžosko (his Romani name) was born and raised in England. In 1971 he became a linguist through PhD graduation. He is a Romani scholar, professor, Romani activist and one of the main contributors in the field of Romani studies. Hancock is director of the Program of Romani Studies and the Romani Archives and Documentation Center at the University of Texas at Austin where he was a professor of English, linguistics and Asian Studies since 1972. In 1998 he was appointed by President Clinton to represent Roma on the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council. His valuable work in the field of Romani Studies is represented in over 300 publications. Some of his works: *The Pariah Syndrome: An Account of Gypsy Persecution and Slavery* (1987), *A Handbook of Vlax Romani* (1995), *We are the Romani people/Ames am e Rromane džene* (2002/2005/2007), „Language Corpus and Language Politics: The Case of the “Standardization of Romani“. In *Nation-Building, Ethnicity and Language Politics in Transition Countries* (2003), “On Romani Origins and Identity: questions for discussion” In *Gypsies and the problem of identity: contextual, constructed and contested* (2006), *Danger! Educated Gypsy. Selected Essays* (2010), .“Mind the Doors! The contribution of linguistics.” In *All Change! Romani Studies through Romani eyes* (2010).

Jusuf, Šaip (1932 or 1933 – 2010)

Šaip Jusuf was born and died in Skopje, Macedonia. He was teacher and writer. Jusuf was one of organizers of the First World Romani Congress in 1971 in London and was a member of the International Romani Union. His whole work was dedicated to Romani language and India which he visited several times. This love brought him to convert from Islam to Hinduism. The *Romani Gramatika/Romska gramatika* he co-authored with Krume Kepeski was published in 1980 by “Naša Kniga” in Skopje as bilingual in Macedonian and Romani is the most valuable work which he did in his lifetime. He was also translator and his translation of the book by Drago Zdučić *Mi smo Titovi, Tito je naš* (1978), Šaip Jusuf translated into Romani in 1979 titled *Amen sam e Titoske, o Tito si amaro*. In 1989 in *Jezik i Kultura Roma/ Romani Language and Culture*, ed. Milan Šipka, his article “O nekim padežnim sufiksima I o formama romskog određenog člana u svetlu uticaja turskog i grčkog jezika sa primedbama o poželjnim merama za očuvanje čistote jezika Roma” / “On Some Case Suffixes and Forms of Romany Definite Article in the Light of Turkish and Greek Language Influence together with Remarks about Desirable Procedure for keeping the Purity of Romany Language” was published by Štamparija “DES” in Sarajevo.

Krasnići, Alija (1952 - ..)

Alija Krasnići was born in 1952 in the village Crkvena Vodica, near Obilić in Kosovo. He writes poetry and fiction for children and adults. His published work by “Jedinstvo” in 1981 is prose published in the Romani and Serbocroatian languages titled «*Čergarske vatre*” / “*Čergaređe jaga* [Nomad’s fire]”. In 1985, the publisher Rilindja published his “*Romske pripovetke s Kosova*” / “*Perralla rome te Kosoves*” [Romani tales from Kosovo]. In 1986, with the publisher Jedinstvo he published a collection of prose in Serbocroatian and Romani in a self-translated work titled “*Povratak u život*” / “*Iripe ano đuvdipe*” [Return to life]. In 1988 with the publisher Rilindja he had a collection of poems published in the Albanian language, with self-translation in Serbocroatian titled “*Umorne noći*”/“*Netet e lodhura*” [Weary nights or Tired nights]. According to him, throughout the course of our conversations, he has written more than 90 books of prose and poetry.

Muc, Jožek Horvat (1965 - ..)

Jožek Horvat Muc was born in 1965 in Murska Sobota, Slovenia. He is president of the Union of Roma of Slovenia and the Roma Community Council of the Republic of Slovenia. He wrote two performances in Romani and Slovenian; *Radfalu paunji/ Krvava voda* [Bloody water] (Murska Sobota: Romsko društvo Romani Union, 1999) and *Hegeduva/ Violina* [The violin] (Murska Sobota: Zvezda Romov Slovenije, 2002). His poetry books *Ciden andi mro aunav/ Plesala zame* [Danced for me] (Murska Sobota: Zvezda Romov Slovenije, 2005) and *Amaro drom/ Naša potk* [Our way] (Murska Sobota: Zvezda Romov Slovenije, 2006) were also published in Romani and Slovenian.

Nikolić, Jovan (1955 - ..)

Jovan Nikolić was born in Belgrade, Serbia in 1955 and currently is resident of Germany. He is best known in Germany for his novel *Bela vrana, crno jagnje* [White Crow, Black Sheep] published in German translation by Bärbel Schulte as *Weißer Rabe, schwarzes Lamm* with Klagenfurt; Drava Verlag, Romani Library in 2006. Some of his other works include *Gost niotkuda/ Dosti khatinendar* [A Guest from Nowhere] in Serbian and Romani languages (1981 Vršac: Književna opština); *Đurđevdan* [St George's Day] (Vršac: Beograd 1987); *Neću da se rodim* [I Don't Want to Be Born] (Ivanjica: 1991); *Oči pokojnog jagnjeta* [The Eyes of the Late Lamb] (Niš:1993); *Telo i okolina* [Body and Environment] (Belgrade: 1994); and *Soba s točkom* [The Room with a Wheel] (2004, Klagenfurt/Celovec and 2011 in Serbian).

Paćaku, Kujtim (1959 - ..)

Kujtim Paćaku was born in 1959 in Prizren, Kosovo. He finished his Masters degree in music pedagogy. Some of his published work: *Baxtalo drom/ Felice Cammino* [Happy way], a poetry collection in Romani and Italian (Italia: Amico Rom,1996); *Purane rromane paramisă/Përallat e vjetra rome* [Romani old stories], prose in Romani and Albanian (Tirana: Albania, 2002); *Sumnakuni Phurt* [Golden Bridge], a collection of poetry translated in Albanian, Serbian and English. (Prizren: Rromani baxt, 2007); *Jekh than tal-o kham* [One place under the sun], a collection of poetry translated in Albanian, Serbian and English (Rromani Baxt:Prizren, 2012).

Papusza, Bronislawa Wajs (1908 or 1910 – 1987)

In the twenties, at the time when Papusza was growing up, literacy among Roma almost did not exist, so they beat her when they caught her reading, and destroyed her books and magazines. “So how did I learn? I asked children who went to school to show me how to write letters. I always stole something and brought it to them so they would teach me, and so I learned a b c d, and so on. Then when I was thirteen years old, I was skinny and as nimble as a wood squirrel, only I was black. I read and *Gypsies* laughed at me for that and they spat at me.” (Anon. on *The Orlando Sentinel* website). Despite tradition and patriarchal community, she defended her wish, when the time came, to marry the young man she wanted. However, when she was fifteen, she was entered into an arranged marriage with an old and esteemed harpist, Dionizy Wajs. She was very unhappy and had no children. Like most Roma songs, Papusza’s songs were lamentations of poverty, of yearnings of impossible love and for the loss of freedom. Her songs were equally sad in tone as well as subject. Papusza wrote and sang about certain events and places. She wrote about the suffering she was a witness to. Most interesting of all was the reconstruction of the events that led Bronislawa Wajs Papusza to be virtually expelled from the Roma community, which had a devastating effect on her psyche. She spent eight months in a psychiatric hospital in Silesia, and for thirty-four years afterward she lived alone and isolated until her death in 1987.

Ranjičić, Gina (1830 – 1891)

The date of birth of Gina Ranjičić has not been determined, but it is probably close to 1830. She was born of Serbian Roma. At one time their tribe was suspected of theft and was expelled by Serbian soldiers. Gina then rebelled against their community and when she was twelve years old she moved to Belgrade. There she took care of an Armenian merchant, who gave her the possibility to pursue a three-year education with a private tutor. Gina later married the merchant’s younger brother. Gina's life was full of friction. She fell in love with an Albanian, whom she called Šiptar in her poems. He was essentially her unrequited love. Over time, Gina became increasingly bitter and she divorced. After the divorce she sometimes lived in luxury and abundance and sometimes in the greatest misery. After a short period of time, she again returned to live with her own Romani community. She died on the 7th of May in 1891. She was buried in an unmarked grave somewhere in Slavonia. Gina once said: “When I was happy, I did not write

any songs...” One alleged connoisseur of Roma, doctor Vlislocki, tried to translate the songs by Gina Ranjičić into German. However, his translation was completely arbitrary and insensitive to what is most important, and is full of sentimental ornamentation. However, his choice to translate her songs has encouraged the interest of others, so much so that her poetry was translated into Swedish.

She was the first Roma poet in Serbia, as some people propose, who wrote Romani folk poetry in her native Romani language in the mid-19th century, but in Serbia became known at the end of the 20th and the beginning of the 21st centuries.

Sejdić, Marko Aladin (1970 - ..)

Marko Aladin Sejdić was born in 1970 in Sarajevo, Bosnia and Hercegovina. He is son of the poet Rasim Sejdić. He published the first songs in Romani and German in a joint collection of poems titled *Kali Čirikli / Der Schwarze Vogel* [Black bird] (Köln: Rom e.V. Köln und die literarischen Gruppe rromano pero, 2008) with Steva Stojko, Hanci Biher and Ruždija Sejdović. His poetry book titled *Me avav dural* [I come from afar] (Milano: I.S.U. Università Cattolica, 2000) is published in Romani and German. Also, Marko Aladin Sejdić lives in Italy and Germany.

Sejdić, Rasim (1943-1981)

Rasim Sejdić (1943-1981) was born in Vlasenica in Bosnia and Herzegovina and belonged to the Xoraxano – Gurbeti Romani group. His poems were published in Italy in Romani and in Italian under the title *Rasim, poeta Zingaro* (Milano: Publi and Press, 1978). One of his best known poems is *Gazisarde romane violina*. He died in age of thirty seven.

Serbeзовski, Muharem (1950 - ..)

Muharem Serbezovski was born on May 2, 1950 in Skopje, Macedonia in the Romani mahala Šuto Orizari. He graduated in Philosophy in Sarajevo and has written more than three hundred songs and poems. He also translated the Qur'an into the Romani language in 2005 (Sarajevo: Romano Lil). He used to live in Germany and now lives in Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina. He has published *Putevi vjetrova i Cigana/E bravalendže thaj e Romendže droma* [Ways of the winds and Gypsies: poetry] (Sarajevo: Bosanski kulturni centar, 1999); *Šareni*

dijamanti [Colourful diamonds], a novel in Serbocroatian (Sarajevo: Veselin Masleša, 1983); *Cigani «A” kategorije* [Gypsies of «A” category], a novel in Serbocroatian (Sarajevo: Veselin Masleša, 1985).

Stojka, Ceija(1933 – 2013)

Ceija Stojka was born on May 23rd 1933, in Kraubath, Syria is an Austrian-Romani writer, painter and musician who survived the Holocaust. She belonged to the Lovari caste, and she was the fifth of six children. She is the sister of Charles Stojko and Mongo Stojko, who were also writers and musicians. Her books: *Wir leben im Verborgenen. Erinnerungen einer Rom_Zigeunerin.* (1980) [We live in Seclusion. The Memories of a Romni.], *Reisende auf dieser Welt* (1992) [Travellers on This World], *Meine Wahl zu schreiben-ich kann es nicht.* Gedichte. (2003) [My Choice to Write-I can not. Poems], *Me dikhlem suno* (Audio CD) [I dreamt], *Träume ich dass ich lebe? Befreit aus Bergen-Belsen* (2005) [Am I dream that I live? Liberated from Bergen-Belsen]. She died on January 28th, 2013.

Taikon, Katarina (1932 – 1995)

Katarina Taikon was born on July 29th 1932 in a Roma tent nearby Erebr in Sweden, one hundred kilometers west from Stockholm. Her paternal grandfather was Kori Kori Kaldaraš originally from Hungary and he was traveling with his community around Europe and Russia. Katarina's father's name was Johan (not the same as his Romani name) and he was born in France. At the time when Katerina Tajkon wrote (she was the first Roma writer in Sweden) throughout all Sweden there were not more than 900 Roma, of which a good half lived in tents. Since the beginning of the sixties she has created and writes continuously. Almost every year at least one new title has appeared in the field of poetry, documentary prose, debate, etc., and there are novels for both children and adults, as well as her inclusions in anthologies and translations. All her books are hugely popular within and outside of Sweden, and the most popular one is her title for children, *Katica*.

Katarina Taikon edited the book of the Romani songs titled "Zigenar Dikter" published by FIBs Lyrikklubb in Stokholm in 1964. She translated more than fifty Romani folk-songs from England, Romania and from the former Yugoslavia from the collection edited by Rade Uhlik. In this book are published four songs by Gina Ranjić (1830-1891.)

Annex II - ANALYSED POEMS

Poems by Ruždija-Ruso Sejdović
Title Phiripe/Putovanja [Traveling]
Language pair/s Romani (Gurbeti dialect-Xoraxano)– Serbo-Croatian

PHIRIPE

Zurardam amare zeja po brršind
thaj xalam
šel metre drom.
Pe amari sinija maladol
e jag
e djili.
O čhavro maladol.

Tala

o nango del
irisavah
maškar e manuša.

Pe sinija ačhile,
thaj e jakha
thaj e čhib...

PUTOVANJA

Kalili smo leđa na kiši
i pojeli
stotinu metara puta.
Na našoj se sofri nađe
i oganj
i pjesma.
Dijete se nađe.

Pod vedrim se nebom
vraćamo
među ljude.

Na sofri nam ostaše
i oči
i jezik.

TRAVELING

We forged our backs on the rain
and ate
hundreds of meters of road.
A dining table can be found
a flame
a song.
A child can be found.

Under a clear sky we
return
among people.

On our dining table remained
eyes
and language.

Poems by

Title:

Language pair/s:

Ruždija-Ruso Sejdović

Autoportreti/Autoportret [Self-portrait]

Romani (Mix dialects) -Serbian

AUTOPORTRETI

Paso

me zuvdimasqo,

fiza me isanosqi.

Izravne vastesa kerdo

biramime tasvir,

kalãrrdi

ćarrli strafin devlesqi,

xoxavno kolorit!

An-o maškar ćhelavni ćakra,

izravni aura dukhavesqi.

Varindě o vast bilal

bizorale mosta kerel,

kleja ćhamenqe,

me kokalenge umblavel,

xale narie trujarel...

Drabarmo than,

haćaripe

artistikane bireslimasqo

thaj phukavipe e palalimasqo.

Darano zeno,

manuś,

bipinzarde godãqo...

AUTOPORTRET

Otisak

mog života,

kontura moje pojave.

Nesigurnom rukom razvučen

neuramljen crtež,

potamnijela

usahla vedrina neba

lažni kolorit!

U sredini treperava ćakra,

drhtava aura paćenika.

Negde se stapa ruka

nemoćni lik stvara,

nakite obrazu,

kostima svojim kaći,

izlizane djelove izobličava...

Zagrižen prostor,

predosjećanje

umjetnikove naivnosti

i nevjerstvo pozadine.

Uplašena pojava,

čovjek,

stanje nepoznate svijesti...

SELF-PORTRAIT

Mark

of my life,

contour of my appearance.

With unsure hand stretched is the

unframed drawing,

darkened

dried clarity of the sky

false colour!

In the middle a trembling chakra,

the trembling aura of the suffering one.

Somewhere a hand merges

to create a powerless likeness,

jewels to the cheek,

bones with one's own hangs,

shabby pieces disfigures.

Bitten space,

intuition

of artist's naivete

and disloyalty of the background.

Scared appearance,

Human being

state of unknown consciousness...

Poems by

Title:

Language pair/s:

Mehmed-Meho Saćip

Cahra/Čerga [Romani tent]

Romani (Kosovo Arli dialect) -Serbian

CAHRA

Avdive akate tajsja avre thaneste
Avdive dikheala tajsja nanetani
Lakri majšukar amalin
i čar, i len hem dajekh bar

O anav lakro cahra
Adžahar pendjardi
Dajekh drom tu da dikhela
Lakri jag thaj lakro thuv

Ko trin kašta o kotlo čhivdo
So pherdžape pani
Andro pani thaj savena čarja
Čerdžola jek čorba sani

O čhavore uzali jag bešen
Grastenge da delape pani
A sa odova i čerga i romani

ČERGA

Danas je ovde sutra tamo
Danas je vidiš sutra ne
Njene su najlepše drugarice
Poljane reke kamenje

Ime joj je čerga
Celom svetu znana
I ti si nekada video
Dim i vatru čerge

O verigama kotlić
pun vode
U njemu bilje svakojako
Za sirotinjsku večeru

Okolo vatre posedala deca
Na reci se konji poje
Sve je to oko čerge moje

ROMANI TENT

Today here tomorrow there
Today you see her tomorrow you don't
Her most beautiful friends
Meadows rivers stones

Her name is tent
Known to all the world
And you saw sometimes
Smoke and fire of the tent

Onto the pothook is put the kettle
Full of water
In the water all sorts of herbs
For an impoverished supper

Around the fire are seated children
Along the river horses drink water
All of this is around my tent.

Poems by

Title:

Language pair/s:

Nedjo Osman

Ma bijan man/ Beni dogurma/ Gebäre mich nicht /Nemoj me rađati/[Don't give me to birth]

Romani (Kovach (Bugurdji) Arli and Djambasi dialect) – Turkish-German-Serbian

MA BIJAN MAN

Okole plajeste mo dat
cinelsine pus
javere grastenge.
Okole cergate mi daj
bijanel sine
djikana o kam takarel i puf.
Te djanav sine trin lafija
anglal te bijangljovav
ka vakeravav sine
ma bijan man.
Uljum paripnaske
bariljum bugjake
puriljum
hem nasavgiljum.
Te muljum
civen pani i lulugienge
muken i car the bajrol
Te muljum
E grasten muken te prastan
o cerenja me cirikle te araken
galbane mace oleske te den
The muljum
asvin ma muken
muken man korkoro
mo suno ma cinaven
Te muljum
mandar kanci ma vakeren

BENI DOĞURMA

O bilinen tepede arpa biçiyordu babam
başkalarinin atlari için
doğurmuştu annem
toprağı yakarken güneş

doğmadan önce
iki sözcük bilseydim sadece
derdim ki
beni doğurma

dert çekmek için yaratıldım
çalışmak için büyüdüm
yaşlandım lime lime

ölürsem
çiçekleri sulayın
birakin çimen büyüsün
ölürsem birakin koşsun atlar
kuşlarima yıldızlar baksın
o altın balıklar yesin
ben öldüğümde
akmasın gözyaşlarınız
düşümü bölmeyin
bendeki ağırlığı alın
ölürsem
benden söz etmeyin.

GEBÄRE MICH NICHT

Auf jenem Hügel
mähte der Vater Korn
Für die Pferde anderer
in jenem Lager

Kam die Mutter nieder
während die Sonne auf die Erde brannte
Hätte ich vor meiner Geburt
Nur drei Worte gewusst
hätte ich gesagt
Gebäre mich nicht
Für's Leid bin ich geschaffen
Für die Fron grossgezogen
Altgeworden und verbraucht
Wenn ich sterbe
Gebt den Blumen Wasser
lasst das Gras wachsen
Wenn ich sterbe
lasst die Pferde laufen
Die Sterne sollen meine Taube hüten
Goldene Fische soll sie bekommen
Wenn ich sterbe

Vergießt keine Träne
Last mich allein
Unterbrecht nicht meinen Traum
Erzählt nich von mir.
Wenn ich sterbe

NEMOJ ME RAĐATI
Na onoj njivi
gde konji prolaze
tata mi žito za njih žanje.
Dok sunce sija
a majka mi rađa u toj čergi
ispod koje zemlja peče

Te tri reči da sam ih samo
prije mog rođenja znao
rekao bih
Ne rađaj me

Moja bit postala je breme
moje rastanje postao je rad
tako ostarih
i razboleh se

Ako umrem
zalijte cveće vodom
pustite nek trava raste
Ako umrem
konje odvežite
i pustite neka jure
moju pticu zvijezde neka čuvaju
nek joj zlatne ribice poklone
Ako umrem
nemojte suze liti
pustite me samog
ne prekidajte mi san

Ako umrem
o meni nemojte ni reč reći

DON'T GIVE ME TO BIRTH

On this field
where the horses were passing
my father gathered hay
for other people's horses,
and my mother was giving birth in a tent
while the sun scorched the earth.
If I knew just three words
Before I was born
I would say

Don't give birth to me

My existence turned
into a burden
growing up turned into work
I got old
I got sick.

When I die
pour water on the flowers
let the grass grow
When I die
release the horses
let the horses run
may the stars protect my birds
may they feed them golden fish
When I die
shed no tear
leave me alone (do not disturb me)
do not break my dream.

When I die
Do not speak about me.

Poems by Hedina Tahirović-Sijerčić
Title: Drabarni/ Gatara/ Fortune-Teller
Language pair/s: Romani (Gurbeti Bosnian dialect)-Bosnian-English

DRABARNI

Ando fildzano me dikhav
Tuche baxt te vacharav.

Na dikh man dukhalo
Naj si sa dzungalo.

Hi man o choxanipe
Me dikhav e dukhalipe.

Kate si o mursh
Vov anel e dukhado brsh.

Na dikh man dukhalo
Naj si sa dzungalo.

Thov talo fildzano cira love
Ka chereh pala nevo patave.

Ka peres ande kamlimata
Von ka avel sar ande phandimata.

Thov talo fildzano sumnakuni angurusti
Ka chereh tut abijavehchi luludji.

Dikhav e vordon, e kuna, e chavoro
Kali khanji, aver Rromni thaj murshoro.

Hi man o choxanipe
Me dikhav dukhalipe.

Na dikh man dukhalo
Naj si sa dzungalo.

Thov talo fildzano sumnakuni merikli
Ka akhareh tut Rromani chirikli.

Phajrar o naj prdal pe kurva
Chichnd e jakha
E gindese del phaka.

Dikhav e dzukel, e prno, e chavorro
Gova dzangljol-pe jekhethane, gugloro.

GATARA

U fildžan ti gledam
Sreću da ti phendam.

Ne gledaj me tako tužno
Nije baš sve ružno.

Imam čudnu moć
Trebaće ti pomoć.

Vidim muškarca kako stoji
I godinu bolnu ti kroji.

Ne gledaj me tako tužno
Nije baš sve ružno.

Ispod fildžana malo para stavi
I nova ljubav će da se pojavi.

Ti ćeš ga voljeti
A on će ti rob biti.

Ispod fildžana zlatni prsten stavi
Svadbeni cvijet biće ti u glavi.

Vidim kočiju, bešiku i dijete,
Crnu kokoš, drugu ženu i muškarca
Moj, lijepi cvijete!

Imam čudnu moć
Trebaće ti pomoć.

Ne gledaj me tako tužno
Nije baš sve ružno.

Ispod fildžana zlatni lanac stavi

Romska ptica pomoće ti glavi.

Pritisni prstom preko kurve,
Zavori oči
I poželi nešto.

Vidim psa, stopalo, dijete
Ovo ti znači: sretno i zajedno, moj cvijete

FORTUNE-TELLER

From inside this cup
I will tell of your luck.

Don't look at me so sad
Things aren't so bad.

I have some magic
I see something tragic.

There is a guy
He makes you cry.

Don't look so sad
It isn't so bad.

Under the cup, just put some money

And it will work to bring a new honey.

You will fall in love
He will be your slave.

Under the cup, put your golden ring
And you will marry him in the spring.

I see a pram, a cradle, a toy
A crow, another woman, and a boy.

I have some magic
I see something tragic.

Don't look so sad
It isn't so bad.

Put your necklace under the cup
And a Romani bird will protect your luck.

Press your fingers on the bitch
And things will go without a hitch
All will work out as you wish.

I see a foot, a dog, a boy
Now you'll be reunited in joy.

Poems by Hedina Tahirović-Sijerčić
Title: CV6/ CV-6/ CV-6
Language pair/s: Bosnian- Romani (Gurbeti Bosnian dialect)-English

CV 6

Ime mi je bilo Mehmed. Rodio sam se i živio sam u Bosni. Kucao sam kazane i kotlove od bakra. Bio sam ostario. Bilo mi je pedeset i pet godina.

Umro sam.

Htjeli su da me sahrane a oni su branili. Nema mjesta na njihovom groblju. U njihovoj crnoj zemlji. Tijelo mi se počelo raspadati. Nakon 15 dana su odobrili komad crne zemlje. Iz higijenskih razloga. Daleko od čerge. Na mjestu gdje me niko neće naći. Na mjestu gdje mi niko neće doći.

Tijelo mi se rasulo i spojilo sa zemljom.

Sada se zovem Duša. Letim spektrom plavih nijansi nebeskog prostranstva.

Tražim mir.

Na oblacima jašem. Mijenjam oblake kao umorne konje. Kiša me umiva. Vjetar me razgovara. Munja me snagom napaja. Letim spektrom plavih nijansi nebeskog prostranstva. Mijenjam oblake kao umorne konje. Sunce mi gradi zlaćanu stazu ka Indiji. Ispod oblaka se nazire Indija.

Drhtim. Sjahao sam u dolinu Ganga. Konj se vratio spektru plavih nijansi neba. Ja se vratio spektru plavih nijansi vode.

CV-6

Mo anav sasa Mehmed. Bijandilem thaj dzivisardem ande Bosna. Cherdem

xarkumache sheja, kazane thaj kotlove. Phurisardem. Seha man pinda thaj pandz brsh.

Mulisardem.

Amare mangle te praxosaren man, von na dije. Nane o than pe lengi limori. Ande lengi kali phuv. Mrno trupo astarda te rispisarel. Athoska 15 djive von dije mandje kotor kale phuvjako. Dure e cahretar. Pe thaneste kaj khonik nashti te rodel man. Pe thaneste kaj knonik nashti te dikhel man.

Mrno trupo raspisarda thaj pharuvda ande kali phuv.

Akana akharav Odji. Ujrav pe plavo delesko duripeste.

Rodav miro.

Iklav po nuvera. Paruvav nuvera sar chindile grasta. Brshind thovel mo muj. Bahval vahcarel mansa. Devlehchi jag del mandje zuralipe. Ujrav pe plavo delesko duripeste. Paruvav nuvera sar chindile grasta. Kham cherel mandje sumnakuno drom koring Indija. Talo nuvera mothovel pes Indija.

Izdrav. Huljardem ande Gangeski xar. Grast boldisarada e plave delese. Me boldisardem e plave pajese.

CV-6

My name was Mehmed. I was born and I lived in Bosnia. I knocked cauldrons and copper boilers. I was getting old. I was fifty-five years.

I died.

They tried to bury me, but they didn't allowed it. There is no place in their cemetery. In their black earth. My body began to crumble/ decompose. After the 15 days they allowed a piece of black earth. For hygienic reasons. Far away from the tent. In a place where no one will find me. At the place where no one will visit me.

My body scattered and merged with the ground/earth.

Now, my name is Soul. I fly on the range of the blue shades of sky.

I Seek my peace.

I ride on the clouds. I exchange/change the clouds as tired horses. Rain washes me. Wind talks to me. Lightning supplies me a power. I fly on the range of the blue shades of sky. I exchange/change the clouds as tired horses. The sun builds for me a golden path to India. Below the clouds it siluetes India.

I'm shivering. I dismounted in the valley of the Ganges. The horse returned to spectrum of the blue sky.

Annex III – LIST OF POETS AND LANGUAGE PAIRS

POET'S NAME <i>in alphabetical order</i> (last name, first name)	LANGUAGE PAIR/S
Avdić, Šemso	Romani-Bosnian
Bajrić, Bajro	Romani-Croatian
Berberski, Slobodan	Serbian only
Brajdić Šajnović, Rajko	Romani-Slovenian
Brezar, Madalina	Romani-Slovenian
Briher, Hanci	Serbian-Romani
Cana, Kasum	Romani-Croatian
Delia, Grigore	Romani-Romanian
Demir, Ljatif Mefailleskoro	Romani-Macedonian-Croatian
Demirov, Sabri	Romani-Macedonian
Demirović, Slavimir	Romani-Serbian
Dimić, Trifun	Romani-Serbian
Djurić, Rajko	Romani-Serbian-German
Đurić, Gordana	Romani-Serbian
Familić, Maja	Serbian- Romani
Farkaš, Ištvan	Romani-Serbian-Hungarian
Haliti, Bajram	Romani-Serbian
Horvat, Romeo	Romani-Slovenian
Horvat-Muc, Jožek	Romani-Slovenian
Ibrahim, Sali	Romani-Bulgarian
Ibraimovski, Fari	Romani-Macedonian-Croatian
Ilić, Emilija	Romani-Serbian
Ilić, Rozalija	Romani-Serbian
Ilijaz, Šaban	Romani-Serbian
Jovičić, Predrag	Romani-Serbian
Kaldaraš, Dragica	Romani-Serbian
Kleibencetl, Janko	Slovenian-Romani
Kovačić, Jlenka	Romani-Slovenian
Krasnići, Alija	Romani-Serbian-Albanian
Kyuchukov, Hristo	Romani-Bulgarian
Livijen, Jože	Romani-Slovenian
Mihai, Luminita Cioaba	Romani-Romanian

Mihajlović, Miroslav	Romani-Serbian
Neziri, Nedžmedin-Nedžo	Romani-Serbian
Nezirović, Slobodan	Romani-Slovenian
Nikolić, Jovan	Serbian only
Osman, Nedjo	Romani-Macedonian-Serbian
Paćaku, Kujtim	Romani-Serbian-Albanian
Petrovski, Trajko	Romani-Macedonian-Serbian
Randelović, Desanka	Romani-Serbian
Ranjičić, Gina	Romani-Serbian
Rašković, Zoran	Serbian only
Saćip, Mehmed-Meho	Romani-Serbian
Šainović, Kadrija	Romani-Serbian
Šainović-Lika, Kadrija	Romani-Serbian
Saiti, Agim	Romani-Albanian
Saitović-Lukin, Baja	Romani-Serbian
Salijesor, Seljajdin	Romani-Serbian
Sejdić, Marko-Aladin	Romani only
Sejdić, Rasim	Romani-Bosnian
Sejdović, Ruždija-Ruso	Romani-Serbian
Serbezovski, Muharem	Romani-Macedonian-Bosnian
Šerkezi, Mladenka	Romani-Slovenian
Stojko, Steva	Serbian-Romani
Sijerčić- Tahirović, Hedina	Bosnian-Romani-English
Tairović, Zoran	Romani-Serbian
Usin, Kerim	Bulgarian
Vukšinić, Helena	Romani-Slovenian

Annex IV – ROMANI LITERARY WORKS/ MY CORPUS

Romani literary writing: authors [male and female] from:

Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Greece, Kosovo, Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia, Romania, Slovenia, Turkey.

Summe of publications: 169

Publications by 41 men: 128

Publications by 18 women: 40 but not counted in a total sum 2 unpublished publications by women: Amela Avdić (BiH) and Izeta Sejdović (Montenegro). In my corpus there are 18 women writers.

From this sum 1 publication published as a joint publication: women and man in Macedonia.

Albania, Greece and Turkey no known Romani authors.

PUBLICATIONS LISTED BY COUNTRIES

BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

Author (male)	Sejdić, Rasim (1943 -1981)
Country of origin	Bosnia and Herzegovina
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(1978) Publi and Press, Rho:Milano
Source language of text	Romani/ <i>Rasim-Poeta-Zingaro</i>
Translations of the text	Italian
Emigrated to	

Author (male)	Avdić, Šemso
Country of origin	Bosnia and Herzegovina

Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(1998) Banja Luka: BZK "Preporod".
Source language of text	Bosnian/ <i>Romi od rođenja do smrti</i>
Translations of the text	Romani/ doesn't have title in Romani
Emigrated to	Italy, Germany, now in Sweden

Author (male)	Avdić, Šemso
Country of origin	Bosnia and Herzegovina
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(1985) Primalpe – Boves (Cn)
Source language of text	Romani/ <i>Poezije</i>
Translations of the text	Italian/
Emigrated to	Italy, Germany, now in Sweden

Author (male)	Avdić, Šemso
Country of origin	Bosnia and Herzegovina
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(1993) Forle: Forum/Quinta Generazione.
Source language of text	Romani/ <i>Ratvarol ilo Romano</i>
Translations of the text	Italian/ <i>Sanguina il cuore dei rom</i>
Emigrated to	Italy, Germany, now in Sweden

Author (male)	Avdić, Šemso
Country of origin	Bosnia and Herzegovina
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(2010) Banja Luka: Dnevne nezavisne novine
Source language of text	Bosnian/ <i>Romska sudbina lancima</i>

	<i>okovana</i>
Translations of the text	Romani/ doesn't have title in Romani
Emigrated to	Italy, Germany, now in Sweden

Author (male)	Sejdić, Marko Aladin
Country of origin	Bosnia and Herzegovina
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(2000) Milano: I.S.U. Università Cattolica.
Source language of text	Romani/ <i>Me avav dural</i>
Translations of the text	Italian
Emigrated to	Italy, now in Germany

Author (female)	Sijerčić- Tahirović, Hedina
Country of origin	Bosnia and Herzegovina
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(2007) Toronto: Magoria Books.
Source language of text	Romani/ <i>Dukh</i>
Translations of the text	English/ <i>Pain</i>
Emigrated to	Germany, Canada, Germany, now in Bosnia

Author (female)	Sijerčić- Tahirović, Hedina
Country of origin	Bosnia and Herzegovina
Genre of text	prose: story
Publishing information	(2009b) (Rromane Paramicha / Romani Folktales Series), No. 2, Toronto: Magoria Books.
Source language of text	Romani/ <i>Sar o Devel Cherda e Rromen.</i>
Translations of the text	English/ <i>How God Made the Roma.</i>

Emigrated to	Germany, Canada, Germany, now in Bosnia
--------------	---

Author (female)	Sijerčić- Tahirović, Hedina
Country of origin	Bosnia and Herzegovina
Genre of text	prose: story
Publishing information	(2010b) (Rromane Paramicha/Romani Folktales Series), No. 6, Toronto: Magoria Books.
Source language of text	Romani/ <i>Macho</i>
Translations of the text	English/ <i>Fish</i>
Emigrated to	Germany, Canada, Germany, now in Bosnia

Author (female)	Sijerčić- Tahirović, Hedina
Country of origin	Bosnia and Herzegovina
Genre of text	prose: story
Publishing information	(2010c) (Rromane Paramicha/Romani Folktales Series), No. 4, Toronto: Magoria Books.
Source language of text	Romani/ <i>Karankochi-Kochi</i>
Translations of the text	English/ <i>Karankochi-Kochi</i>
Emigrated to	Germany, Canada, Germany, now in Bosnia

Author (female)	Sijerčić- Tahirović, Hedina
Country of origin	Bosnia and Herzegovina
Genre of text	prose: story
Publishing information	(2010d) (Rromane Paramicha/Romani Folktales Series), No. 5, Toronto: Magoria Books.

Source language of text	Romani/ <i>Shtar phrala</i>
Translations of the text	English/ <i>Four brothers</i>
Emigrated to	Germany, Canada, Germany, now in Bosnia

Author (female)	Sijerčić- Tahirović, Hedina
Country of origin	Bosnia and Herzegovina
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(2010e) Sarajevo: KNS.
Source language of text	Bosnian/ <i>Čuj, osjeti bol!</i>
Translations of the text	Romani/ <i>Ashun, hachar Dukh!</i>
Emigrated to	Germany, Canada, Germany, now in Bosnia

Author (female)	Sijerčić- Tahirović, Hedina
Country of origin	Bosnia and Herzegovina
Genre of text	novel
Publishing information	(2011b) Toronto: Magoria Books.
Source language of text	Bosnian/ Rom ko grom
Translations of the text	English/ <i>Rom like thunder</i>
Emigrated to	Germany, Canada, Germany, now in Bosnia

Author (female)	Sijerčić- Tahirović, Hedina
Country of origin	Bosnia and Herzegovina
Genre of text	novel
Publishing information	(2012) Sarajevo: KNS.
Source language of text	Bosnian/ <i>Rom ko grom</i>
Translations of the text	
Emigrated to	Germany, Canada, Germany, now in Bosnia

Author (female)	Sijerčić- Tahirović, Hedina
Country of origin	Bosnia and Herzegovina
Genre of text	prose: story
Publishing information	(2008) Tuzla: Bosanska riječ
Source language of text	Bosnian/ <i>Stare romske bajke i priče</i>
Translations of the text	Romani/ <i>Romane Paramicha</i>
Emigrated to	Germany, Canada, Germany, now in Bosnia

Author (female)	Sijerčić- Tahirović, Hedina
Country of origin	Bosnia and Herzegovina
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(2009) Chandigarh: International Writers Asociation
Source language of text	English/ <i>Like water</i>
Translations of the text	Romani/ <i>Sar o paj</i>
Emigrated to	Germany, Canada, Germany, now in Bosnia

Author (female)	Sijerčić- Tahirović, Hedina
Country of origin	Bosnia and Herzegovina
Genre of text	prose: story
Publishing information	(2009d) Toronto: Magoria Books.
Source language of text	Romani/ <i>Rromane Paramicha.</i>
Translations of the text	English/ <i>Stories and Legends of the Gurbeti Roma, German</i>
Emigrated to	Germany, Canada, Germany, now in Bosnia

Author (female)	Sijerčić- Tahirović, Hedina
Country of origin	Bosnia and Herzegovina

Genre of text	prose: story
Publishing information	(2009c) (Rromane Paramicha/Romani Folktales Series), No. 3, Toronto: Magoria Books.
Source language of text	Romani/ <i>Rromano princo Penga</i>
Translations of the text	English/ <i>Romani prince Penga</i>
Emigrated to	Germany, Canada, Germany, now in Bosnia

Author (female)	Sijerčić- Tahirović, Hedina
Country of origin	Bosnia and Herzegovina
Genre of text	prose: story
Publishing information	(2009a) (Rromane Paramicha / Romani Folktales Series), No. 1, Toronto: Magoria Books.
Source language of text	Romani// <i>Jekh Bendjali Familija</i>
Translations of the text	English / <i>An Unusual Family</i>
Emigrated to	Germany, Canada, Germany, now in Bosnia

Author (female)	Avdić, Amela
Country of origin	Bosnia and Herzegovina
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	unpublished work/manuscript
Source language of text	Sweden
Translations of the text	Romani, Bosnian
Emigrated to	Italy, Germany, now in Sweden

BULGARIA

Author (male)	Kerim, Usin (1928.-1983.)
---------------	----------------------------------

Country of origin	Bulgaria
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(1955) Sofia
Source language of text	Bulgarian/ <i>Pesni od katuna</i>
Translations of the text	?
Emigrated to	

Author (male)	Kerim, Usin (1928.-1983.)
Country of origin	Bulgaria
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(1959) Sofia
Source language of text	Bulgarian/ <i>Očite gorjat</i>
Translations of the text	?
Emigrated to	

Author (male)	Kerim, Usin (1928.-1983.)
Country of origin	Bulgaria
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(1968) Sofia
Source language of text	Bulgarian/ <i>Stohostvorenia</i>
Translations of the text	?
Emigrated to	

Author (male)	Kerim, Usin (1928.-1983.)
Country of origin	Bulgaria
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(1978) Sofia
Source language of text	Bulgarian/ <i>Stareeto mi</i>
Translations of the text	?
Emigrated to	

Author (male)	Kerim, Usin (1928.-1983.)
Country of origin	Bulgaria
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(1978) Sofia
Source language of text	Bulgarian/ <i>Sz bastin glasz</i>
Translations of the text	?
Emigrated to	

Author (male)	Kerim, Usin (1928.-1983.)
Country of origin	Bulgaria
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(1989) Sofia
Source language of text	Bulgarian/ <i>Kogato sztrassen patnik sze zavrastam</i>
Translations of the text	?
Emigrated to	

Author (male)	Kerim, Usin (1928.-1983.)
Country of origin	Bulgaria
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(2003) Sofia
Source language of text	Bulgarian/ <i>Lirika</i>
Translations of the text	?
Emigrated to	

Author (female)	Ibrahim, Sali (Radkova – Ivanova Snezhana)
Country of origin	Bulgaria
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(1993) София: Литературен форум.
Source language of text	Bulgarian/ „Космична любов“, „Гривна за Ева“

Translations of the text	Romani
Emigrated to	

Author (female)	Ibrahim, Sali (Radkova – Ivanova Snezhana)
Country of origin	Bulgaria
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(2001) Scorpion
Source language of text	Bulgarian/ Короната на битието
Translations of the text	Romani
Emigrated to	

Author (female)	Ibrahim, Sali (Radkova – Ivanova Snezhana)
Country of origin	Bulgaria
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(2002) София: "Елит-Център за ромска култура-2002"
Source language of text	Bulgarian/ "Цигански видения"
Translations of the text	Romani/"Романе елпиня"
Emigrated to	

Author (female)	Ibrahim, Sali (Radkova – Ivanova Snezhana)
Country of origin	Bulgaria
Genre of text	Myths and legends
Publishing information	(2004) RIVA Publishing House. „Elite“ and Foundation „Next page“ to FOO Bulgaria
Source language of text	Romani/Romani mitologia
Translations of the text	Latin
Emigrated to	

Author (female)	Ibrahim, Sali (Radkova – Ivanova Snezhana)
Country of origin	Bulgaria
Genre of text	Almanac for Romani culture
Publishing information	(2004) RIVA Publishing House. NCH Elite and NFK (National Fund for Culture).
Source language of text	Romani/?
Translations of the text	English/ Sand spread by the wind
Emigrated to	

Author (male)	Kyuchukov, Hristo
Country of origin	Bulgaria
Genre of text	poems
Publishing information	(1997) Sofia: Our Romani world. I part, Romani poems (ed.)
Source language of text	Romani/ <i>Amari Romani Lumja; I kotor, romane poeme</i>
Translations of the text	
Emigrated to	

Autor (male)	Romanov, Manuš / take it out the same like Hristo , might be my mistake
Country of origin	Bulgaria
Genre of text	poems
Publishing information	(1997) Sofia: Our Romani world. I part, Romani poems (ed.)
Source language of text	Romani/ <i>Amari Romani Lumja; I kotor, romane poeme</i>
Translations of the text	
Emigrated to	

Author (female)	Kovačeva, Lili
Country of origin	Bulgaria
Genre of text	
Publishing information	() Ikaldipe katar i Dimi
Source language of text	Romani/ Armanja Baxtaljaripe Paramigies
Translations of the text	
Emigrated to	

Author (male)	Čaprazov, Vasil
Country of origin	Bulgaria
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(1996) Sofia
Source language of text	Bulgarian/ <i>Iskam da samne</i>
Translations of the text	
Emigrated to	

Author (male)	Čaprazov, Vasil
Country of origin	Bulgaria
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(2004) Sofia
Source language of text	Romani/ <i>Romani masalja</i>
Translations of the text	
Emigrated to	

CROATIA

Editor	Dinasi, Adaleta
Country of origin	Macedonia
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information (including	(2012) Zagreb: Romska udruga

works that are not yet published)	“Romski putevi”
Source language of text	Romani/ <i>Antologija e rromane poezijaći</i>
Translations of the text	Croatian/ <i>Antologija romske poezije</i>
Emigrated to	Croatia

Author	Ibraimovski, Fari
Country of origin	Macedonia
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information (including works that are not yet published)	(2005) Rijeka: Udruga žena Romkinja “Bolji život”
Source language of text	Romani/ <i>Đivdipe thaj vrama</i>
Translations of the text	Croatian/ <i>Život i vrijeme</i>
Emigrated to	Croatia

Authors unknown as individuals	Literarna grupa “Mladi Lovari”
Country of origin	Croatia
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information (including works that are not yet published)	(2006) Zagreb: Udruga izvornih Roma-Lovari
Source language of text	Romani/ <i>Paramiče homane paramiče</i>
Translations of the text	Croatian/ <i>Priče romske priče</i>
Emigrated to	

Author (male)	Cana, Kasum (1968 – 2011)
Country of origin	Kosovo
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information (including works that are not yet published)	(2003) Zagreb: AGM.
Source language of text	Romani/ <i>O Roma kedipe gilengo thaj fotografija okotar Rromano gjivdipe</i>

Translations of the text	Croatian/Zbirka pjesama i fotomonografija iz života Roma
Emigrated to	Croatia

Author (male)	Bajro Bajrić
Country of origin	Bosnia
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information (including works that are not yet published)	(1999) Zagreb: Udruga Romi za Rome Hrvatske.
Source language of text	Croatian/ <i>Tamo je sunce</i>
Translations of the text	Romani/ <i>Odori si o kham</i>
Emigrated to	Croatia

KOSOVO

Author (male)	Krasnići, Ali
Country of origin	Kosovo
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	Subotica: Izdavačko preduzeće Rromane pustika – Romske knjige DOO (no date of publishing)
Source language of text	Romani/ Antologija e Rromane poezijaći ane Srbija.
Translations of the text	Serbian/ <i>Antologija romske poezije u Srbiji</i>
Emigrated to	Serbia

Author (male)	Krasnići, Ali
Country of origin	Kosovo
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(1989) Priština: Jedinstvo.

Source language of text	Romani/ <i>Čehrajine sune</i>
Translations of the text	Serbian/ <i>Zvezdani snovi</i>
Emigrated to	Serbia

Author (male)	Krasnići, Ali
Country of origin	Kosovo
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(2004) Kragujevac: A. Krasnići.
Source language of text	Romani/ <i>Rromani mehlava</i>
Translations of the text	Serbian/ <i>Romska mahala</i>
Emigrated to	Serbia

Author (male)	Krasnići, Ali
Country of origin	Kosovo
Genre of text	prose
Publishing information	(1981) Priština: Jedinstvo.
Source language of text	Romani/ <i>Čergarende jaga</i>
Translations of the text	Serbocroatian/ <i>Čergarske vatre</i>
Emigrated to	Serbia

Author (male)	Krasnići, Ali
Country of origin	Kosovo
Genre of text	prose
Publishing information	(1985) Priština: Rilind.
Source language of text	Serbian/ <i>Romske pripovetke s Kosova</i>
Translations of the text	Romani, Arabian
Emigrated to	Serbia

Author (male)	Krasnići, Ali
Country of origin	Kosovo
Genre of text	prose

Publishing information	(1986) Priština: Jedinstvo.
Source language of text	Romani/ <i>Iripe ano đuvdipe</i>
Translations of the text	Serbian/ <i>Povratak u život</i>
Emigrated to	Serbia

Author (male)	Haliti, Bajram
Country of origin	Kosovo
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(2008) Zagreb: Udruga “Romski putevi”
Source language of text	Romani/ <i>Čehrajine sune</i>
Translations of the text	Serbian/ <i>Zvezdani snovi</i>
Emigrated to	Serbia

Author (male)	Haliti, Bajram
Country of origin	Kosovo
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(2004) Batajnica: Memorijalni centar Roma za holocaust studije Srbije i Crne Gore.
Source language of text	Romani / <i>Poema katar e Mum Tadž Mahal</i>
Translations of the text	Serbian / <i>Poema o Mum Tadž Mahal</i>
Emigrated to	Serbia

Author (male)	Saćip, Mehmed
Country of origin	Kosovo
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(1984) Priština: Novi svet
Source language of text	Romani/ <i>Bučarne vasta</i>
Translations of the text	Serbian/ <i>Vredne ruke</i>
Emigrated to	Serbia

Author (male)	Saćip, Mehmed
Country of origin	Kosovo
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(1986) Priština: Novi svet
Source language of text	Romani/ <i>Loli phabaj</i>
Translations of the text	Serbian/ <i>Crvena jabuka</i>
Emigrated to	Serbia

Author (male)	Saćip, Mehmed
Country of origin	Kosovo
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(1994) Priština: Novi svet
Source language of text	Romani/ <i>Sofrako miškuipe</i>
Translations of the text	Serbian/ <i>Pomeranje sofre</i>
Emigrated to	Serbia

Author (male)	Saiti, Agim
Country of origin	Kosovo
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(2011) Subotica: Amaro drom-Naš put.
Source language of text	Romani/ <i>Munrri Čehrajn</i>
Translations of the text	Serbian, Albanian
Emigrated to	Italy

Author (male)	Paćaku, Kujtim
Country of origin	Kosovo
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(1996) Italia: Amico Rom
Source language of text	Romani/ <i>Baxtalo drom/ Felice Cammino</i>

Translations of the text	
Emigrated to	

Author (male)	Paćaku, Kujtim ???
Country of origin	Kosovo
Genre of text	Poetry/anthology
Publishing information	(1997) Amico Rom: Italia
Source language of text	Romani/ Baxtalo drom-Felice Cammino
Translations of the text	
Emigrated to	

Author (male)	Paćaku, Kujtim
Country of origin	Kosovo
Genre of text	Prose/ paramiča
Publishing information	(2002) Tirana: Albania
Source language of text	Romani/ Purane rromane paramisă Përallat e vjetra rome
Translations of the text	Albanian
Emigrated to	

Author (male)	Paćaku, Kujtim
Country of origin	Kosovo
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(2007) Prizren: Rromani baxt.
Source language of text	Romani/ <i>Sumnakuni Phurt</i>
Translations of the text	Albanian, Serbian, English
Emigrated to	

Author (male)	Paćaku, Kujtim
Country of origin	Kosovo

Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(2009) Prizren: Rromani Baxt
Source language of text	Romani/ <i>Amare mule na merna</i>
Translations of the text	Albanian
Emigrated to	

Author (male)	Paćaku, Kujtim
Country of origin	Kosovo
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(2009) Paris: L`armattan
Source language of text	Romani/ <i>E Devlesqe Ćirikle (Jevendesqe Gilã)</i>
Translations of the text	French/ <i>Les Oiseaux du ciel (Chants d'hiver)</i>
Emigrated to	

Author (male)	Paćaku, Kujtim
Country of origin	Kosovo
Genre of text	Poetry/anthology
Publishing information	(2010) Rilindja-Prishtina
Source language of text	Albanian/ <i>Jeta e re-Antologia</i>
Translations of the text	
Emigrated to	

Author (male)	Paćaku, Kujtim
Country of origin	Kosovo
Genre of text	Poetry/anthology
Publishing information	(2011) Traduki: Beograd
Source language of text	Serbian/ <i>Iz Prištine s ljubavlju</i>
Translations of the text	
Emigrated to	

Author (male)	Paćaku, Kujtim
Country of origin	Kosovo
Genre of text	Poetry
Publishing information	(2012) Rromani Baxt:Prizren
Source language of text	Romani/ Jekh than tal-o kham
Translations of the text	Albanian, Serbian, English
Emigrated to	

Author (male)	Paćaku, Kujtim
Country of origin	Kosovo
Genre of text	Poetry
Publishing information	(2012) Rromani Baxt:Prizren
Source language of text	Romani/ Trujal o jaga-Okò vatri
Translations of the text	Albanian – Tahir Hoxha, English Agim Susuri, Serbian –Fadil Bajraj with the publisher Litteris:Zagreb
Emigrated to	

Author (male)	Paćaku, Kujtim
Country of origin	Kosovo
Genre of text	Poetry
Publishing information	(2012) Kultur: Germany
Source language of text	Deutsch/ Albanische Hefte
Translations of the text	
Emigrated to	

Author (male)	Paćaku, Kujtim
Country of origin	Kosovo
Genre of text	Poetry
Publishing information	(2013) Lvinia Dickinson
Source language of text	Italian/ "100 Thousand Poets

Translations of the text	
Emigrated to	

MACEDONIA

Author (male)	Demir, Ljatif
Country of origin	Macedonia
Genre of text	Poetry/translation of poems by Garcia Lorka
Publishing information	(1996) Skopje: Studentski zbor: Skopje
Source language of text	Macedonian/ <i>Izbrani pesni</i>
Translations of the text	Romani/ <i>Mahatma -Alusarde gilja- Garcia Lorka</i>
Emigrated to	

Author (male)	Demir, Ljatif
Country of origin	Macedonia
Genre of text	Prose
Publishing information	(1996) Skopje: Studentski zbor: Skopje
Source language of text	Macedonian/ <i>Dečije priče</i>
Translations of the text	Romani
Emigrated to	

Author (female)	Eminova, Akile
Country of origin	Macedonia
Genre of text	prose: novel
Publishing information	1995. Štip: Kulturno-Prosvjetna Zajednica.
Source language of text	Macedonian/ <i>Amaleet</i>

Translations of the text	
Emigrated to	

Author (female)	Eminova, Akile
Country of origin	Macedonia
Genre of text	prose: novel
Publishing information	2001. Štip: Venecija.
Source language of text	Macedonian/ Tancot na dušata
Translations of the text	
Emigrated to	

Author (male)	Petrovski, Trajko
Country of origin	Macedonia
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	2001. Skopje: BIS - Grafik.
Source language of text	Macedonian/ Romski narodni pesni
Translations of the text	Romani
Emigrated to	

Author (male)	Petrovski, Trajko
Country of origin	Macedonia
Genre of text	prose
Publishing information	2000. Skopje: Romano ilo.
Source language of text	Macedonian/ Snježana i sedam patuljaka. (author: Grim, Jakob.
Translations of the text	Romani/I Snežana thaj o efta patuljakija
Emigrated to	

Authors (female and male)	Toči, Safije and Demir, Ljatif
Country of origin	Macedonia

Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(2006) Skopje: Darhia.
Source language of text	Romani/Purane Romane paramisa
Translations of the text	Macedonian/Stari romski prikazni
Emigrated to	

Authors (female)	Demirova, Enise
Country of origin	Macedonia
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(2005) Štip: NU Biblioteka "Goce Delčev".
Source language of text	Romani/ <i>Romano dživdipe</i>
Translations of the text	Macedonian/ <i>Romskiot život</i>
Emigrated to	India

Authors (female)	Toči, Safije
Country of origin	Macedonia
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(2005) Skopje: Darhia.
Source language of text	Romani/ <i>E Almakoro suno</i>
Translations of the text	Macedonian/ <i>Sonot na Alma</i>
Emigrated to	

Author (male)	Hadži Rustemi, Ali
Country of origin	Macedonia
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(2004) Tetovo
Source language of text	Romani/ <i>Dži kana tu Roma</i>
Translations of the text	Macedonian
Emigrated to	

Author (male)	Ilijaz, Šaban
Country of origin	Macedonia
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(1985) Skopje
Source language of text	Romani/ <i>Korenjata</i>
Translations of the text	Macedonian
Emigrated to	

Author (male)	Osman, Nedjo
Country of origin	Macedonia
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(1999) Istanbul
Source language of text	Romani/Patrin
Translations of the text	Turkish
Emigrated to	Germany

Author (male)	Osman, Nedjo
Country of origin	Macedonia
Genre of text	drama
Publishing information	(2003) Beograd
Source language of text	Turkish/ Medea, Hamlet maüina
Translations of the text	
Emigrated to	Germany

Author (male)	Osman, Nedjo
Country of origin	Macedonia
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(2006) Weilerswist
Source language of text	Romani
Translations of the text	German/ Gebäre mich nicht
Emigrated to	Germany

Author (male)	Serbezovski, Muharem
Country of origin	Macedonia
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(1999) Sarajevo: Bosanski kulturni centar.
Source language of text	Serbian/ Putevi vjetrova i Cigana: poezija
Translations of the text	Romani
Emigrated to	Germany, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbia

Author (male)	Sebezovski, Muharem
Country of origin	Macedonia
Genre of text	prose
Publishing information	(1983) Sarajevo: Veselin Masleša.
Source language of text	Serbocroatian/ Šareni dijamanti
Translations of the text	
Emigrated to	Germany, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbia

Author (male)	Sebezovski, Muharem
Country of origin	Macedonia
Genre of text	prose
Publishing information	(1985) Sarajevo: Veselin Masleša.
Source language of text	Serbocroatian/ <i>Cigani "A" kategorije</i>
Translations of the text	
Emigrated to	Germany, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbia

Author (male)	Sebezovski, Muharem
---------------	----------------------------

Country of origin	Macedonia
Genre of text	prose
Publishing information	(2005) Sarajevo: Romano lil
Source language of text	Bosnian/ Kur'an
Translations of the text	Romani/Kur'ani
Emigrated to	Germany, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbia

MONTENEGRO

Author (male)	Sejdović, Ruždija Ruso
Country of origin	Montenegro
Genre of text	prose
Publishing information	(2011) Podgorica: Centar za očuvanje i razvoj kulture manjina.
Source language of text	Montenegrin/ <i>Eremit</i>
Translations of the text	
Emigrated to	Germany

Author (male)	Sejdović, Ruždija Ruso
Country of origin	Montenegro
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(1988) Titograd: Sekcija pisaca- radnika Crne Gore.
Source language of text	Montenegrin/ <i>Svjetlost u ponoć</i>
Translations of the text	Romani/ <i>E jak an-e jrat</i>
Emigrated to	Germany

Author (female)	Sejdović, Izeta (1964 – 2000)
Country of origin	Montenegro
Genre of text	prose

Publishing information	unpublished work - manuscript
Source language of text	Romani/
Translations of the text	/ Montenegrin - Serbian
Emigrated to	Germany

Co -Authors (males)	Sejdović, Ruždija Ruso/ Stojko, Steva/ Sejdić, Aladin/ Briher, Hanci
Country of origin	Montenegro, Serbia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbia
Genre of text	poetry and prose
Publishing information	(2008) Köln: Rom e.V. Köln und die literarischen Gruppe rromano pero
Source language of text	Romani/ <i>Kali čirikli</i>
Translations of the text	German/ <i>Der schwarze Vogel</i>
Emigrated to	Germany

SERBIA

Editor (male)	Acković, Dragoljub
Country of origin	Serbia
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(2012) Sarajevo: Sarajevske sveske N 39/40: Separat N 1
Source language of text	Languages of former Yugoslavia: <i>Antologija romske poezije</i>
Translations of the text	Romani/doesn't have title in Romani/ some of poetry is in Romani translation
Emigrated to	Serbia

Author (male)	Đurić, Rajko
Country of origin	Serbia

Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(1969) Beograd
Source language of text	Romani/ <i>Rhom rodel o than tal o kham</i>
Translations of the text	Serbian/ <i>Rom traži mesto pod suncem</i>
Emigrated to	Germany, now in SerbiaS

Author (male)	Đurić, Rajko
Country of origin	Serbia
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(1979) Beograd: Narodna knjiga Slovoljublje.
Source language of text	Romani/ <i>Bi kheresko bi limoresko</i>
Translations of the text	Romani/ <i>Bez doma bez groba</i>
Emigrated to	Germany, now in Serbia

Author (male)	Đurić, Rajko
Country of origin	Serbia
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(1980) Beograd: Narodna knjiga Slovoljublje.
Source language of text	Serbian/ <i>Prastara reč daleki svet</i>
Translations of the text	Romani/ <i>Purano svato o dur themestar</i>
Emigrated to	Germany, now in Serbia

Author (male)	Đurić, Rajko
Country of origin	Serbia
Genre of text	Poetry
Publishing information	(1982) Beograd
Source language of text	Serbian/ A i U
Translations of the text	Romani/A thaj U

Emigrated to	Germany, now in Serbia
--------------	------------------------

Author (male)	Đurić, Rajko
Country of origin	Serbia
Genre of text	Poetry
Publishing information	(1984) Leskovac
Source language of text	Romani/Jaga
Translations of the text	Serbian/Vatre
Emigrated to	Germany, now in Serbia

Author (male)	Đurić, Rajko
Country of origin	Serbia
Genre of text	Poetry
Publishing information	(1985) Beograd
Source language of text	Serbian/ Hefestovi učenici
Translations of the text	
Emigrated to	Germany, now in Serbia

Author (male)	Đurić, Rajko
Country of origin	Serbia
Genre of text	Prose
Publishing information	(1985) Beograd
Source language of text	Serbian/ Ciganske priče
Translations of the text	
Emigrated to	Germany, now in Serbia

Author (male)	Đurić, Rajko
Country of origin	Serbia
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(1989)Hamburg: Helmut Buske Verlag.

Source language of text	Romani: doesn't have title in Romani
Translations of the text	German / <i>Zigeunerische Elegien/Gediche in Romani und Deutch</i> (self-translation)
Emigrated to	Germany, now in Serbia

Author (male)	Đurić, Rajko
Country of origin	Serbia
Genre of text	Poetry
Publishing information	(1995) Paris
Source language of text	Serbian/ Učenici Hefesta
Translations of the text	Franch (translation by other than himself)
Emigrated to	Germany, now in Serbia

Author (male)	Đurić, Rajko
Country of origin	Serbia
Genre of text	Poetry
Publishing information	(1996) Berlin
Source language of text	Romani/ Bi kheresko bi limoresko
Translations of the text	German (self-translation)
Emigrated to	Germany, now in Serbia

Author (male)	Đurić, Rajko
Country of origin	Serbia
Genre of text	Poetry
Publishing information	(1996) Paris
Source language of text	Serbian/ Snovi Isusa Hrista
Translations of the text	Franch (translation by other than himself)
Emigrated to	Germany, now in Serbia

Author (male)	Đurić, Rajko
Country of origin	Serbia
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(2002) Paris
Source language of text	Serbian/ <i>Ja sam Ciganin</i>
Translations of the text	Franch (translation by other than himself)
Emigrated to	Germany, now in Serbia

Author (male)	Đurić, Rajko
Country of origin	Serbia
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(2008) Vršac: Biblioteka KOV.
Source language of text	Serbian/ <i>Duša i pepeo- pesme</i>
Translations of the text	
Emigrated to	Germany, now in Serbia

Author (male)	Nikolić, Jovan
Country of origin	Serbia
Genre of text	prose
Publishing information	(2006) Klagenfurt: Drava Verlag, Romani Library.
Source language of text	Serbian/ <i>Beli gavran-crno jagnje</i>
Translations of the text	German/ <i>Weisser Rabe-schwarzes Lamm</i>
Emigrated to	Germany

Author (male)	Nikolić, Jovan
Country of origin	Serbia
Genre of text	prose
Publishing information	(1981) Vršac: Književna opština.

Source language of text	Serbian/ <i>Gost niotkuda</i>
Translations of the text	Romani/ <i>Dosti khatinendar</i>
Emigrated to	Germany

Author (male)	Nikolić, Jovan
Country of origin	Serbia
Genre of text	prose
Publishing information	(2004) Klagenfurt/Celovec
Source language of text	Serbian/ <i>Soba s točkom</i>
Translations of the text	German
Emigrated to	Germany

Author (male)	Nikolić, Jovan
Country of origin	Serbia
Genre of text	prose
Publishing information	(1987) Vršac: Beograd
Source language of text	Serbian/ <i>Durđevdan</i>
Translations of the text	
Emigrated to	Germany

Author (male)	Nikolić, Jovan
Country of origin	Serbia
Genre of text	prose
Publishing information	(1991) Ivanjica
Source language of text	Serbian/ <i>Neću da se rodim</i>
Translations of the text	
Emigrated to	Germany

Authors (males)	Nikolić, Jovan/ Sejdović, Ruždija Ruso
Country of origin	Serbia

Genre of text	drama/theatre
Publishing information	(1990) Cologne/ (2002) Éditions l'Espace d'un instant
Source language of text	Romani (1990)/ <i>Kosovoqo karusèli</i>
Translations of the text	French (2002)/ <i>Kosovo Mon Amour</i>
Emigrated to	Germany, Germany

Author (male)	Nikolić, Jovan
Country of origin	Serbia
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(1993) Niš
Source language of text	Serbian/ <i>Oči pokojnog jagnjeta</i>
Translations of the text	
Emigrated to	Germany

Author (male)	Nikolić, Jovan
Country of origin	Serbia
Genre of text	prose
Publishing information	(1996) Beograd
Source language of text	Serbian/ <i>Telo i okolina</i>
Translations of the text	
Emigrated to	Germany

Author (male)	Dimić, Trifun (1956 -2001)
Country of origin	Serbia
Genre of text	prose
Publishing information	(2002) Novi Sad: Romska matica u Jugoslaviji.Društvo Vojvodine za jezik, kulturu i književnost Roma.
Source language of text	Serbian/ <i>Romske narodne pripovetke</i>
Translations of the text	Romani

Emigrated to	
--------------	--

Author (male)	Dimić, Trifun (1956 -2001)
Country of origin	Serbia
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(1979) Novi Sad: Srpska čitaonica i knjižnica Irig.
Source language of text	Romani/ <i>Kana avasas ando foro</i>
Translations of the text	Serbian/ <i>Dolazeći sa vašara: Antologija narodne poezije vojvođanskih Roma</i>
Emigrated to	

Author (male)	Dimić, Trifun (1956 -2001)
Country of origin	Serbia
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(1986) Novi Sad: Matica srpska.
Source language of text	Romani/ <i>Čidimata e Rromane Djiljendar</i>
Translations of the text	Serbian/ <i>Romska narodna poezijaD</i>
Emigrated to	

Author (female)	Đurić, Gordana (1958-2002)
Country of origin	Serbia
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(1989) Novi Sad: Društvo Vojvodine za jezik i književnost Roma.
Source language of text	Romani/ <i>Dukhadilo ilo</i>
Translations of the text	Serbian/ <i>Ranjeno srce</i>
Emigrated to	

Author (female)	Familić, Maja
-----------------	----------------------

Country of origin	Serbia
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(2011) 2. izd. Novi Sad: Udruženje Roma Veliki rit.
Source language of text	Serbian/ <i>Čup nadanja</i>
Translations of the text	Romani/ <i>O Khoru ažučarimasko</i>
Emigrated to	

Author (female)	Kalderaš, Dragica
Country of origin	Serbia
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(1997) Vršac.
Source language of text	Romani/Gilja
Translations of the text	Serbian
Emigrated to	

Author (female)	Kalderaš, Dragica
Country of origin	Serbia
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(2004) Vršac.
Source language of text	Serbian/ <i>Halejeva kometa</i>
Translations of the text	Romani/ <i>E halejeski kometa</i>
Emigrated to	

Author (female)	Kalderaš, Dragica
Country of origin	Serbia
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(2005) Vršac
Source language of text	Romani/ <i>E čirešin ande lulugi</i>
Translations of the text	Serbian/ <i>Trešnja u cvetu</i>
Emigrated to	

Author (female)	Kalderaš, Dragica
Country of origin	Serbia
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(2007) Vršac: Sunce-kham.
Source language of text	Serbian/ <i>Pesme za decu</i>
Translations of the text	Romani/ <i>Gelja e bajačenge</i>
Emigrated to	

Author (male)	Berberski, Slobodan (1919. -1989.)
Country of origin	Macedonia
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(1950) Zagreb
Source language of text	Serbian/ <i>Za kišom biće duga</i>
Translations of the text	
Emigrated to	Serbia

Author (male)	Berberski, Slobodan (1919. -1989.)
Country of origin	Macedonia
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(1952) Novi Sad
Source language of text	Serbian/ <i>Proleće i oči</i>
Translations of the text	
Emigrated to	Serbia

Author (male)	Berberski, Slobodan (1919. -1989.)
Country of origin	Macedonia
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(1955) Novi Sad
Source language of text	Serbian/ <i>Uze</i>
Translations of the text	

Emigrated to	Serbia
--------------	--------

Author (male)	Berberski, Slobodan (1919. -1989.)
Country of origin	Macedonia
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(1959) Beograd
Source language of text	Serbian/ <i>Nevreme</i>
Translations of the text	
Emigrated to	Serbia

Author (male)	Berberski, Slobodan (1919. -1989.)
Country of origin	Macedonia
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(1959) Beograd
Source language of text	Serbian/ <i>Dnevnik rata</i>
Translations of the text	
Emigrated to	Serbia

Author (male)	Berberski, Slobodan (1919. -1989.)
Country of origin	Macedonia
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(1964) Subotica
Source language of text	Serbian/ <i>Blag dan</i>
Translations of the text	
Emigrated to	Serbia

Author (male)	Berberski, Slobodan (1919. -1989.)
Country of origin	Macedonia
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(1968) Cetinje
Source language of text	Serbian/ <i>Kote</i>

Translations of the text	
Emigrated to	Serbia

Author (male)	Berberski, Slobodan (1919. -1989.)
Country of origin	Macedonia
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(1976) Beograd
Source language of text	Serbian/ <i>Odlazak brata Jakala</i>
Translations of the text	
Emigrated to	Serbia

Author (male)	Berberski, Slobodan (1919. -1989.)
Country of origin	Macedonia
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(1977) Subotica
Source language of text	Serbian/ <i>Kao beskožni jeleni</i>
Translations of the text	
Emigrated to	Serbia

Author (male)	Berberski, Slobodan (1919. -1989.)
Country of origin	Macedonia
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(1979) Zrenjanin
Source language of text	Serbian/ <i>Još san sebe da dovrši</i>
Translations of the text	
Emigrated to	Serbia

Author (male)	Berberski, Slobodan (1919. -1989.)
Country of origin	Macedonia
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(1980) Priština

Source language of text	Serbian/ <i>Kazivanja Roma</i>
Translations of the text	
Emigrated to	Serbia

Author (male)	Berberski, Slobodan (1919. -1989.)
Country of origin	Macedonia
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(1982) Novi Sad
Source language of text	Serbian/ <i>Međe</i>
Translations of the text	
Emigrated to	Serbia

Author (male)	Berberski, Slobodan (1919. -1989.)
Country of origin	Macedonia
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(1983) Zagreb
Source language of text	Serbian/ <i>Svakodnevnica</i>
Translations of the text	
Emigrated to	Serbia

Author (male)	Berberski, Slobodan (1919. -1989.)
Country of origin	Macedonia
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(1984) publishing?
Source language of text	Serbian/ <i>Vode nečekane</i>
Translations of the text	
Emigrated to	Serbia

Author (male)	Berberski, Slobodan (1919. -1989.)
Country of origin	Macedonia
Genre of text	poetry

Publishing information	(1986) publishing?
Source language of text	Serbian/ <i>Dub</i>
Translations of the text	
Emigrated to	Serbia

Author (female)	Ilić, Rozalija /Ilić, Emilija
Country of origin	Serbia
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(2002) Kragujevac
Source language of text	Serbian/ <i>Iz romske riznice</i>
Translations of the text	
Emigrated to	

Author (female)	Šainović, Kadrija
Country of origin	Serbia
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(1984) Leskovac
Source language of text	Serbian/ <i>Stigla je Ciganka i čerga</i>
Translations of the text	Romani
Emigrated to	

Author (female)	Aleksandrović, Marija
Country of origin	Serbia
Genre of text	Poetry/ Romsko epsko-lirske i lirske pesme-starija i nova beleženja: klasifikacija, teme, značenja
Publishing information	(2012) Zavod za kulturu Vojvodine: Novi Sad, Srbija
Source language of text	Serbian/ <i>Bacila sam jabuku u peć</i>
Translations of the text	
Emigrated to	

ROMANIA

Author (female)	Mihai – Cioaba, Luminita
Country of origin	Romania
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(1994) Sibiu: ed. Neo Drom.
Source language of text	Romani/ <i>O angluno la phuveako</i>
Translations of the text	Romanian/ <i>Rădăcina Pământului</i>
Emigrated to	

Author (female)	Mihai – Cioaba, Luminita
Country of origin	Romania
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(1997) Sibiu: ed. Neo Drom.
Source language of text	Romani/ <i>O manuși kai bitinel brišind</i>
Translations of the text	Romanian/ <i>Negustorul de ploaie</i>
Emigrated to	

Author (female)	Mihai – Cioaba, Luminita
Country of origin	Romania
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(2006) Bucuresti
Source language of text	Romani/ <i>Romane asva</i>
Translations of the text	Romanian
Emigrated to	

Author (male)	Daoczi, Jozsef
---------------	-----------------------

Country of origin	Hungary
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(1990) Budapest
Source language of text	Romanian/ <i>Iste homoru arcan</i>
Translations of the text	
Emigrated to	

Author (male)	Daoczi, Jozsef
Country of origin	Romania
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(1991) Budapest
Source language of text	Romanian/ <i>Csontfeher pengeek között</i>
Translations of the text	
Emigrated to	

Author (male)	Daoczi, Jozsef
Country of origin	Hungary
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(1994) Budapest
Source language of text	Romani/ <i>Mashkar le shiba dukhades</i>
Translations of the text	?
Emigrated to	

Author (male)	Daoczi, Jozsef
Country of origin	Romania
Genre of text	Poetry/anthology
Publishing information	(1995) Budapest
Source language of text	Romani/ <i>Romane poetongi antologia</i>
Translations of the text	
Emigrated to	

Co-Author (male)	Delia, Grigore
Country of origin	Romania
Genre of text	Poetry
Publishing information	(2000) Bucharest:Aven Amentza.
Source language of text	Romanian/ <i>Collection: Tineri poeti minoritari</i>
Translations of the text	
Emigrated to	

Co-Authors (males)	Borcoi, Jupiter / Sarău, Gheorghe/Pandelică, Nicolae/ Cordovan, Ionel
Country of origin	Romania
Genre of text	prose
Publishing information	(2012) Botoșani:Arena Cărții.
Source language of text	Romani/ <i>Paramică thaj phenimata le rromenqe</i>
Translations of the text	Romanian/ <i>Povești și povestiri rrome</i>
Emigrated to	

SLOVENIA

Author (male)	Horvat, Jožek Muc
Country of origin	Slovenia
Genre of text	Prose
Publishing information	(1993) Murska Sobota: Romsko društvo Romani Union.
Source language of text	Romani/ <i>Legenda</i>
Translations of the text	Slovenian/ <i>Krvava voda</i>
Emigrated to	

Author (male)	Horvat, Jožek Muc
Country of origin	Slovenia
Genre of text	Prose/performance
Publishing information	(1999) Murska Sobota: Romsko društvo Romani Union.
Source language of text	Romani/ Radfalu paunji
Translations of the text	Slovenian/Krvava voda
Emigrated to	

Author (male)	Horvat, Jožek Muc
Country of origin	Slovenia
Genre of text	Prose/performance
Publishing information	(2002) Murska Sobota: Zvezda Romov Slovenije.
Source language of text	Romani/ <i>Hegeduva</i>
Translations of the text	Slovenian/ <i>Violina</i>
Emigrated to	

Author (male)	Horvat, Jožek Muc
Country of origin	Slovenia
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(2005) Murska Sobota: Zvezda Romov Slovenije.
Source language of text	Romani/ <i>Ciden andi mro aunav</i>
Translations of the text	Slovenian/ <i>Plesala zame</i>
Emigrated to	

Author (male)	Horvat, Jožek Muc
Country of origin	Slovenia
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(2006) Murska Sobota: Zvezda

	Romov Slovenije.
Source language of text	Slovenian/ <i>Ciganga Irina</i>
Translations of the text	
Emigrated to	

Author (male)	Horvat, Jožek Muc
Country of origin	Slovenia
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(2006) Murska Sobota: Zvezda Romov Slovenije.
Source language of text	Romani/ <i>Amaro drom</i>
Translations of the text	Slovenian/Naša potK
Emigrated to	

Author (female)	Kovačič, Jelenka
Country of origin	Slovenia
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(1999) Novo Mesto
Source language of text	Romani/ <i>Domislin pe du mande</i>
Translations of the text	Slovenian/ <i>Pomisli name</i>
Emigrated to	

Author (females)	Brezar, Marina and Vukšinić, Helena
Country of origin	Slovenia
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(2005) Lokve pri Črnomlju: Kulturno romsko društvo Vešoro.
Source language of text	Romani/ <i>Samo hari bajt</i>
Translations of the text	Slovenian/ <i>Samo malo sreče</i>
Emigrated to	

Author (male)	Nežirovič, Slobodan
Country of origin	Slovenia
Genre of text	prose/poetry
Publishing information	(2008)
Source language of text	Romani/ <i>Romane paramiče taj romane gilja</i>
Translations of the text	Slovenian/ <i>Romske pravljice in pesmi</i>
Emigrated to	

Author (female)	Šerkezi, Mladenka
Country of origin	Slovenia
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(1996)
Source language of text	Slovenian/ <i>Pesem je rojena sola</i>
Translations of the text	
Emigrated to	

Author (female)	Šerkezi, Mladenka
Country of origin	Slovenia
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(2007) ?
Source language of text	Slovenian/ <i>Po sledih jutra</i>
Translations of the text	
Emigrated to	

Author (male)	Horvat, Romeo Popo
Country of origin	Slovenia
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(2000) Murska Sobota: Romsko društvo Romska unija.
Source language of text	Romani/ <i>Poposkore djilja</i>

Translations of the text	Slovenian/ <i>Popove pesme</i>
Emigrated to	

Author (male)	Horvat, Romeo Popo
Country of origin	Slovenia
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(2007) Murska Sobota: Romsko društvo Romska unija.
Source language of text	Romani/ <i>Marlenakro gurudo maurimo</i>
Translations of the text	Slovenian/ <i>Marlenina skrita omara</i>
Emigrated to	

Author (male)	Horvat, Romeo Popo
Country of origin	Slovenia
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(2009) Murska Sobota: Romsko društvo Romska unija.
Source language of text	Romani/ <i>Marlenakro gurudo maurimo</i> 2
Translations of the text	Slovenian/ <i>Marlenina skrita omara 2</i>
Emigrated to	

Author (female)	Brezar, Marina
Country of origin	Slovenia
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(2005)
Source language of text	Romani/ <i>Samo hari bajt</i>
Translations of the text	Slovenian/ <i>Samo malo sreče</i>
Emigrated to	

Author (female)	Brezar, Madalina
Country of origin	Slovenia

Genre of text	prose
Publishing information	(2006)
Source language of text	Slovenian/ <i>Belokranjske in romske bajke</i>
Translations of the text	
Emigrated to	

Author (male)	Brizani, Imer Traja
Country of origin	Kosovo
Genre of text	poetry done as songs with notes
Publishing information	(2010) Ljubljana: Studio print, 2005-2010
Source language of text	Romani/ <i>Čhavalen gilaven amencar!</i>
Translations of the text	Slovenian/ <i>6 Otroci zapojte za nami!</i>
Emigrated to	Slovenia

Author (male)	Brizani, Imer Traja
Country of origin	Kosovo
Genre of text	poetry done as songs with notes
Publishing information	(2011) Grosuplje: PARTNER graf d.o.o. 2005-2011
Source language of text	Romani/ <i>Čhavalen gilaven amencar!</i>
Translations of the text	Slovenian/ <i>7 Otroci zapojte za nami!</i>
Emigrated to	Slovenia

Author (male)	Diricchardi, Rinaldo Muzga
Country of origin	Slovenia
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(2011) Ljubljana: Zveza romskih skupnosti Umbrella-Dežnik in Anglunipe – RIC

Source language of text	Slovenian/ no title in Slovenian
Translations of the text	Romani/ <i>Romane Htaj Sintatikhes Ghilja</i> English/ (5 poems translated in English)
Emigrated to	

Author (male)	Šajnović, Brajdić Rajko
Country of origin	Slovenia
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(1995) Dolenjska Založba:Novo Mesto
Source language of text	Romani/ <i>Drom</i>
Translations of the text	Slovenian/ <i>Pot</i>
Emigrated to	

Author (male)	Šajnović, Brajdić Rajko
Country of origin	Slovenia
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(2000) Dolenjska Založba:Novo Mesto
Source language of text	Romani / <i>Ovi Rom Romano čavoro</i>
Translations of the text	Slovenian/ <i>Biti Rom romski otrok</i>
Emigrated to	

Author (male)	Šajnović, Brajdić Rajko
Country of origin	Slovenia
Genre of text	Poetry/translation from Slovenian author Franc Prešern
Publishing information	(2006) Založba Karantanija
Source language of text	Slovenian <i>Pesme i poezija</i>

Translations of the text	Romani/ <i>Djilavani buti djilava/</i>
Emigrated to	

Author (male)	Livijen, Jože
Country of origin	Slovenia
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(1994) Primorska Založba: Murska Subota
Source language of text	Romani/ <i>Čhoneskri angrusti</i>
Translations of the text	Slovenian/ <i>Lunin prstan</i>
Emigrated to	

Author (male)	Livijen, Jože
Country of origin	Slovenia
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(2007) Slovenian very known author Feri Lajinšček: Murska Subota
Source language of text	Slovenian/ Podedovane brazgotine-pesmi o lesi in lovu
Translations of the text	
Emigrated to	

Author (male)	Kleibencetl, Janko
Country of origin	Slovenia
Genre of text	poetry
Publishing information	(2004) Maribor
Source language of text	Romani/ <i>Del tuha, romski pozdrav</i>
Translations of the text	Slovenian
Emigrated to	

Annex V – QUESTIONARY FOR AUTHORS


Questions asked to authors:

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Molim te provjeri, ispravi i nadopuni svoju biografiju i bibliografiju. • Izaberi dvije pjesme sa prijevodom/ima koje želiš da analiziram u svom radu. • Potpuni podaci o publikaciji: naslov publikacije, autori, prevodioci, izdavačka kuća, godina izdavanja. • Molim napiši potpun text tvoje pjesme sa tekstom prijevoda. • Na kojem romskom dijalektu si napisao svoju pjesmu/e? • Na kom jeziku /cima ili /dijalektu/ima si ih preveo? • Koji je motiv tvojih pjesama? • Šta si želio reći i poručiti u svojim pjesmama; na šta ukazati? • Da li si imao problema kod prijevoda i koji su to problemi? • Da li misliš da pjesme pisane na romskom jeziku mogu prevoditi samo Romi i zašto? • Da li misliš da pjesme koje Romi pišu na većinskim jezicima mogu samo oni prevesti na romski? • Da li si prevodio nekad pjesme svojih 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Please, revise, correct and supplement your biography and bibliography. ➤ Choose two poems with their translation/s you wish to be analyzed in my work. ➤ Please submit full information about publication: title of publication, authors, translators, publishing house, year of publication. ➤ Please write whole text of your poem along with its translation/s. ➤ In which Romani dialect did you write your poem/s? ➤ In which language/s/ or dialect/s did you translate your poems? ➤ What is the motive of your poems? ➤ What did you want to say and to tell in your poems; what do you want to point out or emphasize? ➤ Did you have problems while translating and what were those problems? ➤ Do you think that the poems written in Romani can be translated only by Roma and why? ➤ Do you think that the poems that Roma write in majority languages can be translated in Romani only by Roma
--	---

<p>kolega Roma na romski ili na neki od većinskih jezika? Kakvo je tvoje iskustvo po tom pitanju?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Da li si razmišljao da li će i ko će čitati tvoje pjesme? • Kako su Romi prihvatili tvoju pjesmu/e a kako ne-Romi? • Da li se vremenom promijenilo tvoje interesovanje pisanja pjesama na romskom jeziku i o kojim temama sada pišeš i zašto? 	<p>themselves?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Have you ever translated poems written by other Roma colleagues in Romani or in a majority language? What is your experience according to this question? ➤ When you wrote your poems did you think anybody would read them? ➤ How did Roma accept your poem/s and how did non-Roma? ➤ If with time your interest in writing the poems in Romani changed, what thematic are you writing about now and why?
---	---

Annex VI – “Decizia Romane čhibaki”

I KHETANI RROMANI ČHIB

RROMANI ŪNIA		NIŠ
ROMANO MAŠKARTHEMUTNO KHETANIPE		JUGOSLAVIA

Narodna Republika Srbija – Dnevnik, ul. Kralja Petra Prvoga, Beograd – Kontakt: 011/337-014

Varšava, 07.IV.1990

DECIZIA : "I RROMANI ALFABETA"

Pismo na: BEOGRAD, Kraljevića 111-113, 11000 BEOGRAD, SRBIA, TEL: 011/337-014
 Ured: Romani RENE BUDNICKIĆ, Kraljevića 111-113, 11000 BEOGRAD, SRBIA, TEL: 011/337-014
 Kontakt: ul. Kralja Petra Prvoga, Beograd, ul. Kralja Petra Prvoga, 111, 11000 BEOGRAD, SRBIA, TEL: 011/337-014

I Komisia vaš-i standardizacia e rromane čhibaqiri kedisažli and-i Varšava (Jadwisin-Serock) 5 ta 6 Štartomaj 1990 tel-i phak e UNESCO-sqi thaj lias decizie sar maj tele :

- i lekhl'i rromani čhib si jekh, tikne variacijenčar, thaj e Rroma drabaren la tolerancijača, sarkon pal pi dialěkta
- i rromani alfaběta si specifiko, opr-i bāsa e latinikane alfabetaqi, nesave šikne modifikacijenčar, thaj nane te lekhas and-i alfaběta jekhe avere čhibaqi
- and-i standardutni čhib isi 5 (pane) vokāle : a e i o u, nesave si and-i lekhaqāi variācia, ama akaja fenomenā na perel and-i fonetika ja fonolōgia.
- and-i standardutni čhib nane centrisarde vokāle. Arakhlōn numaj and-e tēkete dialektenqe karaktereqa. Atōaka sikaven pe duje ~~maxxkaka~~ viramenčar : " (a sar rumnikane i thaj š ta ž sar and-i germanikani čhib).
- e vokāle konstrikcijača na mukhen^h and-i standardutni čhib
- nane difōnge and-o [w] and-i standardutni čhib
- i prejotizacia sikavel pes e dirikleqa
- aver vokāle nane
- jekh grafēma ja diakritika šaj te ovel la numaj jekh fūkcia
- isi numaj jekh /y/ and-i rromani čhib thaj isi la duj variānte pal-i pozicija (dikh dok.)
- uladōn h (laringal) ta x (velar)
- e tenutne g, k ta kh lekhen pe pal-i protorromani sistēma thaj sarkon drabarel pal-i pi čhib (palatalisarde ja na)
- e phudimē sikaven pe e grafemāqa h : ph, th etc...
- i tendēncia si te ~~maxxkaka~~ si te dikardōl i opozicija maškar duj r : jekh sado thaj jekh aver (cerebral, nakhutno etc...) numaj and-e dialěkte kaj isi akaja opozicija. Lenqe šaj te lekhel pe rr.
- dikardōl i princija e postpozicionqāri, save sikaven i sandhi I, II ta III (dikh dok.) thaj si karakteristiko e Indijaqe neve čibenqe. Lenqe anglune grafēme (arxigrafēma) si q, ç thaj 9 (and-o than e š-aqo, savo na mukhel^h and-o standardutno lekhipe)
- e sibilānte lekhen pe c č ch (ja ch) s š z i ta ğ (ja z)
- čhudel peš o ɔ (dž), savo nane le fonemaqi fūkciois, avri andar-i

— Document 9 —

Document issu de la session scientifique de Jadwisin-Serock :
L'alphabet romani commun — v. no. 695 sq.

chib
 -s sibilante (affricate) sh thaj s (z) vakeren pe [tʃ] resp.
 [dʒ] and-e dialekte I ta II thaj kovle [ʃ] ta [ʒ] and-i dialekte
 III. I neutralizacia maskar [ʃ] ta [ʒ] thaj [s] ta [z] na' mukhel
 pe and-i standardutni chib
 -o strase si general agorutno (oxyton). Odothe haj nane agorutno,
 sikuvel leqo than i diakritika "gravis"
 -mane xarne ta uce vokale and-i opozicja. Savorre si maskarutne
 (median)
 -kana isi adipe maskar duj konstruksie (jekh analitikani thaj
 jekh sintetikani), i preferenca sal and-i sintetikani.

Yursava (Madamin-Serock)

ins. Sait Balic

dr. Rajko Djuric

prof. Georgi Demeter

Sait Jusuf

Moses Heinschink

Andreej B. Lewkowicz

pr. Ignacy Banks

prof. René Geill

Leksa Manus

A. Joshi

Iliar Sabani

S.K. Thakar

Marcel Courthiad

Isa Hancock

Darecki Agnes

prof. Tadeusz Pobożniak

prof. Lew Czarenkow

Viktor Koptilov (UNESCO)

RROMANI UNIA
RROMANO MAŠKARTHEMUTNO KHETANIPE



NIŠ
JUGOSLAVIA

Prvi put: 1957. godine, Beograd
Drugi put: 1962. godine, Beograd
Treći put: 1967. godine, Beograd
Četvrti put: 1972. godine, Beograd
Peti put: 1977. godine, Beograd
Šesti put: 1982. godine, Beograd
Sedmi put: 1987. godine, Beograd
Osmi put: 1990. godine, Niš

Varšava 11.IV.1990
N.7.1990

DECIZIA

O Prezidium e Rromane Uniaqoro aprobisarda i decisia "I RROMANI ALFABETA" d. 07.04.1990, savi presentisarda lesqe i Komisia vas-i Standarisacia e Rromane Chibaqiri, savi kedisajli and-i Varšava (Jadvisin-Serock) 5 ta 6 Štartonaj 1990 ta sava die vas e sene maj tele : ind. Sait Balić, dr. Rajko Djurić, prof. Georgi Demeter, Šaip Jusuf, Moxes Heinschinok, Andrasj B. Lewkovic, prof. Ignacy Danko, prof. Réné Geell, Leksa Manus, A. Joshi, S.K. Thakar, Marcel Courthiade, Ian Hancock, Darocsi Agnes, prof. Tadeusz Pobożniak, prof. Lew Gaarenkow thaj e bidhalde ketar-e UNESKO : R. Viktor Koptilov.

I alfabets, savi si aprobisardi kale lilepa, si i oficiale alfabets e khetane rromane chibaqiri.

Rajko Djurić
dr. Rajko Djurić
pres. e Rromane Uniaqoro

Emil Šćuka
dr. Emil Šćuka
Generalo Sekretari
e Rromane Uniaqoro

Sait Balić
ind. Sait Balić
vice-pres. e
Rromane Uniaqoro



Stanisław Stankiewicz
Stanisław Stankiewicz
vice-pres. e
Rromane Uniaqoro

Viktor Fomulson
Viktor Fomulson
vice-pres. e
Rromane Uniaqoro

— Document 10 —

Décision du comité directeur de l'Union Romani Internationale
d'entériner le document l'*alphabet romani commun*
après son acceptation par le 4ème Congrès Romani en séance plénière le 8 avril 1990.

Decision: "The Rromani alphabet"

Warsaw, 07 of IV 1990

The Commission for the Standardization of the Rromani Language gathered in Warsaw on the 5th and 6th of April 1990 under the patronage of UNESCO and took the following decisions:

1. written Rromani is one language with minor variations, and Rroms read it with flexibility, each according to the pronunciation of his/her own dialect.
2. the Rromani alphabet is specific and based upon the Latin script with some small modifications and we are not supposed to use the alphabet of any other language.
3. one grapheme or diacritic may fulfill only one function.
4. in the standard language, there are 5 (five) vowels: **a e i o u**; some of them are in lexical variations but this phenomenon does not pertain to phonetics or phonemics.
5. in the standard language there are no centralized vowels; such may be encountered only in texts with dialectal character. They are then indicated by two dots " (ä as Romanian â [or î], Russian ъ, Polish y, Turkish ı etc.), ë as Romanian ă, Albanian ë, Bulgarian ъ etc..) and ö and ü as in the Germanic languages [or in Hungarian]).
6. constricted vowels are not accepted in the standard language.
7. there are no diphthongs with [w] in the standard language.
8. pre-yotisation is indicated by means of the "ćiriklo": ˇ (*inflex* or *caron*).
9. there are no other vowels.
10. there is only one **l** in Rromani language and it has two variants according to its position.
11. one distinguishes between **h** (laryngeal) and **x** (velar).
12. dorsal stops **g**, **k** and **kh** are spelled after the ProtoRromani system and everyone reads them according to his/her own dialect (palatalized or not).
13. aspirated consonants are indicated by means of the grapheme **h**: **ph**, **th** etc...
14. there is a tendency to keep the opposition between two **r**'s: one simple and one not (pronounced as retroflex, nasal, etc.) in all the dialects where this opposition does exist. In these dialects it is spelled **rr**.
15. the principle of postpositions is retained; they indicate the sandhis I, II and III and are characteristic for neo-Indic languages. Their first graphem (archigraphem) is **q**, **ç** and **θ** (instead of **8**, which has been rejected from standard spelling).
16. the spirants are written **c**, **ć**, **čh** (or **ch**), **s**, **ś**, **z**, **ž** and **z** (or **z**).
17. the symbol ɟ [dz] is rejected since it has no phonemic value.
18. the spirants (affricates) **čh** and **z** (**z**) are pronounced resp. [tʃh] and [dʒ] in the dialects I and II and smooth [ç] and [z] in the dialect III. The neutral-ization between [j] and [ç] and between [ʒ] and [z] is not accepted in the standard language.
19. the stress is generally final (oxytonic). Where it is not final, its place is indicated by means of the grave accent (**à**, **è** etc.).
20. there are no short and long vowels in opposition. All are medium.
21. when there are two possible constructions (one analytic and the other one synthetic) the synthetic one is preferred.

Warsaw (Jadwisin-Serock) 07. IV. 1990 — signed by S. Balić, R. Djurić, G. Demeter, Š. Jusuf, M. Heinschink, A. Lewkowicz, I. Danka, R. Gsell, L. Manuś, A. Joši, I. Šabani, S.-K. Thakkar, M. Courthiade, I. Hancock, A. Daróczy, T. Pobożniak, L. Čerenkov and V. Koptilov (UNESCO special representative).

BIOGRAPHY

Hedina Sijerčić is a member of the Committee of Experts of the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages for Bosnia and Herzegovina, Council of Europe, Strasbourg. With Cynthia Levine-Raski she is co-editor and contributing author of the *A Romani Women's Anthology: Spectrum of the Blue Water* (2017). In 2016 she published her book *Rodni identiteti u književnosti romskih autorica na području bivše Jugoslavije/ E genderikane identitetura andi literatura savi xramosaren e romane autorke andi nekanutni Jugoslavija* [Gender identities in literature of the Romani women authors in the former Yugoslavia]. From 2012-2014 at the Faculty of Philosophy at the University of Zagreb, Croatia, she was Lecturer on Romani language, literature, and on the culture of Roma. In 2011/2013, her *Romani Dictionary: Gurbeti-English/English-Gurbeti*, and in 2011 her autobiographical novella *Rom like Thunder* were published with Magoria Books in Toronto. In 2010, her Romani-Bosnian and Bosnian-Romani dictionary was published by the Federal Ministry of Education and Science, Bosnia and Herzegovina. She is author of *Romani Folk Tales*, and of six children's books, poetry collections and many academic papers.

BIOGRAFIJA

Hedina Sijerčić, član je odbora eksperata Vijeća Evrope za Evropsku povelju za regionalne ili manjinske jezike. Sa Sintijom Levine- Rasky Hedina je ko-urednica i ko-autorica antologije *A Romani Women in Canada: Spectrum of the Blue Water* (2017). U 2016. godini objavila je knjigu *Rodni identiteti u književnosti romskih autorica na području bivše Jugoslavije/ E genderikane identitetura andi literatura savi xramosaren e romane autorke andi nekanutni Jugoslavija* pri Federalnom ministarstvu za obrazovanje i nauku u Mostaru. Od 2012. – 2014. na Filozofskom fakultetu u Zagrebu, Hrvatska, predavala je romski jezik, književnost i kulturu Roma. 2011/2013 njen *Romani Dictionary: Gurbeti-English/English-Gurbeti*, i njena autobiografska novela *Rom like Thunder* (2011) objavljeni su od strane Magoria Books u Torontu. 2010. godine njen Romsko-bosanski i bosansko-romski rječnik objavljen je od strane Federalnog ministarstva za obrazovanje i nauku u Mostaru, Bosna i Hercegovina. Autorica je romskih narodnih priča i legendi, šest knjiga za djecu, knjiga poezije i više akademskih radova.

Изјава о ауторству

Име и презиме аутора Хедина Сијерчић

Број индекса _16148/D

Изјављујем

да је докторска дисертација под насловом

**LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE OF ROMA WITHIN TRANSLATION IN THE
WESTERN BALKANS: POETRY IN SELF-TRANSLATION
(ЈЕЗИК И КЊИЖЕВНОСТ РОМА У ПРЕВОДУ НА ЗАПАДНОМ БАЛКАНУ:
ПОЕЗИЈА У АУТОПРЕВОДУ)**

- резултат сопственог истраживачког рада;
- да дисертација у целини ни у деловима није била предложена за стицање друге дипломе према студијским програмима других високошколских установа;
- да су резултати коректно наведени и
- да нисам кршио/ла ауторска права и користио/ла интелектуалну својину других лица.

Потпис аутора

У Београду, _____

Хедина Сијерчић

Appendix 2

Изјава о истоветности штампане и електронске верзије докторског рада

Име и презиме аутора: Хедина Сијерчић

Број индекса 16148/D

Студијски програм: "ЈКК - ДАС Модул Култура"

Наслов рада _ LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE OF ROMA WITHIN
TRANSLATION IN THE WESTERN BALKANS: POETRY IN SELF-
TRANSLATION

(ЈЕЗИК И КЊИЖЕВНОСТ РОМА У ПРЕВОДУ НА ЗАПАДНОМ БАЛКАНУ:
ПОЕЗИЈА У АУТОПРЕВОДУ)

Ментор: др Мирјана Даничић, доцент

Изјављујем да је штампана верзија мог докторског рада истоветна електронској верзији коју сам предао/ла ради похрањена у **Дигиталном репозиторијуму Универзитета у Београду**.

Дозвољавам да се објаве моји лични подаци везани за добијање академског назива доктора наука, као што су име и презиме, година и место рођења и датум одбране рада.

Ови лични подаци могу се објавити на мрежним страницама дигиталне библиотеке, у електронском каталогу и у публикацијама Универзитета у Београду.

Потпис аутора

У Београду, _____

Hedina Sijerčić

Изјава о коришћењу

Овлашћујем Универзитетску библиотеку „Светозар Марковић“ да у Дигитални репозиторијум Универзитета у Београду унесе моју докторску дисертацију под насловом:

**LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE OF ROMA WITHIN TRANSLATION IN THE
WESTERN BALKANS: POETRY IN SELF-TRANSLATION**

(ЈЕЗИК И КЊИЖЕВНОСТ РОМА У ПРЕВОДУ НА ЗАПАДНОМ БАЛКАНУ: ПОЕЗИЈА У АУТОПРЕВОДУ)

која је моје ауторско дело.

Дисертацију са свим прилозима предао/ла сам у електронском формату погодном за трајно архивирање.

Моју докторску дисертацију похрањену у Дигиталном репозиторијуму Универзитета у Београду и доступну у отвореном приступу могу да користе сви који поштују одредбе садржане у одабраном типу лиценце Креативне заједнице (Creative Commons) за коју сам се одлучио/ла.

1. Ауторство (CC BY)
2. Ауторство – некомерцијално (CC BY-NC)
3. Ауторство – некомерцијално – без прерада (CC BY-NC-ND)
4. Ауторство – некомерцијално – делити под истим условима (CC BY-NC-SA)
5. Ауторство – без прерада (CC BY-ND)
6. Ауторство – делити под истим условима (CC BY-SA)

(Молимо да заокружите само једну од шест понуђених лиценци.

Кратак опис лиценци је саставни део ове изјаве).

Потпис аутора

У Београду,

Меланија Ђурковић