THE ROMANI LANGUAGE IN THE REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA: STATUS, USAGE, AND SOCIOLINGUISTIC PERSPECTIVES*

VICTOR A. FRIEDMAN

Abstract

The development of Romani language use in the Republic of Macedonia is discussed here primarily in terms of its relation to education and other public and official contexts. The paper gives a detailed account of the statistical and legal position of the Roms in Macedonia and former Yugoslavia, followed by a linguistic account of the standardization of Romani for official use in Macedonia with comments on dialects, political action, publishing, the educational establishment, and the situation in other Balkan countries. Romani has gradually risen in status from total legal absence to legal equality with all other minority languages, even if the *de facto* realization has not yet met the *de jure* possibilities. The standardization of Romani and the fixing of the Arli dialectal base with other elements, together with a consistent orthography, has made significant progress.

As an ethnic group in Macedonia, the Romani people have occupied a marginalized place similar to that in which they find themselves elsewhere in Europe, but with an important difference. While they have been subjected to discrimination (see Silverman 1995a; 1995b), they have not been the target of the kind of racist violence that has occurred and still occurs elsewhere in Europe (cf. Bárány 1994; 1995; Kyuchukov 1995). In fact, in the complex ethnic mosaic of Macedonia, the Roms[1] have maintained their separateness while at the same time functioning as an integral and accepted part of everyday Macedonian life. Since the constitutional revi-

[1] See note at *Rom* in Table 2.

sions of 1974, when the Roms received legal recognition as an ethnic collective, there have been various attempts to advance education in Romani—educational linguistic rights being a cornerstone of identity politics. With the independence of the Republic of Macedonia, the Roms were recognized in the 1991 constitution as a *narodnost* 'nationality' on the same level as Albanians, Turks, Vlahs, and others (mainly Serbs). Although Roms seek to participate in formal educational institutions using their own language, however, the Romani language itself is still in the process of the kind of standardization associated, among other things, with the institutionalized structures of formal education. In this paper, I shall discuss the development of Romani language use in the Republic of Macedonia primarily in terms of its relation to education and other public and official contexts, utilizing both published sources and my own experiences during more than twenty years of field research in Macedonia. In order to frame these issues, I shall first turn to the statistical and legal position of the Roms in Macedonia and former Yugoslavia.

According to the 1994 census Roms constitute approximately 2.3% of the population of the Republic of Macedonia.[2] In former Yugoslavia, Roms constituted between 0.6% and 0.7% of the total population, approximately two thirds in the Republic of Serbia and about one quarter in the Republic of Macedonia. As can be seen from Tables 1 and 2, the figures on people declaring Romani nationality have varied considerably over the years. This is not due to changes in birth or death rates, since the Roms have a natality rate almost twice the Yugoslav average (Stanković 1992, 173). While mechanical growth (migration) could account for some fluctuations, there were no migrations massive enough to account for these differences. Rather the magnitude of changes in the figures reflect differences in social pressure concerning the declaration of Romani as opposed to some other nationality. The tremendous drop in 1961 in the number of self-declared Roms in Serbia but not in Macedonia has been labeled a "statistical enigma" (Stanković 1992, 160), but must clearly reflect a difference between either the censusing or social position (or both) of Roms in Serbia and in Macedonia.

---

[2] Romani ethnopoliticians have on occasion claimed as many as five times the official figures (Čangova 1991), and political leaders of all the other major ethnic groups inside Macedonia as well as politicians in neighboring states with histories of territorial claims against Macedonia have at one time or another claimed numbers as much as 60 times in excess of the 1994 census figures. The point is not one of statistical accuracy but rather claims to political power and hegemony (see Friedman 1996). Nonetheless, given the social stigma attached to Romani identity and the marginalized position of Roms in society, it is well known in demographic literature that Roms often choose to declare a different nationality (Stanković 1992, 161). Another example of conflicting tensions was the appeal to Roms during the 1991 census to register as Roms and not as Albanians or Turks or "something else" out of fear or due to pressure (Nova Makedonija 28.III.91, 4). To the extent that the Macedonian government is seeking to reduce Albanian influence, this has led to increased recognition for both Roms and Macedonian Muslims.

Table 1

Figures concerning Romani nationality in Macedonia and Former Yugoslavia
in the five uncontested post-war censuses. Source: Stanković (1992)

	1981	1971	1961	1953	1948
Macedonia	43125=25.7%	24505=31.2%	20606=65%	20462=24.2%	19500=26.8%
Serbia	110959=66%	49894=63.6%	9826=31%	58800=69.5%	52181=71.8%

The 1991 Yugoslav census was boycotted by part of the population, mainly ethnic Albanians.

Table 2

The ethnic structure of the Republic of Macedonia since World War Two

Census total by year, number, and percentage (rounded upward where necessary)

Declared nationality (*narodnost*)	1948	%	1953	%	1961	%	1971	%	1981	%	1991	%	1994*	%
Macedonians	789548	68.5	860699	66.0	1000854	71.2	1142375	69.3	1279323	67.0	1328187	65.3	1295964	66.5
Albanians	197389	17.1	162524	12.4	183108	13.0	279871	17.0	377208	19.8	441987	21.7	441104	22.9
Turks	95940	8.3	203938	15.6	131481	9.4	108552	6.6	86591	4.5	77080	3.8	78019	4.0
Roms**	19500	1.7	20462	1.6	20606	1.5	24505	1.5	43125	2.3	52103	2.6	43707	2.3
Vlahs	9511	0.8	8668	0.6	8046	0.6	7190	0.6	6384	0.3	7764	0.4	8601	0.4
Serbs	29721	2.6	35112	2.7	42728	3	46465	2.8	44468	2.3	42775	2.1	40228	2.0
Muslims	1560	0.1	1591	0.1	3002	0.2	1248	0.1	39513	2.1	31356	1.5	15418	0.8
Bulgarians	889	0.1	920	0.1	3087	0.2	3334	0.2	1980	0.1	1370	0.0	1682	0.1
Greeks	–	–	848	0.1	836	0.1	536	0.0	707	0.1	474	0.0	368	0.0
Egyptians	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	3307	0.2	3080	0.2
Bosniacs	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	6829	0.4
Yugoslavs	–	–	–	–	1260	0.1	3652	0.2	14225	0.7	15703	0.8	595***	0.0
Others****	8928	0.8	9752	0.8	10995	0.7	29580	1.7	15612	0.8	31858	1.6	9797	0.4
Total	1152986	100	304514	100	1406003	100	1647308	100	1909136	100	2033964	100	1945932	100

Sources: Antonovska *et al.* (1991; 1994a; 1994b; 1996), Latifić *et al.* (1970), Pekevski *et al.* (1973), Savezni zavod za statistiku (1954; 1981).

* According to Dr. Svetlana Antonovska (p.c. 95/05/25), Director of the Republic Bureau of Statistics, the lower figures for some nationalities in 1994 vs. 1991 is due to the fact that citizens living abroad for more than one year were included in the 1991 census, whereas in the 1994 census—in accordance with international norms—only those citizens living abroad for one year or less were counted.

** The predominantly Romani-speaking ethnic group popularly known as *Gypsies* in English and *Cigani* in Macedonian (similar ethnonyms are used in most of the languages of Central and Eastern Europe) is now referred to by the native ethnonym *Rom* (singular) in scholarly literature as well as official documents in many countries. (The term was official in the 1971 Macedonian census.) Although in languages other than English this word has been unhesitatingly adapted to the grammar of the language

in which it is used (e.g. Bulgarian, Macedonian, Romanian, Serbo-Croatian pl. *Romi,* Albanian pl. *Romë*), considerable inconsistency has arisen in English usage. Thus as the plural of *Rom* some scholars and other serious writers use the Romani form *Roma,* others adapt the word to English morphology and write *Roms,* others use a pluralized adjective *Romanies,* and some use the Kalderash collective *Rom* for both singular and plural. I have argued elsewhere (Friedman – Hancock 1995) that just as in English the plural of *Turk* is *Turks* and not *Turkler,* so the plural of *Rom* should be *Roms* and not *Roma.* I would argue that the form *Roma* exoticizes and marginalizes rather than emphasizing the fact that the group in question is an ethnic group just as are *Turks, Magyars* (not *Magyarok*), *Bulgars* (not *Bulgari*), etc.

*** This figure includes those who declared "Yugoslav" as well as nationalities not counted separately in the census, mostly from Africa, East Asia, and the Middle East (MIC 95/01/05).

**** Yugoslav and Macedonian censuses distinguished up to 34 nationality categories as well as several other types including those who declared a regional indentity and those who did not declare a nationality. For the sake of conciseness, I have grouped all the smaller categories, none of which are relevant for this paper, under the designation Other. This designation includes the following specified groups: Austrian, English, Belgian, German, Danish, Jewish, Italian, Norwegian, Polish, Romanian, Russian, Rusyn, Slovak, Slovenian, Ukrainian, Hungarian, French, Dutch, Croatian, Montenegrin, Czech, Swiss and Swedish. This category also includes those who protested the use of nationality as a classification by making facetious declarations, among which the most popular were Lightbulb and Refrigerator (Robert Hayden, University of Pittsburgh, personal communication).

Between the 1971 and 1981 censuses, there was a change in the legal status of Romani that both reflected and encouraged a rise in consciousness of Romani identity—viz. the federal and republic constitutional reforms of 1974 in which Romani (along with Vlah) received the official status of *etnička grupa* 'ethnic group', a step below *narodnost* 'nationality' (the term which came to replace 'national minority' [Macedonian *nacionalno malcinstvo* Serbo-Croatian *nacionalna manjina*] during the 1960's and became official in the 1974 constitutions).[3] This rise in national con-

---

[3] The 1974 constitution recognized three types of ethnically defined collectives: *narod* 'nation', *narodnost* 'nationality', and *etnička grupa* 'ethnic group'. The difference between a *narod* and a *narodnost* was that a *narod* was considered a constitutive nation of Yugoslavia and of its constituent republics (Slovene, Serb, Croat, Macedonian, Montenegrin, and Muslim) whereas a *narodnost* was *de facto* a minority that was a constituent of a national-state other than Yugoslavia, e.g. Turks. An ethnic group was a minority with no nation state beyond the borders of Yugoslavia, i.e. the Vlahs and the Roms. An exception to this principle were the Ruthenians (Rusyni), who live primarily in Vojvodina and who did not have an external nation-state but were nonetheless given the status of *narodnost.* A major complaint of the Albanians during this period was that while they constituted a numerically larger group than Macedonians or Montenegrins, they were considered a *narodnost* while the latter each constituted a *narod.* Each category implied a different level of linguistic and other collective rights mitigated by factors of size and distribution: the language of a *narod* (Slovenian, Macedonian, Serbo-Croatian) was official at the federal level. However, federal laws and regulations were also to be published in Albanian and Hungarian, making them semi-federal. The language of a *narodnost* was official at the republic or provincial level (e.g. Turkish in Macedonia, Hungarian in Vojvodina), the communal (municipality) level (e.g. Italian in Slovenia, Bulgarian in Serbia), or not at all (e.g., German, Polish, and Russian) (see Bugarski 1992; Škiljan 1992). The languages of ethnic groups did not receive guaranteed official support, but their constitutional recognition positioned them to seek such support. Although the Roms had the status of *narodnost* in the Republic constitution of Bosnia-Hercegovina, this had no practical effect (Škiljan 1992, 40).

sciousness was parallel with a rise in linguistic consciousness. It was during this period that the first serious attempts in the direction of Romani-language education were made in Macedonia.

In discussing the relationship of the Romani language to Romani nationality, it is important to keep in mind that there is not an absolute one-to-one correspondence between the two. The figures in Table 3 show the correlation between declared nationality and declared mother tongue for the first and last uncontested Yugoslav censuses conducted in Macedonia and the 1994 Macedonian census.

Table 3
Difference between declared nationality and declared mother tongue for the six main languages
of the Republic of Macedonia: 1953, 1981, 1994

1953
Declared Mother Tongue

Declared nationality	Macedonian	Albanian	Turkish	Serbo-Croat	Romani	Vlah
Macedonians	853971	1986	281	934	277	2565
Albanians	2152	153502	6569	181	70	1
Turks	32392	27087	143615	534	70	10
Roms	1040	860	2066	25	16456	1
Vlahs	137	4	2	14	0	8130
Serbs	3945	0	8	31070	41	9
Muslims	*	*	*	*	*	*
Yugoslavs	2152	25	50	563	2	4
Others	322	341	569	5258	173	31
Total	896651	183805	153160	38579	17089	10751

1981
Declared Mother Tongue

Declared nationality	Macedonian	Albanian	Turkish	Serbo-Croat	Romani	Vlah
Macedonians	1276878	190	160	547	316	*
Albanians	1218	374181	3	440	1697	*
Turks	16608	8592	60768	366	94	*
Roms	4160	1697	808	24	36399	*
Vlahs	1111	1	0	3	2	5257
Serbs	8521	10	3	35867	14	*
Muslims	15075	4968	2038	16325	308	30
Yugoslavs	7645	1943	274	2746	530	*
Others	13282	4247	2853	17031	1280	*
Total	1334498	391829	64907	63349	37780	5931

*Not specified

Table 3 (continued)

1994
Declared Mother Tongue

Declared nationality	Macedonian	Albanian	Turkish	Serbo-Croat[†]	Romani	Vlah	Bulgarian
Macedonians	1289868	124	124	1938	94	259	125
Albanians	2063	426418	210	135	•	•	0
Turks	10885	906	62726	86+•	11	0	•
Roms	5974	1212	1311	14+•	34955	•	•
Vlahs	1800	•	0	12	0	6747	0
Serbs	11693	0	8	27843	•	•	32
Muslims	5552	605	180	1181	20	•	•
Bosniacs[††]	36	21	•	312+•	0	0	•
Bulgarians	358	0	•	80	0	•	1216
Egyptians	961	1856	42	10	•	0	0
Others	3793	221	64	3484	40	30	75
Total	1332983	431363	64665	35095	35120	7036	1448

Sources: Savezni zavod za statistiku (1953a), Savezni zavod za statistiku (1988), Antonovska *et al.* (1996)

† This figure represents *Serbian* and *Croatian* which were listed as separate languages in the 1994 census.
†† 6426 Bosniacs were listed in the column 'Other' for mother tongue. Presumably the overwhelming majority declared Bosnian. 7795 Muslims were also in the 'Other' column and presumably also listed Bosnian.
• Under 10

As can be seen from the table, there is a fairly high correlation between declared Romani nationality and declared Romani mother tongue. In fact, the correlation of over 96% is well above the Yugoslav average of 79.1% of those with Romani nationality declaring Romani mother tongue (Petrović 1992, 120). This can be taken as an indicator of the strength of the correlation between declared Romani language and nationality in Macedonia. What these figures do not—and cannot—reveal, however, is the fact that many Roms declare another nationality (and/or mother tongue) due to the social stigma attached to Romani.[4] Since the majority of Roms in Macedonia are Muslim, and moreover urban, Turkish represents a significant prestige language while

---

[4] Albanian and Turkish are probably more frequent than Macedonian due to the fact that most Roms in Macedonia are Muslim and the former two languages are more closely identified with Islam (cf. note 2). According to Faik Abdi, cited in Čangova (1991), most Roms who declare another nationality and/or mother tongue in western Macedonia declare themselves as Albanians while in eastern Macedonia they declare themselves as Turks. This would reflect the relative numerical strength of these two groups in these two regions.

Albanian represents numerical strength as the language of the largest predominantly Muslim minority. We can also note here that the drop in Roms declaring Turkish mother tongue between 1953 and 1981 correlates with the migration of Turks to Turkey (largely for economic reasons) in the late 1950s (cf. Katona 1969; Jašar-Nasteva 1992). Many other Muslims also declared themselves as Turks on the basis of religion in order to emigrate to a non-communist country. The tremendous discrepancy between declared Turkish and Albanian nationalities in 1948 and 1953 was politically motivated. The 1948 census was conducted before the Tito–Stalin break, when relations with communist Albania were good and relations with non-communist Turkey were bad. By 1953, Yugoslavia had been expelled from Cominform and was not on good terms with Albania whereas by contrast relations with Turkey had thawed considerably (cf. Tanasković 1992). Although not readily ascertainable from census figures, these changes in relations also affected Roms, albeit not those declaring Romani mother tongue. At present, the issue of education for non-Romani speaking Gypsies also involves ethnic politics.[5] There is pressure on Muslim Gypsies to go to Albanian or Turkish rather than Macedonian schools, the better to justify expanding minority language education (cf. e.g. Flaka e Vëllazërimit 86.01.06, 10 on the situation in Kumanovo, also Birlik 84.10.01, 14). Current concern in Macedonia with Romani education is not merely connected to Article 48 of the Republic's constitution, which guarantees minority language rights, but can also be seen as aimed at reducing challenges from Albanian and Turkish.

There are also the *Ǵupci,* or *Egipḱani,* endogamous, non-Romani speaking groups of Romani descent who do not identify as Roms and who in Macedonia speak Albanian (e.g., in Ohrid and Struga) or Macedonian (e.g., in Bitola) as their first language (Friedman 1985b; Ljubisavljević 1990; Risteski 1991; Duijzings 1992; 1997; Hadži-Ristik 1994; Zemon 1996).[6] Although they sought to be recognized as a separate category in the 1981 census, they were placed in the category "unknown" (Nova Makedonija 82.03.06, 9), whereas in the 1991 and 1994 censuses they were recognized as a distinct group (but see Abduramanoski 1994). Both Romani and Albanian ethnopoliticians claim them for their own, but the Ǵupci identify with neither.

While Romani-speaking groups are often associated in the popular mind with nomadism, and indeed many groups were and some still are peripatetic—in France, for example, more than half the Gypsy and Traveler population is nomadic or semi-seden-

---

[5] I am using the term *Gypsy* here as a cover term for all those European groups descended from Indic speakers who arrived in Europe during the Middle Ages.

[6] Like the English term *Gypsy*, these ethnonyms derive from ethnonymic terms meaning 'Egyptian'.

tary (Chalumeau–Gualdaroni 1995)—Romani people have been settled in the Balkans in general and Macedonia in particular for centuries (see Friedman–Dankoff 1991). The social situation of many if not most Roms in Macedonia is thus quite different from that of many groups living elsewhere. The education issues facing many European countries, and the United States as well, involve significant differences between Romani and non-Romani culture—issues such as how to deliver societal services to nomadic groups, adapting the educational curriculum to the needs of children from a very different culture, etc. The Romani-speaking people of Macedonia, however, are part of a region where multilingualism and multiculturalism are a centuries-old tradition. The very existence of the Balkan linguistic league is testimony to this. The Balkan linguistic league (or *Sprachbund*) consists of the Balkan Slavic languages (Bulgarian, Macedonian, and the Torlak dialects of Serbian), the Balkan Romance languages (Romanian, Megleno-Romanian, and Aromanian [Vlah]), Greek and Albanian, all of which share a variety of significant structural similarities as the result of centuries of language contact. As the Slovene linguist Jernej Kopitar wrote in 1829, these languages gave the impression of having a single grammar (*Sprachform*) with different lexicons (*Sprachmaterie*). Moreover, although they are not usually included in studies of the Balkan linguistic league, the Balkan Romani dialects do in fact share a number of significant grammatical features with the other Balkan languages (see Kostov 1973; Friedman 1985a; Matras 1994). A brief illustrative example is given in Table 4.

Table 4
Optative-Subjunctive particle replaces infinitive and other structures in the Balkan Languages

Romani	te džas	mangav	te	hramonav
Albanian	të shkojmë	dua	të	shkruaj
Greek	ná páme	thelō	ná	gráfō
Bulgarian	da trŭgnem	iskam	da	piša
Macedonian	da odime	sakam	da	pišuvam
Torlak Serbian	da idemo	oču	da	pišem
Romanian	să mergem	vreau	să	scriu
Vlah (Kruševo)	s- neádzimŭ	voi	si	scriu
gloss	'let us/if we go'	'I want to write'		

However, while Romani-speakers constitute an integral albeit distinct and sometimes marginalized segment of Macedonian society, and while issues in Romani education parallel issues in other minority language education in Macedonia, there is a significant difference: while the Albanian, Turkish, and Serbian minorities in Macedonia have codified languages to serve as the bases of education, Romani, like Vlah (Aromanian), lacks such a standard. In the case of

Vlah, there is a codified literary language, viz. Romanian, which is sufficiently close that it can provide a model if not a substitute. In fact, there is a movement that would replace Vlah with Romanian, but this is resisted by the majority of Vlahs in Macedonia (cf. Jašar-Nasteva 1997) in the same way that, e.g., the Macedonians resisted the imposition of Bulgarian, the Ukrainians resisted Russian, the Slovaks resisted Czech, or the Norwegians resisted Danish (cf. Haugen 1968). Romani, however, is faced with a different problem which makes it unique in Macedonia and unusual in Europe: not only does there not exist at this time an established Romani linguistic norm, but Romani's closest relatives—the languages of western India such as Hindi and Punjabi—are too distant from Romani to have even the slightest chance of substituting for it, although their relationship to Romani in terms of vocabulary enrichment is a separate issue, one which we shall discuss below (cf. also Friedman 1989). Thus Romani education cannot take place effectively without settling the Romani "questione della lingua" (*čhibakoro phučipe*).

As was mentioned earlier, the 1970s saw both a change in Romani legal status and attempts at advancing Romani-language education. In general, however, these attempts met with a variety of difficulties. In 1971, Šaip Jusuf, a Rom who had earned a B.A. in physical education from the University of Belgrade, began work on a Romani grammar with Krume Kepeski, a professor at the Skopje Pedagogical Academy (Nova Makedonija 80.02.15, 10; cf. also Koneski 1950; Lunt 1952, v). By 1973 Jusuf and Kepeski had completed the manuscript of their grammar (Prof. Kepeski was kind enough to show me the manuscript while I was in Macedonia), and they were seeking publication. Due to various complicating factors, however, the grammar did not appear until 1980. The appearance of Jusuf–Kepeski (1980) in a tirage of 3,000 copies signaled a new phase in the development of the standardization of Romani in Macedonia. The book is written in both Romani and Macedonian on facing pages and was the most ambitious attempt of its kind at the time. The express purpose of the book was the creation of a Literary Romani for use by Roms in Macedonia, Kosovia,[7] and adjacent parts of Serbia, with a view to the creation of Romani-language schools in these areas and to the use of this literary standard as a basis for the creation of a Romani literary language for use by Roms in general (Jusuf–Kepeski 1980, 4–5).[8] The language of the grammar is

[7] Because both the [original] Slavic Kosovo and the Albanian [and Turkish] Kosova currently have political implications whose complexities I wish to eschew, I have chosen to use the productive English suffix when writing about this place in English.

[8] The question of whether Romani is to be considered a single language with numerous dialects or as a group of closely related languages is not of immediate concern to this article. The most commonly held opinion among linguists is that Romani is to be treated as a single language (cf. Kochanowski 1963, 184–92; Hancock 1975, 26; Ventcel' – Čerenkov 1976, 283; Cortiade 1984) despite varying degrees of mutual intelligibility. Questions of the definition of language and dialect

based on the Arli dialect of Skopje, although Jusuf makes frequent use of his native Džambaz dialect—especially when citing Romani forms in the Macedonian text—and occasionally Gurbet and Burgudži forms are also mentioned.[9] I have published a detailed analysis of this grammar elsewhere (Friedman 1985c). For the purposes of this paper it will suffice to point out some of the most salient types of problems raised by Jusuf–Kepeski (1980) with respect to the standardization of Romani and its use in education:

1. Orthographic conventions were not standardized as illustrated by the following examples: syllable final jot is indicated by both *i* and *j* as in the spellings *muj* and *mui* 'mouth', the automatic fronting of velars before front vowels is inconsistently indicated, e.g. *kerdo* and *kjerdo* 'done', the opposition between a uvular fricative /x/ and a glottal glide /h/—phonemic in some Romani dialects but not in others—is not made consistently, e.g. *xor* 'depth' but *hordaripe* 'deepening', *xramonel* 'write' but *hramondikano* 'written', etc.

2. Competing dialectal forms are not selected but rather mixed, as seen in the following examples. The basic form of the instrumental singular marker is {-sa} but the /s/ is lost intervocalically in Arli. On the Romani side of one of the nominal paradigms, the instrumental singular of the word for 'wind' is given as *bavlal-aa, -asa* while on the Cyrillic side it is given as бавлалаја (*bavlalaja*). In fact, *bavlal* is the Arli dialectal form, the Džambaz and etymologically older form being *balval*. Similarly, the second singular present tense morpheme, which also has the basic shape {-sa} and has both the Arli-specific loss of /s/ and a morphological variant without the final /a/ in all the dialects, is used in various places in all its possible

---

involve more factors than mere intelligibility, as can be seen from such classic examples as the mutually unintelligible *dialects* of Chinese or the mutually intelligible *languages* of Scandinavia, but the discussion of the relationship among language, dialect, ethnic identity, and national identity are beyond the scope of this article. For our purposes, we shall adopt the commonly held view of linguists just alluded to (cf. also Haugen 1966; Lunt 1984).

[9] We are accepting here as a useful heuristic device the distinction between the so-called Vlax and Non-Vlax dialects of Romani. Although the Romani dialectal situation in the Republic of Macedonia is quite complex, the majority of speakers use dialects of a Non-Vlax type that are described by the self-ascriptive cover term Arli (< Turkish *yerli* 'local'). Next in importance for Macedonia is Džambaz (< Turkish *cambaz* 'acrobat, horse-dealer', known elsewhere as Gurbet, related to Kalderaš, Lovari, Čurari, Mačvano, etc.), which is a Vlax type dialect that has undergone Non-Vlax influence. Also of significance for Macedonia is Burgudži or Bugurdži (< Turkish *burgucu* 'gimlet-maker', also known as Rabadži [< Turkish *arabacı* 'drayman'] or Kovačja [< Slavic *Kovač* 'blacksmith'], a name which is also used for other groups including the non-Romani speaking Gupci of southwestern Macedonia), which is also a Non-Vlax dialect. The details of Romani dialectal differentiation are beyond the scope of this paper. For a summary of current theories see Hancock (1995). Vencel' – Čerenkov (1976) and Boretzky – Igla (1994, 361–415) give useful comparative sketches of Romani dialects. Cf. also Table 7 for some illustrative examples.

realizations: *keresa/kereja/kerea* ↔ *keres/kere* 'you do'. Similarly, for the nominative plural definite article both Arli/Burgudži *o* and Džambaz/Gurbet *e* are used, e.g. *o Roma* and *e Roma* 'the Roms', feminine nouns in consonants are used with both jotated and non-jotated oblique stems, e.g. *čhiba-* and *čhibja-* 'tongue, language', etc.

3. Neologisms are coined from Hindi, sometimes with disregard for the Romani phonological system, rather than based on native material or borrowed from languages familiar to the speakers e.g. *bhaga* 'consciousness'.

4. The grammar was written on a level for use in a high school or pedagogical academy, but at the time there were no textbooks at the elementary school level. The grammar could thus at most have been used to prepare teachers, but the cadre of educated and motivated individuals and particularly the organizational structure was lacking.

Although the cultural organization *Phralipe* 'Brotherhood' was formed in 1948, it was not until the 1970s and 1980s that sporadic attempts were made at advancing Romani education and related linguistic rights such as use in the mass media. Thus there were radio programs broadcast out of cities and towns such as Belgrade and Niš in Serbia and Tetovo in Macedonia (cf. Puxon 1979, 89), a monthly entitled *Krlo e romengo* 'Voice of the Roms' was published for nine months in 1973 in Belgrade (Dalbello 1989). Books in Romani, most of them poetry, were published in all of the capitals of the ex-Yugoslav republics and autonomous regions as well as in smaller towns such as Leskovac and Preševo. Classes in Romani were begun in Gilan (Gnjilane) and Ferizaj (Ferizovik, Uroševac) in Kosovia (Birlik 9.X.94, 14) and informal classes outside the regular school structure were also organized in the predominantly Romani Skopje suburb Šuto Orizari (Šutka), which was where a large number of Roms from Skopje and later elsewhere settled after the disastrous Skopje earthquake of 1963.[10] In 1977, Šaip Jusuf translated a book about Tito into Romani with significant press coverage (Nova Makedonija 77.09.28-30, 9; Jusuf 1978). It was the first non-periodical publication in Macedonia (and Yugoslavia) by a Rom for Roms. Shortly thereafter, a number of anthologies of Romani poetry and stories were published, mostly in

---

[10] According to the 1994 census (Antonovska *et al.* 1996), 48% of Macedonia's Romani population lives in the five Skopje municipalities, more than half of them in the municipality of Čair, where Šutka is located. The next largest concentrations are Prilep (8.2%), Kumanovo (7.1%), Tetovo (5.6%), Gostivar (4.9%), Bitola (3.9%), Štip (3.3%), Debar (2.5%), and Vinica (2%). In terms of proportions, Roms constitute 3.9% of the population in the five municipalities of Skopje, but 14.7% in Čair. Other relatively sizable proportions are Vinica (4.6%), Debar (4.3%), Prilep (3.8%), Berovo (3.3%), Štip (2.9%), Kičevo (2.6%), Delčevo (2.5%), Kumanovo (2.4%), Kočani (2.3%), and Kriva Palanka (2.2%).

bilingual editions (e.g. Djurić 1979; Dimić 1979; Krasnići 1981; Salijesor 1984; Balić *et al.* 1984; Dimić 1986; see also Dalbello 1989) as well as a Romani–Serbo-Croatian–English dictionary (Uhlik 1983). More than ten years after Jusuf (1978), however, Trajko Petrovski's (1989) translation of the pre-World War Two Macedonian poet Kočo Racin's collection *Beli Mugri* ('White mists') into Romani was still an unusual event.

Throughout this period, pedagogical materials were virtually nonexistent. The classes mentioned above were conducted without formal textbooks. Jusuf– Kepeski (1980), while it brought attention to the Romani language, did not function in an institutional context. Although translations, original belle lettres, folklore collections, and scholarly studies[11] appeared with increasing frequency, they did not change the educational situation. Cortiade (1984), published in an expanded version in Titograd (Podgorica) in 1986, was an attempt to formulate a transdialectal orthography that would serve as the basis of both literary communication and a literary language for use in schools. Although this orthography has been gaining increasing acceptance in Western Europe (see also Cortiade *et al.* 1991; Cortiade 1994), and was even the basis of a primer published in Sarajevo (Kurtiàde 1990) in a tirage of 2,000 with a teachers manual in a tirage of 1,000, this orthography has not had a significant impact on publications in Macedonia. Problems with this orthography will be discussed below (see also Friedman 1995).

In 1990, Yugoslavia along with the rest of Eastern Europe entered an era of political pluralism. The tragic results of the nationalist hijacking of that political process, a course of action that had already begun during the previous decade, are too well known to require further comment here.[12] The Romani contribution to the ethnopolitical movement, however, is not perceived as a challenge to the legitimacy of the Macedonian state and has been careful to insist on its loyalty to the Republic of Macedonia.[13] The Party for the Complete Emancipation of the Roms (Macedonian: *Partija za Celosna Emancipacija na Romite,* Romani: *Partija Saste Emancipacijake e Romengiri;* PCER or PSER) was founded on 12 August 1990

---

[11] An especially prolific scholar has been Rade Uhlik, who published a Serbo-Croatian–Romani dictionary as early as 1947 and had published Romani poetry even prior to that (Uhlik 1937; see also Dalbello 1989).

[12] Of the plethora of books that have sprung from this tragedy, Woodward (1995) is the first major scholarly work in English (see Hayden 1995) and gives a particularly clear analysis of the role of international involvement. Silber – Allen (1995) represents the best journalistic account in English in the opinion of many educated observers (Vesna Pusić, University of Zagreb, personal communication).

[13] This is in contrast to, e.g., some Albanian ethnopoliticians in Macedonia, who on occasion dispute the legitimacy of Macedonian statehood and even national identity (e.g. Xhaferi 1995).

with Faik Abdi (Faik Abdieskoro), a wealthy businessman from Shutka, as its leader.[14] The first item in the party program concerned education. Among the planks in the educational platform were the following (Predlog 1990):

1. Opening of pre-school/day-care centers in which children could be exposed to both Macedonian and Romani simultaneously
2. Elementary education in Macedonian with 2–3 hours a week Romani instruction
3. Founding of a Department of Romology at Skopje University, one which would contribute to the overall improvement of the condition of the Romani nationality
4. Post-graduate studies and exchanges with India
5. Romani children learn the history of their people, especially about Hitler's holocaust against the Roms during World War Two, which is to be made part of the facultative language classes 3–4 hours a week.

The third section of the party program was concerned with the Romani language, and called not only for minority language rights equal with other minority languages but also expressed concern for the normativization of Romani and close cooperation with institutions in India.

On 8 September 1991 a referendum was held concerning independence for the Republic of Macedonia. Material encouraging people to vote was printed in all six major languages of Macedonia including Romani.[15] It was perhaps the first time Romani appeared on the front page of the principal Macedonian daily newspaper, Nova Makedonija (91.09.08, 1).[16]

In Fall 1991, Faik Abdi sent a letter in the name of PCER to the rector of the University of Skopje demanding the opening of a Romani Studies Department but the establishment of such a Department remains a desideratum that has yet to be achieved. In early 1992, a group of Romani intellectuals formed a second Romani political party, the Democratic Progressive Party of the Roms in Macedonia, headed

---

[14] Like other ethnopolitical parties in Macedonia, the leadership of PCER denies that the party is "mononational" and points to the existence of party members belonging to other nationalities to demonstrate this (Čangova 1991). As with other ethnopolitical parties, however, the fact remains that the party's political concerns are focused on a specific ethnic group. In 1991 the party changed its name to Party for the Complete Emancipation of the Roms of Macedonia (Romani: *Partija Saste Emancipacijake e Romengiri tari Makedonija,* Macedonian: *Partija za Celosna Emancipacija na Romite na Makedonija*).

[15] The other five are Macedonian, Albanian, Turkish, Aromanian, and Serbian.

[16] The phrase was *Referendumeske '91. Va: sijam suvereno thaj korkorifundirimi Makedonijake* '[pertaining to] Referendum '91. Yes: I am for a sovereign and independent Macedonia' (Arli dialect). The advertisement was hexaglossic, but there were also monoglot Romani-language posters encouraging Roms to vote in the referendum.

VICTOR A. FRIEDMAN

by Bekir Arif. A major issue for the new party was increasing the pace of education-
al reforms (Nova Makedonija 21.10.1992, 4). There was also disagreement between
the two parties over questions of language standardization, dialectal compromise and
the place of Romani in educational institutions. Among the debated issues were
whether Romani should be a language of instruction (Macedonian: *nastaven jazik*) or
a language of study (Macedonian: *nastaven predmet*) and whether or not the standard
was to be based entirely on the Arli dialect, spoken by the majority or Roms in
Macedonia, or whether elements of other dialects should be included. Table 5 gives a
selection of diagnostic words illustrating some of the most salient phonological, mor-
phological, and lexical differences among the main dialects spoken in Macedonia.
Among the features illustrated are the following: palatal mutation of dentals before
stressed /i/ ('work'), treatment of inherited intervocalic retroflex *ṇd ('bread'),
palatalization and loss of /n/ intervocalically before stressed /i/ ('water'), formation of
the aorist ('I gave'), the shibboleth 'thus', intervocalic /s/ in grammatical suffixes
('with God'), shape and gender in the 3pl pronoun ('they'), and shape of the definite
article (nominative plural = masculine nominative singular vs nominative plural =
oblique singular and plural and distinct feminine nominative singular vs feminine
nominative singular = nominative and oblique plural).

Table 5
Examples of Romani dialectal differences

Burgudži	buci	maro	pani	diyom	kidjal	devlcsa	on, ol	o-i-o-c
Arli	buti	maro	pani	dindjum	agjar	devlca	on, ola	o-i-o-c
Džambaz	buki	manro	pai	diyem	gëja	devlcsa	von	o-i-e-e
Gurbet	buči	marno	pai	diyem	gaja	devlcha	von	o-c-c-c
gloss	*work*	*bread*	*water*	*I gave*	*thus*	*with God*	*they*	*the:*
								Ms-Fs-
								Np-Obl

It was shortly after this split in the Romani political scene occurred that, on Novem-
ber 20–21, 1992 the Ministry of Education of the Republic of Macedonia and the
Philological Faculty of the University of Skopje sponsored a conference for the
purpose of reaching an agreement concerning the introduction of Romani as a
course of study in Macedonian schools.[17] The conference was attended by a num-
ber of Macedonian Roms active in Romani intellectual life, including Šaip Jusuf,

---

    [17] Concerned Macedonian intellectuals were already attempting to respond to the need for
Romani-language education by the summer of 1991, when Dimitar Mirčev, who was then a professor
of Sociology at the University of Skopje, discussed with me the possibility of holding a normativiza-
tion conference in Skopje.

Trajko Petrovski, Ǵuneš Mustafa, Šaip Isen, Ramo Rušidovski, Tahir Nuhi, Iliaz Zendel, and others. Also present were Donald Kenrick and myself as well as members of the Philological Faculty of Skopje University and the Macedonian Academy of Sciences, most notably Olivera Jašar-Nasteva and Liljana Minova-Ǵurkova as well as Živko Cvetkovski, head of the Macedonian Department. Representatives of the political factions were also present at the opening session, but the chair of the meeting deftly prevented the meeting from becoming a series of political speeches and expeditiously turned the conference into a language standardization working group.

It quickly emerged that the Roms present at this conference were not in favor of the establishment of Romani as a language of instruction in a parallel education system but rather the teaching of Romani as a subject in elementary schools and pedagogical academies with a view to preparing a cadre of teachers and ultimately a lectureship and Department of Romani at the University of Skopje. As mentioned above, one of the explicit goals of Romani politics in Macedonia is the establishment of such a Department, but a qualified cadre of faculty has yet to be trained.

The document that resulted from these deliberations, which was reproduced in full and analyzed in detail in Friedman (1995), was agreed upon by representatives of the various political currents as well as by the intellectuals that produced it. The document addresses a number of issues in Romani language standardization, e.g. the Arli dialect is specified as the base, with elements from other dialects being incorporated into it, and basic orthographic, morphophonological and morphological rules are specified in a series of twelve points. The document should be viewed in the context of Jusuf–Kepeski (1980), Kenrick (1981), and Cortiade *et al.* (1991). As indicated above, both Jusuf and Kenrick were present at the conference. Moreover, both Jusuf and Kenrick participated in the deliberations of the Language Commission at the Fourth World Romani Congress, at which Cortiade *et al.* (1991) was discussed and signed. Jusuf was a signatory to that document, but Kenrick was not. Mention should also be made here of Hancock (1975; 1993), which, while important for the history of Romani standardization, did not have a direct bearing on the 1992 conference. The former had been superseded by subsequent publications and events while the latter had not yet appeared.

Orthography has always been an issue for the standardization of Romani. Because efforts at Romani education have taken place in the context of the languages of other countries, as many orthographies have been used for Romani as there are standard languages with which is has been in contact. Although Romani in Cyrillic-using countries such as Russia and Bulgaria has been written in Cyrillic, a consensus has emerged to use a Latin based orthography as the most universally accessible (cf. Kyuchukov *et al.* 1995)—considerations which also influenced the

choice of alphabet for Albanian (see Skendi 1967, 366–90). In the case of Macedonia, which in the context of former Yugoslavia had an established bi-alphabetical tradition, Romani has always been written using a Latin orthography similar to that of Kenrick (1981), although Jusuf and Kepeski (1980) also use a Macedonian-based Cyrillic orthography for Romani in their Macedonian parallel text. At the 1992 Skopje conference, Macedonian Roms preferred to continue developing an orthography like that of the Second World Romani Congress (Kenrick 1981) rather than the Fourth.

Table 6 illustrates some of the salient differences between the Fourth World Romani Congress orthography and that of the 1992 Macedonian Conference.

Table 6
Comparison of current Romani orthographies

	Cortiade *et al.* (1991)	1992 Macedonian Conference	dialectal pronunciations	
Rom (loc. sg.)	Romesθe	Romeste	[romeste]	[romesće]
Rom (loc. pl.)	Romenθe	Romende	[romende]	[romende]
Rom (abl. sg.)	Romesθar	Romestar	[romestar]	
Rom (abl. pl.)	Romenθar	Romendar	[romendar]	
Rom (dat. sg.)	Romesqe	Romeske	[romesće]	[romeske]
Rom (dat. pl.)	Romenqe	Romenge	[romende]	[romenge]
done (pl. pt.)	kerde	kerde	[ćerde]	[kerđe]
Rom (instr. sg.)	Romeça	Romesa	[Romea]	[Romesa]
you do (sg.)	keresa	keresa	[ćerea]	[keresa]

The treatment of underlying or historical dental and/or velar stops is an area of both considerable and salient dialectal variation and morphophonemic alternation in Romani. These phonemes can be pronounced as palatals and/or with affricated or fricativized articulation in various dialects of Macedonia and elsewhere (see Ventcel'–Čerenkov 1976 and Boretzky–Igla 1994 for details). Moreover, as seen in Table 6 (and mentioned earlier), some Romani dialects eliminate intervocalic /s/ in certain grammatical morphemes. Cortiade *et al.* (1991) articulates the principle of using underlying forms in most environments, but has special graphic symbols for the above mentioned morphophonemic alternations in their function as case markers (which Cortiade *et al.* 1991 treats as postpositions, but see Friedman 1991), viz. θ, q, and ç for dentals, velars, and /s/, respectively. Thus in the orthography of

Cortiade *et al.* (1991) the same morphophonemic alternations have different spellings, while the same graphic symbols have different pronunciations whose dialectal variations are represented by different letters in roots and verbal affixes on the one hand and in case affixes on the other, as illustrated in Table 6.

On 17 November 1993 the first issue of a Romani monthly newspaper, *Romani Sumnal/Romski Svet* 'Romani World', was published in Skopje under the editorial leadership of Oskar Mamut, who is also employed in the Romani-language division of Radio-Television Skopje.[18] The newspaper is bilingual, with all material in both Romani and Macedonian. The issue of the codification of a Romani standard language is explicitly addressed on the first page of the first number, where the editorial board states that one of the tasks they have set themselves is contributing to the development and use of literary Romani. As such, the paper can be taken as a measure of the progress and ongoing concerns of the standardization of Romani in the Republic of Macedonia. The role of the mass media is potentially of great importance in language standardization.

In its basic principles, *Romano Sumnal* represents a development in the direction described by the decisions reached at the 1992 Skopje conference and indicated in Jusuf–Kepeski (1980), namely an Arli base with elements from other dialects using a Latin orthography of the type in wide use in Eastern Europe, including Jusuf–Kepeski (1980), and recommended at the 1971 standardization conference (cf. also Hancock 1993; 1995). Nonetheless, specifics of the solutions reached by *Romano Sumnal* differ from those seen elsewhere (see Friedman 1997). Taken as a whole, *Romano Sumnal* clearly represents a step forward in the standardization of Romani in the Republic of Macedonia. The editors are aware of standardization issues and are attempting to make concrete contributions towards a consistent and usable norm.

Of particular importance to *Romano Sumnal* was the issue of education. Four articles were dedicated to the topic in the first issue (Bajramovska 1993; Mamut 1993; Darman 1993; Jašarov 1993). Darman (1993) speaks directly to the concerns of Romani parents for creating a home environment conducive to the success of children who are just beginning school. The other three articles are all critical of the fact that at the time they were written, Romani was still not a subject in any school curriculum in Macedonia, that the rate of educational success among Romani children is not showing any signs of increase, and that the few Romani intellectuals either hide their origins or bicker with one another rather than cooperating. While the very existence of a newspaper complaining about these conditions is itself

---

[18] Although the newspaper was intended as a monthly, it has so far appeared only thrice: 17 November 1993, 10 December 1993, and 1 April 1994.

something of a step forward, the fact remains that Romani education, like many other social programs, has not progressed with alacrity. Emilija Simoska (p.c. 8.XII.95), former Minister of Education, observed that education is functioning as a proxy for interethnic relations so not enough attention is being paid to curriculum.

Nonetheless, progress is being made. When in June–July 1994, at the behest of the International Conference on Former Yugoslavia (ICFY) and under the sponsorship of the Council of Europe, an extraordinary census was carried out in the Republic of Macedonia (see Friedman 1996a), Romani was one of the six official languages of census forms and documents, including the training manual for enumerators, in accordance with Article 35 of the census law. The published materials connected with the 1994 census represent the first official use of Romani in the Republic of Macedonia and were thus intimately connected with the standardization of Literary Romani in that country. The language of the census forms displays significant progress in the achievement of standardization and as such represents a significant development of Romani in official usage (Friedman 1996b).

In September 1995 Šaip Jusuf's Romani textbook for elementary schools was finally in press at Prosvetno Delo, the reviews having been completed in July of that year. Although Jusuf originally envisioned a series of textbooks beginning with grade one, the current book is intended for grade 3. The manuscript contained about a hundred texts, in poetry (24) and prose (80). The amount of material is about twice as much as can be covered in a year at two hours a week (i.e. 70 hours), and the question of norm versus dialect is not explicitly addressed. The final version also included a vocabulary and pages of pictures for stories. One problem with the review process was that the two reviewers with pedagogical expertise knew no Romani, while the Romani reviewer had no pedagogical experience. The Romani reviewer criticized the text for excessive Indicism (e.g., using *namaste* 'hail' (Hindi) instead of *sar sijan* 'how are you' or *šukar/lačho dive* 'good day', the Indicism *badali* instead of the colloquial Turkism *buluti* 'cloud'), but sometimes picked on dialectal details (suggesting *kanzavuri* for *kanauri* 'hedgehog', *farba* (from German) for *renki* (from Persian, probably via Turkish) 'color' (cf. Friedman 1989). However, he also caught orthographic inconsistencies, e.g. the need to treat the syllable *o-* in the 3sg acc. pronoun as part of the stem: *ole* and not *o le* (as if *o* were the definite article). The textbook was officially published and announced to the public on 8 April 1996, but as of this writing (March 1997) it had not yet been released due to financial complications.

Meanwhile, developments in neighboring and other Balkan countries are taking place each independent of the other. In Albania (Kurtiàde 1994) the Fourth World Romani Congress orthography and pedagogical materials sponsored by the European commission are circulating, but it is unclear if any of them are in actual

use. Similarly, in Romania a pedagogical manual for teacher training complete with lessons using the Fourth World Romani Congress orthography (Cortiade *et al.* 1991) has been published (Sarău 1991; cf. also Sarău 1992) and European Commission-sponsored projects are being undertaken (Interface 15[8/94], 5), but so far Romani is only a language of study at the university level (Lemon: Romnet 95.XII.20). In Bulgaria some materials use an adaptation of Bulgarian Cyrillic for Romani (e.g. Malikov 1992), but an English-type Latin orthography using digraphs rather than diacritics is also in use (Kyuchukov et al. 1995), e.g. *sh=š, ch=č, chh/chsh=čh, j=dž, zh=ž, x=ks, h=x* or *h, y=j, ts=c, ph, th, kh, w*=schwa, and studies have been conducted for bilingual literacy (Kyuchukov 1995).[19] Romani is also being taught at the University of Sofia (1995–97) by Birgit Igla, a non-Rom specialist in Romani with extensive fieldwork experience in Balkan Romani. In Greece, various studies have been conducted and conferences held, but none of them are concerned with education of Romani children in Romani (Interface 18[5/95], 18; 13[2/94], 15–20; 8[11/92], 12). Rather, in accordance with Greece's assimilationist language policies towards its minorities (cf. Human Rights Watch 1994), the concern is with teaching Greek. Although former Yugoslavia was home to some of the most progressive Romani activities such as the first Romani summer school, which was held in Belgrade (Interface 16[11/94], 3), the war has resulted in the persecution of Roms living in the FRY and other Former-Serbo-Croatian speaking lands, and many have fled to Western Europe (see Interface 19[8/95], 20–2).

In conclusion we can say that while progress in Romani language education in the Republic of Macedonia has been slow, it has been made. Romani has gradually risen in status from total legal absence to legal equality with all other minority languages, even if the *de facto* realization has not yet met the *de jure* possibilities. The standardization of Romani and the fixing of the Arli dialectal base with other elements, together with a consistent orthography, has made significant progress from Jusuf–Kepeski (1980), to Romano Sumnal (1993) to the census (1994) to Jusuf's third grade textbook (1996). Similarly, the orthography conference of 1992 probably helped make actors aware of the need for consistency. While activity in the Republic of Macedonia has not been coordinated with that going on in neighboring countries or western Europe, it is endeavoring to meet the needs of the people for whom it is intended, and is certainly in advance of, e.g., Greece or FRY. Although politics is clearly playing a role, nonetheless, the essential issues remain pedagogical and normative. The introduction of Romani as a language of study at the elementary level has the potential to exert an enormous influence on the future codification of Romani both within the Republic of Macedonia and beyond its bor-

---

[19] Cf. also Hübschmannová *et al.* (1991), which uses a Czech based orthography.

ders. While Romani education in Macedonia is progressing slowly, it is nonetheless perceptibly progressing, and if other circumstances in the region allow, the future promises to be better than the past.

References

Abduramanoski, I. 1994. Veštačka delba na Romite. In: Nova Makedonija 30.X.94: 7.
Antonovska, S. *et al.* 1991. Broj i struktura na naselenieto vo Republika Makedonija po opštini i nacionalna pripadnost: Sostojba 31.03.1991 godina. Republički zavod za statistika, Skopje.
Antonovska, S. *et al.* 1994a. Statistički godišnik na Republika Makedonija 1993. Republički zavod za statistika, Skopje.
Antonovska, S. *et al.* 1994b. Popis '94: Podatoci za segašnosta i idninata. Prvi rezultati. Soopštenie 1. Zavod za statistika, Skopje.
Antonovska, S. *et al.* 1994c. Popis '94: Podatoci za segašnosta i idninata. Prvi rezultati. Soopštenie 2. Zavod za statistika, Skopje.
Antonovska, S. *et al.* 1996. Popis naselenieto, domak'instvata, stanovite i zemjodelskite stopanstva vo Republika Makedonija, 1994 godina, kn. 1, Naselenie po nacionalna pripadnost, veroispoved, majčin jazik i državjanstvo. Republički zavod za statistika, Skopje.
Bajramovska, V. 1993. Romani siklana—suno ja nane suno!? In: Romano Sumnal 17.XI.93: 4.
Balić, S. *et al.* 1984. Jaga—Vatre. Savet smotra kulturnih dostignicá roma SR Srbije, Leskovac.
Bárány, Z. 1994. Living on the edge: East European Roma in postcommunist politics. In: Slavic Review 53: 321–44.
Bárány, Z. 1995. The Roma in Macedonia: Ethnic politics and the marginal condition in a Balkan state. In: Ethnic and Racial Studies 18: 515–31.
Boretzky, N. – Igla, B. 1994. Wörterbuch Romani–Deutsch–Englisch: Mit einer Grammatik der Dialektvarianten. Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden.
Bugarski, R. 1992. Language in Yugoslavia: Situation, policy, planning. In: Bugarski, R. – Hawkesworth, C. (eds.): Language planning in Yugoslavia, 10—26. Slavica, Columbus.
Chalumeau, N. – Gualdaroni, R. 1995. France: The general and scholastic situation of the Gypsy community. In: Interface 18: 9—17.
Cortiade, M. 1984. Romani fonetika thaj lekhipa. Peskekerdo, Filǎn Than (expanded and reprinted 1986 Pobjeda, Titograd).
Cortiade (Kurtiàde), M. 1990. Rromano startoro. Svjetlost, Sarajevo.
Cortiade, M. *et al.* 1991. I alfabèta e standardone Rromane ćhibaqiri, Décizia: I Rromani Alfabèta. In: Informaciaqoro Lil e Rromane Uniaqoro 1–2: 7–8.
Cortiade, M. 1994. Sikavipen sar te siklŏn e ćhavorre e širpustikaça. Centre National de Documentation Pedagogique de Midi-Pyrenées, Toulouse.
Čangova, K. 1991. Na Romite treba da im se pomogne: Razgovor so Faik Abdi, pretsedatel na PCERM. In: Nova Makedonija 15.X.95: 4.
Dalbello, M. 1989. Prilog bibliografiji o Romima (Ciganima) u SFR Jugoslaviji. In: Šipka, M. (ed.): Jezik i kultura Roma, 429–99. Insitut za proučavanje nacionalnih odnosa, Sarajevo.
Darman, L. 1993. E avgo sikljovneskere avgune hape. In: Romano Sumnal 17.XI.93: 6.
Dimić, T. 1979. Kana vavas ando foro—Dolazeći sa vašara. Irig, Novi Sad.
Dimić, T. 1986. Ćidimata e rromane đilendar—-Romska narodna poezija. Matica Srpska, Novi Sad.

Djurić, R. 1979. Bi kheresko bi limoresko—Bez doma bez groba. Nolit, Belgrade.

Duijzings, G. 1992. De Egyptenaren in Kosovo en Macedonië. In: Amsterdams Sociologisch Tijdschrift 18(2): 24—38.

Duijzings, G. 1997. The making of the Egyptians in Kosovo and Macedonia. In: Vermeulen, H. – Govers, C. (eds): The politics of ethnic consciousness, St. Martin's, New York.

Friedman, V.A. 1985a. Balkan Romani modality and other Balkan languages. In: Folia Slavica 7: 381–9.

Friedman, V.A. 1985b. The sociolinguistics of Literary Macedonian. In: International Journal of the Sociology of Language 52: 31–57.

Friedman, V.A. 1985c. Problems in the codification of a Standard Romani literary language. In: Grumet, J. (ed.): Papers from the Fourth and Fifth Annual Meetings: Gypsy Lore Society, North American Chapter, 56–75. Gypsy Lore Society, New York.

Friedman, V.A. 1989. Toward defining the position of Turkisms in Romani. In: Šipka, M. (ed.): Jezik i kultura Roma, 251–67. Insitut za proučavanje nacionalnih odnosa, Sarajevo.

Friedman, V.A. 1991. Romani nominal inflection: Cases or postpositions? In: Studia gramatyczne 11 (=Problemy opisu gramatycznego języków słowiańskych): 57–64. Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw.

Friedman, V.A. 1995. Romani standardization and status in the Republic of Macedonia. In: Matras, Y. (ed.): Romani in contact: The history, structure, and sociology of a language, 203–17. Benjamins, Amsterdam.

Friedman, V.A. 1996a. Observing the observers: Language, ethnicity, and power in the 1994 Macedonian census and beyond. In: Rubin, B. (ed.): Toward comprehensive peace in Southeastern Europe: Conflict prevention in the South Balkans, 81–105/119–26. Council on Foreign Relations/Twentieth Century Fund, New York.

Friedman, V.A. 1996b. Romani and the census in the Republic of Macedonia. In: Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society (Fifth Series) 6: 89–101.

Friedman, V.A. 1997. Linguistic form and content in the Romani-language press. In: Matras, Y. – Bakker, P. – Kyuchukov, H. (eds.), The Typology and dialectology of Romani, 181–96. Benjamins, Amsterdam.

Friedman, V.A. – Dankoff, R. 1991. The earliest text in Balkan (Rumelian) Romani: A passage from Evliya Çelebi's Seyāḥatnāme. In: Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society (Fifth Series) 1: 1–20.

Hadži-Ristik, M. 1994. Prašanjeto za etnogenezata na Egipḱanite vo Makedonija. In: Nova Makedonija 13–17.IX.1994: 16, 16, 15, 22, 9.

Hancock, I. 1975. Problems in the creation of a standard dialect of Romanés. (= Social Sciences Research Council Working Papers in Sociolinguistics No. 25.) ERIC, Arlington VA.

Hancock, I. 1993. The emergence of a union dialect of North American Vlax Romani, and its implications for an international standard. In: International Journal of the Sociology of Language 99: 91–104.

Hancock, I. 1995. A handbook of Vlax Romani. Slavica, Columbus.

Haugen, E. 1966. Semicommunication: The language gap in Scandinavia. In: Sociological Inquiry 36: 280–97.

Haugen, E. 1968. The Scandinavian languages as cultural artifacts. In: Fishman, J. – Ferguson, C. – Das Gupta, J. (eds): Language problems of developing nations, 267–84. John Wiley & Sons, New York.

Hayden, R. 1995. Review of Woodward 1995. In: Slavic Review 54: 1114–5.

Hübschmannová, M. *et al.* 1991. Romsko-český a česko-romský kapesní slovník. Státní pedagogické nakladatelství, Prague.

Human Rights Watch/Helsinki. 1994. The Macedonians of Greece. Human Rights Watch, New York.

Interface. Information newsletter of the Gypsy Research Centre. Gypsy Research Centre, Université René Descartes, Clichy.

Jašar-Nasteva, O. 1992. Soziolinguistische Aspekte des makedonischen und der anderen Sprachen in der Republik Makedonien. In: Welt der Slaven 37: 188–210.

Jašar-Nasteva, O. 1997. A contribution to the study of the revival of the Aromanians of Macedonia (based on an autographed manuscript by G. Prličev). In: Balkanistica 10: 24–54.

Jašarov, S. 1993. Simfonijakoro orkestri, prima violina agorutne hevja ki bašalni. In: Romano Sumnal 17.XI.93: 7.

Jusuf, Š. 1996. Sikljova romani čhib. Prosvetno Delo, Skopje.

Jusuf, Š. – Kepeski, K. 1980. Romani gramatika—Romska gramatika. Naša Kniga, Skopje.

Jusuf, Š. *et al.* (transl.) 1978. Amen sam e Titoske, O Tito si amaro. (Mi smo Titovi, Tito je naš by Drago Zdunić *et al.*) Univerzum, Ljubljana.

Katona, L. 1969. Le dialecte turc de la Macédoine de l'Ouest. In: Türk dili araştırmaları yıllığı belleten, 57–194.

Kenrick, D. 1981. Romano alfabeto. In: Loli Phabaj 1: 3–4.

Kochanowski, J. 1963. Gypsy studies, Part 1. International Academy of Indian Culture, New Delhi.

Koneski, B. 1950. Za padežite. In: Makedonski jazik 1: 165–72.

Kopitar, J. 1829. Albanische, walachische und bulgarische Sprache. In: Jahrbücher der Literatur 46: 59–106.

Kostov, K. 1973. Zur Bedeutung des Zigeunerischen für die Erforschung grammatischer Interferenzscheinungen. In: Balkansko ezikoznanie 14: 99–113.

Krasnići, A. 1981. Čergarendje Jaga—Čergarske Vatre. Edinstvo, Prishtina.

Kurtiàde 1994 = see Cortiade 1994.

Kyuchukov, H. 1995. Romany children and their preparation for literacy: A case study. Tilburg University Press, Tilburg.

Kyuchukov, H. *et al.* 1995. Romani alfabeta—Romska azbuka. Bulvest-2000, Sofia.

Latifić, I. *et al.* 1970. Vitalni, etnička i migraciona obeležja. Popis stanovništva 1961. Savezni zavod za statistiku, Belgrade.

Ljubisavljević, M. 1990. Nismo ptice selice. In: Svet 9.218: 34—35.

Lunt, H. 1952. A grammar of the Macedonian literary language. Državno knigoizdatelstvo, Skopje.

Lunt, H. 1984. Some sociolinguistic aspects of Macedonian and Bulgarian. In: Stolz, B. – Titunik, I. – Doležel, L. (eds.): Language and literary theory: In honor of Ladislav Matejka (= Papers in Slavic Philology 5), 83–132. University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

Mamut, O. 1993. Soske o sikle stagnirinena!? In: Romano Sumnal 17.XI.93: 5.

Malikov, J. 1992. Cigansko-bălgarski rečnik. Fondacija Otvoreno obštestvo, Sofia.

Matras, Y. 1994. Structural Balkanisms in Romani. In: Reiter, N. (ed.): Sprachlicher Standard und Substandard in Südosteuropa und Osteuropa, 195–210. Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden.

Pekevski, B. *et al.* 1973. Naselenie po narodnost vo SR Makedonija. Popis na naselenieto i stanovite, 1971 god. Republički zavod za statistika, Skopje.

Petrović, R. 1992. Demografske osobenosti Roma u Jugoslavii. In: Mačura, F. (ed.): Razvitak Roma u Jugoslavii, 115–27. SANU, Beograd.

Petrovski, T. (transl.) 1989. Parne detharina (Beli mugri by Kočo Racin). Naša kniga, Skope.

Predlog. 1990. Programa na Partijata za celosna emancipacija na Romite od SR Makedonija. MS. 9pp.

Puxon, G. 1979. Romanès and language policy in Jugoslavia. In: International Journal of the Sociology of Language 19: 83–90.

Risteski, S. 1991. Narodni prikazni, predanija i običai kaj egipḱanite/egupcite vo Makedonija. Nezavisni izdanija, Ohrid.

Salijesor, S. 1984. Bahtale dive atar mire sune. Univerziteti e bućengor, Preševo.

Sarău, G. 1991. Limba romaní. Editura didactică și pedagogică, Bucharest.

Sarău, G 1992. Mic dicționar rom-român. Kriterion, Bucharest.

Savezni zavod za statistiku. 1954. Stanovništvo po narodnosti (Knj. 9): Konačni rezultati popisa stanovništva od 15 marta 1948 godine. Savezni zavod za statistiku, Belgrade.

Savezni zavod za statistiku. 1981. Statistički bilten broj 1295 (1981). Popis stanovništva, domačinstva i stanova u 1981 godini: Nacionalni sastav stanovništva po opštinama. Savezni zavod za statistiku, Belgrade.

Savezni zavod za statistiku. 1988. Statistički Godišnjak Jugoslavije (Knj. 35). Savezni zavod za statistiku, Belgrade.

Silber, L. – Little, A. 1995. The death of Yugoslavia. Penguin, London.

Silverman, C. 1995a. Persecution and politicization: Roma (Gypsies) of Eastern Europe. In: Cultural Survival Quarterly 19: 43–9.

Silverman, C. 1995b. Roma of Shuto Orizari, Macedonia: Class, politics, and community. In: Kideckel, D. (ed.): East-Central European communities: the struggle for balance in turbulent times, 197–216. Westview Press, Boulder.

Skendi, S. 1967. The Albanian national awakening. Princeton University Press, Princeton.

Stanković, V. 1992. Romi u svetlu podataka jugoslovenske statistike. In: Mačura, F. (ed.), Razvitak Roma u Jugoslavii, 159—79. SANU, Beograd.

Škiljan, D. 1992. Standard languages in Yugoslavia. In: Bugarski, R. – Hawkesworth, C. (eds.): Language planning in Yugoslavia, 27–42. Slavica, Columbus.

Tanasković, D. 1992. The planning of Turkish as a minority language in Yugoslavia. In: Bugarski, R. – Hawkesworth, C. (eds.): Language planning in Yugoslavia, 140–61. Slavica, Columbus.

Uhlik, R. 1937. Romane gjilja—Ciganske pesme. Vučen Štrbac, Prijedor.

Uhlik, R. 1947. Srpskohrvatsko–ciganski rečnik (romane alava). Svjetlost, Sarajevo.

Uhlik, R. 1983. Srpskohrvatsko–Romski–Engleski rječnik (Romengo alavari). Svjetlost, Sarajevo.

Ventcel', T.V. – Čerenkov, L.N. 1976. Dialekty ciganskogo jazyka. In: Konrad, N. I. (ed.): Jazyki Azii i Afriki I, 283L. N. 332. Nauka, Moscow.

Woodward, S.L. 1995. Balkan tragedy. The Brookings Institution, Washington DC.

Xhaferi, A. 1995. Regjistrimi i jashtëzakonshëm i popullsisë '94. In: Tribuna-Sh 2(23/24): 12–3.

Zemon, R. (ed.) 1996. Zbornik na trudovi za etnogenezata na Egipḱanite vo Makedonija. Logos-T, Skopje.

Address of the author: Victor A. Friedman
                          The University of Chicago
                          Dept. of Slavic Languages and Literatures
                          1130 East 59th Street
                          Chicago, Illionis 60637
                          e-mail: vfriedm@midway.uchicago.edu