János Imre Heltai, Eszter Tarsoly

3 Romani and translanguaging

In this chapter we elaborate our theoretical stance, which is to distance ourselves from groupism-based approaches to the treatment of Roma identity questions and linguistic practices, and focus on ways of speaking linked to Romani, presenting them as parts of heterogeneous repertoires. Groupism labels a way of thinking based on the idea of fixed ethnic and linguistic categories (Brubaker 2002, 2004). In the lack of a defined territory, nation state or a state-like entity, the mainstream groupism-based identity politics becomes particularly problematic, and the socially constructed nature of ethnic categorisation (Ladányi and Szelényi 2001) is more striking than in the case of other ethnic groups in Central-Europe. By contrast, from an anthropological viewpoint, Stewart argues that Gypsies "who always live immersed inside and dispersed among majority populations and are invariably bi- or multilingual, do not fit the 'one culture, one territory, one social structure' model at all" (2013: 417).

Roma cultural and identity politics in Eastern and Central Europe (e.g. Mirga and Gheorghe 1997; Marushiakova and Popov 2001, 2021) often follow groupism-based nation-state patterns, not only in the matter of standardisation, but also in the attempts to create political unity (for a critical overview from an anthropological point of view, cf. Fosztó 2003). From a groupism perspective, Marushiakova and Popov, for example, define the Roma as an "intergroup ethnic community", which is "divided into a widespread archipelago of separate groupings, split in various ways into metagroups, groups and subgroups" (2001: 33). Such political movements achieve modest results (Barany 2002), while the corresponding scientific approaches are challenged by anthropological viewpoints (e.g. Fosztó 2003; Surdu 2016; Law and Kováts 2018), underlining the nationalist roots and the contradictions of Roma ethnic struggles (for a critical analysis of related debates, cf. Acton 2018). The intended systematicity and homogeneity of groupism-based approaches is challenged by a variety of factors, most prominently by the disruption of ethnically constructed entities by social categorisations.

3.1 The challenges of ethnic and linguistic categorisations

Besides ethnicity, the term *Roma* denotes belonging to a certain social category across Europe and in Hungary. Social belonging has been connected to poor

socioeconomic status, but also to certain occupations or non- or semi-sedentirised (peripatic) ways of life (Törzsök 2001; Janko Spreizer 2013; Mirga 1992). Furthermore, racialised appearences also come into play in the construction on the Romas' difference from majority society members. Dark skin colour and black hair are frequently connected to the Roma by the majorities and sometimes by the Roma themselves. Accordingly, questions such as who is a Roma and who can decide who is a Roma are evergreen topics. Both self-identification and classifications by outsiders are based partly on ethnic, racial, social, or habitual criteria, all of which are often linked to issues of stigmatisation (cf. Lucassen 1991). There are studies showing that in times of economic crises, members of the most marginalised social groups are seen as Roma a generation later (Nagy 2007, 2015, 2020). There are also examples of the reverse: persons that have reached the living standards of the middle classes often dissociate themselves (and are dissociated) from the Roma in social discourses.

Groupism-based ideas permeate to a certain extent Romani studies, too, and result in academics retaining the idea of bounded groups in their arguments. Tremlett (2014) suggested that superdiversity is a helpful theoretical construct in revealing the complexity of discourses and social practices which contribute to the construction of and ethnic group, and it "allows a direction in Romani studies that moves beyond a fixed or limiting notion of 'ethnicity'" (844). It follows from our rejection of groupism that we see it neither practicable nor necessary to give the number of Roma or Romani speakers, either in Europe or in Hungary. The size of these numbers depends on the ideologies along which we construct an ethnic and/or linguistic group. Deleuze and Guattari highlight in their essay about rhizomatic multiplicities (1987) that "the number is no longer a universal concept measuring elements according to their emplacement in a given dimension, but has itself become a multiplicity that varies according to the dimensions considered" (8). We emphasise the rhizomatic multiplicity of social realities: instead of bounded groups such as "Roma" or "Romani speaking Roma" we see qualities of belonging which pull subjects in various directions with variable strength at different points in time. For instance, a young male student at university, with a Vlach Roma father and a Hungarian mother considers himself a Carpathian Rom, which linguistically and in its origins represents a different group from the Vlach Roma. He studied music in Budapest with a group of Carpathian (Hungarian) Roma and identitifies fully with this group, and the fact that he has no Carpathian Roma roots has little significance both for himself and his music teachers.

But just as there is no universal answer to the question of who is, and who is not, a Roma, it is also beyond our remit to decide what the linguistic practices linked to Romani are. Many Roma speak Romani only in specific environments and contexts. Many Roma conceptualise their language as not pure, consisting of

a mix of languages. Many weave into their everyday practices linguistic resources that they consider Romani without calling their speech Romani. Many Roma grow up in families where Romani is present but prefer other linguistic resources in their speech. The non-Roma remain often unaware that the Roma living in their environment speak Romani, including their teachers and interviewers completing census or research questionnaires. For these reasons, we find statistical data irrelevant to the study of the Roma's identity and linguistic practices. To indicate the extent of the issues we are dealing with here and the proportion of the population concerned, the number of speakers who (also) incorporate Romani resources into their everyday practices is in the millions in Europe, with hundreds of thousands of speakers in the Carpathian basin (For an overview of Romani languages in Europe cf. Matras 2002).

In addition to the challenges of the referencial complexities of the term *Roma*, the term *cigány* 'Gypsy', widespread in Central and Southeast Europe, reveals further challenges to ethnic categorisation. In Hungary, Romania, and Serbia many people labelled by others as Gypsy are considered bilingual, speaking the national language and Boyash (in language typological terms described as an Eastern-Romance variety, e.g. Tálos 2001; Landauer 2009), and claim a Boyash identity (Sorescu-Marinković, Kahl, and Sikimić 2021). Since the ethnonym *Roma* is seen as a Romani word for 'people' (the plural of *Rom* 'man'), Boyash speakers in Hungary label themselves with the ethnonym *cigány* 'Gypsy' and not *Roma*. Scientific discourses in Hungary have also adopted this practice and understand *Gypsy* as an umbrella term labelling a larger group than the term *Roma*, including also the Boyash. In addition, many people who are seen as Gypsy/Roma and who also self-identify as Gypsy/Roma, speak neither Romani nor Boyash but the national language. (For an analysis of linguistic ideologies in the scientific classification of Roma, cf. Bodó 2016: 159–174).

Except for small children or socially highly isolated persons, Romani speakers usually follow multilingual practices: besides Romani they speak the majority languages of the region they live in. Their Romani is usually not oriented toward a single prestige variety (standard), and it is often perceived as a language with a high proportion of elements from other languages. Research on mutual linguistic influences between Romani and other languages has a long tradition (Boretzky 1989; Bakker and Courthiade 1991). Para-Romani (Matras 2002: 242–248), following the paradigm of variational linguistics, is "a generic term for a set of contact varieties, in which most of the lexicon is from Romani, but most of the grammatical system is from another language" (Bakker 2020: 353). Secret languages and jargons focusing on lexis are also often associated with Roma and Romani (Matras and Tenser 2020), particularly in Western Europe. In Central and Eastern Europe, Roma communities are often socio-linguistically more salient and Romani can be

made available as a school subject with language examinations available in it. The varieties and typological diversity of Romani have been described in depth, and their discussion remains beyond the scope of the present volume (Matras, Bakker, and Kyuchukov 1997; Boretzky and Igla 2005; Bakker and Courthiade 1991; Matras 1995, 1998).

In Hungary, most of the Romani-speaking Roma are called Vlach-Roma and they speak, according to a diachronic approach, several varieties of the Vlach-Romani dialect group with a high proportion of words of Romanian origin (Bakker and Matras 1997: xvii). From a language-historical perspective, Romani and Romanian are both Indo-European languages, but despite of the similarity in their name they belong to entirely different branches, Romanian belonging to Eastern-Romance, thus closely related to Italian or French, while Romani has no such close affines in Europe. For speakers at our research site in Tiszavasvári, Hungary, older, for example Romanian contact features in the local Romani remain unnoticed. However, the Romani speakers in Tiszavasvári are very much concerned with the frequency and presence of words with a noticeable Hungarian origin. That is, resources due to earlier contacts with Romanian and other languages are seen as parts of the language, as it is understood and constructed by speakers in the present day, but results of recent and ongoing contact with Hungarian is assessed as a loss of the pure form of old Romani (cf. Abercrombie 2018).

There are classification attempts of Romani varieties from a language typological perspective, such as scalar-based decoupling of Romani and Para-Romani, as well as a genealogical and a diffusion model to describe a Romani variety spectrum (Bakker and Matras 1997; Matras 2005; Boretzky 2007; Elšík and Benišek 2020: 390). A wide range of Vlach-Romani varieties are registered in Hungary (Szalai 2007; Baló 2017), constituting units of both dialectal and ethnic bonding, going back to original tribal groupings (Erdős 1959). These exploratory models often provide a very detailed, multi-faceted overview of the diversity and stratification of varieties and contact phenomena. However, the contradictions described above underline that Romani, similar to Roma ethnicity, hardly fits into groupism-based categories. Sometimes the theorists themselves, such as Baló (2017) stress regarding the situation in Hungary the difficulty, inconsistency, and imperfection of categorisation: "the Roma tribes outlined by Erdős (1959), which, in his view, correspond to language varieties, are either sporadically documented or not documented at all. [. . .] However, more recent data collected by myself show that, because of the type and extent of the variation, both the delineation of the tribes (in case they still exist) and the one-to-one correspondence between groups and language varieties is questionable" (Baló 2017: 220–221, translated by János Imre Heltai). Our experience in Tiszavasvári underlines Baló's observation. Vlach-Romani speakers at our research site do not mention any dialectal/ethnic

differentiation regarding their language and ethnic belonging, only that they speak Romani. Romani speakers at our other research site in Slovakia, Szímő (Zemné), live in a Hungarian speaking environment (a minority village); they also speak a variety classified as Vlach-Romani. We are unaware of any perceptions among them of specific ethnic or dialectal distinction of their language.

There are attempts of standardisation of Romani in several European states. These have mostly an impact on national or local level. They are conducted by a narrow group of intellectuals and activists, often with civil or academic support (Halwachs 2020) and (in lack of a state or state-like power centre) they are carried out in a decentralised and pluralistic way (Matras 2015). In Hungary for example, there is a possibility to take a school leaving exam or a language proficiency exam in the standardised Romani variety (a Vlach-Romani variety called Lovari). People might make use of this language certificate to meet requirements at university or in job search, as it is seen as an easier option than other languages such as English or German. In any case, most Roma in Hungary usually do not comply with standardisation efforts and the resources they provide. The Roma might be aware of some standardisation attempts, for instance, the Roma at our research sites might have a Romani translation of the Bible or some other printed materials, but their own Romani practices maintain a noticeable distance from standardised forms (cf. Acton and Klimová 2001; Abercombie 2018).

Due to the lack of institutional use of Romani (such as schools and other social institutions using standardised Romani), Romani speakers do not have an interest to follow standard forms and adapt their ways of speaking to a standard variety (Busch 2012a). In the countries where they live, social progress and competitiveness in education is based on the standard variety of the given national language and not a Romani standard. Nevertheless, living in societies shaped by strong monolingual and standard ideologies, Romani speakers are affected to a great extent by standard-language ideologies as well. As a result, speakers perceive their own non-standard Romani practices increasingly as not pure, mixed and therefore less worthy. Centres of standardisation fail to spread standard linguistic forms, but they successfully circulate standard ideologies (Abercrombie 2018). The Roma in Tiszavasvári typically assume that a pure Romani variety exists somewhere else, even if they are not familiar with it. They located this pure variety in discussions in various ways. Some of them linked it to surrounding villages, others to Budapest.

In Hungary, in the few cases Romani is present in education it features as a heritage or a foreign language, typically as a by-product of national or local standardisation attempts. Romani was provided in the first decade of this century in a dozen schools as foreign or heritage language (Lakatos 2012; for a critical analysis cf. Orsós 2015; Lakatos 2018), and the situation did not change significantly since

then. As there is no teacher training for Romani teachers, Romani is taught by Roma or non-Roma teachers holding a language certificate and a degree in another field. The few teaching materials in Romani follow an alphabet developed in the Romani standardisation project in the 1980s (Choli Daróczi and Feyér 1988; Rostás-Farkas and Karsai 1991; for an analysis, cf. Heltai 2020 and Chapter 14.1), containing letters which do not belong to the Hungarian alphabet. Texts based on this standardised orthography are not easily readable for the Roma who were taught the Hungarian alphabet at school (Réger 1995: 86). Additionally, authors or translators of these materials make use of individual word creations or use words which are part of their local vernacular but unfamiliar to others.

The above considerations reveal tricky and tenacious problems. The next part of this chapter argues that the concept of translanguaging, replacing *named language* with the notion of *repertoire*, offers a starting point to the resolution of some of these problems.

3.2 Translanguaging as an alternative to standardisation

Standardisation attempts of Romani, resulting from prevailing monolingual and standard ideologies in Europe, are ongoing, yet controversial. Hence, it remains problematic to introduce Romani into educational settings. Translanguaging-based education offers a more realistic chance, than the introduction of a standardised Romani variety as language of instruction, for speakers of Romani to enhance their success in school.

Translanguaging as understood in this volume is a concept based on the assumption that speakers' repertoires are not divided into named languages: they are unitary (García 2014; Vogel and García 2017); thus, the knowledge about languages and the consciousness about being a mono- bi- or multilingual person is a result of social learning. Languages exist as social facts (Kleyn and García 2019; Otheguy, García, and Reid 2015), but, translanguaging scholarship argues, it is not necessary to assume "a cognitive duality corresponding to the social duality" (Otheguy, García, and Reid 2019: 626–627). Further important features of translanguaging include multimodality, that is, human communication including body language and gestures (García and Otheguy 2020: 25) and the interconnectedness of cognitive systems (Li 2018: 20). This volume addresses the multimodality of learners' experience in a translanguaging educational environment. Translanguaging scholars view the diversity of speaking not as a system of languages and varieties, but as the dynamic combinability of linguistic resources appearing in speakers' repertoires. Category-

creating procedures concerning language boundaries develop in dynamic and complex ways in speakers' everyday life, and have a central role in this approach.

Translanguaging investigates the speakers' perspective on the connection between different languages and their linguistic resources, thus providing an alternative way of understanding spoken Romani and the everyday practices of Romani speakers. It is a concept for both describing human linguistic practices and building pedagogies based on such new perspectives. Auer (2019: 16) criticises translanguaging scholarship claiming that "disconnected phenomena of language contact and highly diverse bilingual practices are all subsumed under the new term". In our view, translanguaging is not a substitute for language typological approaches; it does not compete with research on language contact and variation. It is a suitable theoretical framework for understanding speakers' language practices and the ideologies underpinning them: it allows us to grasp how speakers make use of different linguistic forms, the way they combine, manipulate, and evaluate them.

These procedures have special characteristics among Romani-speaking Roma, often living in great numbers on the margins of societies in the nation states of Western, Central and South-Eastern Europe. They are, just like all other European citizens, experiencers of various national and European language policies. At the same time, they speak their non-standardised Romani along with other (mostly national) languages. Their multilingualism fits neither the (parallel) monolingual national nor the plurilingual European policies. Their multilingualism is surrounded by language ideologies of otherness, which project the non-Roma view of the Roma's marginalised social position on their linguistic practices. This is underpinned by speakers' own perceptions of Romani's status as a "mixed" language, becoming increasingly apparent as it is undergoing continuous change from generation to generation. It is also often claimed to be restricted to domestic domains (as a home language) and to community-internal language practices (such as secret languages). Translanguaging allows us to describe the linguistic practices of these (bi- or multilingual) speakers in a way which is detached from such ideologies.

Linguistic repertoire is a basic unit in the translanguaging approach. From a cognitive perspective, translanguaging is based on the assumption that the linguistic repertoire is unitary and not divided into languages (García 2014; Vogel and García 2017). The repertoire is a theoretical construct to model mental processes and representations, and as a result it cannot be photographed or documented in any way (Kovács and Téglás 1999: 221). Thus, the repertoire is not a tangible part of the observable biological reality. Therefore, the unitary nature of the repertoire is an assumption, not a proven biological fact.

Linguistic resources are basic units of complex repertoires. They include words, multi-word phrases, phonological realisations, etc. They can be both specific (concrete units of speech, such as words) and schematic (abstract patterns of

speech, such as syntactic units), or often a combination of the two (Blommaert and Backus 2013: 6). In addition to shared resources, communication assumes that speakers have a shared knowledge about how their resources are valued by others in order to avoid being treated as ridiculous or strange. People evaluate their abilities to speak depending on their environment; they use resources others understand and appreciate.

In an early conceptualisation, the repertoire was imagined as an inventory of resources (Gumperz 1964). The model has changed as research into linguistic ideologies has come to the fore, and today the repertoire is seen as constantly evolving in speakers' intersubjectivity, and not as an objectified unit (Busch 2012b, Blommaert and Backus 2013). This approach is based on Bakhtin's often cited idea: "our speech is filled with other people's words" (Busch 2012b cites Bachtin 1979 [1934–1935]: 185; Milani and Jonsson 2012 and Blackledge and Creese 2014 cite Bakhtin 1981). Resources of a person's repertoire are common property, shared with other speakers. Others, but not necessarily everyone, in their environment are familiar with these resources, too.

Speakers making use of resources have a common (and constantly changing) knowledge of their resources' social meanings. This knowledge is multifaceted and complex. It includes, for instance, thoughts and judgements about which language a particular resource belongs to. In Tiszavasvári, for example, pupils are convinced that some words of which their teachers think as Hungarian words with a Romani suffix are actually Romani words. In this case, the judgements of the non-Roma and Roma are different about the belonging of certain repertoire components to one language or the other. Such evaluations often change with time, depending on various factors, such as speakers' desire to distance themselves from, or come closer to, other speakers or communities. Discourses of togetherness, which make use of evaluative statements about language, characterise groups of speakers of various size and create cohesions across these groups.

The linguistic resources of the Roma in Tiszavasvári and Színő (Zemné) are linked by outsiders to more than one language. Most of them speak at home in ways which are considered to be Romani and Hungarian, and in Színő (Zemné) also Slovak. The Roma in Tiszavasvári experience their repertoire differently from the ways speakers of standardised languages do. They often formulate statements which reflect the unitary nature of their repertoire. In our ethnographic fieldwork, when we tried to inquire about the use of Romani and Hungarian as the dominant named languages in the speakers' practices, our attempts often failed, because we received answers such as "we speak Romani and also Hungarian" and even "we speak Romani, that is, Hungarian". In similar fieldwork situations regarding the children's language acquisition we often asked the parents how they speak to the children at home. One of the typical answers was that they spoke both Romani and

Hungarian. Another usual response included examples of the Hungarian phrases they teach children before they go to nursery, such as "I'd like a glass of water" and "I need to go to the bathroom". However, the nursery teachers' perception of how well the children know Hungarian differs from parents' reports.

This difference in judgements reflects a mismatch in what is perceived as Hungarian by the bilingual families and the monolingual nursery teachers. As the Roma do not sense the boundaries in their Romani and Hungarian resources in the same way as Hungarian monolinguals do, they believe that they speak Hungarian, and they speak it well, in situations when monolingual Hungarians do not necessarily think so. The language ideologies underpinning such judgements have an impact on everyday life, on Roma's ways of speaking and the children's linguistic behaviour in and outside of school. In situations which are dominated by the monolingual norm, such as everyday interactions in shops, classrooms and other spheres of public life, the differences in evaluative judgements about language lead to the silencing of ways of speaking characterising the Roma. The non-Roma often remain unaware of the Roma's Romani competences and translanguaged ways of speaking, which they have difficulties substituting with double monolingualism. Translanguaging as a pedagogical stance is instrumental in revealing children's fluid linguistic practices and the unitary nature of their repertoire. It is thus a helpful approach to overcoming the silencing of Roma pupils' ways of speaking at school.

Pedagogies applying a stance based on translanguaging, that is, the multiple but unitary repertoire of the learners, challenge monolingual pedagogies (Creese and Blackledge 2010; García 2014) and seek to develop learners' verbal and learning skills based on their whole linguistic repertoire (García and Kleyn 2016). In this way, "translanguaging theory helps teachers separate *language-specific performances i*n the named language (. . .) – from *general linguistic performances*, that is, the pupils' ability, for example, to argue a point, express inferences, communicate complex thoughts, use text-based evidence, tell a story, identify main ideas and relationships in complex texts, tell jokes, and so forth" (García and Kleyn 2016: 24, italics in the original). A teacher adopting a translanguaging stance includes all languages spoken by the pupils and concentrates on these general linguistic competences instead of competences linked to a single language.

Translanguaging in school helps acknowledging students' spontaneous linguistic practices and integrate them in everyday learning activities, even in classes conducted in a monolingual way. Cenoz and Gorter argue that pedagogical translanguaging in the United States has "more of a social justice focus and is seen as empowering minority students" (2021: 5, referencing García and Lin 2017). They highlight that in the original Welsh context (Williams 1994), the aim was different inasmuch as it was to extend competences in the minority language (cf. Baker 2003). Translanguaging in

this context is, thus, a pre-planned, teacher-guided activity, and a policy which introduces the use of several named languages in the same class (Williams 2002, 2012). The focus is not so much on the development of learners' unitary repertoire as on the development of their minority language competences in order to strengthen minority language practices in a community. Thus, the approach based on William's work questions the tradition of the strict separation of languages in particular classes, but it serves mainly to support and promote successful minority language policies in education (Cenoz and Gorter 2017).

Cenoz and Gorter remind us that Williams (2012) differentiated official and natural translanguaging (2021: 8), where the former is planned and systematic, while the latter occurs at school when the students' competences in the majority language are not yet sufficient. Jakonen, Szabó, and Laihonen (2018) investigate similar practices in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) classrooms. Cenoz and Gorter differentiate, similar to Williams, pedagogical and spontaneous translanguaging as follows: "Pedagogical translanguaging is a pedagogic theory and practice that refers to instructional strategies which integrate two or more languages. Spontaneous translanguaging refers to the reality of bilingual usage in naturally occurring contexts where boundaries between languages are fluid and constantly shifting. A continuum can represent these two types of translanguaging rather than a dichotomy because there can be intermediate situations" (2021: 18, cf. also 2017 and 2020).

García and her colleagues consider it a key feature of translanguaging that it rejects abyssal thinking based on raciolinguistic ideologies (García et al. 2021: 203); thus, for them, translanguaging has a strong political and social commitment (García and Kleyn 2016: 24–25) and it is dedicated to those who are not among the winners of nation-building and global capitalism (García and Otheguy 2020: 28). This reframed interpretation of translanguaging (García 2009; García and Li 2014; Li 2018) shifts the focus from the minority language to learners' repertoires. Cenoz and Gorter contrast both approaches, labelling them also in geographic terms such as 'Welsh' and 'US-concepts'. This volume adopts the US-approach which regards as a basic feature of translanguaging in language pedagogy that it concentrates on speakers instead of issues of language maintenance or revitalisation.

3.3 Summary: Translanguaging stance and student-centred education

The efforts to implement education which is inclusive of Romani speakers have not proven successful and the education of multingual Roma learners remains a

typical example of language-based difficulties in the implementation of a just education (New and Kyuchukov 2018). Education for the Roma takes place all over Europe in languages other than Romani as non-standard ways of speaking have no place in European school systems. Romani is not used as the language of instruction (Gažovičová 2012). This situation is a necessary consequence of the controversies around standardisation: in the lack of a standard, Romani cannot be the language of instruction in a way standardised national languages fulfil this role.

Translanguaging pedagogies do not necessarily require standardisation prior to, or parallel with, their application. In this way, translanguaging pedagogy can bring Romani into school even in its non-standardised form and to mediate the school- and home-language practices of the students. A translanguaging stance enables teachers to make use of Romani resources despite its non-standardised status and to introduce it into written activities despite its non-academic literacy traditions. Our project has shown that it is possible to overcome teachers' monolingual and standard ideologies, and thus launch a gradual transformation of the institutional environment.

The shift from monolingual ideologies in teachers' stance is supported by learner-centred pedagogical approaches. In addition to the differences between Williams' original approach to translanguaging and García's reframed one, the difference in their respective foci and purpose is also striking: extending competences in a minority language through new classroom policies vs. "leveraging students' bilingualism for learning", as formulated in the sub-title of García, Ibarra Johnson, and Seltzer's volume (2017). This difference overlaps with differentiations between teacher-guided and student-centred approaches. In this respect, our volume considers both teacher-guided and student-centred approaches as interdependent parts of translanguaging in the classroom.

Translanguaging pedagogy, according to its US-proponents has a strong potential to support bilingual victims of racism (García et al. 2021), or, more broadly, speakers living on the margins of nation states and/or at the peripheries of global capitalism (García and Otheguy 2020: 28). The transformative power of translanguaging (Li 2018: 23) is, however, not self-evident: success in education depends on a set of factors, and education is part of a complex social system. Language is only one of the factors which can prevent or facilitate success (Jaspers 2018). This volume evaluates translanguaging as a pedagogical stance and as part of inclusive and culturally transformative pedagogies, which have the potential to re-organise participants' interpersonal relations. At the same time, transformation achieved through translanguaging is multi-faceted and not only political in nature: changes in students' and teachers' self-confidence and well-being are all important factors

in the transformation. In our volume, we reflect on our experience of translanguaging pedagogies, including the dilemmas as well as achievements.

References

Abercrombie, Amelia. 2018. Language purism and social hierarchies: Making a Romani standard in Prizren. *Language in Society* 47. 741–761.

Acton, Thomas & Ilona Klimová. 2001. The International Romani Union: An East European answer to West European questions? In Will Guy (ed.), *Between past and future: the Roma of Central and Eastern Europe*. Hertfordshire: University of Hertfordshire Press.

Acton, Thomas. 2018. Alternatives to Romani identity politics. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 41(13): 2329–2336.

Auer, Peter. 2019. 'Translanguaging' or 'doing Languages'? Multilingual practices and the notion of 'codes'. Author's copy, pre-reviewing version, 1–31. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/332593230_%27Translanguaging%27_or_%27doing_languages%27_Multilingual_practices_and_the_notion_of_%27codes%27 (accessed 28 March 2022) Written for: Jeff MacSwan (ed.), *Language(s): Multilingualism and its Consequences*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Bachtin, Michail. 1979 (1934–1935). Das Wort im Roman. In Rainer Grübel (ed.), *Ästhetik des Wortes*, 154–300. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Baker, Colin. 2003. Biliteracy and transliteracy in Wales: Language planning and the Welsh national curriculum. In Nancy Hornberger (ed.), *Continua of Biliteracy*, 71–90. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Bakhtin, Mikhail 1981. *The Dialogic Imagination*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Bakker, Peter & Marcel Courthiade. 1991. *In the Margin of Romani. Gypsy Languages in Contact*. Amsterdam: Instituut voor Algemene Taalwetenschap, Universiteit van Amsterdam.

Bakker, Peter & Yaron Matras. 1997. Introduction. In Yaron Matras, Peter Bakker & Hristo Kyuchukov (eds.), *The Typology and Dialectology of Romani*, vii–xxx. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Bakker, Peter. 2020. Para-Romani Varieties. In Yaron Matras & Anton Tenser (eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Romani Language and Linguistics*, 353–386. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.

Baló, András Márton. 2017. Oláh cigány dialektusok Magyarországon. [Vlach Romani dialects in Hungary]. In Rosenberg Mátyás & Cserti Csapó Tibor (eds.), *Horizontok és dialógusok. VI. Romológus konferencia, tanulmánykötet* [Horizons and Dialogues. VI Romani Studies Conference, Volume of papers.], 203–223. Pécs: University of Pécs.

Barany, Zoltan. 2002. Ethnic mobilization without prerequisites: The East European Gypsies. *World Politics* 54(3). 277–307.

Blackledge, Adrian & Angela Creese. 2014. Heteroglossia as practice and pedagogy. In Adrian Blackledge & Angela Creese (eds.), *Heteroglossia as Practice and Pedagogy*. 1–20. Dortrecht: Springer.

Blommaert, Jan & Ad Backus. 2013. *Repertoires revisited: 'Knowing language' in superdiversity. Working Papers in Urban Language & Literacies 67*. London: King's College.

Bodó, Csanád. 2016. *Nyelvi ideológiák és különbségek* [Language ideologies and differences]. Kolozsvár/Cluj Napoca: Nemzeti Kisebbségkutató Intézet.

Boretzky, Norbert & Birgit Igla. 2005. *Kommentierter Dialektatlas des Romani*. Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz.

Boretzky, Norbert. 1989. "Zum Interferenzverhalten des Romani". *Language Typology and Universals* 42(3). 357–374

Boretzky, Norbert. 2007. The differentiation of the Romani dialects. *Language Typology and Universals* 60(4). 314–336.

Brubaker, Rogers. 2002. Ethnicity without groups. *European Journal of Sociology* 43. 163–189.

Brubaker, Rogers. 2004. *Ethnicity without groups*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Busch, Brigitta. 2012a. Romani zwischen Stigmatisierung und Anerkennung: eine transnationale Sprache im Korsett nationalstaatlicher Bildungssysteme. In Peter Cichon & Konrad Ehlich (eds.), *Eine Welt? Sprachen, Schule und Politik in Europa und anderen Kontinenten*, 71–92. Wien: Praesens.

Busch, Brigitta. 2012b. *Das sprachliche Repertoire oder niemand ist einsprachig*. Klagenfurt/Wien/Celovec/Dunaj: Drava.

Cenoz, Jason & Durk Gorter. 2017. Minority languages and sustainable translanguaging: Threat or opportunity? *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 38(10). 901–912.

Cenoz, Jasone & Durk Gorter. 2020. Pedagogical translanguaging: An introduction. *System* 92. doi: 10.1016/j.system.2020.102269

Cenoz, Jasone & Durk Gorter. 2021. *Pedagogical Translanguaging (Elements in Language Teaching)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Choli Daróczi, József & Levente Feyér. 1988. *Zhanes romanes?* [Do you speak Romani?] Budapest: Magyarországi Cigányok Kulturális Szövetsége.

Deleuze, Gilles & Félix Guattari. 1987. *A Thousand Plateaus. (Introduction: Rhizome)*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Elšík, Viktor & Michael Beníšek. 2020. Romani dialectology. In Yaron Matras & Anton Tenser (eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Romani Language and Linguistics*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan. 389–427.

Erdős, Kamill 1959. *A Békés megyei cigányok. Cigánydialektusok Magyarországon* [The Gypsies of Békés county. Gypsy dialects in Hungary]. Gyula: Erkel Ferenc Múzeum.

Fosztó, László. 2003. Diaspora and nationalism: An anthropological approach to the international Romani movement. Regio – Minorities, Politics, Society – English Edition. 6(1). 102–120.

García, Ofelia &Angel Lin. 2017. Translanguaging and bilingual education. In Ofelia García, Angel Lin & Stephen May (eds.), *Bilingual Education: Encyclopedia of Language and Education 5*, 117–130. Berlin: Springer.

García, Ofelia & Li Wei 2014. *Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

García, Ofelia & Ricardo Otheguy. 2020. Plurilingualism and translanguaging: Commonalities and divergences. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 23(1). 17–35.

García, Ofelia & Tatyana Kleyn. 2016. *Translanguaging with multilingual students: Learning from classroom moments*. New York: Routledge.

García, Ofelia, Nelson Flores, Kate Seltzer, Li Wei, Ricardo Otheguy & Jonathan Rosa. 2021. Rejecting abyssal thinking in the language and education of racialised bilinguals: A manifesto. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies* 18(3). 203–228.

García, Ofelia, Susana Ibarra Johnson & Kate Seltzer. 2017. *The Translanguaging Classroom. Leveraging Students' Bilingualism for Learning*. Caslon: Philadelphia.

García, Ofelia. 2009. Education, multilingualism and translanguaging in the 21. Century. In Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, Robert Phillipson, Ajit K. Mohanty & Minati Panda (eds.), *Social Justice through Multilingual Education*, 140–158. Cromwell: Multilingual Matters.

García, Ofelia. 2014. Countering the dual: Transglossia, dynamic bilingualism and translanguaging in education. In Rani Rubdy & Lubna Alsagoff (eds.), *The Global-local Interface, Language Choice and Hybridity*, 100–118. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Gažovičová, Tina. 2012. The Romani language in the Slovak educational system. *Human Affairs* 22(4). 510–523.

Gumperz, John J. 1964. Linguistic and social interaction in two communities. *American Anthropologist* 66. 137–153.

Halwachs, Dieter W. 2020. Language policy and planning in Romani. In Yaron Matras & Anton Tenser (eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Romani Language and Linguistics*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.

Heltai, János Imre. 2020. Translanguaging instead of standardisation. Writing Romani at school. *Applied Linguistics Review* 11(3). 463–484.

Jakonen, Teppo, Tamás Péter Szabó & Petteri Laihonen. 2018. Translanguaging as playful subversion of a monolingual norm in the classroom. In Gerardo Mazzaferro (ed.), *Translanguaging as Everyday Practice*, 31–48. Cham: Springer.

Janko Spreizer, Alenka. 2013. Roma, Gypsy Travellers, gens du voyage: People who travel? *Domovini* 38. 87–95.

Jaspers, Jürgen. 2018. The transformative limits of translanguaging. *Language and Communication* 58. 1–10.

Kleyn, Tatyana & Ofelia García. 2019. Translanguaging as an act of transformation: Restructuring teaching and learning for emergent bilingual students. In Luciana C. de Oliveira (ed.), *Handbook of TESOL in K-12*, 69–82. Malden: Wiley.

Kovács, Ágnes & Ernő Téglás. 1999. Amikor a kognitív rendszerek elbeszélik a mentális reprezentációkat: a kétnyelvűség pszichológiai vizsgálata [When cognitive systems narrate mental representations: a psychological study of bilingualism]. *Erdélyi Múzeum* 61(3–4). 221–236.

Ladányi, János & Iván Szelényi. 2001. The social construction of Roma ethnicity in Bulgaria, Romania and Hungary during the market transition. *Review of Sociology* 7(2). 79–134.

Lakatos, Péter. 2018. *A romani-magyar kétnyelvűségből eredő iskolai hátrányok okai és megoldási lehetőségei* [Scoolhandicaps resulting from Romani-Hungarian bilingualism and possible solutions]. Budapest: Eötvös Loránd University dissertation.

Lakatos, Szilvia. 2012. *A romani nyelv közösségi használatának és közoktatási helyzetének vizsgálata Magyarországon*. [Analysis of the use of Romani and its situation in public education in Hungary]. Pécs: University of Pécs dissertation.

Landauer, Attila. 2009. Adalékok a beás cigányság korai történetéhez. In Attila Landauer & Pál Nagy (eds.), *Írások a magyarországi beásokról*. [Writings about Boyash in Hungary], 79–95. Gödöllő: Szent István University/Cigány Néprajzi és Történeti Egyesület.

Law, Ian & Martin Kováts. 2018. *Rethinking Roma: Identities, Politicisation and New Agendas*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Li, Wei. 2018. Translanguaging as a practical theory of language. *Applied Linguistics* 39. 9–30.

Lucassen, Leo. 1991. The power of definition. Stigmatization, minorization and ethnicity illustrated by the history of Gypsies in the Netherlands. *The Netherland's Journal of Social Sciences* 27(2). 90–91.

Marushiakova, Elena &Vesselin Popov. 2001. Historical and ethnographic background: Gypsies, Roma, Sinti. In Will Guy (ed.), *Between Past and Future. The Roma of Central and Eastern Europe*, 33–53. Hertfordshire: University of Hertfordshire Press.

Marushiakova, Elena &Vesselin Popov. 2021. Introduction. In: Elena Marushiakova & Vesselin Popov (eds.), *Roma voices in History*, xviii–xxxvi. Paderborn: Brill.

Matras, Yaron & Anton Tenser. 2020. Introduction. In Yaron Matras & Anton Tenser (eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Romani Language and Linguistics*, 1–10. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.

Matras, Yaron, Peter Bakker & Hristo Kyuchukov (eds.). 1997. *The Tipology and Dialectology of Romani*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Matras, Yaron. 1995. *Romani in Contact. The History, Structure and Sociology of a Language*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Matras, Yaron. 1998. *The Romani Elements in Non-standard Speech*. Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz.

Matras, Yaron. 2002. *Romani: a Linguistic Introduction*. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge.

Matras, Yaron. 2005. The classification of Romani dialects: A geographical-historical perspective. In Barbara Schrammel, Dieter W. Halwachs & Gerd Ambrosch (eds.), *General and applied Romani linguistics: Proceedings from the 6th International Conference on Romani Linguistics*, 7–26. München: Lincom Europa.

Matras, Yaron. 2015. Transnational policy and 'authenticity' discourses on Romani language and identity. *Language in Society* 44(3). 295–316.

Milani, Tomasso M. & Rickard Jonsson. 2012. Who's afraid of Rinkeby Swedish? Stylization, complicity, resistance. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 22(1). 44–63.

Mirga, Andrzej & Gheorghe Nicolae. 1997. *The Roma in the Twenty-first Century: A Policy Paper*. Princeton: The Project on Ethnic Relations.

Mirga, Andrzej. 1992. Roma territorial behaviour and state policy. The case of the socialist countries of East Europe. In Michael J. Casimir & Aparna Rao (eds.), *Mobility and Territoriality. Social and Spatial Boundaries among Foragers, Fishers, Pastoralists and Peripatetics*. London: Routledge.

Nagy, Pál. 2007. „Gádzsósodás – cigányosodás". Akkulturáció és parasztosodás a cigányok magyarországi történetében [“Becoming Gadjo – becoming Gypsy" Acculturation and assimilation to peasant society in the history of the Roma in Hungary]. *Amaro Drom* 17(2). 20–22.

Nagy, Pál. 2015: Ki beszél itt cigány történelemről? [Who is talking about Gypsy history?] In Cserti Csapó, Tibor (ed.), *Alapirodalmak a hazai cigány/roma népességre vonatkozó társadalomtörténet, társadalomismeret oktatásához* [Basic literature for teaching social history and social studies of the Roma/Gypsy population in Hungary], 50–127. Pécs: University of Pécs BTK NTI Romológia és Nevelésszociológia Tanszék.

Nagy, Pál. 2020. Parasztok, cigányok, proletárok. Az alsó kaszt és a cigány etnicitás történeti értelmezéséhez (19–20. század) [Peasants, gypsies, proletarians. For a historical understanding of the lower caste and Gypsy ethnicity (19th–20th centuries)]. *Aetas* 35. 166–184.

New, William & Hristo Kyuchukov. 2018. Language education for Romani children: Human rights and capabilities approaches. *European Education* 50(4). 371–384.

Orsós, Anna. 2015. *Cigány/roma nemzetiségi oktatás. Kutatási beszámoló*. Pécs: University of Pécs BTK NTI Romológia és Nevelésszociológia Tanszék/Wlislocki Henrik Szakkollégium.

Otheguy, Ricardo, Ofelia García & Wallis Reid. 2015. Clarifying translanguaging and deconstructing named languages: A perspective from linguistics. *Applied Linguistics Review* 6(3). 281–307.

Otheguy, Ricardo, Ofelia García & Wallis Reid. 2019. A Translanguaging view of the linguistic system of bilinguals. *Applied Linguistics Review* 10(4). 625–652.

Réger, Zita. 1995. The language of Gypsies in Hungary: An overview of research. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 111: 77–91.

Rostás-Farkas, György & Karsai Ervin. 1991. *Cigány–magyar, magyar–cigány szótár*. [Romani – Hungarian, Hungarian – Romani vocabulary]. Budapest: Kossuth.

Sorescu-Marinković, Annemarie, Tede Kahl & Biljana Sikimić eds. 2021. *Boyash Studies: Researching "Our People"*. Berlin: Frank & Timme.

Stewart, Michael. 2013. Roma and Gypsy "ethnicity" as a subject of anthropological inquiry. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 42. 415–432.

Surdu, Mihai. 2016. *Those who Count: Expert Practices of Roma Classification*. Budapest/New York: Central European University Press.

Szalai, Andrea. 2007. Egységesség? Változatosság? A cigány kisebbség és a nyelvi sokféleség [Unity? Diversity? The Roma minority and linguistic pluralism]. *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* 103: 163–204.

Tálos, Endre. 2001. A cigány és a beás nyelv Magyarországon [Romani and Boyash in Hungary]. In Katalin Kovalcsik et al. (eds.), *Tanulmányok a cigányság társadalmi helyzete és kultúrája köréből* [Studies on the social situation and culture of the Roma]. Budapest: IFA–OM–ELTE. 317–324.

Törzsök, Judit. 2001. Kik az igazi cigányok? [Who are the real Gypsies?] In Katalin Kovalcsik, Anna Csongor & Zsuzsanna Bódi (eds.), *Tanulmányok a cigányság társadalmi helyzete és kultúrája köréből*. Budapest: IFA–OM–ELTE. 29–52.

Tremlett, Annabel. 2014. Making a difference without creating a difference: Super-diversity as a new direction for research on Roma minorities. *Ethnicities* 14(6). 830–848.

Vogel, Sara & Ofelia García. 2017. Translanguaging. In George Noblit & Luis Moll (eds.), *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education*, 1–22. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Williams, Cen. 1994. *Arfarniad o Ddulliau Dysgu ac Addysgu yng Nghyd destun Addysg Uwchradd Ddwyieithog* [An evaluation of teaching and learning methods in the context of bilingual secondary education]. Bangor: University of Wales Dissertation.

Williams, Cen. 2002. *A Language Gained: A Study of Language Immersion at 11–16 Years of Age*. Bangor: School of Education.

Williams, Cen. 2012. The National Immersion Scheme Guidance for Teachers on Subject Language Threshold: Accelerating the Process of Reaching the Threshold. Bangor: The Welsh Language Board.