GABRIELA PANĂ DINDELEGAN (coord.), *Limba română. Dinamica limbii, dinamica interpretării* [The Romanian Language. The Dynamics of Language, the Dynamics of Interpretation], Bucureşti, Editura Universităţii din Bucureşti, 2008, 757 p.

Published under the coordination of Professor Gabriela Pană Dindelegan, the collective work *Romanian Language. The Dynamics of Language, the Dynamics of Interpretation* represents the written version of the speeches delivered at the seventh Colloquium of the Department of Language at the University of Bucharest. In its 757 pages, the volume gathers the contributions of 92 participants, affiliated to national or foreign pre-university or university centers, as well as to the Institute of Linguistics "Iorgu Iordan – Al. Rosetti" in Bucharest.

As Gabriela Pană Dindelegan mentions in the foreword, the main objectives of these conferences are to stimulate and to encourage the scientific research in the linguistic field.

The present volume is dedicated to three distinguished Professors at the University of Bucharest, namely Valeria Guţu Romalo, Florica Dimitrescu and Alexandru Niculescu, and to their very important contribution to the study of the Romanian language. The structure of the current work is different from the previous ones. Apart from the four traditional sections – I. Morphosyntax (22 articles); II. Pragmatics and Stylistics (31 articles); III. Lexis, Semantics, Terminologies (19 articles) and IV. History of the Romanian Language and Etymology (5 articles) – the book also gathers the written contributions delivered at two round table discussions. One of them, coordinated by Rodica Zafiu, is dedicated to the phenomenon of grammaticalization and it consists of 7 articles. The other one, whose coordinator is Professor Liliana Ionescu Ruxăndoiu, is dedicated to the History of the Romanian Parliamentary Discourse and it consists of 5 articles. Both round table discussions were meant to fructify the results of the corresponding research projects developed by the members of the Department of the Romanian Language.

The first section of the volume – *Morphosyntax* (p. 15–186) – begins with an article referring to the phenomenon of coordination: *Statutul sintactic al termenilor coordonaţi prin conjuncţia şi* [The syntactic category of coordinates related by *şi* ('and')]. Blanca Croitor and Gabriela Bîlbîie argue that, in the case of the Romanian language, the elements coordinated by *şi* ('and') do not necessarily belong to the same morphological category, but instead they must have the same syntactic position. It is shown that coordination by *şi* applies to bare nouns, verbs, prefixoids, clitics, etc. At the same time, the main conditions that allow the coordination are of semantic nature.

Four articles in this section refer to the complex category of the verb. In *Structura semantică a verbelor de relaţie în limba română* [The Semantic Structure of the Relational Verbs in Romanian], Elena Constatinovici makes a typology of relational verbs. The author classifies the relational verbs according to three criteria: type of the relation, orientation of the relation and participants to the situation encoded by the verb. Using the generative perspective, in *Tipare sintactico-semantice de verbe construite prepoziţional* [Syntactic-semantic Patterns of Prepositional Verbs], Ionuţ Geană makes a classification of the verbs subcategorizing for a prepositional object. The author discusses both the case in which prepositional objects are obligatory from a syntactic point of view and the ones in which they are obligatory from a syntactic-semantic point of view. Emil Ionescu's article, *Constrângeri discursive asupra construcţiilor de contact fizic în română* [Discursive Constraints on Physical Contact Constructions in Romanian] deals with the verbs of physical contact

in Romanian and English (e.g. *a atinge* 'to touch', a *îmbrăţişa* 'to hug'). The author establishes a hierarchy with respect to the degree of the possessor's prominence and reaches the conclusion that, in Romanian, in contrast to English, structures of this kind are heterogeneous in the sense that they display different levels of acceptability. Andreea Şovar's article, *Construcţii cu verbe suport în română* [Support Verbs Constructions in Romanian], deals with the support verb *a face* ('to do') and with its semantic and syntactic features. Further on, she presents some tests that distinguish between support verbs constructions and the idioms containing the verb *a face*. Referring to the category of the verbal aspect, Camelia Dragomir's article *Perifrazele aspectuale de fază iminenţială în limba română* [Imminential Phrases in the Romanian Language] brings into discussion the issue of the operators coding the imminential aspect and identifies different classes of operators that are compatible with verbs expressing dynamic processes, activities, accomplishments and achievements.

Another four articles are concerned with pronominal issues. Dana Niculescu, in her article *Cliticele pronominale posesive în grupul nominal* [Possesive Pronominal Clitics in the Nominal Phrase] argues that the status the possessive pronominal clitic has in the nominal group is the one of an agreement affix. To support her argument, the author uses different tests meant to distinguish between words, affixes, and clitics. The fact that the sequence [noun + clitic] represents a morphophonological and syntactic unit in which the possessive does not manifest any lexical autonomy makes her conclude that the possessive clitic (i.e. *soră-mea*) behaves like an agreement affix. Ion Giurgea, in the article *Pronume descriptive* [Descriptive Pronouns], analyzes the main types of descriptive pronouns, starting from two studies of Paul Elbourne's, published in 2001, respectively in 2005. Further on, the author brings into discussion the problem of *donkey*-pronouns, which have been interpreted by certain linguists, including Elbourne, as descriptive pronouns. The author presents some arguments in favor of the idea that, even elegant and uniform, the interpretation of *donkey*-pronouns as descriptive pronouns is still problematic and needs further attention. In his study ***Altul vs un altul**. Noi explicaţii* [*Other* vs. *An Other*. New Explanations], Alexandru Nicolae presents refined analysis of the pair of the Romanian determiner phrases *altul* ('other') – *un altul* ('an other'). Using both a historical perspective and generativist data on the left periphery of the noun phrase, the author's objective is to explain and comment on the semantic and syntactic evolution of the aforementioned pronouns in the Romanian language. Finally, in *Utilizări pragmatice ale demonstrativului în limba vorbită actuală: **asta** vs **aceasta*** [Pragmatic Uses of Demonstrative Pronouns in Current Spoken Language: *asta* vs *aceasta*], Irina Nicula identifies certain contexts in Romanian in which the two demonstrative pronouns *asta* and *aceasta* ('this') cannot substitute each other. She also tries to show that the impossibility of substitution is not only a matter of stylistic variation, but also a matter concerning the pragmatics of discourse.

Three of the authors present, from different perspectives and with different purposes, some aspects related to the category of the adjective. *In Mecanisme de lectură a construcţiilor N1 de N2 cu un adjectiv substantivat în prima poziţie* [Reading Mechanisms of the Structures *N1 de N2* with a Nominalized Adjective in the First Position], Ana Mihail is interested in describing the semantic types of adjectives occurring in position N1 and also in presenting the possible ways of reading – either appreciatory or depreciatory – of these structures. Aida Todi adopts a normative perspective and discusses some novelties regarding the adjectival inflection in the recent works elaborated by the Romanian Academy in 2005 – GALR (The Grammar of the Romanian Language) and DOOM$_2$ (Dictionary of Orthography, Pronunciation and Morphology) – in comparison with the previous linguistic norm. Carmen Mîrzea's contribution – *Câteva aspecte privind adverbializarea adjectivelor categoriale în limba română* [Some Considerations on the Adverbialization of Categorial Adjectives in the Romanian Language] – refers to the classes of categorial adjectives that can change their morphological category and become adverbs. The author makes a typology of the aforementioned adjectives and, at the same time, presents the syntactic features of the adverbs resulted from categorial adjectives.

Some other articles bring into attention the problem of partitiveness. Starting the analysis from the chapter in the Grammar of the Romanian Language dedicated to the position of the direct object, Isabela Nedelcu tries to answer a very pertinent question: *Se poate vorbi de un complement direct*

partitiv? [Can We Talk about a Partitive Direct Object?]. The author proposes some semantic and syntactic criteria according to which certain structures in the Romanian language can be qualified as partitive direct objects. On the other hand, Mihaela-Tănase Dogaru discusses the grammaticalization of pseudo-partitive constructions in Romanian, focusing on the status of the nouns that occur in first position as well as on the process of grammaticalization suffered by the preposition *de*, which has become a functional preposition.

Mihaela Gheorghe's article – *Constrângeri asupra joncţiunii relativelor libere în română* [Constraints on the Junction of Free Relative Clauses in Romanian] discusses the phenomenon of divergent constraints in free relative constructions. The author shows that case hierarchy is not the main criterion that accounts for case conflict resolution and that the relative pronouns seems to obey the requirements of the verb in the matrix clause.

Another few articles treat of different, mainly syntactic aspects. Viviana-Monica Ilie analyzes the cases of non-expressed subject in the 17th century original texts. Viorela-Valentina Dima studies the temporal reference of the nominal supine; the author shows that, depending on the context, nominal supine can have a present, past and future temporal anchor. Adrian Chircu focuses on the way correlative temporal adverbs function in the discourse, especially on the case of the adverbs *unde* ('where') and *cum* ('how'). The author analyzes the way in which these items cease to function as relative adverbs and acquire a correlative temporal value. Dafina Raţiu's study brings into discussion the semantics and syntax of multiple interrogative sentences making a comparison between the way the phenomenon takes place in English and in Romanian. Melania Roibu's study refers to the structure of echo remarks: *Autonimie şi metalimbaj în structura replicilor ecou* [Autonymy and Metalanguage in Echo Turn Takings]. As the author mentions, her aim is to analyze the functioning of the repetition with echo effects from a semantic, syntactic and semiotic point of view.

The first round table discussion – *Grammaticalization* (p.187–254) – begins with Rodica Zafiu's presentation of the project *Funcţionare discursivă şi gramaticalizare în limba română veche* [Discourse Functioning and Grammaticalization in Old Romanian]. As the coordinator of the project, she defines the two concepts that give its name, makes a brief history of the studies on grammaticalization developed both in Romania and abroad, and also presents the seven articles that gather in the current section.

Larisa Avram's article – *A trebui: de la modalităţi de tip deontic la implicatură epistemică* [*A trebui* ('Must'): From Deontic Modality to Epistemic Implicatures] traces the changes that the verb *a trebui* suffered – from an item denoting deontic modality or necessity to an item expressing epistemic implicatures. As the author notices, the transformations that have occurred in the semantic structure of this verb even since the 17th century also characterize the semantic evolution of modal verbs in many other languages.

In *Reanaliză şi gramaticalizare: structura lui **decât*** [Reanalysis and Grammaticalization: the Structure of *decât* ('than')], Alexandra Cornilescu shows that the evolution of *decât*, either a conjunction or a preposition, is a case of grammaticalization through reanalysis.

Blanca Croitor analyzes the phenomenon of determiner agreement in old Romanian texts: *Aspecte privind acordul în determinare în limba română veche* [On Determiner Agreement in Old Romanian]. The author considers that disappearance of determiner agreement, which happened at the end of the 18th century, can be explained through a more general tendency that the Romanian language has shown, i.e. losing inflectional marking inside the nominal group.

In the article *Concordanţa negaţiei în limba română veche* [Negation Concordance in Old Romanian] Adina Dragomirescu analyzes the phenomenon of alternation between simple and double negation in old Romanian. The author argues that, in terms of grammaticalization, this alternation can be considered a failed stage in the evolution of the process. In favor of this remark, she concludes that the process of grammaticalization did not actually happen.

Gabriela Pană Dindelegan talks about grammaticalized uses of the prepositions *de* and *la* in Romanian: *Tipuri de gramaticalizare. Pe marginea utilizării gramaticalizate ale prepoziţiilor **de** şi **la*** [Types of Grammaticalization. Aspects concerning the Grammaticalized Prepositions *de* and *la*]. Firstly, the author identifies two types of grammaticalization: a morphological and a syntactic one.

Secondly, the author notices two stages in the process of grammaticalization: one of them, more profound, is observed in the evolution of the preposition *de* as an analytical genitive marker and the second one, in the evolution of the preposition *la*, as an analytical dative marker.

Camelia Stan is interested in presenting some diachronic aspects in the evolution of the Romanian nominal phrase: *Grupul nominal românesc (aspecte diacronice)* [Romanian Nominal Group (Diachronic Aspects)]. Using the generative framework, the author first distinguishes between minimal and extended nominal group and, then, she presents the hierarchical organization of the latter. Given its structure, the Romanian nominal group is supposed to have evolved in the direction of the Occidental Romance group, characterized by the presence of a single determiner.

Camelia Uşurelu makes an inventory of the causative operators in old Romanian (16th to 18th century): *Operatori cauzativi din limba română veche, între autonomie şi gramaticalizare* [Causative Operators in Old Romanian, between Autonomy and Grammaticalization]. The author identifies six types of causative structures and observes that only the causative operator *a face* ('to do') suffers a process of semi-grammaticalization and the others remain autonomous.

The next section of the volume (p. 255–518), *Pragmatics, stylistics*, is the most extensive. Most of the articles are concerned with themes belonging to the area of communication and pragmatics of discourse. The first article in the current section, *Dimensiuni pragmaretorice în reclamele de campanie de pe internet* [Pragmaretoric Characteristics of Online Political Campaign Advertisings], focuses on the strategies used by politicians to win their audience and on the relation addresser – addressee in the aforementioned context. Luminiţa Cărăuşu's contribution treats of the political discourse: *Strategii argumentative şi persuasive in discursul politic românesc actual* [Argumentative and Persuasive Strategies in the Present Romanian Political Discourse]. The author shows that political discourse finds itself in-between promotional and managerial discourses and that it makes use of certain techniques of persuasion. The same topic is approached, from another perspective, in Mihaela Constantinescu's article: *Ethosul ludic al parlamentarilor* [The Ludic Ethos of the Parliamentarians]. The author applies her analysis to the political debates that arose in April 2007 when it was decided to suspend President Traian Băsescu from his position. Răzvan Săftoiu pays attention to the structure of the parliamentary discourse: *Debutul sesiunii parlamentare româneşti din perspectivă comunicativă* [The Beginning of the Romanian Parliamentary Session from a Communicative Perspective]. The author makes a typology of the patterns of address that are characteristic for the parliamentary discourse.

Some other articles are concerned with the specific features of argumentation in certain types of discourse. Ioana-Cristina Pârvu is interested in the devices of argumentation in written Romanian press: *Procedee ale argumentării în presa scrisă* [Argumentation in the Written Romanian Press]. She argues that journalists use various lexical and grammatical devices, either figurative or compositional, that ensure the cohesion of the message and serve the purpose of persuasion. Among the devices used, the author mentions the allusions, the wordplays, and the metaphors. Carmen Ioana Radu, in the article *Rolul argumentaţiei în cadrul comunicării conflictuale* [The Role of Argumentation within the Frame of Conflictive Communication] presents the theories of argumentation and the importance that argumentation has, together with assertiveness and aggressiveness, in structuring the conflictual discourse.

Other few articles analyze politeness from a pragmatic point of view. Mara Manta, in *Aspecte ale politeţii pragmatice în discursul didactic* [Aspects of the Pragmatic Politeness in the Didactic Discourse] identifies the strategies of positive politeness that the didactic discourse makes use of. In the article *Cooperarea şi strategii ale politeţii în vorbirea românilor din Vladimirovaţ* [Cooperation and Politeness Strategies in the Discourse of the Romanian Speakers from Vladimirovac], Minerva Trailović-Kondan tries to identify the aspects that are characteristic for the Romanian speakers living in the Serbian locality Vladimirovac in terms of politeness and cooperation. Strongly related to this topic, Angelica Mihăilescu's article – *Salutul în română şi în spaniolă. Perspectivă interculturală* [Greeting in Romanian and Spanish. Intercultural Perspective] – focuses on the similarities and differences between two different cultures, Romanian and Spanish, with respect to the various forms of greeting used in each of the two languages.

The articles that follow focus on different topics. Rodica Cârnu, in *Semiotica imaginii publicitare* [The semiotics of the Advertising Image] analyzes the images used in the Romanian advertisements, focusing on those publicity materials that use figures of women and men to promote certain products. The article is meant to show that positive stereotypes used in advertisements have a great importance from a commercial point of view. Garofiţa Dincă analyzes the homilies written by Antim Ivireanul: *Aspecte de retorică în predicile lui Antim Ivireanul* [Rhetorical Aspects in Antim Ivireanul's Homilies]. She focuses on the techniques used to attract the reader's attention and on the function of the syntactic and semantic figures used by the author. Raluca Dincă proposes a reading model for the so-called "features reports" of Alexandru Monciu-Sudinski: *Cum citim reportajele lui Alexandru Monciu-Sudinski* [How to read Alexandru Monciu-Sudinski's Feature Reports]. In the article, the author offers some reading keys for the interviews published in the volume *Biografii comune* ('Joint biographies'). Alina Dinu develops a theoretical analysis, trying to establish whether the wooden language suffered any modification in time or not: *Există diacronie în limba de lemn*? [Is There a Diachronic Evolution of the Wooden Language?]. Gina Necula analyzes the role of phatic communication in the literary texts from the communist period: *Faticitatea ca trăsătură specifică interacţiunii communicative în textul literar din perioada comunistă* [Phatic Communication Seen as Author/Reader Interaction in Literary Texts]. Cristina Dumitru-Lahaye approaches a theoretical subject: *Conceptul de reprezentare discursivă într-o perspectivă dinamică* [The Concept of Discursive Representation from a Dynamic Point of View]. The author defines the concept of *reprezentare discursivă* ('discursive representation') in a pragmatic context and shows that the discourse representation can be analyzed only in terms of a dynamic process. Angelica Hobjilă approaches the subject of communication from a different perspective: *Microsistemul adjuvanţilor comunicativi – Prezentare selectivă* [The Micro-system of Communicative Adjuvants – Selective Presentation], by inventoring the adjuvants used in the oral and written communication. In *Valori pragmatice ale referinţei personale în româna vorbită actuală* [Pragmatic Values of the Personal Reference in Today Spoken Language], Liliana Hoinărescu aims at underlining the situations of the discourse in which the deictic function of the personal reference has also a rhetorical or an argumentative value. Marioara Ion treats of the commercial negotiation and the strategies, techniques and methods used in it: *Despre strategie, tehnică şi tactică în negocierea comercială* [On Strategy, Technique and Tactics in Commercial Negotiation]. Raluca Levonian's article is applied to the Romanian dramas written between the two World Wars: *Mărci nonverbale ale ezitării în texte dramatice interbelice* [Nonverbal signals of Hesitation in Romanian Dramas]. Using the terminology introduced by Paul Ekman and Wallace Friesen in 1981, the author identifies four categories of gestures that indicate the hesitation of the speakers: deictic gestures, false deictic gestures, self adaptors, and ideographs. In *Forme ale discursului feminin. Bârfa* [Forms of the Feminine Discourse. The Gossip], Nataşa Delia Maier analyzes the rhetoric of a certain discourse genre – the gossip. Margareta Manu Magda focuses her attention on the pragmalinguistic consequences of Romania's EU integration: *Elemente de pragmalingvistică a românei în „epoca integrării europene"* [Pragmalinguistic Aspects of the Romanian Language in the "European Integration Age"]. The author identifies the characteristics of the Romanian language after integration and also treats of the metadiscourse of integration. Starting from a distinction made by Salvatore Attardo in 1994 in what concerns the types of humorous interactions, Stanca Măda aims at discussing the different forms of humor performed at work: *Umorul în cadrul profesional*: *Tipologie şi funcţii* [Humor at the Workplace: Typology and Functions]. Two articles in the present section treat of metaphor. Ramona-Gabriela Eana presents the main semantic types of metaphors characteristic for the Symbolist poetry: *Aspecte semantice ale metaforei în poezia simbolistă românească* [Semantic Aspects of the Metaphor in the Symbolist Romanian Poetry] – the metaphor of knowledge, of travel, of nature, of death, of void, of games, of nuances, of inner universe, of time, and of destiny. The other article, whose author is Ioan Milică, aims at illustrating several types of conceptual representations of time through metaphor: *Timp şi metaforă* [Time and Metaphor]. Daniela Popescu's article, *Naraţiunea în reportajul de presă* [Narrative Models in Press Feature Reports] is meant to identify and characterize the narrative models used in feature reports. The author distinguishes between

homodiegetical and heterodiegetical narration and analyzes the specific features of the two narrative structures. In an article with an innovative title, *Pragmatica necuvintelor* [Non-words Pragmatics], Ileana-Ruxandra Popescu analyzes the forms and the functions of non-words from a pragmatic perspective. By *non-words* the author refers to the lexical items whose meaning is context-depending. Non-words do not properly exist in the lexicon; they are invented by creative associations of sounds, of other words or of words fragments. Oana Ragea's article treats of the relationship between concessive and adversative pragmatic markers. More specifically, it addresses the relationship between the marker *dar* ('but') and the marker *totuşi* ('although'): *Relaţia dintre conectorii pragmatici adversative şi conectorii pragmatici concesivi* [The Relationship between Concessive and Adversative Pragmatic Markers]. Given the fact that both types of markers mentioned above encode the idea of contrast, the author tries to find if and in which contexts they can substitute each other. Finally, the article written by Valeria Sporiş, *Figuri ale repetiţiei adjectivale* [Figures of Adjectival Repetition] is meant to identify and describe the numerous situations in which the adjectival repetition is involved. The author presents the main figures of sonorous repetition, of lexical and of syntactic repetition. As Valeria Sporiş mentions, her approach is interdisciplinary, trying to link the facts of language to the facts of style.

The second round table discussion in the current volume – *The History of Romanian Parliamentary Discourse (1866–1938)* – begins with Liliana Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu's presentation of the articles included in this section. The project is part of a larger study on the evolution of the Romanian parliamentary discourse as an institutional discourse genre. The corpus is represented mainly by the material provided in *Monitorul Oficial* ('Official Journal of Romania'). The approach of the evolution of the Romanian parliamentary discourse is interdisciplinary: the analysis is pursued from a linguistic, politological, historical and sociological perspective.

The first article, *Istorie conceptuală, istoria limbajelor politice şi aplicaţii româneşti în context central şi sud-est European* [Conceptual History, the History of the Political Languages and Romanian Applications in a Central and South-Eastern European Context] is mainly theoretical. The author, Silviu Hariton, makes a brief introduction into what is called *conceptual history* and into the evolution of the program coordinated by the historian Reinhart Kosseleck in the 20th century. Further on, the author introduces the reader into a brief history of the different political languages.

Irina Ionescu makes an analysis of the parliamentary discourse from the point of view of the political science: *Analiza discursului parlamentar din perspectiva ştiinţei politice. Studiu de caz: discursul parlamentar românesc 1866–1938* [The analysis of the Parliamentary Discourse from the Perspective of the Political Science. Case Study: the Romanian Parliamentary Discourse]. Her approach follows the next ideas: establishing the interest that political science has in studying the parliamentary discourse, establishing the coordinates of the parliamentary discourse that can be analyzed from a political perspective, and presenting the advantages of the quantitative methods in the analysis of the parliamentary discourse.

Răzvan Săftoiu approaches the parliamentary discourse from an interactional perspective: *Perspectiva interacţională asupra discursului parlamentar* [The Interactional Perspective on the Parliamentary Discourse]. In his study, the author is interested in the following aspects: delimiting the addressing ritual characteristic for the Romanian parliamentary meetings, analyzing different aspects of verbal politeness, the role of metadiscourse during the meetings, and also the rules of word monitoring.

Mihaela Constantinescu analyzes some fragments of the Romanian parliamentary discourses from the pragmatic and rhetoric perspective: *Perspectiva pragmaretorică* [Pragmarhetoric Perspective]. The author develops the analysis at a macro-structural and a micro-structural level. She observes that the mechanism of quoting and the one of underlining the affiliation or dissidence to certain ideas are the main strategies used by politicians.

Finally, Ariadna Ştefănescu approaches the topic of argumentation in the political discourse: *Argumentarea în discursul politic. Câteva observaţii referitoare la natura conflictuală şi la aspectele emoţionale ale discursului parlamentar* [Observations on the Conflictual and Emotional Nature of the Parliamentary Discourse]. The author pays attention to different aspects in the structure of the

parliamentary discourse: the use of conflictual markers, of euphemistic phrases, and of structures that are emotionally entailed.

The third section of the volume – *Lexis, Semantics, Terminologies* (p. 563–714) begins with Ileana Alexandrescu's article on the evolution of the Romanian vocabulary due to the changes in the socio-political field: *Evoluţii semantice în mass-media românească: Între tehnica liberă a discursului şi discursul repetat* [Semantic Evolutions in the Romanian Mass-Media: Between the Free Speaking Technique and the Repeated Speech]. Apart from observing the massive import of anglicisms, the author analyzes the processes of semantic extension and restriction of the meaning of words, as well as the phenomenon of semantic specialization for certain words in present-day Romanian. Angela Bidu Vrănceanu adds new aspects to the analysis of common and specialized lexis: *Alte aspecte ale relaţiei lexic comun/lexic specializat* [Other Aspects of the Relation Common/Specialized Lexis]. The author aims at analyzing the behavior of certain words from the point of view of their migration from specialized to common lexis. Doina Butiurcă is interested in the study of the neological medical terminology from a socio-semiotic point of view: *Adaptarea neologismelor terminologice în limba română. Terminologia medicală* [The Adjustment of the Terminological Neologisms in the Romanian language. The Medical Language]. Narcisa Forăscu's article also refers to the domain of medical terminology: *Polisemia termenilor medicali* [The Polisemy of Medical Terms]. The author tries to establish if, in the case of certain medical terms such as *alergie* ('allergy'), *miopie* ('myopia'), hemoragie ('hemorrhage'), which migrate from the medical domain to common language, a development of polysemy relations can be observed. The next article, written by a group of linguists from the Institute of Linguistics in Iasi – Marius Radu Clim, Elena Dănilă, Gabriela Haja – brings into discussion the premises of the modernization of scientific research in the field of lexicography with the help of computerized processing of information. Another article dealing with the issue of polysemy is *Problemele polisemiei în limbile română şi spaniolă. Sensuri noi în dicţionarele bilingve* [The Problems of Polysemy in Romanian and Spanish. New Meanings in Bilingual Dictionaries]. The author, Carmen Lozinski, approaches the issue of interlinguistic synonymy, explaining the new meanings acquired by certain words in Romanian in relation to the corresponding terms in Spanish. Luminiţa Crăciun discusses some aspects referring to the dynamics of the terminology of polemology: *Termeni de bază din polemologie ca dinamică a terminologiei militare* [Basic Terms in Polemology as Dynamics of Military Terminology]. The author approaches issues such as the distinction between the lexical and the terminological definition and the relation between specialized lexis and common lexis. In the article *Elemente recente italiene în lexicul gastronomic românesc* [Recent Italien Elements in the Culinary Romanian Vocabulary], Florica Dimitrescu provides a very rich list of terms of Italian origin belonging to the culinary domain. As the author mentions, the terms were gathered from the press and, even if they are very frequently used in common language, they have not been introduced in the main dictionaries of the Romanian language so far. In the *article Interdisciplinaritatea în marketing ca dinamică a terminologiei economice* [Interdisciplinarity in Marketing as Dynamics of the Economics Terminology], Roxana Maftei Ciolăneanu argues for the idea that marketing is an interdisciplinary science, which makes use of terms and methods belonging to different disciplines such as social sciences, psychology, and economy. Constantin Manea and Camelia Maria Manea make some considerations on the glossing of neologisms in the main dictionaries of the Romanian language: *Citind câteva dicţionare ale limbii române contemporane: remarci lexicologice asupra glosării neologismelor* [Reading Some Dictionaries of Current Romanian: Lexicological Remarks on the Glossing of Neologisms]. The authors try to identify the semantic classes to which neologisms belong and to advance some considerations regarding the way neologisms are glossed in the dictionary. An important observation is that indications about the stylistic affiliation of the neologisms are very scarce in dictionaries. Violeta Mihai's article, *Vocabularul violenţei în publicistica românească* [The Vocabulary of Violence in the Romanian Press] has to do also with pragmatics and stylistics. Starting from the definition given to violence in the dictionaries, Violeta Mihai groups the terms or the structures denoting violence according to the register they belong to. Constantin Mladin, in *Addenda la eurojargonul românesc. Derivate „glumeţe" cu pseudoprefixul euro-* [Addenda at the Romanian *Euro*jargon. "Funny" Words Derived

with the Pseudoprefix *euro*-], tries to give an explanation for the derivational productivity with the so-called pseudoprefix *euro*- in the Romanian language and reaches the conclusion that the mentioned phenomenon responds to the expressive or emotional function of language. Elena Museanu's article deals with the English economics terminology in the specialized mass-media: *Terminologia economică românească în presa economică* [Economic English Terminology in the Economic Mass-media]. The author's approach is meant to signal some problems that economics terms encounter with respect to the adaptation to the phonetic and morphological system of the Romanian language. Moreover, Elena Museanu underlines the fact that lexicographical definitions in general dictionaries do not provide accurate information for the correct understanding of the economics terms.

Monica Rizea is interested in analyzing the polysemy of specialized terms: *Polisemia termenilor specializați ca dinamică semantică* [The Polysemy of Specialized Terms as Dynamics of Senses]. As the author mentions, her approach is concerned with the study of the semantic mechanism of external polysemy, limited to the analysis of the lexical sphere of the computer science. In her article, *Din nou despre anglicismele „la modă" în limbajul modei* [Again about the "Fashionable" Anglicisms in the Language of Fashion], Adriana Stoichițoiu Ichim records the latest terms in the sphere of fashion that are to be found in Romanian fashion catalogues, in the magazines for teens, and in daily-papers. In fact, this approach is part of a larger project, meant to observe the influence of English in the language of fashion. Alice Toma's article is concerned with the analysis of the relational nature of terminological definitions with respect to the terms belonging to mathematics: *Trăsătura semantică relațională a termenilor matematici (Un studiu terminologico-lexical)* [The Relational Semantic Feature of Mathematics Terms (A Terminological and Lexical Study)]. At the same time, the author brings into discussion the concept of different levels of "scientificity" with respect to the terms in the domain of mathematics and also the process of lexical vulgarization. Domnița Tomescu observes the different patterns of deonomastic derivation in the political Romanian language: *Derivarea deonomastică în limbajul politic românesc* [The Deonomastic Derivation in the Political Romanian Language]. Finally, Mariana Vârlan analyzes the process of contamination in present-day Romanian: *Câteva aspecte legate de procedeul contaminării în româna actuală* [Some Aspects regarding the Process of Contamination in Present-day Romanian]. The author makes a typology of the words resulted from the process of contamination such as *buvinietă, cosmeceutice, horrorscopul*, etc., grouping them according to the morphological class they belong to and to the type of contamination they display.

The last section of the book, *The History of the Romanian Language, Etymology* (p. 715–757), begins with Maria Cvasnîi Cătănescu's article on the system of parentheses in *Istoria Ieroglifică*, written by Dimitrie Cantemir. As the author explains, the approach is concerned with a particular aspect of the scholarly rhetoric used by Dimitrie Cantemir in *Istoria Ieroglifică*, i.e. the analysis of the parenthetical sequences that represent a kind of "addition" in the direction of a metadiscourse digression. The analysis is pursued at a syntactic, pragmatic and rhetoric level. In *Vechile lexicoane românești și cercetarea variantelor teritoriale ale limbii române* [Ancient Romanian Lexicons and the Research of the Territorial Variants of the Romanian Language], Gheorghe Chivu analyzes some lexicons in the 17th and 18th centuries with respect to their relation to the literary norm of the period. The author's approach is based on the idea that old Romanian lexicons written with Latin characters are very important for the information they contain with a view to the characteristics of the dialectal variants of the Romanian language. Claudia Ene aims at identifying, on a corpus of old Romanian texts, the semantic and pragmatic functions of textual markers: *Tipuri de conectori discursivi în Divanul lui Dimitrie Cantemir și rolul lor în configurarea secvenței explicative* [Types of Discourse Markers in *Divanul* by Dimitrie Cantemir and Their Role in the Configuration of the Explanatory Sequence]. Cristian Moroianu's article approaches the Italian influence in *Peregrinul transilvan*, written by Ion Codru Drăgușanu: *Aspecte ale influenței italiene în „Peregrinul transilvan" de Ion Codru Drăgușanu* [Aspects of the Italian Influence in *Peregrinul transilvan* by Ion Codru Drăgușanu]. The author discusses the Italian influence with respect to morphology, syntax and lexis. The last article in the volume, *Observații asupra dispozițiilor testamentare din secolul al XVII-lea* [Considerations on the Testamentary Dispositions in the 17th Century], written by Oana Uță

Bărbulescu, Mihaela Constantinescu and Gabriela Stoica, aims at analyzing the testamentary dispositions in the 17ᵗʰ century from a typological point of view. At the same time, the authors are interested in the pragmatic and rhetoric approach of this type of texts.

Gathering an impressive number of articles on very different topics, the present volume reflects the stage of the Romanian linguistic research as well as the interest paid to language facts, irrespective of the domain they belong to. Thus, we consider that this collection of studies represents an essential reference for the all those who are interested in the evolution of the Romanian language.

Irina Nicula
"Iorgu Iordan – Al. Rosetti" Institute of Linguistics, Bucharest

DANA-MIHAELA ZAMFIR, *Morfologia verbului în daco-româna veche (secolele al XVI-lea−al XVII-lea)* [Morphologie du verbe en vieux daco-roumain (16ᵉ−17ᵉ siècles)], Bucureşti, Editura Academiei Române, I, 2005, 496 p., II, 2007, 380 p.

Les deux volumes du livre représentent le résultat d'une activité de recherche personnelle de l'auteur de 10 ans environ. La morphologie du verbe roumain est décrite dans une perspective dialectale et historique suivant séparément le 16ᵉ siècle, la première moitié du 17ᵉ et la deuxième moitié du 17ᵉ siècle. Le corpus sur lequel a travaillé l'auteur est défini avec modestie comme étant un fragment représentatif pour la totalité du matériel linguistique de chaque étape qui fait l'objet de la recherche (p. 5), mais, en réalité, il s'agit du corpus le plus riche utilisé jusqu'à présent dans la linguistique roumaine pour une étude de morphologie diachronique.

Le corpus est composé, pour chaque période, des textes littéraires et des documents originaux, tels que *Documente şi însemnări româneşti din secolul al XVI-lea*, les documents édités par Ion Bianu en 1907, *Documente privind istoria Românei, Documenta Romaniae Historica.* Cette dernière collection a été enrichie pour le 2ᵉ volume, grâce à la parution de deux autres volumes de documents. Il faut remarquer aussi l'effort de l'auteur d'utiliser certains manuscrits qui n'ont pas encore été édités et qu'elle a dû translitérer elle-même.

La conception du livre est la suivante : dans le premier volume, il s'agit des problèmes généraux de la morphologie diachronique du verbe, de l'indicatif présent, du subjonctif et de l'impératif, du phénomène d'iotacisation, tandis que le 2ᵉ volume traite des temps passés, du futur et du conditionnel.

Après avoir formulé des observations portant sur le système de transcription et de translitération des textes (étant donné que la plupart des textes appartenant à l'ancien daco-roumain sont écrits utilisant l'alphabet cyrillique), l'auteur discute dans le **premier chapitre** les **verbes irréguliers** (*a fi* 'être'*, a avea* 'avoir'*, a vrea* 'vouloir'*, a lua* 'prendre'*, a da* 'donner'*, a sta* 'rester'*, a bea* 'boire'*, a la* 'laver (archaïque)'). Pour chaque verbe, l'auteur compare l'information offerte par le corpus avec la situation dialectale d'aujourd'hui (illustrée par l'*Atlas linguistique roumain*), ce qui lui permet souvent de faire des observations concernant le moment (approximatif) où la séparation dialectale s'est produite, la région où telle ou telle innovation morphologique a eu lieu, aussi bien que de corriger certaines affirmations générales faites auparavant sur le fondement d'un corpus beaucoup plus réduit.

Le **deuxième chapitre** contient une descriprion détaillée des **classes de conjugaison**. L'auteur prend en considération plusieurs situations[1] : des verbes appartenant à la 2ᵉ conjugaison étymologique qui ont passé à la 3ᵉ (*a ţinea* 'tenir'*, a rămânea* 'rester'*, a umplea* 'remplir') ; 3ᵉ > 1ᵉ (*a adauge − a*

---

[1] Il faut dire que, d'après le suffixe de l'infinitif, les quatre classes de conjugaison en roumain sont : 1. *-a,* 2. *-ea,* 3. *-e,* 4. *-i, -î.*

adăuga 'ajouter', dont le changement est inexplicable, *a vie* 'vivre', *a învie* 'ressusciter', *a scrie* 'écrire', dont le changement a des raisons phonétiques), etc. ; des verbes oscillant entre la 1ᵉ et la 4ᵉ conjugaison (*a adevăra/a adeveri* 'avérer', *a ajutora/a ajutori* 'aider', *a arginta/a arginti* 'argenter', *a curăța/a curăți* 'nettoyer', *a ferica/a ferici* 'rendre qqn heureux', *a găta/a găti* 'finir', *a îmbogăța/a îmbogăți* 'enrichir', etc.) ; des verbes appartenant à la 1ᵉ ou à la 4ᵉ conjugaison ayant des doublets étranges (*a se îndeletnici* 's'occuper de', *a străluci* 'scintiller', *a prelungi* 'prolonger', etc.) et d'autres déviations de conjugaison.

Dans le **troisième chapitre**, l'auteur s'occupe de **l'indicatif présent, du subjonctif et de l'impératif**, dont l'histoire dans l'évolution du roumain a des partie communes. Discutant des problèmes des particularités flexionnelles, l'auteur s'arrête pour expliquer la forme du suffixe de présent à la 1ᵉ personne du pluriel (*cântă* 'il chante'/*cântăm* 'nous chantons'), qui, pour certains verbes, n'est pas étymologique, mai modellée sur la forme des verbes de la 2ᵉ conjugaison (*tace* 'il se tait'/*tăcem* 'nous nous taisons'). Ensuite, la description continue avec les désinences des verbes tels que *a şti* 'savoir', *a (a)coperi* 'couvrir', *a descoperi* 'découvrir', *a suferi* 'souffrir' etc. Les alternances phonétiques dans le radical de certains verbes sont un autre aspect envisagé. L'auteur distingue les alternances générales en daco-roumain (*o ~ oa*) de celles qui caractérisent certaines régions du pays (*e ~ ea, e ~ ă*) et fixe le moment de leur séparation dialectale. D'autres sujets envisagés dans ce chapitre sont: le changement vocalique déterminé par la place de l'accent, les phénomènes de dièrese, le rapport entre les formes « fortes » (sans suffixe spécifique) et les formes « faibles » (avec suffixe spécifique) du présent à la 1ᵉ et à la 4ᵉ conjugaison, les premières individualisant l'ouest du pays et les dernières, le sud. En traitant des problèmes spéciaux de l'impératif, l'auteur souligne la répartition territoriale différente de certaines variantes (par exemple, celles du verbe *a aduce* 'apporter' − *adu/adă/ado/ad*), de même que l'apparition des formes dites « courtes » de l'impératif négatif provenant des verbes *a duce* 'porter ; aller', *a face* 'faire' et *a zice* 'dire'. L'auteur s'intéresse aussi à la possibilité de disloquer le morphème libre du subjonctif roumain (*să* 'que'), au subjonctif passé et au subjonctif surcomposé, aussi bien qu'au subjonctif à participe présent (*să fie făcând* litt. 'qu'il soit faisant'), qui représente l'une des voies de développement du présomptif parfait en roumain.

Le **quatrième chapitre** a comme sujet l'**iotacisation**, phénomène général en ancien daco-roumain, qui consiste dans la palatalisation du segment final des verbes en -*t, -d, -n* et -*r*, à l'indicatif et au subjonctif présent, aussi bien qu'au participe présent. Au 16ᵉ siècle a commencé le processus de dé-iotacisation, c'est-à-dire que les formes étymologiques ont été recréées, sauf le participe présent de certaines verbes. Le point d'irradiation pour ce phénomène a été, à ce que l'on peut savoir, soit la Moldavie, soit l'ouest pour les verbes en -*t* et -*d* et très probablement l'ouest pour les verbes en -*n*, la situation des verbe en -*r* étant moins claire. De toute façon, la plus conservateur s'avère être le sud, ou ces formes avec iotacisme existent encore aujourd'hui en tant que faits de langue populaires.

Passant au 2ᵉ volume, l'auteur discute dans le **cinquième chapitre** le **parfait.** Elle s'occupe des temps du passé et des rapports entre ceux-ci, à savoir le rapport entre le passé simple et le passé composé (qui, en ancien daco-roumain n'anticipait pas la limitation du passé simple à la région de sud-ouest qui se manifeste aujourd'hui), entre le passé composé et le passé surcomposé (le dernier n'étant plus utilisé de nos jours avec cette valeur, mais avec la valeur de plus-que-parfait et seulement dans certaines régions de l'ouest et du nord-ouest), et ensuite des structures non-grammaticalisées, qui acquéraient accidentellement la valeur de parfait. En ce qui suit, l'auteur analyse à tour de rôle les particularités formelles des temps du parfait. En ce qui concerne le passé simple, un moment très important pour son évolution est représenté par l'apparition, au 17ᵉ siècle, des formes non-étymologiques, qui contient le segment -*se-*, le type *zisei* 'je dis' remplaçant le type étymologique *ziş*. La description du passé simple continue avec les problèmes des formes pour chaque personne, avec les paradigmes des verbes irréguliers *a fî* 'être', *a avea* 'avoir' et *a vrea* 'vouloir' et enfin avec l'extension du segment -*ră*- du passé simple aux plus-que-parfait. L'auteur présente ensuite certaines innovations qui concernent le passé composé : la forme de l'auxiliaire *au* (utilisée au début pour le singulier aussi bien que pour le pluriel de la 3ᵉ personne) a été remplacée par *a* au singulier ; la forme *o* représente une innovation du 17ᵉ siècle, utilisée aujourd'hui seulement dans le nord. Les derniers

points de ce chapitre sont : les oppositions thématiques au parfait et au participe passé (pour *a da* 'donner', *a sta* 'rester', *a face* 'faire', *a veni* 'venir' etc.) et les particularités accidentelles des formes analytiques de parfait (la dislocation de l'auxiliaire, la chute de l'auxiliaire dans la coordination, l'inversion, l'accord du participe passé).

Dans le **sixième chapitre**, après avoir passé en revue les types d'**imparfait** qui s'utilisaient en ancien daco-roumain (le type synthétique, *făceam* 'je faisais', et le type analytique, *eram făcând* litt. 'j'étais faisant'), l'auteur s'attarde sur le premier type, qui est le seul utilisé en roumain moderne, présentant : l'apparition des désinences -*m* (1e personne) et -*u* (3e personne du pluriel), la modification formelle du suffixe d'imparfait des verbes de la 4e conjugaison, l'imparfait des verbes *a da* 'donner', *a sta* 'rester' et *a vrea* 'vouloir' qui avaient deux séries de formes, aussi bien que des particularités accidentelles, à savoir la dislocation, les problèmes de la coordination et de l'inversion des formes paraphrastiques.

Le **septième chapitre** concerne le **plus-que-parfait**. L'auteur attire l'attention sur le fait qu'en ancien daco-roumain la paraphrase qui avait cette valeur n'était pas du type *am fost făcut* litt. 'j'ai été fait', comme il l'est de nos jours dans certaines régions du pays, mais du type *eram făcut* litt. 'j'étais fait', aussi bien que d'autres structures dont la grammaticalisation était faible. En ce qui concerne les formes synthétiques, l'auteur affirme que l'apparition de la désinence -*m* pour la 1e personne doit être mise en relation avec le même phénomène qui a affecté l'imparfait et elle rejette l'idée que le flectif -*seşi* de la 2e personne du singulier est une forme originelle − comme on avait dit auparavant − et non une innovation. Le segment -*ră*- qui, conformément aux normes actuelles doit apparaître au pluriel pour toutes les personnes est attesté à la 3e personne depuis le 17e siècle, mai à la 1e et à la 2e personne il n'apparaît qu'au 19e. Vers la fin du chapitre, on peut s'informer sur l'évolution des formes de plus-que-parfait de certains verbes irréguliers, aussi bien que sur les particularités telles que la dislocation, l'inversion et l'accord des formes analytiques.

Le sujet de l'**avant-dernier chapitre** est représenté par les temps du **futur.** Le premier aspect à analyser concerne les rapports entre les temps du futur − la forme courante en ancien daco-roumain (qui est la forme littéraire d'aujourd'hui), le futur à participe présent (*voi fi făcând*), qui est à l'origine du présomptif présent, le futur à subjonctif, le futur composé du verbe *a avea* et du subjonctif du verbe à conjuger. Ensuite, l'auteur discute du futur antérieur et des formes surcomposées. Elle prend aussi en considération histoire de l'auxiliaire du futur (*a vrea* 'vouloir'), qui a subi plusieurs modifications correspondant aux formes populaires d'aujourd'hui. Le chapitre finit sur les particularités accidentelles des périphrases à valeur de futur : l'inversion, la dislocation la chute de l'auxiliaire dans la coordination, la réduplication et l'expansion de l'auxiliaire, l'accord du participe pour le futur antérieur.

Dans le **dernier chapitre,** il s'agit du **conditionnel**. En ce qui concerne le conditionnel présent, l'auteur montre le rapport entre le conditionnel synthétique (qui n'était plus utilisé au 17e dans la langue parlée) et le type *aş fi* (auxiliaire 'avoir' + l'infinitif du verbe), la forme normale de nos jours. Pour ce dernier type, l'auteur discute du moment où l'auxiliaire est devenu invariable à la 3e personne (*ară* > *ar*): l'innovation est apparue au 17e siècle.

À la fin, il faut remarquer la structure symétrique des chapitres, la recherche rigoureuse et systématique du corpus, séparant toujours les documents originaux et les textes littéraires (la plupart étant des traductions), les informations dialectales riches, se référant à langue du 16e−17e siècles, aussi bien qu'au roumain moderne, le recours à l'origine latine des formes, l'effort de reproduire toutes les attestations des formes spéciales, l'interprétation précise des exemples et l'effort de systématiser les valeurs des formes dans le contexte (du texte et de l'époque). Le livre de Dana-Mihaela Zamfir réussit à créer une image très ample de la morphologie du verbe en ancien daco-roumain, qui, jusqu'à présent était un territoire instable, gouverné seulement par des hypothèses. Les trois verbes qui résument la démarche scientifique de ce livre sont : décrire, inventorier, corriger.

Adina Dragomirescu
Institut de Linguistique « Iorgu Iordan − Al. Rosetti » de Bucarest
Faculté des Lettres, Université de Bucarest

Dictionarium Valachico-Latinum. Primul dicţionar al limbii române [The First Dictionary of Romanian Language], Studiu introductiv, ediţie, indici şi glosar de GH. CHIVU, Bucureşti, Editura Academiei Române, 2008, 391 p.

It is to the eminent scholar, Prof. Gh. Chivu, that we owe the editing of two priceless manuscripts, extremely important for the history of Romanian language and for the evolution of the old Romanian writing system: first, a book I already reviewed somewhere else[2], a critical edition of *Institutiones linguae Valachicae*, the first Romanian grammar written in Latin, which was published in 2001 at the Romanian Academy's Publishing House, and was accompanied by a Romanian translation; the second, the *Dictionarium valachico-latinum*, the oldest lexicographic work based on Romanian language, published in 2008, represents the topic of the present review.

B. P. Hasdeu discovered this manuscript in the Budapest University's Library 140 years ago. Although several studies have tried to analyse and discuss it, none could be classified as a modern critical edition of this Romanian – Latin Dictionary. After more than two decades of intensive research, Gh. Chivu has finally produced such an edition: a philological study and a linguistic description of the manuscript, which both attempt to clarify several problems related to its origin – its authorship, and the place and the date it was written. To show the manuscript's evolution from the initial transcription to the last review, Gh. Chivu chose to reproduce the Latin glosses besides the Romanian word entries. Moreover, the complete transcript of the lexicon is accompanied by facsimiles, by footnotes and indexes of all words, constructions and expressions and by a glossary.

Most researchers specialised in the study of old Romanian texts have claimed that *Dictionarium valachico-latinum* was written in the second half of the 17th century. The paper's rigorous filigranological analysis and the calculus method accepted in filigranology allowed Gh. Chivu to argue that the dictionary was undoubtedly written between 1640 and 1660. The paternity of the oldest Romanian-Latin lexicon has also been commented upon and discussed by Chivu's predecessors; nevertheless, he is the one who scientifically compared the orthography found in the initial part of the manuscript kept in Budapest with the very few notes of Mihail Halici, the father on the one hand, and the changes brought to the initial form of the dictionary with the handwriting of Mihail Halici, the son, on the other hand. Although no real proof exists, the latter has been considered the most competent annotator of the text. Linking his findings with historical extralinguistic information, Gh. Chivu claims that "the paternity of the oldest known Romanian- Latin dictionary remains *Anonymus Caransebesiensis* until further evidence; together with other 17th century scholars, translators, editors or simple copyists who used a Latin writing system in a Hungarian manner, the unknown author, who had no connection with the Halicis, illustrated the cultural movement of that time from the Banat region." (p. 28–29).

Gh. Chivu also suggests several convincing proposals related to the model the Romanian-Latin lexicon followed. He analysed carefully several dictionaries used by scholars from Banat and Transylvania during the second half of the 17th century, claiming that Albert Szenczi Molnár's *Lexicon latino-graeco-hungaricum* seems to be the main model-source, together with several other bi- or multi-lingual dictionaries needed to translate the Romanian word entries into Latin.

However, the presence of several word entries whose literary form is different from the one used in Banat during the mid-17th century suggests that the unknown author or annotators might have consulted several other Romanian texts (including dictionaries) that originated in other areas besides Banat.

---

[2] V. "Grigore Maior, Institutiones lingvae valachicae. Lexicon compendiarium latino-valachicum. Ediţie de Alin-Mihai Gherman, vol. I, Alba Iulia, 2001, 336 p ; *** Institutiones linguae valachicae. Prima gramatică a limbii române scrisă în limba latină. Ediţie critică de Gheorghe Chivu. Recenzia şi traducerea textului latin de Lucia Wald, Bucureşti, Editura Academiei Române, 2001, 166 p.", in *Limba română*, L, 3–4, 2001, p. 243–247.

The Latin lexicographic influence is visible at two levels: the way in which word entries were recorded and their orthography. Adjectives' feminine form is often placed immediately after the masculine one, but only by indicating its feminine ending –ă; verbs are given only with their first person singular indicative. Word entries are frequently written in an etymological manner which supports the claim that the Dictionary's author was aware of the relationship existing between some Romanian words and their Latin equivalents, independently of the possible influence of the existing Latin gloss (*afflu, suffer ; summé ; gutté ; appropiedz, suppun* etc.).

The linguistic description of the first Romanian lexicon written with Latin characters Chivu proposes is a remarkable scientific contribution: he analyses thoroughly and comments upon the orthographic, phonetic, morphologic and lexical phenomena encountered in the manuscript.

As already stated, this critical edition of the first Romanian-based lexicographic work produced on a Romanian territory is significant for linguistic and cultural reasons: it registers particular lexical items and brings information about different cultural models present in the Romanian territories during the 17th century. The *Dictionarium valachico-latinum*, the work of person who knew extremely well both the literary and the Banat's dialects of Romanian, is an important linguistic source for historical dialectology, for the history of Romanian lexicography, as well as for any historical analysis of the Romanian language spoken in a cultural area where the idea of a Latin origin of Romanian had already manifested strongly.

The 5325 word entries represent the highest number of Romanian words registered before the turn of the 17th century. The lexicon is extremely rich in regionalisms, some of them of Serbian or Hungarian origin; most of them still have an unknown etymology. The Latin glosses which accompany several word entries prove that some common Romanian words which were thought to have disappeared from the 16th century were still in use in Banat around 1650. Many words are first attested in this dictionary or their presence in *Dictionarium valachico-latinum* allows for different revisions. Last, but not least, *Dictionarium* also contains many words which are not found in any other historical Romanian dictionary.

Gh. Chivu has resolved remarkably the difficulties arising from transcribing the Latin words, signalling any deviation from Classical Latin and from the Medieval and Neo-Latin usage. Thus, the edition under review here becomes an important source for the study of the Neo-Latin written in Romanian territories.

In conclusion, the scientific value of Chivu's edition of the *Dictionarium valachico-latinum* springs both from its content and its form, turning into a model that must be followed by all those who wish to edit and publish not only Old Romanian texts, but any kind of text.

Ana-Cristina Halichias
University of Bucharest

OANA TATU, *Traduceri româneşti din dramaturgia shakespeariană. Studiu lingvistic contrastiv* [Shakespeare's Theater in Romanian Translations. A linguistic contrastive study], Braşov, Editura Universităţii Transilvania din Braşov, 2008, 336 p.

Traduceri româneşti din dramaturgia shakespeariană. Studiu lingvistic contrastiv is the result of an ambitious and insightful investigation conducted primarily within the framework of translation studies. By and large, it is a booklength treatment of literary translation involving the English-Romanian domain, focusing on the difficulties – linguistic, stylistic, rhetorical, cultural – encountered in the process of interlingual transfer.

The author's professed goal is twofold: first, to approach, in a contrastive manner, a fair number of Romanian translations of the Shakespearian drama made between the early XIXth century and the present times; second, to map, while doing so, the more sensitive areas where the two languages

and cultures depart and record the solutions adopted, in the course of time, by Romanian translators in order to bridge the gaps between them.

An interesting, albeit more covert outcome of this meticulous investigation is the glimpse (in Chapter X) that the readers are allowed to take on the historical evolution and growth of the Romanian literary standard as reflected in the successive translations of the Shakespearian work performed over approximately a century and a half.

Why Shakespeare and why his dramatic output? The main factors which seem to motivate this choice relate to the intrinsic value of the source texts, on the one hand, and to its exploitability, translation-wise, on the other. Indeed, due to its universal validity and literary value, Shakespearian drama has become - as early as the XIXth century - a desirable acquisition for the Romanian culture, exercising an unremitting fascination over the Romanian audience, translators included; moreover, given their linguistic, cultural, and rhetorical complexities, the source texts under scrutiny here provide ample and variegated material lending themselves to a comprehensive investigation of most (if not all) the aspects involved in the translation work in general, and of the Shakespearian drama in particular.

The structural organization of this book consisting of eleven chapters is based on the logical progression from the more general aspects of translation theory, the sociolinguistic context of Romanian translations from Shakespeare's work, to more specific, discrete point issues (phonetic, orthographic, lexical, verb-related, syntactic, stylistic) emerging from them; drawing on these data, the author pieces together a panoptic picture of the making of the Romanian *Schriftschprache*.

Each chapter dedicated to the discussion of translation particulars replicates, to some extent, the macrostructure of the book by adopting the same general-to-specific approach, in a manner which reminds of the *mise-en-abîme* technique sometimes found in painting as well as in literary works (Shakespeare's included): considering the fact that the topic at hand stands at the junction of theoretical linguistics, translation and cultural studies, and language history, this manner of approach makes the wealth of data all the more manageable. Moreover, as generally accepted, language facts are best explained and conceptualized in their sociolinguistic context, and in full awareness of all the variables that might be accountable for their status at a given time and place.

Having said that, it becomes understandable why the first three chapters form a theoretical, linguistic, metalinguistic, and sociolinguistic backdrop for the subsequent research. Therefore, Chapter I attempts to defend the view that translation is as much a craft as it is an art, and as much *afflatus* as it is a science. To this end, this opening chapter is a diachronic and synchronic overview of various aspects pertaining to the theory and practice of translation. It clears the ground of the ensuing investigation by looking at how the philosophy of, attitudes to and priorities in translation have changed over time, starting with Graeco-Roman Antiquity; it then touches upon the issue of translatability – still a debated and debatable topic in the specialist literature, and concludes by resorting to authoritative sources to shortlist the translation methods and techniques. Used consistently throughout the book, the terminology and concepts introduced in this chapter are germane to the research recorded in the following chapters. In Chapter II the author deals with what might be called 'the ecology of translation'. In other words, translation – as process and product – is considered from a wider, social perspective: that of the target culture. This chapter begins by tracing the beginnings, in the XVIth century, of translation work performed in the Romanian context; it then goes on to unearth the roots of the tradition of Romanian translation from Shakespeare. What is particularly interesting here is the convincing case for the peculiarity and, at the same time, the universalness of the source-texts in question – attributes that render the Bard's work both a linguistic challenge and a cultural feat. Commendable are also the author's efforts to shed light upon the complexities of drama translation (*q.v.* section 3.2 *et seq.*) and to dispel the somewhat simplistic notion that one and the same translation of a dramatic text will by default be suitable for publication as well as stage performance. Quite symmetrically, Chapter III delves into the source-culture: against the backdrop of the Elizabethan society, it highlights a number of features associated with the dramatic discourse in Shakespeare's masterpieces. Furthermore, in order to set the record straight, the author unveils the possibility that some of the source-texts might not be entirely original or at least

not the initial versions of Shakespeare's works: this is justified by the fact that, for various reasons, among which revisions, adaptations, and censoring of said material, concurrent (diachronic and synchronic) reworks of one and the same text were circulated and made available for translation much in the same way in which we now find different translation versions of one and the same source-text. This begs the question, 'are the Romanian translations of one and the same Shakespearian text different because the source-texts were different, because the source language was different (directly from English or via intermediary languages like German and French), or because of the translators' different professional and social backgrounds?' It will be agreed that it is this eye-opening question, rather than the self-evident answer that carries the weight here.

In Chapters IV to IX, the analysis of linguistic data and facts is streamlined in neat categories, much in the spirit of the theoretical linguistic analysis. In Chapter IV the author concentrates on the phonetic and orthographic particularities of the Shakespearian work. In the XVIth centruy England the literary standard was still in its teens; the ebbs and flows associated with the process of language change were felt on every level of linguistic organization. This explains the large scale occurrence of homophony, pronunciation variants, and spelling inconsistencies – phenomena which fostered ambiguity in language, hampering, as a result, the translation process. Chapter V provides a fine-grained analysis of another language level, *i.e.* the vocabulary, as it appears in the source-texts. At this level, the author aptly distinguishes between those elements which indicate Shakespeare's adherence to the linguistic and/or aesthetic canons of his time, and those areas in which he was an innovator. Drawing on this input, the chapter further maps the lexical problems encountered in translating the Shakespearian texts. Basically, these problems range in the area of denotation, connotation, stress, modality and coherence; furthermore, this chapter surveys in a neutral, non-judgmental manner the various solutions that translators have put forward over time. Moving to a different level, in Chapter VI the author does not approach − as might be expected − the morphological level of Shakespeare's language globally, but rather exploits a narrower, yet extremely interesting vein: the categories of tense and aspect of the English verb, and their rendition (in the loosest sense of the word) in Romanian. To put this complex matter into a broader perspective, the first two sections of this chapter are theoretical excursions into the specialist literature on the matter of tense and aspect in both languages; from this vantage point, the readers are given a clearer view of the conceptual potential and formal repertoires available in the two languages as well as of the translation options that the Romanian translators of Shakespeare's work were presented with. In brief, let it be said that the exploitability of this particular area where English and Romanian are largely non-isomorphic and the pertinence of the results yielded by the contrastive approach to the issue at hand fully compensate for the narrower scope of the analysis included in this chapter. The little correspondence between the syntactic levels of the two languages is the starting point of Chapter VII. Apart from this 'natural' impediment, matters are further complicated by the inconsistencies and fluctuations of a syntactic system which is still in the making. This, it is argued, puts a number of significant constraints on the translator, all the more so considering the fact that the syntax of the Shakespearian texts bears the conspicuous marks of their author's taste for innovation. By and large, the translation difficulties shortlisted and convincingly illustrated here mainly relate to word order, concord, and ellipsis. The various solutions to such problems are those put forward in the translation variants of *Othello*, a text generally considered prototypical for the Shakespearian syntax. In the next two chapters the focus of attention is oriented towards the macrostructure of the source-texts; Chapters VIII and IX concern themselves with the style, rhetoric and dialectal speech used by Shakespeare in his dramatic work. More specifically, Chapter VIII includes a detailed examination of the translation problems engendered by the stylistic variations; Chapter IX focuses on the translation challenges deriving from the alternative use, in the source-texts, of dialectal and register variation, and highlights the different means whereby translators have chosen to circumvent such obstacles.

Drawing on the corpus of data collected so far, Chapter X is an attempt to trace the evolution of the Romanian literary standard as reflected in the translation variants of the Shakespearian drama explored in Chapters IV to IX. Starting from an overview of the milestones in the progress of the Romanian language, on one hand, and of translation work, on the other, the author pieces together the

social and cultural context in Romania between the XVIIIth and XXth centuries. This allows to discriminate between target-texts that comply with the linguistic trends of their time in contrast with translation variants which depart from their contemporary linguistic norms. It is this particular aspect that the author of this book shows interest in: linguistic innovation – lexical, morphological, syntactic, stylistic – that we owe translators of the Shakespearian drama. Chapter XI concludes the book by summarizing the key elements and pulling together all the different strands of the discussion included in each chapter.

Overall, like with any sound and well-argued research, the relevance of the findings included in this insightful work goes beyond the narrower domain of the Romanian language; this is as much due to the breadth of the research scope as it is to its well-thought out analytical framework. A significant amount of scholarly interest has been devoted to both the history of the Romanian language and translation studies, in our context; never before, to my knowledge, have these two lines of research met so felicitously: it is fascinating to find out how and to what extent the whole array of obstacles put in the way of translation by benchmark texts like the Shakespearian drama sparked off the resources of one's own language, refining it and fostering its growth.

Marinela Burada
"Transilvania" University of Braşov

CHRISTOS CLAIRIS, *Vers une linguistique inachevée*, Peeters, Paris-Leuven-Dudley, 2005, 96 p.

Le livre est structuré en quatre chapitres et contient un glossaire qui réunit certains des termes utilisés.

Dans l'**Introduction**, l'auteur parle d'une linguistique à multiples « visages » : *inachevée*, *scientifique*, *dynamique*. Il part d'une idée qui pourrait sembler inquiétante : la linguistique, conçue comme « une étude scientifique du langage humain », ne peut pas être achevée. Dans l'étude scientifique d'une langue, la démarche de connaissance est « nécessairement incomplète », parce que, tout en ayant des zones accessibles à la compréhension, une langue reste inépuisable : « Penser qu'il puisse exister une linguistique achevée qui ne laisserait échapper aucun aspect de la langue est non seulement une utopie, mais une utopie qui peut donner lieu à de dangereuses dérives » (p. 15). L'auteur postule ainsi l'inachèvement comme condition essentielle de la linguistique. La reconnaissance de ce trait évident serait donc la condition fondamentale d'une ouverture permanente à son objet (qui est le langage humain). En d'autres mots, l'étude scientifique d'une langue suppose, dès le début, l'acceptation du fait qu'on a affaire à un objet qui, étant représenté par une activité créatrice et dynamique, échappe à une compréhension complète. De sorte que toute certitude qu'il pourrait y exister une linguistique « achevée » n'est qu'une utopie.

Premièrement, l'auteur fait une très brève histoire de la réflexion sur le langage, soulignant l'importance de l'École linguistique de Prague, qui a pris en compte l'analyse des sons dans l'étude de la langue, après une longue tradition qui prenait en considération seulement l'analyse des textes écrits. L'auteur inscrit de manière explicite sa démarche dans la ligne de la linguistique structurale et fonctionnelle européenne.

En second lieu, l'auteur s'arrête sur la linguistique qui se présente comme scientifique. Une démarche scientifique authentique (donc objective) devrait prendre comme point de départ la délimitation des données auxquelles on s'intéresse et le choix d'un point de vue duquel on les traite. Adoptant la perspective fonctionnaliste, l'auteur confère une place importante à l'observation et au respect des faits constatés, construisant le prototype d'une linguistique dynamique, prête à reconsidérer sa base théorique en fonction des découvertes. Une importance spéciale est donnée au *principe de la pertinence*, l'auteur signalant en ce sens qu'il faudrait prendre en compte les faits *pertinents*, qui jouent un certain rôle dans le processus de la communication ; opérer une hiérarchie

des faits et non pas restreindre l'objet de l'étude : « Aucun détail de la langue étudiée ne doit pas échapper au linguiste, mais celui-ci s'attache à marquer quelle est, dans cette langue, la valeur de chaque fait observé en fonction de sa contribution à la communication » (p. 18). Le linguiste devrait travailler avec deux types d'unités minimales : phonèmes et *monèmes* (l'auteur comprenant par *monème* une « unité significative minimale », p. 90), qui se définissent par opposition dans le système. Le caractère vocal de la langue conduit, par la linéarité, vers l'existence d'une *syntaxe*, tandis que la variation des signifiants des monèmes représente l'objet d'étude de la *morphologie.*

Dans une troisième étape, l'auteur explique ce qu'il faut comprendre par une linguistique dynamique : la variation linguistique étant quelque chose d'inhérent aux langues, elle assure l'évolution, la naissance ou la disparition de celles-ci. Même dans la synchronie, la langue n'est pas une seule structure ou un seul système, mais un mécanisme multiple (coexistence simultanée de formes diverses), ce qui détermine l'auteur de rappeler la formule d'André Martinet – la *synchronie dynamique.* Cette conception met la linguistique en contact avec la sociologie, l'ethnologie, l'économie, l'histoire. L'idée de la multiplicité des formes doit changer aussi la conception sur les grammaires : il n'y a plus une seule norme, une langue immobile et homogène, l'acceptabilité d'une expression dépendant de la réussite de la communication.

1. Dans le premier chapitre, *Structures et libertés linguistiques*, l'auteur traite de la variation linguistique (typologie et mécanismes) et de la prédictivité rendue possible par les recherches entreprises en prenant en compte la dynamique linguistique. S'interrogeant sur le rythme des changements produits au niveau des langues, l'auteur conclut que les faits historiques, politiques et sociaux exercent une influence sur l'accélération ou le ralentissement du changement : voir par exemple une reforme linguistique qui accélère le changement.

Il sera question de trois types de variations de formes correspondant au même sens en synchronie :

a. variations obligatoires et contextuelles (variations formelles d'un même signe, conditionnées par le contexte et appartenant au domaine de la morphologie)

b. variations conditionnées (toutes les variations liées à des facteurs régionaux, sociaux, d'âge, de sexe, de niveau d'éducation, de style, d'appréciation subjective sur la langue ou à une situation de communication particulière)

c. les variations libres ; dans ce cas, l'auteur s'arrête sur la notion de *fluctuation* de *phonèmes* (utilisée dès 1947 par Kenneth L. Pike, en partant des exemples de *kalaba*), qu'il définit dans le glossaire comme « la possibilité pour le même locuteur, dans les mêmes circonstances, de faire alterner librement deux ou plus de deux phonèmes dans la même unité significative, et cela seulement pour certaines unités du lexique ».

Les fluctuations entre phonèmes sont indépendantes des variations conditionnées. C'est Mary Ritchie Key qui a introduit pour la première fois dans le milieu fonctionnaliste le concept de *fluctuation*, absent des travaux fonctionnalistes jusqu'aux années 1970, et même ignoré parfois après. L'auteur rapproche du point de vue théorique la fluctuation du *polymorphisme* (défini par Jacques Allières en 1954): « la coexistence, dans le langage d'un sujet parlant, de deux ou plusieurs variantes phonétiques ou morphologiques d'un même mot, utilisées concurremment pour exprimer le même concept, le choix de l'une ou de l'autre apparaissant comme indépendant du conditionnement articulatoire (tempo, etc.) ou d'une recherche quelconque d'expressivité ». Le polymorphisme représenterait donc l'existence de deux formes concurrentes de la même unité significative, indépendamment d'un conditionnement articulatoire (débit lent/rapide, par exemple) ou stylistique et expressif, et coexistant dans le langage du même locuteur.

L'auteur fait une esquisse de classification des fluctuations, tenant compte de trois perspectives :

A. les rapports des phonèmes considérés entre eux : les fluctuations existent entre phonèmes qui présentent une base commune ou entre phonèmes qui ne présentent pas de base commune (qu'ils soient ou pas voisins dans le système, donc neutralisables ou nonneutralisables) ;

B. les causalités qui provoquent les fluctuations ; ici, l'auteur distingue trois grandes catégories de facteurs qui déclenchent une fluctuation :

– les pressions du système ;

– les contacts linguistiques (entre variétés régionales d'une même langue, entre langue de prestige et langue orale, entre langues orales, entre langues de prestige, entre langues de la même famille ou de familles différentes) ;

– les facteurs extralinguistiques (présence/absence d'une planification linguistique, le rôle de l'écriture, l'importance de l'imaginaire linguistique)

C. la dynamique linguistique ; de ce point de vue, l'auteur distingue quatre cas :

– élimination d'une opposition ;

– acquisition d'une opposition ;

– disparition des langues ;

– cas isolés.

L'auteur se place lui-même parmi ceux qui soutiennent que les fluctuations ne font pas partie de la phonologie (à côté d'André Martinet, Henriette Walter, Jean-Michel Builles). L'argument invoqué serait que « les fluctuations ne peuvent affecter qu'**une partie** du vocabulaire, jamais la totalité » (p. 34), elles existent seulement si l'opposition existe. Étant des variations de forme de certains monèmes, les fluctuations devraient être traitées dans le cadre de la morphologie. En ce sens, l'auteur propose un chapitre nouveau de la morphologie : **la tropologie**, définie comme « l'étude des variations possibles et non obligatoires », une sorte de « morphologie libre » (p. 35). L'auteur croit que les faits tropologiques permettent des hypothèses de prédiction sur les tendances évolutives d'une langue. Il choisit comme exemple pertinent la recherche d'Hélène Béliyanni sur le grec de l'évangile apocryphe de Nicodème et celle de Dragomira Valtcheva sur le grec médiéval, qui ont montré, à travers l'étude des variations libres en synchronie dynamique, des faits concordants avec l'état du grec contemporain.

2. Dans le deuxième chapitre, *Au seuil de la syntaxe : les classes*, l'auteur s'occupe du problème de l'identification des classes syntaxiques d'une langue (« parties du discours »).

Les unités significatives minimales (USM) n'ont pas le même comportement au niveau des relations qu'elles établissent, il y a des préférences (compatibilités) et des restrictions combinatoires, observation qui date des premières réflexions sur la langue, chez les philosophes grecs. L'auteur part du dialogue du *Sophiste* de Platon (dont il reproduit un petit fragment) pour établir la source des premières discussions sur les parties du discours (notamment la première observation de la distinction verbe – nom dans une langue). But : clarifier le principe de répartition des unités de la langue dans des classes distinctes, en fonction de leurs possibilités combinatoires.

L'auteur préfère au terme de *morphème* celui de *monème*, le premier étant trop lié à la forme. À côté de *monème*, on propose également – comme terme moins specialisé – l'expression « signe minimum », issue du syntagme « unité significative minimale ». Quels seraient, d'après l'auteur, les critères de la découverte des classes ? Il fait appel de nouveau à une idée d'André Martinet, celle d'encadrer dans la même classe (à l'intérieur d'une langue) les monèmes présentant les mêmes compatibilités, à condition qu'ils s'excluent dans le contexte. La *compatibilité syntaxique* est définie par l'auteur comme « la faculté de deux ou plus de deux monèmes ou synthèmes d'une langue donnée d'être employés ensemble et liés dans une relation syntaxique » (p. 47). La précision du sens du terme *synthème* s'impose : il s'agit de toute unité du lexique qui est formée de deux ou plusieurs monèmes, mais dont le comportement n'est pas different de celui d'un monème unique.

3. Dans le chapitre *Au cœur de la syntaxe : fonctions et noyau central*, l'auteur se propose d'esquisser l'image d'une syntaxe fonctionnelle conçue comme fondamentalement relationnelle. La détermination est envisagée comme une opération essentielle de la syntaxe, source de la hiérarchie établie au niveau des unités significatives qui existent autour d'un prédicat.

L'auteur définit ici *la fonction*, « unité linguistique qui permet de spécifier le type de détermination entre deux unités significatives pouvant entretenir entre elles plus d'un seul type de rapport et dont l'une assume l'emploi de noyau central (prédicat) ou de prédicatoïde (noyau central de la proposition subordonnée) » (p. 90). Toujours dans ce chapitre, l'auteur développe la distinction entre la **syntaxe nucléaire** et la **syntaxe connective** : la première représente un type de construction enregistrée dans les langues qui présentent l'opposition verbo-nominale, une construction à l'intérieur de laquelle le verbe-noyau distribue les fonctions syntaxiques aux unités qui gravitent autour de lui.

La seconde s'actualise dans la connexion sémantique de deux monèmes non verbaux constituant un énoncé complet, connexion qui peut être directe ou indirecte (dans ce dernier cas, elle est réalisée par l'intermédiaire d'un monème non verbal ou d'un verbe). La syntaxe connective véhicule, du point de vue communicatif, les fonctions d'attribution d'une qualité à une entité, de classification d'une unité dans un ensemble donné ou d'identification de cette entité à d'autres semblables (les structures d'équivalence ou de solidarité sémantique) ; dans certaines langues, elle peut avoir aussi le rôle de localiser, présenter ou prouver l'existence d'une entité.

4. Le dernier chapitre est consacré au **processus de la disparition des langues**. Avant de faire une brève description des facteurs qui déterminent le phénomène, l'auteur présente les situations les plus claires quand ce processus a lieu : une langue disparaît quand les locuteurs disparaissent (« l'assassinat des langues » – correspondant par exemple au génocide d'un peuple) ou quand les locuteurs eux-mêmes cessent de la parler (cela tient de la dynamique naturelle d'une langue : on prend ici le cas du latin, dont l'évolution a eu comme résultat la naissance des langues romanes). Il y a aussi la situation où une langue cède sa place à une autre, étant soumise à des pressions. L'auteur esquisse ensuite une typologie du phenomène de la disparition des langues, essayant d'établir les facteurs internes (la présence d'un grand nombre de fluctuations de phonèmes, la réduction d'un système phonologique, la simplification morphologique, le développement d'une syntaxe facultative, la perte de la richesse stylistique, la diminution des marques de fonctions syntaxiques, etc.) et externes (économiques, démographiques, culturels, éducationnels, de planification linguistique, politiques, etc. d'un côté, et la restriction des situations d'usage d'une langue ou la transmission partielle d'une langue aux jeunes générations, d'un autre côté).

S'inscrivant explicitement dans la perspective de la linguistique structurale et fonctionnelle, le livre traite brièvement d'une série de problèmes de phonologie, de syntaxe et de typologie qui restent d'actualité.

Ana-Maria Mihail
Institut de Linguistique « Iorgu Iordan – Al. Rosetti » de Bucarest

DANIEL SCHREIER, KAREN LAVARELLO-SCHREIER, *Tristan da Cunha. History, people, language*, London, Battlebridge, 2003, VIII + 88 p.

Daniel Schreier and Karen Lavarello-Schreier's book consists of an "Introduction" (pp. 1−4), three chapters (pp. 5-69), an "Epilogue" (pp. 73−76), "A Tristan glossary" (pp. 77−82), the "References" (pp. 83−84), "Useful websites and additional information" (p. 85) and an "Index" (pp. 87−88). It contains one map and 67 photographs.

Chapter 1, "The history of Tristan da Cunha" (pp. 5−28) deals with the history of the island, from its discovery by the Portuguese in 1506 until 2003. Included is a detailed account of the demographic evolutions on the island, from the first permanent settlement in 1816 until the present day.

In chapter 2, "Life on Tristan da Cunha today" (pp. 29−50), the authors address the challenges posed by the socio-economic changes that have affected the island since World War II. Particular attention is paid to the impact of modernization on the traditional Tristanian "way of life" and on the local customs and traditions.

Chapter 3, "The language of Tristan da Cunha" (pp. 51−69) focuses on Tristan da Cunha English[3], a variety of colonial English, spoken on the island since the 1820s. The main issues discussed in this chapter are the origin of the language and the reconstruction of its linguistic past.

[3] Also known as "Tristan Slang", as it is called by some of its native speakers, and as "Tristanian English", e.g. in P. Trudgill (2004), *New-dialect formation. The inevitability of colonial Englishes*, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press.

The origin of Tristan da Cunha English is discussed with reference to the so-called "founder effect", i.e. on the assumption that "the dialects spoken by the founders of a new colony leave a permanent imprint and influence the future development of the newly forming variety" (p. 55). Four founding groups were instrumental in the emergence of this variety of English: British, American, European non-British and a group of women from St Helena. Of the eight pre-1850 British settlers, two came from Southwest England, one from London, one from Sussex, one from Yorkshire and one from the Scottish Lowlands, while the exact origin of the remaining two is unknown (pp. 55-56). Except for one of the pre-1850 American settlers, from Massachusetts, the origin of the other five is not known, but the authors suggest (p. 56) that "they may have come from areas with a strong whaling tradition (i.e. coastal New England)". The most important "founder effects" are attributed to the eight pre-1850 British settlers (p. 56). The linguistic influence of the settlers of European non-British descent appears to be mainly lexical (p. 57). Finally, a linguistically influential group is that of the women who arrived from St Helena in 1827. According to the authors, an English "creole was spoken on the island until fairly recently" (p. 59). Consequently, these women are the source of the creole-like features attested in Tristan da Cunha English.

In reconstructing the history of Tristan da Cunha English the authors resort to a feature analysis, i.e. they attempt to "pinpoint some structures to different areas of origin" and to "speculate […] which of the various input dialects was more influential than others" (p. 60). The authors first illustrate (pp. 60-62) the extent to which the vocabulary of Tristan da Cunha English reflects the social history of its speech community. The examples given include British English dialectal forms such as *dicelen* 'thistle', attested in Devon, and thus likely to represent a contribution of two of the pre-1850 British settlers. A number of Afrikaans and / or Dutch lexical items are also briefly discussed, e.g. *bankie* 'bench', *braai* 'barbecue', *lekker* 'delicious', *snoek* 'a local fish species'. The authors note (p. 61) that "existing English words are re-used for new terms in Tristan English" and that "words were also reused in the domain of the household". They give one such example: "refrigerators are called *coolers* on Tristan da Cunha" (p. 61). The following are the examples of American English lexical influence (p. 62): *gulch*, *mad* 'angry', the verb *guess* 'to reckon', the contracted form *tater* 'potato' and, perhaps, the second person plural pronoun *y'all*. A selected number of phonological, morphological and syntactic features are than analyzed (p. 62−67). The phonological characteristics are: [h] insertion in words beginning with a stressed vowel (pp. 62−63); the reduction of word-final consonant clusters (pp. 64−65), e.g. *des* 'desk', *lif* 'lift'; the replacement of /θ/ with /s/ in e.g. *think*, *throw* (p. 67); the epenthesis of [b] in e.g. *flour*, *shower* (p. 67). The morphological and syntactic features discussed are: the so-called "perfective *be*", i.e. the use of *be* as an auxiliary instead of *have* (p. 62), e.g. *I'm checked the parcels already*; the present tense concord system with no overt marking, e.g. *the dog bark*; the combination of perfective *be* and completive *done* (pp. 65-66), e.g. *I's done gone*; the use of *used to* and *had to* followed by past tense forms[4] (pp. 66−67), e.g. *we had to wen' out*; the omission of the copula, e.g. *I hittin'*; the omission of the auxiliary *be*, e.g. *the cattle more wilder*.

A few comments are in order with respect to the analysis of some of these features of Tristan da Cunha English. Thus, *cooler* 'refrigerator' is not an exclusive feature of Tristan da Cunha English. It also occurs e.g. in American English.

The contracted form *tater* 'potato' is not necessarily of American English origin. First, as mentioned by the authors (p. 62), Tristan da Cunha English is non-rhotic. Second, numerous contracted forms are attested in 19th century British English dialects[5], including *tater*, recorded in

---

[4] The phenomenon is sometimes referred to as "double past tense marking" or "past tense infinitive construction". See e.g. P. Trudgill (2004) *New-dialect formation. The inevitability of colonial Englishes*, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, p. 6.

[5] In J. Wright (1905), *English dialect dictionary*, vol. 6, Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp. 38−40.

Devon. Contracted forms occur today in various locations[6], including Scotland, Devon [tɛdi], Sussex [tɛɪtə] and Yorkshire [te:tɪ], [teətɪ] and [tɛətɪ]. It follows that both the British and the American pre-1850 settlers may have used a contracted form of *potato*. Under the circumstances, the Tristan da Cunha English form may well be the outcome of a compromise between the various American and British English phonetic realizations of the contraction of *potato*.

With respect to the perfective auxiliaries *be* and *have*, English grammar is said to have "varied between *be* and *have* for a long time" (p. 62). In fact, this was not a matter of variation, but of selection: up to the 19th century *have* was used with transitive verbs and *be* with certain intransitive, such as verbs of motion[7].

The authors appear to contradict themselves in their discussion of the possible Saint Helenian English origin of the Tristan da Cunha English *be done* construction (p. 66). Thus, they first write that in Saint Helenian English "'I done eat' is much more common than 'I's done eat'" only to add that "St Helenians […] say that they have never heard a structure that involves both *done* and an auxiliary".

The use of past tense forms after *used to* and *had to* may reflect "the influence of non-native varieties of English on Tristan da Cunha English" (p. 66). However, it cannot be claimed, as the authors do (p. 66), that an L2 acquisition error such as *I didn't meant it* "resembles the Tristanian usage strongly".

The English "/th/ and /dh/ sounds" (p. 67) should read /θ/ and /ð/ respectively. The authors also write (p. 67) that these sounds are replaced by native speakers of other languages with /s/ or /t/. This is certainly true of /θ/, but not of /ð/.

Next, I would like to discuss some of the entries in "A Tristan glossary", in the feature analysis framework outlined by the authors.

Gansey 'knitted pullover' (cf English *guernsey* 'a thick, knitted, closely fitting vest or shirt […] worn by seamen') (p. 78). The Tristan da Cunha English form indicates that it originates in Northern dialects of British English. Consider the following examples: [ganzɪ] 'vest' in the Lincolnshire dialect[8], *ganzee* 'jacket' in Cumbrian[9], *ganzie* 'a thick woolen jersey, especially worn by fishermen' in Geordie[10]. The Tristan da Cunha English form may be therefore traced back to the two pre-1850 settlers from Yorkshire and the Scottish Lowlands respectively.

Haul out 'to change (of the weather and / or wind)' (p. 79). This form may reflect nautical usage. This accords well with the fact that "almost all the male settlers had a strong nautical background" and with the assumption that "they would have acquired a good deal of nautical vocabulary" (p. 60).

Jinny 'female donkey, cf English *Jenny-ass*' (p. 79). The source of the Tristan English form is rather *jinny* [dʒini], typical of Northern British English dialects, attested in the 19th century in Northumberland, Cumbria, Durham, Yorkshire, Lancashire, Cheshire. *Jinny* 'a female ass' is recorded in the 19th century in Yorkshire and Lancashire[11]. *Jinny* [dʒɪni] 'a female donkey' still occurs in Yorkshire[12].

---

[6] See C. Upton, D. Parry and J. D. A Widdowson (1994) *Survey of English dialects. The dictionary and the grammar*, London, Routledge, pp. 308−309.

[7] See, for instance, E. van Gelderen (2006), *A history of the English language*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins, pp. 172 and 215.

[8] In C. Upton, D. Parry and J.D.A. Widdowson (1994) *Survey of English dialects. The dictionary and the grammar*, London, Routledge, p. 165.

[9] Cumbrian dictionary n.d. <http://www.gonmad.co.uk/cumbria>.

[10] Geordie dictionary n.d. <http://www.geordie.co.uk/dictionary/g.htm>.

[11] See J. Wright (1905) *English dialect dictionary*, vol. 3, Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp. 356−357.

[12] C. Upton, D. Parry and J. D. A. Widdowson (1994) *Survey of English dialects. The dictionary and the grammar*, London, Routledge, p. 226.

Sing out 'to holler or shout' (p. 81). The authors comment that "this is […] particularly common in Australian English and in English Pidgins and Creoles in the Pacific", but no connection has ever been established or suggested between these varieties and Tristan da Cunha English. On the other hand, this sense of *sing out* is also attested in several Atlantic pidgins and creoles[13]. Since an English creole appears to have been spoken on St Helena, it may have also used *sing out* with this meaning. If so, this could be the source of the Tristan English form.

Teem 'pour out' (This sense is attested in many different British locations by the EDD although it appears to be rare today.) (p. 82). It is the geographical distribution of of *teem* 'pour out' that is significant. The locations where *teem* occurs with this meaning in the 19th century include Scotland, Durham, Cumbria, Yorkshire, Lancashire, Cheshire, Nottinghamshire, Lincolnshire, Northamptonshire, Warwickshire, Worcestershire, Shropshire and Gloucestershire[14]. Moreover, this sense of *teem* is still attested in Northumberland, Durham, Nottinghamshire, Cumbria, Yorkshire, Cheshire, Derbyshire[15]. In conclusion, *teem* 'pour out' in Tristan da Cunha English can be safely traced back to two of the pre-1850 settlers from the Scottish Lowlands and Yorkshire respectively.

Tissick 'mild bronchitis' (< English *phtisic* [tɪzɪk]) (p. 82). Variants of this form are attested in a number of 19th century British English dialects, including those of Devon, Sussex and Yorkshire[16]. Thus, at least four of the pre-1850 British settlers may have shared this lexical item.

The above comments should be seen rather as additions and suggestions. They do not detract in the least from the merits of the work reviewed. This is a truly fascinating book for which the authors are to be commended.

Andrei A. Avram
University of Bucharest
Department of English

BERND HEINE, TANIA KUTEVA, *World lexicon of grammaticalization*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2002, XII + 387 p.

Bernd Heine and Tania Kuteva's *World lexicon of grammaticalization* is a reference work illustrating grammaticalization processes in the world's languages. The intended readership includes linguists, anthropologists, sociologists and psychologists.

The conception of the work is discussed in the "Introduction" (pp.1−14). The grammatical concepts and the concept labels are listed and defined in "Grammatical concepts used in this work" (pp. 15−26). The main part of the work under review is the "Source-target lexicon" (pp. 27−316) which illustrates some 400 grammaticalization processes in approximately 500 languages. The entries are arranged in the alphabetical order of the sources of grammatical forms, and are illustrated with sample sentences or sample constructions, all of them provided with glosses and translations. The entries include brief comments on the grammaticalization pathway and its genetic and/or areal distribution. There are also three appendixes. Two of these "Source-target list" (pp. 317−326) and "Target-source list" (pp. 327−336) are particularly useful for quick reference. The third appendix, "List of languages" (pp. 337−349), lists all the languages from which data are used to illustrate grammaticalization processes. The "References" (pp. 351−387) consist of some 450 titles.

---

[13] See A. A. Avram, 2004, "Atlantic, Pacific or world-wide? Issues in assessing the status of creole features", *English World-Wide*, 25, 1, 81−108.

[14] See J. Wright, 1905, *English dialect dictionary*, vol. 6, Oxford, Oxford University Press, p. 52.

[15] See C. Upton, D. Parry and J. D. A. Widdowson, 1994, *Survey of English dialects. The dictionary and the grammar*, London, Routledge, p. 419, and C. Upton, and J. D. A. Widdowson (2006) *An atlas of English dialects*, second edition, London, Routledge, map 87 on p. 186.

[16] See J. Wright, 1905, *English dialect dictionary*, vol. 6, Oxford, Oxford University Press, p. 65.

In what follows I would like to make a number of comments and suggestions.

The authors have decided to include what they call "instances of grammaticalization that clearly occurred due to borrowing" (p. 9). This decision blurs somewhat the distinction between grammaticalization, be it contact-induced, and calques. Consider e.g. the case of Romanian *din moment ce* 'because' (p. 291), which rather than illustrating the grammaticalization process TEMPORAL > (2) CAUSE is a calque of the French *du moment que*.

A similar problem arises in the case of pidgins and creoles. What appear, at first sight, to be examples of grammaticalization in pidgins and creoles may in fact illustrate transfer from their substrate languages. Thus, e.g. COPULA > (4) FOCUS (pp. 95-97), GIVE > BENEFACTIVE (pp. 149-151), GIVE > DATIVE (pp.153-154), SAY > COMPLEMENTIZER (pp. 261-265) or TAKE ('to take', 'to seize) > INSTRUMENT (pp. 288-289) may actually be instances of what some linguists refer to as "apparent grammaticalization"[17].

It is not clear why a number of entries do not include any sample sentences or sample constructions. These entries include e.g. ABLATIVE > (7) SINCE (TEMPORAL) (p. 35), BODY > (1) INTENSIVE-REFL (p. 57), BRANCH ('branch', 'twig') > CLASSIFIER (p. 62), CONTINUOUS (1) > HABITUAL and CONTINUOUS (2) > PRESENT (p. 93), COPULA > (2) CONDITIONAL (pp. 93-94), DEONTIC MODALITY > (2) FUTURE (p. 116), HEAD (body part) > (3) MIDDLE (p. 168), A-POSSESSIVE > PARTITIVE (p. 241), and TEMPORAL > (2) CAUSE (p. 291).

Also, it is not clear why of the various types of classifiers attested in the world's languages the authors chose to discuss the grammaticalization pathway of just seven, BRANCH, CHILD, MAN, PIECE, SONG, TREE and WOMAN, all of them numeral classifiers, and do not illustrate the grammaticalization of any other type[18].

Finally, I would like to suggest a number of additional examples of grammaticalization. They mostly illustrate those cases which require more research on the nature of the grammaticalization process and/or its genetic and areal distribution, or for which more examples are required to document a pathway of grammaticalization. For ease of reference I indicate the entry, as labeled by the authors, and the page. The relevant items are in bold characters.

ABLATIVE > (3) MATERIAL (p. 31). Indonesian: *sarong **dari** sutera* 'a sarong made from silk'; Tetun Dili: *halo **husi** kabas* 'made from cotton'; Japanese: *Sake wa kome **kara** tsukurareru*. 'Sake is made from rice'.

ABLATIVE > (4) PARTITIVE (p. 32). Romanian: *Mi-a mâncat **din** prăjitură*. 'He's been eating my cake.'

ARRIVE ('arrive at', 'reach') > (1) ABILITY (p. 45) and/or for ARRIVE ('arrive at', 'reach') > (3) SUCCEED (p. 46). Romanian: *A **ajuns** să citească în chineză*. 'He is now able to read in Chinese.'

ARRIVE ('arrive at', 'reach') > (2) ALLATIVE (p. 45). Indonesian: *Saya ingin naik kereta api **sampai** Bandung*. 'I would like to go by train to Bandung.'; Tetun Dili: *Bele la'o **to'o** ne'ebá ka lae?* 'Can I walk until there?'

ARRIVE ('arrive at', 'reach') > (4) UNTIL (TEMPORAL) (p. 45). Indonesian: ***Sampai** kapan?* 'Until when?; Tetun Dili: *Ha'u hela iha ne'e **to'o** sábadu*. 'I'm staying here until Saturday.'

BACK (body part) > (2) BEHIND (pp. 47−48). Romanian: *în **spatele** casei* 'behind .the house'; Tetun Dili: *iha uma (nia) **kotuk*** 'behind the house'

---

[17] See A. Bruyn (1996), "On identifying instances of grammaticalization in creole languages", in: P. Baker and A. Syea (eds.), *Changing meanings, changing functions. Papers relating to grammaticalization in contact languages*, London, University of Westminster Press, 29–46. Apparent grammaticalization is defined there as "the transfer of the result of a process of grammaticalization that has taken place in another language" (Bruyn 1996: 42).

[18] For an extensive discussion of the origin of the various types of classifiers, see A. Y. Aikhenvald (2000), *Classifiers. A typology of noun categorization devices*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 352−412, and Appendix 2, 442−446.

BEGIN ('begin', 'start') > (3) INCEPTIVE (p. 52). Japanese: *kaki**hajimeru*** 'to start writing' (< *kaku* 'to write', *hajimeru* 'to begin'). The case of Japanese *-hajimeru* is particularly relevant since the verb is transitive but occurs in verbal compounds regardless of whether the first verb is transitive or intransitive.

CHILD > (2) DIMINUTIVE (p. 65). Tetun Dili: *ki'ik **oan*** (*ki'ik* 'small', *oan* 'child') 'tiny'.

COME > (3) HORTATIVE (p. 69). Afrikaans: ***Kom** ons gaan huis toe!* 'Let's go home!; Tetun Dili: ***Mai** ita bá!* 'Let's go!'

COME > (4) VENITIVE (pp. 70−71). Tetun Dili: *Favór ida, lori foos **mai** ne'e.* 'Please bring the rice.'

COMITATIVE > (7) MANNER (pp. 87−88). Romanian: *Lucrează **cu** atenție.* 'He works carefully.'

COMITATIVE > (10) TEMPORAL (pp. 89−90). Romanian: *A zăcut **cu** lunile în spital.* 'He lay in hospital for months (on end).'

COPULA, LOCATIVE > (1) CONTINUOUS (pp. 97−99). Dutch: *Het **is aan** het regenen.* 'It is raining.'; Afrikaans: *Ek **is** 'n brief **aan** die skryf* 'I'm writing a letter'.

EXIST > (1) CONTINUOUS (p. 127). Japanese: *Tarō wa hon o yonde **iru**.* 'Tarō is reading a book.'

DO ('to do', 'to make') > (5) PRO-VERB (pp. 119−120). The use of the Japanese pro-verb *suru* should have actually been illustrated with constructions of the type *benkyō **suru*** (< *benkyō* 'study', *suru* 'to do') 'to study'. Similar constructions also abound e.g. in Persian: *taǧīr **kardan*** (< *taǧīr* 'change', *kardan* 'to do') 'to change'.

FACE (body part) > (1) FRONT (p. 130). Romanian: *în **fața** casei* 'in front of the house'; Indonesian: *di **muka** rumah* 'in front of the house'; Tetun Dili: *iha uma (nia) **oin*** 'in front of the house'.

FINISH ('to finish', 'to complete', 'to end') > (3) COMPLETIVE (pp. 134-137). A very good example is provided by the Japanese verbs *-waru* 'to finish (intransitive)' and *-oeru* 'to finish (transitive)', which appear in verbal compounds such as *iio**waru*** (< *iu* 'to say', *owaru* 'to finish') 'to finish saying'.

FOLLOW > (1) ACCORDING TO (p. 139). Indonesian (< verbal root *turut* 'to follow'): ***menurut** dokter* 'according to the doctor'; Tetun Dili: ***tuir** relatoriu* 'according to the report', ***tuir** ha'u nia hanoin* 'in my opinion'

GO > (1) ANDATIVE (p. 155). Tetun Dili (< *bá* 'to go'): *Ha'u fó osan **ba** loja na'in.* 'I give the money to the shopkeeper.'

GO > (4) CONTINUOUS (pp. 157-158). Afrikaans: *Hy **loop** en sing.* 'He's singing.'

GO TO > (1) ALLATIVE (p. 160). Tetun Dili (< *bá* 'to go'): *ha'u **ba** supermerkadu* 'I'm going to the supermarket'.

HOUR > TEMPORAL (p. 176). Tetun Dili has several adverbs of time containing *oras* (< Portuguese *horas* 'hours') 'hour': ***oras**ida* (< *oras* 'hour', *ida* 'one') 'soon, later', ***oras** ne'e* (< *oras* 'hour', *ne'e* 'this') 'now', ***oras** tan* (< *oras* 'hour', *tan* 'more') 'later, soon'.

LIE ('to lie (down)') > CONTINUOUS (pp. 193-194). Afrikaans: *Hy **lê** en slap.* 'He's sleeping.'

MAN ('man', 'male', 'person') > (2) EXCLAMATION (p. 208). Colloquial Spanish uses *hombre* 'man', even if a female person is addressed: *¡Hombre, calla te!* 'Shut up!. The same is true of colloquial South African English: *Jeanine, **man**, didn't I tell you to go take a hike?*

NEGATION > S-QUESTION (p. 216). The A-not-A structure is a source for S-QUESTION markers in Tetun Dili: *Ita hela iha ne'e ka **lae**?* 'Do you live here [or not]?

ONE (NUMERAL) > (9) TOGETHER (pp. 225–226). Romanian: *împre**ună*** (< *în* 'in', *pre* 'on', *una* 'one fem.') 'together'.

PASS ('to pass (by)', 'to pass through') > (1) AFTER (pp. 228-229). Heine and Kuteva (2002: 229) write that "there are only examples from European languages that have been found so far" illustrating the grammaticalization of a verb meaning 'to pass (by)' into the preposition 'after'. It is, perhaps, worth mentioning the fact that in Indonesian *lalu* 'to pass' has given rise to an adverb of time meaning 'afterwards', 'then'. Consider the following examples: ***Lalu** tuan itu naik mobil.* 'Afterwards the man got into the car.'; *Ia segera berdiri, **lalu** masuk ke kamar.* 'He soon stood up, then he entered the room.'

PASS ('to pass (by)', 'to pass through') > (2) COMPARATIVE (pp. 229-230). Tetun Dili: *Haas ne'e boot **liu** ida ne'ebá.* 'This mango is bigger than that one.'

PASS ('to pass (by)', 'to pass through') > (3) PAST (p. 230). Romanian: *săptămâna **trecută*** (< past participle of *a trece* 'to pass') 'last week'; Indonesian: *minggu yang **lalu*** 'last week'.

PASS ('to pass (by)', 'to pass through') > (4) PATH (p. 230). In Indonesian the verb *melalui* (< verbal root *lalu* 'to pass') 'to pass' also means 'through', 'via'. Tetun Dili uses *hosi* and even the compound preposition *liuhosi* (< *liu* and *hosi*, both meaning 'to pass') 'through'.

SAY > (4) EVIDENTIAL (p. 265). Japanese: *to **iu** koto da*. 'they say/it is said that'.

SIT ('to sit', 'to stay') > (1) CONTINUOUS (p. 276). Dutch: *He **zit** te lezen*. 'He is reading.'; Afrikaans: *Ek **sit** en lees*. 'I'm reading.'

STAND > (1) CONTINUOUS (pp. 280-282). Afrikaans: *Wat **staan** hulle en doen?* 'What are they doing?'

TIME > TEMPORAL (p. 298). Indonesian: *Saya kenal mereka **waktu** saya ada di London*. 'I met them when I was in London.'

TRACE ('trace', 'track') > (1) AFTER (p. 300). Romanian: *Ce faci pe **urmă**?* (*urmă* 'trace'> *pe urmă* 'afterward') 'What are you doing afterwards?'

The book is very carefully edited. Considering the large number of examples from some 500 languages, the book appears to be remarkably free of typos, as far I can tell. I have spotted just three typos: the Modern Arabic forms *al-cima:ratu* 'building' and *li-l-ǧa:micati* 'of the university' (p. 55) should be transliterated as *al-ʿima:ratu* and *li-l-ǧa:miʿati* respectively; the Lingala personal pronoun 'them' is *bangó* not *bongó* (p. 81); the Lingala form *nabyángákí* 'I called' (p. 291) should read *nabángákí*.

In conclusion, Heine and Kuteva have produced an excellent book, which is both extremely authoritative and up-to-date. Their scholarship in the field of grammaticalization is truly impressive and is reflected in the extensive scope of this volume. *World lexicon of grammaticalization* will certainly be a standard reference work for years to come.

Andrei A. Avram
University of Bucharest
Department of English