LEOPOLD KRAUS, *Dicţionaro rromani şib. RMR Dicţionar rromani roman german*, Vienna, Erwin Kraushofer, 2022, 269 pp.

The Kalderash dialect of Romani is doubtless one of the best studied. This state of affairs is reflected, among others, in the existence of a number of dictionaries of this variety, e.g. Barthélemy (1988), Demeter and Demeter (1990), Lee (2010), Calvet (2021). However, Kaldersah as spoken in Romania is an under researched dialect. The lexicographical works published so far include a short dictionary by Sarău and Colceriu (1998) and the Kalderash component of a dialectal dictionary of Romani (Borcoi et al. 2019).

As explicitly mentioned by the author (p. 5), the dictionary[1] under review is "based on a variant of the Kalderash dialect used by Jehova's Witnesses in 2014 in their publications translated into Romani"[2]. The dictionary consists of "Introducere/Einleitung" [= Introduction] (p. 5), "Legendă/Legende" [= Legend] of the symbols and diacritics used (p. 6), a list of "Abrevieri/Abkürzungen" [= Abbreviations] (pp. 7-9), a section of "Explicaţii/Erklärungen" [= Explanations] (pp. 10-11 and 12-13 respectively), the dictionary proper (pp. 16-190), a list of "Prefixe" [= Prefixes] (p. 190), a list of "Infixe" [= Infixes] (pp. 190-191), a list of "Sufixe" [= Suffixes] (pp. 192-197), a Romanian-Kalderash wordlist (pp. 199-231), and a German-Kalderash wordlist (pp. 233-269).

The entries have the following structure: the Kalderash word or phrase and its variants, if any; the Romanian equivalent(s); the German equivalent(s); the grammatical category; orthography; etymology. Consider the following sample entry (p. 16): "acharel > acharél, var: IRU + PV[3]: akharel RO: a chema, a invita DE: rufen, einladen cat: vb/tr; -r-el > -d- ort: achar|él; imp: -Ø! -én!; perf: achard|eá(s) etim: san: ākhyā = nume". Many of the entries also include examples, accompanied by their translation into Romanian and German, respectively.

The inclusion of variants is certainly to be appreciated. It should be mentioned, however, that the author lumps under the heading "variants" a rather heterogeneous range of forms: (i) orthographic variants, e.g. *ándai/anda-i/anda i* 'from, for, about' (p. 20); (ii) pronunciation variants of words, e.g. *anav/nav* 'name' (p. 19), *bistrál/bâstrál* 'to forget' (p. 36), *cărél/cherél* 'to do' (p. 44), *dipáş/dopáş* 'half' (p. 68), *goghí/godí* 'mind' (p. 80), *lokhes/locăs* 'slowly' (p. 105), *părdál/perdál/pordál* 'over' (p. 131), *sicavél/ sikauél/sâcavel* 'to teach' (p. 160); (iii) pronunciation variants of suffixes, e.g. instrumental-associative *-aia* (p. 192), *-eia* (p. 193), *-oia* (p. 197), for *-asa*, *-esa* and *-osa*, respectively; (iv) variants of verbs, with or without the suffix *-isar*, e.g. *iertíl/iertisarél* 'to forgive'; (v) synonyms formed with a different suffix: e.g. *daraló/daranó* 'frightened, scared'; (vi) synonyms, e.g. *citíl/drabarél* 'to read' (p. 54), *jivél/traíl* 'to live' (p. 99). There are also other variants which are not signalled as such, but appear between brackets, e.g. the non-occurrence of inter-vocalic /r/ in 1PL forms[4], *-isarás (-isaoás)*, and of word-final in 2SG.IMP forms[5], *-isár! (- isáo!)* of borrowed verbs formed with the suffix *-isar*. It is worth noting that the lenition $s > x/h$ – between vowels, before /h/ or in word-final position – occurring in other varieties of Kalderash[6], is not attested in any of the forms listed in the dictionary.

---

[1] Available at https://www.academia.edu/73799753/RMR_dictionarul_limbii_rromani_2022_03.

[2] This variety of Kalderash is described by Kraushofer (2021). See also Avram (2022b).

[3] Where IRU = the alphabet of the International Romani Union and PV = the Pan Vlax alphabet.

[4] See also Kraushofer (2021: 32).

[5] See also Kraushofer (2021: 50).

[6] See, for instance, Queraltó (2005: 9), Heinschinck and Cech (2011: 6), Oslon (2018: 54). Many forms illustrating the lenition $s > h$ before /k/ or word-finally can be found in Mihai Cioabă (2012, 2020).

As this is a dictionary of Kalderash Romani, it is not clear why two forms in two other dialects figure among the entries: Ursari Romani *cipota* 'something' (p. 54) and Spoitori Romani *vachiarél* 'to speak' (p. 185). No explanation is provided for the inclusion of these two non-Kalderash forms.

As is well known, among the Romani dialects Kalderash is the one which is most heavily influenced by Romanian. In addition to many loanwords from Romanian which have long been attested in Kalderash, there are many undoubtedly recent lexical borrowings. These include e.g. *bitúmo* 'bitumen' (p. 37), *disponíbilo* 'available' (p. 69), *fictívo* 'fictitious' (p. 76), *opţionálo* 'optional (p. 125), *reacţionil* 'to react' (p. 150), *scaníl* 'to scan' (p. 158), *univérso* 'universe' (p. 183). Not surprisingly, almost all religious terms are borrowings from Romanian, such as *binecuvântárea* 'blessing' (p. 36), *căínţa* 'repentance' (p. 44), *creştíno* 'Christian' (p. 58), *idolátro* 'idolatrous' (p. 87), *predicárea* 'preaching' (p. 145), *rugăciúnea* 'prayer' (p. 154), *scriptúra* 'Scripture' (p. 158).

The strong influence of Romanian is also reflected in a large number of set phrases, which are either total or partial loan translations into Kalderash Romani. Consider first examples of total loan translations: *cadea phendo* 'so-called' [lit. so said] – cf. Romanian *aşa-zis* [lit. so said]; *cána hai cána* 'from time to time' [lit. when and when] – cf. Romanian *când şi când* [lit. when and when]; *cherél gule iacha* 'to make eyes at someone' [lit. to make sweet eyes] (p. 48) – cf. Romanian *a face ochi dulci* [lit. to make sweet eyes]; *cherél lajiavéstar* 'to put to shame' [lit. to make of shame] (p. 48) – cf. Romanian *a face de ruşine* [lit. to make of shame]; *del drom*[7] 'to set free; to turn on (TV, computer)' [lit. to give way] (p. 64) – cf. Romanian *a da drumul* [lit. to give the way]; *del pharimatándar* 'to face hardship' [lit. to give of hardship] (p. 64) – cf. Romanian *a da de greutăţi* [lit. to give of hardships]; *lel o than* 'to replace' [lit. take the place] (p. 103) – cf. Romanian *a lua locul* [lit. to take the place]; *pe léschi mórci* 'personally' [lit. on my skin] (p. 132) – cf. Romanian *pe pielea lui/ei* [lit. on his/her skin]. Examples of partial loan translations include: *anél amíntea* 'to remind' (p. 21) [lit to bring attention] – cf. Romanian *a aduce aminte* [lit to bring attention]; *cherél fáţa* 'to face' (p. 48) [lit. to make face] – cf. Romanian *a face faţă* [lit. to make face]; *del péschi sáma* 'to realize' (p. 64) [lit. to give oneself judgement] – cf. Romanian *a-şi da seama* [lit. to give oneself judgement]; *del târcoálea* 'to roam around' [lit. to give strolls] (p. 64) – cf. Romanian *a da târcoale* [lit. to give strolls]; *lel amíntea* 'to pay attention' [lit. to take attention] (p. 102) – cf. Romanian *a lua aminte* [lit. to take attention]; *phiravél gríja* 'to take care of' [lit. to wea care] (p. 140) – cf. Romanian *a purta de grijă* [lit. to wear of care]; *tot mai but* 'more and more' [lit. all more much] (p. 176) – cf. Romanian *tot mai mult* [lit. all more much]. While most of these set phrases have long been attested in Kalderash Romani, others are more recent ones, e.g. *cherél referírea* 'to make reference' [lit. to make reference] (p. 41) – cf. Romanian *a face referire* [lit. to make reference], *del clic* 'to click (on a computer)' [lit. to give click] (p. 63) – cf. Romanian 'a da clic' [lit. to give click], *încherél cónto* 'to take into account' [lit. to hold account] (p. 94) – cf. Romanian *a ţine cont* [lit. to hold account], *phiravél răzbóio* 'to wage war' [lit. to wear war] (p. 140) – cf. Romanian *a purta un război* [lit. to wear a war].

The author uses a system of transcription largely based on the spelling conventions of Romanian[8]. This explains, among others, why [ɨ] is rendered by <î> or <â>, in accordance with the rules of Romanian spelling, even though such an orthographic distinction is irrelevant to Kalderash Romani, as in e.g. *încherél* 'to hold, to retain, to maintain', *mânró* 'my (м)'. However, and rather unfortunately, opting for such a system of transcription potentially raises several problems for the intended readership. On the one hand, it differs from the orthography employed in Mihai Cioabă (2012 and 2020), which is in part Romanian-based, but also borrows letters from the so-called "Pan Vlax" alphabet[9]. For instance, in the dictionary [ʃ] and [ʒ] are transcribed with <ş> and <j>, respectively, whereas the latter has <š> and <ž>; in the dictionary <ci> and <ci> stand for the sequences [ʧɨ] and [ʧe], whereas in the latter <č> is used across the board. It also differs from the system of transcription used in Borcoi et al. (2019), which is entirely a Romanian-based one[10]. On the other hand, Standard

---

[7] Kalderash *drom* is etymologically derived from Greek δρόμος.

[8] This is also the system of transcription employed by Kraushofer (2021). For a detailed discussion see Avram (2022b).

[9] See Hancock (1995: 37-43).

[10] For a discussion see Avram (2022a).

Romani texts published in Romania use the alphabet of the International Romani Union. Moreover, readers familiar with other, frequently used systems of transcription for Romani, such as the Pan Vlax alphabet, will also have to adjust to the set of conventions adopted by the author. Also, even though transcriptions in the alphabet of the International Romani Union and/or the Pan Vlax alphabet are (inconsistently) provided, the dictionary does not include a list of the correspondences between the author's system of transcription and these widely used alphabets. Finally, two orthographic options are particularly debatable. As explained by the author (p. 6), "ḥ [is] pronounced as h in duh [= spirit] or patriarh [= patriarch]", in e.g. *ḥoḥaimós* 'lie, false rumour' In other words, the author uses <ḥ> to transcribe the voiceless velar fricative [x]. This is rather confusing, given that *ḥ* is frequently used for transcribing the voiceless pharyngeal fricative [ḥ]. Also, it is mentioned that <ħ> does not render "any sound in cħe, cħi, għe, għi", in e.g. *cħerél* 'to do', *agħiés* 'today' (p. 6). That is to say, the sequences [k] and [g] followed by [i] or [e] are transcribed with <cħ> and <għ>, respectively. This is another unfortunate decision, since *ħ* is the IPA symbol for the voiceless pharyngeal fricative [ħ].

A rather strange decision is the alphabetical ordering of the entries. Unlike other dictionaries of Romani, words or phrases starting with <k> and <kh>, <p> and <ph> as well as <t> and <th>, standing for the plain voiceless stops [k], [p], [t] and respectively the aspirated voiceless stops [kʰ], [pʰ], [tʰ] are lumped together under the letters <k>, <p> and <t> respectively.

A number of forms ending in [-i] are erroneously transcribed with <ii>. This holds both for words from the native stock and for loanwords from Romanian. Examples in the former category include *għilabaitórii* 'singer' (p. 79), *pocħinitórii* 'paymaster' (p. 144), *sicaitórii* 'teacher' (p. 160). All these forms should have been transcribed with a single word-final <i>, as they are in other sources: *gilabaytóri* (Demeter and Demeter 1990: 245), *gilabayitóri* (Lee 2010: 141), *dilabaitori* (Mihai Cioabă 2012: 112), *ʒilabatóri* (Calvet 2021: 118); *pokinitóri* (Lee 2010: 234); *sîkaitori* (Mihai Cioabă 2012: 111). These forms are all nouns formed with the agentive suffix *-tóri*[11]. Consider also *morcií* 'skin, hide; fur', in which the second <i> is not justified; compare the forms recorded in other dictionaries of Kalderash Romani: *morčí* (Barthélemy 1988: 90), *morči* (Demeter and Demeter 1990: 256), *morćhi* (Boretzky and Igla 1994: 184), *morki* (Lee 2010: 206), *morčí* (Calvet 2021: 221). As for loanwords, the Kalderash equivalents of Romanian agentive nouns and adjective ending *-tor*, such as *ascultătórii* 'listener' (p. 24), *creatórii* 'creator' (p. 58), *judecătórii* 'judge' (p. 100), *prevăzătórii* 'cautious' (p. 146), *vestitórii* 'announcer' (p. 187), should also have been transcribed with a single word-final <i>. Also, the loanword *cérii* 'sky' should read *céri*, i.e. with a single word-final <i>. This is the only form attested in all dictionaries of Kalderash: *čéri* (Barthélemy 1988: 31), *čéri* (Demeter and Demeter 1990: 240), *čéri* (Boretzky and Igla 1994: 49), *chéri* (Lee 2010: 109), *čéri* (Calvet 2021: 84).

With respect to the heading "category" it should be mentioned that the author uses erroneously the Romanian term *frază*, instead of *sintagmă/grup sintactic* or *expresie idiomatică*, respectively. Consequently, an example such as *amarí erá* 'A.D.' (p. 18) and an example such as *del duma* [lit. to give word] 'to speak' (p. 64) are both labelled "cat: frază". Also, it is not clear why certain phrases are listed as separate entries: *avér bacreá* 'other sheep' (p. 29); *barí mulțímea* 'big crowd' (p. 32); *baró necázo* 'big trouble' (p. 33); *turma țâni* 'small herd' (p. 179).

The heading "orthography" is another misnomer, since it provides phonological information – the stressed syllable and morphological information – e.g. the indication of the root, the oblique case endings for nouns and adjectives, various endings for verbs, etc.

Also, etyma are inconsistently provided. Moreover, some of the etyma suggested are incorrect or doubtful. For instance, the author derives *amal* 'friend' from the non-existing Arabic form *amil* (p. 18). The etymon given for *bárem* 'at least' is Serbian барем (p. 32). However, a Serbian etymon is more than unlikely. This ultimately Turkish word is also attested in an identical form in, among others, Romanian – *barem*, as well as in Bulgarian – барем (Krasteva 2003: 44), and a Romanian source is therefore the most plausible one. The same holds for *dușmáno* 'enemy'. Rather than having been borrowed directly from Turkish *düşman* (p. 72), the word most likely entered the Kalderash dialect via Romanian, with Romanian *dușman* being the most likely etymon. *Práḥo* 'dust' is said to be from

---

[11] See e.g. Queraltó (2005: 82), Oslon (2018: 166).

Croatian *prah* (p. 145), but, since similar forms are attested in several Slavic languages, the etymology indicated by Boretzky and Igla (1994: 223) "< *slav.* prax" is the correct one. For *vazdel* 'to raise' the author gives the etymology Persian *afrāz* 'to raise' + *del*[12] (p. 186). This is also suggested by Boretzky and Igla (1994: 298), but with an important difference: it appears followed by a question mark, i.e. it is signalled as an uncertain etymology.

As already mentioned, there is also a list of what the author calls "infixes" and then refers to them as "insertions". These are -*av*-, -*ar*- and -*isar*- (p. 191). In fact, these are all derivational suffixes: as also mentioned by the author, the first two serve for forming transitive/causative verbs and the third one is optionally used for the conjugation of borrowed verbs.

Finally, it should be stressed that the critical remarks above should primarily be taken as suggestions for improvements, given that, as mentioned by the author (p. 5), "the dictionary will be updated from time to time".

To conclude, *Dicţionaro rromani şib. RMR Dicţionar rromani roman german* is a welcome addition to the literature on Kalderash Romani as used in Romania, for which the author deserves credit.

REFERENCES

Avram, A.A. 2022a. Review of Jupiter Borcoi, Sorin-Cristian Moisescu, Daniel-Samuel Petrilă, Elena-Alexandra Vidraşcu, *Dicţionar dialectal al limbii romani*, *Philologica Jassyensia*, XVIII, 1, 347–351.

Avram, A.A. 2022b. Review of Erwin Kraushoffer, *Gramatica le rromani şibachi. RMR – Gramatica limbii rromani*, *Revue roumaine de linguistique*, LVII, 2-3, 271–275.

Barthélemy, A., 1988, *Dictionnaire du tzigane kalderash*, Paris.

Borcoi, J., S.C. Moisescu, D.S. Petrilă, E.A. Vidraşcu, 2019, *Dicţionar dialectal al limbii romani*, Bucureşri, Editura Centrului Naţional de Cultură a Romilor.

Boretzky, N., B. Igla, 1994, *Wörterbuch Romani – Deutsch – Englisch*, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz.

Calvet, G., 2021, *Dictionnaire tsigane – français, dialecte kalderash*, Paris, L'Asiathéque.

Demeter, R.S., P.S. Demeter, 1990, *Tsygansko-russkij slovar' i russko-tsyganskij slovar' (kaldararskij dialekt)*, Moscow, Russkij Jazyk.

Hancock, I., 1999, *A Handbook of Vlax Romani*, Columbus, Slavica Publishers.

Heinschink, M., P. Cech, 2011, Sprachbeschreibung Romani – Variante Kaldêrašicko. https://www.uni-due.de/imperia/md/content/prodaz/sprachbeschreibung_kalderaschicko.pdf.

Krasteva, V., 2003, *Talkoven rečnik na turtsizmite v balgarskija ezik s iljustrativen material ot literaturata, folklora, presata, radioto i televizijata*. Sofia: Skorpio.

Lee, R., 2010, *Romani Dictionary Kalderash – English*, Toronto, Magoria Books.

Mihai Cioabă, L., 2012, *Ghid de conversaţie Român-Romano Rumînisko-Romano*, Sibiu, Fundaţia Social-Culturală a Romilor "Ion Cioabă".

Mihai Cioabă, L., 2020, *Te sîtiuas te ramosaras thai te drabaras romanes. Să învăţăm să scriem şi să citim romanes*, Sibiu, Neo Drom.

Oslon, M. V. 2018. *Jazyk kotljarov-moldavaja. Grammatika kalderarskogo dialekta tsyganskogo jazyka v russkojazyčnom okružеnii*, Moscow, Dom JAS.

Queraltó, A., 2005, *Curso de Romaní (dialecto de los Kalderaš)*, Barcelona: Asociación "Lachó Bají Calí".

Sarău, G., C. Colceriu, 1998, *Dicţionar roman – rrom (căldărăresc) şi Dicţionar rrom – roman (căldărăresc)*, Bucharest, Kriterion.

Andrei A. Avram
University of Bucharest

---

[12] Romani for 'to give'.

NIKOLAOS LAVIDAS, *The Diachrony of Written Language Contact,* Leiden/Boston, Brill, 2021, 378 p.

This book investigates an important and previously neglected facet of language contact: contact via translations. The book is structured in two sections, a theoretical one (*Written Language Contact and Grammatical Change in English and Greek*), dedicated to the theoretical framework of the study, underlining the relationship between translations and diachrony and focusing on the history of translations in relation to grammatical change in English and Greek, and second part (*Data: English and Greek Translations and Grammatical Change*), in which the author analyses the characteristics of voice and argument structure (continuity in English vs change in Greek), offering corpus-based surveys of different phenomena, often based on comparison between (re)translated and non-translated texts. Given the fact that *written language contact* is an understudied concept, in this review I pay special attention to its theoretical description and I extensively present the first chapter of the book, before moving to the other chapters.

The first part of the monograph contains six chapters. Chapter 1, *Written Language Contact and Translations* (pp. 3-28), begins with an introduction to the issue of written language contact, and then focuses on the main characteristics of the relationship between the study of translations and diachronic linguistics, and the twofold status of translations in this context as a source of grammatical change and as evidence of change. Although the author acknowledges that (oral) language contact has a central role in grammatical change, either as a factor that changes the input of language acquisition, or as an important trigger of grammatical borrowing, he claims that translations can be viewed as another source of evidence of grammatical change. More precisely, in this book he aims at investigating the way in which diachronic retranslations are related to the development of grammar. The analysis is devoted to English and Greek biblical (re)translations, but a more important objective of the book is to put forth a theoretical background that can account for the relation between grammatical characteristics of diachronic retranslations and the development of the grammatical systems of languages. In contrast to direct language contact, retranslations do not reflect grammatical change in a direct way. This is where an important concept comes into play: *grammatical multiglossia* (see Chapter 6), a situation referring to the multiple grammatical systems that *coexist* in a "peaceful" way within a synchronic period; from this perspective, Lavidas' hypothesis is different from the well-known *Competing Grammars Hypothesis* (Kroch 1989[13], 2001[14]) because the multiple grammatical systems are not in *competition*, but rather *peacefully coexist* for a certain period. The author mentions that (re)translations in English and Greek have a different status; that is, in the case of a Greek the situation is more complicated: there are early translations of the Old Testament from Biblical Hebrew and intralingual retranslations from the 16th century onwards. An important distinction is to be mentioned: the author proposes that one should separately analyse translation effects (transfer from the source text) and grammatical characteristics of translations reflecting a grammar parallel to the grammar represented in non-translated texts. Finally, there is a very interesting point concerning the relationship between (re)translations and non-translated text: retranslations demonstrate a parallel grammatical system that has its own development and is in contact with the grammatical system of non-translated texts; moreover, the contact between the grammar of non-translated texts and the grammar of translated texts triggers a bidirectional influence, and grammatical borrowing is evident both in translations and non-translations.

An important section of this chapter is devoted to the terminology of language contact, including definitions for concepts such as *borrowing, transfer, imposition, metatypy,* and *convergence.*

---

[13] Kroch, A., 1989, "Reflexes of grammar in patterns of language change", *Language Variation and Change*, 1, 3, 199–244.

[14] Kroch., A., 2001, "Syntactic change", in M. Baltin, C. Collins (eds), *The Handbook of Contemporary Syntactic Theory*, Oxford, Blackwell, 699–729.

The author identifies two types of change related to language contact: (i) contact-induced changes which are connected to full bilingualism and prevalent code-switching and (ii) shift-induced interferences which are connected to imperfect learning (the source language is dominant). He also highlights the role of social forces in language contact (immigration, conquest or mere geographical proximity): whereas imperfect language learning (brief interaction) creates *simplification*, bilingualism (extended contact) leads to *complexification*, *transfer of grammatical categories*, and *Sprachbund formation*. However, syntactic transfer strongly depends on the availability of analogous constructions in the target language.

A distinct section describes *written language contact.* This concept is usually used in connection to ancient languages in religious contexts (Thomason and Kaufman 1988: 78–79[15]), where *cultural borrowing* has been recognized as a type of contact-induced change (Häcker 2011[16]); it is the case of borrowings from Latin and Greek into later European languages, or from English into modern languages. But another hypostasis of this type of contact is the one in which it takes place via written or indirect oral sources (books, the internet, radio/TV, etc.), without any speakers directly communicating, in which case the effect of the contact is usually less strong (Fischer 2013: 21[17]) and the *spread* of borrowings from the individual to the community is questionable. Lavidas also points out that translations typically crop up in the historical linguistic context in different types of studies (Blake 1992[18]), in works examining the history of education or ideas, in studies of vocabulary, but also in studies of historical syntax; however, translations are only incidentally taken into account in histories of languages and their influence on the language remains out of the scope of historical linguistic research. Another important aspect underlined in this section is that translations from earlier periods differ substantially from present-day translations: whereas today's translations focus on revealing *content*, for earlier translations *form* was more relevant, due to the prestige of the source language over the target language, hence the change through translations was more favoured with early translations. In more recent literature, extensively quoted by Lavidas, the similarities between translation studies and contact linguistics have been underlined. Following Weinreich (1979 [1953]: 7–8, 32[19]), the author mentions that the results of contact-induced changes can be described as areal diffusion or the transfer of linguistic characteristics/elements from one language, a model language, to another, a replica language. Moreover, Heine and Kuteva (2005: 222)[20] state that the study of translational works is the most obvious procedure to reconstruct what speakers in situations of contact conceive of, and treat as equivalent use patterns or categories. An important point is the observation that translations can demonstrate a particular type of contact even though the changes resulting from translations can remain limited only to translated texts. As stated by Lavidas, retranslations "create" a parallel diachrony as they represent a parallel grammar that may reflect earlier periods of the language too.

Chapter 2, *Early History of Translations and Grammatical Change: Landmarks in the Development of Early Translations* (pp. 29-74) presents a history of early translations, with an emphasis on their relation to grammatical change, in a contrastive manner, first in English (section 2.2) and then

---

[15] Thomason, S., T. Kaufman, 1988, *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*; Berkeley, Los Angeles, University of California Press.

[16] Häcker, M., 2011, "French-English linguistic and cultural contact in medieval England: The evidence of letters", *AAA: Arbeiten aus Anglistik und Amerikanistik*, 36, 2, 133–160.

[17] Fischer, O., 2013, "The role of contact in English syntactic change in the Old and Middle English periods", in D. Schreirer, M. Hundt (eds), *English as a contact language*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 18–40.

[18] Blake, N., 1992, "Translation in the history of English", in M. Rissanen, O. Ihalainen, T. Nevalainen, I. Taavitsainen (eds), *History of Englishes: New Methods and Interpretations in Historical Linguistics*, Berlin, Mouton, 3–24.

[19] Weinreich, U., 1979 [1953], *Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems*, Berlin/New York, Mouton de Gruyter.

[20] Heine, B., T. Kuteva, 2005, *Language Contact and Grammatical Change*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

in Greek (section 2.3), starting with the translation of the Hebrew Old Testament into Greek (*Septuagint*), underlining the variation in the faithfulness of a translation (depending on the type of the source text). The contact between Latin and English represents a clear example of *written language contact* (as witnessed by different structures specific to Latin and transposed into English: prepositional phrases with pronominal complements, the *accusativus-cum-infinitivo* construction and the *nominativus-cum-infinitivo* construction, absolute constructions, and the passive infinitive). Lavidas mentions the fact that newer translations may include innovative grammatical characteristics, but also an archaizing style obliterating actual changes, and he considers retranslations as an example of *grammatical multiglossia*. Grammatical multiglossia is the result of: complex transfer from grammars of other languages, transfer from grammars of earlier periods, presence of innovated, retained/archaic features, and borrowed features. As for Greek, the contact between Greek and Latin in late antiquity and between Greek and Semitic languages in the period of Hellenistic-Roman koine involves two significant examples of written language contact.

In Chapter 3, *Biblical Translations* (pp. 75–89), the author investigates the differences between biblical and non-biblical translations. He states that, in contrast to non-biblical translations, in the case of biblical translations, both direct and indirect translation effects are visible: not only transfer of a characteristic in passages where it appears in the source text but a broader influence on the target text, also in other passages where the relevant characteristic does not appear in the source text. The theoretical distinction between translation effects and results of written contact for grammatical changes, presented in the introduction, is resumed here. By comparing English to Greek, the author concludes that translation effects have played a more important role in the history of Greek. A detailed discussion of (intralingual) biblical translations into later Greek is an opportunity for the author to emphasize the importance of parallel corpora in typological research and the role of intralingual translations (additions, restructuring or omission) at the lexical and syntactic levels.

Chapter 4, *Intralingual Translations: Two Directions – to the Past or to the Present* (pp. 90–102) represents a detailed presentation of the characteristics of different types of intralingual translations in the history of Greek and English. As indicated by Lavidas, intralingual translations are directly related to the diachrony of a language; he notices that translation can make communication between these periods of the diachrony of the language possible. The development of grammatical characteristics of (re)translations opens two significant directions and areas of research: (i) translations seen as a source of grammatical change (via multiple grammars) and (ii) translations as evidence of grammatical change.

In Chapter 5, *Examples of Studies on Grammatical Change in English through Translations* (pp. 103–109), the author reviews previous studies on possible grammatical change attributed to translations in the history of English and presents grammatical characteristics and constructions of English that have been considered as influenced by translations. Examples of changes in the diachrony of English being analysed in previous studies as related to (re)translations are: infinitives (AcI) – Latin influence, dative – French influence, passives and word order – Latin influence. In contrast to English, it seems that there are no similar case studies that reveal constructions influenced by another language through translation in the case of Greek.

Just like Chapter 1, Chapter 6, *From Syntactic Diglossia and Universal Bilingualism to What Diachronic Translations Can Tell Us about Grammatical Multiglossia* (pp. 110–126), represents a key point in articulating the theoretical background of Lavidas' analysis of translations: the *Hypothesis of Grammatical Multiglossia*. This hypothesis, based on Kroch's (1989, 2001) "syntactic diglossia" and Roeper's (1999[21], 2016[22]) "universal bilingualism", shows how historical grammatical multiglossia, reflected in the parallel development of grammatical characteristics of non-translated and translated texts, is related to L2 and bilingualism. As explained by Lavidas, historical grammatical multiglossia

[21] Roeper, T.W., 1999, "Universal bilingualism", *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 2, 3, 169–186.
[22] Roeper, T.W., 2016, "Multiple grammars and the logic of learnability in second language acquisition", *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7, 1–14.

is also connected to traditional diglossia contexts (see Ferguson's 1959[23] idea of *stable coexistence* of two grammars). Lavidas considers the existence of grammatical multiglossia as directly related to the two types of grammatical change: natural and semi-natural change. From the perspective of multiglossia, grammatical change can be seen as the result of a failure in the transmission of grammar across time. Furthermore, Lavidas discusses Kroch's model of *syntactic diglossia*, instantiated as *Competing Grammars Hypothesis* or the *Hypothesis of Internalized Diglossia*, in which there is a competition between *a conservative literary* and *an innovative vernacular language*; in this context, the vernacular language is used with a significant frequency, has a psycholinguistic advantage, and prevails over the literary language even in written texts. Starting from here, Lavidas claims that *coexistence* of more than one alternative grammatical rule and characteristics in the same period (or even in the same speaker) is possible, and it is not the case that competition of alternative rules is available only in transitional periods. Importantly, even though translations are described as ephemeral, it can be argued that new elements that appear in translations can really diffuse in a population because of their prestigious character and due to the fact that translations can be influential and trigger semi-natural changes. The novelty of Lavidas' hypothesis is that both internalized multiglossia and proper multiglossia are possible in a language community, and that diglossia may persist for long periods. Similar characteristics of development are also attested in languages with long written tradition, such as Greek, where the contact was steady with earlier forms of the language, and the artificial or second order natural grammar mainly had its source in earlier forms of the same language.

Part 2, which is more data-oriented, contains two symmetrically organized chapters, which begin with a presentation of the most important aspects of the development of the relevant grammatical characteristics, as presented in the previous literature, and continues with a corpus survey of non-translated texts from different periods, adding significant information on the frequencies of these features.

In Chapter 7, *English Data* (pp. 129–209), the author includes certain English corpus studies, with quantitative data, dedicated to the following aspects: the development of voice and argument structure (section 7.2), the contrast between English biblical vs. non-biblical retranslations (section 7.3), and an investigation of the borrowing of features of word formation (i.e., derivational suffixes) in retranslations of Boethius' text *De Consolatione Philosophiae* (Section 7.4.). Investigating phenomena such as voice, argument structure, transitivity (morphological syncretism of the causative and anticausative due to changes in the morphology of the causative/anticausative, the morphological expression of voice + case studies for particular verbs, transitives vs intransitives, object nouns vs pronouns, borrowing of word-formation morphology), the author concludes that the diachrony of retranslations does not reflect the changes in non-translated texts.

Chapter 8, *Greek Data* (pp. 210–318), presents the (quantitative) results of the study of a Greek corpus (biblical and nonbiblical). The author follows the development of characteristics of voice and argument structure as reflected in Greek diachronic retranslations of the New Testament (17th, 19th, and 20th century), comparing the results with the phenomena identified in non-translated texts from the same period.

Chapter 9 contains the *Conclusions* (pp. 325–328) and it is followed by Appendix 1, *Further Information on the Texts of the Corpus*, and Appendix 2, *The Corpus of Translations of Biblical Texts* and *The corpus of Translations of Boethius, De Consolatione Philosophiae.*

In conclusion, Lavidas' book represents an impressive piece of research, which is important both for the data presented and, even more, for its theoretical insights. The author has a clear theoretical proposal for the role of translations in grammatical change: translations are seen both as a source of grammatical change (via multiple coexisting grammars) and as evidence of grammatical change. The author proposes a new hypothesis related to the existence of multiple grammars in contact situation:

---

[23] Ferguson, C.A., 1959, "Diglossia", *Word,* 15, 325-340.

the *Hypothesis of Grammatical Multiglossia*, which differs from Kroch's previous idea on *Competing Grammars* in that there is no competition between two grammars, but rather a peaceful coexistence, which can cover long periods.

Although this book focuses on English and Greek biblical translations, this type of analysis can be a model for other analyses based on (re)translation. Another important issue of the book is the relation between (re)translations and non-translated texts and the way in which innovation can spread from translations to non-translated texts. Also, the book underlines the importance of parallel corpora in typological research. Besides all these merits, maybe the most significant one is that the book clearly throws into prominence the role of translations for linguistic change: in contrast to many previous accounts, in the theoretical framework presented here translation effects are not to be denounced (as altering the structure of the target language), but are considered a natural or semi-natural source of change and, for certain periods and certain languages, sometimes the only witness of grammatical change.

Adina Dragomirescu[24]
"Iorgu Iordan – Alexandru Rosetti" Institute of Linguistics/
University of Bucharest

CRISTINA DAFINOIU, VERONICA NEDELCU, LAURA PASCALE, LUCIA OPREANU, *Limba română pentru străini: nivel A1-A2* [Romanian language for foreigners: A1-A2 level], Otopeni, Editura Eurodidactica – Eurodidactica Press, 2020, 192 p.

In recent decades, the field of teaching Romanian as a foreign language has increasingly grown, resulting in a great number of resources: textbooks, guides, grammars, dictionaries and studies, all dedicated to facilitating the acquisition of Romanian by foreign students.

This review focuses on one such resource, *Limba română pentru străini: nivel A1-A2* [Romanian language for foreigners: A1-A2 level], a textbook designed for foreign students who aim to attain A1-A2 level in Romanian in a shorter, yet intensive, period of time. This textbook was developed by four members of the faculty of "Ovidius" University of Constanța, as part of a project which sought to promote Romanian university programmes abroad (project INTENS-O, CNFIS-FDI-2020-0648, financed by the Ministry of Education, between May-December 2020).

Following the foreword, the volume is carefully structured into 13 chapters, effectively functioning as learning units, each unit intended to be covered within approximately 10 hours of study. The content of each unit is dedicated to specific themes and related subtopics, enabling learners to acquire essential vocabulary and grammatical structures for effective communication. Unlike traditional textbooks that often prioritize a grammatical approach, this resource adopts a predominantly communicative approach, aiming to empower beginner students to communicate within A1-A2 proficiency range, as per the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages.

The first unit, *Alfabetul* [The Alphabet], introduces the Romanian alphabet and other language-specific phonetic particularities (diphthongs, triphthongs, frequent phonetic changes). Learners are then familiarized with Romanian greetings and conversational phrases, which allow them to engage in basic conversations and introduce themselves. This first unit ends with a series of appropriate exercises, for practice and reinforcement.

The second unit, *O ţară nouă, prieteni noi* [A new country, new friends], focuses on professions, nationalities and countries, facilitating more complex personal introductions. Grammatical topics include personal pronouns in the Nominative case, the verb "to be" in the present tense, *wh*-words, numbers from 0–19 and the negative pronouns *nimeni* [no one] and *nimic* [nothing]. These topics are reinforced through a series of oral exercises.

The third unit, *Timpul, vremea, ceasul* [The time, the weather, the clock], includes relevant vocabulary for discussing time-related concepts (parts of the day, days of the week, seasons, months of the year, expressing the date, time adverbs), weather (alongside some frequent pairs of antonyms to describe weather), telling time. Grammatical topics encompass the present tense of the verb "to have" and numbers from 20 onwards.

Unit four, *Locuinţa* [The residence], covers house-related vocabulary. In the exercise section, learners are invited to present their own houses, discuss about advantages and disadvantages of living in flats versus houses, describe various rooms and engage in role-play exercises, such as searching for rental properties. Towards the end of the unit, the authors include a grammar topic related to the main one: the noun (number, gender, indefinite article).

Unit five, *Oraşul* [The city], provides the necessary grammar (the verbs "to live" and "to go" in the present tense, the definite article, adjectives in all four forms) for discussing about the city, ways of transportation, the pros and cons of living in a city versus living in the countryside, navigating the city using maps and giving directions. This unit stands out for its diverse array of oral production exercises, which encourage students to engage in real conversations and apply their language skills effectively.

The sixth unit, *Viaţa de student* [Student life], displays vocabulary linked to school, university and classes. Students are introduced to other places of interest, such as reading rooms, gyms and performance halls. The grammar section addresses the present tense of the verb "to like" and of verbs ending in *-a* (with or without suffix), *-ea* and *-e*, enabling students to express their preferences.

Unit seven, *Ce facem azi?* [What are we doing today?], showcases contextual settings where students can utilize and practice the present tense of verbs. Topics include searching for a job, plans for the day, describing a perfect day by the seaside and in the mountains. The unit also introduces two categories of Romanian verbs: verbs ending in *-i* and verbs ending in *-î*, with and without suffixes.

Unit eight, *La cumpărături* [Shopping], illustrates the main vocabulary associated with food (fruit and vegetable, main categories of foods), clothing and beauty products. Connected to this theme, subjunctive and imperative moods are introduced, in order to facilitate interactions during shopping.

The next unit, *Ce mâncăm?* [What shall we eat?], builds on the previous unit, by addressing kitchen and restaurant-related vocabulary, including appliances, cutlery and daily meals. Traditional Romanian dishes are introduced through reading activities. The main grammar topics presented include the past tense of verbs and demonstrative pronouns and adjectives. Students are encouraged to use these language skills to discuss about their culinary experiences and cultural backgrounds, by sharing, for example, recipes from their own countries.

Unit ten, *O zi din viaţa mea* [A day in my life], focuses on daily routine, hobbies and sports. Related to this topic, reflexive verbs with pronouns in the Accusative case are introduced. Learners are encouraged to discuss about their daily schedules and activities in their own leisure time through a series of tasks built around communicative goals.

The following unit, eleven, *Profesii şi meserii* [Professions and jobs], illustrates vocabulary related to careers, university choices, interview preparations and future professions, supported by the introduction of the future tense of verbs. These language tools enable the learner to talk about future plans and career aspirations.

Unit twelve, *Familia* [The family], presents relevant vocabulary for A1-A2 learners, including relatives, family relationships and important family events and holidays, such as birthdays, weddings and Christmas with family. Grammatical topics cover possessive adjectives, the Genitive case of nouns and comparison degrees of adjectives. This unit encourages students to create family trees, to learn about important event in Romania and to compare them with similar events in their culture.

The final unit of this volume, *Despre sănătate* [About health], explores parts of the body and essential medical vocabulary (dialogues at the doctor, treatments for seasonal illnesses). The second part highlights personal pronouns in the Accusative case and the verb "to ache", in the context of health-related conversations.

At the end of the textbook, a Romanian-English dictionary is included, encouraging self-study. Furthermore, another tool which allows the self-taught learners to successfully use this book independently is the translation into English of all new vocabulary in each unit.

To sum up, *Limba română pentru străini: nivel A1-A2* [Romanian language for foreigners: A1-A2 level] represents a valuable and practical resource for beginners learning Romanian. It adheres to the CEFR recommendations for A1 and A2 levels, offering a cohesive approach to both grammar and vocabulary, covering practical topics, relevant to everyday life. The textbook is well-organized, each one of the 13 units following the same structure, gradually introducing a wide range of activities that encompass almost all aspects of language reception and production while learning a foreign language, except for listening. The communicative perspective adopted in this book is commendable, as it has proven its effectiveness in language teaching. This textbook represents a valuable asset for both students and teachers of Romanian as a foreign language. It equips learners with the essential tools needed to communicate effectively and develop an appreciation for the language and culture of Romania.

Carmen Răriş-Fierbinţeanu
University of Westminster
carmen_raris@yahoo.com