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probably a way of justifying themes like the epistemic and moral mixture, the
improvisation or the taste of conspiracy, which are indeed favorite topics in
Caragiale’s works. Once more, such thematic preferences lead us back to the
generic Balkan features.

Todorova quotes Smith, who confesses that: “In Belgrade one got the first
feeling of the Balkans: Intrigue is in the air one breathes. The crowds in the
Belgrade cafés have the manner of conspirators. There are soldiers on every hand”
(14).

The epic atmosphere is not very different in Caragiale’s Bucharest, where
the air of intrigue and conspiracy becomes gratuitous and almost paranoid, being
always efficient in the process of escaping the banality of the real. But many
features usually associated with Balkan identity are often attributed to Romanians
as well. In summary, we might conclude that both good and bad qualities do not
necessarily combine with a specific ethnic origin. They only describe human
nature as a whole, which was the one and only favorite topic of Caragiale’s world.

Reference Works on Romani of Value to Balkanists

2: Dialettkarten mit einer CD Rom.* Norbert Boretzky and Birgit Igla. Wiesbaden:
Harrassowitz. xx + 344, xxii + 371 pp.

Linguistics (= Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science,
Series V, Vo. 28).* Peter Bakker and Yaron Matras. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John

Review by Victor A. Friedman
University of Chicago

Although Sandfield (1930:3) explicitly excluded Romani from his consideration
of the Balkan languages, an approach implicitly endorsed by Asemova (1989:172,
2002:220), works beginning with Kostov (1973) and Uhlik (1973) and especially
more recently (e.g., Friedman 1985, 2000, 2001, Matras 1994, Boretzky and Igla
1999) have demonstrated the importance of Romani for Balkan linguistics,
including specifying the position of Romani within the Balkan linguistic league.
The two works under consideration here, taken together with Matras (2002) and
Boretzky and Igla (1994), comprise a basic set of reference tools for any library
concerned with the Balkans. Matras (2002) gives a careful historical and structural
description of Romani, including many original solutions to long-standing
problems and a valuable sociolinguistic analysis (see Friedman 2003 for a detailed
review). Boretzky and Igla (1994) covers general Romani vocabulary and specifies
variants for the most important dialects of the Balkans (Arli, Bugazhi, Drindari,
Gurbet, Kalderet, Ursariko, and others). The roughly 12,000 main entries include
eytological information as well as variants and examples of usage. There are
German-Romani (339-51) and English-Romani (352-62) indices of over 3,500 core
items each, indices of Indic (311-32) and Greek (323-38) etyma, as well as a
thorough outline of Romani grammar of the Balkans with dialectal variants (363-
415).

The introductory material of the first volume of *Komentierter Dialetkatalas
des Romani (Vergleich der Dialekte)* by Norbert Boretzky and Birgit Igla
(hereafter “B&I”) consists of a detailed table of contents (v-vii), an index of 113
tables (ix-xi), a guide to the 76 dialects that comprise the basis of the atlas, a list of
abbreviations (xxvii-xviii) and a foreword (xix-x). The main body of volume 1 is
divided into four chapters: Introduction (1-31), Systematic Comparison of the
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Dialects (33-207), Lexicon (209-28) and Evaluation (229-314). The work closes with a bibliography (315-27) of over 350 items, a subject, language and dialect index (329-42), and an index of cited authors (343-44). The second volume contains a total of 562 maps of which 251 pertain to what B&I call the “Northern Conglomerate” and the “Northeast Family,” comprising the first twenty-one dialects, and 253 cover what is labeled as the “Southeast” region comprising the remaining fifty-three dialects, 51 overview labeled “European Dialects.” Five general synthetic maps and two removable versions of map 1 (north and south) serving as keys to the dialects covered by the first two groups of maps. The CD-ROM includes all the maps of volume two in searchable form, with the various features color coded. The color coding is an especially welcome feature from the point of view of pedagogy and academic presentation, since such coding makes various distributional patterns particularly salient.

The Introduction to volume 1 gives a brief survey of the basics of Romani linguistics, and discusses the location, classification and sources of materials for each of the 76 dialects treated by the atlas as well as a few not portrayed on the maps such as Anglo-Romani (which is not a Romani dialect but rather a Para-Romani language based on English). The atlas uses a variant of the basic classification scheme first described in Bakker and Matras (1997) and elaborated by Boretzky (1999a, 1999b, 2000, 2003) and now accepted by the majority of linguists working on Romani. This scheme divides Romani into four major branches: Northern, Central, Vlax and Balkan. The Northern Branch can be divided into Northwestern and Northeastern sub-branches, but this classification is more geographic than genealogical, especially for the Northwestern branch, which comprises a variety of disparate dialects that have long been spoken in western Europe, some of which — e.g. Caló and Anglo-Romani — are now Para-Romani varieties (i.e., Romani lexicon with host-language grammar). Of the Northwestern Romani dialects, Sinil-Mahash constitutes a widespread assemblage of related dialects in Western Europe that is a major source of innovations. In B&I, the Northwestern branch is labeled the “Northern Conglomerate.” This use of conglomerate — as distinct from “family” or “group” — serves a useful function in distinguishing the degrees of relatedness that can currently be discerned among Romani dialect groupings, given the data and analyses available to us at present. The Northeastern sub-branch, which B&I label the “Northeastern Family,” i.e., a group of relatively more distantly related dialects that nonetheless forms a coherent unit, covers Poland, the Baltic republics, Belarus and Russia. The Central, Vlax and Balkan branches constitute relatively coherent genealogical dialect groupings, each of which can be divided into a northern and a southern sub-branch, as is done, e.g., in Elzik and Matras 2001-2006. Basically, the Central branch is spoken on territories of the old Austro-Hungarian Empire (particularly the Czech lands, Slovakia, Hungary and eastern Austria). The Balkan branch is spoken on the territories that were part of or tributary to Ottoman Turkey (basically modern Albania, Kosovo, Macedonia, Bulgaria, southern Wallachia, Greece, Turkey, Crimea and Iran) with the southern sub-branch being spread all over the territory and the northern sub-branch being concentrated in northeastern Bulgaria, Kosovo and some adjacent regions. The Vlax branch — so named because lexical evidence points to a significant sojourn on Romanian-speaking territory during the crucial period of shared innovations — has representatives that have been settled all over Europe, with a major division between those who migrated south to what was then Ottoman Turkey and those who stayed in Romania or went to what was then Austria-Hungary and regions further north, west and east. B&I label the North Central and South Central dialects as distinct groups, the Vlax branch as a dialect family subdivided into North Vlax and South Vlax, and, following Boretzky’s earlier classification, label the South Balkan dialects as South Balkan I Conglomerate and the North Balkan dialects as the South Balkan II Family. This results in a somewhat more atomistic set of classifications than seen, e.g., in Matras (2002): Northern Conglomerate (I), Northeastern Family (II), North Central Group (III), South Central Group (VI), Vlax Family (V), South Balkan I Conglomerate (VI) and South Balkan II Family (VII). In addition there are four dialects included by B&I that do not fit neatly into this classificatory scheme: South Russian, East Ukrainian, Abruzzian (I/VI) and Gopi (I/VI). I shall return to problems of classification below.

The sources (27-31) correspond for the most part to the exposition of the dialect divisions, with a few curious exceptions. Thus, for example, the ten points for South Balkan Romani (24-25) do not correspond to the ten dialect sources (30). The last two points in the dialect outlines are Florina and Serres, in Greek Macedonia, but the last two sources are for Roman and Zargari, which are spoken in Northern Iran by groups descended from migrants from Europe (the latter were first identified by Donald Stilo, currently at the Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology in Leipzig). The Iranian dialects are mentioned without their own numerals (25), while the Romani Morphosyntactic Data Base (Matras and Elzik 2001-2006) is mentioned on p. 25 but not p. 30. It is worth noting here that although B&I and Matras and Elzik 2001-2006 overlap to some extent, each contains materials not found in the other, and so a greater synthesis of available dialect materials remains a work for the future.

Chapter Two, which accounts for most of volume 1, is divided into two large subsections: Phonetics/Phonology and Morphology. It is here that the bulk of the materials whose spatial distribution is displayed in the maps of volume 2 is
discussed in detail. The section on phonetics and phonology (33-64) covers maps 2-21 in volume 2. In addition to straightforward phonetic and phonological processes such as vowel reduction, prothesis, accent shifts, palatalization, depalatalization, the fate of retroflex dentals, etc., this section includes some morphophonemics, particularly deaffrication and the loss of /tʃ/, both of which processes are frequently associated with specific morphophonological environments such as the first singular preterite and the instrumental singular, respectively, to name just some examples.

The section on morphology (65-207) is subdivided into the following sections: nominal (65-135 [maps 24-32 and 47-90]), verbal (135-192 [maps 90-149]) and adverbial/particle (193-207 [maps 150-67]). The section on substantivites (65-77) gives the details for the long and short genitive, oblique plurals, zero masculine plurals, vocatives and the formation of abstract nouns, as well as the adaptation and inflection of post-Greek borrowings. Prepositions (77-87 [maps 33-46]) are also treated here. The section on the verb treats the negative marker, long and short presents, conjunctional classes, allomorphs in the 3sg and elision, preterite markers and depalatalization, passive morphology, transitivization (causatives), the formation of the imperfect, pluperfect, future, imperative, loan verbs, modal and non-finite forms (gerund, participle, infinitive). The section on adverbials treats temporals, locatives and various other words such as "yes" and "a little."

Chapter Three, the lexicon is organized according to lexemes differentiated by phonological developments (36 items) such as dative 'day,' vateor 'speak,' lexemes that are etymologically different, e.g. dar and traqf 'fear,' and lexemes that survive in only a few dialects, e.g. dax 'Slav.' Each of these groups is subdivided by nouns and verbs. The lexical items in Chapter Three correspond to maps 168-253 in volume 2.

Chapter Four is a synthesis of B&I's view on Romani dialect classification and history, summarizing the material in the foregoing chapters. The first section of the chapter (227-89) lists and discusses the salient phenomena of the individual dialect groups, families and conglomerates. The second section (291-314) gives B&I's reconstruction of the history or Romani dialectal differentiation. The material in the first section of this chapter is summarized by 25 maps in volume 2 (341-66), which give a general overview of the distribution of salient features such as palatalization, the loss of /tʃ/, zero plurals in inherited masculines, the ending for the 2pl preterite, the distributions of various lexical items, etc. The last five maps of volume 2 (367-71) reflect the summary in the second half of Chapter Four. As B&I note (293), the dialectal differentiation of Romani cannot be accurately described by the simple application of the Stammbaum model without taking into account Wellensteinian, i.e., in addition to shared innovations that appear as characteristics of a divergent groups, there are shared innovations that spread across already divergent groups as a result of later contact.

The first of the five Overview Maps (2:367) gives a graphic representation of B&I's view of this history of Romani dialectal differentiation. According to them, it is unclear whether this differentiation began in southeastern Europe or before Romani crossed from Anatolia into the Balkans, but from that starting point they trace six distinct lines: North, Northeast, North Central, Vlax, South Balkan I and South Balkan II. They consider South Central to be an offshoot of South Balkan I with differential influence from North Central. The second and third Overview Maps (368-69) represent graphically the number of features that are either shared among or differentiate various dialect groups. Thus, for example, Overview Map Two represents the North and Northeast dialects as sharing 23 features, with an additional 44 features distinguishing the Northeast dialects and 13 [sic] additional features common to the Northern dialects as a group. The Vlax dialects are unified and distinguished from other dialects by 33 features and North and South Vlax are separated by 28 features. The Central dialects are unified by 12 features, North Central is separated from South Central by 60 features, and within the South Central dialects 14 features separate a more southwestern group for a more northeastern group. Moreover, the more southwestern group shares 14 features with Arli, which is a Balkan dialect. The so-called South Balkan II dialects are distinguished by 24 features. Overview Map Three displays features linking and separating North, Northeast, North Vlax and South Russian. From this map it emerges that 14 features link North Vlax and South Russian, and an additional 15 features link North Vlax, South Russian and the Northeast dialects. While these maps are interesting in showing various types of wave relationships, they do not specify which features are included in each count, although these can be figured out by using volume 1. However, since the features in question are of varying significance (e.g., archaisms and losses are not really diagnostic, lexical items are less important than phonological or grammatical innovations), the relationships they are intended to define are not as clear as they would be if the relative values of the features had been coded in some way.

The last two maps of volume 2 summarize the data of the atlas. Overview Map Four portrays the major isoglosses of European Romani using numbers that refer to the preceding detailed maps. Overview Map Five concentrates on the isoglosses separating the Northern dialects from the rest as well as those separating B&I's North (Matra's Northwest) from the Northeast.

The material in B&I overlaps with but does not duplicate that which is found in Matra' (2002:214-237 et passim) Chapter Nine, "Dialect Classification." B&I
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emphasize the Stammbaum approach to Romani dialect classification, while Matras (2002:235) emphasizes what he calls the "geographical diffusion model," which in essence is a type of Wellthetoronic. Accepting as he does the quadripartite model of Romani dialectal differentiation, with bifurcation in each quadrant, Matras (2002:225) identifies three centers of diffusion: one in southeastern Europe spreading from southeast to southwest, one in West-Central Europe with innovations spreading mostly east or southeast, and finally a Vlas center with spreads to the north, south and west. Such a model accounts nicely for various individual dialects that do not fit neatly into the quadripartite division. Matras (2002:236) also makes the point that while the Central dialects appear to be divided by a large number of isoglosses (60 according to B&I as noted above), they are in his words "remarkably consistent in their morphological patterns, sharing future-tense marking, case concord, case markers, demonstratives, and loan-verb-adaptation." Matras also explains east-west divisions in the Balkans as resulting from influences arriving from different centers of diffusion.

For readers of Balkanistica, the importance of B&I's atlas is twofold. First of all, Romani as a whole underwent a crucial formative period in contact with Greek. This is reflected in lexical and grammatical phenomena in all the dialects, no matter where they are spoken. Thus, for example, all Romani dialects (except a dialect spoken in Slovenia) have a modal subordinator te, which functions like Balkan Slavic do, Greek na, Albanian te and Balkan Romance di/tri (see Friedeman 1985 and Matras 2002:181, Ellik and Matras 2006:173-210). From this point of view, then, Romani is a Balkanized Indic language spoken in contact with languages all over Europe. Secondly, those Romani dialects that remained in the Balkans after the first great emigration from Southeastern Europe in the 14th and 15th centuries participated in most of the morphosyntactic changes that are crucial in defining the Balkan Sprachbund, e.g., future formation using an invariant particle descended from a verb meaning 'want,' replacement of synthetic by analytic comparatives, etc. This atlas is thus of great value in showing how Romani dialects help us to map the linguistic Balkans.

The second work under consideration here, Bibliography of Modern Romani Linguistics Including a Guide to Romani Linguistics by Peter Bakker and Yaron Matras (hereafter "B&M"), is of value to Balkanists as a resource for learning more about this increasingly well-studied language. Although an understanding of the importance of Romani for Balkan linguistics has lagged behind the growth in the quantity and quality of scholarly production on Romani linguistics, the understanding is beginning to catch up with the growth. B&M's bibliography thus serves the dual purpose of demonstrating what is available about Romani that is of importance to Balkanists, and providing a guide for those who would seek to include Romani in their work. Although production in this area continues unabated, this bibliography also serves to indicate those areas that have been researched and to point to directions for the future. Given the thoroughness of this work's coverage, any lacunae are potential research topics and notfailings on the part of the authors.

While there were a number of significant scholarly publications relevant to Romani linguistics in the 18th and 19th centuries, the 20th century—especially its last quarter—saw an enormous increase in linguistic scholarship dedicated to Romani. Moreover, while such activity has continued unabated into the 21st century, it is appropriate to take stock of what was achieved from 1900 to 1999. Anyone with an interest in the Romani language is thus tremendously fortunate that Bakker and Matras have produced such a masterful bibliography in such a timely fashion. The authors set as their goal the cataloguing of every work published in the 20th century, including reprints of works published before 1900, and pre-1900 works missing from Black (1914). The bibliography also includes references for 24 unpublished doctoral dissertations as well as for works published 2000-2003 that were available to the authors before the book went to press. The total number of entries is 2,651 (pp. 7-336).

B&M is a model of what a good bibliography should be. The introductory material (vvii-xxviii and 1-6) and indices (337-65), the thoroughness of the entries themselves plus the full cross-referencing and perspicacius keywords make this work of use not only to those interested in Romani, but to anyone planning a bibliographical work of any kind. The Introduction (vii-xv) gives the parameters of the work. Titles in French, German and Spanish are not translated, but titles in the thirty-four other languages besides English are all translated. (In their list of languages, the authors omitted Albanian and wrote Hindi/Panjabi when Hindi/Urdu was meant [viii].) B&M use standard linguistic systems of transliteration for non-Latin alphabets. In addition to Romani, the bibliography covers Domari (known in Arabic as Nawari), which is a language related to Romani, although the authors speculate that the two were already separated before their respective populations left South Asia (xx). The bibliography also covers Lomavren (in Armenian Bosa), as well as Para-Romani varieties. (Para-Romani is the name given by Romologists to languages that have resulted from language shift in which the grammar is that of a non-Romani population but a significant part of the lexicon remains Romani; Lomavren is also of this type, but B&M consider its Indic origins, like those of Domari, to be separate from those of Romani.) The authors exclude from their consideration various non-Romani languages spoken by Gypsies (e.g., Turkish, Romanian), speech forms used by non-Romani groups with peripatetic lifestyles (e.g., Gammon, which is spoken by Irish Travelers) and so-
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called secret languages (which are in fact lexicons usually associated with occupations or other social groups), such as Rotwelsch in Germany. These non-Romani languages are considered only when a study examines the Romani element in their vocabularies. The authors also quite justifiably exclude from consideration works written in Romani unless they involve some sort of linguistic analysis, i.e., the bibliography is a reference work for Romani linguistics, not the Romani language per se. The authors state that text collections of transcribed oral prose that involve some linguistic analysis, however, are included, and this inclusion adds to the value and thoroughness of this work. In practice, B&M’s demands for linguistic analysis are modest, in some cases not extending much beyond the collector’s identifying the dialect of the text (e.g., some of Károly Bi’s collections, wherein the accompanying essays concentrate on folkloristic issues), but such works are indeed of great value to the linguist.

Following the Introduction is a list of abbreviations for the 74 most cited journals (xvi-xviii). The authors then provide a glossary of their 85 keywords (xix-xxvii) with cross-references to related, broader, narrower and antithetical terms. Particularly satisfying is their distinction between Balkan, which is the term used for one of the four main branches of Romani dialect classification, and Balkans, which the authors use here to refer to the geographic region of Southeastern Europe regardless of the dialect in question. The authors then discuss their open class keywords, i.e., geographical locations and specific dialect names (xxviii-xxxi). It is worth noting that in their dialect classification, only the dialects of Abruzzi and Calabria, and the Slovenian/Istrian/Northeast Italian dialect called variously Dolenski, Hravati (Havati in B&M, Hrvati in Matras 2002), or Gopti, are left unclassified. (The former combine Northwest and South Balkan features, the latter South Central and South Balkan features.) We can also note here that although B&M treat South Russian and [East] Ukrainian as unclassified (xiii), elsewhere they describe them as Northeast dialects with later Vlax influence (20), while B&M take the older features as diagnostic in genealogical classification and classify these dialects as North.

After these introductory materials, B&M begin the bibliography proper (1-6) with “A Guide to Romani Linguistics.” As they explain in the Introduction (x), the bibliography itself cannot omit unreliable publications or publications where the material comes from unidentified or inadequately distinguished dialects. The Guide is thus intended to direct those who are not familiar with the field or are just beginning their studies to the most reliable general introductions, histories, overviews, dialect descriptions and classifications, dictionaries and analyses in the fields of language contact, sociolinguistics, typology and syntax. In this the authors

are also to be congratulated for having selected all the best works and placed them in a coherent presentation to which any interested educated reader can turn.

The bibliography itself (7-336) is excellently produced with full citations and abundant cross-references not only for multiple authors, authors whose names are spelled more than one way, and authors using more than one name, but even common misspellings that appear in other works. Thus, for example, the reader who looks up Toporov will learn that in the context of Romani linguistics this title occurs as a misspelling for Toropov. Reviews are listed as separate items but are cross-referenced in the entries for the works that are reviewed, and in the case of more general works that contain a significant section on Romani, e.g., a general introduction to historical linguistics, the relevant page numbers are given. Collections are cross-referenced to individual authors and reviewed works are cross-referenced to the reviews.

The book concludes with three indices: General Terms (339-48), Romani Varieties (349-54) and Languages (355-65). The first index lists all the keywords used in the bibliography. It marks with a following asterisk those that are defined in the introduction (see above) and has 122 additional terms and cross references. The second index has a total of 122 entries and cross-references for all the Romani dialects and Para-Romani varieties mentioned in the Bibliography as well as Domari and Lomavren. The third lists 110 languages, dialects, secret languages and cross references excluding those in the previous index.

While it is beyond the scope of B&M to list electronic resources, there is one public web site for which Matras and Bakker together with Dieter Halvachs of the University of Graz are the project directors that deserves mention here in the context of reference tools, namely the ROMLEX database project located at <http://romani.uni-graz.ac.at/romlex/>. In addition to being the best on-line resource for the Romani lexicon, it has links to the RMS database (Etkik and Matras 2001-2006; only a sample is currently available to the public, but the entire database will eventually be publicly available) as well as to other reliable Romani linguistic online resources.

B&M’s bibliography is a vital reference tool that should be permanently kept in print. With a view to the eventuality that the current print run is exhausted and that the authors will have a chance to correct the minor errors, inconsistencies and lacunae that are inevitable in a work of such exhaustiveness and complexity, I am supplying here a list of such items.
Errors

viii-T16 (et passim): Belarus is the name of a country, but the language is referred to as Belarusan or Belarusian.
x-T17: latters > latter
xix-T5: try and > try to
xix-9B: as spoke > as spoken
xx-2B: approved > proved
xx-T9: branches always > branches is always
xxi-T2: in > is
xxi-T15: Macedonian Turkish > West Rumelian Turkish [the process of linguistic Balkanization took place in dialects of Kosovo and elsewhere beyond Macedonia, and the close parenthesis is missing]
xxvii-B12: The spelling Vlah is never used to refer to the Balkan Romance languages (normally Aromanian, but also Megleno-Romanian and sometimes Daco-Romanian dialects spoken outside Romania). The spellings Vlah or Vlach are used. The spelling Vlah (where <v> represents a uvular fricative in those dialects that have it) is used by Romologists to avoid the potential ambiguity noted by B&M.
13 [52]: Ovvrte > Ovvrte
25 [149]: Karoly > Károly; cállari > ĉalari; ĉurari > ĉurari;
78-T4, p. 80 [583] and B1: The <O> in Durčić should be <Ô>
87 [635]: ...
165 [1250]: Tamil is listed twice in the keywords
274 [1219]: adresse > addressed
309 [2405]: the cross referencing was copied from 308 [2404] instead of changed to refer back to it.
316 [2475]: see under inconsistencies/duplications
354-B1 Xorxani should not be indented.
355-T13/14: An entry for Belarusan is missing from the Languages Index (cf. viii above)

FRIEDMAN: RECENT WORKS ON ROMANI

Inconsistencies/Duplications

313 [2442] and 316 [2475], [2478]: It appears that #2442 and #2475 refer to volumes in the same series, while #2475 and #2478 refer to the same item (owing to references drawn from different bibliographies?).

Item #2442 is listed under Várnagy, Élémér with the year 1982 followed by "A Cigány gyerekek oktatásával-nevelésével foglalkozó Munkacsoport Vizsgálataiból" [survey of the research of the working committee dealing with education of Gypsy children]. Tamúlmányok 3. There is no specification of the number of pages. The keywords are [education, bibliography].

Item #2475 is listed under Vekerdő, József with the date 1981a and the title A magyar cigány nyelvjárás nyelveina [The grammar of the Romergo dialect] followed by place of publication, then publisher in Hungarian and English, then the series title Tamúlmányok a cigány gyerekek oktatásával-nevelésével foglalkozó munkacsoport vizsgálataiból [papers of the Research Committee dealing with education of Gypsy children] IV, and specified as 61 pp. with keywords (Hungary, Romungro, Central, grammar, texts, dialect classification)

Item #2478 is listed under Vekerdő, József with the date 1981d, the title A magyar cigány nyelvjárás [grammar of Hungarian Romani] and then the series title given only in French followed by IV, place of publication, the same publisher’s name only in French, and specified as 105 pp.

Although not indicated in B&M, the item given as #2475/2478 has Várnagy, Élémér specified as the editor of the series Tamúlmányok a cigány gyerekek oktatásával-nevelésével foglalkozó munkacsoport vizsgálataiból, of which No. 4 is Vekerdő’s grammar.

The title in #2475 is correct, while that in #2478 is missing nyelvjárás ‘dialect.’ The length of the work is 105 pp. as specified in #2478. The grammar and lexicon are on pp. 1-61, the texts with a list of references and table of contents take up pp. 62-105. The fact that #2475 includes [text] among the keywords and the identical titles and numbers of the series makes it extremely unlikely that longer and shorter versions were published in the same language in the same place at the same time by the same publisher with the same number in the same series in a truncated and an extended version. The citation and translation used in #2475 should also be the one used for the name of the series in #2442.
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This leaves me wondering about item #2442. The number of pages is not specified, so I suspect this item was not seen by B&M. Also, it is No. 3 in the series but the year is given at 1982, while No. 4 was published in 1981. Finally, since Varnagy is the editor of the series, I am left wondering if he is also the author, and, if so, how B&M are sure it is a bibliography if they did not see it.

One other minor inconsistency relates to the three volumes of Papers from the Annual Meeting of the Gypsy Lore Society — North American Chapter. The volumes bearing this title were from the fourth and fifth, sixth and seventh, and eighth and ninth meetings, all edited by J. Grumet (the last of the three volumes with C. DeSilva and D. Nemeth; papers from the tenth annual meeting, whose chief editor was M. Salo, had the title 100 Years of Gypsy Studies). In entry #892 fourth and fifth are written out, whereas in #893 the forms 4th and 5th are used. Entries #894 and #895 use the numerical forms, but in the actual titles of all three volumes, the numerals are spelled out. In the cross-referenced entries (see below for lacunae) there is also inconsistency in presentation. Also, while the fact that papers from the seventh and eighth meetings were GLS-NAC Publication No. 3 is specified, the information for the preceding and following volumes (Nos. 2 and 4, respectively) is not given. Moreover, while the series number is given in italics immediately after the title in #2061, it is given after the publisher and not in italics in #894 and #895. (I have not checked all the cross-referenced entries for consistency, but the authors should do so if there is a chance to publish a corrected reprint.)

Lacunae/Addenda

#893 - Friedman (#686) was omitted from the cross-referenced authors.

#896 - Friedman (#682) and Hamp (#947) were omitted from the cross-referenced authors.

#2061 - Jusuf (#1212) was omitted from the cross-referenced authors.
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