X. ROMANIAN STUDIES

The place of publication of books is Bucharest unless otherwise indicated

LANGUAGE AND LINGUISTICS

Kim Schulte, *Universitat Jaume I, Castellón de la Plana*

This survey covers the years 2012–2013

1. General

The period under review has seen the publication of extensive collections of selected works by two eminent Romanian linguists, making their oeuvre, including some lesser-known publications, accessible to a present-day readership: Valeria Guțu Romalo, *Periplu lingvistic. Studii și reflecții*, Editura Academiei Române, 783 pp., contains 115 articles and chapters in chronological order, published over a period of more than half a century, that reflect the author's changing research focus but also her overarching desire to gain new insights into all aspects of the structure of the Romanian language, be it in the areas of syntax, morphology, phonology, or pragmatics. Emanuel Vasiliu, *Teorie și analiză în lingvistică*, ed. Marina Rădulescu Sala, Editura Academiei Române, 2012, 425 pp., is a posthumous collection of 48 publications, many of them hitherto not easily accessible, which reflect the theoretical nature of V.'s approach to a wide range of linguistic topics; the volume is subdivided into five sections: general linguistics; phonetics, phonology and dialectology; grammar; semantics, pragmatics and stylistics; and a short final section with two contributions on textuality and intertextuality.

Two publications honouring another eminent linguist, Marius Sala, currently vice-president of the Romanian Academy, have appeared on the occasion of his 80th birthday: a special issue of the periodical *Limba Româna* (*LiR* 61.3, 2012) and the festschrift **De ce am devenit lingvist? Omagiu academicianului Marius Sala*, ed. Emanuela Timotin and Ștefan Colceriu, Univers Enciclopedic Gold, 2012, 398 pp., with contributions by highly respected Romance linguists from across Europe. The 80th birthday of another renowned linguist, Andrei Avram, is celebrated by the belated festschrift **Bătrânul înțelept de la Pyros. Volum omagial dedicat lui Andrei Avram la optzeci de ani*, ed. Ștefan Colceriu, Editura Academiei Române, 2012, 252 pp.

Two double-volume proceedings of the 11th and 12th International Colloquium of the Linguistics Department at the University of Bucharest (2011 and 2012, respectively), *Limba română. Direcții actuale în cercetarea lingvistică*, ed. Rodica Zafiu and Ariadna Ștefănescu, 2 vols, Bucharest U.P., 2012, 324, 347 pp. and *Limba română. Variație sincronică, variație diacronică*, ed. Rodica Zafiu et al., 2 vols, Bucharest U.P., 281, 323 pp., offer papers on a wide variety of synchronic as well as diachronic linguistic topics, many of them by established scholars, covering virtually all areas of linguistic analysis, from phonology and morphology to discourse analysis and translation studies. Similarly, **Convergențe lingvistice*, ed. Nicolae Saramandu, Manuela Nevaci and Carmen-Ioana Radu, Bucharest U.P., 2012, 532 pp., contains a selection of papers presented at the 4th International Linguistics Symposium, organized by the Linguistics Institute 'Iorgu Iordan — A. Rosetti' in Bucharest in 2010; the contributions are divided into four sections: history of the language, dialectology and onomastics; lexicology and lexicography; grammar

(morphosyntax); and stylistics and pragmatics, while Chiţoran, *Contrastive Studies*, inspired by the *Romanian-English Contrastive Analysis Project* that began in 1971, contains 27 articles that examine the differences and similarities between English and Romanian, covering all major areas of linguistic description.

An in-depth monographic study of the Romanian adjective, Raluca Brăescu, *Adjectivul în română. Sintaxă şi semantică*, Bucharest U.P., 274 pp., examines the syntax, semantics and discourse functions of items belonging to this syntactic category, offering a clear description and analysis of issues such as the position of the adjective within the NP and the interdependency of adjectival syntax and semantics. A monograph on the adverb in Romanian, C. Mîrzea Vasile, *Eterogeneitatea adverbului românesc: tipologie şi descriere*, Bucharest U.P., 2012, 261 pp., covers the areas of morphology, semantics and syntax, focusing especially on the multi-functional nature of many adverbs and combining theoretical discussion with corpus data.

2. History of the Language

Historical and diachronic studies in the areas of morphology and syntax, lexicon/etymology and varieties will be discussed in the respective sections.

The Dacian substrate and its contribution to the formation of Romanian continues to be a topic of interest and controversy. C. Leschber, 'Arhaism, insule relicvă şi continuitate (II)', *SCL,* 63, 2012:17–34, the second part of an article by the same author in *SCL,* 62, 2011:157–72, discusses the importance of areal factors for a correct historical linguistic reconstruction and examines the semantics and geographical distribution of Dacian substrate elements in Romanian, drawing an interesting distinction between substrate words that have a cognate in Albanian and those that do not. G. Brâncuş, 'Problemele substratului limbii române', *LiR,* 62:417–23, defends the orthodox view that Thraco-Dacian had the role of a substrate language in the emergence of Romanian, taking a stance against recent 'pseudo-scientific' publications that greatly exaggerate the importance and proportion of non-Latin substrate elements in Romanian. One such publication is Lucian Cherata, *Despre substratul indo-european al limbii române*, Craiova, Aius Printed, 515 pp., an attempt to show that Romanian is a direct descendant from Dacian, as spoken prior to the Roman conquest; according to this theory, most of the similarities between Romanian and Latin are due to their shared Indo-European ancestry.

A later stage in the evolution of Romanian language and culture is the object of A. Niculescu, '"Barbarii" şi imperiul Romei', *Dacoromania,* 17, 2012:7–25, which focuses on the transition from Latin to Romance under the influence of large-scale Slavic migration into the former Roman province, leading to a mixed ethno-linguistic identity.

3. Texts

Religious Texts. Religious texts are the object of a considerable number of studies published during the period under review. G. Chivu, 'Scrisul religios, componentă definitorie a culturii vechi româneşti', *Dacoromania,* 17, 2012:54–67, examines the evolution of religious writing, noting the importance of linguistic as well as theological methods for their analysis, and emphasizing the importance of taking into consideration stylistic and formal features. Concentrating specifically on gospel texts, E. Pavel, 'Textul evanghelic în cultura română (încercare de sinteză)', *LiR,* 61, 2012:26–37, analyses and explains the differences in form and style from the Slavonic to the early modern period, providing some concrete parallel text analyses.

Other, more specific, studies examining various aspects of biblical texts include the following, presented in the approximate chronological order of the respective translations or editions of the

Bible. E. Conţac, 'Sursele predosloviilor la cele patru evanghelii din *Noul Testament* de la Bălgrad (1648)', *LiR,* 61, 2012:175–233, revisits the prefaces to the four gospels in the Bălgrad New Testament with special attention to a number of Protestant-sounding features, which are somewhat unexpected in a text that is generally understood to be the outcome of a 'thoroughly Orthodox initiative'. A. Chirilă, 'Un *hapax legomenon* în textele lui Antim Ivireanul: *corhor*', *LiR,* 62:506–11, examines an interesting case of a nonce borrowing from Greek that appears as part of an idiomatic expression, the rest of which is translated into Romanian ('*corhorul* între alte verdeaţe'). E. Pavel, 'Comentarii pe marginea traducerii *Vulgatei* din 1760–1761', *LiR,* 61, 2012:372–79, discusses the first 'western' translation of the Old Testament, based on a 1592 version of the *Vulgata*, in which the translators' deliberate attempts to break with the style and language of the established eastern Septuagint leads to a lexically rich but very literal translation. A.-M. Gînsac, 'Despre echivalarea toponimelor biblice descriptive în limba română', *SCL,* 63, 2012:121–35, analyses the translation of descriptive toponyms in Romanian versions of the Greek Septuagint, between the 17th and 19th century. D.-L. Teleoacă, 'Morfosintaxa textului biblic actual: *Evanghelia după Matei*', *LiR,* 61, 2102:91–108, aims to establish how archaic the morphosyntactic structures are in modern versions of the Bible, examining the Gospel of Matthew in three versions of the Bible published in Romanian between 1980 and 1990; the same author examines discursive strategies used in the Book of Psalms in 'Stratégies discursives dans le texte des Psaumes', *RRL,* 58:189–203, noting that indirect speech acts or implicit performatives play an important part in this religious text genre.

Studies of religious texts beyond the Bible, again presented in approximate chronological order of the respective texts, include A. Mareş, 'Două note coresiene', *LiR,* 62:481–522, who attempts to disprove Vasile Oltean's hypothesis that textual similarities between Slavonic manuscripts and texts translated and edited by Coresi are evidence of a direct influence of priests from the Şcheii Braşovului on Coresi's work. A. Gafton, 'Valorile conceptului biblic "chemare" în vechile traduceri româneşti', *ib.*, 512–22, observes that, in early translations of religious texts, lexical items with a broad semantic range in the source language can cause the equivalent lexical item in the target language to expand its range correspondingly. Cristina-Ioana Dima, *Apocalipsul Maicii Domnului. Versiuni româneşti din secolele al XVI-lea — al XIX-lea,* Editura Academiei Române, 2012, 330 pp., is a commented edition of nine versions of the *Apocalypse of Mary* written between the 16th and 19th c., including sample facsimile pages and a glossary of obsolete words. C. Sava, '*Cuvîntul lui Ipolit* în literatura românească veche. Versiunea prescurtată', *LiR*, 62:498–506, presents four 18th-c. manuscripts containing the abridged version of a homily attributed to Hippolytus, translated into Romanian. Mihail Neamţu, 'Conversing with the World by Commenting on the Fathers: Fr. Dumitru Stăniloae and the Romanian Edition of *The Philokalia*', pp. 61–69 of *The Philokalia. A Classic Text of Orthodox Spirituality*, ed. Brock Bingaman and Bradley Nassif, OUP, 2012, xvi + 350 pp., discusses the Romanian edition of this 18th-c. compilation of important Orthodox texts written in Greek between the 4th and the 15th c.; rather than being a mere translation, the Romanian version by Dumitru Stăniloae, published in 12 volumes over much of the 20th c., is characterized by a significant amount of 'enrichment' and additions to the original text.

Secular Texts.   A. Mareş, 'Note privind vechi descântece manuscrise', *LiR,* 61, 2012:329–36, examines a late 17th- or early 18th-c. manuscript containing two short magical texts, known as the Guşă incantations. In 'Două scurte scrieri cu caracter monahal atribuite lui Neagoe Basarab. Consideraţii filologice', *ib.*, 16–22, the same author argues that two documents attributed to Basarab, the early 16th-c. ruler of Wallachia, are in fact forgeries from the second half of the 17th century, and in 'O scriere imaginară: *Păucenia* lui Alexandru-vodă din Ţara Moldovei', *ib.*, 211–18, he attempts to disprove the hypothesis that the *Păucenia* were written in the mid-16th c. and are the basis of the 1643 *Cărţii românseşti de învăţătură*.

E. Timotin, 'Considerații despre lexicul tipăriturii *Pânea pruncilor* și neîmplinirile unei ediții recente', *LiR,* 61, 2012:225–33, critically assesses a recent edition of this text (originally published in 1702) and compares loanwords from Latin and Hungarian in it with those in general use at the time, in order to establish to what extent we are dealing with genuine lexical innovation. M. Maziliu, 'Vechi anale privind istoria țării românești de la începutul secolului al xviii-lea', *ib.*, 218–25, examines two manuscripts from the early 18th c., found in a volume printed by Antim Ivireanul, that deal with the history of Wallachia since its foundation. Id., '*Avestița, aripa Satanei.* Redacțiile Românești', *LiR,* 62:491–98, discusses a text, first attested in the mid-18th c., that has influenced popular superstition; one of the conclusions is that we are probably dealing with a translation that follows a Slavic model, copying the structures of a text from the 17th or early 18th century.

The influence of Italian on 18th-c. Romanian texts and translations is discussed in several articles, including E. Timotin, 'Apprendre et expliquer. Les gloses dans une *Vie de Skanderbeg* traduite de l'italien en roumain au xviiie siècle', *RRL,* 58:205–21, a study of the glosses added to the Romanian translation of a 16th-c. biography of Skanderbeg by Vlad Boțulescu, many of which serve to explain Italian words retained in the translation, whilst 'Cele mai vechi atestări ale unor neologise românești. Note lexicale pe marginea manuscrisului 67 din Arhivele de la Veneția', *SCL,* 63, 2012:241–248, and 'Neologisme necunoscute dintr-un manuscris românesc din Arhivele de Stat din Veneția', *LiR,* 61, 2012:402–12, by the same author, focus on the question whether the Italian loanwords in this text are deliberate borrowings. Two other documents copied and translated by Boțulescu, one dealing with geography and astronomy, the other a vocabulary of the Iroquoian language, are discussed in C.-I. Dima, 'Un vocabulaire iroquois-roumain traduit au xviiie siècle', *RRL,* 57, 2012:291–303, which also includes edited versions of the Iroquoian vocabulary in Italian and Romanian.

A.-M. Gherman, 'Samuil Micu și începuturile limbajului filosofic românesc (câteva observații pe marginea *Loghicii*)', *LiR,* 61, 2012:205–11, examines the lexical choices in this late 18th-c. text, highlighting the use of descriptive, more easily comprehensible expressions instead of the established philosophical terms, which may be due to the influence of the German and Hungarian literary language at the time.

A. Mareș, 'Cine a tradus *Istoria lui Schinder*?', *LiR,* 62:65–69, analyses the linguistic features of this translation and compares them with those of the *Chronicle of Moldova*, presumably written by Alexandre Amiras, concluding that both texts are written by the same person, and N. A. Ursu, 'Alte două traduceri necunoscute ale lui Petru Maior', *LiR,* 61, 2012:413–16, argues that two short texts, dealing with European politics and business administration in the early 19th c., are translations by Petru Maior, citing linguistic similarities with other texts by the same author as evidence.

4. Orthography, Phonetics, and Phonology

Orthography and punctuation. Sixty years after the last official spelling reform of 1953, V. and D. Draica, '60 de ani de la ultima reformă ortografică în limba română', *LiR(M),* 23.1–4:138–46, provide an overview of the orthographic changes implemented in 1953 as well as giving an account of previous spelling reforms since 1904 and subsequent changes to the orthographic system.

In a series of short articles in *LiR(M),* 22, 2012, A. Dragomirescu covers various aspects of Romanian orthography: In 'Ortografia limbii române: definiție, scurt istoric, instrumente. Principiul fonologic', *LiR(M),* 22.1–2, 2012:56–63, the application of the phonological principle in

Romanian orthography is extensively exemplified; in 'Principiul tradiţional-istoric în ortografia limbii române', *LiR(M),* 22.3–4, 2012:25–29, the focus is on orthographic features based on etymology or traditional spelling; 'Principiul morfologic în ortografia limbii române', *LiR(M),* 22.5–6, 2012:224–29, discusses how morphology can determine the correct orthographic choice; 'Alte principii în ortografia limbii române: sintactic, simbolic, distribuţional', *LiR(M),* 22.7–8, 2012:110–15, covers areas such as compound spelling or separation of words depending on their syntactic function, the capitalization of proper names, and the positional rules determining the choice between the letters *î* and *â*; 'Greşeli frecvente de grafie în limba actuală', *LiR(M),* 22.9–10, 2012:34–40, deals with common spelling mistakes such as the omission of diacritics, incorrect capitalization and abbreviations; and 'Folosirea cratimei', *LiR(M),* 22.11–12, 2012:121–25, focuses on the different uses of the hyphen. A short paper on a specific punctuation issue, I. Vintilă-Rădulescu, 'Ortografia limbii române în dezbatere', *LiR,* 62:27–29, questions the use of a comma before parentheses and encourages a debate on the issue.

Phonetics and phonology.   As in previous years, publications in this area have been relatively scarce. A good number of publications adopt a comparative approach, contrasting aspects of the phonetics or phonology of different languages. W. Heeren et al., 'Can Speech Pitch Perception be Measured Language-Independently?', pp. 55–67 of *Linguistics in the Netherlands 2012*, ed. Marion Elenbaas and Suzanne Aalberse, Amsterdam, Benjamins, 2012, v + 158 pp., is a comparative study of the perception of F_O in Dutch, Italian and Romanian, taking into account the influence of duration on perception, while L. Dascăla Jinga, *'The Front Vowels of Romanian and English (A Contrastive Study)', Chiţoran, Contrastive Studies*, 59–68, and V. Ştefănescu-Drăgănești, *'Preliminary Remarks to a Contrastive Analysis of the Consonants in English and Romanian', ib.*, 69–74, contrast different classes of segments in these two languages.

Chiţoran*, Contrastive Studies* also includes three contributions examining the influence of Romanian phonetics and phonology on English (spoken by Romanians as a second language): A. Avram, 'Intonation Curves in the English of Romanians' (85–106); and two articles by H. Pârlog and M. Popa, 'Intonation Errors' (107–14), and 'Remarks on the Realization of Rhythm by Romanian Speakers of English' (75–84).

Andrei Avram, *Studii de fonetică istorică a limbii române*, Editura Academiei Române, 2012, 359 pp., deals with historical sound changes in Romanian, whilst a wider Romance perspective is adopted by B. Nielsen Whitehead, 'On Italian, Ibero-Romance and Romanian Imperatives in *-i* and the Fate of Latin Final *-e*', *RevR,* 47, 2012:283–304, who argues that the regular outcome of Latin word-final post-tonic long *-ē* in Proto-Romance was *-i*, which would explain, among other things, the final *-i* in some Romanian singular imperatives (e.g. *vezi* < vidē). H. J. Wolf, 'La "palatalisation secondaire" romane, aussi en Sardaigne', *RRL,* 57, 2012:255–75, shows that the secondary palatalization of Latin qu followed by a front vowel, often considered to be typically Romanian, is, in fact, far more widespread in the Romance languages (and Albanian), and can, against all odds, even be found in Sardinian.

5. Morphology and Syntax

The Grammar of Romanian, ed. Gabriela Pană Dindelegan, OUP, xxxiv + 656 pp., is the first comprehensive grammar of modern standard Romanian written in English. Based on the Romanian Academy's *Gramatica limbii române*, 2008, 1800 pp., and the shorter, somewhat simpler *Gramatica de bază a limbii române*, Univers Enciclopedic, 2010, 918 pp., it provides an academic yet not overly theoretical, mainly descriptive account of all important aspects of Romanian syntax and morphology, with occasional references to language history and non-standard

usages. C. Mărănduc, '*Gramatica Academiei*, edițiile din 2005–2008, momemte de referință în sincronizarea terminologică', *LiR,* 62:441–50, discusses the changes in linguistic terminology used in the grammars published by the Romanian Academy, concluding that the terminology in recent editions has changed in line with the novel theories and frameworks applied, making it easier to compare the grammar of Romanian with that of other languages described within the same frameworks. Isabela Nedelcu, *101 greşeli gramaticale*, Humanitas, 2012, 192 pp., the fifth volume of the series *Viața cuvintelor* edited by Marius Sala, presents and discusses a wide range of common grammatical 'mistakes' or non-standard features; despite its fundamentally prescriptive approach, it provides the linguist with very useful information about actual present-day language usage. Similarly, N. Moglan, 'Incertitudinile prepoziției *pe* în limba română', *LiR(M)*, 22.5–6, 2012:230–33, points out incorrect usages and omissions of the preposition (and accusative case marker) *pe*, thereby implicitly providing an account of how it *is*, in fact, used; a central issue discussed here is the somewhat controversial prescriptive rule that direct object relative pronouns should be marked as such by the anteposition of *pe*.

Morphology.   In the area of derivational morphology, I. Mărgărit, 'Despre suprapunerea valorică a unor prefixe *des-* / *ne-*', *LiR,* 62:31–37, discusses the partial semantic overlap of these two prefixes from a synchronic and diachronic perspective. C. Moroianu, 'Aspecte ale analogiei lexico-semantice în limba română. Studiu de caz: *pune(re)* < lat. *ponere*', *SCL,* 63, 2012:3–15, examines the influence of derivational prefixes inherited from Latin on the later integration of learned loanverbs, and Id., 'Importanța modelului verbal moştenit în configurarea limbii române literare moderne', *ib.*,171–87, presents different patterns of morphological derivation involving a series of verbs inherited from Latin and shows that these patterns are also analogically extended to loanwords.

Inflectional verbal morphology is the topic of A. Todi and M. Nevaci, 'Conjugation Changes in the Evolution of Romanian (Daco-Romanian and Aromanian) in Verbs of Latin Origin', *RRL,* 57, 2012:377–88, a contrastive study of verbs switching conjugation in two Daco-Romance varieties. M. Maiden, '"Semi-Autonomous" Morphology? A Problem in the History of the Italian (and Romanian) Verb', Cruschina, *Boundaries*, 25–44, examines the complex interplay of phonology and morphology in the emergence of morphomic patterns in verbal paradigms; with reference to Romanian, the dialectal variation between the gerund forms *fugind* and *fugând* is discussed. Id., 'The Latin "Third Stem" and its Romance Descendants', *Diachronica,* 30:492–530, analyses the path of the Latin participial stem into Romance, especially Romanian, concluding that form–meaning iconicity is an important factor in the preservation of morphomic patterns. Also dealing with the fate of Latin participial stems, G. Pană Dindelegan, '*Înțelept şi mort* — participii cu istorie convergentă —', *LiR,* 61, 2012:312–20, observes how the morphological irregularity of two past participles led to their reanalysis as adjectives and to the emergence of new, regular participles for the respective verbs.

Publications focusing on morphophonology include T. Cychnerski, *'Sintagmatica flectivelor afixale nominale şi verbale, o comparație morfonologică', *Annales Universitatis Apulensis — Series Philologica,* 13.1, 2012:413–22, comparing the morphophonology of nominal and verbal paradigms, and A. Belchiță-Hartular, *'The Contrastive Morphophonology of Romanian and English', Chițoran, *Contrastive Studies*, 115–39, comparing morphophonological patterns between languages.

Regarding nominal morphology, A. Kihm, 'Old French and Romanian Declensions from a *Word and Paradigm* Perspective and the Notion of "Default Syncretism"', *RRL,* 57, 2012:3–34, observes that the syncretism in the Romanian nominal paradigms is neither semantically motivated nor completely arbitrary, proposing an analysis based on the notion of default syncretism. T. Repina,

'Cu privire la tendinţele panromanice în istoria declinării româneşti', *LiR,* 61, 2012:380–86, points out how a typological shift from Latin to Romance affected nominal inflection and defends the hypothesis that the preservation of case inflection in Romanian is due to the fact that the (inflected) suffixed article stabilized the system of inflectional case endings. G. Pană Dindelegan, 'Flexiunea cazuală — între analitic şi sintetic. Cardinale şi cuantificatori non-numerici în româna veche', *LiR,* 62:159–73, examines the case inflection of numerals and non-numeric quantifiers (or its absence) in Romanian before the mid-18th c., showing a high degree of variability in case marking strategies. I. Söhrman, 'Les valeurs possessives et localisatrices du génitif roumain et des prépositions *de, de la* et *din* — et de la juxtaposition dans une perspective romane', *Dacoromania,* 17, 2012:26–43, is an interesting study of how three different types of genitive-like NP types (inflectional, prepositional and morphologically non-overt) are correlated to different types of possession. I. Giurgea, 'The Origin of the Romanian "Possessive-Genitival Article" *al* and the Development of the Demonstrative System', *RRL,* 57, 2012:35–65, argues that *al* is derived from Latin *illu(m)*, which by different processes of reanalysis became both the genitival and the ordinal particle it is today; the demonstratives of the type *ăl(a)*, on the other hand, are not a direct continuation of *ille*, but the outcome of an analogical reduction of *acel*, modelled on *acest > ăst(a)*. Id. and C. Dobrovie-Sorin, 'Nominal and Pronominal Possessors in Romanian', pp. 105–40 of *The Genitive*, ed. Anne Carlier and Jean-Christophe Verstraete, Amsterdam, Benjamins, vii + 356 pp., provide an overview of some important morphological and syntactic features of the Romanian genitive, propose that the absence of the particle *al* immediately after definite articles is due to a PF-deletion rule, highlight the difference between possessors that show morphological agreement with the possessed (*meu, mea, mele* etc.) and those in the 3rd person that do not (*ei, lui, lor*), and argue that the agreeing possessors are, in fact, pronouns rather than adjectives. Tracing the origin and evolution of two clitic pronouns, I. Giurgea, 'L'origine des clitiques roumains de 3e personne pluriel datif et de 1ere personne pluriel datif-accusatif', *RRL,* 58:125–36, argues that the original forms *nă* and *lă* turned into *ne* and *le* as an indirect consequence of a phonological process in which /e/ following a labial consonant turned into /ă/ (as in 1sg *me > mă*); an extension of this pattern of phonological alternation throughout the pronominal paradigm then caused /ă/ to become /e/ in the forms in which it was not preceded by a labial consonant.

A. Chircu, 'L'adverbe roumain dans la perspective romane', *RRL,* 57, 2012:83–92, examines the evolution of adverbs from Latin to Romance, observing that Romanian differs considerably from the other Romance languages in how it forms its adverbs; whilst there are some similar patterns, Romanian has, in many respects, gone along a different path and developed its own adverbial morphology. C. Mîrzea Vasile, 'Un tipar adverbial specific românei: *pe alese, pe nemâncate*. Corespondenţe romanice şi balcanice', *LiR,* 62:274–58, compares the Romanian adverbs of the type [pe PTCP-e] with a vaguely similar adverb construction found in other Romance languages that involve a preposition followed by a noun or verb root with the suffix *-on* (or variants thereof); after establishing that these two types of adverbs have rather little in common, more similar structures found in Aromanian and Albanian are considered, leading to the conclusion that we are probably dealing with a typically Balkan type of adverb.

Synchronic syntax. *A Reference Grammar of Romanian. Vol. 1: The Noun Phrase*, ed. Carmen Dobrovie-Sorin and Ion Giurgea, Amsterdam, Benjamins, xxviii + 900 pp., is an extensive and very comprehensive volume, with contributions by 19 established linguists covering virtually all aspects of the Romanian noun phrase, including all types of adnominal phrases, from a primarily formal linguistic perspective; in addition to pure syntax, it also deals with morphological issues and the interface between syntax and semantics, and it provides some genuinely new analyses. Another Minimalist study of NP syntax, A. Nicolae, 'Notă de sintaxă

comparată: parametrul [+definit] în sintaxa grupului nominal românesc', *LiR,* 62:186–208, argues that Romanian nouns and adjectives have a morphosyntactic feature giving them the parameter setting [+definite], a feature shared with Hebrew and Arabic but not with English or French. R. Brăescu, 'Topica adjectivului în romăna. O perspectivă tipologică', *LiR,* 62:209–25, examines the word order of adjectives in relation to the head noun and in relation to other adjectives within the NP, concluding that, despite the fact that many word-order constraints favour postposition, adjectival word order in Romanian is essentially free. V. Hill, 'Features and Strategies: the Internal Syntax of Vocative Phrases', pp. 79–102 of *Vocatives! Addressing Between System and Performance,* ed. Patricia Noel and Barbara Sonnenhauser, Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter, 323 pp., compares the types of vocative phrases found in Romanian with those in other languages, providing a formal analysis based on the assumption that the pragmatic features of vocatives are converted into functional features.

Binominal NPs are the topic of several publications. Mihaela Tănase-Dogaru, *The Syntax of Quantity and Quality in Romanian: Prepositional Binominal Structures*, Bucharest U.P., 2012, 164 pp., distinguishes three types of binominals: pseudopartitive, quantitative (in connection with cardinal numbers above 19), and qualitative binominals, all of which differ in terms of their syntactic structure. In 'On the Two Types of Cardinal–Noun Constructions in Romanian', *RRL,* 58:179–87, the same author argues that cardinal numbers above 19 have a head–complement relation with the noun, whilst those up to 19 occupy the specifier position of the noun. R. Vişan, 'Qualitative Binominals Revisited', *SCL,* 64:207–26, proposes a classification to distinguish different types of qualitative binominals on the basis of their syntactic and semantic features. A.-M. Barbu, 'Construcțiile substantiv-substantiv. Atributul substantival în nominativ', *SCL,* 63, 2012:153–170, discusses binominal NPs without a prepositional linker of the type *martor cheie* ('key witness'), which she analyses not as a compound noun but as an NP in which the second noun functions as a predicative adjunct of the first; its predicative status is also the reason why it appears in the nominative case. In 'Substantivele relaționale. Structura trinominală', *SCL,* 64:15–24, the same author examines NPs consisting of three nouns, one of which makes reference to the type of relation between the other two, e.g. *relație om natura* ('man-nature relationship'), arguing that this is not a compound structure but a *Relational Coordination Construction*, the semantic content of which is reciprocity, in which the relation noun has two complements.

I. Nedelcu, 'Complementul consecutiv. Realizarea particulară a consecutivului prin infinitiv', *SCL,* 63, 2012:95–106, argues that consecutive clauses are not adjuncts but complements in connection with degree markers such as *atât de* or *prea*, as such degree markers make the presence of either a consecutive or comparative clause obligatory; whenever the verb of the consecutive clause is an infinitive, we are dealing with a complement, which is taken as evidence that the prepositional phrase containing the infinitive depends on the degree marker rather than on the main verb. V. Hill, 'A Main Clause Complementizer', pp. 279–96 of *Main Clause Phenomena: New Horizons*, ed. Lobke Aelbrecht, Liliane Haegeman and Rachel Nye, Amsterdam, Benjamins, vi + 433 pp., analyses an interesting phenomenon: sentences in which both the matrix and the embedded clause are introduced by the complementizer *că*. As this is mainly found in the spoken language, it is likely that we are dealing with a discourse pragmatic feature which, according to current Minimalist theory, can be encoded in a field that is projected at the left periphery of clauses above ForceP; the article argues that the repetition of the complementizer reflects the repetition of ForceP. G. Alboiu and V. Hill, 'The Case of A-Bar ECM: Evidence from Romanian', pp. 25–39 of *Proceedings of the 42nd Annual Meeting of the North East Linguistic Society*, vol. 1, ed. Stefan Keine and Shayne Sloggett, Amherst, GLSA (Univ. of Massachusetts), 354 pp., discuss constructions in which the subject of the complement clause of knowledge and perception verbs

surfaces in the matrix clause, as the direct object of the matrix verb; this is explained by a process that combines features of A-movement and A-bar movement. Also dealing with the complements of perception verbs, D. Niculescu, 'Romanian Passive Participles as Complements of Perception Verbs', *RRL,* 58:55–71, focuses on non-finite complement clauses of perception verbs, in which the gerund is used for the active and the participle for the passive voice. Interestingly, the *be*-passive with the gerund *fiind* cannot be used after perception verbs, meaning that the participle, on its own, encodes the passive in these cases, which makes it difficult to distinguish eventive and resultative complement clauses.

Ionuț Geană, *Construcții verbale prepoziționale în limba română*, Bucharest U.P., 264 pp., investigates verb+preposition constructions, discussing issues such as the distinction between prepositional objects and adjuncts, whether or not the preposition can be omitted and what the implications of this are for the theoretical analysis, as well as offering an analysis of which verb types participate in prepositional constructions; this is followed by an inventory of verbs that occur in this kind of construction. A.-M. Iorga Mihail, 'Relevanța tipologică a trăsăturii [±animat] în realizarea prepozițională a dativului din construcția ditranzitivă', *LiR,* 62:174–85, is an extremely interesting study in which the degree of acceptability of prepositional, rather than inflectional indirect object marking is shown to be related to the referent's position in an animacy hierarchy; the higher up on the animacy scale an indirect object is, the less likely speakers are to use the prepositional construction.

I. Nedelcu, *Particularități sintactice ale limbii române în context romanic. Infinitivul*, Editura Muzeului Național al Literaturii Române, 222 pp., is a comprehensive monograph dealing with the infinitive, an area of Romanian syntax that is still sometimes considered marginal by Romance linguists. This volume will, hopefully, finally put an end to such erroneous views, as it highlights the wide range of constructions in which the infinitive can be found; whilst it is undeniable that the use of this verb form is, in Romanian, relatively restricted in some environments, it is important to note that there are other areas in which it outperforms the infinitive in some other Romance languages, for instance in terms of its discourse-pragmatic functions and regarding the possibility of having its own overt subject. A narrower study by the same author, 'Le sujet de l'infinitif en roumain', *RRL,* 58:41–54, distinguishes three types of subjects the infinitive can take: controlled, raised and lexical subjects; the constraints on these three constructions are identified, both for contemporary Romanian and historically. A further in-depth study of the infinitive, Mădălina Spătaru-Pralea, **Concurența infinitiv-conjunctiv în limba română*, Editura Universitară, 220 pp., focuses on the choice, or competition, between the infinitive and the subjunctive in Romanian, an interesting topic because there are, from a purely syntactic point of view, no cases in which the infinitive must be used, but many in which it cannot be used.

I. Pomian, 'Observații pe marginea conceptelor sintactice de *procaz* şi *profuncție* în sintaxa limbii române', *Dacoromania,* 18:120–31, proposes a system to formally account for non-overt clausal constituents that cannot always be analysed as simple ellipsis, as the syntax of the clause can differ from what it would be like if the respective constituent were overtly present; by assuming the existence of the empty categories *pro-function* and *pro-case*, the latter being capable of assigning one morphological case whilst substituting a constituent with another, this phenomenon is explained within a unitary model. A. Cornilescu and A. Nicolae, 'Nominal Ellipsis as Definiteness and Anaphoricity: The Case of Romanian', *Lingua,* 122, 2012:1070–1111, provide an account of nominal ellipsis in DPs, within the Minimalist framework, focusing particularly on the issue of definiteness of the DP and the remnants left behind by the elided element. F. Hoyt and A. Teodorescu, 'How Many Kinds of Sluicing, and Why? Single and Multiple Sluicing in Romanian, English, and Japanese', pp. 83–103 of *Sluicing: Cross-Linguistic Perspectives*,

ed. Jason Merchant and Andrew Simpson, OUP, 2012, xiii + 291 pp., use comparative data to argue that the term *sluicing* is a general label for ellipsis of sub-constituents of embedded questions, the exact properties of which differ from language to language; therefore, sluicing is better described in terms of different types of ellipsis in combination with other language-specific parameters.

Dealing with the syntax of adverbs, D. Protopopescu, 'Romanian Manner Adverbs — Syntactic Positions', *SCL,* 63, 2012:203–15, observes that, of the four possible positions in a basic SVO sentence, Romanian manner adverbs tend to appear in one of the two possible postverbal positions; if positioned between subject and verb or before the subject, they tend to be prosodically and pragmatically marked. A. Cuniță, 'Un cuvânt polimorf: *doar*', *SCL,* 64:25–40, examines the 'semi-adverbial clitic' *doar* ('only'), which has traditionally been classified as an adverb but can, in fact, modify verbs, nouns, adjectives, adverbs or even complete sentences; interestingly, it has also developed a number of modal and discourse-pragmatic uses, possibly via a process of grammaticalization (or pragmaticalization).

In the area of early grammar and the acquisition of syntactic structures, Ioana Stoiescu, *The Acquisition of Tense and Aspect in Romanian*, Bucharest U.P., 287 pp., discusses issues such as the relation between morphology and syntax in language acquisition, to what extent functional categories in early grammar exist or are equivalent to those in adult grammar, and what the different stages in the acquisition of tense and aspect are. The theoretical framework chosen in this volume is a combination of Minimalist syntax and Discourse Representation Theory semantics.

Topics in Language Acquisition and Language Learning in a Romanian Context, ed. Larisa Avram and Anca Sevcenco, Bucharest U.P., 235 pp., a collection of selected papers from the 2011 Bucharest Colloquium of Language Acquisition, offers the following contributions on topics related to early grammar in Romanian: M. Tănase-Dogaru, 'On the Acquisition of Romanian Pseudo-Partitives (39–50); A. Sevcenco, L. Avram, and I. Stoiescu, 'Subject and Direct Relative Clause Production in Child Romanian' (51–85); C. Măniță, 'The Comprehension of Multiple WH-Questions in Child Romanian' (87–106); and V. Tomescu, 'The Acquisition of Directional and Locative Particles in a Romanian-Hungarian Bilingual Context' (107–27). A. Sevcenco and L. Avram, 'Romanian-Speaking Children's Comprehension of Relatives', *RRL,* 57, 2012:219–39, observe that children between approximately three and seven years of age are significantly more likely to correctly understand subject relatives than direct object relatives; the frequent failure in the comprehension of DO relatives is attributed to computational overload and the fact that children have not yet developed the capacity to combine language knowledge and extralinguistic cues. On the same topic, A. Benția, 'Subject vs. Object Relatives: What can Romanian Children Tell us about Their Acquisition?', *ib.*, 203–18, presents very similar data, but offers a different explanation, suggesting that it is difficult for children to compute DO relatives because their grammar contains a stricter version of Relativized Minimality (RM) than adult grammar does.

HISTORICAL AND DIACHRONIC SYNTAX. G. Alboiu and V. Hill, 'Early Modern Romanian and Wackernagel's Law', *SKY Journal of Linguistics,* 25:7–28, dispute the hypothesis that the use of enclitics in Early Modern Romanian is due to Wackernagel's law, arguing that it is an independent phenomenon caused by discourse-driven syntax; the frequent occurrence of enclitics is due to syntactic processes that lead to the fronting of the verb and are thus unrelated to the phonological properties of the clitics. C. Stan, 'Sintaxa documentelor românești de la Muntele Athos: probleme și rezultate", *LiR,* 61, 2012:387–92, identifies a number of syntactic structures of Old Romanian by examining 23 texts written in Romanian in the 17th and 18th cs; some interesting features are the morphological (and sometimes prepositional) case marking of all elements within an NP as well as its apposition, the double function of *de câtre* as both a genuine preposition ('whence') and the marker of the passive agent, and some residual uses of the infinitive in DO-complements.

A. Chircu, 'Despre *fel*, "*în multe chipuri*". Observaţii asupra lexicalizării şi gramaticalizării adverbiale a unui substantiv, românescul *fel*', *LiR,* 61, 2012:10–16, investigates the grammaticalization path of the noun *fel* ('manner, kind'), an early loan from Hungarian, which has, in addition to retaining its original meaning, turned into a common component of adverbs such as *altfel* ('otherwise') and modal markers such as *într-un fel* ('in a way'). V. Hill, 'Romanian "can". Change in Parametric Settings', pp. 264–79 of *Parameter Theory and Linguistic Change*, ed. Charlotte Galves et al., OUP, 2012, xviii+386 pp., discusses the different syntactic structures found in connection with the verb *a putea* ('to be able to') and suggests they can be accounted for by the different functions this verb has acquired during a process of grammaticalization, such as that of modal auxiliary (deontic and epistemic) and pragmatic marker. Id., 'The Direct Object Marker in Romanian: a Historical Perspective', *AJL,* 33:140–51, examines the historical development of the Romanian differential object marker (DOM), offering a genuinely new perspective that goes beyond mere syntactic description; providing evidence from Early Modern Romanian documents, the author shows how this feature emerged as a discourse marker and subsequently underwent a functional evolution. G. Pană Dindelegan, 'Feminine Singular Pronouns with Neutral Value', *RRL,* 57, 2012:249–61, compares the use of feminine pronouns with neutral value, i.e. referring to a (genderless) clause, in Modern Romanian with that in Old Romanian, noting that this feature is already well established in the earliest Romanian texts and has only changed in certain minor details over the centuries. M. Gheorghe, 'Parametrul desplasării multiple a elementului *WH* (interogativ/relativ). Observaţii privind structurile cu grup interogativ/relativ multiplu în limba română veche', *LiR,* 62:240–46, presents the different patterns of multiple wh-fronting found in Old Romanian and compares the hierarchical order in which fronted wh-words appear with the situation in present-day Romanian, identifying some factors that may overrule the default order.

C. Stan, 'La nominalizzazione dell'infinito in rumeno — osservazioni diacronico-tipologiche', *RRL,* 58:31–40, traces back the development of the 'long' infinitive from verbal to nominal through the documented history of Romanian, pinpointing the 17th c. as the period in which most hybrid structures can be found, which indicates that this was the moment the category switch took place. According to this analysis, the decisive factor was the disappearance of the inflectional centre (the *a* preceding the infinitive), which heralded the demise of its verbal use and led to the reanalysis of the final morpheme *-re* as a nominal inflectional marker. A. Dragomirescu, 'O schimbare parametrică de la româna veche la româna modernă în sintaxa formelor verbale compuse cu auxiliar', *LiR,* 62:225–39, analyses the disappearance of two syntactic phenomena, (a) the separation of main and auxiliary verb by inserting a dislocated element and (b) auxiliary inversion, both of which have, furthermore, been shown to be related with clitic inversion and XP–V–S word order, arguing that a single parameter shift is likely to have caused these syntactic features to disappear in modern Romanian. A. Dragomirescu and A. Nicolae, 'Pasivul cu *a veni* — traducere din italiană sau inovaţie românească?', *LiR,* 61, 2012:73–108, investigate the passive construction formed with *a veni* ('to come') plus participle, which is found in two different linguistic registers, at different times in history, with somewhat different semantic nuances. The construction currently used in spoken Romanian, also present in Istro-Romanian, evolved along a normal path of grammaticalization and is thus a language-internal innovation, whilst the construction found in literary and scientific texts is a direct calque from Italian that entered the language in translations from Italian. N. Vişan, 'New Developments in the Evolution of English and Romanian Possessive Perfects', *SCL,* 63, 2012:188–202, offers a comparative analysis of the *have*-perfect in English and Romanian within Heine and Kuteva's grammaticalization framework, concluding that the grammaticalization of this construction is somewhat more

advanced in Romanian than in English. V. Hill, 'The Emergence of the Romanian Subjunctive', *LRev,* 30.4:1–37, argues that the subjunctive with *să* emerges in Early Modern Romanian not due to Balkan Sprachbund influence, but due to language-internal shifts in the complementizer inventory of Romanian at the time. In 'The Emergence of the Romanian Supine', *JHL,* 3:230–71, the same author attributes the emergence of present-day constructions involving the supine to its role in the replacement of the infinitive in non-finite relative clauses that use *de* as a relativizing complementizer (e.g. *apă de-a berea*, 'water [*de*] to drink'); the fact that *de* can be either a complementizer or a preposition led to the a double development with the supine, with [*de*+supine] being analysed either as a CP or a PP.

6. Lexicon, Phraseology and Onomastics

Lexicon and etymology. C. Mărănduc, 'Modernizarea definiţiei lexicografice', *LiR,* 61, 2012:251–61, criticizes the structure of definitions in Romanian academic dictionaries, in particular the Romanian Academy's *Dicţionarul explicativ al limbii române (DEX)* and *Dicţionarul limbii române (DLR)*, arguing that they follow outdated principles and do not satisfy modern international lexicographical standards in terms of accuracy and economy. G. Chivu, 'Cărţile de bucate, un izvor lexicografic insuficient explotat', *LiR,* 61, 2012:304–11, makes a case for the use of cookbooks as a valuable yet underused source for the new edition of the *DLR*, offering several examples of lexical items that are first, or only, attested in 17th and 18th-c. cookbooks.

C. Athu, *Aspecte actuale ale terminologiei*, Bucharest U.P., 196 pp., provides a general introduction to the study of terminology, defining the concept, giving a brief historical overview, and explaining the basic mechanisms of the formation, standardization and function of terminology, followed by two more specific chapters on current issues in Romanian terminology and the role of English in the formation of present-day Romanian terminology. Angela Bidu-Vrănceanu, *Terminologie şi terminologii*, vol. II, Bucharest U.P., 2012, 247 pp., draws a distinction between lexical and textual/discursive terminology, discusses the role of linguistics in the study of terminology, and also highlights the diachronic element in terminology studies; this is followed by a collection of contributions, by different authors, focusing on issues such as diachronic variation in terminology, terminological variation in different areas of specialized language, and the interface between lexical and textual terminology.

More specific lexicological studies include D.-L. Teleoacă, 'Interferenţe lingvistice "sacru/profan" în spaţiul romanic', *SCL,* 63, 2012:73–94, discussing the influence of the Eastern Orthodox religion, in combination with regional factors on the religious terminology of Romanian, highlighting the existence of numerous lexical doublets as well as the absence of several Latin-derived terms that are found in all other Romance languages, and I. Vintilă-Rădulescu, 'Rom. *bunăstare.* Corespondente şi antonime romanice şi neromanice', *SCL,* 64:41–56, explores the different meanings and usages of the Romanian word for 'well-being', observing that definitions currently offered in dictionaries do not accurately reflect the meanings and usage of this lexical item.

Focusing on earlier stages of the language, A. Gafton, 'Uzul, valorile şi dispariţia unor termeni: *făţărie, a făţări, făţărnicie, a făţărnici, făţarnic', LiR,* 61, 2012:193–204, presents a complex case of competition, in translations, between lexical items formed from the same root, showing how meanings expressed by more than one term in the source language affect the choice between these related words in the target text; M. Stanciu Istrate, 'Denumiri ale miraculosului în vechea română literară', *LiR,* 61, 2012:394–401, offers a diachronic analysis of the lexical field *miracles/the miraculous*; and M. Stanciu-Istrate, 'Derivate neobişnuite într-un text românesc din a doua jumătate a secolului al xvii-lea', *ib.,* 37–43, identifies a number of lexical items in Udrişte Năsturel's

17th-c. translation of *Viața Sfinților Varlaam și Ioasaf* that are not attested in other documents, and others that were previously believed to be first attested at a later date, arguing that the literary language during this period had more lexical options at its disposal than generally believed.

Several dictionaries of synonyms, antonyms and homonyms provide data that may be of use for more in-depth studies of the Romanian lexicon: Doina Coibeț and Laura Manea, *Dicționar general de sinonime al limbii române (DGS),* Chișinău, Gunivas, 2112 pp., is a very comprehensive academic dictionary of synonyms that takes into account recent developments in Romanian scientific terminology and linguistic usage; aimed at a more general public, four works by Emil M. Alexandru, *Dicționar de sinonime*, Drănic, Lizuka Educativ, 314 pp., *Dicționar de omonime*, Drănic, Lizuka Educativ, 394 pp., *Dicționar de antonime*, Drănic, Lizuka Educativ, 213 pp., and *Dicționar de sinonime, omonime și antonime*, Drănic, Lizuka Educativ, 734 pp., cover these three areas of lexical relations.

Three dictionaries of neologisms, Florin Marcu, *Dicționar actualizat de neologisme*, Saeculum I.O., 1079 pp.; Emil M. Alexandru, *Dicționar neologisme,* Unicart, 2012, 544 pp., which is largely identical with Id., *Dicționar de neologisme*, Drănic, Lizuka Educativ, 581 pp.; and a new, updated edition of the more academic *Dicționar de cuvinte recente*, ed. Florica Dimitrescu, Alexandru Ciorlan and Coman Lupu, provide extensive inventories of lexical items that have recently entered the language, though it is sometimes difficult to distinguish whether a 'neologism' has already become an established part of the language, is used regularly but still felt to be different in some way, or is used only spontaneously or sporadically; this is an underlying issue in E. Comșuela, 'Neologismul în dezbateri la Academia Română', *Dacoromania,* 18:106–12, which presents a historical overview of the approaches to the inclusion or omission of neologisms in academic dictionaries from the publication of the first edition of the Romanian Academy's dictionary in the 1870s to the present day.

A large number of publications deal with loanwords and neologisms from specific languages. Alina-Maria Mardari, *Anglizismen in der deutschen und rumânischen Jugendsprache*, Bucharest U.P., combines theoretical sections on adolescent language and language contact with an extensive comparative empirical study of anglicisms used by German and Romanian adolescents, showing that there is a considerable degree of overlap between the linguistic behaviour of these two groups of informants and that anglicisms are felt to be an integral part of youth culture. I. Vintilă-Rădulescu, 'Anglicisme în legislația românească postdecembristă', *SCL,* 64:153–69, identifies close to a hundred English words, abbreviations and set phrases that appear in post-1989 Romanian legislative texts, arguing that many of these neologisms should be included in future editions of the Academy's *Dicționarul explicativ al limbii române (DEX)* due to the fact that these terms have no exact synonyms in Romanian. I. C. Frânculescu, 'The Romanian Word *tril*: Problems of Homonymy, Synonymy, and Hyponymy. Semantic Clarifications', *RRL,* 58:113–23, examines the homonymic clash between the specialized medical term *tril* ('quivering of the heart') < Engl. 'thrill' and the popular *tril* ('trill') > Ital. *trillo*, concluding that the former is not a useful addition to the Romanian language because it is used polysemously and there are alternative Romanian words available.

G. Scurtu and D. Dincă, 'Étude lexico-sémantique du micro-champ lexical des meubles de rangement en français et roumain', *RRL,* 57, 2012:305–16, examines three Romanian loanwords denoting storage furniture (*bufet, comodă, servantă*) and the three corresponding French source words, within the framework of comparative componential analysis, identifying common as well as distinguishing features, and M. Popescu, 'Les emprunts lexicaux roumains au français: approche lexicographique et sémantique du vocabulaire de la mode vestimentaire', *RRL,* 58:153–68, takes a very similar approach to the analysis of three clothing terms borrowed from French

into Romanian (*bluză, vestă, jupă*), complemented by a discussion of pragmatic, sociolinguistic and diachronic factors involved in the evolution of these words.

F. Dimitrescu, 'Împrumuturi vechi şi împrumuturi noi de origine italină în limba română', Lupu, *Lingvistică Romanică I,* 9–34, notes that the earliest lexical loans from another Romance language in Romanian came from Italian and provides examples of both direct and indirect early borrowing, before focusing on the large number of recent loans in the lexical field of food and gastronomy. I. Coja, 'Servici sau seviciu?', *LiR(M),* 23.1–4:147–51, offers some interesting thoughts on variation between two versions of the same loanwords from Latin and/or other Romance languages, providing examples of root and inflectional doublets. E. Dima, 'Împrumuturi latine savante în contexte româneşti actuale. Aspecte ale comportamentului morfosintactic', *SCL,* 64:171–82, observes that learned loanwords from Latin in legal texts are generally used without adapting them to Romanian morphology, retaining their original morphological form and gender, whilst Latin archaeological terms like *atrium* and *cubiculum* tend to be used in their original form in the nominative/accusative case but alternate with morphologically adapted forms (*atriului* etc.) in the genitive/dative. In the two articles 'Del griego al rumano. La situación de los grecismos *aer* y *aether* en latín y la continuación de *aer* en rumano', Lupu, *Lingvistică Romanică I,* 35–56, and 'La continuación del lat. *aer* en las lenguas románicas', *SCL,* 63, 2012:216–229, S. Georgescu traces the path of Greek ἀήή, borrowed into (vulgar) Latin with a stress shift to the first syllable, that then continued into the Romance languages, including Romanian, where it temporarily all but disappeared from the common language, replaced by Slav. *văzduh*, before being revived as part of the re-Latinizing process in the 18th and 19th c.; the traditional hypothesis that the homophonous Romanian word *aer* 'veil' is borrowed from Byzantine Greek /a'ir/, either directly or via Slavic, is disputed, as the this would imply a stress shift as well as a vowel change. F. Vasilescu, 'Din hrisoave: cuvintele *harturghie* şi *hărturărie* (?)', *LiR,* 62:20–25, investigates the word *harturghie* ('paper mill'), borrowed from Greek and first attested in Romanian in 1776, which has given rise to *hardughie* ('big, shabby building'), but it is unclear whether the morphologically adapted form *hărturărie* ever existed. C. Mârzea Vasile, 'Les adverbiaux roum. *în chip..., în mod...* "d'une manière". Notes synchroniques et diachroniques.', *RRL,* 57:263–89, discusses two adverbs expressing manner, both of which contain a borrowed element: *chip* from Hungarian, *mod* from Romance. In the modern language, *în mod* is the more common choice, whilst *în chip* is largely restricted to formal and literary usages; the author offers some credible explanations why *în chip* did not become the default choice: on the one hand, *chip* appears to be associated with non-factual or even counterfactual modality, and on the other hand the 18th- and 19th-c. re-Latinizing trend may also have played a role.

A revised and slightly expanded edition of *Dicţionarul etimologic al limbii române (DELR), Vol. 1, A–B,* ed. Marius Sala and Andrei Avram, Editura Academiei Române, 2012, 552 pp., has appeared, as well as P. Boerescu, 'Completări la *Dicţionarul etimologic al limbi române (DELR),* vol. 1, A–B', *LiR,* 62:425–33, an article proposing etymologies for a number of words that appear with the remark 'unknown etymology' in the *DELR.* V. Celac, 'Din "procesele-verbale" ale şedinţelor de lucru la *DELR* (*căţăra, catapultă, caţar*)', *ib.,* 451–80, observes that much of what is discussed at meetings of the team that is working on the *DELR* cannot be included in the dictionary itself, and he therefore proposes the publication of a series of articles that remedy this shortcoming by providing a more extensive discussion of selected items; he himself makes a start by exploring, in depth, the etymologies of three terms that will be included in vol. II of the *DELR.*, and in 'Observaţii privind tratarea dialectelor limbii române, problema datării lexemelor şi valorificarea surselor în noul "Dicţionar etimologic al limbii române"', *FD,* 31, 2012:205–26, the same author raises a number of issues regarding the methodology used in the *DELR.*

D. Moldovanu, 'La découverte d'un mot et de son étymologie. Le lat. *clivus* en roumain et dans les patois ukrainiens carpatiques', *RevR,* 47, 2012:161–79, discusses the development of Latin *clivus* 'slope' to regional Romanian *chiu* (attested in Vrancea County); a phonologically less eroded version has been preserved in dialectal Ukrainian *klyva*, and cognates can also be found in Albanian, Rhaeto-Romance and Northern Italian dialects. L. Agache, 'Consideraţii asupra unor termeni vechi referitori la unităţi de capacitate', *LiR,* 61, 2012:291–97, investigates the diverse origins of five archaic units of volume, *chilă, oborocul, vadra, ocaua* and *bute*, some of which are still in use in regional varieties; I. Mărgărit, 'Consideraţii asupra unor termeni din lexicul tăbăcăriei', *LiR,* 62:434–40, revisits the etymologies of several words related to the craft of tanning; and F. Nicolae, 'Jewel Terminology in Romanian Biblical Translations', *RRL,* 58:137–51, examines the terms used for twelve types of precious stones in different Bible translations over the centuries, identifying loans from Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Hungarian, and possibly from German and Russian. M. Marin, '*Argea* şi relaţiile sale cu *bordei, chiler, pivniţă*', *SCL,* 64:85–91, discusses four lexical items (one borrowed from Turkish, one from Slavic, and two from the pre-Latin substrate) that can refer to types of basement or underground dwellings, from a semantic and etymological point of view; P. Boerescu, 'Etimologii: *şpagă, şperţ*', *LiR,* 62:8–16, discusses different hypotheses regarding the origin of two words meaning 'bribe', concluding that the currently popular *şpagă* comes from Albanian *shpagë*, whereas *şperţ* has its origin in German *Sperzoll*; Id., 'Note etimologice şi lexicale', *LiR,* 61, 2012:45–53, claims that *fulg* 'snowflake, fluff' is probably of onomatopoeic origin, related to words like *a fâlfâi* 'to flutter', whilst the archaic and regional word *stâlpuri* ('branches') is derived from a the Latin diminutive plural form of *stirps* ('branch'), **stirpulae*; and V. Celac, 'Din problemele lexicului moştenit ïn limba română (1) *festucă*', *ib.,* 163–74, convincingly argues that *festucă* is not inherited from Latin, but a loanword that entered the language in the 19th c., as part of the re-Latinizing trend that was prevalent at the time.

Phraseology.   Cristinel Munteanu, *Frazeologie Românească. Formare şi funcţionare*, Iaşi, Institutul European, 251 pp., is a collection of revised versions of articles published by the author previously, dealing with specific set expressions and groups of set expressions (e.g. expressions containing the word *sâmbătă* ('Saturday'), as well as theoretical issues such as the distinction between set expressions and idioms, multiple etymologies of set expressions, and the difference between phraseology in the strict sense (set expressions and idioms) on the one hand, and in a wider sense (repetition, analogies, etc.) on the other. Id., 'Despre motivarea contextuală a frazeologismelor', *LiR(M),* 23.1–4:116–28, observes how, especially in literary texts, the choice of a particular idiom or set expression can be motivated by the fact that one of its constituent elements is semantically or phonologically similar to a word, name or concept that appears in the context. Id., 'Despre expresia *cai verzi pe pereţi* (o incercare etimologică)', *ib.,* 152–61, attempts to explain where the two parts of this idiom, meaning 'something impossible', literally 'green horses on the walls', come from; possible sources for the first element (*cai verzi*) are either a passage from the Bible or a similar idiom in Albanian, whilst the second element (*pe pereţi*) is likely to have been added for the sake of rhythm and/or (near) rhyme: *verdz — perets*.

I. Mărgărit, 'De la "solidaritate lexicală" la etimologie', *SCL,* 64:3–13, deals with the issue of *lexical solidarity* between pairs of words, one of which (usually a modifier) only ever occurs in the presence of the other, proposing a novel analysis of the relationship between those items and observing that they form a single 'harmonic' unit. C. Popuşoi, '*Nici un/nici o* vs *niciun/nicio* în frazeologie', *LiR,* 61, 2012:81–90, shows that the choice between the compounded negative adjective (*niciun*) and its non-compounded counterpart (*nici un*) depends, to a considerable extent, on the type of noun it qualifies; the same is true for set expressions, with certain types always requiring

the compound form (e.g. *nicio mişcare*! 'don't move!'), whilst in others the non-compound form is obligatory, and still others permit the use of either form.

Ilie-Ştefan Rădulescu, *Dicţionar de exprimări pleonastice*, Niculescu, 312 pp., provides an extensive list of pleonastic expressions, many of which are established phraseological units that form part of the language, though the author views their use as incorrect. M. Mudure, 'Translating Proverbs', *Dacoromania,* 18:95–105, discusses the difficulties involved in translating proverbs, addressing the issues of finding an equivalent proverb in the target language and how literal the translation of proverbs should be.

Onomastics.   V. Pavel, 'Despre crearea unităţilor de vocabular din perspectivă onoma-siologică', *LiR(M),* 22.11–12:32–37, discusses the different mechanisms involved in the formation of proper names from a morphological and semantic perspective. **Name and Naming. Synchronic and Diachronic Perspectives*, ed. Oliviu Felecan, Newcastle, Cambridge Scholars, 2012, 443 pp., is the English version of the proceedings (or selected papers) of the *First International Conference on Onomastics*, held in Baia Mare in September 2011; the volume contains contributions on a wide range of topics, some of which deal with Romanian onomastics, such as D. Tomescu, 'The Change of Names in 20th Century Romanian Toponymy' (353–64), examining the successive replacement of place names between WWI and WWII, under the socialist regime, and after 1989. A. Rezeanu, 'Oiconomie Maramureşeană', *LiR,* 61, 2012:61–71, develops a theory of interdependence between oikonyms and toponyms in which a distinctive feature or 'seme' of a place determines the initial proper name, which in turn can be transmitted or extended along a chain of associated toponyms; a similar approach is also presented in Id., 'Extensiuni toponimice derivaţionale', *LiR,* 62:99–111, explaining how an existing, established toponym can be extended to other place names that it is in some way related to. Id., 'Relaţia toponomie/dialectologie ', *LiR,* 61, 2012:263–71, investigates the interconnections between dialectology and toponymy, arguing that there is a direct link between 'popular geographical terms' and toponyms, and F. Barbura, 'Apelative geomorfologice întâlnite în structura unor toponime din Valea Crişului Alb', *SCL,* 64:183–205, highlights the important role of lexical elements describing geo-morphological features in the formation of place names in the Crişul Alb valley.

Nicolae Saramandu, *Dicţionarul toponimic al României. Muntenia (DTRM), vol. v (N–P),* is the continuation of a major project aimed at documenting and analysing all toponyms of the Muntenia region, and A. Eremia, 'Tradiţii istorice şi spirituale româneească în toponimia Basarabiei', *LiR(M),* 22.5–6, 2012:161–66, makes the point that the vast majority (90%) of toponyms in the Republic of Moldova are of Romanian origin. L. Codreanca, 'Interferenţa bilingvă în onomastica românească din Basarabia (1812–1918)', *ib.,* 167–74, provides some interesting data on the effects of language contact on personal names in Bessarabia under the long-standing influence of Russian; as some people were yet to be assigned surnames during the 19th c., there is lasting evidence of this contact situation, especially because Russian/Ukrainian suffixes were added onto Romanian surnames (e.g. *Radul > Radulov, Barba > Barbovschii*). L. Groza, 'Observaţii referitoare la folosirea cuvintelor coreene în limba română', *LiR,* 62:454–60, observes that Korean person and place names in Romanian have preserved the pre-1989 spellings (e.g. *Kim Ir Sen* 'Kim Il Sung', *Phenian* 'Pyongyang') that came about because they were transliterated from Korean into Russian and then from Russian into Romanian.

7. Semantics and Pragmatics

Semantics.   At the interface between syntax and semantics, V. Roman, in two articles, 'Fenomenalizări ale omonomiei şi ambiguităţii sintactice (I)', *Dacoromania,* 17, 2012:68–80, and 'Fenomenalizări ale omonomiei şi ambiguităţii sintactice (II)', *Dacoromania,* 18:132–37,

discusses semantically ambiguous syntactic structures like the genitive (subjective vs. objective genitive), the gerund, subordinate clauses with *când* and *dacă*, as well as constructions that are structurally distinct but superficially indistinguishable, such as the gerundial predicative adjunct, whilst E. Oglindă, 'Aspecte ale sinonimiei gramaticale', *LiR(M),* 22.11–12, 2012:25–31, deals with the opposite phenomenon, the existence of synonymous grammatical constructions, both in the areas of syntax and morphology, from a theoretical point of view. Viorela-Valentina Dima, *The Temporal Interpretation of Nominal Phrases in English and Romanian*, Bucharest U.P., 328 pp., examines how NPs receive their temporal interpretation from a combination of lexical and morphological features within and outside the respective NP, as well as from contextual explicature and extra-linguistic factors that are incorporated into the interpretation through a process of *pragmatic enrichment.*

D. Caluianu, 'Four Romanian Verbs of Occurring: The Effect of Argument Structure on Verb Meaning and Use', pp. 231–54 of *Argument Structure in Flux. The Naples-Capri Papers*, ed. Elly van Gelderen, Jóhanna Barðdal and Michela Cennamo, Amsterdam, Benjamins, viii + 578 pp., discusses different constructions centred around four verbs with different argument structures (*a avea loc, a se petrece, a se întâmpla, a (o) pati*), all of which mean 'to occur', exploring the relation between argument structure and verb meaning, the effect of verb meaning on argument selection, and the consequences of these syntactic and semantic factors on the use of these constructions.

RRL, 58.3, a special issue reserved for papers presented at the 2013 International Workshop on the Syntax and Interpretation of Specificity, contains three contributions dealing with the semantics (and syntax) of perception verbs: G. Alboiu and V. Hill, 'On Romanian Perception Verbs and Evidential Syntax' (275–98) and I. Nicula, 'The Romanian Verbs of Perception *vedea* and *auzi*. Between Direct and Indirect Perception' (313–27) both examine how the difference between direct and indirect perception is reflected syntactically, while M. Neagu, 'What Is Universal and What Is Language-Specific in the Polysemy of Perception Verbs?' (329–43) analyses the multiple meanings of prototypical perception verbs in English, French and Romanian from a comparative perspective, adopting a cognitive linguistic approach and arguing that universal 'conceptual polysemy' is distinct from language-specific 'gradual polysemy'.

A. Sobol, 'Echivalente româneşti ale verbelor aspectuale din limba rusă cu prefixul *∂o-*', *LiR(M),* 63.9–12:114–20, shows how a single Russian verbal prefix denoting the completion of an action gives verbs a wide range of different meanings, which are expressed by a variety of different structures in Romanian.

PRAGMATICS AND DISCOURSE.   L. Haegeman and V. Hill, 'The Syntacticization of Discourse', pp. 370–90 of *Syntax and its Limits*, ed. Raffaella Folli, Christina Sevdali, and Robert Truswell, OUP, xxvi + 450 pp., examine the syntactic status and distribution of *hai*, a discourse particle of direct address that has developed some verb-like morphology, and compare it with a similar particle found in West Flemish. Two articles dealing with the emergence of discourse markers via a path of grammaticalization and/or pragmaticalization are R. Zafiu, 'Conectorii disjunctivi din perspectivă semantico-pragmatică: ipoteze asupra proceselor de gramaticalizare', *LiR,* 61, 2012:417–28, which analyses the process of modal verb forms and desiderative verbs turning into disjunctive markers with the modal value 'free choice', and B. Fagard, '*É vida, olha...*: Imperatives as discourse markers and grammaticalization paths in Romance', pp. 117–39 of *Pragmatic Markers and Pragmaticalization: Lessons from False Friends*, ed. by Peter Lauwers, Gudrun van der Bauwhede, and Stijn Verleyen, Amsterdam, Benjamins, 2012, vi + 157 pp., a diachronic, corpus-based comparative Romance study showing how a process of grammaticalization (or pragmaticalization) turns imperatives of the verb 'to look' into multi-functional discourse markers.

I. Tămaş, 'Elipsa textual-discursivă: problema coerenţei şi a contextului', *Dacoromania,* 17, 2012:44–53, focuses on the phenomenon of ellipsis from a discourse perspective, highlighting the role of context in such cases, concluding that if sufficient information can be recovered from the context, ellipsis does not lead to a loss of discourse coherence. I. Duduţă, **Politeţea în conversaţie*, Editura Universitară, 210 pp., is a monograph that investigates the rules and mechanisms of politeness in conversation.

Dealing with specific types of discourse, V. Maftei, 'Aspecte ale dialogului în emisiuni de tip "tele-realitate"', *SCL,* 63, 2012:59–71, looks at aspects such as politeness, turn-taking and pragmatic co-operation in Romanian reality TV shows, and E. Buja, 'The Acquisition of Narrative Skills by Romanian Children', Avram, *Acquisition*, 9–37, finds that children begin to produce adult-like narratives around the age of nine, both in terms of micro- and macro-structure.

Examining aspects of religious language, **Text şi discurs religios*, vol. IV, ed. Alexandru Gafton, Sorin Guia, and Ioan Milică, Iaşi U.P., 2012, 537 pp., is a collection of papers presented at the 4th National Conference on Religious Texts and Discourse, held in Iaşi in 2011. D. Butiurca, '"Mărturie raţională" (origine) şi model conceptual în limbajul religios', *LiR(M),* 22.1–2, 2012:74–79, examines the ways in which the witnessing of an event is expressed metaphorically in different religious traditions. Four articles by D.-L. Teleoacă dealing with different aspects and types of religious discourse have appeared during the period under review: 'Strategii discursive în rugăciune creştină', *SCL,* 64:263–83, investigates discourse strategies in Christian prayers, such as 'praising amplification', 'positive politeness' and expressions of humility and self-deprecation, combined with formulaic phrases that are analysed as performative utterences; in 'Din nou despre limbajul bisericesc actual', *ib.*, 93–104, it is observed that present-day religious language is progressively assimilating to the standard language, though the language of the Orthodox Church is considerably more conservative than its Catholic counterpart in terms of lexicon as well as grammatical structures; 'Inovaţia lexicală în textul biblic modern: "construcţie *vs* deconstrucţie", "identitate *vs* alteritate" (I)', *LiR,* 62:470–80, is a comparative study of the Book of Psalms in a recent, modern Protestant translation and the conservative Orthodox version, enabling the author to identify innovations and neologisms in the former; and in 'Conservatorism şi expresivitate în literatura religioasă. Posibile repere de definire a unui stil ştiinţific (didactic) în context religios', *ib.*, 46–63, it is argued that religious literature, and religious didactic texts in particular, preserve certain conservative, biblical features, not due to linguistic conservatism as such, but because they are a defining feature of this textual genre, which the author attempts to analyse as having a special type of scientific style.

Specific features of journalistic discourse are the topic of C. Munteanu, 'Discursul repetat şi titlurile jurnalistice atipice', *LiR(M),* 23.9–12:11–19, who discusses newspaper headlines that do not adhere to the generally accepted maxims such as informativeness, relevance and economy, but instead try to grab the reader's attention by using word play, which can be based on orthographic and phonological effects, or on altered versions of set expressions and idioms. M. Manu Magda, '*Rumour* in the Present Romanian Press: Aspects of Knowledge Sources and their Linguistic Markers', pp. 175–88 of *Spaces of Polyphony*, ed. Clara-Ubaldina Lorda and Patrick Zabalbeascoa, Amsterdam, Benjamins, 2012, vii + 299 pp., examines the way in which rumours are marked in Romanian journalistic discourse, paying attention to introductory formulae that flag rumours, as well as evidential markers used by journalist to make it clear that they cannot vouch for the veracity of the rumour.

At the interface between journalistic and political discourse, Maria Bafană Tocia, *Strategii de mediatizare a discursului politic în presa regională*, Editura Universitară, 290 pp., analyses a corpus of political discourse consisting of more than 700 articles published in the local press of

Constanța between 1996 and 2010, observing that the style used is frequently inappropriate for the purpose of informing the public. L. Ionescu-Ruxandoiu, 'Perspectivation in the Romanian Parliamentary Discourse', pp. 151–66 of *Dialogue in Politics*, ed. Lawrence N. Berlin and Anita Fetzer, Amsterdam, Benjamins, 2012, vii+313 pp., finds that in parliamentary speeches, 'voice staging' is used as a strategy in which there is a complex relation between subjectivity (e.g. evaluation) and intersubjectivity (alignment), in order to challenge the opponents' authority and increase the speaker's own persuasiveness. Another article dealing with parliamentary debates, M. V. Constantinescu, 'Humour as a Relation Management Strategy in the Romanian Parliamentary Debates', *RRL,* 57, 2012:389–98, observes that the confrontational atmosphere in the Romanian parliament frequently leads to *face*-threatening acts (threatening both positive and negative *face*), and that humour is used as a tool to establish and confirm in- and out-group relationships, as sharing a joke involves complicity. N. Mihai, '"Limbajul guvernanților" înainte şi după 1989', *LiR,* 62:71–97, contrasts the situation before 1989, when nicknames and ironical lexical creations to refer to the political class and its activities were used only in private, with the post-revolution situation in which similar creations now attain semi-official status through their use in the mass media, and A. D. Rachieru, 'Limba vs "limbajul de lemn"', *LiR(M),* 22.7–8, 2012:97–109, compares discourse features used by the pre-1989 socialist political class with the present-day globalized media discourse characterised by neologisms and consumerist language, viewing both types of discourse as linked to ideology.

A. I. Velea, 'Syntactic and Functional Patterns of the Form "*te/vă rog*" in Romanian Written Communication', *SCL,* 64:105–116, examines the syntax of *te/vă rog* ('please') in a corpus of emails sent in an academic context, finding a systematic distribution in which *te/vă rog*+imperative is used to address a single addressee, whilst *te/vă rog*+subjunctive can be used to address single or multiple recipients. V. Manole, 'Forms of Address in Professional Communication in Brazilian Portuguese and Romanian', pp. 265–80 of *Professional Communication across Languages and Cultures*, ed, Stanca Măda and Răzvan Săftoiu, Amsterdam, Benjamins, 2012, vi+284 pp., observes that the forms of address used in business correspondence, both in Brazilian Portuguese and Romanian, are less formal than often suggested, with first names and informal 2nd-person pronouns being used on a daily basis, not just among colleagues, but also in correspondence with clients and business partners; this is clearly a feature of language in the workplace, but it may also be part of a more general trend towards a simpler and less formal addressing system. M. Gheorghe and A. Velea, 'Control Acts in Romanian', *ib.,* 135–68, present a qualitative and quantitative analysis to identify different types of control acts in workplace correspondence and to establish which of them are most commonly used. B. Timoni, 'Using Money Metaphors in Banking Discourse. Three Possible Scenarios', *Metaphor and the Social World,* 2, 2012:201–32, analyses a corpus of 74 documents issued by the Romanian Central Bank and three commercial banks, showing how medical, military and aquatic expressions are used to create metaphorical scenarios; such metaphors are employed to persuade customers, create identities and transfer ideologies.

8. Varieties

The period under review has seen the publication of the second volume of the linguistic Atlas of Romania, *Atlasul lingvistic român pe regiuni. Sinteză. (ALRR sinteză),* vol. 11, ed. Nicolae Saramandu, Editura Academiei Române, 2012, 527 pp., documenting lexical, phonological and morphological regional variation in 463 dialect maps of the entire territory of Romania based on 8 regional linguistic atlases published between 1973 and 2005. Nicolae Saramandu and

Manuela Nevaci, *Sinteze de dialectologie română*, Editura Universitară, 232 pp., is a monograph on regional variation in Romanian, while A.-M. Iorga Mihail, 'Realizarea analitică a dativului (*la + acuzativ*) în româna dialectală', *SCL,* 64:239–61, examines one specific syntactic feature found in many Romanian dialects, the prepositional indirect object construction, which is shown to be the preferred variety in many dialects, not only to mark the Beneficiary or Goal, but also in Possessor and Experiencer constructions; an important factor determining the acceptability of the analytic construction is the referent's degree of animacy: the higher up in the animacy hierarchy the referent is located, the less likely it is for the prepositional dative to be used.

Ohara Donovetsky, *Forme şi valori ale verbului în graiurile munteneşti*, Editura Universitară, 2012, 275 pp., is a comprehensive study of the verb in the varieties of Muntenia, including two important chapters on paradigmatic and syntagmatic variation of the verbs in these varieties, before continuing with an extensive description of their morphology and usage, in which each tense/mood paradigm and non-finite form is discussed separately. I. Mărgărit, 'Împrumuturi turceşti opace în vocabularul Dacoromâniei sudice', *LiR,* 61, 2012:345–53, examines a number of Turkish loanwords that have only survived on the southern edge of the Daco-Romance-speaking area, albeit with modifications to their form as well as their meaning.

M. Marin, 'Particularităţi lingvistice comune unor zone submontane din Transilvania', *LiR,* 61, 2012:337–44, examines dialectal features found in the foothills inside the Carpathian Arc, such as the backing of stressed /a/, the use of *ar* < Lat. *habuerunt* for the 3pl. of *a avea*, and the form *[i]esc(u)* for the 1sg. of *a fi*, created by analogy with 2sg. *eşti* and 3sg. *este*, noting that these are old features shared with some dialects spoken south of the Danube.

M. M. Deleanu, *Izvoare şi preocupări dialectale în Banat. 1. Restituiri*, Timişoara, Print Press, 2012, 398 pp., is a volume primarily concerned with the way the dialects of the Banat region have been viewed and studied, covering topics such as the first documented texts recording dialectal features, scholars and amateurs who have studied and documented the language spoken in this area over the centuries, and the public attitude towards the regional language and culture. I. Mării, 'De la latinescul *aula* la bănăţeanul *avlie. Notiţă lexicologică*', *LiR,* 61, 2012:354–62, investigates the etymology of the dialectal word *avlie* ('yard, courtyard'), commonly used in the Banat region but also widely attested in various languages of the Balkan Peninsula; like its standard Romanian cognate *aulă* ('lecture hall'), a relatively recent loanword from German *Aula* < Latin *aula* < Greek αὐλή, *avlie* ultimately derives from the same Greek source word, but entered the language as a popular term via Byzantine Greek and one or several Balkan Slavic languages (*avlija*).

The role of the Romanian language as a symbol of Moldovan pre- and post-Soviet cultural identity continues to preoccupy intellectuals and linguists, with a number of publications on the borderline between linguistics and political manifesto, such as A. Eremia, 'Limba română — simbol naţional şi atribut al statalităţii Republicii Moldova', *LiR(M),* 22.9–10, 2012:26–33; V. Cujbă, 'Cultura lingvistică *versus* conştiinţa naţională', *LiR(M,)* 23.7–8:5–8; A. Crijanovschi, 'Limba Română şi noi', *LiR(M)* 22.5–6, 2012:234–39; and I. Ciocanu, 'Contribuţia lui Nicolae Mătcaş la cultivarea limbii române', *LiR(M),* 22.3–4, 2012:30–34. The published version of the doctoral thesis by Carolina Popuşoi, *Limba română actuală din Basarabia. Particularităţi morfosintactice şi lexico-semantice*, Editura Muzeului Naţional al Literaturii Române, 365 pp., and a condensed version thereof, 'Greşeli de limbă în română actuală din Basarabia', *SCL,* 63, 2012:107–20, are thorough studies of recent innovations in the Romanian of the Republic of Moldova; though the approach adopted is, at least on the surface, lamentably prescriptive, stigmatising the non-standard features as 'errors' or 'not advisable' usages, the inventory of 'errors' or features provided is very comprehensive and a genuine contribution to Romanian dialectology. Non-standard usages are found at all levels of linguistic description (phonetics/phonology, morphosyntax,

lexicon), the main contributing factors being language contact with Russian and patchy exposure to educated standard Romanian. In 'Calcuri semantice sau împrumuturi lexicale în limba română din Basarabia?', *LiR,* 62:460–69, the same author identifies a series of lexical items that, in colloquial Moldovan Romanian, have been borrowed (or calqued) from Russian but adjusted semantically to cover the range of meanings of the corresponding Romanian term. V. Dumbravă, 'Ce limbi sunt vorbite în instituțiile medicale din Găgăuzia?', *LiR(M),* 22.11–12, 2012:126–30, gives an interesting account of the somewhat chaotic linguistic situation in medical contexts in Gagauzia, describing how Russian is in many cases the *lingua franca* because medical staff speak neither Romanian nor Gagauz, so that even essential communication is often severely impeded by linguistic barriers.

   Maria Marin and Iulia Mărgărit, *Românii din Ungaria. Texte. Glosar Studiu Lingvistic*, Editura Academiei Române, 396 pp., is a valuable documentation of Romanian spoken in Hungary, containing more than 100 pages of transcribed oral texts, an extensive glossary, followed by a comprehensive description of the dialectal features. I. Mărgărit, 'Câteva observații în legătură cu vocabularul românilor timoceni (Bulgaria)', *LiR,* 61, 2012:235–50, identifies a number of features, inherited from Latin as well as loans and internal creations, in the Romanian varieties of the Timoc Valley in Bulgaria, arguing that the dialect is unique in its evolution, whilst also clearly being a Romanian variety. T. Nedelcea, 'O nouă limbă: "vlaha"', *LiR(M),* 22.5–6, 2012:240–45, argues that the Romanian ethnic minority in the Timoc Valley in Serbia should be considered Romanian and not given the separate name *Vlach*, as there is clear evidence that they are not culturally or linguistically separate. Manuela Nevaci, **Scriitori Aromâni de ieri și azi. Antologie de texte și studiu filologic*, Editura Universitară, 288 pp., is a collection and philological study of Aromanian texts from the past and present.

   K. Schulte, 'Daco- and Ibero-Romance in Contact: On the Origin of Structural Similarities between Related Languages', *RRL,* 57, 2012:331–54, examines a contact situation between three Romance languages (Romanian, Spanish and Catalan) that has arisen due to migration; after identifying a number of contact-induced features in the local version of Romanian, ranging from phonology to syntax and pragmatics, the question is raised as to whether it is likely that these features will eventually turn into a genuine new Romance variety. A similar contact situation, that of Romanian-speaking migrants in Italy, is the point of departure for D. Arpenti, 'Bilingvism și contact lingvistic în sânul emigrației românofone din Italia', *LiR(M),* 22.7–8, 2012:116–23, who rejects the idea that emigrant children are bound to lose their parents' language, providing a clear overview of the issues arising when bringing up a child bilingually. Margareta Manu Magda, *Dialogul în Comunități plurilingve. Texte germane din zona Sibiului*, Editura Academiei Române, 2012, 211 pp., is a valuable contribution to the study of multilingual dialogue, showing how Transylvanian German speakers incorporate Romanian features into their language, following the same patterns that have been identified in other long-standing contact situations. Teodora Dobrițoiu-Alexandru, *Elemente lexicale românești în graurile slovace și cehe din Moravia*, Bucharest U.P., 197 pp., deals with Romanian loanwords in Czech and Slovak dialects spoken in Moravia, providing a short introduction, extensive glossaries of certain and possible loans, as well as short sections on the phonological and morphological adaptation of loanwords and on semantic shifts; this is followed by an appendix containing a good number of short dialectal texts.