

# A Grammar of the Russian Kelderar Dialect of Romani

VIKTOR ELŠÍK

*Univerzita Karlova, Filozofická fakulta, nám. Jana Palacha 1/2,  
CZ 11638 Praha 1, viktor.elsik@ff.cuni.cz*

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18690/scn.17.1.240-252.2024>

---

1.04 Strokovni članek – 1.04 Professional article

---

Prispevek predstavlja nedavno objavljeno slovnico ruskega kelderarskega narečja romščine (Oslon 2018), ki je doslej najbolj podroben opis katere koli romske jezikovne različice. V članku je najprej predstavljeno romsko narečje, nato pa so podane glavne značilnosti slovnice: viri za slovnico in podatki o njej, zgradba slovnice, razmerje med sinhronijo in diahronijo, opozorjeno pa je tudi na jezikovno stičnost. Članek predstavlja izbrane inovativne analize in pri tem opozarja tudi na dve, ki sta manj jasni. Oslova slovnica bi lahko bila model za pripravo različnih romskih slovnice.

The contribution aims to draw attention to a recently published grammar of the Russian Kelderar dialect of Romani (Oslon 2018), the most detailed description of any Romani variety to date. After introducing the dialect described, the paper characterizes the grammar in terms of its sources and representation of data, its structure, and its attention to synchronic variation and diachrony, including language contact; it highlights selected innovative analyses; and discusses two debatable analyses. The paper concludes that Oslon's grammar could become a model for Romani grammaticography.

**Ključne besede:** romski jezik, rusko kelderarsko narečje, slovnični opis, slovnicearstvo

**Key words:** Romani language, Russian Kelderar dialect, grammatical description, grammaticography

---

## 1 Introduction

There are dozens of sound grammatical descriptions of different varieties of Romani, an Indo-Aryan language (or a group of closely related languages, as conceived, for example, by Glottolog, Hammarström *et al.* 2023) spoken primarily though not exclusively in Europe. In the present paper, I would like to draw attention to a recently published grammar that stands out for its broad coverage and detail of description. The grammar of the Moldovaya subdialect of the Russian Kelderar dialect of Romani (Oslon 2018) written in Russian by

Mikhail Oslon is, with its 952 pages, by far the longest and the most detailed description of any Romani variety.<sup>1</sup>

The in-group language of the Kelderar (also Kalderar, Kelderash, Kalderash etc.) is certainly the geographically most widespread dialect of Romani, being spoken in many parts of Europe (e.g. Boretzky 1994, Calvet 1993, Fennesz-Juhász *et al.* 2003, Gjerdmán & Ljungberg 1963, Matras 1994, Kyuchukov & Mladenov 2004, Sabaini 2015) and the Americas (e.g. Hancock 1995, Pădure 2020). (The English name of the group and the dialect used in this paper is based on the Russian Kelderar endonym *kəldərər-i*, a loanword of the Romanian professionym *căldărar* ‘coppersmith’.) The global number of Kelderar speakers may be estimated at several hundreds of thousands (Oslon 2018: 5). Kelderar shares a layer of lexical and grammatical borrowings from Romanian as well as several internal innovations with the other dialects of Vlax Romani, one of a dozen of primary Romani dialect groups (e.g. Matras 2002, Boretzky 2003, Elšík & Beníšek 2020).

The author of the description argues on linguistic grounds that the Kelderar dialect originates in the Romanian parts of Banat (Oslon 2018: 6). The demic spread of the Kelderar followed the abolition of Romani slavery in Wallachia in the mid-nineteenth century and the first groups of the Kelderar reached Imperial Russia towards the end of that century (Oslon 2018: 5). There are presently around 30 thousand Kelderar on the territory of the former USSR, especially in Russia and the linguistically Russian parts of Ukraine (Oslon 2018: 5). The book describes the Moldovaya (from Kelderar *moldovàja* ‘Moldavians, Moldovans’) subdialect of Russian Kelderar, which is spoken by over three quarters of the “post-Soviet” Kelderar (Oslon 2018: 8).

## 2 Data and their representation

Russian Kelderar had not been an undescribed idiom. Oslon was able to build on previous descriptions of the dialect – a dictionary (Demeter & Demeter 1990), several grammar sketches (Čerenkov & Demeter 1990, Tscherenkov 1999, Šapoval 2008), and several papers on specific topics (e.g. Kožanov 2013, Oskol’skaja 2013), though most of these publications describe a different, the so-called Vungriko, subdialect of Russian Kelderar.

The data for Oslon’s 2018 description have mostly been obtained through linguistic fieldwork, including elicitation and text collection, which the author undertook in several Kelderar settlements (*kýrdur’a*) in European Russia and Ukraine, starting in the vicinity of his native Tula. Some of the analysed folklore texts were collected by the author’s collaborator Kirill Kozhanov (Kožanov

---

<sup>1</sup> Granqvist’s 2007 grammar of Finnish Romani, written in Finnish, comes second (714 pages). The most detailed Romani grammar written in English seems to be Beníšek’s 2017 unpublished PhD thesis on Eastern Uzh Romani (478 pages).

2013, Kožanov & Černyx 2016, 2017, 2018), who introduced Osłon to the study of Romani. Among the analysed material are also data from a book of Russian fairy tales translated into Kelderar by a native speaker (Abramenko 2012). The overall extent of data and the number of speakers consulted are not specified but are clearly considerable.

The grammar contains innumerable examples of Moldovaya wordforms, lexemes, and utterances, which are provided with idiomatic translations into Russian, though there are no interlinear morpheme-by-morpheme or word-by-word translations. Elicited examples (“deliberately created by the speaker”, Osłon 2018: 4) are distinguished from those originating in spontaneous speech and there are also graphical symbols indicating the song register (see below) and the translated text source (see above). Nevertheless, there are also numerous unindexed example utterances, which appear to have been constructed by the author of the grammar and only checked by the speakers (Osłon 2018: 21). Some examples in the electronic version of the grammar are linked to sound files on Osłon’s website.

The transcription of the examples employs the Latin Script and is largely phonological, with a few exceptions: phonemically palatalized consonants are not indicated before front vowel graphemes, e.g. <telè> /t’eł’è/ [t’e’ɫe ~ t’e’ɫe] ‘downwards’; word-final neutralization of voicing and aspiration are not reflected in the transcription; and optional debuccalization of /s/ (see below) is not indicated in constructed examples. The employed graphemes largely correspond to those used in most academic publications on Romani, including digraphs for phonemic aspirates, e.g. <ph> [p<sup>h</sup>]. Palatal secondary articulation, which is phonemic in the dialect, is mostly indicated by an apostrophe, e.g. <ph’> [p<sup>h</sup>ʲ], though palatals proper are marked by a kernered apostrophe (fused caron), e.g. <t’> [tʲ]. Sibilants are differentiated by further diacritics, e.g. the retroflex <š> [ʂ] with a caron and the alveolopalatal <ś> [ɕ] with an acute, in addition to the alveolar <s> [s] and the palatalized alveolar <s’> [sʲ]. Specific graphemes are employed for the central vowels <y> [ɨ] and <ə> [ə]. Stress is marked by the grave accent. Alongside the “orthographic” transcription, Osłon also uses strictly phonological and phonetic transcriptions whenever appropriate.

A complex morphophonological transcription (Osłon 2018: 66–67, 101–102) is employed to represent basic allomorphs and to indicate morphophonological alternations. For example, the verb form *icòl* ‘s/he peppers’ is morphophonologically represented as {ĪT.”.ᵀÒ|L} (Osłon 2018: 66–67, curly brackets added by the author of this paper). Different types of morpheme boundaries are distinguished, with the hyphen being used for clitic boundaries even in the “orthographical” transcription (in this paper, the author uses the hyphen for word-internal morpheme boundaries and the equal sign for clitic boundaries).

### 3 Grammar structure

Osłon's 2018 grammar consists of six chapters: an introduction; the core chapters on phonology, morphophonology, morphology, and syntax; and a final chapterette on registers. The core chapters are organized in up to six levels of hierarchical structure; the table of contents extends over 16 pages.

The phonology chapter provides an overview of vowel and consonant phonemes, their distributional variants (allophones), various phonological processes, phonotactics of words and morphemes, and word prosody. An important chapter, rarely found in descriptions of Romani, is the one on morphophonology, which not only provides a detailed overview of morphophonological alternations (distinguishing, for example, several types of palatalization) but also presents a typology of morphemes and wordforms. The core of the morphology chapter is structured primarily by word class, which is why inflectional, derivational, and adaptational morphology do not occur in separate chapters. The syntax chapter is by far the longest (526 pages) and describes a large variety of topics such as the structure of syntactic “groups”, grammatical relations, agreement and government, valency and voice patterns, speech-act types of sentence, word order and intonation, pronominal substitution and ellipsis, negation, coordination and subordination, and more.

The grammatical description is neither strictly semasiological (form-to-function) nor strictly onomasiological (function-to-form), though the semasiological perspective is prominent in lower-level sections. Many structures are described in various perspectives in different parts of the grammar, which contains precise and exhaustive cross-referencing. As expected, there are numerous paradigm tables, construction schemas, tree diagrams, and various other figures. Sentential examples are renumbered within each section.

The description contains no dictionary or glossary, though the lexicon is richly – even exhaustively in the case of morphologically simplex and unproductively formed lexemes – illustrated in the relevant grammar sections, especially in those on inflectional classes. The lexicon of the Moldovaya subdialect of Russian Kelderar is systematically compared to the lexicon documented in Demeter & Demeter's 1990 rather extensive dictionary of the Vungriko subdialect. Two of the three appendices are also lexical in nature: the first one describes speech formulas such as greetings, requests, thanks, hospitality formulas, well-wishes, congratulations, toasts, and curses, while the second one provides a well-arranged overview of kinship terminology.

The third appendix of the book contains 12 text samples (26 pages), ten of which (six songs, two fairy tales, one anecdote, and a children's horror story) were recorded by Osłon or his collaborator Kirill Kozhanov between 2011 and 2018. The horror story, which was told by an 11-year-old girl, illustrates structural attrition in the varieties of the youngest speakers. In addition, there is a translation of a Russian fairy-tale, written in Cyrillic by a native speaker of the dialect; and excerpts from an academic paper by the author (Osłon 2017),

a non-native speaker (which is unusual but beautifully illustrates the potential of functional expansion of the traditionally oral language).

#### 4 Variation, diachrony, and language contact

Like most Romani grammars, Oslon's 2018 grammar is descriptive rather than prescriptive. The author meticulously describes attested structural variations within the Moldovaya subdialect, mostly indicating estimated frequencies of variants and their distribution across speaker generations and registers. In this respect, two main registers are distinguished: the colloquial register, which is used in most contexts, including traditional storytelling, and the song register. A whole chapter is devoted to specific structural (phonological, morphological, syntactic as well as lexical) features in the song register, many of which are archaic and/or may have originated in the Vungrika subdialect (Oslon 2018: 891). Not infrequently, the description also notes Moldovaya's passive knowledge of archaic and heterodialectal forms. Archaic and rare words are marked by indices, and so are dubious elicited forms acceptable to some speakers only or unacceptable to most. A subsection (Oslon 2018: 360–361) of the morphology chapter is devoted to irregular form variation due to sporadic processes such as contamination. The introduction contains sections on the classification of Russian Kelderar groups (Oslon 2018: 8–13) and their subdialects (Oslon 2018: 17–20). While the book primarily describes the Moldovaya subdialect, there are frequent comparative remarks on the other three to four subdialects of Russian Kelderar within the grammar. Several phonological features, such as the reflexes of Proto-Romani \*/<sup>h</sup>e/, serve as shibboleths in inter-group linguistic interaction.

A section of the introduction (Oslon 2018: 15–17) outlines three diachronic layers (or chronological compartments) of Russian Kelderar morphological, morphophonological, and to a limited extent also phonological structures. Oslon's Layers I and II, which correspond to the pan-Romani distinction between the morphology of indigenous lexicon and early loanwords into Proto-Romani on the one hand and the morphology of late Proto-Romani and dialect-specific loanwords on the other hand, are in Romani linguistics usually termed thematic and athematic (e.g. Bakker 1997, Matras 2002) or oikoclitic and xenoclitic (e.g. Elšík & Matras 2006) compartments, respectively. In Russian Kelderar, Layer II contains a large lexical component originating in Romanian, which was spoken in the speech community until recently, namely only a few generations ago. The current contact language of Russian Kelderar, including the varieties spoken in Ukraine, is Russian, which is acquired non-natively by school-age children. Some loanwords from Russian adapt into the xenoclitic or Layer II compartment, while spontaneous insertions of words, collocations, and utterances from Russian, often with no or little adaptation, constitute Oslon's Layer III of Russian Kelderar, which speakers do not consider Romani proper and is thus not described in the grammar.

Oslon's grammar is primarily a synchronic description, however, it contains numerous diachronic notes. Alongside comparative observations on cross-dialect variation within Russian Kelderar, there are also numerous notes on deeper (e.g. Romanian, Proto-Romani, and Old Indo-Aryan) origin of selected structures. However, not all structures are analysed diachronically: for example, the origin of affixes (e.g. of the adjective-deriving suffix *-ícòs-*, a borrowing of Romanian *-icios*) is not consistently indicated; and the reader may wonder whether the phonemic palatalization of consonants, a dialect-specific innovation, results from the current contact with Russian or reflects an older Romanian influence (despite there being a note on a possible Romanian origin of the phonetic realization of some of the palatalized consonants in Oslon 2018: 40–41). In sections on morphological adaptation of inflected loanwords (Oslon 2018: 185–189, 221–222, 340–344), only the adaptation patterns of loanwords from Russian, the current contact language, are analysed. Adaptation patterns of loanwords from previous contact languages are not analysed (though the xenoclitic inflectional and derivational classes are properly described in the relevant sections). A summary chapter on Romanian and Russian structural influences would certainly have been welcome.

## 5 Innovative analyses

The grammatical analyses and terminology in Oslon's 2018 grammar are frequently innovative and exhibit a high degree of autonomy *vis-à-vis* the dominant grammaticographic tradition and practice in Romani linguistics. For example, Oslon renames some of the cases (e.g. the traditional dative to a directive) and introduces novel case values (e.g. the abessive) (Oslon 2018: 116, 371–406); uses the convenient term *inflect* for the non-perfective subparadigm of verbs and reanalyses the role of the aspect and tense–mood categories in verb inflection (Oslon 2018: 544–586; cf. Matras 2001); considers the uninflected modals *šàj* 'can' and *naštì* 'cannot' to be verbs on the ground of their syntactic behaviour (Oslon 2018: 266, 324, 737–738; cf. Elšík & Matras 2009); and much more.

The grammar does not cite much previous work on the structure of Romani (rare exceptions being Matras' 1994 and 1998 studies on the functional distinctions in adnominal demonstratives), which testifies to the fact that the author of the grammar generally does not compare or contrast his analyses with previous descriptions, be it Kelderar or other Romani dialects. This is, in principle, not a problem in a purely descriptive work and may even be an advantage, given the imperative of descriptive linguistics to depict each linguistic variety in its own terms (e.g. Boas 1911, Haspelmath 2010, 2019). The theoretical parts of the grammar are extensive and provide a solid explicit background for the actual analysis of the data (parts of the chapter on syntax owe some inspiration to Testelec 2001). Nevertheless, students of Romani would have welcomed a

more detailed comparative discussion of some of Oslon's innovative analytic decisions.

Oslon's classification of lexemes into word classes is three-dimensional (see the scheme in Oslon 2018: 107). The major division is between verbs, nominals, and several classes of function words (prepositions, conjunctions and particles, and utterance words). The class of nominals (*имя*) is conceived as including not only nouns and adjectives but also adverbs. In another dimension, all types of nominals may be divided into pronominals and non-pronominal words (*назывные*). Specific types of adjective are possessives (usually analysed as inflectional forms of nouns, e.g. Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2000, Elšík 2020) and articles. Participial forms of verbs also show adjectival behaviour. The class of numerals is a semantically defined subclass of nominals. The three-dimensional model efficiently accounts for the multi-faceted nature of lexemes such as *sodivar* 'how many times', which is simultaneously an adverb, a pronominal, and a numeral. Oslon innovatively (but see also Elšík 2022: 197–198) recognizes the category of status (dependent vs. independent) in adjective inflection, which accounts for the fact that all adjectives, with the exception of articles, are nominalized (i.e. transposed into noun forms) when used in headless, independent, positions.

An entirely novel feature within the context of Romani grammaticography is the delimitation of two types of wordforms: narrow wordforms, which may contain various types of affixes; and broad wordforms consisting of several narrow wordforms, some of which are clitics, e.g. *te=nà=maj=dikh-l'àm-as=am-e* 'if we had not seen each other again' (Oslon 2018: 64) consisting of five narrow wordforms, the first three of which are proclitics and the last of which is an enclitic (the usual transcription would here consist of five orthographic words). The broad wordform is defined by the criteria of uninterruptedness and internal linear stability (Oslon 2018: 64). As for the affixes within narrow wordforms, Oslon differentiates (derivational) prefixes, (derivational and inflectional) suffixes, (inflectional) desinences (*окончание*), and (inflectional) postfixes. Postfixes – in practice there are only two, viz. *-a* and *-(s)as*, both in verbal inflection – follow the desinences and are always unstressed. The grammar sometimes vacillates between a clitic and an affixal analysis. For example, while the abessive/privative/caritive *bi=* is described as a proclitic in adjectives, possessives, and participles (Oslon 2018: 223, 228, 296), in the noun *bi-bàxt* or *bi-baxt* 'bad luck' the morpheme is treated as a proclitic (Oslon 2018: 97) or as a prefix (Oslon 2018: 168).

## 6 Debatable analyses

Only some analyses presented in the grammar are likely to become contentious. Two examples of analyses will be given in this chapter that are found debatable:

The Moldovaya subdialect is described as having 50 phonemes, including 43 consonants (Oslon 2018: 25, 33–34). The large number of consonant phonemes is partly a consequence of phonemic palatalization, which occurs in most, though not all, consonant qualities, with some phonemically palatalized alveolars being phonetically realized as palatals or alveolopalatals. There is an interaction between consonant quality and vowel quality (see also Oslon 2017): “soft” (i.e. palatalized, palatal, or alveolopalatal) consonants cannot immediately precede central vowels [ɨ] or [ə], and the other, “hard”, consonants cannot immediately precede front vowels [i] or [e]. While high vowels [ɨ] and [i] contrast word-initially, the distribution of mid vowels [ə] and [e] is fully complementary, as only [ə] is allowed to occur word-initially. The phonemic status of [ə] vs. [e], as presented in the description, is thus questionable.

External case (and possessive) markers in nouns are analysed as enclitics by Oslon, who terms the resulting constructions secondary case forms. For example, the nominalized possessive form *dadeskərənca* ‘with those of a/the father’, which would usually (e.g. Elšík 2020) be described as a single word-form with four inflectional suffixes, viz. *dad-es-kər-ən-ca*, is analysed as a broad wordform consisting of three narrow words: the oblique singular noun form *dad-es*, the oblique plural form of the possessive clitic =*kər-ən*, and the instrumental case clitic =*ca*. Oslon’s approach is in stark contrast with Friedman’s 1991 widely accepted conclusion on the status of Romani external case markers as suffixes rather than (enclitic) postpositions. A major consequence of Oslon’s enclitic analysis is that he only recognizes three primary, narrowly synthetic, case forms in nouns (viz. direct, oblique, and vocative), in contrast to a larger number (eight in most Romani dialects) of synthetic cases under the mainstream analysis.

Indeed, Oslon’s argument appears to rest on the optional phonological process of debuccalization of the sibilant /s/ at the end of narrow words, including before enclitics, e.g. *dad-əs=tar* [daʲɛstar ~ daʲɛhtar] ‘than the/a father’, but not within narrow words (Oslon 2018: 53–55). However, all instances of the non-alternating sibilant in coda position occur not only word-internally but also morpheme-internally, e.g. *sast-ò* [saʲsto] ‘healthy’ or *plòsk-a* [ʲploska] ‘decorated bottle’, with the only instances of the non-alternating sibilant in a morpheme-final position being intervocalic, e.g. *kər-əs-a* [kərʲəsa] ‘[if] you do’. Thus, a generalization that appears to be superior to Oslon’s is that debuccalization may only affect a morpheme-final /s/ occurring in coda position.<sup>2</sup> Consequently, the phonological process cannot be felicitously employed as a criterion for the distinction between narrow and broad wordforms and thus as an argument for the enclitic status of the external case markers. Moreover, morphophonological alternations affecting the presumed case clitics, including the possessive clitic,

<sup>2</sup> The debuccalized intervocalic sibilants in examples such as *dikh-əs=am-e* [ʲiʲkʰəfiamʲe] ‘we’ll see each other’ may be analysed as resulting from resyllabification (before a vowel-initial clitic) after coda debuccalization had been applied.

are specific to the external case markers and do not affect most of the (other) clitics, e.g. the progressive voicing in *dad-èn-dar* {DAD-ÈN-TAR} ‘than (the) fathers’ but not in *žâ-n=tar* ‘they are leaving’ (Oslon 2018: 90–91). This also favours the mainstream analysis of the external case markers as suffixes (or in any case morphemes that show a greater degree of fusion with their stems than the enclitics).

Minor errors and other flaws are rare. A few examples: The definition of the Kelderar first person as referring to the speaker or a group including the speaker but not the addressee (Oslon 2018: 266) is imprecise, as *amè* ‘we’ and other first-person plural markers may also refer to groups including the addressee, i.e. there is no exclusive vs. inclusive distinction. It is unclear why the diminutive adverb *xurd-oř-ès* should be derived from the deadjectival adverb *xurd-ès* ‘tinily’ (Oslon 2018: 232) rather than from the diminutive adjective *xurd-oř-ò* (which is unattested in the grammar, though see Oslon 2018: 219 for the productivity of adjective diminutives). The perfective stem of the verb *aš-* ‘to stay’ is mostly segmented as *aši-l-* (Oslon 2018: 281, 283, 297) but as *aš-il-* in the running text in Oslon 2018: 297. The author of the grammar misses the generalization that the verbs of the inflectional class of *phàndel* ‘to bind’ (Oslon 2018: 306–307), which have a distinct perfective inflection from the verbs of the class of *cýrdel* ‘to pull’ (Oslon 2018: 305–206), all share the cluster /nd/ in their stem.<sup>3</sup> The transitive *hur’avèl* ‘to dress’ is considered to be the causative of *hur’âl* ‘to fly’ (Oslon 2018: 331), though there is no plausible semantic connection, synchronically, and though the base of the former verb is etymologically distinct from the latter verb (e.g. Oslon & Kožanov, in prep.: 871–874). The heading of section 3.11.3.7. *Формы инфлекта + -a* (“имперфект”) should contain the suffix *-as* rather than *-a* (Oslon 2018: 278). The main title of Šapoval 2008 in the references (Oslon 2018: 933) should read *Kratkoe rukovodstvo po cyganskomu jazyku* instead of *Samoučitel’ cyganskogo jazyka* (the latter is the main title of Šapoval’s 2007 book on a different Romani dialect of Russia).

## 7 Conclusion

All in all, this is an excellent, well-researched, well-organized, and well-written, grammar. As its author himself notes (Oslon 2018: 22), numerous, especially syntactic, topics had not been described in any previous grammar of, or specialized grammatical study on, Romani. The grammar of Russian Kelderar may provide a manifold inspiration for researchers of the Romani language and the

<sup>3</sup> A single exception to this generalization is the verb *šàdel* ‘to vomit’. Interestingly, there are variants reflecting the proto-form *\*čhàndel* with /nd/ in other Romani varieties, especially those of the Central dialect groups (*čhandel*) but also some Vlax varieties (Slovak Lovari *šandel*). Thus, the aberrant behaviour of Russian Kelderar *šàdel* may perhaps reflect an earlier form with /nd/, i.e. *\*šàndel*.

author of this paper does not hesitate to aver that it should become a model for Romani grammaticography. It is a real pity that the description has not been, so far, widely noted and cited in Romani linguistics (as far as this author is aware, it is only cited in Elšík & Beníšek 2020). This, one might speculate, partly reflects the fact that it has been written in Russian; a version in English, like it or not the present-day academic *lingua franca*, would certainly increase the impact of the grammar.

## REFERENCES

- Ol'ga A. ABRAMENKO (ed.), 2012: *Skazki na cyganskom jazyke (kèldèrarskij dialekt). Knižka-raskaska s voprosami i zadanijami*. Sankt-Peterburg: Anima.
- Peter BAKKER, 1997: Athematic morphology in Romani: the borrowing of a borrowing pattern. *The typology and dialectology of Romani*. Eds. Yaron Matras, Peter Bakker, Hristo Kyuchukov. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 1–21.
- Michael BENÍŠEK, 2017: *Eastern Uzh varieties of North Central Romani*. PhD dissertation. Prague: Charles University.
- Franz BOAS, 1911: Introduction. *Handbook of American Indian languages, Volume I*. (Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin, 40). Ed. Franz Boas. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office. 1–83.
- Norbert BORETZKY, 1994: *Romani: Grammatik des Kalderaš-Dialekts mit Texten und Glossar*. (Balkanologische Veröffentlichungen, 24). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Norbert BORETZKY, 2003: *Die Vlach-Dialekte des Romani. Strukturen – Sprachgeschichte – Verwandtschaftsverhältnisse – Dialektkarten*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Georges CALVET, 1993: *Dictionnaire tsigane-français, dialecte kalderash*. Paris: L'Asiathèque.
- Lev N. ČERENKOV, Roman S. DEMETER, 1990: Kratkij grammatičeskij očerk kèldèrarskogo dialekta cyganskogo jazyka. *Cygansko-russkij i russko-cyganskij slovar' (kèldèrarskij dialekt)*. Ed. Roman S. Demeter, Petr S. Demeter, Lev N. Čerenkov. Moskva: Russkij jazyk. 285–306.
- Roman S. DEMETER, Petr S. DEMETER, Lev N. ČERENKOV, 1990: *Cygansko-russkij i russko-cyganskij slovar' (kèldèrarskij dialekt)*. Moskva: Russkij jazyk.
- Viktor ELŠÍK, 2020: Romani morphology. *The Palgrave handbook of Romani language and linguistics*. Eds. Yaron Matras, Anton Tenser. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan Publishers. 155–186.
- Viktor ELŠÍK, 2022: Vowel length in Selice Romani: phonology, morphophonology, and diachrony. *Romani Studies* 32/2, 185–219.
- Viktor ELŠÍK, Michael BENÍŠEK, 2020: Romani dialectology. *The Palgrave handbook of Romani language and linguistics*. Eds. Yaron Matras, Anton Tenser. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan Publishers. 389–428.
- Viktor ELŠÍK, Yaron MATRAS, 2006: *Markedness and language change: the Romani sample*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.

- Viktor ELŠÍK, Yaron MATRAS, 2009: Modality in Romani. *Modals in the languages of Europe: a reference work*. (Empirical Approaches to Language Typology, 44). Eds. Björn Hansen, Ferdinand de Haan. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 267–322.
- Christiane FENNESZ-JUHASZ, Dieter W. HALWACHS, Mozes F. HEINSCHINK, Dragan JEVREMOVIĆ, Gerd AMBROSCH, Katharina DEMAN, Barbara SCHRAMEL, 2003: *Wörterbuch des Kalderaš-Romani. Teil I: Romani-Deutsch-Englisch. Teil II: Deutsch-Romani, Englisch-Romani*. (Arbeitsbericht des Romani-Projekts, 6). Graz: Romani-Projekt.
- Victor A. FRIEDMAN, 1991: Case in Romani: old grammar in new affixes. *Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society* V/1, 85–102.
- Olof GJERDMAN, Erik LJUNGBERG, 1963: *The language of the Swedish coppersmith Gipsy Johan Dimitri Taikon. Grammar, texts, vocabulary and English word-index*. Uppsala: Lundequistska Bokhandeln & Copenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaard.
- Kimmo GRANQVIST, 2007: *Suomen romanin äänne- ja muotorakenne*. Helsinki: Suomen Itämainen seura & Kotimaisten kielten tutkimuskeskus.
- Harald HAMMARSTRÖM, Robert FORKEL, Martin HASPELMATH, Sebastian BANK, 2023: *Glottolog 4.8*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. <http://glottolog.org> (17.4.2024).
- Ian HANCOCK, 1995: *A handbook of Vlax Romani*. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica.
- Martin HASPELMATH, 2010: Comparative concepts and descriptive categories in cross-linguistic studies. *Language* 86/3, 663–687.
- Martin HASPELMATH, 2019: How comparative concepts and descriptive linguistic categories are different. *Aspects of linguistic variation*. Eds. Daniël Van Olmen, Tanja Mortelmans, Frank Brisard. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. 83–114.
- Maria KOPTJEVSKAJA-TAMM, 2000: Romani genitives in cross-linguistic perspective. *Grammatical relations in Romani: the noun phrase*. Eds. Viktor Elšík, Yaron Matras. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 123–149.
- Kirill A. KOŽANOV, 2013: Modal'nye konstrukcii s glagolom 'byt' v keldërarском cygansком (govor kotljarov-moldovaja). *Cyganskij jazyk v Rossii. Sbornik materialov Rabočego soveščanija po cyganskomu jazyku v Rossii, Sankt-Peterburg, 5 oktjabrja 2012 g.* Eds. Kirill A. Kožanov, Sof'ja A. Oskol'skaja, Aleksandr Ju. Rusakov. Sankt-Peterburg: Nestor-Istorija. 71–104.
- Kirill A. KOŽANOV, A. V. ČERNYX, 2016: Mifologičeskie personaži cygan-keldërarov: "Mamërry". *Tradicionnaja kul'tura* 17/4, 135–146.
- Kirill A. KOŽANOV, A. V. ČERNYX, 2017: Ljaguška v obyčajax i obrjadax cygan-keldërarov. *Živaja starina* 3, 43–46.
- Kirill A. KOŽANOV, A. V. ČERNYX, 2018: "Talismany udači" v tradicionnoj kul'ture cygan-keldërarov. *Tradicionnaja kul'tura* 19/1, 115–125.
- Hristo KYUCHUKOV, Zlatko MLADENOV, 2004: *Kratka grammatika na kalderaškia romski dialekt v Bălgaria*. Sofia: Delfi.
- Yaron MATRAS, 1994: *Untersuchungen zu Grammatik und Diskurs des Romanes: Dialekt der Kelderaša/Lovara*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Yaron MATRAS, 1998: Deixis and deictic oppositions in discourse: evidence from Romani. *Journal of Pragmatics* 29/4, 393–428.

Yaron MATRAS, 2001: Tense, aspect, and modality categories in Romani. *Language Typology and Universals (STUF)* 53/4, 162–180.

Yaron MATRAS, 2002: *Romani: a linguistic introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sof'ja A. OSKOL'SKAJA, 2013: Karitiv v kèldèrarskom dialekte cyganskogo jazyka. *Cyganskij jazyk v Rossii. Sbornik materialov Rabočego soveščanja po cyganskomu jazyku v Rossii, Sankt-Peterburg, 5 oktjabrja 2012 g.* Eds. Kirill A. Kožanov, Sof'ja A. Oskol'skaja, Aleksandr Ju. Rusakov. Sankt-Peterburg: Nestor-Istorija. 105–133.

Mikhail OSLON, 2017: Jek pušimos la istorijaka fonetikako la kèldèraricko šibaki: le vokalongê žutengi e : ê aj i : î distribucija. *Das amen godi pala Lev Čerenkov: Romani historija, čhib taj kultura*. (Grazer Romani Publikationen, 5). Eds. Kirill Kozhanov, Mikhail Oslon, Dieter W. Halwachs. Graz: Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz. 325–338.

Mixail V. OSLON, 2018: *Jazyk kotljarov-moldovaja. Grammatika kèldèrarskogo dialektu cyganskogo jazyka v ruskojazyčnom okruženii*. Moskva: Jazyki slavjanskoj kul'tury. Electronic version: [www.rromanes.org/pub/Oslon/Ослон М.В. Язык котляров-молдавоя.pdf](http://www.rromanes.org/pub/Oslon/Ослон М.В. Язык котляров-молдавоя.pdf) (17.4.2024).

Mixail V. OSLON, Kirill A. KOŽANOV, in preparation: *Ètimologičeskij slovar' cyganskogo jazyka (obščecyganskaja leksika)*. Electronic manuscript: [rromanes.org/pub/ЭСЦЯ.pdf](http://rromanes.org/pub/ЭСЦЯ.pdf), version 2023-12-18.

Cristian Tudor PĂDURE, 2020: *La variation copule/clitique sujet en romani du Mexique au contact de ser et estar de l'espagnol*. București: Editura Universității din București.

Astrid SABAINI, Dieter W. HALWACHS, Mozes F. HEINSCHINK, 2015: *Kalderaš-Romani*. (Languages of the World/Materials, 108). München: Lincom.

Viktor V. ŠAPOVAL, 2007: *Samoučitel' cyganskogo jazyka: russka roma: severnorusskij dialekt*. Moskva: Astrel'.

Viktor V. ŠAPOVAL, 2008: *Kratkoe rukovodstvo po cyganskomu jazyku (kèldèrarskij dialekt)*. Sankt-Peterburg: Memorial.

Lev N. TCHERENKOV, 1999: Eine kurzgefasste Grammatik des Russischen Kalderaš-Dialekts des Romani. *Grazer Linguistische Studien* 51, 131–166.

Jakov G. TESTELEĆ, 2001: *Vvedenije v obščij sintaksis*. Moskva: Rossijskij gosudarstvennyj gumanitarnyj universitet.

## ROMSKA SLOVNICA RUSKEGA KELDERARSKEGA NAREČJA

V članku je predstavljena nedavno objavljena slovnica moldavskega poddialekta ruskega kelderarskega narečja romščine (Oslon 2018), ki je doslej najbolj podroben opis katere koli romske jezikovne različice. Podatki za opis so bili večinoma pridobljeni z jezikovnim terenskim delom v več kelderarskih naseljih v evropski Rusiji in Ukrajini. Slovnica vključuje poglavje o morfofonologiji, ki ga redko najdemo v opisih romščine, in obsežno poglavje o skladnji, ki zajema številne teme, ki niso bile opisane v nobeni prejšnji slovnici romščine. Strukturne razlike znotraj moldavskega poddialekta, vključno s posebnimi

značilnostmi registra pesmi, so natančno opisane, pogoste pa so tudi primerjalne opombe o drugih poddialektih ruskega kelderarskega jezika. Čeprav gre predvsem za sinhroni opis, slovnica vsebuje tudi številne diahronne opombe. Slovnične analize in terminologija so pogosto inovativne in tudi avtonomne glede na prevladujočo slovničarsko tradicijo romskega jezikoslovja. V prispevku so izpostavljene: (1) izbrane inovativne analize slovnice, kot je na primer razmejitev dveh besedotvornih tipov; (2) dve sporni analizi: fonemski status [ə] proti [e] ter analiza zunanjih sklonskih in svojilnih označevalcev pri samostalnikih kot enklitik (npr. *dad-es=kər-ən=ca*). Oslonova slovnica bi lahko postala zgled za romsko slovničarstvo.

---