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Introduction

The purpose of this work is to present an up-to-date bibliography of monographic dictionaries and selected wordlists that record the lexicological wealth of the many varieties of the Romani language. While salient features of each dictionary will be discussed, the bibliography is not intended to offer a comprehensive book review of each dictionary. It is also not within scope of the bibliography to present a detailed overview of the Romani language and its dialects per se, as this has been covered well in myriad other resources, including in the additional information found in many of the dictionaries cited in this bibliography. I will, however, give a brief overview of certain features of Romani insofar as this will help understand the organization of the bibliography and clarify some of the features of the works which I have chosen to highlight in the annotations. This bibliography is intended primarily for scholars and students interested in Romani from the linguistic perspective to aid in identifying appropriate dictionaries for their research. It can also be of use to libraries in assessing their collection to determine if they have key lexicological resources for those researching Romani.

Romani comprises a large number of related dialects that ultimately originated as Indic dialects in northwest India and subsequently spread to Europe and beyond. It is spoken by several millions of native speakers who are almost universally bilingual in at least one other language of their country of residence. The original core Indic element in Romani is now somewhat small, including approximately 600 words which are generally retained consistently across dialects. However Romani dialects do differ from each other substantially due to borrowed lexicon and grammatical influences from the other languages of their home countries. Even within one country, speakers may speak differing dialects that strain mutual intelligibility. Dialect differences can affect not only vocabulary but also pronunciation, morphology, and syntax. Therefore, it is important for dictionaries to make clear which dialect is being described or to label individual words for dialect if the dictionary covers dialects that differ to any substantial degree. In addition to what are usually called “true-Romani” dialects, there are also very linguistically impoverished forms of original Romani, often referred to by linguists as “para-Romani.” Anglo-Romani and Spanish Caló are two of the most well known examples. This bibliography also covers a few books in the German and Scandinavian Rotwelsch variants. The linguistic material on these para-Romani variants is somewhat notorious for its unreliability, therefore in this bibliography my treatment of dictionaries of these para-Romani variants is briefer than those for true-Romani dictionaries. In some cases I have included them only because OCLC WorldCat catalog records for these items often erroneously include the subject heading “Romani language” in the metadata.

Language dictionaries tend to fall into two broad categories according to the compiler’s intent, namely descriptive and normative. Descriptive dictionaries strive to describe the lexicon
of a language as it is actually spoken. A descriptive dictionary of Romani will therefore naturally only be able to cover individual or a small number of closely related dialects. Descriptive dictionaries will also often include etymologies. While not a prerequisite, in the case of Romani, many students of the language may be interested in the origins of vocabulary (Indic, Greek, Armenian, Persian, Turkish, Slavic, German, etc.). Normative dictionaries, on the other hand, are intended to help choose “appropriate” words for speaking and writing, and may suggest preferred spellings, pronunciations, and grammatical forms. There are many fewer normative Romani dictionaries than descriptive ones. Historically there has not been a robust interest in Europe in teaching Romani in schools, an environment in which a normative dictionary can be helpful, and writers will in most cases write as they see fit. Educational opportunities for Roma children in Europe have begun to improve in some countries, so there has been more active interest in creating appropriate Romani pedagogical materials. In the annotations in this bibliography I will make clear the intent of each dictionary, i.e. descriptive or normative, when it can be ascertained from the introductory text.

Romani is relatively complex in its morphology and retains a number of conservative older Indic grammatical features that have even been lost in the modern Indic languages of South Asia. Romani’s morphology includes noun gender (masculine and feminine), and two numbers, singular and plural. Nouns can appear in what, from a traditional European linguistic perspective, have been viewed as grammatical cases, but which many linguists prefer to view as a reflex of postpositions (particles that follow the modified noun), such as those still found in the modern Indic languages, such as Hindi or Punjabi. In Romani these have traditionally been written as part of the modified noun stem, whereas in Indic languages these are often written separately.

The Romani verb is fascinating and complex from both morphological and syntactic perspectives, and for this reason I have been especially attentive to the treatment of verbs in the dictionaries. Verbs are conjugated for six persons in the present, past (aorist) tense, and future tense. In some dialects, an analytic future tense is used in place of the synthetic one. There are a large number of irregular aorist-tense stems in the verbs of original Indic origin. The Romani verb lacks an infinitive form and the form of verbs presented in dictionaries is most frequently the third person singular. The choice of this form makes the most sense as, if provided, the aorist-tense form of some verbs, namely intransitive one, varies from those of transitive verbs in some dialects. In these cases intransitive verbs will generally have a third-person singular aorist form based on a participle which has distinct forms for masculine, feminine, and plural antecedents. On the other hand, transitive verbs have a conjugated aorist form throughout all persons that does not vary for gender.

An indication of a verb’s transitivity, that is, transitive or intransitive, is important especially in Romani-English dictionaries, since English glosses for some verbs, e.g. ‘to break’ can be transitive or intransitive in English without further context. In Romani, the transitive and intransitive equivalent will usually have different verb-stem forms, e.g. *phagel* (transitive) ‘He/she breaks [something]’ and *phagjovel* ‘It breaks [down]’.

Closely related to transitivity is verb valency, which effects which kinds of arguments can
accompany a verb, such as, in the case of Romani, direct, indirect, comitative (also called instrumental or sociative), locative, or ablative objects, or none at all. Since Romani nominal arguments can appear in any of these grammatical cases, labeling a verb’s valency is very helpful. Nominal arguments in Romani can also appear as prepositional phrases instead of the case (i.e postpositional) forms, and which structure is preferred depends on the dialect. Linguistically-rigorous dictionaries should clearly indicate which arguments can accompany the verb, however this feature is unfortunately more often than not lacking in language dictionaries of all types.

While Romani has a transitive verb for the sense ‘to break [something]’ as well as a separate intransitive form for the sense, e.g. ‘the window broke’, other European languages usually handle this second type, which is, in a sense, a vestige of the Indo-European middle voice, with reflexive-form constructions. In addition to the typical transitive versus intransitive distinction often helpfully indicated in Romani dictionaries, Romani verbs can appear in forms corresponding to passive voice, impersonal intransitive constructions, inchoative, and reflexive forms that are constructed in the same manner as passive forms. Causative, iterative, factitive, and augmentative verbs, on the hand, are derived by suffixation of transitive verbs. In some dialects, periphrastic reflexive forms, using the reflexive pronoun pes or pe, ‘self’, have replaced the Romani intransitive verbs of the middle-voice type. These more complex verbal types are frequently not treated systematically, nor labeled in dictionaries beyond the transitive/intransitive distinction, and even that distinction is often lacking. Linguistic scholars of Romani also classify verbs as either thematic (inherited from Indic) or athematic (borrowed more recently from other languages, typically Greek, Slavic, Romanian, German, English, etc.). This classification is an important distinction in that it substantially effects the morphology of the verbs. Since labeling for theme is unfortunately not common in Romani dictionaries, I will only point out cases where this does appear. Please note these terms should not be confused with the unfortunately identical terms used in Indo-European linguistics to indicate whether an original Indo-European verb stem ended in a vowel, called the thematic vowel (thematic), or in a consonant (athematic).

An important feature of bilingual dictionaries is the inclusion of lexical collocations, which can encompass idioms, fixed expressions, proverbs, and the like. All languages use lexical collocations and how such collocations are used is often unpredictable based on the individual lexical units that are combined. Dictionaries that are mere wordlists are of limited utility in conveying how a language is actually spoken. Good dictionaries will included as many common collocations as possible, however, understandably, no dictionary can include all collocations found in a language.

Since all Romanies reside in countries with one or more, official, standardized written language, it is common for Romani, when written, to appear in the alphabet of the home country. Beginning in the 20th century, a number of special alphabets have been proposed and used, with varying degrees of success, for putting Romani to print. These typically have also adhered fairly closely to the orthography of the home country. A few additional alphabets, developed primarily by linguists to make written Romani more supranational, have been developed, e.g. the
International Romani Union Standard Alphabet, created by the linguist Marcel Courthiade and adopted by the Union in 1990 (see “Comparison of Alphabets” after Introduction). With the advent of the internet, email, blogs, texting, and computer social networking, Romani speakers will generally use whatever writing system they feel most comfortable with in their communications, especially when inputting special characters or diacritic marks is problematic or unnecessary for communication. In my annotations I have commented on the form of orthography chosen for each dictionary, as these, in many cases for the reasons explained above, will not actually reflect what is used by native speakers.

In addition to the author index, I have created a geographical index by country or countries where the form of Romani covered is spoken, and a separate index for the names of dialects. In the case of countries that no longer exist, e.g. Yugoslavia, I have created an index point for each of the current former constituent countries. The dialect index was somewhat more problematic. There are a variety of ways in which linguists have classified and named Romani dialects, based on different factors such as geographical distribution, grammatical features, pronunciation of certain consonants, self-designation, occupation, or even religious affiliation of speakers. In addition, dialects can be classified as main dialects and sub-dialects, even going as granular as by town, and indeed dialects are often named after the towns or cities where they are spoken. After careful consideration I decided that it was too problematic to try to create supra-and sub-dialect categories for indexing purposes. In most cases I have therefore only indexed dialects as they are named in the title or introductory text. Dialect names can vary widely in spelling, as there are no hard and fast conventions, so I have chosen what seems to be the most common representation in English in the linguistic literature in order to keep the names consistent in this bibliography. In a few cases I was unsure of the exact dialect, so I have made my best guess and followed the dialect with a question mark in the dialect index.

There has been considerable controversy among Rrom intellectuals and scholars of Romani studies about the propriety and utility of creating normative dictionaries. There have been concerns among some Rrom intellectuals and cultural leaders that these linguistic efforts have been mostly promoted by non-Rroma. Some linguists of Romani have attempted to “enrich” written Romani by introducing modern Indic words, such as from Hindi, to replace other European borrowings. For obvious reasons, these artificially introduced words rarely make their way into natural language. Others have asserted that language planning for Romani is unlikely to be successful because of the many varieties of Romani spoken. Nevertheless, there has been interest in a number of countries to at least try to standardize orthographies so that vernacular pedagogical materials can be created for Rrom students at the primary school level as a means to boost interest in literacy. To that end, normative dictionaries can be an asset. In most cases, the writers of Romani dictionaries appear to be quite sensitive to these issues, and each dictionary’s goal is generally explained in the introductory text.
Other conventions used in this bibliography

While I have not striven to include entries for general Romani grammars that contains limited vocabularies or wordlists, I have made some exceptions that will be explained in the annotations. A comprehensive list of grammars up to 2003 can be found in (Matras 2003), in “Other Works Consulted” below. Some of the older dictionaries I have included have appeared in several editions, many of which are essentially just different printings with the identical content. I have not tried to include an entry for every edition for these works. I have generally tried to included at least one newer edition in cases where an older items has a fairly recent reprint edition that may be loanable from another library, whereas the older ones are often not, for reasons of age, condition, collection restrictions (e.g. in a rare books library), etc.

Two kinds of URLs may appear in a citation. In all cases I have included a link to the Open WorldCat record. Open WorldCat (https://www.worldcat.org) is a publicly-accessible interface to a bibliographic database used by most US public and academic libraries to record their libraries’ holdings and provide catalog records for their institution’s catalogs. The WorldCat catalog record can assist users in finding a loan copy at another library via interlibrary loan. In cases where there is a publicly accessible full-text version (i.e. “open access” or OA) of the resource available on the Internet, I have linked to those as well. In most cases these will be hosted in the HathiTrust database (https://www.hathitrust.org). HathiTrust has many resources that are accessible only to those with institutional subscriptions, so I have only provided links for items that are in the public domain and freely accessible.

In annotations for bidirectional dictionaries, Romani will always be listed first, e.g. Romani-Czech, in the annotation, and the languages in the reverse direction, e.g. Czech-Romani will not be repeated. The American Library Association-Library of Congress Romanization schemes (https://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/roman.html) are used to transliterate titles and authors’ names that are printed in Cyrillic, as transliteration is preferred by most bibliographic citation styles. The terms “roman script” and “Latin script” are interchangeable, and in order to remain consistent, I will refer to this script as the later, “Latin script”, which recently has also become the preferred designation in bibliographic records. The process of script conversion, however, is still referred to as “romanization.” Where I have provided English translation for book titles these will be either my own translation or an added parallel title from within the book. When I have provided my own translation for a quote in an annotation I have enclosed these in single quotes, otherwise quotations will have double quotes. Romani examples from dictionaries will be in italics. Letters and digraphs as written are enclosed in angle brackets, phonemes are given in forward slashes (using International Phonetic Association transcription), and English glosses are in single quotes. When using single quotes for glosses, for reasons of personal preference, punctuation will follow the closing quote mark. If introductory and/or grammatical information in a dictionary is also provided in English, this will be explained in the annotation, otherwise it
can be assumed that this information is only in the language of publication.

If the term “Gypsy”, or another language equivalent, e.g. ciganin, is found in this bibliography, this will be from the title of a dictionary itself. For the sake of consistency and cultural sensitivity, I have translated variations of names of the ethnic group as “Rrom” (singular noun and adjective) and “Rroma” (plural), with double consonant <rr>. While the Library of Congress subject heading for the ethnic group is “Romanies”, a cursory Google search finds this term to be relatively not very common, and the term “Rroma,” based on the double <rr> convention to represent the uvular /ʁ/ sound, results in somewhat more hits. The alternate spelling of the ethnonym, “Roma,” is problematic, as it retrieves over 600 millions hits because of its being a homograph with the capital of Italy, as well as a popular personal name. In order for the electronic version of this bibliography to be easily findable the “Rroma” term will better serve this purpose. Additionally, in order to avoid possible confusion, when referring to a scholar who is ethnically Rrom, I will use the term “Rrom scholar.” Otherwise, or in cases of uncertainty, I will refer to those who study Romani as a disciple “rromologs.” For the name of the language, I have used the Library of Congress authorized subject heading “Romani” in my annotations, as it is fairly unambiguous. However the other popular spelling “Romany” appears in many English dictionary titles, especially older ones. In a few instances, such for my briefer annotations for para-Romani dialects such as Caló, which do not represent true Romani dialects, I have resorted to the local term, e.g. Gitano rather than Romani, as the latter seems somewhat anachronistic in the Iberian Gitano context.

I will provide a dataset for the resources included in this bibliography, minus the annotations, in Endnote format or another format if in my ability to convert, free to any individual to use or repurpose for non-commercial purposes with informal written agreement to use the data according to the Creative Commons CC-BY-SA license https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/2.0/. Please email husic@ku.edu with your request.

Keywords: Romani language; Rromani language; Romanies; Rroma; Dictionaries; Lexicology; Bibliographies
### Comparison of Alphabets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IPA</th>
<th>1971 Romani World Congress Alphabet</th>
<th>Hungarian Lovari Alphabet</th>
<th>Hungarian Carpathian Romani Alphabet</th>
<th>Pan-Vlax</th>
<th>International Romani Union Standard Alphabet</th>
<th>American Romani Alphabet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[a]</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[b]</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[c]</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C, Č[i16]</td>
<td>Čh</td>
<td>Ts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[č]</td>
<td>Č</td>
<td>Čh</td>
<td>Č</td>
<td>Čh</td>
<td>Čh</td>
<td>Ts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[d]</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ď]</td>
<td>Đ</td>
<td>Đh</td>
<td>Đ</td>
<td>Đh</td>
<td>Đ</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[e]</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ę]</td>
<td>Ń</td>
<td>Ń</td>
<td>Ń</td>
<td>Ń</td>
<td>Ń</td>
<td>Ń</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ď]</td>
<td>Đ</td>
<td>Đh</td>
<td>Đ</td>
<td>Đh</td>
<td>Đh</td>
<td>Đ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ę]</td>
<td>Ė</td>
<td>Ė</td>
<td>Ė</td>
<td>Ė</td>
<td>Ė</td>
<td>Ė</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[g]</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[h]</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[i]</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[k]</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[k']</td>
<td>Kh</td>
<td>Kh</td>
<td>Kh</td>
<td>Kh</td>
<td>Kh</td>
<td>Kh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[l]</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[m]</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[n]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ń]</td>
<td>Ny</td>
<td>Ny</td>
<td>Ny</td>
<td>Ny</td>
<td>Ny</td>
<td>Ny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[o]</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[p]</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ph]</td>
<td>Ph</td>
<td>Ph</td>
<td>Ph</td>
<td>Ph</td>
<td>Ph</td>
<td>Ph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[r]</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[s]</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[š]</td>
<td>Š</td>
<td>Š</td>
<td>Š</td>
<td>Š</td>
<td>Š</td>
<td>Š</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[t]</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ť]</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>Th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ć]</td>
<td>Ć</td>
<td>Ć</td>
<td>Ć</td>
<td>Ć</td>
<td>Ć</td>
<td>Ć</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[u]</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[v]</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>X[i17]</td>
<td>X[i17]</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>B b</td>
<td>Б Б</td>
<td>Б</td>
<td>Б</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>C c</td>
<td>Ц Ц</td>
<td>Ц</td>
<td>Ц</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Č</td>
<td>Č č</td>
<td>Ч Ч</td>
<td>Ч</td>
<td>Ч</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>D d</td>
<td>Д Д</td>
<td>Д</td>
<td>Д</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Đ</td>
<td>Đ đ</td>
<td>Đ đ</td>
<td>Đ</td>
<td>Đ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>F f</td>
<td>Ф Ф</td>
<td>Ф</td>
<td>Ф</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>G g, Q q[18]</td>
<td>Г Г</td>
<td>Г</td>
<td>Г</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>H h</td>
<td>Г [19] Г</td>
<td>Г</td>
<td>Г</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>I i</td>
<td>І І</td>
<td>І</td>
<td>І</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ĐĐ</td>
<td>ĐĐ đ</td>
<td>Đк</td>
<td>Đк</td>
<td>Đк</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>K k, Q q[18]</td>
<td>К К</td>
<td>К</td>
<td>К</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kh</td>
<td>Kh</td>
<td>Кх</td>
<td>Кх</td>
<td>Кх</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>L l</td>
<td>Л Л</td>
<td>Л</td>
<td>Л</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lj</td>
<td>Lj</td>
<td>Лj</td>
<td>Лj</td>
<td>Лj</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>M m</td>
<td>М М</td>
<td>М</td>
<td>М</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>N n</td>
<td>Н Н</td>
<td>Н</td>
<td>Н</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nj</td>
<td>Nj</td>
<td>Нj</td>
<td>Нj</td>
<td>Нj</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>P p</td>
<td>П П</td>
<td>П</td>
<td>П</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph</td>
<td>Ph</td>
<td>Пх</td>
<td>Пх</td>
<td>Пх</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>R r</td>
<td>Р Р</td>
<td>Р</td>
<td>Р</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>S s</td>
<td>С С</td>
<td>С</td>
<td>С</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Š</td>
<td>Š š</td>
<td>Ш Ш</td>
<td>Ш</td>
<td>Ш</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>T t</td>
<td>Т Т</td>
<td>Т</td>
<td>Т</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Th</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>Тх</td>
<td>Тх</td>
<td>Тх</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Č</td>
<td>Č kJ kJ (Čk)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>V v</td>
<td>В В</td>
<td>В</td>
<td>В</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X [21]</td>
<td>Х Х</td>
<td>Х</td>
<td>Х</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ž</td>
<td>Ž ž</td>
<td>Ж Ж</td>
<td>Ж</td>
<td>Ж</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Romani Dictionaries


A unidirectional Slovak-Romani dictionary apparently of the Slovak-Romani dialect, which is a member of the larger Central European Romani dialect group. The work unfortunately begins immediately with the grammar, followed by the dictionary, without any preliminaries or introduction discussing the scope and goals. The lexical material included appears to have relied heavily on Hübschmannová (1991, 1998). The dictionary portion is rather basic although encompassing a fairly large number of Slovak lemmas, approximately 10,000 based on my rough estimate. The Romani words are not labeled for part of speech, and only the gender of nouns is provided. Verbs are cited in the 3rd person singular and neither aorist forms nor information on valency are supplied. Nevertheless, the part of speech for Romani words will generally be clear from the Slovak lemmas, and passive-form Romani verbs are clear from the addition of the reflexive pronoun “sa” with the Slovak verbal lemma. The orthography is that used for Slovak. Word stress for Romani words is not indicated. The compilers do not appear to have ever issued a Romani-Slovak companion to this volume.


A descriptive dictionary of approximately 10,000 words from the speech of Romani musicians in the Bulgarian cities of Liaskovets, Kotel, Zlataritsa, Tucha, Vŭrbitsa, Omurtag, Sliven, Shumen, and Razgrad. The compiler does not mention any specific dialect names in the very brief introduction, and Vlax Romani, Balkan Romani, and Sinté are all spoken in Bulgaria. Without a grammatical sketch it is more difficult to determine the dialect class, however based on certain phonetic characteristics, such as the palatalization of velars such that the common Romani [kin-] is pronounced /tsin-/; this dialect appears to be Drindari.

Basic parts of speech are provided, and word stress is indicated. Verbs lemmas are accompanied by all personal forms for the present tense, however no past-tense forms are given, nor any indication of transitivity or other verbal morphological features. Some past-tense forms can be found in the examples; however, this is not adequate to determine how all personal forms are constructed or to ascertain the forms used for the 3rd-person singular aorist forms of intransitive verbs. Lemmas are accompanied by an impressive number of examples. The orthography used is the Bulgarian Cyrillic alphabet with a few modifications. Aspirated consonants are indicated with the Cyrillic letter <х> after the consonant, e.g. <пх> = /ph/. The digraph <нр> rather uniquely represents the uvular /ʁ/, which the compiler mistakenly calls ‘cerebral’ in the introduction.

Library catalog records for this ethnic group, the Beás, often erroneously include the subject heading “Romani language,” however the Beás speak a form of Romanian, rather than Romani. This entry is included only to provide clarity.


Library catalog records for this ethnic group, the Beás, often erroneously include the subject heading “Romani language,” however the Beás speak a form of Romanian, rather than Romani. This entry is included only to provide clarity.


Library catalog records for this ethnic group, the Beás, often erroneously include the subject heading “Romani language,” however the Beás speak a form of Romanian, rather than Romani. This entry is included only to provide clarity.

6: Anonymous (1755). Rotwellsche Grammatik, oder Sprachkunst: das ist, Anweisung wie man diese Sprache in wenig Stunden erlernen, reden, und verstehen möge [Rotwelsch grammar, or, the art of language, that is, Instruction in how one can learn this language in a few hours...]. Frankfurt am Mayn: [publisher not identified]. WorldCat: https://www.worldcat.org/oclc/221037105. (OA version: https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?PPN635717018). [Text in: German]

This work is representative of a number of similar publications from this time period that attempt to describe what has been variously termed “cant” or “para-Romani.” This is essentially a form of the primary language which has been embellished with a limited amount of vocabulary from Romani, and which was used to obfuscate, when necessary, by code-switching to this semi-cryptic language. I include it in this bibliography only because it appears in the WorldCat database with the misleading subject heading “Romani language.”

see Wikipedia: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rotwelsch

A bidirectional Romani-Slovak dictionary of the Eastern Slovak-Romani dialect. This work is the first comprehensive dictionary of this dialect to be published, but likely benefited greatly from Hübschmannová’s Romani Czech dictionary Hübschmannová (1991). The introduction mentions there are 15,000 lemmas, which probably includes both the Slovak and the Romani ones. Somewhat atypically, this dictionary was compiled for the use of Rroma in learning Slovak and includes two different grammatical sketches, one of Slovak and one of Romani. Because of the intended users of the dictionary the labeling of the Romani portion of the lexicon is understandably less formally detailed. For example, when a Slovak lemma is followed by more than one Romani gloss, even if the glosses are of different grammatical genders (i.e. masculine or feminine), the Romani definite article, which is sometimes included for the first gloss but not the others, may not reflect the gender of the following glosses. Romani lemmas are, in fact, not labeled at all for part of speech, and the only morphological feature included is the plural for certain nouns, e.g. the word for ‘snake’ and its nominative plural form “sap /-a vretenica.” It is unclear why this feature is included when other equally important ones, such as the stems of irregular aorist verb forms, are not.

The Romani lexicon included is quite extensive and, in addition to simple lemmas, includes many phrasal entries, especially when the Slovak gloss consists of only one word, e.g. “te dikhel ando suno vysnivať” [‘to dream of’], or one semantic unit, e.g. “te podel pes vzdat’ sa” [‘to give up’]. The orthography used in the Romani section is not discussed in the grammatical sketch but closely reflects that of Slovak, with typical additions such as the digraphs with “h” to form the aspirated consonants /ch/ /kh/, /ph/, /th/. The two typical “r” types, i.e. the flapped or trilled “r” and the uvular one, are not distinguished in the orthography, and the phonemic distinction between them is presumably neutralized in this dialect. Word stress is indicated when atypical, i.e. non-final, since stress is phonemic in this dialect and minimal pairs based on place of stress occur, e.g. “čoriben korist’” [‘benefit’] (word-final stress is not marked) versus “čóriben lupež” [‘robbery’].

A multi-dialect, descriptive Romani-German-English dictionary and grammar primarily of Balkan dialects. This is an almost encyclopedic dictionary and will be appreciated especially by those studying Romani from a linguistic perspective. It is currently one of the two most comprehensive, scientific dictionaries of Romani available, the other being Courthiade (2009). Interestingly, according to the introduction, the dictionary was originally intended to serve a
normative function. However, the compilers ultimately agreed that as Romani was only in the early stages of standardization it was premature for the dictionary to serve that function. Abandoning the normative aim allowed them to include much more material than a normative dictionary could realistically accommodate. It includes material from a number of Balkan dialects, primarily from countries and regions of the eastern portion of former Yugoslavia (Vojvodina, Serbia, Kosovo, Macedonia, Bosnia and Herzegovina), such as Bugurdži, Drindari, Gurbet, Kalderash, Ursari, as well as closely related dialects spoken in Bulgaria, Romania, and Hungary.

Glosses are provided in English and German, and there are German-Romani and English-Romani indexes. Part of speech is indicated for each item and verb types are elaborately labeled as transitive, intransitive, causative, and reflexive. As aorist tense forms can vary from dialect to dialect, the variant forms are given where the lemma is otherwise the same across dialects. Grammatical observations, contextual examples, and word etymologies are also provided. The orthography used is the typical South Slavic alphabet in Latin script, but also includes the letters <ć>, <š>, <dź>, and <ź> to distinguish the more palatal version of these sounds from the typical <ć>, <š>, <dž>, and <ž>. Word stress is indicated.


Reprint. See Borrow (1874)


Reprint. See Borrow (1874)


Reprint. See Borrow (1841).


Also available in several reprint editions. In volume 2 “Zincali: Vocabulary of their language.” In
this work Borrow compares vocabularies and texts of Anglo-Romani with those of dialects spoken in Hungary and Spain. There are several other reprint editions of this work.


Reprint. See *Borrow* (1841).


Reprint. See *Borrow* (1874).


An etymological dictionary of 257 Spanish words of Romani origin, preserved in Caló and later borrowed into Spanish. As with all para-Romani Caló forms, the vocabulary is fully integrated into Spanish morphology. As is often the case with other books on Caló, library catalogs and databased such as WorldCat often have the erroneously assigned subject heading “Romani language” in the metadata.


A unidirectional Caló-Spanish dictionary of 4500 words. No grammatical sketch or others linguistic comments are included. The dictionary was published with the cryptic attribution of the compiler as D.A. de C., however the compiler is believed to have been Don Adolfo de Castro (1823-1898), who had written other works on the topic of Caló (*Buzek 2009:51*) in *Other Works Consulted*. For a Caló dictionary of the period it does a fairly respectable job in presenting the vocabulary. All lemmas are labeled for part of speech, including noun gender. The orthography used closely follows that of Spanish.


A unidirectional Romani-French dictionary, with a French-Romani index, of the Kalderash
dialect, a member of the Vlax Romani dialect group. The dictionary covers 3257 lemmas. This is one of the best, comprehensive dictionaries of the Kalderash dialect available to date. While the dictionary does not have a grammatical sketch, the compiler has included a list of Kalderash prefixes and suffixes and explains their meanings and functions. Some of these prefixes, e.g. -av-, have specific morphological and semantic functions, in the case of -av-, serving to create causative verbs from other intransitive and transitive verbs. In the absence of a grammar section, the discussion of these suffixes is very helpful. Lemmas are labeled for part of speech, and noun gender and plural forms are included. Verbs are cited in the verb-stem form, which is helpful for clarification in a small subset of mostly intransitive verbs, such as asa- ‘to laugh’ or dara-, ‘to fear’, the stem of which ends in a vowel rather than the more typical consonant stem ending. Verbs are further labeled as either transitive or intransitive, and aorist forms of the verb are provided. The dictionary includes copious contextual examples and etymologies, including from Sanskrit and Hindi.

The orthography used is that typical of the South Slavic languages in the Latin script, similar to Pan-Vlax in the see Comparison of Alphabets chart after Introduction, with a few exceptions. The sound /ʃ/ does not exist in this dialect and has merged with /ʃ/, written as <š>. The sound /ʒ/ is written as <ʒ>. The uvular /ʁ/ is distinguished from the trilled or flapped [r], and is written as ɹ. The letter <ŭ> represents the semi-vowel /w/, as in English. Etymologies and source language of borrowed words are included.


A descriptive, unidirectional Romani-French dictionary with a French to Romani index. According to the preface, this work is based on a very limited vocabulary from the Erli dialect of Sofia, Bulgaria, a member of the Southern Balkan Romani group. Although the only records in WorldCat appear to be from this 1982 reprint, the work seems to have been copyrighted in 1957, so an earlier version likely exists. The dictionary is based on a number of fairytales that were first collected and published in print published by Bernard Gilliat-Smith in various issues of the Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society between 1909 and 1914. The sole information for the tales and the vocabulary was a sedentary Muslim Rrom named Mr. Paši Suljoff.

Lemmas are labeled for part of speech, and noun gender and plural forms are provided. The oblique stem of nouns is also provided, which is very helpful for those many nouns with somewhat irregular stems. Lemmas are followed by numerals in square brackets, that might presumably direct one to case or conjugation paradigms, but not sure paradigms are found in the dictionary. A number of contextual examples from the fairytales are included. Verbs are cited in the 3rd person singular and are labeled as either transitive and intransitive, and aorist forms are provided.

The orthography used is that typical of the South Slavic languages in the Latin script, similar to Pan-Vlax in the Comparison of Alphabets chart after Introduction, with a few exceptions. The
sound /ʒ/ is written as 〈ʒ〉. The uvular /ʁ/ is distinguished from the trilled or flapped [r], and is written as 〈ŗ〉. The Bulgarian letter ь is used to represent the shwa /ə/ sound. Word stress is indicated.


A descriptive dictionary of Spanish Caló-Spanish a para-Romani dialect, which I do not cover in full in this bibliography. It is, however, of interest, in that it is one of the earlier comprehensive descriptions of the lexicon of this interesting language variety, along with Borrow (1841), Pott (1841), and Trujillo (1844).


Unavailable for review. I will attempt to include for a further edition.


This dictionary is a facsimile of the the Gypsy-English dictionary section of Demeter (1990). As this is a mimeographed version held by only one library, it appears this section was copied and recataloged as an analytic record.


A descriptive, unidirectional dictionary of the Gurbet dialect, a member of the Southern Vlax dialect group, spoken in Knjaževac, Serbia, and the neighboring town, Minićevo. The stated goal of the dictionary is to facilitate the documentation of the language and culture of the local Rrom community. The lexical material, which consists of a modest 900 entries, is based on a corpus of interviews collected among the local Romani-speaking population. One of the most exciting aspects of the dictionary is that much of the work in creating it was accomplished by a group of young, local Rroma, who had attended a comprehensive workshop to learn the concepts of, and how to conduct, linguistic field research. This linguistic education then gave them the skills to
offer their services in other Rrom communities in Serbia. Certain Romani words, even if they were known by the linguistics to be common in related dialects, were not included if they could not be found in the corpus or were not widely used by the locals. The dictionary, as explained in the introduction, includes a large number of loanwords for Serbian, the exclusion of which would make the lexical representation somewhat artificial. These Serbian loanwords relate to multiple linguistic categories, e.g. nouns, verbs, and even prepositions, such as the borrowing za, i.e. ‘for’.

The lemmas are labeled for part of speech, and noun plurals and the 3rd person singular form of the aorist tense of verbs are included. Verbs are not labeled for transitivity, however as in the case with other Romani-Slavic language dictionaries this is not generally necessary, as the Serbian gloss will always be unambiguous in this regard. A contextual example from the corpus is included with each lemma. The orthography used corresponds to the Pan-Vlax alphabet (see Comparison of Alphabets chart after Introduction). Lemmas are marked for place of stress.


A descriptive, bidirectional Romani-Albanian dictionary and grammar covering a number of closely-related dialects spoken in Albania, i.e. Mechkari, Kabudji, Rupani, and Shkodrani. This is a carefully compiled and scientific dictionary. The orthography used is the International Romani Union Standard Alphabet, designed by Courthiade. All parts of speech are labeled, and aorist forms of verbs are provided. Word stress is indicated when not word-final. Plurals and object-case stems are provided for nouns, as the formation of these can differ between thematic and athematic nouns. Special attention is given to verbs, which are labeled as transitive, intransitive, reflexive, reciprocal, or causative.

In addition to being descriptive, the dictionary also has normative aims, alerting the user to a preferable choice when a particular word may not be widely understood by other Romani speakers outside of the immediate speech area. The dictionary includes a large selection of words from European Romani dialects that not are not well understood among speakers in Albania, Kosovo, and Macedonia. These words are enclosed in angle brackets. This is very useful for studying these closely related variants in the context of other Europe dialects. The dictionary also includes numerous phrases and contextual examples.


A reprint of Sztojka’s O császári és magyar királyi fensége József főherceg magyar és czigány nyelv gyök-szótára with an introduction and commentary by Marcel Courthiade. For the full discussion, see Sztojka (1886).
In full disclosure I (Geoff Husić) served as one of two editors of the English content of this dictionary. This is both a descriptive and normative, linguistically scientific, Romani-multilingual dictionary and grammatical sketch that has attempted to codify a form of European Romani suitable for publication, education, and other literary spheres of Romani life. This is a somewhat artificial form of Romani, but this is not unusual in the sense that many languages have based their literary forms on what, at their beginning, were artificial forms of the spoken language, e.g. choosing vocabulary, pronunciation, and grammatical features from a number of different dialects, especially when there has not been one predominate prestige dialect. In the case of this dictionary, this form is often called Common Romani, which refers to a collection of features which are the most broadly understood by Romani speakers across Europe, while at the same time avoiding words that are peripheral or unique to only smaller numbers of speakers. For the same reason, newer, non-core loanwords into Romani that are specific to only one or two other countries have been avoided. At the same time neologisms that have been recently coined by Romani writers have sometimes been included to supplement the vocabulary, especially for, e.g. technological concepts. The vocabulary for this dictionary was agreed upon by the large number of Rroma contributors, ensuring a product that it both cross-national and representative of the majority of speakers. There is an extensive introduction in both Hungarian and English that clearly delineates the approach, parameters, and aims of the dictionary.

The Romani lemmas are accompanied by glosses in Hungarian, English, French, Spanish, German, Ukrainian, Romanian, Croatian, Slovak, and Greek glosses, in that order. Lemmas are also labeled for basic parts of speech. The dictionary takes a morphological approach to parsing the lemmas to show the word stem, which in some cases can be ambiguous, e.g. the verb ‘to laugh’ is entered as asa/l to make it clear that this verb has the less common vowel-ending stem. Nouns similarly have the forward slash to indicate the stem, and are also accompanied by the plural form, and the stem for the oblique cases for both singular and plural forms, e.g. ‘song’ is entered as “i/e gil/i, -ǎ,-, -ǎ,-, -ěn-”. This is a useful feature that allows the user to accurately create other case forms based on the information in the grammar section. To serve its normative function, many words are included that are not recommended, and the user is directed to a preferred choice, e.g. daxn/o ... [≠ zervo]. Verbs are labeled according to a fairly complicated discussion in the introduction that delineates the different strata of Romani. In the case of verbs, this primarily affects the formation of the aorist tense form, which varies among dialects in intransitive verbs. In order to accommodate these variations across dialects, the varying aorist forms are provided and these are labeled with superscript numerals. For example, again, our verb ‘to laugh’ has: “asa/l, -ândilo1 ÷ -ândilăs1 ≈ ājas23”. Other strata features are included, but it is a bit too complicated to go into further detail here.

The orthography used is the same alphabet that was designed by the compiler, Marcel Courthiade.
(see International Romani Union Standard Alphabet after *Introduction*) and has subsequently been adopted by many other Romani writers and organizations in Europe. This alphabet is ingenious for cross-dialect use, in that it employs diacritics that can use pronounced or ignored, depending on the speaker’s own pronunciation, without otherwise distorting the graphic presentation of the rest of the word. For example, the aorist of the verb “he does”, *kerel*, is written as *kerdás*. In some speakers this will be pronounced simply /kerdas/, while others will say /kerdjas/. In actually writing, depending on the orthography used, this could be written kerdas, kerd’as, kerdjas, kerdyas, kerdias, etc. Use of the diacritics allows less distortion in the more important morphological elements of the word.

Unlike most other scientific dictionaries, this dictionary has a wealth of small, very charming illustrations that accompany many lemmas.


A brief, bidirectional Romani-Hungarian dictionary of the Lovari dialect. An inadequate 4-page grammar is also included. Lemmas are labeled for basic part of speech. Nouns are labeled for gender and plural forms are provided. Verbs are labeled as either transitive or intransitive, with no further distinction made for causative and passive-form verbs. The aorist forms of verbs are also provided. The orthography used corresponds to the American Romani alphabet. Word stress is not indicated.


A unidirectional dictionary with 911 lemmas and grammatical sketch of Spanish Caló, a para-Romani dialect not generally considered to be a true Romani dialect (see also Introduction). In addition to the alphabetical Spanish-Caló dictionary section, a number of helpful thematic Caló-Spanish wordlists, such as body parts, kinship terms, foods, etc., a collection of sayings, and the Lord’s Prayer, are also provided. The compilers are somewhat vague about how the vocabulary was collected, so it is unclear if they collected the material from informants or from other published sources. The orthography closely follows that of Spanish. Škrabánková (2010:55) has done a detailed analysis of the overlap of this dictionary with the earlier Rebolledo (1909) and notes that there is considerable, but not total, overlap of the vocabulary included.

See also Škrabánková (2010) in Other Works Consulted.

A descriptive dictionary, published in two volumes, vol. 1, *English to Romani* and vol. 2, *Romani to English*. The compiler states that the vocabulary included was collected primarily from Sampson’s *Dialect of the Gypsies of Wales* (1926), with additions based on his own observations. He correctly observes that the vocabulary included will not necessarily closely correspond to that used by Rroma of Wales today. It is reasonable to assume therefore that there will be some admixture of older and more modern vocabulary items, although not all are labeled as such. Nevertheless, it is a respectable collection of vocabulary and has some very helpful additional features. For example, in the English-Romani section, rather than just providing lemmas consisting of nouns, verbs, etc., as is common in shorter works such as this, Dawson includes a number of phrasal entries, such as “in high spirits” = *ladilo*. Verbs are labeled as (v.), but somewhat inconsistently, and there is no indication with English verbs of ambiguous transitivity such as ‘to close’, of whether the verb is transitive or intransitive. Otherwise no other parts of speech are labeled.

The orthography used is based on that typical for Anglo-Romani, eschewing any diacritics, unlike Sampson’s dictionary, which uses a sophisticated phonemic transcription liberally employing diacritics such as macrons and carons. Aspirated consonants are indicated with a following apostrophe, and the digraph <kh> represents the voiceless velar fricative /x/ and not the aspirated /k/. The affricate /tʃ/, and the fricatives /ʃ/, /ʒ/ are written with the digraphs <ch>, <sh>, and <zh> respectively. The common Romani voiceless alveolo-palatal affricate /tɕ/ and the aspirated counterpart of /tʃ/, i.e. /tʃh/, had merged with <ch> in this dialect. Word stress is not provided, nor is vowel length.


A descriptive, bidirectional Romani-Russian dictionary and grammar covering the Kalderash dialect of the Vlax group spoken in the former USSR, which, the compiler explains, has the second largest number of speakers in the territory, Baltic and Ukrainian Romani having the most. The dictionary is also supplemented with a unidirectional Romani-English index, and the “Structure of the dictionary” section is also in English. The dictionary is preceded by an informative introduction giving a detailed overview of the dialects of Romani spoken on the territory of the USSR, and a detailed discussion of the various layers of vocabulary found, e.g. 1) vocabulary borrowed before entering Europe, which is mostly common to all currently spoken Romani variants; 2) that vocabulary which is original but only common to closely-related dialects; and 3) that vocabulary acquired from European languages among which the Rroma have lived. Within this context, he explains that the Kalderash vocabulary in this last category comes primarily from the Banat-Transylvania dialects of Romanian.

Lemmas are labeled for gender, part of speech, and noun plurals, many of which are irregular plural forms based on Romanian neuter noun plurals. Verbs are not labeled in regard to transitivity or valency, but as these will generally be obvious from the Russian gloss, it is not an
impediment. Aorist forms are provided for transitive verbs. Past-tense participial forms are given for intransitive verbs, alongside the aorist forms used in some dialect variants. Verb lemmas are accompanied by copious examples of verbal fixed and figurative expressions. Word stress is provided in all entries.

Etymologies are provided for words not of the original Indic stock, and in most cases, these will be from Romanian or Slavic languages. The orthography used in the Romani-Russian section is the Russian Cyrillic alphabet with the addition of letter $<$x$>$ after consonants to indicate aspiration, $<$r$>$ to indicate $/$h/, and $<$pp$>$ to distinguish the uvular $/$ʁ/ sound. The orthography used in the Romani-English sections is somewhat more elaborate and distinguished some sounds that the Cyrillic does not, $<$š$>$, $<$ž$>$ (palatal) versus $<$š$>$, $<$ž$>$ (non-palatal), and the shwa, written as $<$ə$>$.  


A bidirectional Romani-Montenegrin (former call Montenegrin Serbian) dictionary. The compilers explain that the dictionary is both descriptive and normative. It is descriptive in that much of the vocabulary appears to be based on the Gurbet dialect, although the dialect designation is not mentioned in the introduction. It is also normative in that it includes a large number of Montenegrin calques, as well as many Romani words found in other dialects that have been lost in the speech of the Rroma in this region. The compilers explain it is important to preserve and teach this linguistic heritage in order to fully understand Romani culture. There are approximately 7200 lemmas in the Romani-Montenegrin section. As either a descriptive or normative dictionary it is substantially lacking. Romani lemmas are labeled only for basic part of speech and noun gender. Noun plurals are not provided nor is word stress. Verbs are labeled simply as “verb” with no further guidance provided. In some cases, word variants are provided, which is helpful, e.g. ajrat ‘tonight’ is accompanied by the variants erat, arać, although it is unclear if these are local variants or equivalents from other dialects. No contextual examples or phrases are given except in the case of verbs using the auxiliary del ‘to give’, which is commonly used to create compound verbs, e.g. del avazo ‘to vote’. No etymologies are provided to distinguish core Indic and other early Romani words from later borrowing from neighboring languages. As one of the stated goals of the work is to help understand Romani culture, including etymologies would certainly have been a useful feature.

The orthography is based on the Montenegrin Serbian alphabet with typical modifications. The voiceless alveolo-palatal affricate $/$t$ʃ$/ is written as $<$ć$>$ and the voiceless retroflex affricate $/$t$ʃ$/ as $<$ć$>$. The voiced alveolo-palatal affricate $/$d$ʒ$/ is written as $<$dj$>$ and the voiced retroflex affricate $/$d$ʒ$/ as $<$dž$>$. Aspirated consonants are written with a following $<$h$>$ for $<$č$>$, $<$č$>$, $<$kh$>$, $<$ph$>$, and $<$th$>$. Curiously, while all the other aspirated consonants have their own alphabetic heading in the dictionary, words beginning with $<$ph$>$ are interfiled with other lemmas
in the “P” section. The uvular /ʁ/ is written as <rr>, and /x/ as <x>.


Reprint of (Dorph 1837). Please see the entries for *Rotwelsche Grammatik (1755)* and Girtler (2010) for my comments on the Para-Romani variant.


Not a comprehensive dictionary, but rather a dictionary of core Romani verbs and their etymological origins from older Indic languages and their semantic and syntactic features.


A descriptive, bidirectional Romani-Greek dictionary, with approximately 1,500 lemmas in each section. The dialect recorded is an unspecified variant of the Vlax-Romani group, but naturally one with an even larger number of more recent Greek loanwords than appear in Vlax dialects spoken in other countries. The compiler does not appear to be have been very comfortable in his own methodology. He states that he hopes the work will be later improved by other scholars and ask readers to report errors. Nevertheless, this small dictionary is a helpful contribution to the documentation of Greek-Romani lexicology, about which there are only a few other published works.

The dictionary is rather basic. Lemmas are not labeled for part of speech, nor is noun gender indicated. Plural forms of nouns are, however, provided. No contextual examples are given. The orthography is based on the modern Greek alphabet and therefore some entries will be found in somewhat usual areas, especially if one’s knowledge of Greek is based on the classical form of the alphabet. For example, wording beginning with the consonants /b/ and /d/, will be filed under the digraphs <ντ> and <μπ> respectively. The consonant cluster /nt/ is thus written as <ν-τ> to disambiguate it from <ντ>. The uvular /ʁ/ is written as <ρρ>. The sound /g/ is written with the digraph <γκ>. The aspirated consonants /kh/, /ph/, and /th/ are written as <κχ>, <πχ>, and <θ>, respectively. The fricative /ʃ/ and the affricates /tʃ/ and /dʒ/ are written as <ς>, <τσ>, and <τζ> respectively. Word stress is indicated.

A descriptive Romani-French dictionary of the Sinté Romani dialect spoken in the Piedmont region of southern France, with a French-Romani index. The vocabulary of 1586 words is based on two corpora of texts collected among Sinti informants, one collected by George Calvet in the Rhône region in 1982 and 1983, and the other by Bernard Formoso in 1960. This dialect, as noted by the compilers, is especially interesting due to the large number of loanwords from the western European languages, primarily German, and Italian dialectal words, e.g. Piedmontese, which exceed the number of French loanwords, in addition to the other loan sources common to many other dialects, e.g. Slavic, Greek, and Romanian vocabulary.

The vocabulary is labeled for all parts of speech. Nouns include labels for gender and plural forms are included. The treatment of verbs is especially good, as verbs are labeled as either transitive or intransitive, and the aorist stems of verbs are provided. Contextual examples for the corpora are included. The language source of loanwords is also indicated.

The orthography used is that typical of the South Slavic languages in the Latin script, similar to Pan-Vlax in Comparison of Alphabets chart after Introduction, with a few exceptions. The letter [ć] is lacking. The uvular /ʁ/ is not distinguished from the trilled or flapped [r], having been neutralized in this dialect due to influence from German, in which the difference in the two sounds is regional rather than phonemic. Several additional vowel letters, [ü], [ē], and [ī] have been added to represent the sounds in the French mur and peu, and the Polish [y] respectively, which occur in loanwords from those and other languages.


A descriptive dictionary and grammatical sketch of the Xoraxané dialect, which is spoken predominately by Muslim Rroma in Italy, most of whom were originally immigrants from Bosnia. This dialect, a member of the Vlax group, although using the same name, differs from the one spoken by Muslims in the Thrace region of Greece (see Liapes (1998)). The work appears to be a typescript and the only two known copies are owned by Michigan State Libraries and the Cleveland Public Library.


I have included this book in order to avoid any confusion that may arise, as the topic of Rotwelsch, a kind of German ‘cant’, or secret language, is occasionally mistakenly found in the context of the Romani language. I suspect that the somewhat ill-defined term 'cant’ explains the erroneous subject heading “Romani language” that has been added to the WorldCat cataloging record for this book. Rotwelsch was used by traveling tradesmen and vagabonds in southern
Germany and Switzerland and still exists today among some traveling show people. While Rotwelsch certainly does use some words of Romani origin, the language itself is clearly German, with a large number of loan words from other languages, such as Yiddish, Italian, the Slavic languages, and German regional dialects.

The complier includes several wordlists categorized by topic such as clothing, work, beggar terminology, etc. Of the several hundreds of words under these categories, the vast majority are from Yiddish or German dialects. Several words appear to be mislabeled. While Rotwelsch, as a crypto-language, is very interesting in its own right, the Romani element is too diffuse to be of linguistic interest to those studying the Romani language.


A descriptive, bidirectional Romani-English dictionary of over 3600 words and grammar of the form of Kalderash Romani spoken by Johan Dmitri Taikon (1879-1950), a Swedish-Rrom coppersmith. It appears to be the first detailed study of Romani spoken in Sweden. While Taikon claimed to be born in Sweden this was never able to be verified. He lived most of his life in Sweden and also claimed to have traveled in Norway, Finland, Russia, the Baltic states, Poland, German, and France. He was said to have also been fluent in Russian, which leaves somewhat of a mystery concerning his actual origin. The first compiler of this book, Gjerdman, met Taikon in 1942. Taikon aided Gjerdman as a linguistic informant for an article “Tattarna och deras språk” [The Rroma and their language]. Taikon had apparently already had a linguistic interest in his own language and had compiled a collection of paper cards with words written in Romani and Swedish. Taikon seems to have been motivate by the desire to learn if Romani was related to Sanskrit, a fact that had already been long known by scholars. Gjerdman and Taikon had a long acquaintance and worked together further on their wordlists and grammar with financial support from the Swedish crown prince and a humanitarian foundation.

The dictionary portion of the work (pp. 193-396) consists of approximately 3,600 words. An English word index (pp. 399-451) follows the dictionary. The responsibility for the dictionary belongs primarily to the second compiler, Ljungberg (1843-1915), an industrial engineer by profession, who had traveled for three years with Taikon and other Romani families. Lemmas are followed by a brief Swedish gloss, but the remainder of the entries, e.g. linguistic labels and contextual examples, are in English. Lemmas are labeled for part of speech and gender, and stress is indicated. Etymologies are provided for words of non-Indic origin. Nouns and verbs are labeled with a numeral correlated to grammatical classes elaborated in the grammar, from which conjugation type, plural formations, and verbal forms such as the aorist can be derived. While verbal valency is not overtly indicated, these can generally be ascertained through the ample contextual examples provided in the entries.

The orthography is that typical of those used in the South Slavic countries, using the letters <$š$> and <$ž$> for the sibilants /ʃ/ and /ʒ/. The affricates /ts/, /tʃ/, and /dz/ are written as the digraphs
<ts>, <tš>, and <dž>. The aspirated consonants are written as <kh>, <ph>, and <th>. The uvular /ʁ/ is written as <r̥>. The quality of vowels (open or closed), is indicated. The closed vowels are written as the plain letters <a>, <e>, <i>, <o>, and <u>. There are two separate phonemes for the vowels /e/-/ɛ/ and /i/-/ɪ/. The open counterparts for the first vowel is written as <e̥>. The letter <i̥> represents a vowel shorter than <i>, similar to the vowel in English “bit”. The alphabet also includes the vowel <i̭> under the influence of Swedish. The diphthongs are written as they usually appear in Romanin but with a low circumflex under the semivowel, i.e. <aj>, <æi>, <ço>, <je>, <oq>, <uy>, e.g. phabai ‘apple’, træba ‘matter’, hulæo ‘eagle’, djæs ‘day’, kœaza ‘shell’, and phuçi (variant of phuv ‘soil’).


A descriptive, bidirectional Romani-French dictionary of the Sinté dialect, or Manouche (Manush), as it is usually referred to in France, a member of the Northwestern Romani dialect group. The compiler thanks a large number of individuals, presumably his linguistic informants, in his introduction, however there is little information to indicate the scope of the vocabulary or the methodology used. The compiler states that the dictionary is intended for both Sinté speakers as well as speakers of French. Several other published works on Sinté are cited in his bibliography, and these may be the primary source of the vocabulary. The vocabulary is heavily derived from German. Since this dictionary does not included a grammar section, one might be misled to believe that Sinté is a para-Romani dialect, although the common Romani syntax and morphology is preserved in this dialect. The dictionary includes some items which are quite unusual for dictionaries of this type, such as the Romani equivalents of ethnonyms for nationalities such as taïlánari for “Thai”.

The dictionary labels Romani lemmas for basic part of speech, including noun gender, but little else. Nouns plurals are not included, nor are aorist forms of verbs. Verbs are cited in the 1st person singular, which in this dialect usually appears as the ending -o, a contraction of the original, common-Romani ending -av, e.g. chwimo “Je nage”, i.e. ‘I swim’, and are labeled simply as “verb” with no information about transitivity. In the French-Romani section, verbs are listed and indexed after the French pronoun “je”, e.g. the Romani verb do, ‘I give’, is located at “Je donne”, among all the other verbs, indexed under the letter ‘J”. This is a very unusual way of handling indexing in a dictionary and is a feature that the user will have to be aware of in order to be able to locate desired verbs in this section.

Etymologies are usually included, which is useful, however in some cases the etymology does not seem to bear any relationship to the lemma. For example, the etymology given for rara, French “longtemps”, i.e. ‘for a long time’, is the Persian hamisheh (my romanization), which in fact means ‘always’.

40: Győrffy, Endre (1885). Magyar és czigány szótár: Czigányul mondva vakeriben
A unidirectional Hungarian-Romani dictionary. What makes this dictionary different from any other is that inflected noun forms, noun plurals, and conjugated verb forms for both Hungarian and Romani appear as individual lemmas. Since many poorer dictionaries do not take any care in presenting these critical grammatical points, it is very refreshing to see this feature, even if it makes the overall presentation a bit messy. Other than this integrated feature, there is no labeling for grammatical features, including noun gender. The orthography used is identical to that of Hungarian.


Unavailable for review, however this appears to be a dictionary of pronunciation of the Hungarian Lovari dialect.


This is the first unidirectional, normative, Serbian-Romani dictionary and grammar. It is a rather monumental work due to the sheer number of vocabulary items covered, approximately 50,000 words. The compiler is a Rrom writer and advocate for Romani rights from Kosovo. He states that the goal of the work is to establish cultural and linguistic bases for standardizing Romani and to support integrating Romani into the Serbian education system. The dictionary is based primarily on the Gurbet, Kalderash, and Arli dialects. However, individual words are not labeled accordingly, and there is no way to distinguish the dialect of the entry if they differ.

Glosses are very basic, and word stress is not indicated. There are no examples with fixed or figurative expressions provided. Basic parts of speech are labeled. The treatment of verbs is, however, somewhat confusing. Verbs are labeled simply as “verb” with no further qualification, such as transitivity. Lemmas have Serbian reflexive and non-reflexive form verbs together, e.g. iskriti (se), which can be confusing, as Romani reflexive and non-reflexive forms often have different stem forms, and that information about the variant forms is not provided. In addition, the Romani verbs are labeled as perfective or imperfective, which makes little sense since Romani does not share the binary verbal-aspect system found in Slavic languages. This label reflects the aspect of the Serbian verb in the lemma, not the Romani one. No aorist forms are provided, which is surprising, considering the stated normative nature of the dictionary, since past-tense forms, as discussed in my introduction, vary substantially among dialects. It would be difficult for a user to know how to derive a past-tense form for a verb such as čhol ‘to put
in’ (under uterati, p. 476). This verb is a shorter-form variant of a fuller form ćhuvel, not found in this dictionary, and most likely has the aorist form ćhutja in these dialects. The form of reflexive verbs that is common in these dialects, whereby the active verb is accompanied by the reflexive pronoun pes ‘self’, a feature borrowed from other Balkan languages, is common in the dictionary, but is not discussed in the grammar section.

Some words are labeled based on the etymology of words not of the original common Romani stock, e.g. Latin, Arabic, Greek, but oddly not for Romanian, which has had profound influence on these dialects. Words pertaining to technology are labeled according to discipline, e.g. geology, linguistics, etc., which is doubtless useful for the Romani audience. The orthography used is the International Romani Union Standard Alphabet. There is also a Slovenian version based on the Serbian edition see Haliti (2012).


This descriptive, unidirectional Slovenian-Romani dictionary of the Gurbet dialect is based primarily on Haliti (2011), and comments on that edition are also valid for this work. The authors also took the additional step to verify words for inclusion using Gurbet-speaking informants, originally from Kosovo, now residing in Maribor, Slovenia. While the dictionary portion covers the same lexicon as the Serbian edition, the introduction, by Hazemina Đonlic, and the grammatical sketch, by Gjoko Nikolovski, are different, and contain a discussion of Romani dialects and an expanded grammar section.


A normative Romani-German dictionary of approximately 4,700 words. The dialect appears to be Burgenland-Romani, a member of the larger Southern Central Romani dialect group. As the title indicates, the goal of this project was apparently an attempt to standardize a form of Romani to be suitable for pedagogy in Austria. The Romani lemmas are labeled for part of speech, gender, and variants, the latter usually based on phonetic differences among dialects, are provided, e.g. the word ‘song’ has the entry: dschili subst. fem. b. Lied [gili]. Plural forms for nouns are not provided nor or any other morphological forms. The orthography is based on that of German, as can be seen in this rather unwieldy dschili, pronounced [dʒili]. Word stress is not indicated.

I am grateful to the wonderful library staff at the Michigan State University Special Collections for scanning portions of this dictionary for my review, as it is not available for interlibrary loan. MSU is the only known holding library for this work. The reason for this becomes clearer when
reading the introduction, which states that it was printed in a very small run exclusively for the
use of the participants of a linguistic project called *Kodifizierung und Didaktisierung des Roman*
[Codification and Didactization of Romani] at the Karl Franzens Universität, Graz, Austria.
More info on the project at: [http://romaniprojekt.uni-graz.at/autroma-project.de.html](http://romaniprojekt.uni-graz.at/autroma-project.de.html)


A descriptive, bidirectional Anglo-Romani-English dictionary. This is a rather typical collection
of Anglo-Romani words and phrases, which, due to its para-Romani nature, I will not treat in
full. The compiler’s grandparents were apparently native speakers of Anglo-Romani when it was
still to be heard in England, and he became interested in their language as a teenager but was not
fluent in the language himself. The work seems typically derivative of earlier works, and even
perpetuates some of the errors found in earlier Anglo-Romani dictionaries [1] while also
introducing some European features that do not naturally occur in Anglo-Romani [2]. The
dictionary is, however, very entertaining to read, and the photographs and drawings are very
charming.


46: **Horváth, Rudolf** et al. (2014). *Magyarországi kóbor czigányok nyelvtana: czigány-magyar

Unavailable for review. I will attempt to include in a future edition.

[Romani-Czech and Czech-Romani pocket dictionary]*. Praha: Fortuna. ISBN:
9788071686194. WorldCat: [https://www.worldcat.org/oclc/44732716](https://www.worldcat.org/oclc/44732716). [Text in: Czech]

A reprint of the 1991 edition **Hübschmannová (1991)**. There do not appear to be any changes or
additions to the content, and pagination has remained identical.


This is the first comprehensive, descriptive, bidirectional Romani-Czech dictionary. A detailed
grammatical sketch is also included. The primary compiler, Professor Milena Hübschmannová
(1993-2005) of Charles University in Prague, was a leading authority on the Romani language.
and the founder of the first undergraduate academic Romani-studies program anywhere in the world [1]. She had studied Romani for over 30 years, and much of this dictionary was the result of her own field research. The vocabulary selected seems to be primarily from the Romungro dialect spoken in Slovakia, since the dialect spoken in the Czech Republic had mostly died out, however this designation does not appear explicitly in the introductory text. Some words are labeled as (reg.) for "regional," however without any further explanation to which region the words pertain, this label is not particularly helpful.

The dictionary includes an impressive number of words and a larger than typical number of contextual examples for the lemmas. Curiously, verbs are not labeled at all, and aorist forms are not provided in association with the lemma. Many different unlabeled forms of verbs are presented, such as imperative, causal, impersonal, and passive forms, however these appear as separate lemmas with no information linking the various forms. Lack of any information or systematic treatment for verbs other than the gloss is a considerable deficiency. Nevertheless, it is possible to implicitly glean the transitivity and valencies of most verbs based on the Czech glosses of the examples. In Czech, like other Slavic languages, it is usually much easier to ascertain the transitivity of verbs than from English glosses.

The orthography is based on that of Czech, similar to the alphabet that had already been adopted by the Svaz Cikánů-Romů (Union of Gypsies-Roma) in Czechoslovakia in the early 1970s [2]. In addition to the typical Czech characters, aspirated consonants are indicated by following the consonant with the letter <h>, e.g. <th>. The digraph <dž> is used to distinguish this affricate /dʒ/ from the more palatal <d’>. Word stress is not indicated. The aim of the dictionary is primarily descriptive insofar as it covers a specific cluster of northern Romani dialects spoken in Slovakia. There are no specific recommendations favoring one-word choice over another, although some words are labeled with an asterisk to indicate that they are obsolete in contemporary speech. Etymologies are not provided.


Library catalog records for the language of this ethnic group, the Beás, often erroneously include the subject heading “Romani language,” however the Beás speak a form of Romanian, rather than Romani. This entry is included only to provide clarity.

This is a verb basic Caló-Spanish wordlist, which I do not cover in full in this bibliography. There are several reprint editions also available in WorldCat.


This Romani-Serbian-English dictionary is limited to religious terminology. As it is not a general dictionary, I have not reviewed it for this bibliography, but have chose to include the entry for those interested.


The first comprehensive, bidirectional Romani-Croatian dictionary and grammar. The compiler had a difficult task, as such a large number of Romani dialects, some with strained mutual intelligibility, are spoken in Croatia. He chose as the basis for the dictionary the Gurbet and Arli dialects, as they are represented by large numbers of speakers and are widely represented in the other countries of the Balkans. Gurbet lemmas are unlabeled and Arli lemmas are labeled as such, as are words in other dialects that occasionally appear. The compiler mentions that the dictionary began with normative aims but ended up going the more descriptive route. However, his inclusion of a large number of neo-Indic coinages of interest to romologs, but not normally recognized among the actual speakers, appears to be a concession to this earlier aim. He also includes a large number of neologisms from common European and Slavic words, and Romani calques based on these, e.g. *šunavipe* ‘slušateljstvo [listenership]’. Lemmas are glossed only in Croatian and are labeled according to the basic part of speech and gender, but there are very few grammatical observations or contextual examples. The treatment of the verb is a specific weakness. Verbs are labeled only as verb, with no further information about transitivity, causality, reflexivity, etc. While the Croatian gloss will make some of this information clear, this will not be of much assistance to users who do not read a South Slavic language. Past participles are not distinguished from adjectives. The aorist form, for the Gurbet only, are provided. No etymologies, other than those inherent in the neologisms and neo-Indic labels, are given. The orthography is based on Croatian with the typical additions, e.g. <h> after a <č>, <p>, and <k> to indicate aspiration, distinguishing <h> from <x>, and <ř> to indicate the uvular /ʁ/ sound.

Norwegian]

Unavailable for review. I will attempt to include in a future edition.


A Romani-Norwegian-English dictionary of the Norwegian para-Romani dialect, Rommano, which incorporates original Romani words into Swedish grammar.


A bidirectional Romani-Hungarian dictionary of the Lovari dialect. There is no introduction, so the scope and intent are not entirely clear. In my rough estimated there are approximately 6500 Romani lemmas in the Romani-Hungarian section. A brief grammatical sketch is included at the end. The Romani lemmas are labeled for basic part of speech and noun gender, and noun plural forms are included. Verbs are presented in the 3rd personal singular and are labeled as either transitive or intransitive, however aorist tense forms are not provided, although their formation is discussed in the grammar section. The main orthography used is similar to the American Romani Alphabet (see Comparison of Alphabets chart after Introduction), however lemmas are also spelled out using Hungarian orthography to aid pronunciation, e.g. the lemma lunzhol is accompanied by the pronunciation aid (lunszol). This is perhaps to also accommodate Romani users who are more comfortable with the Hungarian alphabet. Lemmas are not marked to indicate word stress.


While primarily a grammar of Romani spoken in Macedonia, this work is noteworthy as the first attempt to produce a normative Romani grammar and vocabulary in any country. The authors began the work in 1973, but it was not published until 1980 [1]. The grammar is based on the most widespread dialects in Macedonia, Arli, Bugurdži, and Džambazi. The grammar has parallel Romani and Macedonian text. The vocabulary that accompanies the grammar consists of about 2000 lemmas. In the foreword to the dictionary section, the compilers explain that the selection of words includes both vocabulary from the grammar section as well as other very common words and expressions shared by the three dialects, although the dictionary itself does not label any individual words by dialect. The authors have also introduced many Hindi words for grammatical and other technical concepts for which there are no common Romani words, e.g. avazi ‘speech sound’ from Hindi avaz ‘voice’.
Lemmas are labeled for basic part of speech, however plural forms of nouns are not provided. Verbs, which are cited in the 3rd-person singular of the present tense, are not labeled at all, however the aorist forms, which appear in separate lemmas, are labeled. A variety of derived verb forms often accompany the basic verb forms, but these also appear in separate lemmas without any systematic treatment showing their relationships. The authors developed their own orthography for use in their grammar. In order to make their alphabet more accessible to Rroma in neighboring countries where the Latin script is used, they based their alphabet on the Serbian Latin script with the addition of the letter <ä>, to represent a rare shwa sound. The letter <x> serves as the Cyrillic letter <х>, the voiceless velar fricative, to distinguish that sound from the Latin letter <h>, the glottal fricative. In addition, they introduced two digraphs <kj> and <gj>, to represent the palatal quality of those consonants.


Kogâniceanu (1817-1891) was a Romanian polymath and prime minister of Romania from 1863-1865. His history of the Rroma, written first in French and then translated into German in 1840, is primarily a synthesis of other literature on the topic available at the time, but also includes many of his own original observations. A unidirectional French-Romani wordlist, primarily reflecting the Northern Vlax dialect, is included on pages 37-46 following a brief grammatical sketch. The wordlist appears to consist of vocabulary collected by other researchers, as is evidenced by certain mistaken information such as the frequently cited entry for ‘hedgehog’ - *hotschautscha*, which is taken from Anglo-Romani *hochiwichi* and would not have occurred in any variant of European Romani with which the author could have come in contact. The orthography used is based primarily on conventions for French. I have included this brief entry primarily because I have referenced it in my discussion of (Vaillant 1837).


Romani-Finnish-English companion volume to Koivisto (2001). While the dictionary includes both Finnish and English glosses, contextual samples, which are ample, are glossed only in Finnish. The introduction is in English but addresses only the history of the language and the problems of Romani language retention in Finland. Lemmas are labeled for basic part of speech.
Verbs are cited in the 1st-person singular form, but no further information concerning transitivity or valency is provided, nor are aorist forms given. No indication of gender is given for nouns, and plural forms are also not provided. Word stress is also not indicated.

The orthography is a modified form of the Finnish alphabet and uses the Finnish convention of doubling vowels to indicate length in the vowels <aa> and <ee>. The affricates /dʒ/ and /tʃ/ are written as <dž> and <tš>. The voiceless velar fricative /x/ is written as <ȟ>. The dictionary does not include any etymological information, however the dictionary does indicate the other bibliographic sources from which lemmas and examples are borrowed.


A descriptive, unidirectional Finnish-Romani dictionary of the Finnish Romani dialect called Kaalo. While the dictionary does contain an impressive number of Finnish lemmas and associated Romani glosses, it will not be very helpful to users, even Finnish speakers, studying this dialect from a linguistic perspective. The dictionary does not provide any English glosses or contextual examples, unlike his Romani-English companion volume, Koivisto (1994). The grammatical categories of the Romani glosses must be inferred from the Finnish lemmas, since the only part of speech labeled is the gender of nouns. No plural forms of nouns are provided. Verbs are not labeled at all, however the transitivity and valency of the Romani verbs will, in most cases, be obvious to speakers of Finnish. Verb lemmas appear in the first-person singular, which, in this variant of Balkan Romani appears as a final long /a:/ written <aa>. The third-person singular follows in brackets. No aorist forms or stems are provided. Some source dictionaries from which variant forms are taken are labeled with abbreviations, and the full citations of the sources appear in the bibliography. However, since these source dictionaries range in publication date from 1901 to 1994, there is the possibility of some problems from the descriptive, synchronic perspective. The orthography is a modified form of the Finnish alphabet and uses the Finnish convention of doubling vowels to indicate length in the vowels <aa> and <ee>. The affricates /dʒ/ and /tʃ/ are written as <dž> and <tš>. The voiceless velar fricative /x/ is written as <ȟ>.


This is an English-Romani companion volume to the Romani-English counterpart. Please see Lee (2010) for full commentary.

There are so few resources that document Romani as it is spoken in North and South America that we are very fortunate to have access to three books that have been compiled by Ronald Lee. This descriptive dictionary of the Vlax Kalderash dialect is a companion volume to his Romani dictionary: English-Kalderash, and both are, in turn, companions to his Learn Romani (Lee 2005, 2013), see in Other Works Consulted. The compiler’s stated audiences are young Rroma in North America and others interested in Romani. To better serve the first audience, he has chosen to employ a form of orthography easily accessible to speakers of English and Spanish (more below). The vocabulary included is based primarily on the author’s own dialect and is supplemented with useful common Vlax Romani words used by European speakers with which the compiler became familiar during his travels. These European words are labeled as such, with “Eur,” where they occur in the two dictionaries. Lemmas are also labeled for a number of additional features such as European origin, although French and Spanish seem to be the only languages thus labeled. Other topical labels, such as for military, music, neologisms, and slang, also appear.

Basic parts of speech and gender are indicated for each lemma. Only irregular plurals of nouns are provided, otherwise the user must rely on information on plural forms that is found in the grammar section. Explanations such as “Plural nouns such as love ‘money’ and tsáliya ‘clothes’ are entered as nm/pl or nf/pl” are not particularly helpful, without further context. These plurals are, in fact, pluralia tantum, but the compiler does not explain this concept. While the topic of thematic/athematic morphological forms is discussed in the grammar section, entries are not labeled as such, e.g. in the case of athematic verbs. Instead, the user is informed in the grammar section (p. 6) that these can generally be identified by their non-word-final stress. Word stress is only indicated in cases where it does not fall on the final syllable of the word and therefore appears mostly in athematic words. In this dialect, the stress on even thematic adjectives may shift to the first syllable. In such cases this occurs after the definite article, e.g. Wo si manush barvaló ‘He is a rich man’ versus O bárvalo manush mulo ‘The rich man died’. These stress shifts are indicated in the contextual examples.

Verbs, which are presented in the 3rd person singular form, are labeled as transitive, intransitive, or reflexive, although a more elaborate treatment of verbs does appear in the grammar section. A generous number of contextual examples are included for the more common verbs. Regrettably, past tense forms are not provided with the lemmas, although these do occasionally appear in examples provided in the entry. Past tense forms, both the aorist for transitive verbs and the participial forms for intransitive verbs, which are used in the dialect, must be determined based on information provided in the grammar section, unless they occur in an example, such as Daráilo o grast ‘The horse became frightened’. While past participles are included, it will be difficult for a casual user to employ these forms to generate conjugated past tense forms. Reflexive forms are not clearly linked to their active counterparts, and so these will frequently not appear contiguously, e.g. del ‘to give’ and dinyol to be given.

The orthography used avoids any diacritics or special characters in order to be accessible to the average North American user. The digraphs <ch>, <sh>, and <zh>, are used in place of the
common European <ë>, <ês>, and <ż>. The letter <y> rather than <j> is used for the semivowel. Vowels in the dictionary do include some diacritics, but, as explained in the compiler’s introduction, these have been included to assist in explaining their approximate pronunciation and to distinguish between similar vowels. It is not expected that users will employ these in their own writings and personal communications.


A descriptive, unidirectional Greek-Romani dictionary of the Xoraxané dialect spoken by Muslims in the Thrace region of Greece. This particular dialect is a member of the Southern Balkan Romani group and therefore differs from the Vlax dialect, also called Xoraxané. The orthography used is the Greek alphabet.


A descriptive, bidirectional, Romani-German dictionary A substantial portion of the book (pp. 1-122) contains an historical overview and sociological study of the German Rroma, albeit a disturbingly biased and overtly racist one. The Romani-German section contains approximately 1500 lemmas. The dialect covered seems to be Sinté, although this designation does not appear in the introduction. The compiler was a criminal lawyer who claimed to have had several decades of close contact with Rroma clients. The compiler states that the vocabulary is based on the work of Pott (Pott 1844), however Liebich’s main contribution seems to have been stripping out much of the useful information that Pott supplied in his dictionary. He claims to have verified each word with at least three Rroma to verify accuracy and to note discrepancies. His informants were presumably German Rroma speaking Sinté, however he includes certain examples such as bullīna ‘elephant’, about which he states, ‘I have only heard this word once, and from a French Rrom.’

The chapter preceding the dictionary, “Allgemeine Bemerkungen über die Sprache der Zigeuner” [General comments on the language of the Rroma] is superficial and does not address the structure of the dictionary. Parts of speech are not labeled, but these are generally clear from the German gloss. Noun gender is curiously not provided, nor are noun plurals. Stress is indicated when not word-final, although this is not explained. Verbs are cited in the 1st-person singular, otherwise no information is given about other conjugated and tense forms. Occasional contextual examples are included. Liebich has not included any etymologies. The orthography is based on German in roman-Latin script, rather than the Fraktur script used for the German content of the book, with the following modifications typical of German orthography: /ds/ as <dsch>, /tf/ as <tsch>, /x/ and as <ch>. The digraphs <kh>, <ph>, and <th> represent the aspirated consonants. The minimal pair /tf/ and /tʃ/ are not differentiated and are both written as
The uvular /ʁ/ is also not differentiated from /r/, and both are written as <r>.

Although not a lexicological matter, I would be remiss not to mention a sinister association with this book. It is claimed that a quote from this book was later borrowed by Karl Binding and Alfred Hoche in their book *Die Freigabe der Vernichtung lebensunwerten Lebens* (1920) [Allowing the Destruction of Life Unworthy of Life], which justified euthanasia and was later applied to justify the extermination of Rroma during the Second World War.[1] Although Liebich’s book is often cited as the source of this term ‘lives not worth living,’ a page number is never provided. While I have gone through this text word-for-word, I have not been able to find this exact phrase. It may have originated in some other of his writings, as it certainly seems consistent with Liebich’s general opinion of the Rroma.


Facsimile reprint edition of Liebich (1863), therefore also in Fraktur script. This reprint edition has additional commentary and a bibliography written by Erich Carlsohn.

64: Liebich, Richard and Erich Carlsohn (1968). *Zigeuner in ihrem Wesen und in ihrer Sprache* [Rroma in their lives and language]. Wiesbaden: Dr Martin Sändig oHG. WorldCat: https://www.worldcat.org/oclc/941953643. [Text in: German (Fraktur script)]

Unavailable for review. I will attempt to include in a future edition.


A substantial dictionary of Spanish Caló, a para-Romani dialect. The work is highly derivative of Rebolledo (1900).


This work, based on the Lovari dialect, purports to be a trilingual English-French-Romani dictionary, but it is trilingual only for the reason that the English lemmas are glossed in both French and Romani. As there are no French-to-Romani, or Romani-to-French, or Romani-to-English indexes, this approach is of no utility when trying to come from the direction of the
Romani word. The selection of words and the forms presented is rather random, and the scope of the lexicon is not clear or discussed in the introduction. At first glance, this appears to be a phrase book, but that misunderstanding is based on the rather confusing and inconsistent way words are presented. The preface was written by Félix Monget, however the authorship of the remaining introductory matter is unclear. This appears to have been written by someone other than Lush, as it is in very poor English, and Lush, who is an American from Indiana, would presumably have written something more idiomatic. The introductory matter also gives no guidance into the structure and intent of the dictionary.

Lemmas are not labeled in any fashion, e.g. for part of speech, noun gender, plural forms, word stress, etymologies, etc. Verbs may be presented in a naked-root form, the 3rd person singular, or another finite form via a phrase, with no consistency. For example, for the lemma “to laugh” he gives the Romani glosses “as, assal”. Confusingly, and with no explanation, the following heading, “he laughs”, is given as “hasal”, “he laughed” as “hasasalo”, and finally “laughter” as “asalimo, asalipe”. Some English lemmas offer a number of variants, with no explanation of their scope, e.g. the entry “Egg = Oeuf = angro, yaro, anro, ando, yanro, kuki, tojaši, andro, ivandro, vandro.” There are a few utterly perplexing entries. For example, there is a heading for English “Me at” (space between letters “e” and “a”). This is clearly a typo, as the Romani gloss is mas, i.e. “meat”. However, the French equivalent is glossed as “Moi à”. It is unclear how an error of this nature could have crept in. I can only guess that the French glosses were provided from the English by someone with no familiarity with Romani.

The writer of the preface, Félix Monget, makes the bold statement that one of the missions of the book is to “give an incontestable orthographic basis to a vocabulary that has been used primarily for oral transmission.” While I am not certain what he is trying to say with word “incontestable,” Monget seems to be unaware of the many other forays into creating Romani orthographies that go back nearly a century, and that to this day no one alphabet has been, or is likely to be, universally accepted for reasons I discuss in my introduction. The orthography used appears primarily based on the Hungarian, using most of the common letters as they are used in Hungarian. Exceptions are the use of <č> and <š> instead of Hungarian <s> and <cs>. Aspirated consonants are written with the typical <h> following the consonant. The sound /ʒ/ is written as <j>, however the phonetic description he provides is incorrect, and as appears as “dz” rather than the correct “dž”, which appears on the prior page in a reference from letter “d”.


A unidirectional wordlist including approximately 2500 Romani words of the Erli dialect, collected among settled Rroma in Sofia, Bulgaria. This small book actually manages to compact a bit more information than it appears at first glance. While I would not call this a full-fledged dictionary, as a pocket dictionary for language beginners interested in the Bulgarian Romani variants or as a word-identifier, it has its place. Words are not labeled for part of speech, however noun gender, and, occasionally, noun plural forms, are given. Words do have word-stress...
indicated, which is helpful, as in this dialect there appears to be a great deal of variation in word stress even among related forms, such as in verbal nouns as opposed to their finite verb forms or related adjective and participles, c.f. the entries for (with my romanization) phérdo ‘full’ versus pherdó ‘filled’. The treatment of verbs is somewhat inconsistent. These are often cited, in separate lemmas, in the 1st and 3rd-person singular, and sometimes the 3rd-person plural. Past participles are occasionally provided which can be helpful in determining the root for the aorist tense, although these aorist forms are sometimes given in the 1st-person singular. The orthography is based on the Bulgarian Cyrillic alphabet, the only addition being the Cyrillic letter <x> being used to create a digraph to distinguish the aspirated consonants.


A descriptive, bidirectional Romani-Latvian dictionary and grammar of the Baltic Romani dialect. Information on the dictionary structure and pronunciation are in both Latvian and English, however introduction is only in Latvian. Parts of speech are given with English abbreviations and English glosses are included as well. Verbs are labeled for transitivity, and past-tense forms are included. Etymologies for words of non-Indic origin are also given. The orthography uses the Latvian alphabet. Word stress is indicated, as are long vowels. As vowel length is not a universal feature in Romani dialects, this addition is very helpful.


I believe that this dictionary, as it was cataloged in WorldCat, had the subject heading Romani language assigned incorrectly. The Cincars are in essence Aromanians and this speak a Balkan-Romance language, also called Vlach or Vlax (not to be confused with Vlax Romani), which is similar to Romanian, as can be clearly seen in the parallel title Dicţionar armânescu-sârbeşcu. I have corrected the WorldCat master record to reflect this, however the incorrect heading may persist in local online catalogs.


This is a particularly rare item as it was intended to be circulated privately. It appears to be held by only held by 3 libraries (John Jay College of Criminal Justice, University of Texas, Austin, and Milwaukee Public Library) and will only be loaned under strict conditions of in-library use. The stated intent of the work is to give police linguistic tools for dealing with “Gypsy” criminals who speak the Kalderash or Machwaya dialects. This small work is disturbing on a number of
levels, not the least of which, it would have been ineffective for its stated purpose. Most glaringly, the data he includes seems to have been collected in a highly unethical manner, as he states (p. 6): “no definition of a Romany word or phrase was accepted for inclusion in this booklet until it had been carefully checked with numerous Gypsies, none of whom were aware that a study of their language was being conducted.” The compiler does not appear to be a trained linguist, and he has surely misunderstood the phonetic nature of many of the words he heard. For example, many cases where Romani dialects have a flapped /r/ sound, the compiler has transcribed the letter <d>. The romanization used for the words is chaotic. The glosses are wholly inadequate, e.g. verbs, which are mostly presented in the first person singular, are glossed with just the English verb, without the “to,” in which case it is not always possible to distinguish an English verb from a noun. In summary, this wordlist cannot be relied upon as accurate information for any form of Romani spoken by any American Romani speakers.


A grammar and Caló-Spanish dictionary, a para-Romani dialect that I do not cover in full in this bibliography. It was originally published under the pseudonym Francisco Qindale.


Facsimile reprint. See Mayo (1870).


A grammar and Caló-Spanish dictionary. Very similar to Mayo (1867).


A Romani-French and English etymological dictionary of what the compiler calls “Common Romani.” A French-Romani index is also included. The primary dialects covered are Caló, Sinté (also called Manush), Kalderash, Lovari, and Baltic Romani and consists mostly of vocabulary collected from other sources, including Calvet (1993), and Manush (1997). The lemmas are accompanied by glosses in French and English. Etymologies based on Sanskrit for words of Indic origin as well as newer words from other languages are provided.
A descriptive, unidirectional Romani-English glossary and grammar of a variant of Romani spoken in Agia Varvara, a suburb of Athens, Greece. The compiler has achieved all the goals he states in his introduction, despite his humble claims regarding his results. The linguistic material was collected primarily by the compiler himself in situ in the 1970s. He was further aided to fill in some of the gaps by Frederick Rogovin, an American who had lived many years in this same suburb. Messing emphasizes that this is only a glossary, not a comprehensive dictionary, however there is enough material to provide a glimpse into this interesting, and possibly unique dialect. Although he does not claim to know with certainty, he believes this variant to be closest to Turkish Romani, also called Xoraxané, due to features such as the verb conjugations in common with that variant and the large number of Turkish loanwords used, at least among the older speakers. His reasoning seems quite sound, as many of these speakers are known to have been fairly recent immigrants from Turkey, perhaps having arrived in the 1920s. The glossary also includes a grammatical sketch, which, although brief, is quite thorough, despite the author’s apologies to the contrary. For a much harsher critique, in my opinion, unnecessarily so, see Tong (1995:215) in Other Works Consulted.

The glossary labels words for basic part of speech, and plural forms of nouns, word stress, and aorist form of verbs are provided. Etymologies are provided for the many Greek and Turkish words in common usage. Verbs are cited in the 1st person singular. Although verbs are not labeled according to transitivity or valency, Messing gives ample examples from which these can be readily gleaned. For example, for the verb ‘to fear’ trašav, which is transitive in English, is governed by the ablative case in Romani, as is illustrated in his example “trašav lestar” ‘I fear him’. It is likely that there are errors in some his definitions and indications of stress, however these seem to be limited.

The orthography used is similar to the typical South-Slavic Latin script. Exceptions are <tš> instead of the expected <ć> and <y> for the semivowel rather than <j>. The letter <x> represents the velar fricative /x/. Aspirated consonants are written with <h> following the consonant, but enclosed in parentheses, e.g. p(h)uro ‘old’. The compiler explains that he has enclosed this modifier in parenthesis since many speakers have lost the aspirated consonants and use only the unaspirated counterparts.

Issued in two parts as volumes VII (A-K) and VIII (L-Z) of his Über die Mundarten und die Wanderungen der Zigeuner Europa’s, 1872-1880. As the title makes clear, this is a comparative
study of the lexicon of the Romani dialects spoken in Europe. The Romani lemmas are accompanied by German glosses. Miklosich (1813-1891), a Slovene who served as chair of the department of Slavic Philology at the University of Vienna, was a superb linguist, and his multivolume study of the Rroma stands out as the first systematic and scientific study of the Romani language, its variation, and theory concerning the migration routes from India into Europe. Since at the time of writing the conventional system now used to classify the dialects had not yet been elaborated, dialects in the study are classified only by the German adjective for the predominate ethnic group in the area where each dialect is spoken: Greek, Romanian, Hungarian, Bohemian, Polish, German, Russian, Finnish, Scandinavian, Italian, Basque, English, and Spanish. Miklosich was one of the first linguists to understand the importance of the Greek element in many Romani dialects in both grammar and lexicon. Miklosich makes clear that his study is interested not only in original Indic words, but also the loan words from various contiguous languages that have been incorporated in the dialects. Words are labeled for basic part of speech and occasional plural forms are provided. No contextual examples are included. The orthography has been adapted to be consistent to represent Romani words across all dialects and is similar to those orthographies used in the South Slavic countries, and word stress is indicated.


A collection of Caló texts and a bidirectional Caló-Spanish dictionary, a para-Romani dialect that I do not cover in full in this bibliography. Also published in a number of facsimile reprint editions.


A bidirectional Romani-Hungarian dictionary and grammar of the Lovari dialect. Although the dictionary contains a respectable number of lemmas, there is not much grammatical insight included in the dictionary section. Gender is indicated for nouns, but plural forms are only provided in exceptional cases, such as in words for which the singular and plural are the same, e.g. *dand* ‘tooth’. Verbs are labeled as either transitive or intransitive only, and the intransitive label encompasses the passive forms and the reflexive forms using the reflexive pronoun *pes*. Aorist forms of verbs are not indicated. Fixed expressions or contextual examples are only provided in a few, apparently random, cases. Etymologies are also not included. The orthography is based on Hungarian but with a number of notable exceptions. The sounds of the Hungarian letters *<cs> /ʧ/*, *<gy> /ʒ/*, *<s> /ʃ/*, *<sz> /ʃ/*, *<zs> /ʒ/*, and *<dzs> /dʒ/*, are written as *<ch>*, *<dy>*, *<sh>*, *<s>*, *<zh>*, and *<dzh>*. which is potentially confusing to a Hungarian user. The sound /x/, absent in Hungarian, is written as *<hh>*. The aspirated consonants are written as *<kh>*, *<ph>*, and
Word stress is not provided.


A descriptive grammar and dictionary in two volumes. Pott (1802-1887) was a pioneering scholar of the Romani language in the 19th century, and this work represents the first published comprehensive study of the Romani language. Pott was a student of the German linguist, Franz Bopp, the first linguist to closely investigate the relationship of Sanskrit with the European languages, thus establishing the field of Indo-European studies. The first volume consists of an introduction and a grammar. The second volume is the dictionary entitled *Einleitung über Gaunersprachen: Wörterbuch und Sprachproben* [Introduction to thieves' languages: dictionary and speech samples]. Despite the unfortunate, racially-tinged title, this was the first systematic, lexicological comparison of the known dialects or Romani, both the true Romani dialects and para-Romani languages such as Caló. His approach was predominately etymological. Pott appears to have been the first linguist to make systematic comparisons between Romani and Sanskrit, although Johann Rüdiger (1751-1822) and other scholars had earlier noted that Romani was an Indic language [1].

The organization of the dictionary is somewhat complicated. The words are arranged based on the traditional ordering of Sanskrit words, which is difficult to use for those not familiar with that tradition. An assortment of letters are grouped together to accommodate the differing orthographies of the languages in which the words had been recorded, i.e. “I, J, Y” and “K, C, Q” are grouped together to accommodate lemmas such as *kov*, *coripen*, and *queliben*. Lemmas are labeled for basic part of speech and nouns are labeled for gender. Verbs are cited in the 1st-person singular form. Participles and irregular aorist forms are provided. Words are glossed as they appeared in the sources cited, which were mostly in English, German, French, or Spanish.


A bidirectional Caló-Spanish dictionary and grammatical sketch. The title *A Chipicalli* is based on the common Romani word *čhib* ‘tongue, language’ and the ethnonym *caló* (feminine *cali*).

The first known bidirectional Caló-Spanish dictionary including 643 Caló lemmas. The work also contains a grammatical sketch, including verb conjugations, irregular verbs, some Caló tales, and a history of the Caló people. As with all Caló dictionaries, the language recorded represents a para-Romani dialect, in which original Romani words are integrated into Spanish grammar, Romani verbal roots have been appended with Spanish personal suffixes and are conjugated in the same manner as Spanish verbs, e.g. for the verb ‘to have’: “tener a. abilar, tereblar”, continuing throughout the various tenses and modes which mirror the Spanish verbal paradigms. Due to the close integration of Spanish and Romani in Caló, the orthography used closely follows that of Spanish. See also Škrabánková (2010:42) in Other Works Consulted and entry for Dávila (1943) for a discussion of overlap between the two dictionaries.


Facsimile reprint. See Rebolledo (1909).


Facsimile reprint. See Rebolledo (1909).


This unidirectional Romani multilingual dictionary of about 1300 lemmas will appeal primarily to those interested in etymology and the relationship of Romani with Hindi and Sanskrit. There is no introductory text to explain the scope of the work. However, it appears to cover the core of Romani lexicon of Indic origin. It does not appear that vocabulary was chosen from one specific dialect but was chosen from various Romani variants to serve the etymological purposes of the collection. Romani lemmas are accompanied by glosses in Hindi, English, French, and Russian. Etymologies based on Sanskrit or other Indic languages are provided. There are a number of entries for words that are not of original Indic stock, such as the Greek word *petalo* ‘horseshoe’. They have presumably been included because they entered the language relatively early and are common to many dialects. The compiler also notes words in other languages that are loans from Romani, e.g. Romanian *beldie* from Romani *beli* ‘pole’.

A Romani-Punjabi-English dictionary. The premise of this dictionary was that Punjabi is, according to the compiler’s contention, the closest living Indic dialect in India to Romani, sharing some very similar linguistic structures and some vocabulary unique to only Punjabi and Romani. The compiler does not mention the specific dialect or dialects from which the Romani lemmas are taken, however they appear to be predominately from Balkan Romani dialects. The work serves primarily as an excellent etymological dictionary. Etymologies based on Sanskrit and Persian cognates are provided, and Romani lemmas are glossed with English and their close Punjabi cognates. Lemmas are labeled for basic part of speech and noun gender, but otherwise no grammatical notations are included. The work does, however, include a brief grammatical sketch at the end of the book. A few additional wordlists are included. There is a wordlist for indeclinable adverbs and adjectives, which is very helpful, as these are often “lost” in dictionaries and therefore hard to study systematically. There is also a wordlist for verbs, are also included which is very helpful. Both wordlists also included the English glosses and the Punjabi cognates. The orthography used is that typical of the Balkan dialects, using the typical South Slavic Latin-script diacritics. Word stress is not indicated.


A basic descriptive, bidirectional dictionary and grammar of Carpathian Romani, also known as Romungro. Lemmas are not labeled for part of speech, however these will be clear to speakers of Hungarian. Noun gender is indicated with the gender-specific definite articles i (feminine) or o (masculine). No contextual examples are provided. The orthography used corresponds to the American Romani Alphabet with the exception that the aspirated affricate /tʃh/ is included and written as [chh]. The aspirated consonants [ch], [kh], [ph], and [th] are interfiled with [k], [p], and [t]. Word stress is not indicated.


A descriptive, bidirectional dictionary of Romani and Hungarian based on the Hungarian Lovari dialect. The lemmas in the Romani-Hungarian section are carefully labeled for part of speech and distinguish transitive from intransitive verbs. The orthography used is a modified form of Hungarian conventions and avoids any diacritics except for the circumflex over vowels, in most cases the letter ă. The function of the circumflex is not explained in the pronunciation section but is presumably intended to represent a variation in vowel quality such as occurs in Hungarian, i.e. <a> versus ă. A few graphemes are substituted, so that where Hungarian has <s>, <sz>, and <cz>, the Romani orthography uses <sh>, <zh>, and <ch>. A grammatical sketch is included.

A descriptive, bidirectional Romani-Hungarian dictionary of the Lovari dialect. This is an updated and expanded edition of Karsai (2009). Please see the entry for that edition, as my comments there pertain also to this dictionary. Unlike the previous edition, this version includes an introduction.


A descriptive, unidirectional Romani-German dictionary of the southern Polish-Romani dialect, a sub-dialect of Carpathian Romani. At the end of the volume are a number of narrative texts which form the basis of the vocabulary included in the dictionary portion. The work was based on unpublished materials originally collected in 1902 by the compiler, Rozwadowski (1867-1935), which was posthumously published with commentary, introduction, and additional material by Edward Klich, in 1936. Prior to Rozwadowski’s death the material had languished for several years, his attention focused elsewhere. Klich is also responsible for noting derivations and etymologies where they occur. Of special interest is Klich’s observation that much of the borrowed Slavic vocabulary in this dialect appears to come from eastern Slovak rather than from the more expected Polish. This observation somewhat contradicts Rozwadowski’s own comments included at the very beginning of the introduction, where he contends that his informants were not likely recent arrivals in the Zakopane region from Slovakia.

The phonetic descriptions provided for the dialect are some of the most elaborate to be found in any Romani dictionary of the time and can be explained by Rozwadowski’s career as a professor of linguistics at Jagiellonian University and member of the Polish Academy of Science. The grammatical descriptions provided are, however, substantially less elaborate than the phonetic ones, a weakness which Rozwadowski clearly admits in his original brief comments quoted in Klich’s introduction. Lemmas are labeled according to basic part of speech, however the treatment of verbs is less detailed than desirable and somewhat inconsistent. Verbs are generally inadequately labeled as either “verb trans[itive]” or “verb intrans[itive],” however others, such as the verb *daral* ‘to fear’, an intransitive verb the object of which is governed by the ablative postposition *-tar/-dar*, is labeled as simply “verb” with no grammatical guidance. Some contextual examples are provided which do illustrate such grammatical relations, but since the dictionary does not provide a grammatical sketch, these are not provided in a coherent context. Occasionally, especially for more irregular verbs, e.g. *te żal* ‘to go’, conjugations and aorist forms are provided. Although the dictionary includes numerous examples of complex verbal derivations such as causatives, inchoative, reflexive, medio-passive forms, etc., in most cases these not labeled other than in the basic manner described above. This is somewhat perplexing since the list of abbreviations found at the beginning of the dictionary does list designations for many of these complex derivations in a very granular manner. I can only speculate the compiler had originally planned to expand his grammatical observations at a later time.
The orthography used is intended to represent the most accurate possible transcription of the pronunciation of the narrative texts, based on which this vocabulary was collected, rather than to represent any actual or suggested written orthography for textual communication. However the basis of the transcription leans towards the orthography used for Czech, with a few additions from Polish, such as the barred <ł>. Rozwadowski additionally employs a large selection of other diacritics to represent word stress, consonant palatalization, or sounds not found in Polish, such as the aspirated consonants. For additional commentary see Ackerley (1937) in Other Works Consulted.


A brief, unidirectional Romani-French dictionary. The compiler states in the introduction that the work is based on Balkan Romani, Manush, and Piedmont Sinté. However since none of the vocabulary items are labeled to indicate the dialect, if they differ, it is difficult for this dictionary to fill an accurate descriptive function. Lemmas are labeled for part of speech. Nouns are labeled for gender, but plural forms are not provided. Verbs are labeled only as “v.” with no information about transitivity, and are cited according to the verbal root, e.g. baš- and the 1st personal singular form and past participle are included. The orthography is similar to those used in the South Slavic countries, using the typical diacritics, such as [š] and [ž], however here the letter [j] represents the phoneme /dʒ/, and [h] follows consonants to indicate aspiration, e.g. [ph]. Several alternate spellings are provided, e.g. the verb ‘to fear’ has the entry “traš- (trach, drasch, tasas, etc.” although the source of these variants is unclear. Word stress is not indicated.


The subtitle of this dictionary is misleading, as this is not a word frequency dictionary in the true sense, but rather a dictionary of frequent Romani words and phrases, arranged according to the districts and towns in Slovakia where the words occur. The words and phrases are arranged in columns under the Czech lemmas above and the name of the location spoken on the left, so there is no way to interpret these words in terms of frequency. Although a variety of different Romani dialects are spoken in Slovakia, e.g. Western Slovak Romani, Eastern Slovak Romani, and Romungro, this dictionary does not label the words for dialect affiliation. It is difficult to say much more about this work, as there is no introductory matter or bibliographic sources to provide any insight into the scope or methodology. With more context this dictionary could have been a useful contribution to the field.

Welsh Romani was a very conservative dialect that became extinct in the 1950s. The larger part of this work (pages 1-415 in the secondary pagination) consists of the “Vocabulary.” This is a very detailed dictionary of Welsh Romani words, including grammatical notes, etymologies and comparison with Prakrit languages, cited usages from other lexicographers, and contextual examples. It concludes with a list of other Indic cognates as well as lists of loan words into Romani from Iranian languages, Greek, Romanian, the Slavic languages, German, French, English, and Welsh.


Unavailable for review. I will attempt to include in a future edition.


A unidirectional Romani-Romanian dictionary. While a record exists for this item in WorldCat, there are no holdings attached to the cataloging record, which is very unusual. I was able to locate a version of this dictionary on the Internet at the URL provided above. In the copy I viewed there is no introduction, however there is a note that the dictionary was included in another work called *Comunicare în limba rromani: destinat anului I de studiu* [Communicating in Romani: for first year of study]. Based on the educational goal of the main work I assume that the dictionary is meant to serve a normative role, and therefore the form of the language may not exactly correspond to any one natural dialect. In fact, it appears to be a form of the aspirational “Common Romani” that is also used in *Courthiade (2009)*.

Lemmas are labeled for part of speech and noun gender. Noun plural forms are provided. Word stems are separated from endings with a forward slash. Verbs are presented in the 3rd person singular and are labeled as transitive or intransitive. Aorist forms of verbs are also provided. There are no etymologies or contextual examples provided. The orthography used corresponds to the International Romani Union Standard Alphabet (see *Comparison of Alphabets* chart after *Introduction*).


Unavailable for review. I will attempt to include in a future edition.

A normative Romani-Romanian dictionary and grammar, based on a variety of closely related Vlax-Romani dialects spoken in Romania, namely Kalderash, Ursari, and Zlătari. Lemmas are labeled for part of speech, and noun genders, and plural forms are provided. When words differ among the three dialects above, the name of the dialect is provided. Verbs are cited in the 1st person singular. While the 1st person singular of the aorist tense is also provided, this is not as helpful as it would be if the citation form were the 3rd person singular, since there is no guidance to the form of the 3rd person aorist of intransitive verbs, which often differs from that of transitive verbs. In the case of very irregular verbs, e.g. sem ‘I am’ or meraw ‘I die’ more conjugated forms are included in the entry. A modest number of contextual examples are given.

A morphophonemic orthography, similar to the International Romani Union Standard Alphabet, is used (see Comparison of Alphabets chart after Introduction), including the distinctive letters [8], [ç], and [q], which are pronounced /t/, /s/, and /k/ after a voiceless stem, and /d/, /z/, and /g/ after a voiced stem, and are only used with the postpositions for the ablative, instrumental, and dative cases respectively. The two quirky characters Ꞣ and ꞣ used to represent the phonemes /dz/ and /ds/. These two characters were, in fact, included in an early version of the International Romani Union Standard Alphabet but were eventually rejected and replaced with [dz] and [s]. Note, however that on the back cover these are incorrectly shown to represent /p/ and /ph/.


Unavailable for review. I will attempt to include in a future edition.

granular manner than many other dictionaries. The presentation of the verb is, however, somewhat confusing. Occasionally, several personal forms of a verb are given as different lemmas, and aorist tense forms are not provided.

The orthography, which is a basic Latin script without any diacritics except < hernia >, is somewhat idiosyncratic. Lemmas are accompanied with a pronunciation guide in Bulgarian Cyrillic script, including word stress. The main differences from the Latin script used in many other dictionaries are: <w> /ə/, <rr> (uvular /ʁ/, and < hernia > (voiceless velar fricative /x/). The more typical letters <š>, <č>, and <ž> are written as <šh>, <ch>, <zh>. Aspirated consonants are written as <kh>, <ph>, <th>.


A unidirectional Romani-Russian dictionary of approximately 10,000 words and grammar. The compilers claim it is the first attempt to capture the lexicological fund of Romani spoken in the Soviet Union in a published dictionary. The material appears to come primarily from the Russian portions of the USSR. The compilers refer to the Romani variant as “southern dialect,” however, I believe the lexicon reflects what scholars typically call “Northern Romani.” Lemmas are labeled for part of speech and for certain stylistic categories, such as poetic or colloquial. Abbreviations for cities are provided where words are particularly regional. Nouns are marked for gender, and plural forms are given. Verbs are cited in the 2nd-person singular forms for the present tense, and in the 1st-person singular for the aorist forms. Verbs are unlabeled, and no information is provided about transitivity or valency. Word stress is indicated in all cases. The dictionary provides ample phraseological examples.

The orthography is based on Russian Cyrillic with the addition of only one letter, < hernia >, which represents /h/. The aspirated consonants are written as the digraphs <kh>, <пх>, <тх>, and <чж>. /dʒ/ is written as <дж>. The distinction between /te/ and /tʃh/ is handled somewhat differently, the consonant < hernia > remaining the same. The /te/ is indicated by following < hernia > with the Russian jotized vowel, e.g. <я>, <ю>, or <ё>, e.g. чяво ‘boy’, while the affricate /tʃh/ are followed by the non-yotized vowel, e.g. чанг ‘foot’. However, most words beginning with < hernia > are crossed-referenced both ways, so the e.g., чар and чяр ‘grass’, and чури and чюри ‘knife’. It is unclear whether this implies that the distinction between these two sounds had been neutralized in this dialect, or whether it is simply confusion stemming from the strict rules of
Russian orthography which dictate which vowels can be combined with certain consonants.


This vocabulary of Romani, spoken in the United States at the time of writing, was compiled from Sinclair’s manuscripts that are held in the New York Public Library [1]. The lexicological material was collected personally by the compiler based on his interviews with American-Rroma informants, either born in Great Britain, or recent decedents of British Rroma. The introduction also states that Sinclair noted that none of the Rroma he consulted were familiar with all the words, although many were familiar with most of them. Based on the origin of the speakers, it is safe to assume this vocabulary reflects the English-Romani variant, also known as Romanichal.

The vocabulary covered is rather random, and many common Romani words are absent. Words are not labeled according to part of speech, nor are plural or aorist forms provided. The citation form for verbs is sometimes inconsistent, e.g., ‘to live’, is cited as jiv, which is simply the verb root, whereas ‘to go’ is cited as jal, i.e., in the 3rd person singular indicative form. Forms cited in the grammar of Turkish Romani by A.G. Paspates are included for comparison as the compiler believed Turkish Romani to be the “purest form of the language.” [2] Very few contextual examples are given. Hindi cognates are provided for words of Indic origin if they are similar. The orthography is based on that of Sampson (1926) and other linguists who have written on British Romani. The caron is used over consonants in <č> and <š>. /x/ is written with the English <j>, and the voiceless velar fricative /x/ is written as <x>. Long vowels are indicated with the macron. There is no distinction made for aspirated consonants or the uvular /ʁ/.

[1.] Information on Sinclair’s archived manuscripts can be found at: http://archives.nypl.org/mss/2760


A descriptive, bidirectional Romani-English dictionary reflecting the vocabulary of two Bulgarian Romani dialects, the Sofia Erli dialect and the dialect of the Christian Roma of Sliven. The Romani-English section contains approximately 3200 lemmas. The lemmas are not specifically labeled for the source dialect. The compiler claims the dictionary is based on pre-existing works on these dialect as well as his own personal collection of “street jargon” and interviews conducted with Rroma informants ranging in age from 22-91 years of age.

Lemmas are labeled for basic part of speech and language of origin (Romanian, Serbian, Greek,
Turkish, Armenia, or Persian) if the word is not from native core Romani. There is no further elaboration of grammatical forms such as gender or noun plural forms. Verbs are inconsistently cited in their the 1st-person singular or the 3rd-person singular with no explanation for the discrepancy. No further information on verbs is provided in the entry such as transitivity or aorist forms. No contextual examples are provided to help clear up ambiguity that occurs when trying to gloss verb with English verbs, the transitivity of which is often flexible. A few aorist forms are listed separately for no apparent reason and lack an adequate gloss, e.g. “tsidinè v. got started.” This aorist form is, in fact, the 3rd-person plural, and should be glossed as ‘they got started’. A number of other strange entries can be found, such as the heading “climbed up (adj.) ikestilò” in which the verb, apparently another aorist form, has been mislabeled as an adjective. These deficiencies make the dictionary unsuitable for use by a serious student of Romani.

The orthography is based on the English alphabet. Aspirated consonants are indicated with the typical letter <h> following the consonant for <kh>, <ph>, and <th>. The letters for the sounds /tʃ/, /ʃ/, and /ʒ/ are written as <ch>, <sh>, and <zh> respectively. The cluster <csh> represents /tʃ/. The letter <lr> is somewhat of a mystery. Anguchev (2009) uses the digraph to represent the uvular /ʁ/. Slavov uses it, at least in initial position, in only six words. Other than the one word which means ‘spoon’, rloy (common Romani pronunciation /ʁoʃ/), the remaining six words have basically the same meaning (cane, bat, drumstick) with slightly different pronunciations. This digraph does not appear in positions where it would be expected to occur, such in rom ‘Rrom man’. Word stress is indicated.


A unidirectional, descriptive dictionary of two Romani dialects spoken in German, the more typical Sinté, and a Balkan Romani dialect spoken in Lithuania. The two dialects are presented in two different sections. The first dictionary, which covers Sinté, is much more detailed than the Lithuanian Romani one, which the compiler explains is due to the relative dearth of resources for the latter. While he has relied on nineteen earlier dictionaries and vocabulary lists from periodical literature, he has tried to filter the lexicon he has chosen to ensure that it reflect the actual usage of the German Rroma at this time.

The work is typical of the systematic scholarship of German philologists in this period although it is lacking in certain respects. The labeling of parts of speech is inconsistent. Noun gender is included, but plural forms are not. Participles are given as separate lemmas. Verbs are only occasionally labeled as transitive or intransitive. The source language of loanwords is provided. A few contextual examples accompany the entries. The limited amount of grammatical information can be explained by the compiler’s comment in his introduction that he hopes that the dictionary will serve as a useful index to the sources he has utilized. In this goal the work is indeed very useful. The orthography used the typical Latin-script South Slavic diacritics. Word stressed is not indicted in the lemma but is included if it was provided in the variants from other
sources he has also cited.


A fascimile reprint. See (Sowa, 1898).


A bidirectional Romani-Hungarian dictionary. It would be more accurate to say that these are really only wordlists. There is no preliminary material to discuss the scope or structure of the dictionary, the structure, or the pronunciation of the Romani words listed. Each lemma includes only a simple gloss. There is no labeling for grammatical features of any sort, even the gender of nouns. The only added feature is the addition of the acute accent to words, but it is unclear if these, since they can appear multiple times in a word, e.g. \textit{dáravél}, if these are meant to indicate pronunciation as well as stress. Since this dictionary follows the Hungarian orthographical conventions, the [á] may be intended to reflect the distinction of quality in the Hungarian letters [a], a more open vowel, and [á], a more closed one. Since some words, e.g. \textit{droto} have no acute accents, this accent as a indication of pronunciation is the most likely possibility.


A unidirectional Hungarian-Romani dictionary of the Lovari dialect including approximately 13,000 words. This work is sometimes cited under the more unwieldy title: Ő császári és magyar kiralyi fensége József Főherceg Magyar és cigány nyelv gyök-szótára: románé alava. A collection of Romani poems, tales, and folksongs follows the dictionary. Sztojka, whose primary profession was violinist, was the first known Rrom lexicographer. This dictionary, as evidenced by the honorific in the full title, was supported and financed by Archduke Josef Karl Ludwig of Austria (1833-1905), who had a great interest in the Romani language in fact published several works on Romani grammar himself. Since the dictionary is only Hungarian to Romani, it would not have been particularly useful for anyone trying to interpret the Romani texts included.

The Hungarian lemmas are accompanied by Romani glosses which are labeled for basic part of speech and noun gender. Noun plurals are not provided. Stress is indicated when not word-final. The orthography closely follows that of Hungarian, so that \textit{/tʃ/}, \textit{/ʃ/}, and \textit{/ʒ/} are written as <cs>, <s>, and <s>, respectively. The coincidence with the last character can be explained by the fact that in this dialect the affricate \textit{/dʒ/} had mutated to the fricative \textit{/ʒ/}, or possibly \textit{/z/}. The aspirated
consonants are written as <kh>, <ph>, and <th>. Sztojka introduced the digraph <rr> to represent the uvular sound /ʁ/. For a more detailed discussion of this dictionary and Sztojka, see Courthiade (2007).


A very basic descriptive, unidirectional Romani-Hungarian dictionary, apparently of the Lovari dialect. This dictionary is the companion to Sztojkó. Ungriko-romano vasteski alav, (2002). The associated grammatical sketch appears only in this companion volume. The Romani lemmas are not labeled, even for basic part of speech, however noun gender is indicated by including the masculine or feminine indirect article, i.e. o and e, respectively, before the noun, as well as being labeled for masculine or feminine, which is redundant. The orthography used closely follows that of Hungarian and word stress is not indicated.


A very basic descriptive, unidirectional Hungarian-Romani dictionary, apparently of the Lovari dialect. This dictionary is the companion to Sztojkó. Romano-ungriko vasteski alav (2002). The work has no introduction and begins immediately with a grammatical sketch of Romani so we can glean nothing about the intended scope. Romani glosses are inconsistently labeled for part of speech as are sometimes the Hungarian lemmas. Morphological forms such a noun plurals and aorist forms of verbs are discussed only in the grammar section and are not provided in the dictionary section. No contextual examples are provided. The orthography used closely follows that of Hungarian and word stress is not indicated. Because of these deficits the dictionary will not be very helpful for those learning Romani, even beyond the fact that the knowledge of Hungarian is not widespread outside of Hungary and parts of Serbia and Romania.


A rather basic bidirectional Romani-Bosnian dictionary based on the Gurbet dialect of Bosnia and Hercegovina. The compiler does not explicitly indicate whether the intent of the dictionary is descriptive or normative. She explains that many of the terms have been selected from the dictionary by Uhlik (1983). However, she has also consulted other dictionaries, including those of the Canadian Rrom scholar, Ronald Lee, who studies North American Romani variants, so it is unclear how those selections fit in with the otherwise Gurbet-dialect coverage. Lemmas are labeled according to the basics, such as gender and part of speech. Verbs are simply labeled as “v.” with no further information about transitivity, however, as transitivity is usually clear in the
Bosnian verb gloss, this is not a great hindrance. Past tense forms are not indicated, which makes the verb entries less useful. The orthography used is the basic Latin alphabet without any of the South Slavic diacritics, e.g. <ch> and <sh> rather than <č> and <š>. Word stress is not indicated. The compiler explains in the foreword that this orthography was chosen because it has been widely represented in electronic communications, such as emails, blogs, and social media, thus having become an informal common convention comprehensible to a wide cross-section of speakers. For an updated edition of this dictionary see Tahirović Sijerčić, (2013).


A bidirectional Romani-English dictionary and brief grammatical sketch focusing primarily on the vocabulary of the mostly settled Romani groups in Bosnia and Hercegovina, specifically the Gurbet and Chergash groups. The extent of the lexical items provided is quite impressive, and it is an excellent starter dictionary for any student wishing to become familiar with the most common vocabulary. A modest number of contextual examples are also included. The compiler has based her dictionary primarily on core Romani words, i.e. those most likely to be common across multiple dialects, however she also includes many neologisms that have been coined by Ronald Lee (see other works by Lee in this bibliography) and others, and that have been used in the Romani journal, Romano lil, published in Toronto, of which she was an editor until 2002.

Lemmas are labeled for basic part of speech, including noun gender. Plural forms of nouns are not provided, nor are the rules for their formation clearly explained in the grammatical sketch, although they are included in the few examples of the noun-morphology paradigms. The treatment of verbs is somewhat of a weakness. Verbs, which are generally cited in the 3rd person singular, are labeled merely as (v) with no further elaboration to clarify transitivity of verbs in case of ambiguity in English verbs such as “open”, “close”, etc. Aorist forms are not consistently included; however they sometimes occur in separate entries as phrases, e.g. “lijem (v) I have taken”, in this case presented in the 1st person singular. Considering the large number of irregularly formed aorist forms in core Romani verbs, this treatment is inadequate.

The orthography used is based on English-alphabet convention used by Ronald Lee, which avoids the use of diacritics or special characters in order to facilitate writing for speakers in North America. This is the same orthography which appears in see Comparison of Alphabets chart after Introduction, under the column for “American Romani Alphabet.” However, she has helpfully also provided a variant for the spelling based on the Bosnian-based orthography in italics when it differs from the headword form, e.g. “chiral, čiral cheese.” Her primary orthography does not distinguish between the unaspirated <č> and the aspirated <čh> which are however distinguished in the Bosnian-based form. In the English-based form, both are written as <ch>. She additionally indicates variants in the case of the alternation of the consonants /s/ and /h/, which distinguishes a number of Romani dialects, even various Gurbet ones, e.g. “le(h)sa (pron/inst) with him.” Word stress is regrettably not indicated, although she does briefly address the typical stress patterns on pages xv-xvi of her grammatical section.
A unidirectional, descriptive Romani-Russian dictionary with approximately 1000 lemmas. In structure the dictionary is very similar to the later edition Toropov (2003). The primary differences between this edition and the later edition is this edition contains no grammar section, and the nature of the orthography. Whereas the 2003 edition uses a modified form of the Russian Cyrillic alphabet, this edition uses a modified Latin script similar to those used in the Balkans, e.g. /ʃ/ = <ч>, /ʃ/ = <ш>, and /ʒ/ = <щ>. The sounds /dʒ/ and /ɨ/, i.e. Russian <ы>, are uniquely written <Ӧ> and <ɨ>, respectively.

A scientific, unidirectional, descriptive dictionary and grammar of Crimean Romani, a dialect generally classified with the Southern Balkan Romani group. The dictionary includes approximately 2400 lemmas. The named compiler, Toropov, compiled the dictionary in partnership with his Crimean Rrom friend, Pavel Borisovich Gumerogly, who passed away before the publication of this second edition. The words were collected primarily in the Krasnodar region (also known as Kuban) of Russia and in western Republic of Georgia and have been expanded since the previous edition, Toropov (2003).

Lemmas are labeled for part of speech, and nouns are labeled for gender and plural forms are shown. There are no etymologies provided. Verbs are presented in the 3rd-person singular, are labeled for transitivity and voice, and causative verbs are also labeled as such. Aorist and participle forms are provided. My only criticism in the presentation of verbs is that verbal derivations are cited in different lemmas, and therefore are often located alphabetically at a distance from each other, e.g.: “дэл ‘давать’ (‘to give’), динёл ‘даватьсь’ (‘to yield’), динярел ‘заставлять давать’ (‘to make [someone] give’).” Because of this occasional lack on contiguity, it can make it difficult to readily glean the semantic relationship between these related verb forms. This is not a major problem, however, as the number of verbs with internal changes in the vowel of the verb root is relatively few. The dictionary also does not include contextual examples or fixed phrases, which would have been a welcome addition to this excellent dictionary. The orthography is based on Russian Cyrillic, with the typical digraphs <х> after <кх>, <пх>, <тх>, and <чп> to indicate aspiration. However, the digraph <рх> represents the voiced glottal fricative /ɦ/, similar to the Ukrainian pronunciation of <ч>. The affricate /dʒ/ is written as <дж>. Word stress is indicated.
A transcribed version of the Caló-Spanish dictionary of 1,268 words with an extensive introduction by Torrione, based on the compiler’s manuscript from 1837. See also Usoz i Río (1837).


A unidirectional Spanish-Caló dictionary of the para-Romani Caló dialect. This appears to be the first vocabulary list of Caló to be published in Spain where the dialect was actually spoken. As is the case with other Caló dictionaries from the 19th and early 20th centuries, the linguistic material presented is not reliable. Much of the material appears to have been taken from other sources of questionable reliability, e.g. from Borrow (1841), which came out only three years earlier, and seems to have been collected with little or no consultation with native-speaking informants. Borrow’s hand is also seen in vocabulary, besides that present in his dictionary, that appear in his Caló translation of the *Gospel of Luke* Borrow (1937) in Other Works Consulted. Borrow’s work as the source of much of this vocabulary is carefully analysed in Ignasi-Xavier (2005:127-128) in Other Works Consulted. In his detailed article, Ignasi-Xavier also reveals how Trujillo’s glosses for many entries make it clear that Trujillo had very little understanding of the grammatical structure of Caló.


Reprint. See Trujillo (1844).


A normative, bidirectional Romani-Russian dictionary of the Lovari dialect. The writer of the introduction, N.G. Demeter, states that the dictionary is the first published attempt in Russia to codify the widely spoken Lovari dialect. Lemmas are not labeled for part of speech, however, these are generally clear from the Russian glosses. Nouns are labeled for gender and include the plural forms. Verbs are accompanied by the aorist form but there is no further verbal information provided. Since verbs are cited in the 1st person singular form and there is no grammatical sketch, the differentiation in the 3rd person aorist forms of transitive and non-transitive verbs that exists in many dialects is not clear, nor are the conjugations and other tense forms clear, except
for isolated separate entries such as сам ‘we are’. Stress is only indicated in a small number of cases, e.g. аёр ‘end’, although it is unclear why only in these cases. Although this dialect has both short and long vowels, the distinction is not usually phonemic, therefore the dictionary only indicates these in a few cases by doubling the vowel letter, e.g. пативаало ‘honest’.

The orthography is based on Russian Cyrillic. The aspirated consonants /kh/, /ph/, and /th/ are written as <кх>, <пх>, <тх>. The consonant corresponding to the Ukrainian voiced glottal fricative /ɦ/, is written as <г′>. Etymologies are provided for words of non-Indic origin (usually Greek, Romanian, Hungarian, or German), and the foreword includes a list of Romani words with cognates in Sanskrit and Hindi as well as a discussion of the origins of the language.


This unidirectional, descriptive dictionary of the Gurbet dialect spoken in parts of Serbia, Bosnia, Montenegro, and Macedonia is a predecessor of Uhlik’s Srpskohrvatsko-romsko-engleski rečnik (1983). The compiler mentions the term Gurbet, which he also associates with Čergaši, ‘nomads’, once in the introduction. Thereafter he refers to this language as ‘Serbian Romani’. He distinguishes this dialect from the Vlax Romani varieties spoken in Yugoslavia, although Gurbet is now considered by most dialectologists of Romani to be a Southern Vlax Romani dialect. This dictionary, like the 1983 edition, is somewhat difficult to use, and the scope is somewhat unclear. Part of the confusion stems from this use of the term ‘Serbian Romani’ since most of the speakers of this variant at the time of writing resided in Bosnia and Herzegovina, with smaller numbers in Serbia and Montenegro, and the fewest in Macedonia. Regardless of the rather confusing dialect discussion, the lexicological material relates to a variety of Vlax Romani dialects, spoken at that time in the territories mentioned above. The compiler further explains that, even among these closely related dialects, the degree of linguistic influence from the Balkan Romance languages, Romanian and the Vlach dialects, varies substantially. This explanation is helpful in understanding the construction of the dictionary, in that it is sometimes difficult to draw clear lines between any lexical item and its relation to specific dialects. [1]

The Serbian lemmas are often accompanied by several Romani glosses. In the case of the word časovnik ‘clock’ there are 10 glosses given. Many verbs have almost as many Romani glosses. Glosses separated by commas are listed in order of their frequency among speakers of this variant and include local variations. These glosses are occasionally followed by additional ones, after a semi-colon, which the compiler explains: ‘are taken from the territory of Serbia (including Vojvodina, and Kosovo-Metohija), Montenegro, and Macedonia’ (p. 19). The compiler explains further that to keep the dictionary manageable it was necessary to leave out the several thousand Serbian loanwords that are regularly used by speakers of these dialects. Loanwords that belong to the earlier, more entrenched layer of borrowing are included as appropriate. Parts of speech are not labeled except for noun gender and plural, but only in cases where the Serbian noun is a singular form with a corresponding Romani plural form. Information about the valency and transitivity of words is not provided, but in many cases, these can be inferred from the Serbian
lemmas. Etymologies are not included.

The orthography is based on Serbian in Latin script with the addition of the digraphs <čh>, <čh>, <dž>, <kh>, <ph>, and <th> for the aspirated stops, a feature, which the compiler explains, has been lost in many regional variants, especially to the east of the Drina and Sava rivers. The more palatal affricates, represented by the letters <ć> and <đ>, are distinguished from the harder <č> and <dž>, although again, he observes this difference has been lost in many areas. He further uses <x> for the voiceless velar fricative /x/, and <ř> for voiced uvular fricative /ʁ/. Word stress is indicated.

[1]: The name of the Romani dialect is usually now spelled "Vlax" to avoid confusion with "Vlach," the name of the group of Balkan-Romance dialects.


This unidirectional, multilingual and multidialectal dictionary based on the Gurbet dialect is an updated edition to Uhlik (1947). The introduction explains how the dictionary is constructed, and discusses the classification of Romani dialects and Romani phonology. There is no discussion at all of grammar. He states that words appear: ‘first in Serbo-Croatian, then a translation (one or more) in Gurbet, then there is a translation in our local Vlax Romani, then translations in Turkish or Greek Romani, and more rarely in cant (i.e. secret language). At the end is a translation in English.’ Since the words are not labeled for dialect, and the number of words per entry can vary, separated only by commas, it is not possible to easily determine to which dialect a gloss belongs without already being familiar with the dialects. This is quite frustrating considering the wealth of forms collected and presented. It is left up the user’s devices how to deal with an unwieldy entry such as: “plašim se, bojim se, darav, čav dar, nakhavav darape, darav mae, dar mae, tradav an darape, trašav, trašinavav, lebma fira, čav trušuj, daranjovu, darandivav», I am afraid (of), I fear.”

The compiler, in fair disclosure, states that he has left out many of the features that make dictionaries of the great world languages ‘difficult to use.’ However, I would argue that it is exactly these missing features that would have made this dictionary more useable. He has chosen to not include word stress, as ‘stress varies from dialect to dialect, and even within the same dialect.’ The only manner of grammatical marking for lemmas is the gender of nouns, for which plural forms are not given. Beyond gender, there is no further labeling of parts of speech. The entries consist solely of lemmas and the glosses. There are no contextual examples provided.

The orthography used is the Serbian Latin alphabet, with the addition of the letters <x> for the voiceless velar fricative /x/, <ř> (for the voiced uvular fricative /ʁ/), <i> (similar to the Romanian vowel î), <ć> (for the sound more palatal than <č>, i.e. /ʨ/), and the digraphs <čh>, <čh>, <kh>, <ph>, <th>.  
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A Caló-Spanish list of 1,268 items. The original exists only in manuscript form and is housed in the Biblioteca Nacional de Madrid. The lexical content is only available as a 1987 reprint. See Torrione (1987).


A descriptive, unidirectional Romani-French dictionary of approximately 3600 words included at the end of his grammar. Vaillant (1804-1886), a French expatriate teaching in the then principality of Wallachia, was best known as an historian, educator, and political activist but also dabbled in language and linguistics, having produced a grammar of Romanian in addition to this Romani grammar and dictionary. This was published before the classification of various dialects of Romani had been delineated. Various dialects were spoken in the regions that make up current-day Romania, however based on phonology and morphology, this work seems to reflect primarily the Northern Vlax dialect, although there are some anomalies that seem to more reflect Southern Vlax variants. For example, the word for “dog” is given as jukel, i.e. /dʃukel/, whereas ‘woman’ is given as j’uvle, i.e. /dʃuvle/. Several earlier reviewers have expressed considerable skepticism about Vaillant’s methodology, and some claim much of his material was merely copied from the works of others. For example, he includes the word hoc’awiça, glossed as “hérrison,” i.e. ‘hedgehog’, which is, in fact, a loanword from English and as such had only been attested in Britain. This word was likely copied from another work Kogălniceanu (1837:41) as hotschauitscha and both compilers seem to have included it without attribution see Acton (1997:197) in Other Works Consulted. The dictionary is not reliable as a reflection of any one spoken variant of Romani at that time. The orthography used is based on French, and Vaillant seems to have systematically transliterated the words that he borrowed from other works, e.g. the “hedgehog” above. The distinctive letters he used are <č> for /tʃ/, <š> for /ʃ/, and <t̥> for /ts/. The aspirated consonants are not distinguished from the non-aspirated counterparts in his orthography.


An etymological dictionary of the Finnish-Romani language. The dictionary provides concise etymological information of the Finnish-Romani lexicon and the original Indic and other thematic elements, as well as common words of European origin. Glosses are provided in Finnish and English. Lemmas are also labeled with an abbreviation for the name of the informant and the date collected, and the name of the bibliographic source from which the reference was taken (bibliography on pp. 10-12). Words of Indic origin are correlated with Sanskrit as well as
the modern Prakrit languages. Somewhat more unusual for etymological dictionaries, comparisons between Romani phrases and similar phrases in say, Hindi, are also provided. The orthography used is similar to that typical of the Balkan dialects, using the letters <š> and <ž> for the fricatives /ʃ/ and /ʒ/, except the affricate /tʃ/ is represented by <tš>. Vowel length is indicated with a macron.


A unidirectional Bulgarian-Romani wordlist of approximately 2800 words, of the Erli dialect of Sofia, Bulgaria. The compiler states that this wordlist is based on the earlier unidirectional Romani-Bulgarian wordlist by Malikov (1992). This version does in fact appear to contain the original Romani and Bulgarian words in Malikov’s wordlist, merely changing the direction of the dictionary. Since in all other ways the wordlist is very similar to that of Malikov, please see the entry for Malikov for my comments.


A descriptive Romani-Hungarian dictionary of the dialects of Romani spoken in Hungary, including Lovari, the predominant dialect, the closely related dialects Mashari and Drizdari, Gurvar, Romungro, Vend, and the more distantly related Sinté. Of these, Romungro had mostly died out in the country at the time of publication. Sinté is considered part of the Northern Romani dialect group, while the others are all variants of Vlax Romani dialect group. Glosses are provided in both Hungarian and English, and there are separate Hungarian and English indexes. Some contextual examples are also provided.

As this is intended to be a descriptive dictionary of dialect variants there is not a great deal of attention given the grammatical forms, and parts of speech are not labeled. However, the aorist forms of irregular verbs are provided, which is helpful as there is substantial variation in these forms across dialects. The dictionary includes etymologies, both for early borrowings such as from Armenian, Persian, Greek, and later European borrowings. Sanskrit cognates are provided when applicable. The summary is provided in both Hungarian and English. The orthography used is like that of the Balkan dialects, using carons to modify consonants, and <h> after stops to indicate aspiration. The letter <ö> is also included for Hungarian loanwords. The dictionary was published in a mimeographed format created from a manually typed manuscript and the text is rather blurry in places. Most of the content has been included in Vekerdi (2000), which is commercially printed and much more legible.

A comparative dictionary of the Romani dialects spoken in Hungary and is an expanded version of Vekerdi (1983). The compiler claims that the dictionary contains all words in the extant dialects that have been recorded, however he has deliberately not included words from dialects that had mostly died out, such as Romungro. Of the Hungarian loanwords in the Vlax dialects, and German words in the Sinté dialect, he includes only the most common and important ones, such as certain adverbs. The compiler collected most of the lexicological material himself, but also references several other reliable works on the contemporary dialects.

Since the focus of the dictionary is to compare dialects, not much attention is paid to grammatical categories; some parts of speech are labeled, but not universally, e.g. *ajivénd* ‘last winter’ is labeled as an adverb, however *akanák* ‘now’ is not. The grammatical category of many words must be determined from the English and Hungarian glosses. Verbs are presented in the 3rd person singular, but no information is provided on transitivity or valency. Aorist forms are, however, provided. Lemmas from different dialects that differ phonologically in minor ways are helpfully grouped together, e.g. “*achel* R, *āchel* Ve, *ācel* / *āchel* G, *āsel* / *āsol* V, *chel* S” for the verb ‘to wait’, the upper-case letters representing the dialect, in this case Romungro, Vend, Gurvari, and Sinté, respectively. Etymologies are provided for words not of the original Romani stock. The orthography used corresponds to the Croatian and Serbian in Latin script, with the addition of <x> for /x/ and vowels <ö> and <ü> for the corresponding Hungarian vowels. Aspirated consonants are indicated with the typical <h>, i.e. <kh>, <ph>, <th>. Word stress is indicated.


This is a well-compiled, bidirectional Macedonian-Romani dictionary and grammar based on vocabulary from the Arli, Džambaz, and Kovač dialects, although the specific dialect is not indicated for the vocabulary items. Since Arli (Southern Balkan Romani) and Džambazi, also known as Gurbet (Southern Vlax Romani), belong to different dialect groups, this is a bit curious. Lemmas are labeled for part of speech, and in cases where not obvious, the etymology of the word, e.g. from Greek, is indicated. Verbs are labeled as transitive, intransitive, or reflexive. Past-tense stem forms are given with the 3rd-person singular form. The orthography for Romani is in the Latin script using the diacritics typical of South Slavic languages in the Latin script.

A descriptive, bidirectional Romani-Italian dictionary. According to the introduction, this dictionary is, in fact, based primarily on the Romani content of the authors’ *Makedonsko-romski i romsko-makedonski rečnik* but with the addition of some newer words not found in the earlier work. Since this lexical material reflects the dialects spoken in North Macedonia it may not closely correspond to the language as spoken in Italy. However it is a useful addition to the field as Italian is better known in the West than is Macedonian. Please see the entry for *Velickovski (1998)* for full comments based in this original dictionary.

At the time of writing this dictionary is only held by one known North-American library (Michigan State University Libraries Special Collections) and is not available for loan. I am grateful to the library staff who were kind enough to scan the introduction and a few pages so it could be included in this bibliography.


A descriptive grammar and dictionary of Romani spoken in Transylvania at the time of writing. Although the compiler does not specify a dialect in his introduction, based on the forms given for the verb ‘to be’ in the grammar section this appears to reflect the Romungro dialect. The compiler also clarifies that the main differences in the three variants spoken in Transylvania pertain to the inclusion of loanwords from the three major constituent languages of Transylvania at that time, i.e. Hungarian, Romanian, and German.

Lemmas are labeled for basic part of speech and gender of nouns is indicated, although plural forms are not provided. Verbs are cited in the 1st-person singular. No aorist forms are provided, so it would not have been possible to determine participles and aorist forms for irregular verbs based on the lemma alone. No etymologies are given.

The orthography used is somewhat unusual for a work in German. The Latin script is used with the following distinctive letters: <ç> for /tʃ/, <ç> for /x/, <j> for /dʒ/ as in English, <ñ> for /ɲ/, <sh>, for /ʃ/, and <y> for /j/. The acute accent is used above vowels to indicate vowel length, and since the acute can occur on multiple syllables, e.g. táváv; ‘I cook’, this cannot be relied on to indicate word stress. There are a number of digraphs for diphthongs (⟨Áe⟩, ⟨ái⟩, ⟨au⟩, ⟨ei⟩, ⟨ui⟩, ⟨oi⟩, ⟨oe⟩), but the distinction between the first two is not explained. ⟨oe⟩ presumably reflects the common Hungarian and German vowel ⟨ö⟩ in loanwords from that language. Aspiration is only indicated for two consonants with <ç> following the consonant, i.e. <pç> and <tç>, but not for /kh/, e.g. /kher/ is written as kér. There is no distinction made between the typical /r/ and the uvular /ʁ/ sound.

A print-on-demand facsimile of the 1884 edition with no additional content. Please see entry Wlislocki (1884).


A descriptive, unidirectional Romani-German dictionary with 3862 entries. It includes an alphabetical German index rather than a full German-Romani section. The dictionary does not include any original material but is rather based on 47 earlier dictionaries and other lexicological literature. As these earlier sources stretch over more than a century, there will naturally be a chronological mismatch between words presented under any particular lemma. The etymologies are taken from Pott (1844) and Miklosich (1877). Since it consolidates information from these earlier dictionaries, it is not always clear from which dialects words are taken, so this information must be obtained by referring to the original source. Despite this lack of clarity about dialect or geographical scope of the words, it is a very useful resource for studying Romani etymology as well the history of Romani lexicography as a discipline. To this latter end, a bibliography of earlier Romani dictionaries and glossaries is included (pp. 36-43).

Lemmas are accompanied by basic parts of speech, and transitivity of verbs is indicated when necessary to clarify meanings. Because words are cited exactly as found in the source literature, locating known words can be problematic as there is no consistent orthography, and the alphabetical organization is not reliable. For example, the lemma *jálea* ‘sorrow,’ a loan from Romanian and pronounced /ʒalea/, will be interfiled with others in which the letter <j> is the semi-vowel, e.g. *jasvin* ‘tear’, and not with the similar and related entry *žalja* found later in the dictionary. However, in the compiler’s defense, trying to consolidate all entries under a consistent orthography would have been a Herculean task. No grammatical sketch is provided, as this would not have been feasible in such a dictionary that combines materials from many different dialects and time periods.


A descriptive, unidirectional Romani-German dictionary with 3862 entries. It includes an alphabetical German index rather than a full German-Romani section. The dictionary does not include any original material but is rather based on 47 earlier dictionaries and other lexicological literature. As these earlier sources stretch over more than a century, there will naturally be a chronological mismatch between words presented under any particular lemma. The etymologies are taken from Pott (1844) and Miklosich (1877). Since it consolidates information from these earlier dictionaries, it is not always clear from which dialects words are taken, so this information must be obtained by referring to the original source. Despite this lack of clarity about dialect or geographical scope of the words, it is a very useful resource for studying Romani etymology as well the history of Romani lexicography as a discipline. To this latter end, a bibliography of earlier Romani dictionaries and glossaries is included (pp. 36-43).
Dialect Index

**Anglo-Romani** (4)


Borrow, G. (1923), *Romano lavo-lil: word book of the Romany, or, English gypsy language, with specimens of gypsy poetry, and an account of certain gypsyries or places inhabited by them, and of various things relating to gypsy life in England.*


**Arli** (5)


**Balkan Romani** (2)


**Baltic Romani** (3)


**British Romani** (1)


**Bugurdži** (1)


**Burgenland Romani** (1)


**Caló** (21)

Borrow, G. (1841), Zincali, or, An account of the Gypsies of Spain. With an original collection of their songs and poetry, and a copious dictionary of their language.


Borrow, G. (2007), Zincali, or, An account of the gypsies of Spain: with an original collection of their songs and poetry, and a copious dictionary of their language.

Buzek, I. (2010), Imagen del gitano en la lexicografía española.

C., D.A.d. (1851), Diccionario del dialecto gitano: origen y costumbres de los gitanos.

Campuzano, R. (1848), Orijen, usos y costumbres de los jitanos y diccionario de su dialecto: con las voces equivalentes del castellano y sus definiciones.

Dávila, B. and B. Pérez (1943), Apuntes del dialecto “caló” o gitano puro.

Jimenez, A. (1853), Vocabulario del dialecto Jitano: con cerca de 300 palabras.

Mayo, F.d.S. (1867), *Diccionario gitano: primera parte*.

Mayo, F.d.S. (1870), *Gitanismo: historia, costumbres, y dialecto de los gitanos*.


Pabanó, F.M. (1915), *Historia y costumbres de los gitanos colección de cuentos viejos y nuevos, dichos y timos graciosos, maldiciones y refranes netamente gitanos*.

Rebolledo, T. (1900), *A Chipicalli: la lengua gitana*.


Trujillo, E. (1844), *Vocabulario del dialecto gitano*.


Usoz y Río, L.d. (1837), *Diccionario caló-español*.

**Carpathian Romani (1)**


**Chergash (1)**


**Common Romani (4)**


**Crimean Romani (2)**

Toropov, V.G. (1999), *Slovar’ iazyka krymskikh tsygan*.

Toropov, V.G. (2003), *Slovar’ iazyka krymskikh tsygan*.

**Drindari (3)**


**Džambazi (3)**


**Erli (4)**


**Finnish Romani (3)**


68

Valtonen, P. (1972), *Suomen mustaläiskielen etymologinen sanakirja.*

**Gurbet** (12)


Uhlik, R. (1947), *Srpskohrvatsko-ciganski rečnik = Romane alava.*


**Gurbet?** (1)

Đurić, R. (2009), *Romski glagoli, njihovo poreklo i značenje.*
Gurvari (2)


Kaalo (2)


Kabudji (1)


Kalderash (14)


Cherenkov, L.N., R.S. Demeter, and P.S. Demeter (1990), Gypsy-English dictionary: Kalderash dialect: 5300 words.


Gjerdman, O., J.D. Taikon, and E. Ljungberg (1963), Language of the Swedish coppersmith gipsy, Johan Dimitri Taikon: grammar, texts, vocabulary, and English word-index.

Haliti, B. (2011), Srpsko-romski rečnik sa gramatikom i pravopisnim savetnikom = Serbikano-
**Rromano alavari e gramatikaça thaj e vòrtaxramosaripnasqe sikavipnaça.**


Sărău, G., C. Corneliu, and (1998), *Dicționar român-rrom (căldărăresc) și dicționar rrom (căldărăresc)-român.*

**Kalderash?** (1)


**Kovač** (2)


**Lovari** (17)


Györffy, E. (1885), *Magyar és czigány szótár: Czigányul mondva vakeriben.*


Sztojka, F. (1886), *Magyar és ezigány nyelv gyök-szótára = románé álavá*.


**Machwaya (1)**


**Mechkari (1)**


**Multidialectal (6)**

Miklosich, F. (1877), *Vergleichung der Zigeunermundarten*.

Wörterbuch und Sprachproben


**Northern Romani (2)**


Sergievskiĭ, M.V. and B.A. P. (1938), *TSygansko-russkiĭ slovar‘: około 10000 slov s priloženiem grammatiki tsyganskogo iazyka*.

**Para-Romani (22)**

Anonymous (1755), *Rotwellsche Grammatik, oder Sprachkunst: das ist, Anweisung wie man diese Sprache in wenig Stunden erlernen, reden, und verstehen möge*.


Borrow, G. (2007), *Zincali, or, An account of the gypsies of Spain: with an original collection of their songs and poetry, and a copious dictionary of their language*.


C., D.A.d. (1851), *Diccionario del dialecto gitano: orígen y costumbres de los gitanos*.

Dávila, B. and B. Pérez (1943), *Apuntes del dialecto “caló” o gitano puro*.


73


Mayo, F.d.S. (1867), *Diccionario gitano: primera parte*.

Mayo, F.d.S. (1870), *Gitanismo: historia, costumbres, y dialecto de los gitanos*.


Pabanó, F.M. (1915), *Historia y costumbres de los gitanos colección de cuentos viejos y nuevos, dichos y timos graciosos, maldiciones y refranes netamente gitanos*.

Rebolledo, T. (1900), *A Chipicalli: la lengua gitana*.


Trujillo, E. (1844), *Vocabulario del dialecto gitano*.


**Polish Romani, Southern (1)**


**Romanichal (1)**


**Romano, Norwegian (1)**


**Rommano, Norwegian (1)**

**Rommano, Swedish (1)**


**Romungro (6)**


Wlislocki, H.v. (1884), *Sprache der transsilvanischen Zigeuner: Grammatik, Wörterbuch*.


**Rupani (1)**


**Shkodrani (1)**


**Sinté (10)**


Liebich, R. (1863), *Zigeuner in ihrem Wesen und in ihrer Sprache*.
Liebich, R. and E. Carlsohn (1968), *Zigeuner in ihrem Wesen und in ihrer Sprache*.


**Slovakian Romani (2)**

Adam, G., et al. (2012), *Gramatika rómskeho jazyka a slovensko-rómsky slovnik*.


**Slovakian Romani, Eastern (1)**


**Spoitori (1)**


**Turkish Romani (1)**


**Ursari (2)**


**Vend (2)**


Vekerdi, J. and V. Zsuzsa (2000), *Magyarországi cigány nyelvjárások szótára* = *Comparative dictionary of Gypsy dialects in Hungary*.

**Vlax Romani (1)**

Jovanović, V.Z. (2001), *Romsko-srpsko-engleski rečnik religijskih reči i izraza*

**Vlax, Northern (2)**

Kogalniceanu, M. (1837), *Esquisse sur l'histoire, les moeurs et la langue des cigains, connus en France sous le nom de Bohémiens, suivie d'un recueil de sept cents mots cigains*.

Vaillant, J.A. (1868), *Grammaire, dialogues et vocabulaire de la langue des Bohémiens ou Cigains*.

**Vlax, Southern (1)**


**Welsh Romani (2)**


Sampson, J. (1926), *Dialect of the Gypsies of Wales: being the older form of British Romani preserved in the speech of the clan of Abram Wood*.

**Xoraxané (2)**


**Zlătari (1)**

Country/Region Index

Albania (1)


Austria (1)


Balkans (1)


Bosnia and Herzegovina (5)


Uhlik, R. (1947), *Srpskohrvatsko-ciganski rečnik = Romane alava.*


Bulgaria (6)


**Canada (2)**


**Croatia (1)**


**Denmark (1)**


**England (4)**


Borrow, G. (1923), *Romano lavo-lil: word book of the Romany, or, English gypsy language, with specimens of gypsy poetry, and an account of certain gypsyries or places inhabited by them, and of various things relating to gypsy life in England*.


**Europe (3)**


Miklosich, F. (1877), *Vergleichung der Zigeunermundarten*.


**Finland (3)**


Valtonen, P. (1972), *Suomen mustalaiskielen etymologinen sanakirja*.

**France (6)**


Kogalniceanu, M. (1837), *Esquisse sur l'histoire, les moeurs et la langue des cigains, connus en France sous le nom de Bohémiens, suivie d'un recueil de sept cents mots cigains*.


**Georgia, Republic of (2)**

Toropov, V.G. (1999), *Slovar’ iazyka krymskikh tsygan*.

Toropov, V.G. (2003), *Slovar’ iazyka krymskikh tsygan*.

**Germany (6)**

Anonymous (1755), *Rotwellsche Grammatik, oder Sprachkunst: das ist, Anweisung wie man diese Sprache in wenig Stunden erlernen, reden, und verstehen möge*.

Liebich, R. (1863), *Zigeuner in ihrem Wesen und in ihrer Sprache*.

Liebich, R. and E. Carlsohn (1968), *Zigeuner in ihrem Wesen und in ihrer Sprache*.


**Great Britain** (1)


**Greece** (3)


**Hungary** (21)


Anna, O. (2008), *Beás-magyar kisszótár*.


Györffy, E. (1885), *Magyar és czigány szótár: Czigányul mondva vakeriben*.


Karsai, E. (2009), *Cigány-magyar és magyar-cigány kisszótár = Romano-ungriko haj ungriko-romano cino alavari*.


81


Sztojka, F. (1886), *Magyar és czigány nyelv gyűk-szótára = románé álává*.


**Italy** (3)


**Kosovo** (1)


**Latvia** (1)

Macedonia (6)


Uhlik, R. (1947), *Srpskohrvatsko-ciganski rečnik = Romane alava*.


Montenegro (2)

Demir, L., N. Durmis, and F. Demir (2015), *Crnogorsko-romski i Romsko-crnogorski rječnik = Crnogorikani-romani thaj Romani-Crnogorikani lavustik*.


Norway (2)


Poland (1)


Romania (9)


Sărău, G., C. Corneliu, and (1998), *Dicionar român-rrom (căldărâresc) și dictionar rrom (căldărăresc)-român*.

Vaillant, J.A. (1868), *Grammaire, dialogues et vocabulaire de la langue des Bohémiens ou Cigains*.

Wlislocki, H.v. (1884), *Sprache der transsilvanischen Zigeuner: Grammatik, Wörterbuch*.


**Russia (6)**

Cherenkov, L.N., R.S. Demeter, and P.S. Demeter (1990), *Gypsy-English dictionary: Kalderash dialect: 5300 words*.

Demeter, R.S., D.P. S., and C.L. N. (1990), *TSygansko-russkiî i russko-tsyganskii slovar': keldærarskiî dialekt: 5,300 slov*.


Sergievskiî, M.V. and B.A. P. (1938), *TSygansko-russkiî slovar': około 10000 slov s priloženiem grammatiki tsyganskogo iazyka*.

Toropov, V.G. (2003), *Slovak iazyka krymskikh tsysan*.


**Serbia (7)**


Đurić, R. (2009), *Romski glagoli, njihovo poreklo i značenje*.

Haliti, B. (2011), *Srpsko-romski rečnik sa gramatikom i pravopisnim savetnikom = Serbikano-
Jovanović, V.Z. (2001), *Romsko-srpsko-engleski rečnik religijskih reči i izraza*

Uhlik, R. (1947), *Srpskohrvatsko-ciganski rečnik = Romane alava.*


**Slovakia** (5)


**Slovenia** (1)


**Spain** (21)

Borrow, G. (1841), *Zincali, or, An account of the Gypsies of Spain. With an original collection of their songs and poetry, and a copious dictionary of their language.*


Borrow, G. (2007), *Zincali, or, An account of the gypsies of Spain: with an original collection of their songs and poetry, and a copious dictionary of their language.*


C., D.A.d. (1851), *Diccionario del dialecto gitano: origen y costumbres de los gitanos.*

Campuzano, R. (1848), *Orijen, usos y costumbres de los jitanos y diccionario de su dialecto: con las voces equivalentes del castellano y sus definiciones.*
Dávila, B. and B. Pérez (1943), *Apuntes del dialecto “caló” o gitano puro.*

Jimenez, A. (1853), *Vocabulario del dialecto Jitano: con cerca de 300 palabras.*


Mayo, F.d.S. (1870), *Gitanismo: historia, costumbres, y dialecto de los gitanos.*


Pabanó, F.M. (1915), *Historia y costumbres de los gitanos colección de cuentos viejos y nuevos, dichos y timos graciosos, maldiciones y refranes netamente gitanos.*

Rebolledo, T. (1900), *A Chipicalli: la lengua gitana.*


Trujillo, E. (1844), *Vocabulario del dialecto gitano.*


Usoz y Río, L.d. (1837), *Diccionario caló-español.*

**Sweden (2)**


**Ukraine (2)**
Toropov, V.G. (1999), *Slovar’ iazyka krymskikh tsygan*.

Toropov, V.G. (2003), *Slovar’ iazyka krymskikh tsygan*.

**United States** (4)


**Wales** (2)


Sampson, J. (1926), *Dialect of the Gypsies of Wales: being the older form of British Romani preserved in the speech of the clan of Abram Wood*.

**Yugoslavia, Former Republics of** (1)

Target Language Index

**Albanian** (1)


**Bosnian** (1)


**Bulgarian** (5)


**Croatian** (3)


Uhlik, R. (1947), *Srpskohrvatsko-ciganski rečnik = Romane alava.*


**Czech** (2)


Danish (1)


English (21)


Borrow, G. (1841), *Zincali, or, An account of the Gypsies of Spain. With an original collection of their songs and poetry, and a copious dictionary of their language.*


Borrow, G. (1923), *Romano lavo-lil: word book of the Romany, or, English gypsy language, with specimens of gypsy poetry, and an account of certain gypsyries or places inhabited by them, and of various things relating to gypsy life in England.*


Jovanović, V.Z. (2001), *Romsko-srpsko-engleski rečnik religijskih reči i izraza*


dictionary.


Sampson, J. (1926), *Dialect of the Gypsies of Wales: being the older form of British Romani preserved in the speech of the clan of Abram Wood*.


**Finnish (3)**


Valtonen, P. (1972), *Suomen mustalaiskielen etymologinen sanakirja*.

**French (9)**


Vaillant, J.A. (1868), *Grammaire, dialogues et vocabulaire de la langue des Bohémiens ou Cigains*.

**German** (16)

Anonymous (1755), *Rotwellsche Grammatik, oder Sprachkunst: das ist, Anweisung wie man diese Sprache in wenig Stunden erlernen, reden, und verstehen möge*.


Liebich, R. (1863), *Zigeuner in ihrem Wesen und in ihrer Sprache*.

Liebich, R. and E. Carsohn (1968), *Zigeuner in ihrem Wesen und in ihrer Sprache*.

Miklosich, F. (1877), *Vergleichung der Zigeunermundarten*.


Wlislocki, H.v. (1884), *Sprache der transsilvanischen Zigeuner: Grammatik, Wörterbuch*.


**Greek** (2)


**Hungarian** (20)


Anna, O. (2008), *Beás-magyar kisszótár*.


Györffy, E. (1885), *Magyar és czigány szótár: Czigányul mondva vakeriben*.


Karsai, E. (2009), *Cigány-magyar és magyar-cigány kisszótár = Romano-ungriko haj ungriko-romano cino alavari*.


Sztojka, F. (1886), *Magyar és czigány nyelv gyök-szótára = románé álaláv*.


**Italian** (2)


**Latvian** (1)


**Macedonian** (2)


**Montenegrin** (1)

Demir, L., N. Durmis, and F. Demir (2015), *Crnogorsko-romski i Romsko-crnogorski rječnik = Crnogorikani-romani thaj Romani-Crnogorikani lavustik*.
Multilingual (2)
Courthiade, M., et al. (2009), *Morri angluni rromane čhibăgi evroputni lavustik = Első rromani nyelvű európai szótáram*


Norwegian (2)

Panjabi (1)

Romanian (6)

Sarău, G., C. Corneliu, and (1998), *Dicționar român-rrom (căldărăresc) și dicționar rrom (căldărăresc)-român*.

Russian (6)

Sergievskiǐ, M.V. and B.A. P. (1938), *TSygansko-russkiĭ slovarʹ: około 10000 słów s priloženiem...*
grammatiki tseyganskogo iazyka.

Toropov, V.G. (1999), Slovar’ iazyka krymskikh tseygan.

Toropov, V.G. (2003), Slovar’ iazyka krymskikh tseygan.


Serbian (7)


Đurić, R. (2009), Romski glagoli, njihovo poreklo i značenje.

Haliti, B. (2011), Srpsko-romski rečnik sa gramatikom i pravopisnim savetnikom = Serbikano-rromano alavari e gramatika thaj e vórtaxramosaripnasqe sikavipnaça.

Jovanović, V.Z. (2001), Romsko-srpsko-ingleski rečnik religijskih reči i izraza

Uhlik, R. (1947), Srpskohrvatsko-ciganski rečnik = Romane alava.


Slovak (3)

Adam, G., et al. (2012), Gramatika rómskeho jazyka a slovensko-rómsky slovnik.


Slovenian (1)


Spanish (20)

Borrow, G. (2007), Zincali, or, An account of the gypsies of Spain: with an original collection of their songs and poetry, and a copious dictionary of their language.

Buzek, I. (2010), Imagen del gitano en la lexicografía española.

C., D.A.d. (1851), Diccionario del dialecto gitano: orígen y costumbres de los gitanos.

Campuzano, R. (1848), Origen, usos y costumbres de los jitanos y diccionario de su dialecto: con las voces equivalentes del castellano y sus definiciones.

Dávila, B. and B. Pérez (1943), Apuntes del dialecto “caló” o gitano puro.

Jimenez, A. (1853), Vocabulario del dialecto Jitano: con cerca de 300 palabras.


Mayo, F.d.S. (1867), Diccionario gitano: primera parte.

Mayo, F.d.S. (1870), Gitanismo: historia, costumbres, y dialecto de los gitanos.


Pabanó, F.M. (1915), Historia y costumbres de los gitanos colección de cuentos viejos y nuevos, dichos y timos graciosos, maldiciones y refranes netamente gitanos.

Rebolledo, T. (1900), A Chipicalli: la lengua gitana.

Rebolledo, T. (1909), Diccionario gitano-español y español-gitano.


Trujillo, E. (1844), Vocabulario del dialecto gitano.


Usoz y Río, L.d. (1837), Diccionario caló-español.
Swedish (2)


Welsh (1)

Other Works Consulted


14: Matthews, W. K. “Suomen kielen etymologinen sanakirja I (Finnish Etymological Dictionary) (Book Review)”. *The Slavonic and East European review* (1928), 35, no. 84, 1928,
pp. 278-281.


