
Cartography, a research program within the Principles and Parameters framework of syntactic theory, aims to map out the functional structure of natural language sentences; more generally, it aims to draw precise and detailed maps of syntactic configurations. By the beginning of the year 2000, Cartography gains an independent status thanks to a series of workshops organized in Italy in the late 1990s, which are followed by the publication of the revised version of the presentations given at these events or even diverse articles directly related to the Cartographic Project. Cartography becomes known to the general public and makes a name for itself first of all through the ten independent volumes of the Oxford University Press/Oxford Studies in Comparative Syntax series entitled The Cartography of Syntactic Structures. The book under review here is the tenth, that is, the latest volume dedicated to the cartographic approach to syntax. It marks an important milestone in the history of Cartography and this is also reflected in the title of the Swiss colloquium (Syntactic Cartography: Where do we go from here?) where the earlier versions of the papers collected in this volume were presented in the summer of 2012. The proceedings of the Geneva colloquium are all articles that address questions at the core of research in syntactic cartography through comparative studies across a wide range of languages (in different diachronic stages) and dialects.

The volume is structured into four sections and the sixteen articles are thematically grouped into one of these sections. The three fundamental questions that these papers address are: 1. Where do the contents of functional structure come from?; 2. What explains the particular order or hierarchy in which they appear?; 3. What are the computational restrictions on the activation of functional categories?

The book opens with Introduction (pp. 1–19), in which the editor, following the tradition established in the previous Cartography volumes, briefly presents the cartographic enterprise and summarizes the contributions one by one.

Part One is entitled The Articulation of Focus and it comprises five articles.

The first paper is written by Giuliano Bocci and Cinzia Avesani (Can the Metrical Structure of Italian Motivate Focus Fronting?, pp. 23–41). Starting from the fundamental claim that there is a systematic interplay between discourse-related properties, syntax, and prosody, the article presents the general properties of focus fronting in Italian, emphasizing the distinction between fronted focus and Clitic Left Dislocated topic mostly from the perspective of their prosodic pattern. Then, it discusses the two competing approaches to focus fronting: the Cartographic approach, according to which focus is coded in syntax, and the stress-based approach, according to which focus is prosodically encoded. The last section, the core of the chapter, brings arguments against the latter approach by giving the details of a production experiment previously discussed in a different prosodic model by these authors, and by presenting the results of a new comprehension experiment. The two main claims made in the first experiment and further supported in the second are the following: at least in Italian, given information is not destressed and postfocal constituents are associated with phrasal heads.

Adriana Belletti’s contribution (The Focus Map of Clefts: Extraposition and Predication, pp. 42–59) addresses the forms of focalization in cleft sentences. Although it is a generally accepted fact that cleft sentences are focus structures, upon closer inspection it turns out that there is a distinction between Subject and Object/non-Subject clefts with respect to the type of focalization that they express. This results in the assumption of two different Focus positions: whereas the vP-peripheral low

Focus position is exploited in the former type of clefts, which can express focus of new information; it is the left-peripheral Focus position that is exploited by the latter kind of clefts (and sometimes by Subject clefts as well) to express corrective/contrastive focus. The subchapter dedicated to the subject and predicate of clefts sheds light on the fact that, irrespective of the type of the structure and the type of focalization, (1) the complement of the cleft copula is a CP small clause with a Pred position, (2) cleft subjects, which are not expletives but contain the silent functional noun THING, are merged in the [Spec,Pred] position, from which they move to the matrix clause subject position, and (3) the CP/FinP predicate of clefts undergoes a process of Extraposition to a higher position in the clause. The general conclusion drawn from the discussion is that the possibility to offer a unified analysis of Subject and Object/non-Subject clefts is due to the fine-grained (i.e. cartographic) decomposition of syntactic structures.

Valentina Bianchi’s chapter is entitled Focus Fronting and the Syntax-Semantics Interface (pp. 60–72). These few pages deal with focus fronting in Italian. At first, the reader might have the impression that the discussion on focus fronting and on the distinction between the two interpretive flavours (the corrective versus the mirative import) associated with it is a continuation of Chapter 1, but in fact this is a semantic analysis of the above phenomena. What may seem interesting is that in Italian focus fronting is allowed both in main clauses and in complement clauses of nonfactive verbs of saying and opinion, and this holds under the two interpretations. The situation, however, is different in case the matrix clause contains a NegP. The last phenomena analyzed here are the complement clauses of factive verbs. To sum up, in Italian focus fronting seems to be restricted to clauses that may update the discourse context because of the specific types of import (mirative or corrective) associated with it. Reversing Montague’s famous sentence, Bianchi concludes that the best use for semantics is as a preliminary to syntax.

In The Syntax of It-clefts and the Left Periphery of the Clause (pp. 73–90), Liliane Haegeman, André Meinunger, and Aleksandra Vercauteren aim to evaluate two cartographic analyses of English it-clefts. To this end, they take a close look at the interpretive and derivational similarity between it-clefts, focus fronting, and interrogative and relative clauses. After offering a short theoretical introduction to the relevant aspects of Cartography, the authors present the two competing analyses of clefts. The embedded and matrix approaches are presented through the critical examination of some previous accounts. After identifying several problems that arise from these accounts, the authors discuss wh movement of the clefted XP (What was it that you saw?) and the compatibility of it-clefts with negative inversion (On no account should it be THE STUDENTS who are correcting these papers!), and conclude that in order to maintain the matrix analysis, it is necessary to postulate a higher landing site for fronted wh-phrases, as well as a specialized left peripheral position for negative inversion. This results in a loss of parallelism: focus fronting, negative inversion, and fronting of the cleft focus can no longer be considered homogeneous. The main claim is that the type of focus movement identified in it-clefts must be distinct from regular focus movement, but this undermines the attractive part of the matrix analysis concerning the parallelism between it-clefts and focus fronting.

The paper by Stephanie Durrleman and Ur Shlonsky (Focus and wh in Jamaican Creole: Movement and Exhaustiveness, pp. 91–106) closes this part of the book with an analysis of wh and ex situ focus constructions in Creoles, with special interest in Jamaican Creole. The discussion starts with a series of arguments in favour of the fact that Jamaican Creole focus and wh questions involve internal and not external merge, that is, their constituents are merged internally and move to an ex-situ position instead of being directly merged there. And this seems to be an important detail because the data presented here support the fact that a cleft analysis cannot, but a cartographic/left-peripheral approach can account for them. In other words, the syntactic behaviour of focus and wh questions in this language is systematically different from the one exhibited by clefts and copular constructions. If this is so, the only possibility left is to argue that focalization in this creole language resembles left peripheral focus movement. Moreover, this movement is claimed to be driven by the need to satisfy the so-called Exhaustiveness Criteron. Before they conclude, the authors discuss the difference between exhaustive and contrastive/corrective focus. The claims are supported by a wide range of examples from Hungarian, Tuki, English, and Italian.

Part Two, Word Order, Features, and Agreement, is built on four chapters.
The first chapter, that is, Chapter 6 proposes to investigate the internal structure of Old Italian DPs, and highlights the differences between Old Italian and Modern Italian left peripheries of the DP phase (Cecilia Poletto, *Word Orders in the Old Italian DP*, pp. 109–127). The author first illustrates the IP-like structure of the DP phase, and discusses the position of prenominal and postnominal adjectives in English and Romance. Moreover, based on the similarity between DPs and CPs, she concludes that, as the inflected verb can undergo movement to lower (e.g. Fin) or higher (e.g. Top) C projections, the N can also raise not only to the lower d, but also to the higher D. More importantly, although the internal structure of the DP in Old and Modern Italian seems to be identical, in the former language there are at least two movements that are no longer allowed in present-day Italian: on the one hand, there is the movement of a PP originating inside the DP and moving to a Specifier position situated at the edge of the DP phase (this is a case of left peripheral movement); on the other hand, there is the movement of a genitive phrase originating inside the DP and moving to a Specifier position in the IP-like space, to a structural case position of possessive pronouns (this is a case of phase internal movement). The arguments are sustained by a wealth of examples taken from three Old Italian texts. The last section focuses on a distinct but related phenomenon: the difference in the order of adjectives. Whereas Old Italian allows movement of adjectives to the left peripheral DP area, hence giving rise to prenominal adjectives with restrictive interpretation; this movement is excluded in Modern Italian, or, to put it differently, restrictive adjectives are postnominal, and prenominal adjectives can only be appositive.

Christopher Laenzlinger’s study (*The CP/DP (Non-)Parallelism Revisited*, pp. 128–150) is concerned with the well-known but not unproblematic generalization that the structure of clauses mirrors the structure of nominals. It proposes to answer, through an analysis of twelve languages, two fundamental questions: (1) To what extent is the clause and the noun structure parallel cross-linguistically? and (2) What is general/universal and what is parameterized within their structure? Two large sections are devoted to the cartography of clauses and noun phrases, respectively. As far as clauses are concerned, they are divided into three domains, namely the Nachfeld (vP, the Θ-domain of the verb), the Mittelfeld (TP, adverb, case and agreement domain), and the Vorfeld (CP, the domain of focus, topic, i.e., the left periphery). The analysis is on the exact positions that the subject, the direct object and the verb can occupy with respect to three different positional Mittelfeld adverbs: the higher (probably) in [Spec,ModeP], the middle (often) in [Spec,AspP], and the lower (quietly) in [Spec,VoiceP]. The analysis is led through the SVO, VSO and SOV configurations. The general and cross-linguistic observations focus on the landing site of the preverbal and postverbal subject, as well as the object, and the distinct properties (parameters) refer to verb movement. The section on the fine-grained structure of nouns shows that although we cannot talk about a perfect parallelism between the structure of clauses and the structure of noun phrases, in the latter case we can identify exactly the same domains, namely the Nachfeld (nP, the Θ-domain of the noun), the Mittelfeld (the domain of modifiers, PPs, Case and agreement), and the Vorfeld (the domain of quantification, i.e., the left periphery). The movements are similar to the ones previously observed; the differences between the two domains lie in the precise landing sites of the moved elements. The survey is conducted across a large number of languages grouped according to the order of their adjectives. The analysis, which is based on the distribution of adverbs in the clausal domain and the distribution of adjectives in the nominal domain, closes with a summary of the similarities and differences between these two domains.

Anna Cardinaletti’s joint work with Giuliana Giusti, *Cartography and Optional Feature Realization in the Nominal Expression* (pp. 151–172), compares the behaviour of nominal expressions in Italian and some central Italian dialects. The cartography of these phrases is the one the readers are already familiar with: the lexical, the inflectional and the complementizer layer (in a bottom-up order). Out of the three feature-sharing processes, the authors discuss only two, the lesser-known Projection and Concord. They identify four types of Concord, depending on whether the concordling element in the Specifier position has overt or non-overt concord for the features of the head, and depending on whether the features of the head are overt or non-overt. The bulk of the paper is devoted to the discussion of a particular instance of Concord, called Compensatory Concord, in which the
non-overt/null concord on the Specifier goes hand in hand with the overt feature of the head, or, in other words, the realization of the head compensates for the lack of features on the Specifier. This type of Concord is represented by the adjective bel and the determiners quel and del, three vocabulary items in prenominal position, whose morphology (-l) is not part of the functional structure of the vocabulary item itself but is the overt realization of the functional head in whose Specifier the vocabulary item (be-, que-, and del) is merged. The rest of the paper contrasts these Italian data with the data from the central Italian dialect of Ancona, as well as with the facts in two other dialects: Florentine and Perugino.

Pavel Caha’s contribution is on numbers in Czech (Czech Numerals and No Bundling, pp. 173–195). The higher numerals under study here are five to ten, hundred and thousand. They present some interesting properties, which lead to the fact that they can be analyzed neither as ordinary nouns nor as ordinary adjectives. They have both lexical and functional properties, so they are semilexical. The solution proposed by Caha is that these semilexical categories can be explained in Nanosyntactic terms, namely if we hypothesize that lexical items spell out a whole set of projections (provided these projections form a constituent), more precisely, these numerals may be considered special nouns that spell out NumP. To put it differently, numerals are a special type of lexical items that spell out a phrasal constituent that includes a nominal projection at the bottom and a higher functional projection (Num). The approach put forth is compatible with the No Bundling hypothesis: if numerals are a special class of phrasal nouns, then there are actually two nouns in the structure, and the two K projections are allowed as there are two independent functional sequences/extended projections. In order to highlight the properties of Czech numerical phrases, a parallel is drawn between these phrases and binominal case-attraction structures: the internal mechanism of case attraction is placed under scrutiny and the phenomenon is analyzed through data from languages such as Czech, Guugu Jaliang and Old Georgian. The analysis offers an elegant answer to why hundred and thousand are ambiguous in Czech between nouns and numerals, and why numerals can move to certain higher positions.

Part Three contains three papers directly connected to The Left Periphery.

The first article, by Irene Franco, Cartographic Structures in Diachrony: The Case of C-omission (pp. 199–219), is a case study of the diachronic changes in finite subordinating elements, more precisely in the requirements of their morphological realization in Old, Renaissance and Modern Florentine. It takes a look at the conditions under which C-omission may occur in these three diachronic stages of Florentine, as well as in present-day Italian. C-omission can be not only possible or impossible, but also dependent on some specific feature specification (e.g., mood marking in Modern Italian). Assuming that person features of clausal arguments are interpreted in FinP, where discourse coordinates (nominal and spatio-temporal deixis) are encoded, the discussion is on how some microparametric changes in Florentine had a direct impact on the diachrony of C-omission. The changes taken into account are: the loss of V-to-C, which is related to a change in the pro-drop parameter, and an active/inactive distinction in the case of relative clauses that is also reflected in the morphosyntax of C-elements. The author concludes by stating that it is precisely Cartography and its fine-grained decomposition of the CP domain that permits to single out the factors involved in diachronic changes, in this case the changes that are at the basis of C-omission and its optionality.

Yoshio Endo’s paper, Two ReasonPs: What Are *(n’t) You Coming to the United States For? (pp. 220–231), contributes to the debate about why and its syntactic locus. What we have to know is that basically there are two opposing positions in the literature: Rizzi (2001) claims that why is base-generated in the CP zone, more precisely in [Spec,IntP]; whereas Shlonsky and Soare (2011) show that it undergoes movement to the CP zone from a base-generated position ([Spec,ReasonP]) to be found in the IP zone, higher than Neg. Building on this latter hypothesis, Endo proposes that in order to account for the what ... for way of asking the reason in English, we must assume that in fact there is another ReasonP (ReasonP2), lower than Neg, where what and for are generated, and that what jumps over Neg, violates the negative island constraint and provides an explanation for the ungrammaticality of the example given in the title. This is in line with the basic cartographic suggestion: if we are able to identify a morpheme that adds a given property (or meaning) to the expression it is part of, this
indicates that the underlying syntactic structure contains an independent head corresponding to that property (and meaning). Moreover, according to the strongest position, if there is evidence for the existence of ReasonP2 in English, then there is evidence for the existence of this particular head (and projection) in all other languages, but in some languages there may be no overt evidence for it. But what is the landing site of this element? The cross-linguistic analysis given here proves that what targets the [Spec,IntP2] position and it is in this position that it acquires its semantic interpretation related to reason, which is different from the interpretation of why, which targets the [Spec,IntP1] position. The paper closes with a brief discussion on how come and why the hell.

The last chapter of Part Three ( Günther Grewendorf, Double Fronting in Bavarian Left Periphery, pp. 232–252) turns to a language that has not received wide attention so far in this volume. The interest is in the left periphery of this Southern dialect of German, which allows doubly filled COMP in embedded clauses. The paper investigates the phenomenon called double fronting. The interesting properties that this kind of extraction from an embedded clause is associated with, and all the conditions under which it is licensed raise several questions that the paper attempts to give an answer to. The first question refers to the target position of Bavarian extraction. As opposed to some previous analyses, according to the author we have good reasons to believe that the target position is not located in the left periphery of the matrix clause but in the left periphery of the embedded clause. The second question addresses the motivation behind this extraction and the reason why clausal fronting is required. Whereas the necessity of moving X to the left periphery can be accounted for in terms of the theory of phases (syntactic objects with unsatisfied feature requirements are claimed to move to the edge of their phase so that their relevant unvalued feature becomes/is accessible to a probe and hence their uninterpretable features are valued by this higher probe in the subsequent phase), Agree of the extraction element must be with a head in the left periphery of the matrix clause and it is the necessity of this relation that motivates fronting of the embedded clause. The next question targets the properties of the gap in the matrix clause and the way this gap is licensed. This gap is claimed to be not a parasitic gap, but its presence is the result of topic drop. Finally, the last question, Why is Bavarian extraction from wh-clauses with complex wh-elements disallowed?, seems to have two alternative answers, and it appears that there is more to this co-occurrence restriction than the fact that the topic part of the complex wh-element and the extraction element itself compete for the same syntactic position. The answers to these questions make use, as expected, of the cartographic approach to the left periphery of the clause, combining the parametric approach to the functional structure of the left periphery with properties of the Chomskian theory of phases.

The last part, Part Four, is concerned with Hierarchies and Labels. The first chapter, that is, Chapter 13, by Mamoru Saito (Cartography and Selection: Case Studies in Japanese, pp. 255–274), tackles the cartographic issue of the Japanese right periphery. More precisely, it proposes to reconsider the functional sequence proposed for Japanese modals, the hierarchical relation of complementizers, and the distribution of sentence-final particles. To foreshadow the discussion, what the author proposes is that s-selection plays a crucial role in determining the distribution of heads in the right periphery. As far as modals are concerned, though there may be a sequence proposed for them in the literature, they cannot co-occur in one simple sentence. In syntactic terms, this means that no modal can take a ModalP as its complement. This generalization and more generally the distribution of modals, most of which are verbal suffixes, is claimed to follow from morphology and s-selection. With respect to the complementizers no, ka, and to, they differ from modals because they can co-occur, so we need an explanation for their hierarchy. The possible combinations among them stem from, again, their s-selection requirements (especially the requirement of no), and their semantic properties. Finally, turning to sentence-final particles such as wa, yo, ne, and na, we see that they can co-occur, albeit in a fixed order. The author discusses their properties and concludes that the distribution of these genuine discourse elements is jointly dictated by s-selection and the specific speech acts that they convey. The general conclusion is that the three different functional sequences are consequences of the properties of the lexical items that are included in the hierarchies themselves and so there is no need to postulate hierarchies for Japanese phrase structure as the relevant facts are derivable from lexical properties.
The premise of Wei-Tien Dylan Tsai’s paper *On the Topography of Chinese Modals* (pp. 275–294) is that modals in this language exhibit both verbal and nominal properties, and they can also express a wide variety of modality ranging from deontic to epistemic. The paper intends to contribute to the tripartite structure of the clause by encoding epistemic modality on the complementizer layer, deontic modality on the inflectional layer, and dynamic modality on the lexical layer. The modal hierarchy, which establishes that epistemic adverbs and auxiliaries always appear higher than their deontic and dynamic counterparts, is established with the help of several syntactic tests, which also cast light on the fact that deontic and dynamic modals are not the same, and are situated within different phases. These findings help the author sketch the correct and precise topography of Chinese modals. What is more, epistemic modals, being discourse/knowledge-oriented, are associated with information structure in CP; deontic modals, being more subject-oriented, are associated with event structure encoded in IP; and dynamic modals, being essentially agent-oriented, are associated with argument structure.

*The Clausal Hierarchy, Features, and Parameters* by Theresa Biberauer and Ian Roberts (pp. 295–313) surveys three distinct types of formal hierarchies and addresses the question of their role and nature in current syntactic theory. First, clausal hierarchies are connected to two seminal works: Rizzi’s (1997) work on the fine structure of the left periphery (CP level), and Cinque’s (1999) elaborate work on the functional categories associated with various types of adverbials (TP level). In their attempt to relate the three hierarchies and suggest that they are in fact unified, the authors “see these approaches as reflecting two different levels of featural organization” (2015: 297). That is, we can talk about different levels of organization in the clause, where, depending on the level of granularity, we have either the core functional categories of Minimalism (C, T and v) or the fine-grained structures of Cartography. Then, featural hierarchies are represented by Harley and Ritter’s (2002) hierarchical dependencies between the three φ-features. Finally, as concerns parameter hierarchies, they are studied by the authors of this article and some of their project colleagues. The basic idea is that the single formal hierarchy is not predetermined by Universal Grammar alone, but it is the property of the interaction of Universal Grammar, Primary Linguistic Data for language acquisition, and third-factor considerations of cognitive computational conservativity (Feature Economy and Input Generalisation). In the diagnostics that show the unity of the hierarchies, Relativized Minimality seems to play a crucial role.

The closing chapter is written by Luigi Rizzi (*Cartography, Criteria, and Labeling*, pp. 314–338) and it explores the relationship between two apparently distinct phenomena, more exactly, the consequences of a labeling algorithm for the system of Criteria. It first discusses the system of Criteria and the effects of Criterial Freezing. To put it in a nutshell, in some (more complex) cases, once a complex phrase reaches the closest criterial position and satisfies the criterion, part of that phrase (the criterial goal) is frozen in place and hence it becomes unavailable to further movement(s). It then presents the latest approach to labeling, where the basic idea is that – just as in previous labeling proposals – a syntactic object created by Merge is assigned the label of the closest head but, in addition, labeling must also be complete at the interfaces. Although ‘the closest head’ seems to be a clear and unproblematic term sending us to the locality conditions on labeling and to Relativized Minimality, special attention is dedicated to a particular formalization of the criterial notion of ‘closeness’ by taking a close look at different types of merge (Head-Head, Head-Phrase and Phrase-

---

1 Inevitably, the complexity of Cartography has been compared to the simplicity of Minimalism. As far as this point is concerned, there seems to be no consensus whatsoever among researchers. Whereas some consider that there is a serious tension and contradiction between them, and the two are incompatible; others argue that the two approaches are compatible as Cartography is an extension of Minimalism and the two represent a division of labour.

2 These are not the only levels of organization in the clause. The chapter also talks about phase level and Extended Projection (both of which are higher levels of organization), and Nanosyntax (which is the lowest level of organization).
Phrase). Next, it tries to relate the two phenomena and derive the freezing effect from labeling, i.e., it tries to relate the ungrammaticality of *Which book John wonders Bill read?, which violates Criterial Freezing, to the Chomskian labeling algorithm. Moreover, this labeling algorithm provides a comprehensive solution to another phenomenon called ‘the halting problem for movement’.

The book closes with Index (pp. 339–357).

The contributions collected in this volume, through an examination of various phenomena, are representative of the state of the debate on the issues they present, they give a rich sample of some currently addressed issues in theoretical linguistics, and they provide a stimulating picture of the state of the art of Cartography. The elaborate functional structures either bring evidence in favour of the well-known hierarchies (Rizzi 1997, Cinque 1999) by taking a close look at some lesser-studied languages, or they offer a more fine-grained decomposition by proposing phrases not included in previous functional sequences. In line with current work in Cartography trying to extend the approach to as many languages as possible, the arguments are supported by a wide variety of cross-linguistic evidence.

These cartographic studies fill in some of the theoretical gaps left by previous studies but they also leave some questions for future research. The concluding section of numerous articles stresses the fact that further research can be and should be done on the issues under discussion, in footnotes the authors very often remark that they leave for future study certain issues that have not been solved yet, sometimes they admit that certain accounts need to be made more precise in future. We hope that subsequent Cartography volumes will provide an answer to at least some of these issues.
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The collective volume, published in 2012, contains works of the 25th edition of the Romance Colloquium, held on 30 April 2010 at the Institute of Romance Studies, University of Vienna. The studies collected in this volume address two main issues: linguistic typology, and history of settlements and migration in southeastern Romania. The volume contains thirteen contributions in German and French, belonging to researchers from Austria, Germany, Romania and Greece: Jurgen

The first contribution, *Was kann die Linguistik für extralinguistische Fakten in Südosteuropa leisten? Eine Selbstkritik*, belongs to Jürgen Kristophson. He highlights the difficulties in extracting extralinguistic factors from Romance vocabulary of Romanian language. The Slav-RO manic contact is certain, but social conditions are conceived speculative, localization is difficult. Romanian Language has a mixed botanical and zoological vocabulary (both Slavic and Latin elements), the terms indicate a modest intellectual culture and a primitive Christianity. In the study *Die Balkanbund aus romanischer Perspektive*, Maria Iliescu resumes the Balkan linguistic union concept and highlights the need to address it in Romance perspective. Are reviewed three of the four common linguistic features of the Balkan languages: homonymy genitive – dative, future with *velle*, enclitic definite article, explained by the influence of spoken Latin. She highlights together with Coşeriu, the need to detail the research about the Balkan linguistic union, because a series of words that are considered Balkanisms, come in fact from Balkan Latin. Based on a set of morpho-syntactic similarities of idioms of the Balkan linguistic union and dialects of Southern Italy, Wolf Dietrich emphasizes the role of dominant languages, observable in three historical linguistic layers, in *Historische Sprachchichten von Suditalien bis zum Balkan. Areale Gemeinsamkeiten und ihre historische Deutung*. Morpho-syntactic coincidences between Romanian, Albanian, Greek and southern Italian dialects can be explained mostly by the Greek language.

Based on three texts of Romanian linguist Gh. Ivașnescu, Eugen Munteanu (editor of the 2012 edition of the paper *Problemele capitale ale vechii române literare*), in the study *Die Konzeption von Gheorghe Ivașnescu über die mittelalterlichen Wanderungen der Rumenen*, calls into question the issue of Romanian migration and the arguments of his teacher. Romanian migration was not the movement of the entire population, but of larger or smaller groups at different times and in different directions. The first and most important migration occurs after the 17th century and the 18th century from south over the Danube in the north and has as consequence the mixture of idioms and forming the main Romanian dialects. Wochele Holgher’s contribution, *Das Rümanische als Repräsentantin der Romania auf der Balkanhalbinsel: Wahrnehmung und Bewertung der Beziehungen zu den Nachbarsprachen sowie zur Restromania in historischer Hinsicht*, discusses the membership of Romanian language at the Balkan linguistic union based on two texts (*Sprachlobtexte*) in which linguistic consciousness is affirmed. Are selected and summarized two texts from the early twentieth century belonging to Sextil Pușcaru and Dumitru Caracostea. Both authors agree that the Romanian language differences compared to other Romance languages is not a deficit.

Joachim Matzinger, in the study *Der lateinisch-albanische Sprachkontakt und seine Implikationen für Vergeschichte des Albanischen und der Albaner*, points to a number of aspects of the prehistory of Albanian language and Albanians. On the territory currently inhabited by Albanians have exercised influence languages as Greek, Latin along with the Romanization of the area, Slavic in late antiquity. Albanian Language is seen as the current successor of the ancient Illyrian language, indicating that Latin loans in Albanian are an interesting research object. Daniel Göler, in *Kontinuität und Wandel im Siedlungssystem Albaniens*, highlights aspects and stages of a typology of settlements in the Albanian area. Distribution and development of settlements are determined by geographical and anthropogenic factors, in several stages. Meanwhile, there are migration and concentration of population, especially in urban areas, with discontinuity and continuity lines. Ina Arapi, in *Albanisch-rumänische Parallelen im Bereich der Wortbildung: Die Suffixe*, makes an overview of suffixes common to Albanian and Romanian languages, in a detailed alphabetical inventory. Based on reference works from the two languages are presented in parallel suffixes of indigenous origin or uncertain, of Latin, Slavic languages (concerning the suffix -işte, cf. Floresco 2008) and Turkish, being established every time for Albanian language if the suffix is general or dialectal.

Gabriela Schubert speaks in *Aromunen und Zinzaren in Ungarn, insbesondere in Budapest*, about the Aromanians which were established in the 18th century in Hungary and have developed a strong commercial activity in the cities Buda and Pest. It is emphasized the role of such families in
the Romanian Orthodox organization, establishment of a Romanian school and in particular, the role of the most popular Aromanian, Emmanuel Gojda. Although by the end of the first World War, Aromanians from Hungary were Hungarianised, there are traces of Aromanians in official and cultural Hungarian life. About the Aromanian dialect, as considered by Romanian linguists, Stamatis Béis in *L’aroumain dans le cadre des langues romanes balkaniques*, stresses once again the pronounced Balkan character on the differences and similarities with Eastern Romance languages at all levels of language. He presents phonological differences compared with Romanian language, lexical and morphological differences arising from Greek influence. Fanis Dasoulas’s study, *Aromunische Ortsnamen im Pindos – Gebirge. Anthropologische und sprachwissenschaftliche Bemerkung*, is intended as a preamble to the study of Aromanian toponymy from Pindos Mountains, totaling approximately 1600 toponyms. In a structural linguistic analysis with consideration of anthropological component of the peindustrialize world, are shown some popular toponyms own to Aromanians in the region. For these Albanians the peaks and other geographic features are the only points of orientation, which is why the use of official toponyms is long ignored.

The purpose of Thede Kahl and Joana Nechiti’s study, *Aschenputtel bei den Bajeschi und Rudari. Vergleich zweier Marchen anhand von Feldaufnamen in Ungarn und Griechenland*, is the development of Cinderella motif at some Gypsies populations, living in central Greece and in southern Hungary, speaking an archaic Romanian dialect, but without contact with the school and literacy in Romanian language. Are linguistic transcribed, summarized in German and analyzed at different levels of language two recorded versions of the story widespread in Europe. Some features indicate that the basic variant is Romanian, pointing out that mobility and segregation of a population have a positive effect on oral cultural heritage. Based on Byzantine, old Slavic and Ottoman sources and on toponymy, Mihailo St. Popović, in *Spätbyzantinische Siedlungen und slawische Transhumanz in den Flusstäler der Strumica und Kriva Lakavica*, extracts clues about the grazing economy and Wallachian presence in Strumica and Kriva Lakavica river valleys. Although the area was considered "no man’s land", the sources prove a functional grazing economy in the late Byzantine period and an active presence of Wallachian shepherds.

The studies are focused on the issue of linguistic, cultural, social aspects of migration of populations in southeastern Romania (various principalities and ideologies influence in Albanian migration to cities, successive migrations with changes in direction of the Romanians in the south and north of the Danube, migrations in the early 18th of the Aromanians in Budapest and the cultural and economic role of their presence, migrations of Gypsies populations in Greece and Hungary and their stories, etc.). The volume, edited by six known Romanists, is an argument for rigorous, careful and detailed research of similarities and differences between idioms of Balkan union, influenced at a time of Latin, but also an argument for layered reconstruction of complex historical, demographic, ethnic and cultural relationships in southeastern Europe.

REFERENCES


Alina-Mihaela Pricop

Department for Lexicology and Lexicography
The “A Philippide” Institute of Romanian Philology, Iași
"Harta sonoră" a graiurilor și dialectelor limbii române ['La carte sonore' des parlers et des dialectes de la langue roumaine], édité par MARIA MARIN, MARILENA TIUGAN, București, Editura Academiei Române, 2014, 100 p. (+ CD).

Le volume "Harta sonoră" a graiurilor și dialectelor limbii române ['La carte sonore' des parlers et des dialectes de la langue roumaine], récemment paru (2014) aux Éditions de l’Académie Roumaine, est un petit recueil de textes roumains nord- et sud-danubiens, qui, chose unique pour les sources textuelles dialectales du roumain, est accompagné d’un CD comprenant les enregistrements des productions orales transcrites dans le volume.

Avant les textes proprement-dits (pp. 21–97), se trouve une courte Introduction (pp. 5–8) et des renseignements sur la transcription phonétique et le décodage des divers signes employés (pp. 9–19). L’Introduction comprend un très court exposé chronologique sur la recherche dialectale roumaine, qui aide les non-initiés à mieux situer le présent volume parmi les travaux thématiques. Cet historique est mis en relation avec l’importance de l’étude de la langue nationale et de ses variétés régionales, en tant qu’une des plus significatives modalités de manifestation culturelle d’un certain groupe ethnique (p. 6).

L’idée de cet ouvrage est déjà ancienne. La sélection des fragments sonores a été réalisée en 1983, dans le but d’éditer un disque chez Electrecord ; ce disque aurait dû être accompagné d’une brochure contenant les textes en transcription phonétique et leur variante en roumain littéraire, standard. Le disque est sorti en très peu d’exemplaires et n’a été distribué que dans des lycées, et la brochure n’a jamais vu le jour (p. 6).

Les textes, dont quelques-uns ont été déjà publiés dans des recueils de textes dialectaux (pp. 6–9), sont reproduits à partir de l’Archiva fonogramică a limbii române [Archives des phonogrammes de la langue roumaine], « musée sonore » des parlars roumains, constitué en 1956 à la suggestion d’Al. Rosetti et comprenant à présent des enregistrements de plus de 900 localités. La sélection des textes inclus dans le volume présenté a été faite par un groupe de chercheurs du Département de dialectologie de l’ancien Institut de Recherches Ethnologiques et Dialectologiques, département faisant partie d’aujourd’hui de l’Institut de Linguistique « Iorgu Iordan – Alexandru Rosetti » de l’Académie Roumaine, groupe formé de : Rodica Bratu, Maria Marin, Bogdan Marinescu, Valeriu Rusu, Nicolae Saramandu, Marilena Tiugan, Magdalena Vulpe.


Le volume présente huit cartes. Une première carte aide à localiser les six régions dialectales concernées et les localités d’où proviennent les textes. Chaque section consacrée à un sous-dialecte daco-roumain commence aussi par la carte de la région correspondante. Il convient de mentionner que, en ce qui concerne les dialectes sud-danubiens, seul l’isto-roumain est localisé sur une carte, le sujet enquêté étant origininaire de la localité Šušnjevica/Sušnjevića, dans l’actuelle Croatie. Pour l’aroumain et le méglélo-roumain, les informateurs proviennent du sud du Danube, mais ils se sont établis en 1940 en Dobroudja ; c’est pour cette raison que les localités illustrées par les textes aroumains (Palazu Mare et Techirghiol, dans le département de Constanța) et mégléno-roumain (Cerna, dans le département de Tulcea) sont situées sur la carte du dialecte valaque, en Dobroudja.

Le parler muntean (ou valaque, de la Munténie ou Valachie – aire du sud), dans lequel les éditeurs incluent aussi les parlers dits « de transition » (Caragiu Marioțeanu 1989 : 415 et la

Les conventions de transcription phonétique des textes, les signes diacritiques, les signes de ponctuation, ainsi que les symboles temporels (comme les pauses), les signes marquant l’intonation ou renvoyant à des indications paraverbales et métalinguistiques sont clairement expliqués.

Le système de transcription de tous les textes est celui utilisé dans Atlas lingvistic român [L’Atlas linguistique roumain], auquel ont été apportées des modifications et des ajouts pour mieux correspondre à la réalité phonétique des parlers et des dialectes dont on donne les exemples.

Ces dernières décennies, dans l’édition de volumes de textes dialectaux, il a été fait attention à la notation la plus exacte possible de l’intonation. Les éditeurs du présent volume ont aussi accordé de l’importance à cet aspect. Ainsi, vu que les unités sémantico-syntactiques ne correspondent souvent pas aux unités d’intonation de l’expression orale (voir aussi Vulpe 19894 : 170–172), il a été renoncé à certains signes de ponctuation, tels le point, la virgule, le point-virgule, la majuscule (même pour les anthroponymes, les toponymes et les noms des fêtes religieuses), etc. Par exemple, vu qu’a été bibliographie citée) de l’Oltenie et de la Dobroujda, est représenté par quatre textes, des localités Râșcați et Nușoara (en Valachie, respectivement dans les départements de Dâmbovița et d’Argeș), Verbița (en Oltenie, dans le département de Dolj) et Luncavița (en Dobroujda, dans le département de Tulcea). Le parler moldovean (moldave, de la Moldavie) bénéficie de deux textes, des localités Gânești (département de Galati) et Iănești (département de Botoșani). Un texte de Giulești (département de Maramureș) représente le parler maramureșean (du Maramureș). Deux textes dans le parler crizean (de la Crișana) sont de Lelești et Burzuc (toutes deux localités du département de Bihor). Le parler bănățean (du Banat) est illustré par un texte de Jupâlnic (ville d’Orgova, département de Mehedinți). Enfin, deux textes, de Bâlan (département de Sălaj) et de Răciu (département de Mureș), représentent les parlars transylvains (de la Transylvanie) ; le texte de Bâlan, localité qui se trouve dans le département de Sălaj (dans l’extrême est de la région géographique de Crișana), a été inclus dans la section des parlars transylvains en raison de ses particularités linguistiques. Les éditeurs ont choisi un seul texte pour illustrer chacun des parlars aroumain, celui de la région du Pindé (Grèce), celui de Frashërë (Albanie), dit aussi farsherent, le dialecte mégléno-roumain et le dialecte istro-roumain.

Chaque texte est présenté sous deux formes : une variante en transcription phonétique, sur la page de gauche, et, sur la page de droite (en miroir), une variante en transcription orthographique (allégée donc des régionalismes phonétiques), avec les régionalismes morphosyntaxiques conservés et les régionalismes lexicaux glosés entre crochets. Cette deuxième variante du texte a été mise au point par le même groupe de dialectologues qui ont choisi les 16 textes du recueil. En ce qui concerne les textes en dialectes sud-danubiens, les transcriptions phonétiques sont doublées d’une variante en daco-roumain orthographique.

Les textes sont précédés par des informations concernant leur localisation (voir supra les 16 localités d’où proviennent les textes) et leur datation (les enquêtes ont été menées dans les années ’60 et ’70, plus précisément, dans la période 1960–1977). À la fin de chaque texte se trouvent le nom de l’informateur et son âge, et aussi, pour les textes en aroumain et en mégléno-roumain, le lieu d’origine de celui-ci. La grand majorité des enregistrements transcrits ont entre 2 et 4 minutes (le minimum étant 1’04'', et le maximum, 4’10’’).
privilégiée la délimitation des unités d’intonation, la conjonction ‘et’ est très souvent suivie des signes graphiques qui marquent la limite d’une unité avec contour intonatif final (/\) ou non-final (\). Pour suggérer le type de contour intonatif (non)final, on a aussi conservé des signes de ponctuation traditionnels, tels le signe d’interrogation, le signe d’exclamation, les deux-points. On a aussi utilisé les points de suspension. Toujours pour rester au plus près de l’intonation, il a été choisi d’utiliser trois types d’accents : l’un (accent aigu) pour marquer la voyelle de la syllabe accentuée dans un mot polysyllabique ou dans une unité accentuelle comprenant un groupe de mots ; un autre (accent grave) pour marquer l’accent secondaire des mots polysyllabiques composés ; enfin, un autre (accent d’intensité) pour marquer une syllabe dont l’accentuation est emphatique, ayant un enjeu stylistique.

L’ouvrage est très approprié à une utilisation à but didactique, pendant les travaux pratiques, autant avec des étudiants roumains qu’avec des étudiants étrangers en linguistique romane s’intéressant au roumain. La variante allégée du point de vue phonétique et les explications des mots régionaux rendent le texte dialectal plus accessible aux étudiants et, s’ensuit, plus attractif. Les fichiers audio, à part leur utilité en tant qu’échantillons auditifs représentatifs des dialectes et des parlers roumains, peuvent être un matériel didactique facile à utiliser dans des exercices (par exemple, reconnaître la variété dialectale, faire sa description appliquée, transcription phonétique, etc.).

La réalisation du recueil présenté est bien conforme à son but. Les éditeurs ont respecté les principes de base permettant de se faire comprendre du public visé : la qualité, la pertinence, la quantité et la clarté (cf. les quatre maximes conversationnelles de Grice). À part le côté scientifique et didactique, l’anthologie se remarque par sa représentativité, montrant donc des exemples choisis, typiques des variétés (daco-) roumaines. C’est pourquoi, il est souhaitable que l’ouvrage, qui se distingue également par cette originalité qu’il inclut un CD comprenant les enregistrements des textes, soit publié en un nombre d’exemplaires le plus grand possible et bénéficie d’une large diffusion.
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