
The purpose of this volume of the *Routledge Handbooks in Linguistics* series is threefold. First, it aims to offer an overview of those aspects of syntax that have been explored and developed extensively in recent years and decades, with special focus on emerging and cutting edge areas, as well. Second, it proposes to go beyond the major areas of empirical investigation and the different approaches to syntactic theory; therefore, it includes chapters on the interfaces of syntax with other components of the human language system. Third, it targets to discuss experimental and computational approaches to syntax.

As for the structure of the handbook, we can say that it is divided into five large parts and thirty-two chapters, each of which covers a different major focus of syntactic research.

The book opens with *Contents, Contributors, Acknowledgments, and Editors’ introduction.*

**Part I**, entitled *Constituency, categories, and structure*, looks into the nature of the basic building blocks of phrases and sentences, and investigates the major principles of syntactic derivation.

The opening chapter (*Merge, labeling, and projection*, Naoki Fukui and Hiroki Narita, pp. 3–23) provides an overview of the development of theories of the generative and transformational aspects of human language. The historical voyage back in time starts with phrase structure rules and transformations, then goes on to discuss the emergence of principles and parameters, and X-bar Theory, and ends with the framework of Bare Phrase Structure (Chomsky 1995). The presentation of the evolution of the theory of phrase structure into the theory of Merge is done by a critical examination of the technical devices and their reduction to a conceptual minimum. The remainder of the chapter deals with Minimalism, projection-free syntax and linearization. The last section shows that there are several questions that need to be answered by future research.

The next chapter is written by Jaume Mateu (*Argument structure*, pp. 24–41) and it is devoted to examining the major issues related to verbal argument structure. The discussion revolves around the debate between the projectionist and constructivist/neoc-constructivist approaches to argument structure. The first approach argues that argument structure is determined by the lexical (and semantic) properties of the predicate itself, and this can be expressed in terms of thematic roles, in terms of proto-roles, or in terms of lexical-semantic decomposition of the predicate. The second approach claims that argument structure and argument structure alternations are not encoded in the lexical entry of the verbal predicate but are built in the syntax proper. In presenting the two approaches, the author does not limit himself to reviewing the literature, but careful readers can also find details about the fine distinction between the neoc-constructivist and cognitive constructionist approaches to argument structure.

In Chapter 3 (*The integration, proliferation, and expansion of functional categories: An overview*, pp. 42–64), Lisa deMena Travis illustrates the three stages in which lexical categories (called major categories) progressively dissolve into more and more functional categories (called minor categories), and these minor categories come to acquire a major role. The section on their integration concentrates on the first steps in the development of a theory of functional categories. As far as their proliferation is concerned, relevant tests are employed to uncover some functional categories. The focus is on Pollock’s (1989) Split IP Hypothesis, Cinque’s (1999) Cartography, and Starke’s (2009) and Caha’s (2009) Nanosyntax. With regard to their expansion, the attention is turned to the dividing line between the functional and lexical domain, and the shift in the division between the two. In a nutshell, what this chapter shows is that, gradually, functional categories have gone from being an insignificant category to being the defining material of syntactic structure.

Jeffrey Punske’s chapter (Functional structure inside nominal phrases, pp. 65–88) is intended as an overview of some of the major issues in and contributions to the study of the syntax of the nominal phrase. The first major issue is the historic development of the DP-hypothesis through different generative approaches. What is particularly extraordinary is that, compared with the expanded number of proposed functional heads in more recent (Cartographic) approaches to the syntax of nominals, Abney’s (1987) [DP [NP]] structure proves to be very impoverished. Of central importance here is the functional category D, as well as intra-linguistic and cross-linguistic variation that argue for or against its existence. The basic question is the universality of the DP-hypothesis, and whether the lexical absence of the determiner is reflected in the syntactic absence of a functional structure associated with D or not, and the potential semantic and syntactic consequences of the lack of this structure. The last section sketches the behaviour of other nominal-internal projections, and discusses functional categories projected by quantifiers, demonstratives, number, case, and gender.

Artemis Alexiadou’s contribution is entitled The syntax of adjectives (pp. 89–107), and it is an attempt to look at the syntax of this highly complex and significantly less studied lexical category. The discussion opens with the discussion on the basic patterns in which adjectives can occur. The analysis of these modifiers forces the author to confront fundamental and critical issues such as the syntactic movement(s) lying behind the surface adjective order in Germanic and Romance languages, the different interpretations that adjective placement gives rise to, ordering restrictions on adjectives, the categorial status of adjectives, and their behaviour vis-à-vis intersectivity. But the most interesting part is the one that discusses the syntactic differences between Germanic (English) and Romance (French) APs, and their mirror image orders in the two languages (and language families/groups).

The first part of the handbook closes with another chapter on modifiers (The syntax of adverbs, Thomas Ernst, pp. 108–130). From the very beginning, the author makes it clear that there are two opposing approaches to the study of adverbs: the scopal and the cartographic approach, and all the questions addressed here are answered from the viewpoint of these two approaches. The most important issues that this contribution touches upon are the way the surface order of adverbs is accounted for, the effect of adverb semantics on syntax, how syntax and semantics are related in the case of adverbials, and the nature of movement that underlies the proper explanation of adverb distribution. The discussion on the advantages and drawbacks of the two analyses is not meant to highlight the conceptual superiority of one approach over the other; it only sheds light on the differences in the way the two approaches relate to the above questions.

The chapters of Part II, Syntactic phenomena, provide an overview of the most important phenomena that form the empirical foundation of formal syntactic research and they address issues pertaining to basic syntactic phenomena.

The first chapter, that is, Chapter 7 (Head movement, Michael Barrie and Éric Mathieu, pp. 133–149) gets down to this right away by concentrating on the core problems of head movement. The brief history of its development charts how head movement was first conceived and perceived, how its role was reconsidered and expanded in Government and Binding, and how it was viewed in Minimalism and Bare Phrase Structure. Once with the introduction of the operation Merge, head movement raises several problems to which various solutions have been proposed in the literature. Before closing the chapter with a discussion on how head movement is affected in patients with aphasia and how it is detected by them, a few brief remarks are made on the current status of head movement.

In Case and grammatical relations (pp. 150–166), Maria Polinsky and Omer Preminger examine case systems and case marking in general. As the discussion unfolds, the readers become accustomed to some basic terms such as morphological case, abstract case, Case Filler, Exceptional Case Marking, but they also find out that classifying languages according to variation in the number of distinct overt cases leads not only to languages with no morphological case marking at all, but also to languages with a very rich case system comprising more than fifty cases. The bulk of the chapter is
devoted to some fundamental concerns such as the feature that makes a head a potential case-assigner, the relationship between case and agreement and the explanations for a much tighter coupling between the two in Minimalism, the way head-centred and configurational approaches relate to case and case assignment, and case assignment in ergative languages. The data in the entire chapter are illustrated with a wealth of examples taken from a wide variety of languages (Russian, Korean, Icelandic, Latin, etc.).

A central and recurrent theme throughout (generative) syntax has been the operation called Movement. Thus, it is the goal of Chapter 9 (A-bar movement, pp. 167–191), by Norvin Richards, to run through the main issues surrounding one type of movement, namely A-bar movement. Although in some cases it is not easy to draw a precise borderline between A-movement and A-bar movement, the first section talks about the clear differences that exist between the two. In short, the three topics covered by this chapter are (i) the participants in this movement, (ii) the conditions on where the (final and intermediate) landing site/sites of such movement is/are, (iii) and some general conditions on movement.

The literature of ellipsis phenomena is so vast that the authors of the next chapter, Masaya Yoshida, Chizuru Nakao, and Iván Ortega-Santos, can only present the tip of the iceberg. In The syntax of ellipsis and related phenomena (pp. 192–213), they mostly present and examine clausal ellipsis, that is, cases of missing sentential material. More specifically, they take a close look at the deleted material, the cases involving non-identity or mismatch in terms of the syntactic structure (voice, size, etc.) of the ellipsis site and the antecedent site, the material that remains after ellipsis, and the processes responsible for ellipsis (or ellipsis-like) constructions. The authors review a body of work on clausal ellipsis and some controversial cases (multiple sluicing, sluice stripping, etc.), as well as a number of phenomena with a bearing on these issues, and show that the great strides that have been made in understanding a wide variety of data point to a deeper understanding of their syntactic complexity.

Robert Truswell’s chapter, entitled Binding Theory (pp. 214–238), begins by addressing the problems related to Chomsky’s (1981) Binding Theory and its three principles that show towards a tripartite division of nominals into reflexives, pronouns and full NPs (R-expressions). Following this, two sections discuss the scope of Binding Theory; more precisely, they take a close look at the distinction between binding and coreference, and the closely-related obviation principle. Then, there is one section that discusses two related empirical challenges to the form of the binding principles: (i) the puzzling problem that many pronouns behave both like reflexives and like pronouns, and (ii) long-distance reflexives (zich-forms), which pose serious problems to the three principles mentioned above. Before closing the chapter with the interaction of movement and binding, some challenges are mentioned about the claim that reflexives and pronouns are in complementary distribution.

Norbert Hornstein’s joint work with Aipto Nunes (Minimalism and control, pp. 239–263) focuses on movement and PRO-based approaches to control. Starting from the four aspects any theory of control should account for (the kinds of control structures made available by Universal Grammar, the nature of the controller, the configurational properties of control, and the interpretation of the controlltee), this contribution shows, first and foremost, that many of the properties of obligatory control can be explained if this operation is assumed to involve A-movement of the controller. The chapter goes beyond the discussion of the behaviour of PRO in classic obligatory control structures, as it also considers adjunct control structures triggering obligatory control, and examines how the Movement Theory of Control (Hornstein and Polinsky 2010) and PRO-based accounts fare with respect to the PF side of the grammar. The final point made in the chapter is that the Movement Theory of Control offers straightforward and precise answers to questions rising from the four aspects mentioned above, in sharp contrast to standard PRO-based accounts of control.

The next review chapter is on scrambling (Yosuke Sato and Nobu Goto, Scrambling, pp. 264–282). The discussion here revolves around four central issues raised by this phenomenon: (i) the relation between scrambling and free word-order, (ii) the precise features of scrambling and its nature as
syntactic movement, (iii) the potential driving forces (if any) behind scrambling, and (iv) the syntactic properties of scrambling more generally and of the three distinct types of scrambling that can be found (at least) in Japanese. In addition, this chapter touches upon two puzzles related to Japanese scrambling: the Proper Binding Condition effect (Fiengo 1977), and the difference between long-distance scrambling out of finite clauses and non-finite complements.

The last chapter of Part II (Kumiko Murasugi, *Noun incorporation, nonconfigurationality, and polysynthesis*, pp. 283–303) is built on three large sections; each of them dedicated to one topic typically associated with a wide variety of (mostly) non-Indo-European languages. Noun incorporation is defined as a construction in which an N and a V stem combine to yield a complex verb. As far as nonconfigurationality is concerned, it is viewed as a classification for languages that lack a structural distinction between the two arguments of the V: subject and object. Finally, with respect to polysynthesis and polysynthetic languages, this is concerned with cases where a large number of distinct ideas are amalgamated by grammatical processes and form a single word. The author connects the three phenomena by stating that “all three have contributed greatly to syntactic theory by providing insights into languages whose properties could only be discovered through field research” (p. 283).

The topic of Part III, entitled *Syntactic interfaces*, is the relationship between syntax and other components of the human language system.

Chapter 15 (*The syntax–semantics/pragmatics interface*, Sylvia L. R. Schreiner, pp. 307–321) opens the series of chapters on the areas where syntax interfaces with other parts of the human language system. The huge number of phenomena that prove to be important to our understanding of the structures and meanings of natural language lie at the juncture between syntax and semantics/pragmatics, and it is this that makes this interface very important. Some of the most representative phenomena at the interface between syntax and semantics are compositionality, theta theory, functional heads, events, argument structure, quantifiers, scalar implicature, and verbal phenomena (mood, modality, focus, force, middle, aspect, etc.). Some of these have also been analyzed as interacting with pragmatics (e.g. scalar implicature). The chapter also shows how this interface has surfaced in various ways in models both inside and outside the generative tradition. As many other contributions, the chapter closes with some directions for future research.

In *The syntax–lexicon interface* (pp. 322–344), Peter Ackema approaches the problem of this interface from several perspectives. In order to do this, first he outlines how the term *lexicon* is understood. As the theta roles a predicative element assigns need to be listed in the lexicon, this raises the issue of the content and number of theta roles assigned to arguments. One section contains a discussion on the (possible) correspondences between types of theta roles, on the one hand, and syntactic arguments and argument positions, on the other hand. The central question here is how we can account for the fact that a particular type of theta role is assigned to an argument with a particular grammatical function and not other. Although in very many cases there are the same correspondences between theta roles and syntactic positions, there are some cases where the correspondences between theta roles and argument positions are changed. These are the cases of argument structure alternations, whose possible analyses are discussed in the closing section.

Chapter 17, entitled *The morphology–syntax interface*, by Daniel Siddiqi (pp. 345–364), is an overview considering the major issues in the way the morphological component feeds the syntactic component in some way. It starts with a brief history of Lexicalism, the perspective that syntax and morphology are two separate generative components of the grammar. It continues with a detailed discussion of the connections between syntax and the three types of inflectional morphology: case, agreement, and verbal inflection. In fact, there is a typological generalization that languages can express grammatical relations by using either syntax or morphology. The connections between syntax and morphology strongly suggest that inflectional morphology is a function of the syntactic component of grammar. The bulk of the chapter discusses the distinctions between derivation and inflection, and the ramifications of this split on Weak Lexicalism. The last two sections summarize the contemporary arguments in favour of and against Lexicalism.
The closing chapter of this part is written by Yoshihito Dobashi (Prosodic domains and the syntax–phonology interface, pp. 365–387). This chapter is concerned exclusively with the syntax–phonology interface in a narrow or traditional sense; hence, it only deals with the prosodic domains that are sensitive to syntax. It sketches some of the theories proposed over the last few decades in order to provide a general overview of the developments in the field of the syntax–phonology interface. This chronological history covers both standard theories and more recent developments. The general conclusion the reader gets is that despite the huge number of theories and approaches, numerous research questions related to the syntax–phonology interface are still unanswered. Moreover, the interface itself should be viewed from a broader perspective and it would be important to conduct research on prosodic domains not in individual languages but in language families/groups.

The contributions of Part IV, Syntax in context, situate syntactic theory in its context by surveying four major topics in syntax as a part of grammar employed by humans.

The first topic is explored in Chapter 19, entitled Syntactic change, by Ian Roberts (pp. 391–408). Syntactic change and variation in grammars in the context of generative grammar is explained by parameters, which can also predict what can change diachronically. The cases of syntactic change that are illustrated here are grammaticalization, word-order change, and verb movement. The chapter discusses parameter hierarchies, which show that parameters are not equal (in terms of their formal properties and/or their effects on the outputs of the grammars they determine), but we can talk about a hierarchy among them, which gives rise to a quaternary division into macro-, meso-, micro- and nanoparameters. What is noteworthy is that hierarchies are not prespecified, but emerge from the interaction of the underspecified Universal Grammar, Primary Linguistic Data, and the general markedness conditions.

The next study (Syntax in forward and in reverse: Form, memory, and language processing, Matthew W. Wagers, pp. 409–425) explores the ways in which syntactic structure guides and influences language processing and language comprehension. The focus is, from the perspective of mnemonic properties and processes of syntactic structure, on the abstract compositional structures that intervene between sound and meaning. The author presents in great detail numerous case studies, experiments and two pieces of evidence from the areas of verbatim memory, and short-term remembering and forgetting in dependency formation (with interest in the formation of both local and non-local dependencies). What the readers learn from here is how the interaction of sentence processing with theories of memory is mediated by the content of syntactic representations.

Susanah Kirby’s study (Major theories in acquisition of syntax research, pp. 426–445) is concerned with child language acquisition. It begins with an overview of two major theoretical camps in acquisition research: the nativist theories and the emergentist approach. One significant distinction between the views of the researchers of the two camps is the way in which children construct multiword utterances (distinction in stance on the continuity/discontinuity debate), but this distinction between the two is sharpened through the description of how each one accounts for two large tasks in acquisition: the acquisition of basic word order and the acquisition of adult-like wh-questions. The chapter concludes with a few final comparisons and distinctions between the two approaches.

Maggie Tallerman’s chapter (The evolutionary origins of syntax, pp. 446–462) closes this part of the handbook with a presentation of language in an evolutionary context. The search for the origin of syntax starts with a close look at the question of whether syntax emerged suddenly or evolved gradually, and with the examination of the Minimalist views on the evolutionary origins of syntax. Then, the attention is turned to various possible scenarios for proto-language: the form of the earliest (proto-)words and the putative properties of early protolanguage, assuming a more gradual development of syntactic principles. Before concluding the chapter, some ideas are mentioned about the evolution of movement processes and the processes of grammaticalization, with a view to explaining the appearance of distinct word classes, and various types of syntactic constructions and structures.

Part V, Theoretical approaches to syntax, contains brief descriptions of several dominant models of syntax.
The first chapter, that is, Chapter 23 (The history of syntax, Peter W. Culicover, pp. 465–489) is concerned with the problem of theorizing about syntax and the most important milestones in the development of our thinking about syntax. The first milestone is represented by Chomsky’s (1957) Syntactic Structures and it is followed by the Standard Theory, the Extended Standard Theory, the Revised Extended Standard Theory, Government and Binding Theory, Principles and Parameters Theory, and the Minimalist Program. Hence, the brief line of development that is followed here is called the mainstream generative grammar. The historical review also touches upon some critical branch points in the development of syntactic theory, with an eye to understanding where we are today and how we got here.

The following chapter, entitled Comparative syntax (Martin Haspelmath, pp. 490–508), focuses on the comparative study of the similarities and differences between the combinatorial systems of languages. It focuses on the two research orientations in comparative syntax (the nonaprioristic and the restrictivist approach), and the distinctions between them with respect to the way syntactic universals are explained in and by them.

In Principles and Parameters/Minimalism, Terje Lohndal and Juan Uriagereka (pp. 509–525) view the Minimalist Program as an attempt to rationalize the principles of Government and Binding. The necessary background is provided by Section 2, which describes how the Minimalist Program evolved, and illustrates the changes in the transition from Government and Binding to the Minimalist Program. The most substantial part of the chapter tries to characterize this (research) program by presenting two approaches (methodological and ontological minimalism), and discussing the consequences of the different views one may have of the program. The chapter ends with a discussion of some prospects and challenges addressed to Minimalism, relating them to the notion of ‘program’.

The chapter entitled Head-driven Phrase Structure Grammar, by Felix Bildhauer (pp. 526–555), opens the series of chapters on the various contemporary approaches to syntactic structure and syntactic theory. Besides the description of the advent of Head-driven Phrase Structure Grammar, the chapter also introduces the technical machinery, (i.e. how this grammar handles specific grammatical phenomena such as constraints or lexical rules), and contains an overview of how linguistic structures are modeled, with special interest in phrase structure and semantic representation. The chapter closes with some current developments and computer implementations of this grammar.

George Aaron Broadwell’s contribution is on Lexical-Functional Grammar (Lexical-Functional Grammar, pp. 556–578). The structure of the chapter is similar to the previous one. Taking as a point of departure some of the fundamental ideas of this grammar, these few pages are oriented towards providing an overview of the basic ideas of the theory. They focus on syntactic representations in this grammar, with special emphasis on the two primary syntactic representations (constituent-structure and functional-structure), and on some syntactic phenomena such as movement and empty categories. The closing section talks about recent developments and changes in the theory.

The chapter on Role and Reference Grammar is written by Robert D. Van Valin, Jr. (pp. 579–603). What makes this grammar different from other grammars is the emphasis laid on typologically diverse languages in the formulation of a linguistic theory, and the importance attached to semantics and pragmatics. The description of the architecture of this grammar is restricted to (i) the syntactic, semantic and information structure representation of sentences, (ii) grammatical relations or, rather, privileged syntactic arguments and their hierarchy, and (iii) the structure of complex sentences. As far as the linking between syntax and semantics is concerned, this is governed by the Completeness Constraint (Van Valin 2005), which states that all of the specified arguments in the semantic representation of a sentence must be realized in syntax, and all of the expressions in syntax must be linked to something in the semantic representation of a sentence.

Broadly speaking, depending on whether a theory of syntax is based on the principle of dependency or on the principle of constituency, there are two types of theories: Dependency Grammar and Constituency Grammar. The following chapter is devoted to the former theory of syntax (Dependency Grammar, Timothy Osborne, pp. 604–626). The brief history of dependency in the study of grammar is followed by some key aspects of Dependency Grammar more generally and syntactic dependencies
more specifically: representing and identifying dependencies, types of dependencies, and the approach of Dependency Grammar to word order. Last but not least, some ideas are mentioned about a recent development within this grammar, called catena units.

The next grammar type is called Functional Discourse Grammar. In *Morphosyntax in Functional Discourse Grammar* (pp. 627–646), J. Lachlan Mackenzie first makes some introductory remarks about this grammar and then introduces the basics of the Morphosyntactic Level. After that, he sets out the major mapping principles and the notion of transparency, and introduces the notion of absolute and relative positions (which are four in number) at the Clause, Phrase, and Word layers. Finally, he talks about dummies and agreement, two phenomena that are distinctive to the Morphosyntactic Level, and about the relationship between this level and the Phonological Level. The discussion closes with an overview of some recent and current Functional Discourse Grammar works on morphosyntax.

In the chapter dedicated to *Construction Grammar* (pp. 647–669), Seizi Isawa writes about Goldberg’s (1995) account and the basic tenets of Construction Grammar together with fundamental differences between Generative Grammar and Construction Grammar. The fact that Construction Grammar offers a way to handle non-compositional cases is acknowledged to be its biggest appeal. Interested readers also find sections on how to account for “overriding” cases, the role of verb meaning, and levels of abstraction. These issues are presented from the perspective of the most important Construction researchers. The chapter ends with a short discussion of the current shift of attention among advocates of Construction Grammar.

The last chapter, Chapter 32, is entitled *Categorial Grammar* (Mark Steedman, pp. 670–701). The introductory remarks (but, in fact, all the sections of this chapter) are interwoven with a long list of references intended for those who would like to investigate the discussed matters further. The two most prominent varieties of this grammar that are illustrated here are Pure Categorial Grammar and Combinatory Categorial Grammar. Then, mention is made of Categorial grammars with \textsc{wrapp} combinatory rules and Lambek grammars. Also, as for the view on semantics, the categorial grammar view on semantics makes a distinction between a so-called profane and sacred approach to semantics. As mentioned in the section entitled Conclusion, Categorial Grammars have attractive properties not only for theoretical and descriptive linguists, but also for psycholinguists and computational linguists.

The book closes with Index. This is a modern, accessible and meticulously researched handbook, reflecting the wide diversity of ways in which syntax has been and is approached. With its rich empirical detail covering a broad range of different phenomena from a wide variety of languages and with the many references collected at the end of each and every chapter, this is an impressively comprehensive handbook.

What is also praiseworthy is that, as mentioned in the *Editors’ introduction*, although most of the chapters are written by leading experts in the field of linguistics, some of them have as their author(s) some lesser-known scholars. It is mostly this mix of senior and junior linguists that makes this a refreshingly forward-looking handbook.

Although several handbooks were written in the recent past, no doubt the *Routledge Handbook of Syntax* is the essential volume anyone interested in syntax should have on his or her bookshelf.
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This is one of those books where the title provides only a partial indication of the breadth of material included, for Stoica’s study of affect and affectivity, while pointed towards an exploration of their conceptualization and lexicalization for Old Romanian as announced in the title, manages to include much that will be of interest to students and researchers looking for new avenues of interpretation in the domain of lexical semantics, semiotics and pragmatics. The book lies at the interface of several domains of knowledge, since the author takes the reader on a journey of investigating the concept of affectivity from a psychological, sociological, intercultural and linguistic perspective. It is also a book worth persisting with, certainly beyond the introductory chapter, which at times has a tendency toward inflated quotation from previous works. This is, however, to be expected in a study of these proportions where the author tries to be exhaustive in establishing the framework of research. When Stoica turns to the main task it is clear that the book is groundbreaking being among the first linguistic investigations that researches and documents the vocabulary of Old Romanian; countless pages of instances of Old Romanian usage of affectivity vocabulary are ample indication of the wealth of scholarship that lies within it.

Stoica’s opening words aptly sum up the theme: ‘Affectivity is a vast and heterogeneous research domain lying at the interface of several connected subjects of study (psychology, neurology, sociology, anthropology, the history of ideas and, obviously, linguistics), constituting in its complexity and variation, a genuine challenge for scientific research’ (p. 13). To those, like myself, whose interest in lexical semantics has been traditionally rooted in comparative research based on a synchronic approach, such a study comes as something of an eye-opener, something that goes far beyond the usual distinctions between semantic concepts analyzed for modern vocabulary. Stoica also underlines (p. 13) the need to embark upon a diachronic analysis of affectivity as the study of affects also entails a historical dimension which has been molded culturally through time in accordance with cultural and historic mutations on a larger scale. As she says (p. 13), ‘we consider that a rigorous semantic analysis of affective terms cannot be varied out without previous research of the characteristics of the realities they designate’.
The book is divided into two parts, the first part dealing with affectivity as an interdisciplinary research domain, setting in five chapters the framework for the analysis, and the second part of the book dealing with the vocabulary of affectivity in Old Romanian, analyzing in three chapters the various lexical and semantic aspects related to affectivity in Old Romanian.

In her first chapter, ‘Affectivity from a psychological perspective’ (pp. 18–40), Stoica examines psychological theories regarding the nature of affective processes pointing out that there is a lack of a unifying and appropriate metalanguage which makes for a variety of referential terminology in designating the various forms of affective life. As previous authors suggested before Stoica, every psychologist is faced with the challenge of clearly stating from the very beginning their terminological choice for their research. Then she proceeds by defining and classifying affective processes and discussing the basic concepts in the theory of affects: affect, emotion, sentiment, passion, and disposition.

Chapter two, ‘Affectivity from a sociological perspective’ (pp. 40–43) discusses the oldest perspective on affect and affectivity, the sociological aspect, which places the concept in line with the individual belonging to a collectivity. One of the most important ideas that emerge from this discussion is that emotional-expressive behaviour plays an important part in communication (p. 41). The main conclusion is that emotional behaviour can be conceived of as a conventional semiotic space which is culturally and historically determined, capable of varying both inter- and intra-culturally as well as diachronically. Thus, language becomes an interface between the two possible dimensions of an affect: private – public / individual – collective (p. 43).

Chapter three, ‘Affectivity from an intercultural perspective’ (pp. 44–52) discusses the long lasting debate over the universality of cultural specificity of emotion. What is of interest in this case is the possibility of lexical equivalence of affective concepts from one language/culture into another, as well as the identification and analysis of exceptional affective terms that are strongly confined to a cultural point of view (p. 47). This is mainly due to the cultural and linguistic differences between languages. Whereas English has hundreds of terms designating affection/affectivity, the Chebang dialect from Malaysia has less than ten. Different languages exhibit different preferences when it comes to the lexicalization of affective concepts. Russian and Modern Greek for instance prefer rich verbal patterns involving a durative dimension, while English has a preference for the nominal pattern, mostly adjectival and participial, which can be interpreted as a passive attitude in the mental collective. Adopting Levy’s cognitive model which is culture specific, affects can be either ‘hyperrecognized’ – in a culture having an elaborate cognitive structure with a large number of words designating them – or ‘hypocognized’ with a lesser developed cognitive model, where certain affects are weakly lexicalized if at all (p. 49). Hence, affectivity and culture are interdependent since the former defines the cultural matrix while the cultural and mental contexts shape the conceptualization of affects.

In turning to the linguistic theme of affectivity, chapter four presents the grammatical view (pp. 53–91) discussing the various typological, syntactic and semantic approaches to affectivity terms. The novelty of the book consists in identifying the vocabulary of affectivity as a distinct lexical-semantic field. Adopting the Coserian view of the semantic field, the author advocates for its application to the field of affectivity in order to see whether it can be viewed as an independent semantic field with particular and distinctive features for the inventory of lexemes belonging to such a field (p. 63). Stoica proceeds with an extensive overview of the various methods of analysis for the vocabulary of affectivity: the lexicographic analysis, componential analysis, contextual semantic analysis, the lexical combinatorial method, textual semantics, natural semantic metalanguage contrastive analysis, while from a pragmatic-rhetorical perspective, the reader is offered an overview of the rhetorical pragmatic approach and the interactional approach. All these models of analysis are presented in light of their most recent developments and are illustrated with relevant examples for the topic of affectivity.

Having offered scholarly insight into the various approaches to the study of affectivity in different disciplines of study, the first part of the book ends with a chapter introducing the framework proper for the analysis at hand. Chapter five ‘Theoretical and methodological proposals for affectivity
and affective vocabulary’ (pp. 92–111) To this extent, Stoica provides her readers with a redefinition of affect, affective and affectivity and supplies a structure of the affective lexicon following Ortony, Clore and Foss 1987 (p. 97). In accordance with the theoretical framework introduced in this chapter, the author proposes a new classification and organization of the affective lexical universe into factic or retrospective affects and episemic or anticipative affects with further subclasses (p. 103). Furthermore, Stoica proposes a redefinition of the vocabulary of affectivity as a polysemantic, lax and mobile lexical semantic macro-field (p. 105). The author establishes the goal of identifying defining semantic parameters capable of configuring a prototypic semantic script of the analyzed affective terms, checking the script against the lexicographic definition and validating the semantic script by employing working principles pertaining to the combinatorial lexical and textual semantics method. The analysis, that Stoica proposes for affective terms, is carried out at micro-semantic (lexeme or phrase) and meso-semantic (paragraph or complex sentence) levels.

The second part of the book turns to the core issue announced in the title, namely the vocabulary of affectivity in Old Romanian. The three chapters that follow deal with the historical and diachronic treatment of the vocabulary of affectivity, the affective lexicon and a lexical semantic analysis of prototypical affective words.

The first chapter ‘The vocabulary of affectivity from a historical and diachronic perspective’ (pp. 113–121) introduces the reader in the historical and cultural context of what is considered to be the period of Old Romanian 16th–18th centuries. This period is heavily marked by religious texts or a religious presence in literary texts. Another important influence in the literature of this period is the strong connection between the Romanian and the Slavic culture which can be explained in the context of the strong spiritual climate which gave birth to the literature of the period. A brief presentation of the corpus of texts used in the analysis follows and the main working hypotheses are set forth. The author sets forth to draft a representative inventory of identifiable affective terms which are recurrent in the corpus in an exponential rather than in an exhaustive manner.

‘Affective Lexicon’ (pp. 122–216) introduces the data with the relevant classification. Stoica makes a clear-cut distinction between learned affective lexicon and colloquial affective lexicon. The affective universe has two main features: polarity and dynamism. What is interesting is that the dynamics of various forms of affective life is rendered in lexical semantics by polysemes, the same term having the capacity of designating either alternatively or successively and emotion or a feeling, an emotion or a temperamental feature. The author delves into the classification proposed in the first part of the book and illustrates every subclass of retrospective and anticipative affects extensively. The wealth of examples taken out from the corpus is useful not only for illustrating the classification but also for further studies in the domain of affectivity.

The last chapter of the second part of the book is also the most extensive. ‘Prototypical affective words. Lexical-semantic analysis’ (pp. 217–408) deals with case studies, or rather the analysis proper of prototypical affectivity words from a lexical semantic perspective. Stoica illustrates her first category, fear, from both a psychological and anthropological point of view as well as from a linguistic perspective. Then she proceeds to the process of its lexicalization in Old Romanian, analyzes the prototypical semantic script, provides a lexicographic, micro- and meso-semantic analyses as well as a semiotics of fear. The next concepts, rage, sadness, joy, love and hate follow the same structure and pattern of analysis. The extensive discussions and the impressive amount of data provided is overwhelming and extremely convincing, making this book a groundbreaking enterprise in the domain of lexical and semantic analysis.

No review can adequately represent the width of ideas, analysis and discussion that Stoica has managed to inject into this work, many of them inserted in passing while dealing with more major topics. This, in fact, is part of its strength: an ability to combine the wide-ranging with the specific and to introduce a broad spectrum of detail within the overall theme.

Mădălina Deacomi
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L’étude combine d’une manière appropriée l’empirique et le théorique, l’analyse minutieuse et la généralisation qui synthétise les résultats obtenus analytiquement. D’ailleurs, l’auteure Alice Toma est un chercheur avec une bonne expérience de travail de ce genre, ayant deux titres de docteur obtenus à l’Université de Bucarest et à l’Université de Genève. Sa première thèse de doctorat, en philologie, a été soutenue avec succès à Bucarest en décembre 2005. Tout comme le sujet de ce livre, le sujet traité dans sa première thèse était également relié aux mathématiques, mais la perspective de recherche était terminologique – tel que l’indique le titre: Le langage mathématique et son impact terminologique interdisciplinaire. À l’époque, en tant que membre du jury, j’ai apprécié le travail immense, d’un haut niveau scientifique qui ouvrait pour la linguistique roumaine la direction de la terminologie discursive – une branche de la terminologie en plein essor actuellement.

L’apport théorique fondamental de L’architecture relationnelle du texte scientifique est la caractérisation de type monographique des relations logico-sémantiques choisies: la généralisation, la particularisation, l’exemplification, l’exception et la reformulation. L’apport applicatif de ce livre est donné par l’investigation du langage des mathématiques en utilisant principalement le modèle de l’analyse textuelle telle qu’elle est développée par Emilio Manzotti. Dans ce cadre théorique, les principaux volets visés par l’analyse sont le niveau sémantique et le niveau grammatical, sans pour autant exclure le niveau conceptuel et le niveau pragmatique. Il s’agit d’un cadre théorique qui s’avère fructueux dans l’investigation des textes littéraires. L’investigation du langage mathématique montre la validité du modèle dans l’analyse des textes scientifiques. La méthode de base est la lecture intensive analytique qui permet l’identification des composants « fins », sémantiques, grammaticaux, conceptuels ou pragmatiques de l’architecture textuelle.

Le livre est une contribution à un domaine central de recherche linguistique, tel qu’il est caractérisé dans la Préface : « S’il existe un domaine central pour les études sur le texte – c’est-à-dire pour la linguistique textuelle ou ‘du discours’ – c’est bien celui des relations, qu’on étiquette souvent de ‘logiques’, entre couples ordonnés < p1, p2 > de propositions ou groupes d’une certaine manière unitaires de propositions contiguës < {pi} ∨ {qj} >, à contact ou à distance, explicites (signalés par des expressions ‘connectives’, dont les connecteurs constituent un cas particulier) ou implicites (exigeant des inférences, des opérations de reconstruction). Ces relations fondent en effet dans leur ensemble l’architecture conceptuelle du texte, ou au moins contribuent d’une façon essentielle à sa constitution. Et il va de soi qu’une telle architecture est à la base de tout texte scientifique, mais aussi, même si moins directement, de tout texte, y compris les textes poétiques, qui paraissent plutôt exploiter la dimension analogique. ‘p est la cause matérielle de q’, ‘q suit dans le temps p’ (relations extra-linguistiques ou pour ainsi dire ‘ontologiques’) ; ‘q est un cas particulier de p’, ‘p est du même genre de q’ (relations notionnelles) ; ou encore ‘l’assertion / l’hypothèse que p est justifiée par q’, ‘l’assertion de p est conditionnée par (la réserve) q’ sont des exemples bien connus de ces relations ‘logiques’ dans un sens très large du terme – exemples censés donner ici une idée de la variété de leurs réalisations sur les différents plans de l’entièreté ‘texte’ (sur celui des illocutions, en particulier), en laissant de côté, bien entendu, les relations dialogiques du type question-réponse » (p. 11).

La base de la recherche dans ce livre est constituée d’une analyse minutieuse et exhaustive sur un nombre impressionnant d’exemples extraits d’un corpus de textes mathématiques qui constitue le matériel empirique. Ce matériel permet l’accès au laboratoire de la recherche et met en lumière le
parcours méthodologique du travail. Les observations sur les relations logico-sémantiques, observations qui font avancer l’investigation scientifique, sont enregistrées dans un tableau complexe qui comprend plusieurs rubriques concernant la marque relationnelle, sa position énonciative, la ponctuation, la syntaxe et la sémantique des parties gauche et droite de la relation, le fonctionnement micro et macro textuel de la marque relationnelle (v. p. 233). Les rubriques du tableau sont constituées en partant de l’hypothèse conformément à laquelle une «relation textuelle» est une structure de trois segments textuels – la partie gauche, le ‘relationneur’ et la partie droite de la relation – structure qui a la fonction d’assurer la progression (cohérence) textuelle. Le sens global du texte (en tant que résultat de plusieurs relations reliées, à leur tour, entre elles) ou du fragment de texte (résulté de la concaténation des trois segments qui constituent une relation) est assuré par le bon fonctionnement de l’action relationnelle, à savoir, l’adéquation réciproque des trois parties de la structure » (p. 33). En termes syntaxiques, dans un exemple classique, la succession des trois segments revient à : syntagme + marque (relationneur) + syntagme. Dans certaines situations, un des trois constituants de la structure relationnelle peut manquer. Au total, les tableaux des annexes enregistrent 349 exemples de relations logico-sémantiques extraits des textes mathématiques.

Le corpus comprend environ 200 pages de textes mathématiques que l’auteure retient pour l’analyse à partir de tracts de mathématiques, de livres de mathématiques ayant pour public cible les mathématiciens ou de cours universitaires de mathématiques en ligne pour les étudiants de Genève.

Les cinq chapitres correspondent aux cinq relations analysées: la généralisation, la particularisation, l’exemplification, l’exception et la reformulation. L’écriture est soignée, le style est élégant et permet une lecture claire des idées. L’auteure fait preuve d’avoir parcouru attentivement une bibliographie riche et bien sélectionnée, à partir des grammairies du début du XXe siècle jusqu’aux études les plus récentes.

Le premier chapitre, La généralisation, comprend plusieurs considérations générales sur la généralisation et les processus sous-sous-jacents, l’induction et la déduction. Mais la partie essentielle en est la distinction proposée entre la généralisation intentionnelle et la généralisation extensionnelle. La généralisation extensionnelle est annoncée en général, la généralisation intentionnelle est annoncée par plus généralement. Dans ce sens, les conclusions du chapitre sont clairement formulées: « Sémantiquement, en général fonctionne comme un quantificateur universel faible. Il multiplie du point de vue numérique le Gé [généralise] à une classe quasi totale, le Gént [généralisant]. Cette classe admet toujours au moins une exception. Il nous fait appliquer la prédication pour une classe d’entités ou des circonstances de laquelle on enlève les exceptions. Autrement dit, il fait que la validité de la proposition p soit réduite; la prédication n’est pas générale; l’ensemble auquel elle s’applique admet des exceptions. En somme, sa fonction sémantique est d’adverbe de phrase (pas d’énonciation) quantifiant. Il n’est pas compatible avec la généralisation absolue; il ne se combine pas avec un quantificateur universel. Par contre, plus généralement est un modificateur de l’énonciation; il est généralisant et pas quantifiant; il présente le Gént comme une entité plus abstraite par rapport au Gé, toujours explicit; il envisage l’entité à laquelle il s’applique comme énoncée d’une manière qui enlève les détails par rapport à ce qui aurait pu être dit. Autrement dit, il existe une base de départ pour généraliser après. Le Gént est d’un niveau général seulement par rapport au Gé. Plus généralement est compatible avec la généralisation absolue. Dans notre corpus, tout apparaît une fois sur l’exemple (16). Gé et Gént sont des énoncés universels. Nous pourrions dire que plus généralement et plus général qu’en général » (pp. 72–73).

Si pour la généralisation les mathématiques éliminent l’ambiguïté par une hyper spécialisation des marques relationnelles, pour la particularisation, la solution est l’effacement de l’emploi relationnel d’une des marques qui constituent le couple synonymique ; le cas échéant, particulièrement perd son emploi relationnel dans les mathématiques devant sa paire en particulier. En outre, les mathématiques construisent des marques relationnelles de particularisation, plus ou moins spécifiques pour le discours scientifique en général, en utilisant le nom cas.
Le chapitre *L'exemplification* met en relief les multiples fonctions que l'exemple remplit dans le texte mathématique. Nous retenons ici la liaison entre le général et le particulier à travers l'exemple: « L'exemplification constitue, à l'intérieur d'un texte, la liaison nécessaire entre "un cas particulier et un cas général". La marque du passage à titre d'illustration apparaît soit au début du passage exemplificatoire, soit à l'intérieur de celui-ci, soit à sa fin. L'exemplification est suivie d'un retour à un degré plus haut de généralisation qui est relié au fragment exemplifié.

Exemple: (1) Signe d'appartenance. Élément *dans* un ensemble: par exemple $3 \in \mathbb{N}$ et $\pi \in \mathbb{R}$. On écrit indifféremment $n \in \mathbb{R}$ ou $\mathbb{R} \ni n$.

Dans l'exemple ci-dessus la marque d'exemplification *par exemple* précède le passage exemple, l'Exnt étant $3 < \mathbb{N}$ et $\pi \in \mathbb{R}$. La partie générale, l'Exé *Élément dans un ensemble* est reprise dans le passage qui suit l'Exnt et enrichie avec le symbole introduit dans l'Exnt. Nous constatons qu'à l'aide de l'exemple on introduit un sens supplémentaire au signe d'appartenance, à côté de 'dans', à savoir 'contient' » (pp. 103–104).

Le chapitre le plus développé est *L'exception*. Cette fois-ci le spécifique de l'architecture relationnelle mathématique n'est ni la spécialisation des marques relationnelles (le cas de la généralisation), ni l'effacement des marques pour éliminer la synonymie relationnelle (le cas de la particularisation), mais l'ajout d'un sens spécifique à une marque qui est autrement utilisée en langue commune, la marque *quitte à*. Pour montrer cet ajout sémantique l'auteure fait une ample description de l'exception en langue commune, en parcourant l'inventaire quasiment exhaustif des marques d'exception: *à moins que*, *à moins de*, *à moins que de*, *excepté*, *excepté que*, *excepté si*, *hormis*, *hormis que*, *hors*, *hors que*, *quitte à*, *sauf*, *sauf que*, *sauf si*, *sauf à*, *sinon*, *sinon que*. Elle mentionne qu'elle développe un matériel discuté pendant un cours de M. prof. Emilio Manzotti qu'elle a suivi il y a quelques années (2001–2002). D'ailleurs la bibliographie montre des résultats déjà publiés sur ce thème. Le chapitre fait aussi la distinction entre les exceptions et les réserves. L'investigation linguistique impose qu'on opère avec plusieurs concepts bien maîtrisés parmi lesquels nous rappelons: *quantification*, *valeur de vérité*, *sémantique négative*, *définition négative*, *préédication*, *état de choses*, *informativité*, *factif*, *non factif*, *hypothétique*, *condition*, *conséquence*, *étymologie*, *formalisation*, *etc.*

La *reformulation* est un chapitre qui constitue une sorte de démonstration au niveau relationnel de la thèse de la *synonymie infinie* soutenue par Solomon Marcus. La marque la plus fréquente de la reformulation est « *c'est-à-dire* ». Elle fonctionne au niveau transphrastique, propositionnel et syntagmatique. Elle marque des rapports sémantiques variés entre la partie gauche et la partie droite de la relation: l'équivalence globale, la synthèse ou l'implication. Le trait sémantique commun de ses emplois est l'altérité. Au niveau discursif, l'altérité apparaît principalement entre le discours factuel et le discours conceptuel, entre le langage naturel et le langage artificiel.

Je cite pour conclure Emilio Manzotti qui signe la *Préface* : « Bienvenue donc à une étude fouillée et de longue haleine comme celle qui est ici proposée, qui comble, en partie au moins, une réelle lacune. Ayant (courageusement) choisi de travailler sur un exigeant corpus de textes mathématiques, Alice Toma s’est essayée à caractériser dans ses composantes centrales l’architecture relationnelle (qui ne peut être que ‘logique’) du discours scientifique, ce qui l’a amenée à se pencher en détail sur les relations ‘verticales’ de généralisation d’une part et de particularisation (dans ses différentes manifestations – dont l’exemplification) de l’autre. Ces relations réellement constitutives de tout discours scientifique sont ainsi l’objet ici d’une analyse linguistique approfondie » (p. 14).

Le livre est moderne et réalise un équilibre parfait entre la théorie et son application. Aux aspects nouveaux proposés en théorie s’ajoute une analyse minutieuse d’une quantité grande de matériel empirique et, surtout, la nouveauté de la méthodologie et la manière dans laquelle la thèse montre le parcours de l’empirique au théorique et vice versa – selon le cas. Le livre se constitue comme une démonstration sérieuse du spécifique relationnel du langage mathématique, au niveau
quantitatif et qualitatif. Il apporte aussi des clarifications théoriques pertinentes pour les relations logico-sémantiques auscultées. Le livre est une contribution nouvelle et importante pour le domaine de la linguistique textuelle, en général, pour les relations logico-sémantiques, en particulier. Il est aussi, une caractérisation intéressante du langage mathématique.
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