The volume under review represents an important contribution to the description of the historical grammar of Romanian, being – as Ian Roberts himself writes in the Foreword – “the first in-depth treatment of aspects of the diachronic syntax to appear in English” (Foreword, p. ix). In addition to the diachronic syntax, the papers included in this volume cover the fields of comparative and diachronic Romance linguistics, and, of course, the Romanian historical linguistics. The four parts of the book contain a selection of papers presented at the workshop entitled “Diachronic Variation in the Syntax of Romanian”, held on the 14th and 15th of December 2012, at the University of Bucharest. The sixteen chapters of the volume are organized in three thematic sections – Nominal and Adjectival Structures (chapters three – eight), Verbal Structures (chapters nine – fifteen), and Discourse Issues (chapter sixteen) –, while the first part (chapters one and two) is dedicated to the key speakers: Adam Ledgeway and Martin Maiden. The four parts are preceded by a Foreword and the Editors’ Introduction (that familiarizes readers with the structure and purpose of the book), and followed by a list of Abbreviations, Functional Words Specific to Romanian, Symbols, and also by some biographical notes on the contributors.

As a continuation of his previous research on Romance languages, organized in two remarkable volumes: Cambridge History of the Romance Languages (Cambridge University Press, 2011) and From Latin to Romance. Morphosyntactic Typology and Change (Oxford University Press, 2012), Adam Ledgeway provides in the first chapter of the book some plausible answers to the questions raised by the selection of the Romance perfective auxiliary. Entitled Romance Auxiliary Selection in Light of Romanian Evidence (pp. 3–31), the topic of this paper is of “enormous interest among Romance and theoretical linguists” (p. 3), and this is one of the reasons why the structural analysis of this Romanian morphological issue is permanently completed by the author with data about similar phenomena described for Romance or for Balkan/Slavonic languages. Rejecting the traditional idea that the Romanian finiteness split is a result of the contact with the Slavonic languages (especially with Bulgarian), the researcher gives plenty of arguments (and examples from different languages) in order to support the hypothesis that the origins of the particular distribution of the Romanian perfective auxiliaries should be related to the development of the “largely analytic TAM (tense, aspect and mood) system” (p. 9) of this Romance variety.

Martin Maiden, focuses in his article on the morphological structure of the Romanian feminine noun (pp. 33–52) from a diachronic perspective, but also on some recent exceptions to the general paradigm, namely the feminine nouns with three forms (for example, the noun carne that has two plural forms: cărni and cărnuri). After a detailed presentation of the origins of the Romanian feminine noun and adjective morphology, the author infers that the concept of lexical identity is crucial for “the survival of systematic mismatches between form and function” (called morphemic, in the sense of Aronoff 1994) (pp. 34–35).

Chapter three, entitled Some Functions of the Definite Article in Old Romanian (pp. 55–65), opens the second Part of the volume, dedicated to the nominal and adjectival structures of Romanian. In this article, Camelia Stan relates to the 16th century in order to date the first texts in which the definite article is used with “two main functions”: “as a definite determiner” and “as an inflectional marker” (p. 57). The emphasis is on the second function, more precisely, on the use of the article as case marker and also as gender and number marker. Although both functions are preserved in present-day
Romanian, still there were two processes that influenced their diachronic evolution: restriction in the usage of the definite article as a morphological marker, and “competition with the demonstrative cel in common contexts” (p. 62).

Based on one of his previous research articles (published in 2012), Ion Giurgea explores in chapter four (pp. 68–96) the reanalysis of the article al into a genitive marker and the emergence of the adnominal dative in Romanian. After a consistent introduction, in which he discusses the origin of al, derived from the Latin ille (in prenominal position), and in which he also tries to reconstruct the features of the Proto-Romanian nominal syntax system, the author focuses on explaining “why al has not been generalized as a genitive marker in two special contexts: immediately after the suffixal definite article and with predicative bare nouns” (p. 81). The answer to this issue resides in the correlation between the reanalysis of this article as a genitive marker and that of the dative as an adnominal structural case, this being “a strong similarity between the syntax of possessives and genitives” (p. 93) in Romanian.

The next contribution, Remarks on the Constructions NEMIC(Ă) ALT(Ă) and ALT(Ă) NEMIC(Ă) in Old Romanian (pp. 97–120), belongs to Adrian Chircu. He analyzes these structures in a few Romanian texts attested from the 16th and the 17th centuries, and then he compares the results with similar phenomena described for other Romance languages. The conclusion was that all these observations, along with the fact that these constructions were preserved in present-day Romanian, represent arguments for the idea that the phrases consisting of an indefinite pro-form and a negative pronoun may have been inherited from Latin.

Another chapter dedicated to the linguistic/morphological features inherited by Romanian from its mother language – Latin – is The Adjectival Category of Intensity: from Latin to Proto-Romanian (pp. 121–149), by Gabriela Stoica. As the title itself suggests, the researcher stops only at some primary (two) stages of the diachronic development of the category of intensity/comparison: Latin (Classical Latin, Vulgar Latin, Late Latin) and Proto-Romanian (and Old Daco-Romanian). The results of the analysis revealed, on the one hand, the preservation of “the triadic Latin system of marking degrees of intensity” (p. 145), and, on the other hand, the grammaticalization process underwent by some adverbs that finally became abstract comparative markers.

Closely related to this chapter, the next article (pp. 151–167) restricts the perspective to the superlative intensifier foarte “very”, analyzed also as a grammaticalized marker by Raluca Brâscu. Following the theoretical framework proposed by Marchello-Nizia (2006), the author investigates the status change of this lexeme involved in a grammaticalization process (from the Latin etymon until the present-day Romanian). Although the changes at the syntactic and category levels are also described and exemplified, the emphasis is on “the semantic evolution of the term – from a word with lexical meaning to a morpheme with abstract meaning” (p. 165).

Part II of this volume ends with chapter eight – The Diachronic Relation between DE NESPUS (OF UNSPOKEN) and NESPUS DE (UNSPOKEN OF) “VERY” (pp. 170–193) –, written by Adina Dragomirescu. Based on data provided by texts from the Old Romanian language, and also on two important processes that affected these constructions – reanalysis and analogy –, the paper brings evidence to sustain the idea that this two apparently similar superlative patterns have different diachronic sources, and, consequently, two independent development processes.

Gabriela Pană Dindeleșgan’s question-article – Does Old Romanian Have “Mixed Categories”? (pp. 197–224) – opens the comprehensive Part III of the volume, the one devoted to the verbal structures. As far as present-day Romanian is concerned, the answer to this question is quite simple, and given right from the beginning of the article, the author highlighting the fact that Romanian, as well as other Romance and non-Romance languages, has mixed categories (as defined by Bresnan 1997 and Panagiotidis 2010). Still, the focus of the article is on the inventory of these categories in Old Romanian, on their description, and diachronic evolution. In order to achieve this goals, the linguist investigates the “long” infinitive (nominal vs. verbal infinitives), the deverbal adjectives (-tor agentive suffix derivatives), and the (nominal and verbal) supine. The conclusion is that the behaviour of mixed categories in the history of Romanian language is scalar: while the first two forms lost their mixed behaviour, the supine is “a mixed category par excellence” (p. 221).
Two Types of Infinitival Complex Predicates: a Diachronic Perspective (pp. 225–251), by Isabela Nedelcu, starts with stating the four criteria used for the identification of a complex predicate containing auxiliaries or modals before the infinitive. The comparative analysis is meant to emphasize the differences in syntactic behaviour between the complex predicates in the Old Romanian, Modern Romanian, and present-day Romanian texts. The most significant aspect concerns the degree of cohesion displayed by these constructions, meaning that, unlike the current language, in the old and modern periods of language evolution the complex predicates were less cohesive and it was possible for “an adjunct, a complement or a subject to intervene between the auxiliary and the infinitive” (p. 249).

Emanuela Timotin’s joint work with Isabela Nedelcu, Stability and Innovation in the Use of the Infinitive in an 18th Century Translation from Italian into Romanian (pp. 253–275), investigates the unique and extensive usages of the infinitive in the manuscript Life of Scanderbeg, translated by Vlad Boțulescu in 1763 (first published in Venice, in 1584). Actually, this translated text is considered as emblematic for the old period of the Romanian language, although the Italian influence cannot be denied. The results of the analysis highlight the archaic, innovative or dialectal usages of the infinitive in coordinated or subordinate structures, of the infinitives selected by perception verbs or preceded by different prepositions. At the same time, the diachronic perspective explains the decline or the revival of these constructions in the Romanian language.

The next chapter, The Romanian Reflexive SINE “SELF”: Grammar and Beyond (pp. 277–308), is written by Andra Vasilescu, whose intention was to surpass the borders of the morphosyntactic analysis, and to complete it by bringing important data from the pragmatic field. As such, the author observes that sine as a strong reflexive is in “complementary distribution with the clitic se”, and this produced a “discourse-syntax split” (p. 305). In addition, the diachronic perspective highlights the important changes carried by reflexivity and intensification in the development of the Romanian language.

In The Grammaticalization of a Constraint on Passive Reflexive Constructions in Romanian (pp. 309–361), Alexandra Cornilescu and Alexandru Nicolae describe, using the concepts/instruments of parametric syntax, the phenomena that affected the reflexive-passive structures in the earlier stages of Romanian as compared to the late modern Romanian. The comparison between these stages of language evolution reveal, in the end, a “clear tendency to strengthen the effects of the Animacy Hierarchy, which requires that in reflexive passive sentences the Theme should not outrank the Agent” (p. 357).

Another article on the complex process of grammaticalization is written by Camelia Ușurelu, and investigates the constructions with direct and indirect object doubling in Old Romanian (pp. 363–387). The paper focuses on the analysis of the contexts extracted from old Romanian texts (16th–18th centuries), starting from the morphosyntactic definition of the term clitic, and from some general observations about the Romanian clitics. In these specific contexts, it is being underlined the fact that the clitic doubling developed progressively: it appeared before the 16th century, and grammaticalized up to the 20th century, when a number of syntactic and semantic rules for doubling were set.

The last chapter of Part III – The Position of the Light Adverbials ŞI, CAM, MAI, PREA, and TOT in the Verbal Cluster: Synchronic Variation and Diachronic Observations (pp. 389–421), by Carmen Mirzea Vasile– tackles the placement of these five adverbs in Daco-Romanian and the south-Danubian varieties, and also the features indicating their clitic morphosyntactic status. The author contradicts the general assumption that these have a fixed preverbal position, adopted by the traditional Romanian grammar, and associates their positional variation (the so-called “deviant” order) both with a process of semantic-pragmatic specialization, and with some phonological and lexical-semantic contexts favouring a certain order.

The volume ends with Part IV, presenting Discourse Issues, and contains one important contribution by Rodica Ţaflă: Presentative Markers in Old Romanian: Divergent Changes in the Syntactic and Pragmatic Uses of ADICĂ and IATĂ (pp. 425–453). Based on a corpus from the 16th century and the first half of the 17th century, the paper investigates the syntactic structures containing the two presentative markers above mentioned, insisting on their functional status, but also on their deictic and semantico-pragmatic values (as focalizers and connectors). By comparing the results of
the corpus analysis to the usages of these lexical items in the present-day Romanian language, the
author concludes that the two markers evolved differently: adică lost its presentative value, and
became a reformulator, whereas iată continued to be used as a presentative marker, but, at the same
time, extended its use as a focal particle.

In conclusion, as a reviewer, I appreciate the editors’ effort to bring together the papers of a
significant number of established authors in the field of Romanian language, in order to create an
excellent volume on diachronic variation and language change. It is a welcomed addition to the
growing contexts of current research in the history of the Romance languages, especially if we take
into consideration the fact that many comparative studies dedicated to these Romance varieties ignore
the Romanian data. One very important advantage of this volume is given by the extended analyses
based on the grammaticalization theory (although using different approaches), but also by the number
of examples included in each chapter. They are meant to support the theoretical concepts and
assumptions, thereby, making the book attractive to both researchers and practitioners. In fact, the
editors state that the volume is intended for a wide audience, including advanced graduate and
postgraduate students in theoretical linguistics, diachronic linguistics, and Romance/Romanian
linguistics, as well as researchers in the fields of typological and historical linguistics,
morphosyntactic theory and the history of the Romance languages. What makes the volume attractive
to such a wide audience is the fact that the most important areas of Romanian grammar – the nominal
and the verbal domain – are well represented. Still, I am sure that there are also many discourse issues
that should be taken into consideration when talking about the diachronic variation of Romanian,
although only one aspect is presented here.

Alice-Magdalena Bodoc
Transylvania University, Brașov

FLORICA DIMITRESCU, Teme lexicale actuale (începutul secolului al XXI-lea)
[Thèmes lexicaux actuels (début du XXIe siècle)], București, Editura

L’ouvrage Thèmes lexicaux actuels (début du XXIe siècle), paru en 2014 aux Éditions de
l’Académie Roumaine, présente une sélection de recherches menées par l’auteure dans la période
2002–2014 (comme indiqué dans le sous-titre du livre : début du XXIe siècle) et déjà parues pour la
plupart dans des revues et éditions spécialisées, dans des volumes d’hommage etc. Cette édition
s’inscrit dans les préoccupations constantes de l’auteure pour le roumain actuel, toujours en
mouvement, préoccupations qui étaient déjà évidentes dans quelques volumes antérieurs, tels que
Dynamique du lexique roumain – hier et aujourd’hui (1995)1, le Voyage ininterrompu de la langue

Le volume présenté ici rend hommage au souvenir du professeur Iorgu Iordan, qui avait
insufflé à l’auteure l’amour de la langue vive, actuelle, et il s’adresse autant au grand public intéressé
par l’état actuel de développement du lexique roumain qu’aux linguistes.

Le livre comprend 30 études concernant la dynamique du lexique roumain actuel. Avant les
études proprement-dites, présentées dans l’ordre chronologique de leur rédaction, sont placées la
bibliographie, les sources et les abréviations (p. 9–21), un Avis au lecteur (Cuvânt înainte, p. 23–25)
et une préface originale (În loc de prefață. La persoana I singular [En guise de préface. À la première

1 Dimitrescu, Florica, 1995, Dinamica lexicului românesc – ieri și astăzi, București, Logos;
Cluj-Napoca, Clusium.
2003, Cluj-Napoca, Clusium.

Les 30 études présentées se basent notamment sur le matériel linguistique recueilli par l’auteure pour les trois éditions du Dictionnaire de mots récents (DCR)4, qui illustre la dynamique du lexique roumain de ces 50–60 dernières années.


Au-delà des thèmes ponctuels ou généraux traités, quelques desiderata de l’auteure sont récurrents dans toutes les études : l’importance du traitement électronique des textes roumains anciens et contemporains et l’utilisation des corpus dans les études linguistiques ; l’utilité d’élaborer un dictionnaire du roumain du XVIe siècle ; la nécessité impérative de réviser le Dictionnaire explicatif de la langue roumaine (Dictionarul explicativ al limbii române – DEX) tous les 5 ans, au moins tous les 10 ans ; l’importance qu’il y a à étudier la langue vivante, telle qu’elle est parlée aujourd’hui (p. 54).

L’histoire personnelle Florica Dimitrescu couvre de manière heureuse plus de la moitié de l’histoire de la linguistique roumaine. Grâce au volume présenté ici, les jeunes linguistes sont assurés de la validité de quelques principes généraux de recherche, comme l’importance d’avoir une perspective large (culture-civilisation) pour analyser les faits linguistiques (p. 54) et la nécessité qu’il y a à reprendre une thématique scientifique, à la réévaluer après un certain temps (p. 134, 303). L’auteure réaffirme également quelques idées ponctuelles, qui sont des idées de base en matière de recherche au niveau de l’histoire des mots, comme par exemple : l’importance de la première attestation de la forme et du sens d’un mot afin d’établir son étymologie et les précautions qu’il faut prendre concernant cette première attestation (p. 306), en tenant compte pour la première attestation non seulement des auteurs consacrés, mais également des auteurs mineurs (p. 54), l’utilité de consigner les mots très nouveaux, dès leurs premières utilisations, même si ces mots ne seront pas toujours adoptés (p. 54–55).

L’ouvrage ici présenté se particularise par la chaleur humaine qu’il dégage, ainsi que par l’intérêt très généreux qu’a l’auteure pour la recherche dans le domaine linguistique et pour la vérité en général. C’est un livre qu’on lit avec plaisir, c’est une lecture attrayante tant pour le linguiste, que pour toute personne curieuse de l’évolution de la langue roumaine contemporaine et de son état actuel, toujours en mouvement. C’est en même temps une précieuse source d’information sur le lexique actuel et un manuel implicite des méthodes et pratiques de la recherche linguistique.

Carmen Mircea Vasile
Institut de Linguistique « Iorgu Iordan – Alexandru Rosetti », Faculté de Lettres, Université de Bucarest

THERESA BIBERAUER, MICHELLE SHEEHAN (eds), Theoretical Approaches to Disharmonic Word Order, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2013, 550 p.8

The book is structured in five parts (“On the nature of disharmony”, “The role of prosody”, “The question of antisymmetry”, “Novel alternatives to antisymmetry”, “The Final-over-Final constraint”), which include 15 chapters, preceded by the introduction to the volume written by the editors, Theresa Biberauer and Michelle Sheehan (henceforth B&S).

The introductory chapter written by the editors, entitled “Theoretical Approaches to Disharmonic Word Order” (pp. 1–44), is more than a roadmap of volume (as introductions to

8 The review was originally published online, on the Linguist List: http://linguistlist.org/issues/26/26-3529.html
volumes of collected papers generally are); rather, it is a substantive contribution which assesses the place of word order in linguistic theory, with special focus on the problem of harmonic and disharmonic word order. Every chapter of the book is thus placed in a tradition of research, a very useful strategy for the reader. Furthermore, B&S not only present, but critically examine every chapter of the book. After an extremely scholarly survey of word order preoccupations prior to Greenberg’s (1963) seminal work, which appear to be very scarce, B&S closely examine the Greenbergian notions of harmony and disharmony, and review and assess the limits of the main approaches to harmonic and disharmonic word order since Greenberg (1963) to the present-day, paying special attention to Kayne’s (1994 et seq.) notion of ‘antisymmetry’. The antisymmetric approach (via the Linear Correspondence Axiom (= LCA)) imposes a rigid theory of word order, the canonical position of constituents being spec-head-comp; structures diverging from this order (e.g. head-final structures) are derived via movement. While evidence of the non-existence of rightward specifiers has been repeatedly noted in the literature, the same cannot be said for the ban on leftward complements. The final part of the introductory chapter is devoted to the Final-over-Final Constraint (=FOFC), a constraint which rules out head-initial phrases dominated by head-final phrases which are part of the same extended projection. FOFC is taken as a crucial piece of evidence for the fact that the order of heads and complements falls under the domain of the LCA.

The second chapter, “Word-Order Typology: A Change of Perspective” (pp. 47–73), written by Gugliemo Cinque, is programmatic. Cinque attempts a shift of paradigm, starting from a novel research question, namely “what precisely the harmonic word-order types are that we can theoretically reconstruct, and to what extent each language (or subset of languages) departs from them” (p. 49) rather than “what the predominant correlates of OV and VO orders in actual languages are” (ibidem). On the basis of Merge (reflecting scope properties) and Move, Cinque identifies two harmonic types, the head-initial type and the head-final type. He illustrates them with clausal (CP-VP) and nominal (DP-NP) structures, and then establishes two generalizations which hold within these two purely harmonic types: (i) whatever precedes the VP/NP reflects the order of Merge; (ii) whatever follows VP/NP is the mirror image of the order of Merge. The most important consequences of this proposal are (i) the possibility of measuring the degree of deviation of actual languages from one or the other ideal type (which allows for a finer-grained typologization); (ii) the possibility of establishing which correlations are most stable and which are more prone to be relaxed; and (iii) the possibility of giving a principled account, dictated by minimal derivational desiderata (e.g. Merge), of certain intra-category generalizations (e.g. FOFC).

Chapter 3, “Postposition vs Prepositions in Mandarin Chinese: The Articulation of Disharmony” (pp. 74–105), coauthored by Redouane Djamiouri, Waltraud Paul and John Whitman, deals with the highly controversial issue of PPs in Chinese. These are, as the authors observe, both mixed (comprising pre-, post-, and circumpositions) and disharmonic (prepositions occur with head-final NPs, postpositions appear with head-initial VPs). The analysis put forth by the authors is maximally simple and elegant: they show that postpositions are categorially similar to prepositions (hence, they are not nouns) but they denote Place, while prepositions denote Path; the circumpositional structure observes the universal ordering Path > Place. Furthermore, postpositional phrases are shown to pattern with the other phrase-head-final structures of Mandarin, namely NP and CP, whose common property is the inability of their head to assign Case to its complement. Thus, since postpositions are non-Case assigning heads, their complement moves to the specifier of the postpositional projection, and Case assignment is ensured either by (internal/external) merger in an argument position or by a prepositional selecting head. This solution elegantly accounts for the distributional disparities between PrepPs and PostPs while still preserving the same categorial status for pre- and postpositions, and derives disharmony from a hierarchical universal (Path > Place; cf. Svenonius 2007) combined with a language-particular property of Chinese (the inability of phrase-final heads to assign Case).

The fourth chapter, “The Mixed OV/VO Syntax of Mòcheno Main Clauses: On the Interaction between High and Low Left Periphery” (pp. 106–135), written by Federica Cognola, represents a
fine-grained analysis of main clause word order in Mòcheno, a Tyrolean (Germanic) variety spoken in Northern Italy. Mòcheno is generally characterised as a Germanic variety heavily influenced by Romance as far as constituent-positioning is concerned. The characteristic clause structure (V2) of Continental Germanic is possible, but not obligatory; different parameter settings are assumed to account for the OV/VO variation. Against this background, Cognola presents an extensive analysis of main clause direct object topics and foci, and of the V2 syntax of Mòcheno, and convincingly shows that the OV/VO variation results not from different grammars in competition (cf. Kroch 1989), but rather from a fine-grained interaction between the inner workings of the V2 rule and the information status of the scrambled constituents. The former is argued to apply both to the finite verbs in the higher phase and the past participle in the lower phase. Several interesting results are established (the isomorphy, but not identity, of the CP and vP peripheries; the parallel drawn between FinP and VoiceP, and the identification of a LowForceP), which will certainly be taken up in future research.

Joseph Emonds' chapter, “Universal Default Right-Headedness and How Stress Determines Word Order” (pp. 139–161), the fifth in the book, opens the section devoted to the role of prosody in determining word order and headedness. The main objective of the chapter is to put forward a unified account of how the position of heads in morphology and syntax is determined (“morphology, at least as it is usually conceived, has no special principles for head placement that distinguish it from syntax”, p. 141). Thus, Emonds takes issue with Kayne’s (1994) universal underlying left-headness and proposes, in its place, that the universal default setting is right-headedness, and left-hand heads result only from language-specific deviations. The universal ordering principles advanced by Emonds depend on language-particular stress patterns, and may be summarised on the basis of the following generalizations: (i) “Universal Default Head-Final Order”: as a default at the syntax-PF interface, heads are right sisters of non-heads (p. 145), and (ii) Nespor and Vogel's (1982) “Complement Law”: complements rather than heads are preferred locations for stress in all types of domains. Importantly, phonology-driven accounts of word order like the one proposed by Emonds in this study are starting to develop into a separate research strand – witness Richards’ (2016) monograph and the next two chapters (Hinterhölzl; Tokizaki and Kuwana), for example.

Roland Hinterhölzl (“(Dis)Harmonic Word Order and Phase-Based Restrictions on Phrasing and Spell-Out”, pp. 162–189) sets as his goal the derivation of (dis)harmonic word orders in a framework which (at least in part) allows for the encoding and manipulation of prosodic information in narrow syntax. Focusing especially on (the “heaviness” of) event-related adjuncts and their position with respect to the verb in English and German, Hinterhölzl argues for the existence of two types of transparency, prosodic transparency (Mapping Condition to PF = “a heavy syntactic constituent must appear on a dominant branch in prosodic phrasing if its containing phase is weight-sensitive”, p. 163) and scope transparency (Mapping Condition to LF = “if a scopes over b, the Spell-Out copy of a should c-command the Spell-Out copy of b”, p. 163). These conditions are coupled with the distinction between homorganic and non-homorganic phases (homorganic phases are projected by the same phase predicate). Based on these assumptions and on a novel approach to the relation between vPs and event-related adjuncts (viewed as a derived subject-predicate relation), Hinterhölzl successfully manages to encode certain prosodic requirements in narrow syntax and derive word order constraints by interweaving syntax and prosodic structure.

In “A Stress-Based Theory of Disharmonic Word Orders” (pp. 190–215), Hisao Tokizaki and Yasutomo Kuwana establish a strong correlation between the position of stress and the availability of complement-head orders (i.e. roll-up, comp-to-spec movement, cf. Kayne 1994) in a given language. Starting from the empirically supported assumption that the “juncture” (= the relation between segments in a sequence) is shorter in left-branching structures (i.e. complement-head structures), it is shown that complement-head structures behave like compounds, and hence should have the same stress location as the words and compounds in the language concerned. Hence, complement-to-specifier movement in a language/structure should be allowed only if the resulting stress configuration does not clash with stress pattern of the language in question; otherwise, this instance of movement (taken as being obligatory) is postponed to LF (or resolved via Agree not followed by
movement, as suggested in fnt. 5/p.193). Coupled with a fine-grained typology of word-stress locations, this proposal elegantly accommodates the discrete scale of head-finality (e.g. Japanese) to head-initiality (e.g. Romance, Bantu) on the basis of the position of word-stress.

In chapter 8, “Why Are There No Directionality Parameters?” (pp. 219–244), Richard S. Kayne sets out to reinforce one of the basic results from his 1994 antisymmetry theory (Kayne 1994) – namely, that there are no directionality parameters, and the basic format provided by UG is S(pecifier)-H(ead)-C(omplement) – in a more derivational approach to syntax, which makes use of the Agree (Probe-Goal) system put forth by Chomsky in the post-2000 papers (Chomsky 2000, 2001, 2008). After reviewing a series of cross-linguistic gaps and asymmetries which indicate that we are not living in a “symmetric syntactic universe” – dislocations and hanging topics, clitics, agreement, relative clauses, serial verbs, coordination, and forward and backward pronominalization –, Kayne carries on by showing that a point which was taken as axiomatic in Kayne (1994) – i.e. the absence of directionality parameters via the Linear Correspondence Axiom (LCA) – can actually be derived if precedence is part of narrow syntax. In order to demonstrate this point, Kayne explores an alternative presented (but not pursued) in Chomsky (2008): the merger of two syntactic objects is taken to form an ordered pair \(<X,Y>\), not a set \(\{X,Y\}\). Coupled with the assumption that the merger of two phrases is unavailable and with the notion of \((\text{immediate})\)-precedence, Kayne shows that a head H can be merged with at most two elements, a C and a S, placed on opposite sides of H. Hence, the S-H-C format of UG is derived from more primitive syntactic operations and need not be taken as an axiom; the non-existence of multiple specifiers is also elegantly derived in this account.

Michael Barrie (chapter 9, “Antisymmetry and Hixkaryana”, pp. 245–269) also makes a strong case for antisymmetry, thus continuing Kayne's line of thought. Focusing on Hixkaryana and tangentially on Urarina (two genetically unrelated OVS languages), Barrie questions the existence of the Head Parameter, and shows that such an approach is unable to accommodate asymmetries like the one discussed here: SOXV orders are allowed in SOV languages, while OXVS orders are not allowed in OVS languages. The unavailability of OXVS in the languages under scrutiny is elegantly accounted for by the following operations: (i) roll-up movement of O across V in a “ghost AgrO’P”, (ii) VP-movement of the newly created VP-shell across the subject, thus smuggling O above S (cf. Collins 2005) and circumventing relativized minimality effects. The second operation is inspired by Massam’s (2001) work on Nuecan, more specifically, by the assumption that EPP in OVS languages is satisfied by VP rather than DP.

In contrast to the two previous chapters, in chapter 10 ("Postverbal Constituents in SOV languages"; pp. 270–305) Balkız Öztürk argues for the existence of rightward movement on the basis of the contrastive analysis of the behaviour of postverbal constituents (PVCs) in two SOV Altaic languages, Khalkha Mongolian and Uyghur Turkic. It is shown that while there is no evidence of a movement-based derivation of PVCs in Khalkha, PVCs in Uyghur display a parallel behaviour to leftward scrambled elements, hence their derivation should involve (rightward) movement. Furthermore, on the basis of cross-Altaic evidence (Japanese, Turkish, Eastern Uzbek, and Osh Kirghiz), a parameterisation of rightward movement on the basis of the presence or absence of EPP-effects is argued for.

In the same line of reasoning, Arantzazu Elordieta (chapter 11 “On the Relevance of the Head Parameter in a Mixed OV Language”, pp. 306–329) carefully reviews the evidence which tilts the balance in favour of a modified version of the Head Parameter over an antisymmetric approach, on the basis of an extensive examination of Basque. It is shown that Basque is a non-FOCF-violating disharmonic language (on FOC, see Biberauer, Holmberg and Roberts 2014, and Part V in the book): the C-domain (i.e. the heads associated with discourse and scope) shows all the signs of head-initiation, while the domain below C is uniformly head-final. The derivation of PP complements and the position of manner adverbs with respect to PPs constitute the crucial pieces of evidence which help tell apart the two competing accounts (other constructions being equally well derivable under a Head Parameter account and an antisymmetric approach). The results are supported by findings from language acquisition and language processing.
In the chapter that opens up the fourth section of the book dedicated to novel alternatives to antisymmetry, Mark de Vos (chapter 13 “Afrikaans Mixed Adposition Orders as a PF-Linearization Effect”) puts forth a novel approach to linearisation based on dependency formation, formalised as Dependency Spell-Out. The upshot of Dependency Spell-Out is that the structure passed to the PF-interface is not merely a set of phrase-markers, but a set of functional dependencies; in their turn, the functional dependencies established in narrow syntax play a pivotal role in determining linearization. Setting out to provide an account of the disharmonic word orders (mixed headedness) present in the Afrikaans adpositional system, de Vos shows that disharmony/mixed headedness is only apparent; building on previous literature, it is elegantly shown that a uniformly head-initial system combined with syntactic functional dependency linearisation suffices to account for the data.

The second alternative to antisymmetry put forward is Takashi Toyoshima’s transversal linearisation of bare phrase structure (chapter 13 “Traversal Parameter at the PF Interface: Graph-Theoretical Linearization of Bare Phrase Structure”, pp. 358–388). Toyoshima starts by discussing the shortcomings and predicaments of Kayne’s LCA, identifying as weak points both the necessity of postulating functional projections which play no other role than supplying landing-sites, and fact that the original formulation of the LCA does not axiomatically exclude a series of structures (which are – paradoxically! – taken by many researchers to be excluded), such as n-ary branching (n>0), adjunction of heads to non-heads and vice versa, multiple specifiers, etc. (see also Guimarães 2008). To overcome these problems, Toyoshima proposes a linearisation procedure alternative to Chomsky’s (1995) Bare Phrase Structure, based on a graph-theoretical approach (see also Kural 2005) which is assumed to apply at the PF interface, as understood in the earlier Y-models.

In chapter 14 (“Disharmonic Word Orders from a Processing-Efficiency Perspective”, pp. 391–406), John A. Hawkins puts forward an alternative account of disharmonic word orders based on language processing and efficiency considerations. The starting point of the discussion is the typological observation that while consistent (head-initial or head-final) types account for the majority of languages, mixed types (both FOFC-violating, and non-FOFC-violating) are generally dispreferred and occasionally unattested. The upshot of Hawkins’ proposal is that “grammars have conventionalised syntactic structures in proportion to their degree of preference in performance” (p. 406). In the present contribution, Hawkins reviews a series of parsing principles (Mother Node Construction; Immediate Constituent Attachment; Minimize Domains), subsumed to the Performance-Grammar Correspondence Hypothesis, which have been put forward and extensively developed in his own work (Hawkins 1994, 2004, 2014), taken to account for (dis)harmony from a processing perspective.

Michelle Sheehan (chapter 15, “Explaining the Final-over-Final Constraint: Formal and Functional Approaches”, pp. 407–444) examines two competing accounts of FOFC: a functional approach grounded in the work of Hawkins (1994, 2004, present volume), and a formal explanation developed in the author’s own work, i.e. a PF-interface account, different in certain respects from the formal account provided in Biberauer, Holmberg and Roberts (2014) (and previous work). An important part of the paper is devoted to the review of the empirical evidence for FOFC (inflected auxiliary placement and the verb phrase: the cross-linguistic absence of V-O-Aux orders; polarity question particles and complementizers; clausal complements), and of the counterexamples to FOFC (some of which are apparent, some of which at the very least have an unclear status, e.g. particles). Thus, while both the functional and the formal approaches fare well in accounting for a large amount of FOFC effects and violations, several empirical considerations, as well as the fact that performance based-approaches entail that there is a relation between cross-categorial harmony and FOFC (contrary to fact), tip the scales in favour of the formal account of FOFC, a variant of which is put forward in this chapter.
In the final chapter of the book, Brian Hok-Shing Chan (chapter 16, “Sentence-Final Particles, Complementizers Antisymmetry, and the Final-over-Final Constraint”, pp. 445–468) approaches the thorny problem of sentence-final particles (SFPs) in different Chinese varieties. Chinese SFPs are known to be a notorious counterexample to FOFC, given their traditional analysis as C-heads. However, by systematically comparing the behaviour of true complementizers and SFPs, the author shows that SFPs receive a more adequate analysis if they are treated as a category of their own, different from complementizers. Thus, SFPs are analysed as affixes attached to a focused constituent, which moves to the specifier of a phonetically null Focus head, a solution which avoids FOFC-violations.

The book reviewed is impressive from many points of view. First and foremost, from an empirical perspective: the material discussed in the chapters of the book is drawn from a large number of genealogically unrelated, typologically distinct and geographically diverse languages, some of them familiar to the general public, some of them rarely discussed in the literature. A second important strength of the volume is the range of perspectives from which the issue of harmony and disharmony is analysed: virtually every level of the faculty of language (narrow syntax, interfaces, phonological structure, etc.) plays an important part in the identification and explanation of (dis)harmony. It goes without saying that the book is a 'must-read' not only for researchers interested in the issue of word order, but also for typologists, generativists, theoreticians, and descriptive linguists.

Besides this general characterisation, I would also like to point out a few other aspects, which (at least to me) seem to hold true across a large number of chapters in the book. To begin with, a recurrent (beneficial) theme is that disharmony appears to be derived from universal constraints and language specific characteristics (parameter settings), a result which offers a principled account of disharmony. Strong evidence for the antisymmetric nature of natural language syntax is another important result, central to Kayne’s and Barrie’s chapters (ch. 8 and 9), but also visible in other parts of the book (e.g. in the discussions surrounding FOFC). Another interesting (and somewhat controversial) issue taken up in various points in the book is the problem of "precedence" and its relation to narrow syntax and the interfaces (and hence word order): contrary to the general assumption that the merger of two syntactic objects forms a set, Kayne (ch. 8) claims that precedence is part of narrow syntax and derives from the fact that the result of merger is an ordered pair; de Vos (ch. 12) claims that precedence is established in narrow syntax in the form of a dependency relation, which is then transferred to the PF-interface, playing a pivotal role in linearisation.

On a final note, the editors of the volume should be warmly congratulated, not only for managing to harmonise the contents of the book by selecting complementary analyses which neatly piece together the puzzle of word order harmony and disharmony, but also for the excellent introductory chapter, a well-informed, up-to-date discussion of the multiple issues raised by harmony and disharmony.
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