

GABRIELA PANĂ DINDELEGAN (coord.), *Dinamica limbii române actuale – Aspecte gramaticale și discursive* [La dynamique de la langue roumaine – Aspects grammaticaux et discursifs], București, Editura Academiei Române, 2009, 555 p.

Le volume *Dinamica limbii române – Aspecte gramaticale și discursive* représente une contribution très valeureuse dans l'étude de la langue roumaine actuelle, c'est-à-dire la période après la Révolution de 1989 et surtout après 2000. Le livre est conçu comme une continuation et un accomplissement de la *Grammaire de la langue roumaine* (grammaire de l'Académie, parue en 2005) décrivant un grand nombre de phénomènes qui concernent l'usage linguistique aussi bien que la norme grammaticale et examinant les concepts liés à la dynamique linguistique d'un point de vue synchronique. Le volume prend en discussion deux types de phénomènes linguistiques: grammaticaux et discursifs.

L'équipe qui a réalisé ce projet est composée des membres du Département de grammaire de l'Institut de Linguistique « Iorgu Iordan – Al. Rosetti » de Bucarest, coordonnés par le chef du département, Gabriela Pană Dindelegan. Les auteurs des articles sont: Gabriela Pană Dindelegan, Blanca Croitor, Cristina Dediu, Raluca Brăescu, Ana-Maria Mihail, Andra Vasilescu, Rodica Zafiu, Irina Nicula, Monica Vasileanu, Marina Rădulescu Sala, Alexandru Vasile, Adina Dragomirescu, Carmen Mârzea Vasile, Andreea Dinică, Isabela Nedelcu, Dana Manea, Adriana Gorăscu, Camelia Stan, Mihaela Gheorghe, Laurenția Dascălu Jinga et Margareta Manu Magda.

Le premier article, *Trăsături flexionare ale substantivului în româna actuală* [Traits flexionnels du nom dans le roumain actuel] signé par Gabriela Pană Dindelegan expose le problème des noms féminins (la comparaison des types flexionnels féminins), les désinences pour le pluriel des féminins et des masculins, les emprunts récents de l'anglais, les noms invariables, les moyens analytiques pour l'expression de l'invariabilité et la situation actuelle des alternances phonétiques concernant la flexion du nom. L'auteur a précisé les modèles inactifs dans le roumain actuel, la spécialisation d'un certain registre stylistique pour les féminins, le poids des noms invariables et les alternances vocaliques et consonantiques.

Blanca Croitor dans *Dinamica flexiunii substantive reflectată în DOOM* [La dynamique de la flexion nominale reflétée en DOOM] prend en discussion le comportement morphologique des substantifs roumains introduits en DOOM₂: les types de flexion dans lesquels s'encadrent les noms entrés en Roumain, l'inventaire, les modèles flexionnels, les difficultés d'encadrement, les observations concernant la statistique, la flexion des anglicismes, des italianismes, des hispanismes, des germanismes et la productivité des préfixes et préfixoïdes. Les résultats de l'enquête relèvent le nombre des formes préférées par les locuteurs.

Dans l'article *Adjectivul invariabil în limba română actuală* [L'adjectif invariable dans le Roumain actuel], Cristina Dediu présente les adjectifs invariables dans le roumain actuel. Elle établit les différences entre DOOM₁ et DOOM₂ et souligne les disparitions, les parutions et les modifications d'une édition à l'autre. Les critères utilisés pour la typologie des adjectifs invariables sont l'ancienneté dans la langue, la distribution et la préférence pour certains styles fonctionnels et domaines. Les différences entre les deux éditions du dictionnaire sont: la parution et la disparition des certains adjectifs invariables, la typologie des adjectifs invariables en roumain, la possibilité de gradation des adjectifs invariables et le degré d'invariabilité.

Raluca Brăescu analyse dans *Observații asupra substantivizării adjectivelor în limba română actuală* [Observations sur la substantivation des adjectifs dans le roumain actuel] les aspects sémantiques, grammaticaux et référentiels de la substantivation de l'adjectif, le rôle de l'ellipse (permanente et accidentelle), les substantivations des termes du domaine sportif (par exemple, *europenele, mondialele, o scurtă la fileu*, etc.).

Utilizarea tiparului afectiv (Det)N1 de N2 (nebulul de Ion) în limba română actuală [L'utilisation du modèle affectif (Det) N1 de N2 (*nebulul de Ion*) dans la langue roumaine actuelle] écrit par Ana-Maria Mihail présente ce type de structure du point de vue diachronique, prenant en considération le niveau de langue et le contexte communicatif. L'auteur étudie les constructions comparatives (*un boboc de fată, un dulap de femeie*), les structures de degré zero (*o catastrofă de summit*), le comportement syntaxique, les propriétés morphologiques du premier élément et la productivité de la structure.

Elemente de dinamică discursivă a pronumelui [Eléments de dynamique discursive du pronom] appartenant à Andra Vasilescu analyse les particularités de l'usage des pronoms en roumain actuel par rapport aux autres contraintes typologiques spécifiques au système grammatical roumain. Parmi les phénomènes discutés sont: l'évolution du pronom vers l'anaphoricité/deicticité diffuse, l'attraction des pronoms vers la fonction des marques linguistiques des certains procédés discursifs, le redoublement pronominal (*lasă-mă pe mine*), le datif pronominal et accusatif (*își bate capul*), les syntagmes possessives (*de-al meu*), l'emphase des pronoms de renforcement (*de noi înșine*), l'opposition de fréquence dans l'utilisation des déictiques/anaphoriques, l'opposition formel/informel, l'expression du vague, de l'imprécision, l'approximation, les stratégies de gradation de l'assertivité (*să lași de la tine*) etc.

Rodica Zafiu présente dans *Utilizările actuale ale lui alde* [Les utilisations actuelles de *alde*] les constructions syntaxiques et les valeurs sémantiques et pragmatiques de *alde*, les utilisations énumératives, populaires et régionales de ce mot, les tendances actuelles: le contraste stylistique, les structures syntaxiques, l'articulation proclitique (*lui alde*), la spécialisation de *alde* comme *ca* et son rôle de connecteur comparatif.

Irina Nicula prend en discussion dans *Dinamica pronumelui și a adjectivului demonstrativ în limba română actuală* [La dynamique du pronom et de l'adjectif démonstratif dans le Roumain actuel] la fréquence et l'utilisation des démonstratifs dans les corpus de roumain parlé, les possibilités de combinaison du pronom démonstratif, la fréquence du démonstratif, l'utilisation dans la langue parlée les formes simples (par rapport à celles composées), le comportement syntactique de chaque classe.

Monica Vasileanu expose dans *Locuțiunile pronominale alocutive. Utilizarea în limba română actuală* [Les expressions pronominales allocutives. L'utilisation dans le roumain actuel] la spécificité pragmatique de ces expressions, les difficultés d'interprétation du statut et les particularités orthographiques, syntaxiques et sémantiques (la politesse, le protocole etc.).

L'article *Numeralul și norma lingvistică* [Le numéral et la norme linguistique] écrit par Marina Rădulescu Sala analyse l'expression de l'heure, de la date, les constructions avec le numéral et les tendances actuelles dans l'utilisation de cette partie du discours. Alexandru Nicolae en *Utilizarea numeralului multiplicativ în limba română actuală* [L'utilisation du numéral multiplicateur dans le roumain actuel] mentionne les formes actuelles et non-actuelles des numéraux multiplicateurs, leurs particularités dans l'utilisation, la fréquence, les correspondances entre les numéraux multiplicateurs et ceux cardinaux et fractionnaires.

Adina Dragomirescu présente dans *Dinamica normei lingvistice. Observații statistice asupra verbelor din DOOM₂* [La dynamique de la norme linguistique. Observations sur les verbes de DOOM₂] l'actualisation des données extraites par Gr. Brâncuș dans la première édition du *Dictionnaire explicatif de la langue roumaine* (1975), l'analyse statistique des verbes, les modèles de conjugaison (productifs/non-productifs) en roumain et les tendances générales dans la flexion du roumain, la productivité des classes de conjugaison. Parmi les conclusions, on peut rappeler les suivantes: les données statistiques concernant les verbes du roumain actuel de DOOM₂ n'offrent pas des modifications spectaculeuses par rapport au DEX 1975; DOOM₂ est plus permissif que les dictionnaires antérieures, acceptant plus de variation libre; les verbes néologiques ont dépassé comme

poids les verbes du vieux fond, les verbes récents ont des modèles dans les structures déjà existantes dans la langue. Adina Dragomirescu présente dans *Relația dintre normă și uz. Rezultatele anchetelor lingvistice* [La relation entre norme et l'usage. Les résultats des enquêtes linguistiques] les tendances actuelles dans la flexion des verbes reflétées dans l'usage des variantes verbales (acceptées ou non par la norme académique). Les enquêtes ont été appliquées aux élèves de lycée et aux personnes entre 19 et 66 ans. Ils ont choisi entre deux formes verbales: *bombăne/bombănește, destăinuie/destăinuiește, ignoră/ignorează, anticipă/anticipează*, etc. Les conclusions soutiennent que les solutions retrouvées dans DOOM₂ reflètent généralement l'usage réel de la langue.

Carmen Mârzea Vasile a analysé dans son article *Adverbul și exprimarea adverbului de mod în româna actuală* [L'adverbe et l'expression de l'adverbe de mode dans le roumain actuel] l'inventaire, la fréquence, l'utilisation des préférences stylistiques, les synonymes expressifs, les variantes syntactiques, les adverbes en *-ește (-icește)*, *-iș (-îș)*, *-mente* etc. La conclusion reflète le fait que les adverbes en *-ește (-icește)* et *-mente* sont plus productifs dans la presse et le roumain actuel. Andreea Dinică souligne les aspects sémantiques et syntaxiques des adverbes *numai* et *doar* et la fréquence de chaque adverbe.

Dans l'article *Utilizările prepozițiilor partitive în româna actuală* [Les utilisations des prépositions partitives en roumain actuel], Isabela Nedelcu expose le problème de la variation libre des prépositions partitives *din* et *dintre* et les contextes spécifiques pour chaque préposition. *Utilizările prepozițiilor « simetrice » dintre și între în limba română actuală* [Les utilisations des prépositions symétriques *dintre* et *între* en roumain actuel] se concentre sur l'utilisation de chaque préposition dans le roumain actuel, les types de contextes où elles apparaissent, la variation libre qui reflètent la dynamique de la langue.

D'autres sujets qui se retrouvent dans le volume sont: l'extension de l'utilisation de la préposition *pe* dans la langue actuelle (Blanca Croitor), la dynamique des corrélatifs (*nici, nici, fie, fie, ori, ori*) (Dana Manea), la conversion des unités discursives construites avec les connecteurs (Adriana Gorăscu), les propriétés syntaxiques et sémantiques des structures conditionnelles, concessives et disjonctives (Adriana Gorăscu), la dynamique des structures de quantification dans les expressions nominales, verbales, adjectivales et adverbiales (Camelia Stan), les connecteurs et l'organisation générale des structures relatives (Mihaela Gheorghe), les sens, les valeurs pragmatiques et lexicales des certains clichés dans la langue parlée et la presse écrite, les interjections allocutives (Margareta Manu Magda). Le dernier article (signé par Blanca Croitor, Andreea Dinică, Adina Dragomirescu, Carmen Mârzea Vasile, Isabela Nedelcu, Alexandru Nicolae, Irina Nicula, Marina Rădulescu Sala, Rodica Zafiu) présente les phénomènes dynamiques du discours de la presse et les tendances actuelles de la langue parlée.

Le livre offre une image d'ensemble des tendances grammaticales et discursives de la langue roumaine après 1990 et s'adresse à tous ceux qui veulent savoir de plus sur la langue roumaine.

Mona Moldoveanu Pologea

Institut de Linguistică « Iorgu Iordan – Al. Rosetti », Bucarest

MIHAELA GHEORGHE, *Limba română. Probleme teoretice și aplicații* [The Romanian Language. Theoretical Issues and Applications], Brașov, Editura Universității Transilvania Brașov, 2009, 186 p.

The book under review is conceived, as the author herself mentions, as a "modern grammar manual" meant to help both students in the field of philology and teachers to assimilate and to understand better new linguistic concepts used in modern grammatical descriptions. From the very beginning, Mihaela Gheorghe, professor at the Transylvania University of Brasov, announces the

main reason which led her to writing the present book, i.e. the fact that current linguistic literature may prove to be difficult to understand by students or teachers interested in linguistics in the absence of a correct and profound explanation of the underlying concepts.

From the point of view of its structure, the work consists of an introduction and five distinct chapters combining the theoretical perspective with the practical one. Each theoretical chapter is provided with an extensive set of exercises or with examples meant to simplify the description and to fix the data easier.

In the introduction, the author sets the objectives of the book, namely presenting and explaining some concepts of great importance in the actual grammatical theory. Her approach may be useful to linguistics teachers and to students who assume to have a correct understanding of the so far unfamiliar notions in the recent grammatical theory.

The first chapter *Gramatică și gramatici* [*Grammar and Grammars*] gives a brief description of the ways the concept *grammar* evolved. The term covers two distinct meanings: in a narrow sense, by using the notion *grammar* people refer to morphosyntax; in a wide sense, *grammar* covers all the components that are part of a linguistic theory.

The meaning of the word *grammar* has varied greatly. At the very beginning, when the main preoccupations of grammarians were to study Latin and Greek, by saying *grammar* people referred to morphology. As such, Romanian grammars also were structured according to two different so-called “sections”, corresponding to what is now called morphology/syntax. Still, the greatest interest was paid to morphology. That is why Romanian didactic grammars treat morphology and syntax separately and it was only in the last decades the concept *morpho-syntax* as a coherent and unitary concept has started to gain ground. On the contrary, modern orientations such as generativism give great importance to syntax, which triggers another ambiguity of the term *grammar*. From this perspective, the concept covers at the same time the general structural properties of human language and the specific characteristics of a particular language.

Further on, the author defines and labels four distinct types of grammars in a language: theoretical, descriptive, academic, and normative grammars, each type with its own objectives and patterns of language analysis. In connection with this classification, Mihaela Gheorghe refers to *the Academic Grammar of the Romanian Language* (GALR), the current Romanian reference grammar, which aims at describing both the academic norm and the way language works and evolves. In fact, the author’s purpose becomes clearer at this point: to elucidate new concepts included in the aforementioned academic grammar, especially the ones referring to complements. The author’s remarks start from the comprehensive and elaborate chapter on the status and behavior of complements in Romanian, included in what is known as GALR.

The second chapter *Concepte ale gramaticii moderne* [Concepts of Modern Grammar] and the most extensive one is dedicated to the explanation and illustration of the main new concepts at the interface between semantics and syntax. Generally speaking, the approach serves at understanding how words come to depend upon one another and to enter syntactic relations. All the theoretical ideas introduced are exemplified with numerous examples, which make the analysis easier to follow.

In the first section of the chapter, several basic syntactic notions of modern grammar are defined and explained: head, constituent, valency, syntagm, syntactic group, lexical category, logical and semantic predicate, argument, modifier, etc. The author adopts the modern terminology and defines lexical categories according to their morpho-syntactic features.

Further on, the analysis deals with the syntactic and semantic classification of the elements belonging to different lexical categories. In accordance with their morpho-syntactic behavior, they may have the status of predicates, arguments, or modifiers. As such, verbs are always predicates, adjectives may be either modifiers or predicates, and adverbs are modifiers.

In the third section of the chapter, the author defines and exemplifies the notion of *semantic* or *thematic* role, which is predictable from the syntactic organization of a sentence. As is known, the inventory of semantic roles is rather variable, as no consensus has been reached on the nature and number of thematic roles. Still, the author lists the following roles: Agent, Patient, Theme, Result,

Causal or Force, Instrument, Experiencer, Stimulus, Possessor, Benefactive and circumstantial roles – in the sense that they have a circumstantial meaning (locative, temporal or modal): Locative, Goal, Source, Path, Mode, etc.

The semantic roles mentioned above are interrelated in the sense that the presence of a thematic role in a sentence may either exclude or necessarily embed the presence of another semantic role (e.g. the semantic role of Instrument is prototypically triggered by the presence of an Agent or the Causal involves the presence of a Theme). Consequently, there is a very strong connection between the semantic type of a predicate and the semantic roles expressed by the constituents of that predicate.

In the fourth section of the chapter, the author shows how the relations in the syntactic group are coded from the linguistic point of view. The linguistic coding of the relation between the head of a group and its arguments depends on the nature of the head. For example, the verbal head prototypically imposes case constraints, constraints on the selection of a certain preposition or complementizer, and, in some special cases, agreement constraints. The approach also illustrates different possibilities in which constituents are tied to the syntactic head.

The next subchapter considers the notion of subcategorization frame and explains the relation between a head and its constituents: the arguments of a predicate are legitimized by the semantic and syntactic qualities of that predicate. More simply, a predicate combines with different constituents on the basis of its internal properties. For example, a verb like *a trimite* 'to send' allows the presence of three arguments: a subject, a direct object and an indirect object. And a verb like *a se referi* 'to refer to' necessarily requires the presence of a prepositional object, and not the presence of a dative nominal.

The author also shows how the relations between a head and its determinatives are linguistically expressed. Prototypically, case marking is done through inflection inside the verb phrase and, with certain constraints, inside the adjectival phrase, the noun phrase, the adverbial phrase, and the prepositional phrase. Different examples are given to illustrate the phenomenon of prepositional marking also.

The fifth section of the chapter deals with the notions of *complement* vs. *adjunct*. The parallel is of great importance, because, in fact, it introduces a distinction that did not exist in traditional grammar: either the compulsory or the optional syntactic character of constituents in a sentence. The author talks about sentence organization in terms belonging to modern grammar and draws certain distinctions that are worth mentioning: in modern taxonomies, complements are those constituents that are required by the syntactic internal properties of the head; on the contrary, adjuncts are constituents whose presence in the sentence is syntactically optional. Further on, complements are characterized according to their prototypical features: uniqueness and compulsoriness.

The next to last subchapter classifies complements according to the type of head they are required by: verbal complements, adjective complements, adverbial complements, preposition complements, and complements of interjection.

Before moving to exercises, the author makes a very schematic review of the concepts presented so far, meant to help students understand and organize information in an easier way. The set of exercises and answers placed at the end of the chapter undoubtedly enhance the usefulness of the work.

The next two chapters, gathered under the name *Sintaxa complementelor în română. Fișe de sinteză și aplicații* [The Syntax of Complements in Romanian. Notes and Applications] deal with the semantic and syntactic properties of complements. The author distinguishes two large classes of complements: (a) complements that are required in the subcategorization frame of a head and are assigned a theta-role by it. More precisely, she refers to a first class of complements that are syntactically and semantically required by a head, according to its semantic and syntactic internal properties; (b) complements that appear in reorganized (surface) structures and are not necessarily required by the semantic and syntactic properties of the verbal head in the sentence they occur. Reorganized structures are obtained through different syntactic transformations (such as passivization, deletion, etc.) applied to deep structures.

More specifically, class (a) includes the following complements: subject, direct object, secondary object, indirect object, prepositional object, subject complement (copula), and object complement.

It is to be noticed that the current perspective triggers major changes in comparison with the traditional one. We will randomly mention just three of them: 1. the subject is considered complement of the verbal head due to the interdependence relation they enter into; 2. the secondary object corresponds to the second direct object, which, in old classifications, was supposed to be required by the so-called ditransitive verbs and is a very distinct position from the direct object; 3. prepositional objects are those constituents obligatorily preceded by a preposition required by the verbal head and they definitely differ from indirect objects.

Each of the complements mentioned above is briefly described according to the syntactic features it displays: prototypical realization, free/constrained word order, case constraints, substitution class, compulsory/optional lexicalization, resumption by clitic doubling or coordination. Further on, the semantic features are indicated: prototypical and unprototypical thematic role assigned to each type of a complement. The next section refers to the processes of syntactic reorganization in which complements may participate. Among these transformations, the following ones are mentioned: impersonalization, passivization, nominalization, movement, clefting, and deletion.

A so-called list of verbs claiming the presence of the different types of complements in their subcategorization frame is given.

Class (b) defined above includes the following complements: passive agent, possessive complement, comparative complement and small clause¹.

The complements belonging to the second class are analyzed according to their syntactic properties (the same as for class (a)) and semantic ones. The major difference in what concerns the syntactic characteristic is that all complements in class (b), except for the possessive one, are optionally expressed, i.e. their absence in the sentence does not affect the utterance grammaticality.

The last chapter of the book – *Teste complexe* [Complex Tests] – is composed of three tests. The assignments are as follows: identifying the syntactic position in which a constituent occurs; mentioning the syntactic means by which certain constituents are tied to the head of the group they belong to; deciding on the compulsory/optional character of a constituent in the group it belongs to; mentioning the deep/reorganized character of a structure.

As we have already suggested, the merit of this book is twofold: firstly, it introduces and explains new important linguistic concepts present in the Romanian Academic Grammar; secondly, it helps students fix the theoretical data, by proposing numerous exercises and providing solutions for them.

To sum up with, the coherent exposition of ideas and the easy-to-read writing style makes the present book an enjoyable read for the people interested in linguistics.

Irina Nicula

“Iorgu Iordan – Al. Rosetti” Institute of Linguistics, Bucharest

DANA NICULESCU, *Mijloace lingvistice de exprimare a posesiei în limba română* [Linguistic Means of Expressing Possession in Romanian], București, Editura Universității din București, 2008, 355 p.

Dana Niculescu's inquiry into the complex field of *possession* is a pioneering work in Romanian linguistics, since it is the first Romanian extensive study devoted to this topic. The author accomplishes the difficult tasks to describe *possession* both from a syntactic and a semantic perspective, and to make use of different theoretical frameworks, each of them suitable for the description of a particular aspect of this matter. For instance, the author appeals to cognitive

¹ In this context, by *small clause* we refer to the optional constituent which predicates something about the subject (e.g. *În fiecare seară vine obosită acasă* ‘Every evening she comes home tired’).

linguistics for defining the possessive domain – she defines the relation of possession and its mechanism –, and to generative grammar for the syntactic analysis of different types of possessive relations.

The study of possession in Romanian is necessary both from a theoretical and an empirical point of view: Romanian disposes of a large inventory of means of expressing possession, of which not all are found in Romance; the usage of different types of encoding possession is stylistically constrained – the author uses a big corpus to show the preference for a construction in a certain style; a general view of possession clarifies some interesting diachronic developments.

In chapter one, *Possession. Theoretical framework* (pp. 15–44), the author defines the concept of *possession* from a cognitive point of view, and establishes the semantic oppositions relevant for the description of possession encoding (p. 13). Section 1 (*The concept of possession*) describes the fine grained distinctions that circumscribe the concept of possession: possession in a large/broad sense, possession/dependency/belonging; related concepts: alienable/inalienable, possession in the VP/possession in the NP. As well, this section distinguishes possession from the semantic relations related to it: location and meronymy. In section 2, the author reviews the main hypotheses regarding the functional structure of the clause (Chomsky 1981, 1986, 1993, 1995, Pollock 1989, Belletti 1991, Ouhalla 1991, Dobrovie-Sorin 1994 a.o.) and of the DP (Abney 1987, Giorgi&Longobardi 1991, Ouhalla 1991, Cinque 2002, Alexiadou, Haegeman, Stavrou 2007) put forward in the generative literature; this inquiry will be the groundwork for the analyses in the chapters that follow.

Chapter two, *The possessive relation in the noun phrase* (pp. 45–141), is structured as follows: *The features of the possessive relation encoded in the noun phrase* (section 1), *The relation between the nominal possessive structure and the predicative one* (section 2), *Means of expressing possession in the noun phrase* (section 3), *The possessive adjective* (section 4), *The possessive affix* (section 5), *Prepositional possessive predicates* (section 6), *Conclusions* (section 7). In this chapter, the author touches upon controversial subjects regarding the syntax of the Romanian DP: the interpretation of the relation between two nominal expressions in a possessive construction, the genitive case (the assignment, the semantics, the morphology and the syntax of Romanian genitives), the features and the categorial status of the so-called ‘genitival-possessive’ article *al*, the description and interpretation of the Romanian adnominal dative, the syntax of possessive constructions with functional prepositions, the analysis of the possessive adjective. In this chapter, the author also extensively describes and analyzes the *possessive affix* – which has been previously analyzed in the Romanian literature as a *possessive clitic*; the author brings rich evidence in order to support her analysis. In the concluding section of this chapter, the author observes that Romanian has a rich inventory of encoding possession in the noun phrase, and that the nominal possessive constructions have multiple semantic interpretations.

Chapter 3, *Possession encoded at the sentential level* (pp. 142–231) is made up of the following subchapters: *The possessive dative with verbal support* (section 1), *The possessive Accusative* (section 2), *The possessive Nominative* (section 3), *Conclusions* (section 4). The means of expressing possession investigated in this chapter are forms of *external possession* – the two entities in relation are part of different phrases/expressions, subordinated to IP; therefore, as the two possessive entities are not in a direct subordination/dependency relation, the possessive relation is signalled through other linguistic means (in some cases, through an anaphoric relation, p. 142). Concretely, Niculescu analyzes the following constructions: the possessive dative with verbal support (the semantics of the dative and of the verbs which allow for this construction, the syntax of this construction), the possessive accusative, and the possessive nominative. In the section devoted to the description of the possessive dative, the author extensively surveys the syntactic-semantic interface values of the dative (possessive and non-possessive): *dativus dandi*, *dativus (in)commodi*, *dativus sympatheticus*, etc.

Chapter 4, *The possessive relation in the verb phrase. Predicative possession* (pp. 232–309) is structured as follows: *The verb have in Romanian* (section 1), *Encoding possession in copulative constructions* (section 2), *Conclusions* (section 3). The chapter begins with an *Introduction* (pp. 232–240) in which the author briefly examines, on the one hand, the conceptual frames of

possessive configuration of *be* and *have*, and, on the other hand, the main hypotheses about the syntactic structure of these verbs – Perlmutter’s Unaccusative Hypothesis, Burzio’s Generalization, etc. In the section reserved for the analysis of the verb *have*, the author surveys the following topics: the distribution of *to have* with nouns without determiners in Romanian, with a special focus on the constructions typical for Romanian; the functions of the verb *be* in Romanian; types of possessive relations encoded by this verb; the relation between *be* and *have*; *have* as an unaccusative verb; *have* as an attributive verb (in structures such as *Maria are copilul doctor* $\text{Maria}_{\text{Nom}}$ $\text{have}_{\text{Present Indicative}}$ $\text{child}_{\text{Acc}}$ $\text{doctor}_{\text{Default Nom/Acc}}$ ‘Maria’s child is a doctor’). Next, the following topics regarding the verb *to be* are investigated: the copulative structure with genitival possessor, and the types of possessive relations encoded in this structure; the copulative structures of the types ‘to be with’ and ‘to be in’. Finally, the author argues for a unified analysis of the predicative structures encoding possession, considering Romanian *be* and *have* ergative verbs with a Small Clause complement, a path of analysis also previously suggested in the Romanian and foreign (mainly generative) literature.

In chapter 5, *Other types of verbal and non-verbal possessive predicates* (pp. 310–328), the following facts are investigated: nominalizations (‘post-verbal nouns’), where two classes are distinguished according to their feature composition; the semantic relations subsumed to the concept of possession, encoded by verbs and nouns with a possessive meaning; adjectival suffixes and categorial adjectives with possessive meaning. The author concludes that ‘Romanian has a rich inventory of lexical elements which may encode/express a possessive relation’ (p. 328).

Dana Niculescu’s monograph on the topic of encoding possession in Romanian has a high scientific value because of several facts which need to be emphasized. The author makes use of different approaches that go beyond the simple syntax of root clauses (for instance, information structure concepts) in order to offer a better understanding of certain phenomena such as the heterogeneous values of the Romanian dative – for instance, the specific thematic values of the dative clitics (i.e., in case it has more than one value) are derived by means of a fine-grained information packaging conception (pp. 158–159). Moreover, each particular phenomenon investigated in the book has a solid syntactic and semantic analysis. Also, the author makes diachronic observations (not accounts) in seek for deeper explanations. One may also point out to the fact that this monograph is interesting from a practical point of view: the author translates and adapts the Anglo-American and French terminology, suggesting Romanian terms or creating new ones.

Alexandru Nicolae

“Iorgu Iordan – Al. Rosetti” Institute for Linguistics, Bucharest

ANGELA BIDU-VRĂNCEANU, *Câmpuri lexicale din limba română. Probleme teoretice și aplicații practice* [*Champs lexicaux en roumain. Problèmes théoriques et applications pratiques*], București, Editura Universității din București, 2008, 326 p.

Angela Bidu-Vrănceanu, dans *Les champs lexicaux en roumain*, fait preuve d’une performance de scientifique mature; le livre est à la fois un traité scientifique de haut niveau et de grande respiration et un livre dont l’écriture rend la lecture fascinante et attirante.

Les mises du livre sont multiples et l’auteur même nous fait parvenir ses intentions dès l’avant-propos. Le livre vise: i) de démontrer – et le fait magistralement, avec persuasion absolue de l’interlocuteur – « la validité et l’actualité des principes théoriques et méthodologiques » (p. 11), plus anciens ou plus nouveaux; ii) de réaliser « l’analyse effective des fragments du lexique de la langue roumaine » (p. 11) (des champs lexico-sémantiques); iii) de « montrer différents directions de l’application des résultats théoriques obtenus en amont » (p.11). Ces buts sont atteints par le livre grâce à l’expérience et au professionnalisme de l’auteur.

Angela Bidu-Vrăncianu reprend avec ce livre la problématique des champs lexico-sémantiques quelques décennies après ses premières études dans le domaine. Sur ce sujet, nous rappelons ici, par exemple, l'article « Systématique des noms de couleurs. Recherche de méthode », București, Editura Academiei RSR (1976) et le livre *Structura vocabularului limbii române. Probleme teoretice și aplicații practice* [La structure du vocabulaire de la langue roumaine. Problèmes théoriques et applications pratiques], București, Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică (1986). D'ailleurs, ce thème de recherche a bénéficié d'une attention relativement constante à travers les années de la part de la chercheuse (v. dans ce sens, parmi d'autres, *Lexic comun, lexic specializat* [Lexique commun, lexique spécialisé], București, Editura Universității din București, 2000). C'est pourquoi l'ouvrage actuel est une synthèse incontestable de la linguistique roumaine concernant les champs lexico-sémantiques, mais pas seulement. *Les champs lexicaux en langue roumaine* s'inscrit aussi dans la littérature européenne actuelle de spécialité en apportant une perspective contemporaine dans l'étude des lexiques des langues.

Un argument à l'appui de ces affirmations est l'inventaire des concepts opérationnels de ce livre et, plus ou moins implicitement, les principes théoriques que le livre prend en compte. Il s'agit d'un inventaire riche de termes et de leur définitions finement et clairement formulées qui met en lumière la profondeur de la réflexion linguistique sous-jacent aux résultats que le livre nous offre. Si nous reprenons les plus importants concepts, la liste comprendrait: *champ lexical* (avec ses variantes: *champ sémantique, champ lexico-sémantique*, p. 47); *lexique; analyse sémique ou componentielle; mot; lexème; sémème; sème; archilexème; sèmes communs; sèmes variables; dénotatif; sème référentiel; sème résiduel; sème lexicale; lexicographie; analyse contextuelle; sémantique différentielle; désambiguïser les mots polysémiques; opérations avec les sèmes: activation, propagation, inhibition; sème inerente; sème afférente*. Les concepts clairement définis permettent l'obtention de résultats profonds, finement nuancés. Par exemple, reprenons ici, en parallèle, les définitions de l'*archiséme* et de l'*archilexème*: « L'*archiséme* caractérise le signifié commun d'un paradigme lexico-sémantique (ou d'un champ lexical); il est la somme des *sèmes communes à tous les membres* de ce paradigme. [...] Si, pour un *archiséme*, il existe un certain signifiant, alors celui-ci est l'*archilexème*. L'*archilexème* a une forme synthétique et non périphrastique, c'est-à-dire il est un seul mot. Les différences de lexicalisation d'une langue à l'autre constituent une modalité de déterminer et d'établir le spécifique sémantique des langues. » (p. 19).

Un autre argument pour la valeur scientifique incontestable de ce livre est sa structuration même. Les quatre parties constituent un parcours équilibré et complète de la théorie à la pratique et vice versa, comme les titres nous l'indiquent: *Première partie: Principes d'analyse sémantique; Deuxième partie: Les champs lexicaux. Problèmes théoriques; Troisième partie: Les champs lexicaux en roumain; Quatrième partie: Les champs lexicaux dans une perspective applicative*. Ce va-et-vient entre la théorie et la pratique assure une réflexion flexible et évite aussi bien la théorie stérile que la pratique sans fondements solides.

Évidemment, l'argument décisif à invoquer est le contenu du livre. Tandis que les deux premières parties ont un caractère plutôt théorique, les deux dernières parties sont applicatifs, mais sur des degrés différents. Ainsi, on trouve un équilibre et une symétrie parfaite entre la partie théorique et la partie applicative du livre: la deuxième partie et une sorte d'« application » de la première partie et la troisième partie et une sorte de « théorie » pour la quatrième partie. La première partie nous présente les unités de l'analyse (*le champ, le mot, le lexème* etc.), les types d'analyse (*l'analyse sémique et l'analyse contextuelle*) et l'interdépendance entre la sémantique différentielles et la lexicographie. La deuxième partie définit le champ lexical, justifie le choix de son dénomination et nous présente un brève historique des champs lexicaux. Cette partie montre aussi la relation entre le linguistique et l'extra-linguistique dans l'étude des champs lexicaux et nous fournit les méthodes pour délimiter les champs lexicaux en utilisant principalement les notions de paradigme et de hyponymie.

La troisième partie décrit effectivement huit champs lexicaux de la langue roumain. Il s'agit de sept champs concrets (*les dénominations de parenté; les dénominations des animaux domestiques; les dénominations des animaux sauvages; les dénominations des habitations; les dénominations des*

institutions; les termes chromatiques; les dénominations des phénomènes sonneurs) et d'un champ abstrait (*les noms des affects*). L'analyse effective des champs lexicaux est utile en soi, mais elle a des applications importantes en domaines tels que: la lexicographie (monolingue ou bilingue), la didactique (de la langue maternelle et de la langue seconde ou troisième) et l'étude contrastive des langues – fait mis en évidence par la dernière partie du livre.

Les arguments que nous venons d'évoquer dans ces quelques lignes pour mettre en lumière la contribution scientifique d'exception, contribution théorique et applicative, de l'autrice Angela Bidu-Vrănceanu dans l'étude des vocabulaires de langue sont autant d'invitations à la lecture de ce livre, la lecture seule pouvant apporter tous les bénéfices que le volume incombe dans ses 326 pages denses.

Alice Toma

Université de Bucarest/Université de Genève

ROXANA-CRISTINA PETCU, *Ergativity in English and Romance*, București, Editura Universității din București, 2009, 378 p.

This book – the doctoral dissertation of Roxana Petcu, reader at the English Department of the University of Bucharest – is meant to offer an account for the “core syntactic and semantic properties of middles in Lexicon and Syntax languages” (p. 371), from the point of view of the linguistic phenomenon of unaccusativity. The author analyzes middle formation in English, but she also indicates the differences between English and Romanian (and sometimes other Romance languages). The main theoretical framework is the Theta System proposed by Tanya Reinhart.

Apart from the introduction and the conclusions, the book contains 5 chapters: 4 theoretical sections and a large contrastive lexicon (English – Romanian), which proves that the system adopted in the book is able to explain the formation of both Romanian and English middle constructions.

In the *Introduction* (p. 9–12), the author defines ergativity or unaccusativity, “a syntactic theory which proposes the existence of two classes of intransitive verbs, namely unergatives and unaccusatives” (p. 9), and explains the differences between these classes proposed in the literature: at the level of deep structure (internal versus external unique argument), Case (Burzio's Generalization – unaccusatives cannot assign the Accusative Case), semantic roles (Perlmutter's Unaccusative Hypothesis and more recent theories), and tests (telicity, *there*-insertion, and the co-occurrence with resultative phrases).

The first chapter, *Unaccusativity* (p. 13–46), offers a presentation of the concept of unaccusativity as a linguistic phenomenon, using the best-known names in the literature: Perlmutter, Levin and Rappaport Hovav, Van Hout. The chapter goes on with the presentation of the syntactic and semantic classes of unaccusative verbs in English, following usually Levin and Rappaport Hovav (1995)²: underived unaccusatives (verbs of existence and appearance, verbs of spatial configuration, verbs denoting involuntary emission of stimuli, verbs whose argument is assigned the theta role Patient/Theme) and derived unaccusatives (change of state verbs, inchoative verbs, aspectual verbs). The author admits the existence of two-place unaccusatives (the *piacere* class of verbs with Experiencer object), and accepts Burzio's idea, namely, that the reflexive *si* in Italian is an affix marking the lack of the theta role of the nominal occupying the subject position, so that the verbs bearing this affix are unaccusative verbs. Like the *piacere* class, reflexive verbs (in Italian) pass the tests for unaccusativity. Another section is dedicated to the diagnostic tests of the unaccusative–unergative distinction: *there*-insertion (English), auxiliary selection (some Romance

² B. Levin, M. Rappaport Hovav, *Unaccusativity*, Cambridge, MIT Press.

and Germanic languages), the possibility for the telic unaccusatives to appear in resultative constructions (English), past participles used as pronominal noun modifiers (English), *ne*-cliticization (Italian), the cognate object, and passivisation. Finally, there is a presentation of the approaches to unaccusativity: syntactic approaches, semantic approaches, and the lexicalist approach.

In chapter 2, *The Theta system* (p. 47–76), Roxana Petcu presents the debates around argument alternation in the generative literature. The author describes Reinhart's Theta System, referring to the feature clusters (m – mental state – and c – cause change), to interpretation and incompatibility of these clusters, and to the relation between these features and theta roles: [-c-m] = Theme; [-c] = Recipient, Goal, Benefactor; [-m] = Subject Matter, Source; [+c+m] = Agent; [+c] = Cause; [+m] = Sentiment; [-c+m] = Experiencer; [+c-m] = Instrument. In Reinhart's system, there are arity operations that reduce or augment the number of theta roles of a verb. The reduction operations are **expletivization** (reduction of a external theta role) and **reflexivization** (reduction of an internal theta role); in the system proposed by Chierchia (1989)³ and Reinhart (in her own papers or in papers written with E. Reuland or T. Siloni) there is another operation, the **saturation** (reduction of a internal or external theta role), which involves the existential closure of one of the arguments, and which is represented by passivization. The most representative arity operation augmenting the number of theta roles is the lexical causativization. Analyzing the level at which these operations take place, Reinhart formulates the Lexicon-Syntax Parameter: UG arity operations can apply in the Lexicon (English) or in the Syntax (Romance).

Chapter 3, *Middle Constructions in English* (p. 77–120), presents the main problems related to middle constructions: on the one hand, the differences between middles, ergatives, and passives, and, on the other hand, the middle formation process. With respect to the first issue, the author notes that middles, ergatives and passives are all one-argument constructions, and describes the properties that differentiate middles (like *This door opens easily*, in English) from ergatives (like *The door opened*) and passives (like *The door was opened*): middles are stative, occur in generic sentences, and are usually restricted to Simple Present Tense; the middle construction obligatorily involves the presence of an adverbial modifier of manner, a negative operator, an overt modal verb or focus; there is no control in purpose/rationale adjunct clauses; as well, there may be an implicit Agent. Roxana Petcu analyzes several definitions of middle constructions proposed in the literature. After that, she presents in detail the properties of middles, and the main bibliographical sources related to this subject. An interesting section is dedicated to the middle formation process which is a parametrizable operation: there are languages where middle formation takes place in the Lexicon (English), and languages where the operation takes place in Syntax (Romanian, French). The author pays a special attention to the syntactic analysis of middles, and to the relation between middles and the Theta System.

Chapter 4 briefly describes *The Middle Formation Process in Syntax Languages* (p. 121–128), starting from the idea that, with the exception of Expletivization (the lexical operation that gives rise cross-linguistically to unaccusative verbs), arity operations may apply either in the Lexicon (English) or in Syntax (Romance, Slavic). In the second category of languages, middle constructions, such as passives, reflexives, reciprocals, impersonals, unaccusatives, are morphologically marked by the clitic *se*; in this type of languages, there is no feature cluster manipulation, like in Lexicon languages. But, despite these differences, the author concludes that middles in Syntax languages have the same properties as middles in Lexicon languages: they are generic sentences, they retain an implicit argument interpreted as ARB (arbitrary), with a [+ Human] flavour. Another conclusion is that in Syntax languages middle derivations are unaccusative.

³ G. Chierchia, *A Semantics for Unaccusatives and its Syntactic Consequences*, mss., Cornell University. (A more recent work of G. Chierchia, in which he revises the theory formulated in 1989, is included in a volume edited by A. Alexiadou, E. Anagnostopoulou, M. Everaert, *The Unaccusativity Puzzle. Explorations of the Syntax-Lexicon Interface*, [Oxford], Oxford University Press, p. 22–59.)

Chapter 5 is *An English–Romanian Lexicon* (p. 129–370), which contains 460 English verbs and their Romanian counterparts. Each English verb is analyzed from the point of view of its transitive derivation (base entry, features, features clusters, the marking rule, the merging rule, the type of merge – external or internal), the operations that apply on the verbal entry (expletivization, reflexivization, lexical causativization), and the possibility of middle formation. For each step, the author gives the Romanian equivalents.

This book is useful for all linguists who want to know more about unaccusativity⁴ and about middle constructions. The theoretical framework adopted by Roxana Petcu seems to be able to explain which verb (or which feature(s) of the verbs) allows expletivization, reflexivization or middle formation in English. The comparison with Romanian is able to prove that, cross-linguistically (or at least in two different type of languages, i.e., one which disposes of the lexical arity operation, and one which uses the syntactic arity operation), these operations can be analyzed using the same theoretical system.

Adina Dragomirescu

*“Iorgu Iordan – Al. Rosetti” Institute of Linguistics, Bucharest
Faculty of Letters, University of Bucharest*

⁴ Perhaps the author should have used in the title of the monograph the term *unaccusativity* instead of *ergativity*, the latter being used mainly in the typological literature (ergative vs accusative languages), and less frequently in the syntactic and semantic studies.