Ralli, Angela, *Compounding in Modern Greek* (= Studies in Morphology 2). Dordrecht: Springer, 2013. xiv + 302pp. ISBN 978-94-017-8272-2 (paperback), ISBN 978-94-007-4959-7 (hardback), ISBN 978-94-007-4960-3 (online).

Reviewed by METİN BAĞRIAÇIK[1]

Angela Ralli's most welcome book *Compounding in Modern Greek* is the first and the only book devoted entirely to the process of compounding in Modern Greek (hereafter, MG) and it is actually one of the very few comprehensive works on compounding in any one language. It is not easy to deal with a linguistic phenomenon in a language which has written attestation of over two millennia and as such diachronic investigation often becomes indispensable for a better understanding of some synchronic linguistic phenomenon. AR is well aware of it, and thus enriches her discussion on MG compounds and on their building-blocks with extensive reference to earlier periods of the language. Besides, although the book is clearly on compounding in standard MG, the claims and proposals are enriched through systematic comparison of the phenomenon to its counterparts in various other languages of either the same or different language families. The book also offers systematic comparison of data drawn from the dialects of MG. While linguists are used to macro-comparative research in general and, despite the growing interest in micro-comparative syntactic research in the last few years (for example, Kayne 2013), micro-comparative morphological research, as far as I can tell, is still in its infancy. I believe that this book is a substantial contribution for the advancement of this area of inquiry. The book is of considerable interest for a wide range of scholars and students, such as Hellenists, Greek dialectologists, linguists working on compounding and indeed on the syntax/morphology interface, and on ((micro-)comparative)

morphology. It constitutes a follow up on AR's earlier work on word-formation and compounding in general, which spans over the last 20 years.

The central aim of the book is '[…] to offer a description and analysis of compounds of Standard Modern Greek' (p. 3), admittedly one of the most ubiquitous structural features of MG, and to show that MG one-word compound formation '[…] belongs to the grammatical component of morphology, along with the process of derivation and – to some extent – inflection' (p. 2). This claim clearly entails a modular approach to grammar where syntax and morphology constitute distinct components of grammar and AR makes it explicit following '[…] the lexicalist approach which is based on the principle that no syntactic operation has access to the internal structure of words' (p. 2). AR is well aware of the literature on compounding and thus, for almost all phenomena and data sets appearing in the book, she presents an exhaustive account of previous approaches offered, and of the terminology generated, without making strict adherence to any. Hence, it is quite common to see (almost) conflicting ideas on the same phenomenon on the same page, side by side. This is a welcome point and one of the strengths of the book, which clearly has an introductory value to compounding in MG and also to compounding in general. AR makes careful use of the existing literature and consistently follows what she calls rule-based framework within which compounding '[…] is considered to be governed by a set of rules and principles, which handle word-formation units and a set of features with morphosyntactic, semantic and phonological content' (p. 2).

The discussion spreads over twelve chapters of almost equal length, including Chapter One ('Introduction', pp. 1-6), where the aims and objectives of the book are given. Chapter Two ('Defining a Greek Compound', pp. 7-27) starts with a primer to MG word-formation, and mainly to stems, that is, lexemes stripped of their inflection.

They are the input to word-formation and also play a central role in one-word compounding in MG, which, for expository reasons, I exemplify with (1) below. MG one-word compounds are the concatenation of two lexemes, α and β, with a COMPOUND MARKER (hereafter, CM) *-o-* almost always interpolating in between and inflection appearing at the right edge:

(1) α CM β

kal -ó- ɣer-os = *kaló ɣeros*

good -o- old.man-INF

'monk'

Throughout her book, AR builds a novel list of possible combinations in one-word compounding in MG, which I present here at the outset to assist the reader in following the rest of the review:

(2) (a) [WORD [STEM [STEM *α*]-o-[STEM *β*]]-INF]

(b) [WORD [STEM *α*]-o-[WORD *β*-INF]]

(c) [WORD [WORD *α*]-[STEM *β*]-INF]

(d) [WORD [STEM [STEM *α*]-o-[STEM *β*]-DER]-INF]

(e) [WORD [STEM [WORD *α*]-[STEM *β*]-DER]-INF]

In the rest of Chapter Two, AR presents a number of properties of these one-word compounds that are absent in corresponding phrases (for example, *kalós ɣéros* 'good old man', *cf*. (1)), such as having single stress (*kalóɣeros*), involving at least one stem (both *kal-* and *ɣer-* in (1)), involving a CM (*-ó-* in (1)), exhibiting various degrees of semantic compositionality (the meaning 'monk' in (1)), showing lexical integrity, that is, not allowing syntax to manipulate their units, and graphic unity.

Chapter Three ('Grammatical Category and Constituents', pp. 29-46) provides a categorization of MG compounds, both according to the lexical category of their

constituents and according to the lexical category of the output. MG compounds are productively built as N + N, Adj + N, Adj + Adj, Adv + V and N + V, whereas Adv + Adv compounds are only derivatives from Adj + Adj compounds. The chapter also makes a brief introduction to V + V compounds, a structure that is not attested in other (Indo-)European languages.

Chapters Four to Seven dive into a more detailed structural account of one-word compounds. In Chapter Four ('Compound Marking', pp. 47-73), AR provides the reader with an account of the CM, which, she argues, marks the process of compounding. Its occurrence is stem-driven, that is, it occurs in between the constituents only when α is a stem (therefore, it does not appear in (2c) or (2e)). Following this, she presents some exceptional cases where the existence of the CM, or lack thereof, is phonologically or lexically conditioned. She then presents evidence for the existence of CMs cross-linguistically, and establishes relevant correlations between (a) the existence of overt paradigmatic inflection and the existence of a CM in a language, and (b) the nature of α and obligatory/optional existence of a CM. Chapter Five ('Stress and Morphological Structure', pp. 75-98) is dedicated to the morphology-phonology interface, specifically to stress position in one-word compounds. Based on her earlier joint work (for example, Nespor & Ralli 1996), AR argues that there is a COMPOUND-SPECIFIC STRESS RULE (hereafter, CSR) in MG that affects compounds containing stems both in α and β positions (2a) and assigns stress on their antepenultimate syllable. Compounds in which β is a fully inflected word (2b) are stressed exactly on the same syllable as β is, where β is stressed in isolation. Chapter Six ('Headedness and Classification', pp. 99-129) provides two further classifications of MG compounds (a) on the basis of the grammatical relations holding between α and β, and (b) on the basis of occurrence of a head. In the former,

AR divides MG compounds into two broad categories: (a) those bearing a dependency, and (b) those bearing a coordinative relation between the constituents. Those that bear a dependency relation are further sub-classified into subordinative and attributive ones. As to attributive compounds, in endocentric (headed) compounds β, the right-hand lexeme, assumes the role of the head (2a) to (2c), while in exocentric compounds, a derivational suffix at the right edge, following β and prior to inflection assumes the role of a categorial head (2d) and (2e). In other words, exocentric compounds are not outputs of compounding alone, but of compounding and derivation in the respective order. This statement allows certain strong predictions on MG compounding: exocentric compounds can only have stem + stem or (very limitedly) word + stem as their input (*viz*. (2d) and (2e)), which are invariantly submitted to derivation, whereas endocentric ones can be stem + stem, stem + word and word + stem combinations. Chapter Seven ('Constraints, Allomorphy and Form of Compound Constituents', pp. 131-55) addresses the issue of allomorphy in compound constituents. AR argues that allomorphy in MG compound structure may be morphologically-conditioned, morpho-phonologically-driven or lexically-specified. An apparent overt-reflex of the first is the BARE-STEM CONSTRAINT (hereafter, BSC) according to which α of an MG one-word compound should be stripped off any derivational/inflectional suffix. One intriguing result of this constraint is allomorphs of lexemes that only show up in compounding. Few apparent counterexamples to BSC are justified by the author diachronically or lexically. Morpho-phonological conditioning of allomorphy materializes with OPTIMAL SYLLABLE CONSTRAINT (hereafter, OSC) operant on α. According to OSC, a certain allomorph of constituent α can be selected as input to compounding, so that an optimal syllable including the CM (which is an open, consonant-vowel syllable in

MG) is formed. OSC is subject to exceptions especially when there is no allomorph available of α to enable formation of an optimal syllable. Lexically-specified allomorphy occurs in compounding, as it occurs in derivation and inflection in MG, but it is also subject to further morpho-phonological constraints.

Chapter Eight ('Coordinative Compounds', pp. 157-79) is an account of coordinative compounds. Structurally, these are one-word compounds and single phonological words, and they are formed as stem + word or stem + stem structures (2a) and (2b). They can be of the Adj + Adj, N + N and V + V types. The Adv + Adv type occurs only as derivation from Adj + Adj compounds. Primary Adv + Adv compounds clearly do not exist as one-word compounds, since each constituent keeps its own stress and no CM is present in their structure. According to AR, '[…] structural headedness in N [+] N and A[dj +] A[dj] coordinative compounds cannot be tested and confirmed on the basis of the features of gender and inflection class.' (p. 166), whereas in V + V compounds it can, since the latter are inarguably stem + word structures, where β, which is a word, carries its own inflection and stress when it is in a compound as well. AR provides a novel diachronic explanation for the emergence of coordinative compounds, especially those of the V + V type: the rise of the latter, which appeared relatively late with respect to Adj + Adj or N + N compounds (only around the 14th century AD), is, according to AR, '[…] due to an instantiation of a grammatical need to respond to the rise of productivity of compounding in general and coordinative compounding more particularly' (p. 172). She acknowledges, however, that the rising productivity in Adv + V and N + V compounds (the latter first as backformations from N + N compounds, and later as primary compound formations) and the rise of syntactic parataxis also contributed to the emergence of V + V compounds. As far as I can tell, this is the first diachronic explanation of V + V

coordinative compounds in MG (incidentally, a phenomenon clearly endemic to MG in the (Indo-)European language family), based on the rise of compound productivity in the language.

Chapters Nine and Ten are devoted to compounds with (de)verbal constituents. Chapter Nine ('Verbal and Deverbal Compounds', pp. 181-99) discusses verbal and deverbal (that is, synthetic) compounds. AR argues that MG has a small set of exocentric compounds, where α is a verbal constituent and the output is a nominal one (in the shape of (2d)). All other compounds with V and/or a deverbal element in β position are discussed as endocentric compounds in the forms (2a) and (2b). AR provides convincing reasons against previous, and by now abandoned, analyses of Adv + V.(DE)VERBAL, N + V.(DE)VERBAL concatenations as incorporation (pp. 190-3) following Smirniotopoulos & Joseph (1998), and argues that these are morphological endocentric compounds. In Chapter Ten ('Deverbal Compounds with Bound Stems', pp. 201-20), AR analyzes compounds with a bound stem in β position (compounds roughly correspond to neoclassical ones in the international literature). AR first argues that these are indeed stems, not affixes/affixoids, albeit bound ones, that is, they cannot stand alone even with suitable INF, they are synchronically nouns derived from AG verbs through conversion, ablaut and overt affixal derivation, and they participate actively only in endocentric compounds where they occupy the head, β, position (2a). In the same section, she argues that bound stems provide considerable evidence for the inexistence of a radical separation of morphological categories into words, stems, affixoids and affixes which, according to AR, stand on a morphological cline. Some restrictions imposed on compounds with bound stems (for example, bound stems occupy only β position, do not follow CSR, and are not involved in

coordinative compounds), have been accounted for convincingly on independent grounds (pp. 214-5).

Chapter Eleven ('Compounding versus Derivation and Inflection', pp. 221-41) elaborates on what has been touched upon occasionally in the previous chapters: The interaction between compounding and derivation, and compounding and inflection. The chapter provides evidence for the fact that derivation and compounding are not hierarchically ordered within the same, morphological, module. Exocentric compounds with a Ø or overt derivational suffix at the right edge (2d) and (2e) show that the order of word-formation is 'compounding < derivation'. On the other hand, compounds with the structure stem + word (2b) prove that the order can be 'derivation < compounding' as well. The rest of the chapter is devoted to the interaction between compounding and inflection (pp. 233-9): stem/word + stem compounds (2a) and (2c) are formed prior to inflection, since the inflection of the compound is different than that of β in isolation (for example, *xion-ó-vrox-o* snow-CM-rain-INF 'rain with snow (flakes)' *vs. vroxí-ø* 'rain.INF'), whereas that of the stem + word type (2b) bears the same inflection with the β in isolation (for example, *pefk-o-ðás-os* pine-CM-forest.INF *vs. ðás-os* 'forest.INF'). This suggests that β is inflected prior to being submitted to compounding.

Finally, Chapter Twelve ('Compounds versus Phrases', pp. 243-70) introduces a couple of entirely new data sets, the common characteristics of which are that α and β are independently inflected, phonological words, that they lack CM, and that they involve only adjectives and nouns. The first data set is composed of Adj + N and N + N.GEN concatenations, such as *eθnikí oðós* 'national road' and *aʏorá erʏasía-s*, market + job.GEN 'job market' respectively, which have been attested only in the last two centuries and are possibly calques from European languages. In Adj + N

concatenations there is phi-feature agreement between the non-head α and the head β and in the N + N.GEN ones, the non-head, β, is inflected in the genitive. They reflect the syntactic word order but, unlike syntactic phrases, the order of the constituents cannot be scrambled and their structural integrity cannot be interrupted by independent modification or by parenthetical insertion. Based on their structural affinity to ordinary phrases and their integrity reminiscent of one-word morphological compounds, AR calls them 'phrasal compounds', arguing that '[…] their structure is derived in syntax in that, it is not based on morphologically proper units and is not the product of a morphological process' (p. 250). The next (not-so homogenous) set involves N + N attributive structures, such as *léksi kliði*, word + key 'keyword'. Although similar to phrasal compounds, they resist to certain syntactic processes, the inflection on the non-head, β, in these concatenations may vary according to the syntactic environment, and it may not agree with the head at all. This, according to AR, constitutes a difference between these concatenations and N + N.GEN phrasal compounds in which the non-head is invariably inflected in the genitive. Therefore, she calls this set 'phrasal-compound-like phrases' and argues that '[…] they are under the process of desyntacticisation, in the sense that they are progressively passing from a full syntactic status to that of phrasal compounds.' (p. 255). According to AR, N + N appositive structures with fully inflected constituents, such as *arxitéktonas arxeolóɣos* 'architect archeologist', should be subsumed into this category as well. The final set of data involves some Adj + N structures, such as *θeatrikí kritikí*, theatrical + criticism 'drama review', another set of N + N.GEN concatenations (for example, *paraɣoɣí kapnú*, production + tobacco.GEN 'tobacco production') and N + N.ACC concatenations (for example, *sáltsa domáta*, sauce + tomato.ACC 'tomato sauce'). As opposed to phrasal compounds and similar to ordinary phrases, their

structure tolerates insertion of parenthetical elements and the order of their constituents may be reversed. Moreover, in Adj + N concatenations, definiteness spreading is possible, and in N + N.GEN concatenations the non-head can serve as an antecedent of an outbound pronoun. Finally, N + N.ACC concatenations can show up as N + N.GEN (*sáltsa domáta-s*, sauce + tomato.GEN 'tomato sauce') or can be paraphrased with a PP (*sáltsa apó domáta*, sauce from tomato.ACC 'tomato sauce') which suggest a silent/covert P in the corresponding N + N.ACC construction. Based on their syntactic transparency, AR calls this latter set 'constructs' (following Borer 1988). At the end of the day, three sets of data, that is, phrasal compounds, phrasal-compound-like phrases and constructs emerge, which show varying degree of syntactic transparency. AR argues that these three sets of data are syntactic formations albeit with different inputs: Phrasal compounds are built on syntactic heads, whereas constructs are built on projecting categories (that is, bar-level categories). As one can expect, this leaves the status of the input for the intermediary hybrid phrasal-compound-like phrases unclear. AR provides supporting cross-linguistic evidence for the existence of syntactic compounds (phrasal compounds and constructs) and argues that compounding can take place both in syntax and in morphology, depending on the compound structure and on the language under investigation.

AR presents her book as a description and analysis of compounding in MG, but many results of the analyses she offers in the book in fact constitute either strong arguments that readily carry over into other languages, or hypotheses that are still waiting to be tested with cross-linguistic data. In this sense, the book is not just a description and analysis of MG compounding, but constitutes a significant contribution to the overall literature on compounding as a word-formation process.

One of these results seems a trivial one, but has strong cross-linguistic implications. It is the possible existence of compound markers in natural languages devoted solely to marking the process of compounding. The existence of a linking element in compounds has already been proposed for a number of languages (see references on p. 53). However, the term 'linking element' has always been a vague notion, which is used outside the realm of compounding as well. For example, Baker (2003: 193, fn.3) states that in languages such as Tagalog, an Adj + N, which is a universal syntactic configuration, needs a licensor, 'a linking morpheme' to surface in syntax. Baker states further that such a 'linker' occurs in Tzutujil Adj + N configurations too, but this time it is a pure PF phenomenon: It is required after monosyllabic adjectives but not after polysyllabic ones. Overall, we end up with a vague notion of 'linking element' that can be licensed due to morphological, syntactic or phonological requirements and that may appear on configurations of different linguistic domains. What AR presents and discusses as 'compound marker', to my mind, sorts out this vagueness: According to AR, *-o-* in MG '[…] ha[s] no other function than indicating compounding' (p. 60). It is non-morphemic and is an output of a readjustment rule applying to structures created by word-formation rules. She acknowledges, however, that the status of CMs should be analyzed language-specifically; while in MG it does not have an affixal status, AR does not rule out the possibility that CMs might be morphological affixes or even functional heads in some other languages where they indeed occur.

At this point, it is worth mentioning the two correlations/dependences that she establishes concerning the status of CMs. The first one is that a CM occurs in a given language if there is overtly expressed paradigmatic (nominal) inflection, that is, '[…a] set of phonologically related forms sharing the same base, while their morpho-

syntactic features may vary according to the context.' (p. 62, fn.22). The reader easily notices that overt realization of nominal inflection, at least according to our linguistic knowledge today, cannot be expressed as an absolute value in a language but it can only be presented relative to some other languages. Although ultimately the morphological typology of natural languages IS a scalar taxonomy, and although the *continuum* approach shows up occasionally in AR's book, the reader cannot help feeling that one of the variables in this dependence is not well-defined.

The second correlation concerns the locus of CM in a compound structure in a language and the morphological classification of the same language: AR states, yet tentatively, that whether a language is fusional or agglutinative determines the locus of CM in that language: In a fusional language, such as MG, they tend to appear between α and β, whereas in an agglutinative language, such as Turkish, they tend to appear at the right edge, right-aligned to β. Although AR clearly acknowledges that it is in its infancy (p. 66), the latter correlation is a bit unfortunate, because it is vaguely designed (why, in a polysynthetic language like Mohawk, do they occur in between α and β?) and is easily refutable: In Mongolic languages, for example, which belong to the agglutinative group, CMs show up in between the constituents: *buu-nii noxoi*, gun-CM dog 'spy' (Khalka), *bugï-n eber*, deer-CM horn 'antlers' (Buryat), *kuli-n xoroo*, foot-CM finger 'toe' (Dagur), whereas in Tungusic languages, which are also agglutinative, there is variation in where CMs occur (in Udege they occur at the right edge (for example, *agba to:-ni*, government fire-CM 'electricity') whereas in Manchu, they occur compound internally (for example, *abka-i jui*, heaven-CM son 'emperor'). Despite these weaknesses, AR's attempt to find cross-linguistic correlations/dependences in the occurrence and loci of CMs is a novel one, and it certainly opens a new path of investigation in the realm of compounding.

The next intriguing result of the book is the assertion of a non-hierarchically ordered morphology component, where derivation/inflection and compounding can precede or follow each other. This is especially salient in the exocentric compounds of (2d) and (2e). As far as I can tell, AR is the first modern scholar (see also Andreou 2013), who rejected exocentricity as a notion based on semantic (non-)headedness. Instead, she proposed that an exocentric compound is in fact structurally headed, albeit by an overt/covert derivational morpheme and it is this affixal head which is responsible for the compound's category and semantics. This means that exocentricity in compounding amounts to the order of application of word-formation processes as 'compounding < derivation'. This is a consequential point, as overt reflexes of this argument can immediately be observed cross-linguistically. In Turkish, for example, (a type of) exocentric compounds occur with relational (or privative suffixes) at the right periphery, such as *taş kalp-li*, stone heart.REL 'stony-hearted'. Interstingly *taş kalp* 'stony heart' exists in Turkish, but **kalpli* does not, which further provides evidence for the argument that exocentric compounds are those where compounding precedes derivation. Similarly, it is not uncommon that a bound functional element can serve as the structural head of a configuration outside the confines of the given configuration: Kornfilt (2005) and von Heusinger & Kornfilt (2005) provide convincing syntactic evidence for this by arguing that, when an overt head is missing in free relatives and partitive constructions in Turkish respectively, a suffix external to the NP configuration serves as the structural head of the configuration. Another ramification of AR's novel approach to exocentricity is the possible generalization of headedness to a domain of morphology other than derivation. We know by now that derivation is a process that involves structural heads, that is, affixes and, with AR's work, we are now also in a position to test cross-linguistically whether compounding

is a process that necessarily involves structural heads, either as lexical or functional items.

Another remarkable result that far exceeds the aim of the book is surely the (indirect) relaxation that the book offers to the LEXICAL INTEGRITY PRINCIPLE (hereafter, LIP). In Chapter Twelve, AR argues that compounding, as well as a morphological phenomenon, can also be a syntactic phenomenon depending on the language or on the compound type within a single language. However, morphological compounds should be defined as clearly as possible by principles that are operant on morphology, whereas syntactic (that is, phrasal) compounds should be defined as syntactic formations which make use of syntactic elements. The view of compounding as a process '[…] which cuts across two grammatical domains' (p. 250) is a remarkable contribution to the vicious debate on LIP, and on the nature of compounding in general. As a logical outcome of AR's proposal, testing the LIP with the latter type becomes meaningless and indeed errant. It should be noted that such a distribution of compounds into distinct components as proposed by AR should have empirical correlations in and/or should be able to carry over into other domains outside the realm of compounding, otherwise AR's model would be redundant. Such a correlation in fact exists: In their analysis of compounds as morphological and syntactic objects, Bağrıaçık & Ralli (to appear) argue that it is only within syntactic compounds, such as those of Turkish, that the non-head can be phrasal, that is, longer than a lexeme. Along with compounds such as *çamaşır makina-sı*, laundry machine-CM 'washing machine', Turkish also allows the following structures (which correspond to NP-complement structures or phrasal compounds, in English):

(3) [CP.*yalnız mı bırakıldın?*] *soru-su*

alone Q leave.PASS.PAST.2SG question-CM

‘the question whether you were left alone/ “were-you-left-alone?” question’

On the other hand, MG morphological one-word compounds, such as *oð-ó-sim-o*, road-CM-sign.INF ‘road sign’ do not allow phrase-level projections in the non-head position:

(4) *[CP *mi ríxnete skupíðja]-(o)-sim-o*

not throw.2PL garbage-(CM)-sign-INF

‘int: do-not-litter sign’

A logical question that follows from AR’s distribution of compounding into two domains is whether word-formation in general can be set free from the monopoly of morphological module or not. Some cross-linguistic data hint that an affirmative answer is plausible: Even the seemingly same suffix might attach syntactically and morphologically in some languages, such as the nominalizer *-mA* in Turkish (Kornfilt 2012: 188-9). Conversely, one should also ask whether a phenomenon that is generally taken to be syntactic can also be morphological. Again, there is a growing body of cross-linguistic evidence showing that essentially the same process can be distributed into different components, that is, syntax and morphology, for example, lexical *vs*. syntactic passives (Laks 2013), lexical *vs*. syntactic reflexivization (Reinhart & Siloni 2005) or lexical *vs*. syntactic reciprocalization (Siloni 2012).

Although the book touches upon some complex phenomena of MG that ultimately have complex cross-linguistic implications, it is written in a fashion that will make it accessible to the reader without specialist knowledge of MG, a language which can indeed be quite challenging in its morphology. It is well-organized with just enough recapitulations and cross-references, and a list of references is provided at the end of each chapter. The examples are well translated and excessive morphemic information is frequently and, to my mind, righteously avoided. Moreover the book is

accompanied by an index (pp. 297-301), and three appendices that locate the various discussions in the book within a clearer context: The first is the diachronic and diatopic presentation of Modern Greek, which allows the reader to follow diachronic discussions easily and understand dialectal examples better (pp. 273-7); the second is a brief but comprehensive account of verbal and nominal inflection in MG, which accompanies the reader through the complex jungle of inflectional classes of MG that appears on almost every page of the book (pp. 277-82); the last appendix is a long list of compounds in MG, those that appear in the book and beyond (pp. 282-95). Unfortunately, this list is not quite in alphabetical order and there is no classification of the compounds, semantic or structural. Besides, some dialectal examples that do not occur in standard MG are also listed here (for example, *αψ apsadrú* (from the dialect of Lesbos) *mesotzerítis* (from the dialect of Cyprus)). Incidentally, some examples are either misplaced or not selected carefully, as they do not exemplify the discussion revolving around them, for example, *ital-o-kanaðós* 'Italian-Canadian', where the second constituent is not vowel-initial (p. 149, line 6ff), or *matóklaðo*, eye-branch 'eyelash', which is not an example of incorporation, because the second constituent is not (de)verbal (p. 191, example 13d). However, neither these, nor the very limited number of typos have more than a slight impact on the cohesion and coherence of the text.

In sum, the strength of AR's book lies in her willingness to tackle some of the most demanding problems both of compounding in MG, and of cross-linguistic theoretical approaches to compounding. Instead of only providing the reader with the full range of compound structures in MG and a neat analysis of them, she provides micro- and macro-comparative accounts and touches upon some gruesome topics, even at the expense of occasionally posing more challenging questions than her own

answers can deal with. AR's elaborate study of one of the quirkiest phenomena of MG is likely to remain a reference book for future work on compounding, both in MG and beyond.

Abbreviations

ACC – accusative; CM – compound marker; CP – complementizer phrase; DER – derivational suffix; GEN – genitive; INF – inflectional suffix; PASS – passive; PAST – past tense; PL – plural; Q – question marker; SG – singular.

References

Andreou Marios 2013. Headedness in word formation and Lexical Semantics: Evidence from Italiot and Cypriot. Doctoral dissertation, University of Patras, Greece.

Bağrıaçık, Metin & Angela Ralli, to appear. Phrasal vs. morphological compounds: Insights from Modern Greek and Turkish. *STUF*.

Baker, Mark 2003. *Lexical categories: Verbs, nouns and adjectives* (= Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 102). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Borer, Hagit 1988. On the morphological parallelism between compounds and constructs. In Geert Booij & Jaap van Marle (eds.), *Yearbook of morphology 1988*. Dordrecht: Foris. 45-87.

Kayne, Richard S. 2013. Comparative syntax. *Lingua* 130: 132-151.

Kornfilt, Jaklin 2012. Revisiting 'suspended affixation' and other coordinate mysteries. In Laura Brugé, Anna Cardinaletti, Giuliana Giusti, Nicola Munaro & Cecilia Poletto (eds.), *Functional heads: The cartography of syntactic structures, Volume 7* (= Oxford Studies in Comparative Syntax). New York NY: Oxford University Press. 181-196.

Kornfilt, Jaklin 2005. Free relatives as light-headed relatives in Turkish. In Hans Broekhuis, Norbert Corver, Riny Huybregts, Ursula Kleinhenz & Jan Koster (eds.), *Organizing grammar: Studies in honor of Henk van Riemsdijk* (= Studies in Generative Grammar 86). Berlin and New York NY: de Gruyter. 340-349.

Laks, Lior 2013. Passive formation in Palestinian and Standard Arabic: Lexical vs. syntactic operations. *Word Structure* 6: 156-180.

Nespor, Marina & Angela Ralli 1996. Morphology-phonology interface: Phonological domains in Greek compounds. *The Linguistic Review* 13 (3-4): 357-382.

Reinhart, Tanya & Tal Siloni 2005. The Lexicon-Syntax parameter: Reflexivization and other arity operations. *Linguistic Inquiry* 36: 389-436.

Siloni, Tal 2012. Reciprocal verbs and symmetry. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 30: 261-320.

Smirniotopoulos, Jane & Brian D. Joseph 1997. On the so-called adverb incorporation in Modern Greek. In Gaberell Drachman, Angeliki Malikouti-Drachman, Celia Klidi, & Yannis Fykias (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference of Greek Linguistics*. Graz: Neubauer. 117-128.

von Heusinger, Klaus & Jaklin Kornfilt 2005. The case of the direct object in Turkish: Semantics, syntax and morphology. *Turkic Languages* 9: 3-44.

Author's address: *(Metin Bağrıaçık)*

Department of Linguistics

Ghent University

Blandijnberg 2, 9000

Ghent, Belgium

E-mail: Metin.Bagriacik@UGent.be

Notes

1 I thank Eline Scheerlinck for her corrections on the text. Needless to say, I am alone responsible for the remaining mistakes and misrepresentations.