

Book Reviews

Andrieux-Reix, Nelly, Croizy-Naquet, Catherine, Guyot, France, Oppermann, Evelyne, *Petit traité de langue française médiévale*. (Collection Etudes littéraires.) Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 2000, 172 pp. 2 13 051078 7, ISSN 0764 1621

Ce petit volume trouve sa place dans la série des études littéraires parce que son but principal et avoué est d'aider les étudiants de lettres à lire, à comprendre, et surtout à traduire, des textes du moyen âge. Conseils et suggestions pour la traduction sont explicites pp. 109, 135, 148, et 149, où il est recommandé de traduire 'si m'aît Dex' par 'les formes contemporaines de la même validation', ce qui souligne qu'en pareil cas les étudiants français n'ont pas les mêmes problèmes que leurs homologues anglophones, pour qui la formule se transpose mot à mot, à l'ordre près, en 'so help me God'. Le public visé est, bien entendu, celui des étudiants en Sorbonne et autres agrégatifs, et c'est à leur intention que sont développées les explications linguistiques des systèmes nominal et verbal de l'ancien français. À côté des 'structures d'engendrement' des formes verbales, les chapitres liminaires consacrés aux graphies, ou à l'ordre des mots, font figure de parents pauvres. Un public qui voudrait lire les textes, sans forcément avoir à en commenter le détail linguistique, aurait sans doute aimé voir plus développés les chapitres, assez sommaires, de la quatrième partie, qui traitent des emplois de *que*, *car*, *si*, et *se*. Les auteuses ont fait le choix qui à elles s'imposait.

On se demande pourtant si même le lectorat sorbonicole appréciera le peu de soin qui a été apporté à la production du volume. Le lambda de 'Lorsque la consonne finale est [λ]' (p. 29) devrait être, comme l'indique l'exemple *chevaus/chevax*, un simple 'l'. A la place de 'Pow' (p. 19 note 1), on doit lire *pour*. La même flèche ⇒ signifie p. 31 le contraire de ce qu'elle indique p. 165, et les termes précédés d'un astérisque ne sont pas tous repris et expliqués dans les 'Précisions terminologiques' pp.163–65. *Zone verbale* (sans astérisque) est commenté de façon assez sommaire p. 116 note 2, avec un renvoi à un précédent chapitre, et encore une fois, avec renvoi à l'Index terminologique', p. 119 note 1. On trouve *neuil* expliqué p. 115 et de nouveau p. 123. Par contre, les formes de l'imparfait d'*estre* sont renvoyées en note, p. 82, et en général la présentation, avec ses paragraphes numérotés entrecoupés de 'Rem.', de 'Comm.' et de 'Ex.', n'est pas des plus accueillantes. Le début du *Chevalier de la Charrette* reproduit en annexe aurait mérité au moins une pleine page, pour que la transcription diplomatique et la version moderne, ainsi que le commentaire très intéressant, prennent toute leur valeur. Un petit volume utile, visant un public particulier, qui aurait dû être mieux fait.

Stephen F. Noreiko
Department of French
University of Hull
Hull HU6 7RX
UK
e-mail: s.f.noreiko@french.hull.ac.uk

(Received 21 February 2001)

Baldinger, Kurt (ed.), *Dictionnaire onomasiologique de l'ancien gascon*, fascicles 1–9 (1975–1998), x + 720 pp; *Dictionnaire onomasiologique de l'ancien occitan*, fascicles 1–7 (1975–2000), x + 561 pp; *Dictionnaire onomasiologique de l'ancien occitan, Supplément*; Hörsch, Nicoline (ed.), *DAO/DAG: Index (nos 1–1185)*, xviii + 251 pp. (2000); Pfister, Max (ed.), *Dictionnaire onomasiologique de l'ancien occitan: Supplément bibliographique* (1999), v + 74 pp. Tübingen: Niemeyer (separate ISBN for each fascicle)

The DAG and DAO have been appearing since 1975 yet – astonishingly – neither has ever been reviewed in Britain. They are complementary works; DAG covers one sub-area of Occitan, the DAO covers the rest and inevitably intrudes into DAG territory too. Quite apart from the importance of being the first major dictionaries of Occitan to appear for three-quarters of a century (a remarkable fact in itself), these works offer two important innovations: (1) they are organized on onomasiological principles, and (2) they cover not just Occitan and Gascon, but French and Latin too (for both of these, a range of often quite lengthy quotations is usually supplied). In the case of the DAO, the core information (dates, locations of attestations, references to other dictionaries) is in DAO itself, the quotations appearing in the *suppléments* which began to appear in 1980; in the case of DAG, the supporting quotations follow (in smaller typeface) the main entry, but all in the same place.

That DAO and DAG have chosen to present all the relevant data irrespective of language means that between them they supply the fullest available information on the entire linguistic situation in southern France, and provide direct and invaluable evidence for the relationship between the various languages throughout the Middle Ages. Indeed, not the least of the achievements of the DAG and DAO is precisely that they demonstrate conclusively that in the Midi (as no doubt elsewhere) it is nonsensical to treat the written evidence (which is all we have) of medieval Occitan in isolation from the written evidence in other languages, which so patently co-existed with it. An entry such as **814 légume** makes the point. The extensive run of Latin evidence in DAO 814,1–1 from 1139 to 1501 is juxtaposed to the Occitan data (1293–1781 [! rouerg.]) and to French texts from 1563 to 1603. The Occitan attestations vary from the clearly vernacular forms *liom* (Manosque 1293), *luome* (Avignon 1438), *lyoms* (Orange 1472), *lieums* (1526 St-Martin-de-Crau) through to Gallicized (rather perhaps than Latinized) *legums* (Montpezat-de-Quercy 1493), *légum* (1774, 1781 Rouergue). The corresponding Gascon entry (DAG 814) offers a similar conspectus of forms but over shorter time-scales: Latin 1385–1543, Gascon 1308–1734 [GrammGasc, Dax], French 1577–c.1731. Forms are less abundant in Gascon than in the remainder of the Occitan data, with the intervocalic *-g-* consistently retained even in the earliest attestations.

The onomasiological ordering-system, based on the Hallig-Wartburg *Begriffssystem*, generates a distinct and fresh approach which (it might be argued) reflects the

Book Reviews

connection between *Sachen und Wörter* more faithfully than does the traditional, alphabetic ordering of the latter, nevertheless preserved in an indispensable *Index* (2000) to the articles so far published (1–1185). The approach taken here, because it starts with the realities of the world around, has the marked added advantage of ensuring that non-literary language performance features prominently in the dictionaries' treatment, to an extent hitherto absent from Occitan lexicography. This goes quite some way to redressing the obsession with the lexis of *belles-lettres*, and to offering a true panorama of the language rather than just of the narrow register of courtly writing: anything less would of course have been surprising from Heidelberg. Thus, for example, DAO 544,1–3 *abetado* (Toulouse, 1637) 'lieu planté de sapins' is absent from the DOM, as is 488,1–3 *abore* 'hêtre', despite being recorded in Simin Palay sub **haboure**.

But the real importance of the method is apparent when the material assembled is looked at in terms of semantic fields. Take, for example, the information on points of the compass in DAG 62–73, and the related data on winds (DAG 147–52; cf. Rothwell 1955). At once, the wide range of terminology is evident: for **65 sud**, for example, Occ. *midy*, *miey jom*, *enta montanhe part*, *de la part de sus*, *dessuus*, *sud*; French offers just *midi* and *sud*; Latin, *meridies* and *auster* (no vernacular reflex, nor in the adjective **66 méridional**). There is evidence of geographical variation: *enta montanhe part*, missing in FEW MONTANEA, PARS, is exclusively Landais (Morcenx); *de la part de sus* is Pyrenean, and especially Lavedan. Throughout this series of closely linked, indeed overlapping articles, Bearnese, and particularly the relatively isolated Lavedan, display a certain eccentricity: thus, in **68 ouest**, *de la part darre*, *darrer* and the shorter *darrer* are again restricted to the Pyrenees; forms such as *de la part de bad*, *debat*; *deba(i)g* (**71 nord**) likewise. These designations are not strictly directional, rather they reveal a different conception of (local) geography. Not only are detailed semantic studies suddenly easily achievable where once laborious data-collection across half the alphabet would have been involved; the DAG presentation also opens up real possibilities of quasi-dialectological treatments of semantic fields of vocabulary (socio-historical as well: within **71 nord**, the politico-historical reality of the Anglo-French connection is recorded for 71,11–1 *nord*, *nort*, *northt*, the first quotation (by nearly 200 years) for which emanates from Westminster.) If we turn then to DAO **1215 graisse**, this is confirmed: the obvious *graisa* (*CRASSIA) is set beside the competing *sagi*, *seu*, *pena* (*pan porcin*), *paolha*. The DAOSuppl 1215 quotations flesh out the entry for all save *paolha* and refer the reader to DAG (forthcoming) for this last. There are for some reason no French quotations within DAOSuppl 1215 although Latin is represented (I). What is curious is that the compilers do not comment on either geographical distribution or frequency of use of different items: in many respects the presentation remains one of (high-quality) raw data, but I would like to have known what the editors make of it.

All dictionaries are dependent on their sources and the DAG and DAO (in common with most comparable works) largely restrict themselves to printed material. There has not been a programme (for example) of archive-exploration. That said, the coverage is impressive and certainly more extensive (and more rigorously documented) than in any previous work. These dictionaries are remarkable contributions to scholarship, which add enormously and lastingly to our knowledge of Occitan and Gascon. The Heidelberg Akademie, the editors, and Niemeyer are to be congratulated for producing them.

REFERENCES

- DOM = Stempel, W.-D. (ed.), *Dictionnaire de l'occitan médiéval* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1996–).
- Rothwell, W., 1955. 'Winds and cardinal points in French', *Archivum linguisticum*, 7 (1955), 29–56.

D. A. Trotter
Department of European Languages
University of Wales Aberystwyth
Aberystwyth SY23 3DY
UK
e-mail: dt@aber.ac.uk

(Received 20 March 2001)

Bentolila, Fernand (ed.), *Systèmes verbaux*. Louvain-La-Neuve: Peeters (Bibliothèque des Cahiers de l'institut linguistique de Louvain). 1998, 334 pp. 90 429 0708 8 (Peeters Leuven), 2 87723 413 4 (Peeters France)

The idea for this volume was the result of an organised debate on the nature of verbal systems, published subsequently in *La Linguistique* (vol. 24, 1988–91). The aim was for a number of authors to describe the verbal system of the language they specialised in using exactly the same methodology, A. Martinet's *Grammaire fonctionnelle du français*. Thus, despite comprising chapters written by sixteen different authors, this volume forms a homogeneous whole. The first chapter, written by F. Bentolila describes the methodology, which is very simple. He states in the first place the need to establish classes of words, which may be considered to be verbs, or may function as verbs. Such a class of words is obvious in French but not so obvious in Chinese or in Malagasy. The second stage is to determine the grammatical determiners of the verb (GDV), which may be modal, temporal or aspectual (but this list was not seen as exhaustive at the beginning of the research). They too may be grouped into different classes. All classes are established according to the two basic functionalist principles of compatibility and mutual exclusion e.g. a marker of the future tense can only 'determine' the nucleus or *forme nue* of a verb (in some languages an infinitive form, in others a root) and cannot itself be 'determined'. Having explained the methodology, he goes on to analyse the conclusions that can be drawn from the data provided in the following chapters, since all follow this pattern.

Among the most interesting points to emerge is the very odd position occupied by the imperative in nearly all the languages examined; its real role seems to be purely at the enunciative level (there are three kinds of enunciation, 'assertion', 'questioning' and 'injunction'). This suggests that its status in the verbal system should be re-examined (it is usually classified under 'moods' in French). It could be argued that the whole concept of enunciation could be usefully re-examined in this context, since Choi criticises Lee's analysis of Korean for not taking intonation into consideration in this respect (the same would apply in French in terms of assertion and Yes/No style questions). F. Bentolila also notes that some GDVs may indicate subordination. Thus in Turkish the GDV indicating supposition may combine with all other GDVs, which

Book Reviews

means it should be considered as a marker of subordination, in order to maintain the principle of mutual exclusion. Finally, he discusses the difficulty in some languages of distinguishing GDVs from affixes, and how to class various verbal items into units. Some of the analyses also reveal some units to be variants of others, while others may function differently in different contexts (cf. the French subjunctive, carrier of meaning in some contexts but not others). He also tries to set up a hierarchy and classification of GDVs, presumably as a first step towards language universals in this area. This leads to Bentolila's final conclusion as to the homogeneity of the semantic content denoted by GDVs, which are nearly always temporal, aspectual or modal. Even if affixes are included there is similar convergence, since they nearly always (at least according to the data presented) express the factitive, the passive or reciprocity, with some languages privileging one or the other of these notions (e.g. voice in Malagasy, aspect in Arabic, tense in Nandé, enunciation in Japanese). There are cases however where several interpretations are possible (cf. the two analyses given of Korean), and languages being always in a state of change, one description may become more accurate than another in time.

Some of the languages examined will most probably be unknown to the reader: Montagnais, Phurhépecha, Konkani, Hindi, Réunion Creole, Amharic, Kâsim, Ôtètèla, Merina, the Merina variety of Malagasy, Ingouche, Korean and Wallisian. This means that the book will mainly be of interest to specialists in General Linguistics. On the other hand, languages such as Portuguese, Modern Greek, Latin, and Modern Arabic could broaden its possible readership: reading about a language which may be known to the reader, even slightly, can be very revealing. In other words an interesting project because of its homogeneity, but limited in terms of its readership to those interested in typology, or those wishing to take a new look at a given verbal concept.

Anne Judge

School of Language, Law and International Studies

University of Surrey

Guildford, GU2 7 XH

UK

e-mail: a.judge@surrey.ac.uk

(Received 2 March 2001)

Bres, Jacques (éd.) *L'imparfait dit narratif. Langue, discours. (Cahiers de praxématique. 32.)* Montpellier: Publication de l'Université Paul-Valéry, Montpellier III, avec le concours du CNRS, 1999, 257 pp. 2 84269 332 1

'Il y a 14 ans, le 26 avril 1986, un réacteur de la centrale nucléaire de Tchernobyl, en Ukraine, explosait.' Thus spake Claude Sérillon, on *Le Journal TV5* (25/4/00), utilising spontaneously and, one might feel, predictably, a variant of the so called, seemingly oxymoronic, *imparfait narratif*, subject of the seven substantial papers in this number of *Cahiers de praxématique*. They present, in the words of its coordinator, Jacques Bres, a confrontation and dialogue of the 'tenants de la polysémie' and 'ceux de la monosémie'. The papers were presented at a *Conscila* seminar (12 mars 1999) at Paris V, and reworked subsequently for this publication. Along with the presentation by Bres and the abstracts of each paper, they fill 210 pages. In addition the number includes nine substantial reviews (some thirty pages) of recent publications (Alain

Ratel on point of view, Bernard Combettes on *constructions détachées*, Catherine Schnedecker on *noms propres*, Robert Vion on *énonciation et interaction*, . . .).

‘Un impie nommé Pasolini. Voici juste vingt ans, l’écrivain cinéaste disparaissait violemment’, titrait *Le Monde* (27/10/95). A nineteenth-century development, affirms Bres in an enlightening presentation of the papers, the *imparfait narratif* is perceived as the use of an imperfect when one would expect a *passé simple*. In my Pasolini example, one might immediately ask whether *disparut/a disparu* would in practice – given the context and contemporary usage – be more ‘expected’ than the imperfect, in that sort of statement of a past occurrence headed up by a date. That particular type of narrative imperfect ‘comportant un complément temporel en position thématique’ (in Sthioul’s terms, quoted by Bres, p. 4), arguably stylistically normative, seems clearly separable from another less stylized set, ‘les énoncés à l’imparfait sans complément temporel qui font néanmoins avancer le temps’, familiar, for example, to readers of Georges Simenon’s *Maigret* novels. And what of *titrait* in the example? Indeed the feeling of straying from expectations has clearly evolved and to some extent lost focus with time, while the variety of labels attached to such unnatural/unexpected *imparfaits* – *de rupture*, *pittoresque*, *impressionniste*, *perspectif*, *aoristique*, etc. – arise from analytical divergencies in dealing with discursive multiplicity.

Three approaches are possible: homonymic, polysemic and invariability (or monosemic). The papers fall into one or other of the polysemic camp (Laurent Gosselin, Sarah de Vogüé, in particular) or the monosemic camp (Jacques Bres, Jean-Claude Chevalier, most clearly). Gosselin (‘Le sinistre Fantomas et l’imparfait narratif’, pp. 19–42), for example, defends the idea of the ‘imparfait’, normally aspectually ‘inaccompli’, taking on an aoristic value by virtue of certain cotexts, whereas Bres (‘L’imparfait dit narratif tel qu’en lui-même (le cotexte ne le change pas)’, pp. 87–117) maintains that there is no narrative imperfect as such, but rather an ‘effet de sens narratif’, issuing from the same contextual contradictions.

De Vogüé (‘L’imparfait aoristique, ni mutant, ni commutant’, pp. 43–69), as do Anne-Marie Berthonneau and Georges Kleiber (‘Pour une réanalyse de l’imparfait de rupture dans le cadre de l’hypothèse anaphorique méronomique’, pp. 119–66), focus particularly on the imparfait dit *de rupture* (xtemps plus tard + *Vimparfait*): ‘Trois jours plus tard il mourait’. De Vogüé, somewhat disconcertingly, chooses to work on ‘des exemples sinon inventés du moins “construits”’ (p. 44 n.2). Let us throw in a ‘real life’ example: ‘Un moment après, à la gare, il l’installait dans le wagon-lit’ (Camus *La Peste*), where there is neither the sense of the habitual, nor of ongoing action.

Further comparative, translingual insights, are offered by Barbara Kuzmider (‘La neutralisation aspectuelle: les cas de l’imperfectif passé polonais à valeur perfective et de l’imparfait narratif français’, pp.71–86), and Jean-Claude Chevalier (‘«L’imparfait narratif»: à quel prix?’, pp. 189–210) who, while arguing for a monosemic approach, extends the discussion to other Romance languages, Spanish and Italian principally. He shows that the discursive narrative use of the imperfect exists in these languages and argues for an analysis in terms of an ‘effet de sens narratif’.

This number 32 of *Cahiers de praxématique* rehearses expertly many aspects of this intriguing usage, but leaves differences of opinion on both the ‘effet de sens’ (how the usage is perceived by the francophone) and how most meaningfully to classify it. As Jacques Bres puts it: ‘c’est non seulement la question de l’imparfait narratif qui se trouve désormais mieux posée, mais également celle de la pluralité des valeurs en discours de l’imparfait. Au-delà, on trouvera, dans les différents développements,

Book Reviews

matière précise et précieuse à verser au débat de l'un de la langue et du multiple des effets de sens en discours.' (p. 10)

Anthony S. Newman
Department of French
University of New South Wales
Sydney 2052
NSW
Australia
e-mail: s.newman@unsw.edu.au

(Received 14 February 2001)

Chalmers, Marianne and Pierquin, Martine, *The Pocket Oxford Hachette French Dictionary*. Second edition. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2000, x + 950 pp. 0 19 860279 0

'Pocket' moves to the top of the spine for this second edition, on a red bar for emphasis. It's still a misnomer. Like its predecessor (*Oxford* 1996), this dictionary is bigger than even a septuple Livre de Poche (closer in size to the 1978 Hachette edition of Perec's *La vie mode d'emploi* than to the LdP version, number 5341). 'New' is now printed on a yellow circle instead of the first edition's triangle, and is perhaps more accurate than the other claim. Clearer typefaces and a more open page layout, with sub-headings set down, make for easier consultation, while navigation through the alphabetical listings is aided by the grey bars on the outside margin which provide a thumb-index effect. The sample correspondence in the centre pages now includes an e-mail: *mél* is explained here, though not listed. *Courriel* is listed, as is *mail* 'e-mail', but in the article for *mail/maj/'mall*'. These centre pages also provide a calendar of French traditions and holidays, with explanations, and a useful 'A-Z of French Life and Culture'. *Vignette* has of course since fallen victim to fuel protests, and other betting formulae have joined the old *tiercé*, but coverage is good, and the articles are generally well written. Dumbed-down (*dumb down* is listed) or just more user-friendly (also in *Oxford* 1996)? Between *fer* and *fer-blanc*, six new entries identify parts of *faire*. Future and conditional of *aller* account for another twelve entries, and *tiens* has a separate listing, though not *viens*. Similarly, between the table of French verbs and the guide to numbers at the end, is a glossary of grammatical terms. One might quibble at the definitions, but they are a starting point and a help to the puzzled. Some of my earlier criticisms of the dictionary remain valid. There are questionable definitions: *migraine* is not only or even necessarily 'splitting headache', nor is an oil slick quite the same as a '*marée noire*'; surely the entry for *spartiate* should include 'sandal', and why not simply 'panic attacks' instead of 'spasmophilia' for *spasmophilie*? But we find *brouteur* 'browser', *ISP* 'fournisseur d'accès Internet', *hypertoile* 'World Wide Web', even *boy band*. Like its predecessor, this second edition is a dictionary that could well be recommended to English learners, from pre-GCSE upwards. 'Higher, AS & A Level', says the cover, and the accompanying press release mentions 'general and business users who need a general-purpose desk dictionary'. For £8.99, all of these would be well served, by a dictionary which is practical, clear, and easy to consult. But not 'pocket'.

REFERENCES

- Noreiko, S. F. (1998). Review of *Oxford* (1996). *JFLS*, 8: 258–59.
Oxford (1996). Corréard, Marie-Hélène (ed.), *The Pocket Oxford Hachette French Dictionary*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Stephen F. Noreiko
Department of French
The University of Hull
Hull HU6 7RX
UK

e-mail: s.f.noreiko@french.hull.ac.uk

(Received 21 February 2001)

Cusin-Berche, Fabienne (dir.), *Rencontres discursives entre sciences et politique dans les médias*. (Carnets du Cediscor 6.) Paris: Presses de la Sorbonne Nouvelle, 2000, 226 pp., 2 87854 199 5

Ce volume, le sixième des Carnets du Cediscor (groupe de recherche voué à l'étude des discours de transmission des connaissances – discours de recherche, discours médiatiques et toutes formes intermédiaires de discours didactiques et de discours de vulgarisation), est consacré aux 'images du monde scientifique que les discours médiatiques ordinaires véhiculent' et à 'la représentation des relations entre sciences et politique dans le traitement de faits politico-scientifiques' (p. 10). Les thèmes des corpus de discours médiatiques ordinaires sur lesquels s'appuient les travaux présentés (sang contaminé, sida, plantes transgéniques, maladie de la vache folle, effet de serre entre autres) suffisent à confirmer ce dont il s'agit, mais surtout l'importance et la pertinence des enjeux théoriques et méthodologiques engagés.

Ses douze chapitres se répartissent en trois parties, dont la première, 'Discours institutionnels vs discours médiatiques', rend compte de façon globale d'aspects thèmes de recherche de l'ouvrage: variations dans les pratiques culturelles et discursives en fonction de différents critères – types de savoir concerné, type de diffusion, forme de socialisation de la science considérée, par exemple (Beacco) –, mais aussi politiques scientifiques nationales, avec l'exemple révélateur du Brésil (Guimarães) et celui de l'Espagne (Calsamiglia) qui vient compléter cette contextualisation générale par un aperçu rapide d'études en cours et de voies d'investigations susceptibles de mettre à jour les spécificités des discours de divulgation et de diffusion par rapport à celui de la vulgarisation.

C'est ce qui est repris dans la seconde partie, 'Les protagonistes: médiateurs, chercheurs, experts, citoyens et témoins . . .', dont les cinq chapitres s'articulent, comme le suggère le titre, sur les différents acteurs de l'interlocution, et analysent suivant différentes démarches tenant de l'analyse du discours et de la lexicologie les glissements et traits discursifs associés aux rôles joués, projetés ou perçus par ces acteurs, et à leur interaction dans les médias ordinaires. Moirand s'attache ainsi au médiateur, 'gestionnaire discursif entre l'univers de la science et celui du public présumé' (p. 45), dont elle souligne à différents égards (objets du discours, représentations du monde scientifique, par exemple) l'insécurité discursive dans la presse ordinaire. Petit s'arrête lui sur la figure de l'expert (point de vue de la dénomination,

Book Reviews

de ses modalités, de son efficience sémiotique et des catégories référentielles mises en place par le discours). Rakotonoelina s'appuie sur la question du sida pour étudier les représentations et types de discursivité de la figure de témoin (patients, personnels soignants) dans les discours médiatiques et les virages discursifs qui s'y manifestent, et Reboul-Touré sur celle des plantes transgéniques pour s'intéresser à la mise en œuvre de la création lexicale et à la diffusion de termes spécialisés dans le repositionnement du journaliste et dans la mise en place d'un discours plurilogal qui mobilise le citoyen. Le thème de la parole citoyenne des non-spécialistes, dans ses conflits avec la parole savante, est également central dans l'étude de Cusin-Berche et Mourlhon-Dallies relative aux débats autogérés sur Internet, où l'absence de médiateur en met en relief les implications discursives.

A ce tableau du statut discursif et lexical des ces différents acteurs succède dans la troisième partie, 'Pluralité sémiotique de la médiation', un examen sémiotique de la mise en scène des discours: de la définition de l'hyperstructure comme élément de structuration de l'information intermédiaire entre celui [supérieur] du journal dans son ensemble et celui [inférieur] de l'article (Adam et Lugrin); des rapports intersémiotiques et interdiscursifs, dans la presse, entre les divers éléments textuels et visuels présents, certains appartenant à des genres rédactionnels différents, et de l'incidence de leur imbrication sur l'hétérogénéité ou l'homogénéité discursive de l'espace-temps (Blondel); de l'intrication, dans le discours télévisuel, des aspects verbaux et visuels, là encore de natures hétérogènes, et de son impact sur la représentation des événements (Battestini-Drout); de l'hétérogénéité sémiotique de supports discursifs différents (presse écrite, émissions radiophoniques et télévisées), dans ses variations comme dans ses données communes, et de ses effets sur le mode de construction du discours scientifique dans ces médias (Petiot et Pialoux).

Ensemble imposant donc, d'une grande cohérence et d'une grande rigueur y compris dans sa présentation générale, chronique sur le vif des évolutions du discours, outil de lecture critique et outil critique de recherche, dont l'originalité tient à sa pluralité: celle manifeste dans l'éventail des phénomènes considérés et celui des méthodologies déployées; mais celle surtout, comme le souligne Jeanneret dans un article de conclusion qui inscrit dans une dynamique historique les enjeux discursifs et politiques convoqués dans les études présentées, qui s'affranchit du prévisible pour faire d'emblée toute sa place à la multiplicité des ressorts qui interviennent dans les représentations et paroles sur la science, pour promouvoir non pas tant la description de nouvelles instances médiatiques que de nouvelles façons de les aborder.

Marie-Noëlle Guillot
*School of Language, Linguistics
and Translation Studies
University of East Anglia
Norwich NR4 7TJ
UK
e-mail: m.guillot@uea.ac.uk*

(Received 3 April 2001)

Dubois, Colette et Kasbarian, Jean-Michel et Queffélec, Ambroise (éds.) *L'expansion du français dans les Suds (XVe–XXe siècles). Hommage à Daniel Baggioni. Actes du colloque d'Aix-en-Provence – mai 1998*. Aix-en-Provence: Publications de l'Université de Provence, 2000, 348 pp. 2 85399 450 3

L'expansion du français dans les Suds (XVe–XXe siècles) présente les actes d'un colloque international tenu en mai 1998 à Aix-en-Provence, mais le volume est aussi un hommage à celui qui aurait dû animer ce colloque s'il n'était pas disparu prématurément: Daniel Baggioni, chercheur universitaire à l'Université de Provence. Après une introduction qui expose les orientations scientifiques que Daniel Baggioni aurait souhaité donner au colloque, citant longuement son texte d'appel à communication, écrit en 1997, les trois éditeurs (collègues et amis travaillant à l'université de Provence) nous offrent d'abord une série d'hommages et une bibliographie (première partie), ensuite vingt-deux articles dont la plupart traitent de la diffusion du français dans le Sud de la France (deuxième partie) et dans les territoires d'outre-mer (troisième partie), le reste signalant la langue française dans sa situation isolée – et menacée (quatrième partie).

L'image qui ressort des hommages est celle d'un chercheur très actif qui était non seulement un vrai 'historiographe de la linguistique' (p. 30), ayant publié plusieurs articles sur le développement des sciences du langage en Allemagne, en France et en Italie, mais aussi un des premiers sociolinguistes en France (il avait participé à la préparation du premier colloque sociolinguistique à Rouen en 1978) dont les travaux témoignent de trois intérêts majeurs: d'abord le domaine du bilinguisme, du multiculturalisme et de la créolistique, ensuite celui de la francophonie (la situation du français en dehors de la France), et finalement celui plus général des questions de norme et d'identité langagières. L'approche historique était cependant fondamentale, qu'il ait travaillé en théorie des sciences ou avec les réalités sociolinguistiques.

En quelque sorte, ce portrait de Daniel Baggioni fonctionne comme un fil conducteur pour la lecture des articles qui suivent: tous sont empreints d'une approche historique aux situations sociolinguistiques qu'ils décrivent.

Cet angle diachronique est particulièrement sensible dans la deuxième partie, où certains auteurs remontent aussi loin qu'au treizième siècle pour décrire l'implantation progressive du français dans le Sud de la France. Ces descriptions partent d'endroits géographiques différents (Marseille, Corse, Gascogne, Provence tout court), et travaillent sur la base de sources différentes (documents administratifs, littérature et théâtre, grammaires, monographies linguistiques issues d'enquêtes de terrain), mais tournent autour des mêmes problèmes: la première 'cohabitation' des langues régionales avec le français, leur transformation en 'français régionaux', et les attitudes et enjeux identitaires actuels à leur égard.

Pour des raisons historiques évidentes, la troisième partie se concentre sur les dix-neuvième et vingtième siècles. Dans douze articles, tous les coins de l'Afrique francophone sont explorés dans l'optique de suivre le processus d'expansion du français: le Maroc et la Tunisie au Nord, l'Éthiopie et Djibouti à l'Est, le Sénégal, la Côte d'Ivoire, le Togo, le Cameroun à l'Ouest et l'île de Madagascar au Sud. Malgré la situation actuelle très diversifiée du français dans ces régions (survie mieux garantie en Afrique subsaharienne, à Madagascar et sur les îles de l'Océan Indien que dans la zone Maghreb par exemple, cf. p. 152), les diverses contributions laissent voir de façon très nette les problèmes sociolinguistiques communs rencontrés lors de la phase de

Book Reviews

francisation. D'une part, le dilemme colonial typique qui a donné naissance à des stratégies d'enseignement différentes d'une époque et d'un lieu à l'autre: faut-il bannir complètement les langues locales, en imposant le français, ou faut-il au contraire accepter les idiomes locaux dès l'école? D'autre part, le dilemme des parents indigènes face au français: faut-il insister sur la langue identitaire, ou faut-il donner à son enfant la possibilité d'une promotion sociale à travers le français? Centrée sur l'enseignement du français, cette troisième partie met aussi en lumière le rôle particulier des missions religieuses et de l'Alliance Française en Afrique, tout en explorant également d'autres voies de diffusion (armée, voies ferrées, etc.).

C'est un peu le miroir inverse que nous tend la quatrième partie. Traitant des isolats francophones au Val d'Aoste (région autonome du Nord-Ouest de l'Italie), à Jersey (Ile Anglo-Normande) et aux Etats-Unis (la Louisiane et la Nouvelle Angleterre), ces articles dépeignent des français menacés par le même genre de stratégies d'enseignement et d'assimilation culturelle que la France a elle-même mises en vigueur pour faire disparaître les langues indésirables sur ses territoires, que ce soit dans l'Hexagone ou dans les outre-mers. Cette dernière partie souligne donc que quelle que soit la ou les langue(s) visée(s), les mécanismes 'glottophages' sont universels, et les réactions psychologiques chez les locuteurs impliqués également (crises identitaires, attitudes équivoques devant le produit linguistique 'mixte' qui est souvent le résultat du contact).

L'expansion du français dans les Suds est en soi une richesse extraordinaire d'information, écrit comme il est par des experts chacun dans leur domaine. Grâce aux bibliographies à la fin des articles, le volume constitue en même temps une véritable clé pour celui qui veut faire des études sociolinguistiques approfondies dans une des régions francophones traitées. Les trois éditeurs et les collaborateurs peuvent se féliciter d'un ouvrage qui est une source d'inspiration, autant pour l'étudiant que pour le chercheur n'ayant pas eu la chance de connaître personnellement Daniel Baggioni.

RÉFÉRENCES

- Lodge, A. (1993). *French: from Dialect to Standard*, London & New York: Routledge.
[*Le français: histoire d'un dialecte devenu langue*, Paris: Fayard, 1997]]
Marley, D., Hintze, M.-A., Parker, G. (1998). *Linguistic Identities and Policies in France and the French-speaking World*, London: AFLS/CILT.

Anita Berit Hansen
Institut d'Etudes Romanes
Université de Copenhague
Njalsgade 80
DK-2300 København S
Denmark
e-mail: berit@hum.ku.dk

(Received 30 April 2001)

Enckell, Pierre, *Répertoire des prénoms familiaux. Dédé, Juju, Margot, Bébert et les autres*. Paris: Plon, 2000, 231 pp. 2 259 19262 9

In his introduction, Enckell berates traditionalist chroniclers of French usage for having ignored 'les petits noms', pointing out – only slightly tongue-in-cheek – that 'MM. Larousse, Robert et compagnie, élitistes comme c'est pas permis, ne veulent les connaître que dans les seuls cas où ils désignent des rois, des reines ou des saints. Et nous? Nous les petits, les obscurs, les sans-grade? Exclus, interdits de présence, absents du répertoire, comme si l'on n'existait pas.'

This collection of some 1,000 hypocoristics admirably corrects the imbalance, reminding us of the importance in day-to-day life of these markers of familiarity and endearment. Not that we are merely dealing here with any old Dédé, Didi, Dodo or Doudou. As a nation, too, the French have shown their affection in the same way. Louis Bobet, France's champion cyclist, was known to the general public only as Louison. More recently, in football, the names Mémé (Aimé) Jacquet and Zizou (Zineddine) Zidane have become common currency. In the field of entertainment, Maurice Chevalier was known as Momo, Alexandre-Georges-Pierre Guitry as Sacha. Notorious criminals likewise came to be identified in the media by their pet-names, for example Dédé-le-Book (André Boulade) and Lulu-le-Baratin (Lucien Monge).

Many literary titles record the same phenomenon, as in *Nana*, *Toine*, *Gigi*, *Pierrot mon ami*, *Zazie dans le métro*. A Nastasie appears in *Madame Bovary*, a Bebeth and a Babal (Hannibal) in *Le Côté de Guermantes*. Caroline Flaubert writes a letter to 'mon cher Gus'. Hugo used to call Juliette Drouet, his mistress, Juju; she called him Toto. Early examples come from the *Oeuvres poétiques* of Marot: 'Janeton a du tétou,/Et Cathin a du tétin,/Martine de la tétine,/Et Oudette de la tette' (p. 49). Cotgrave (1611) provides Jacquet, Jacot, Jacotin. Enckell's sources range from late fifteenth-century texts to St Valentine's Day messages in *Libération* in the year 2000. It is here that the true value of this book is to be found: in the extensiveness and reliability of the research undertaken. Over 400 works are listed in the bibliography, including novels, theatre, poetry, correspondence, articles on language, and dictionaries. Enckell also includes regional French, as described for instance in the excellent *Littré de la Grand'Côte* by Nizier du Puitspelu. In almost every case, quotations illustrate the name under consideration. Indeed, 'ce sont les citations qui structurent notre dictionnaire: elles apportent des attestations d'emploi, de date et de contexte sociologique qui manquent généralement dans les livres consacrés aux prénoms' (p. 11).

The work is of interest too from the viewpoint of lexical morphology. A striking characteristic of many of these 'petits noms' is that aphaeresis (initial syllabic deletion) – relatively rare in common nouns – is well represented, e.g. Bastien, Colas, Lalie, Norine, Toinette, Polyte, sometimes involving reduplication as in Riri, Fonfonse, Guiguite, Momone, Titine, Totor, Tatave. Certain derivatives, such as Coco (Jacques) and Lolo (Charles), appear far removed from their base forms until earlier derivations are recalled (Jacquot, Charlot). One and the same base form can prove to be highly productive over time. Thus from Élizabeth derive, among others, Babette, Élixa, Elsa, Lili, Lisa, Zaza; from Marguerite, Margot, Goton, Guiguite, Guite. Conversely, several derived forms represent different originals: Bébert (Albert, Dagobert, Gilbert, Hubert, Norbert, Robert), Titine (Augustine, Célestine, Christine, Clémentine, Ernestine, Florentine, Léontine, Valentine). Others, such as Tonton, Zizi, Cloclo, Cricri, Dodo, Louison, can refer to both sexes. Fashion has of course changed over the

Book Reviews

centuries. 'Si *Nénesse*, *Polyte* et *Fifine* sont aujourd'hui désuets, ce n'est pas parce que l'usage des petits noms aurait pris fin, mais parce que Ernest, Hippolyte et Joséphine ne courent plus les rues avec autant d'agilité que jadis' (p. 8). Enckell lists a number of unusual forenames in his dictionary, including Apollonie, Astolphe, Bénigne, Euphrosine, Évariste, Floridor, Thémistocle, Zéphirine. These are counter-balanced by the contemporary Jean-Ba (Baptiste), Jean-Do (Dominique), Jean-Mi (Michel), Marie-Jo (José), Marie-No (Noëlle), Marie-Thé (Thérèse), and by the borrowed Bobby, Charlie, Dicky, Freddy, Betty, Maggie, etc.

The derivatives, entered under their base forms, are easily located by means of an 'Index des petits noms' (pp. 203–14). A short 'Appendice' groups forms of doubtful attribution (e.g. Bibi, Pinpin, Zouzou). This is a unique publication, by a fine scholar. Enckell has already contributed hugely to our knowledge of the history of the French lexicon, through the INaLF *Datations et documents lexicographiques* series, and with his *Dictionnaire des façons de parler du XVIIe siècle* (CNRS, 2000). Here is yet another valuable contribution.

Ken George
196 Meadvale Rd
London W5 1LT
UK

(Received 30 January 2001)

Flaux, Nelly and Van de Velde, Danièle, *Les noms en français: esquisse de classement*. (Collection l'essentiel français, n.n.) Gap/Paris: Ophrys, 2000, iv + 127 pp. 2 7080 0958 3

This book comprises an introduction, five chapters, a conclusion, a glossary and a bibliography. The introduction explains that the consideration of the properties of nouns included in the work is based on syntactic and morphological properties, rather than semantics or prototype theory. This leads to coverage which is both exhaustive and affected by gaps, as traditional categories, to which a separation between intensive and extensive is added, account for all nouns, but many semantically differentiable subclasses so far cannot be assigned clear morpho-syntactic distinguishers. Proper nouns, pronouns and nominalised adjectives are excluded from the study, these being recognised on the same morpho-syntactic grounds as other classes. The point is made that the approach is not collocational, as only formal grammatical, and not lexical, patterns are taken into account, but neither is it based on pure distributional criteria, as it looks to broader context and interpretation.

The first chapter (I) covers questions of methodology. Certain special cases are first considered. The distinction is made between 'complémentation', usually found in French rightwards of the head of a noun phrase, and 'détermination', normally leftwards of the head. (The close similarity with what are termed 'qualifier' and 'modifieur' in systemic syntactic descriptions may be a useful parallel to draw for speakers of English.) This leads to the treatment of certain nouns as really determiners, both quantifying, including various expressions of quantity, measurements, numbers and fractions ('*nombre* d'étudiants', 'un *tas* d'idées', 'trois *mètres* de tissu', and so forth), and also qualifying, involving insults and metalinguistic uses ('une *espèce* de chapeau' shows use of a word that falls on the borderline between these two types). These

special cases are excluded from the category of 'true nouns'. Within this latter, the binary divisions concrete versus abstract, extensive versus intensive, count versus non-count, animate versus inanimate, human versus non-human, and natural versus man-made are established. Numerous criteria are used. For instance, abstract nouns syntactically tend to have argument structures, reminiscent of those involving verbs, and morphologically are mostly derived; intensive nouns are all abstract and the distinctions between 'combien/que de' and 'quel' are lost when they combine with this type (for instance, 'quel courage' is the same as 'que de courage'); only spatially or temporally extensive nouns can fall in the count grouping; non-count nouns take the partitive article, and when used with the indefinite are understood as meaning 'a standard portion of' or 'a specific variety of' the substance they name (e.g. 'un café', 'un fromage'); human, and to some extent animate, nouns are the only ones able to use 'être à' as a way of expressing possession (e.g. 'cette maison est à ma soeur', but not *'ces arbres sont à mon jardin'); the man-made category uses 'à' for possession, since 'de' implies producer (compare 'j'ai un livre à/de lui').

Succeeding chapters cover concrete count nouns (II), concrete non-count nouns (III), intensive abstract nouns (IV), and extensive abstract nouns (V) in more detail, with many examples. The degree of detail is such that it makes more sense to give a random selection of interesting points, rather than to try to summarise the close argumentation. So, to give just three instances, in section III.1.3 there is a discussion of when to use 'en' and when 'de' with nouns expressing materials. Section IV.4.1 explains how it is possible to distinguish sentiments, both permitting and requiring only two arguments (the experiencer and the sentiment), from emotions with a more varied syntactic repertoire, and both of these from psychological states. In section V.2.1, subclasses of activity nouns are covered, showing why one may say equally well 'une promenade de deux heures' or 'deux heures de promenade' but not *'je fais de la promenade', while it is possible to say 'je fais de la natation' and 'deux heures de natation', but not *'une natation de deux heures'.

The conclusion notes how the tendency to oppose nouns, with inherent features such as animate, concrete, human, to verbs and adjectives, with contextual features such as animate subject, is over-simplistic. The same is stated to be true of a number of binary divides, such as the count versus non-count distinction made in the book. It is the case that 'table' is a typical count noun, and 'bière' a typical non-count. However, the conclusion notes the existence of words that can fall into both categories, such as 'veau', and also that 'bière' can be used quite freely in count structures ('j'ai bu une bière'), while it is possible to have a (marked) non-count use of 'table' ('l'usine produisait de la table en bois blanc').

The book as a whole is a useful and data-driven account of aspects of the grammar of French nouns. While it is in no sense a language-teaching textbook, it would be a useful reference work beyond the most narrowly defined circle of theoretical linguistics.

W. Steven Dodd
Language Centre
UCC

The National University of Ireland
Cork
Éire

e-mail: s.dodd@ucc.ie

(Received 26 March 2001)

Book Reviews

Gezundhajt, Henriette, *Adverbes en -ment et opérations énonciatives: analyse linguistique et discursive*. (Sciences pour la communication. 59.) Berne: Peter Lang, 2000, x + 358 pp. 3 906763 55 2

Honnêtement, on ne peut dire que les linguistes soient grandement d'accord sur la nature de l'adverbe. Mêmement sur ses fonctions. Dans son introduction, Gezundhajt expose brièvement ces divergences, puis s'engage hardiment à emboîter le pas à Guimier, dont elle cite copieusement le travail sur les adverbes anglais (1987). Évidemment, si l'anglais peut, marginalement, avoir *redly*, *rougement* n'est pas possible en français. Curieusement, le français n'a pas non plus d'équivalents d'*interestingly*, *intriguingly*. L'exemple n'est pas soulevé, mais il mériterait sans doute discussion. Avant d'aborder son corpus, constitué de trois diffusions d'*Apostrophes*, dont la 'formule de débats symbolise mieux les situations d'interaction habituelles' (11), Gezundhajt s'attache à présenter (compendieusement) le cadre théorique de ses travaux, la Théorie des Opérations Énonciatives d'Antoine Culioli. Tout au long du livre, Gezundhajt souligne à quel point les adverbes en *-ment*, essentiellement d'appréciation, sont différents des adverbes simples, plus aptes à la précision objective. Certaines de ses affirmations me paraissent douteuses: la phrase 'le chat est sur la table' est non seulement 'grammaticalement correcte' (29), mais en plus elle est proférée chez moi quotidiennement et sur tous les tons; il me semble également qu'on peut très bien dire 'Actuellement, je vais travailler' (57). Pareillement, l'argument étymologique (5) me paraît peu convaincant. D'autres remarques sont judicieuses, mais volontairement plus catalogue raisonné – et par là même susceptible d'être pour d'autres une source de données – qu'analyse, le livre de Gezundhajt passe en revue les exemples d'adverbes relevés, s'attachant à démontrer que 'les adverbes ne sont que la trace au niveau de l'énoncé d'opérations cognitives particulières de l'énonciateur (. . .) ni complètement lexicaux ni totalement grammaticaux, ce sont plutôt des marqueurs modaux' (90).

Lue d'une traite, cette thèse remaniée est quelque peu indigeste, mais sa consultation sur des points précis, notamment sur *finale*ment, est instructive. 'Il est difficile de catégoriser les adverbes en *-ment*', dit l'auteure (la quatre de couverture l'appelle 'auteur', mais cette Canadienne utilise ce féminin p. 13), avant d'entamer un chapitre sur 'la tentation phonologique', spectrogramme à l'appui. Encore une fois, les résultats sont intéressants, mais non concluants. 'Opérations prépondérantes plutôt que (. . .) classes rigides' (331). Gezundhajt soulève des questions intéressantes, et, je dirais en anglais 'fittingly', elle termine son étude sur une question, de l'utilité de partir, non pas des traits morphologiques, mais des opérations, pour en trouver les marqueurs de toutes sortes. Assurément.

RÉFÉRENCE

Guimier, Claude (1987). *Syntaxe de l'adverbe anglais*. Lille: Presses Universitaires de Lille.

Stephen F. Noreiko
Department of French
University of Hull
Hull HU6 7RX
UK

e-mail: s.f.noreiko@french.hull.ac.uk

(Received 21 February 2001)

Groensteen, Thierry. *Système de la bande dessinée*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1999, 207 pp. 2 13 050183 4

Réjouissez-vous, amateurs de bandes dessinées! Voici en effet un livre qui vous permettra de dépoussiérer vos albums préférés pour les soumettre à une nouvelle lecture sémiologique et pragmatique. Si vous pensiez avoir extrait la dernière goutte de plaisir de ces albums, Thierry Groensteen vous convaincra du contraire en vous préparant à déterrer des richesses inespérées enfouies entre bulles et images. L'objectif de l'auteur est en effet moins de faire un exposé académique sur le sujet de la bande dessinée que de 'proposer une analyse neuve des fondements du langage de la bande dessinée'. Thierry Groensteen est directeur du Musée de la bande dessinée à Angoulême, auteur de huit livres et éditeur de onze ouvrages collectifs sur le sujet (voir son site internet: www.cnbd.fr/thierryg.index.htm).

Dans l'introduction Groensteen explique que la dispute sur ce qui constitue l'unité signifiante en bande dessinée est inutile. Selon lui la bande dessinée est 'une espèce narrative à dominante visuelle' (p. 14). Pour définir la bande dessinée, Groensteen se base sur deux principes fondateurs: le premier est celui de la solidarité iconique, le second est celui de l'arthrologie combinée à la spatio-topie. Il définit comme solidaires 'les images qui participant d'une suite, présentent la double caractéristique d'être séparées (. . .) et d'être plastiquement et sémantiquement surdéterminées par le fait même de leur coexistence *in praesentia*' (p. 21). Ces images entretiennent différentes sortes de relations (arthrologie) et se déploient dans un espace (spatio-topie).

Le livre est constitué de trois chapitres. Le premier chapitre est consacré au système spatio-topique. L'auteur y traite successivement de la prégnance de la vignette, des paramètres spatio-topiques, de l'hypercadre et de la page, de l'importance de la marge, du site, de la composition de double page, des multiples fonctions du cadre, du strip qui est un espace intermédiaire et de la bulle qui est un espace additionnel, de l'incrustation et finalement de la mise en page.

Le chapitre 2 traite de l'arthrologie restreinte, c'est-à-dire, des relations au niveau de la séquence: comment la navette du récit traverse et investit le dispositif spatio-topique, comment le dialogue entre les vignettes produit du sens. L'auteur propose ici une analyse des relations sémantiques de type linéaire.

Le chapitre 3 est consacré à l'arthrologie de la bande dessinée au niveau supérieur, celui du réseau. Il s'agit du quadrillage qui 'consiste à diviser l'espace que l'on propose d'investir en un certain nombre d'unités ou de compartiments' (p. 171) et qui précède le tressage 'qui consiste en une structuration additionnelle et remarquable qui, tenant compte du découpage de la mise en page, définit des séries à l'intérieur d'une trame séquentielle' (p. 173).

Dans la conclusion, l'auteur insiste sur la nécessité d'aborder la bande dessinée en termes de système. Elle constitue en effet 'une totalité organique, associant, selon une combinatoire complexe, des éléments, des paramètres et des procédures multiples' (p. 187).

Le dessin dans les bandes dessinées répond à cinq caractéristiques principales selon l'auteur:

- 1) l'anthropocentrisme (la case constitue l'habitable naturel du personnage représenté);
- 2) la simplification synecdochique (évacuation de tout ce qui n'est pas essentiel);
- 3) typification (simplification appliquée aux personnages, comme la houppe de Tintin);

Book Reviews

- 4) l'expressivité (étant donné le caractère discontinu de la narration en BD chaque dessin doit être le plus expressif possible au niveau du gestuel et de la mimique; il est fréquemment renforcé par des idéogrammes ou signes conventionnels comme les gouttelettes autour du visage qui soulignent l'émotion;
- 5) la convergence rhétorique (afin d'optimiser la lisibilité, tous les paramètres de l'image se renforcent et concourent à la production d'un effet unique).

Groensteen analyse également les parallélismes et les différences entre cinéma et bande dessinée. Le neuvième art est plus souple quant à la forme de ses cadres. Alors que le cadre au cinéma 'prélève', assignant des limites à la profusion du représenté, le cadre d'une vignette de bande dessinée se contente de circonscrire (p. 50). La fermeture de la vignette ne signifie en outre pas pour autant la fin du dessin. Alors que le cinéaste est préoccupé par ce qu'il doit exclure, le dessinateur lui est préoccupé par ce qu'il veut inclure dans son image. L'auteur illustre ses propos avec plusieurs extraits de bandes dessinées (Blueberry, Corentin, Jojo, Tintin . . .).

La lecture de ce livre procure un plaisir à la fois intellectuel et esthétique. L'auteur nous apprend à mieux 'lire' les bandes dessinées en faisant apparaître les ficelles. On apprécie autant la méthode utilisée que son résultat. En effet, il est clair que les grands dessinateurs de bandes dessinées sont de véritables artistes. L'admiration que j'ai pour mon compatriote Hergé n'a fait que croître après la lecture de l'analyse rapportée par Groensteen de la première planche de *Coke en stock*, qui consiste d'une série compacte tout à fait brillante et ingénieuse: l'apparition du général Alcazar dans la dernière case est précédée par trois références visuelles et autant de références verbales dans les vignettes distribuées selon un axe vertical.

Amateurs de bandes dessinées, la lecture de ce livre s'impose!

Jean-Marc Dewaele
School of Languages, Linguistics and Culture
Birkbeck College, University of London
43 Gordon Square
London WC1H 0PD
UK
e-mail: j.dewaele@bbk.ac.uk

(Received 22 November 2000)

Hindley, Alan, Langley, Frederick W., and Levy, Brian J., *Old French-English Dictionary*. Cambridge University Press, 2000, xv + 621 pp. 0 521 34564 2

Compiling a one-volume dictionary of Old French is no easy task. Conspicuous difficulties include the incomplete information available in the full-scale dictionaries, with only Gdf and the first edition of the FEW covering the whole alphabet. TL is almost there; the remarkable DEAF is invaluable for G and H, but is a long way from the end (or indeed the beginning) of the alphabet. Moreover, OF rewards the traveller with some strictly linguistic and philological pitfalls along the way. Many (if not most) words are slipperily polysemic; formal and orthographic criteria for what constitutes a word (in the sense of sense-unit) often do not work; the identification of different 'words' is an enterprise often fraught with difficulty. It is perhaps not surprising that there does not exist a useful and reliable one-volume dictionary.

So this work (henceforth OFED) could, and should, have been a valuable addition. Sadly, it is not. In an era when bilingual dictionaries of modern languages are, increasingly, corpus-based, or at least dependent on what seem to be authentic quotations, it is frankly mind-boggling that OFED should supply no quotations at all, and that it does not even indicate (as does, say, Greimas) the source of its materials. Stranger still is the fact that all this evidence does exist, in a database (pp. ix–x), but that it has been left out. Greimas at least gives textual references in abbreviated form, and a bibliography: the editors of this dictionary provide neither. As a result, other than the information that OFED arose from COFREL, a parent electronic corpus of a wide variety of (unidentified) texts (p. ix), the reader has no idea of where the words in the dictionary actually come from, no evidence that OFED's definitions are correct, and no indication of chronology. The bibliography is virtually devoid of references to modern research.

These fundamental deficiencies alone mean that this dictionary is of no use to any serious scholar in any discipline. Scholarship depends on evidence and the possibility of verifying conclusions. OFED does not supply the former and it is impossible to check the latter. It is something of a mystery how this dictionary came to get through CUP's refereeing process.

Maybe it would be fairer to judge OFED not on what is omitted, but on the material which it does contain. Here, the classic pocket-dictionary phenomenon of a plethora of glosses attached to one word, with no context to help, is all too apparent. So, for example, **forcele** (for the range of meanings with evidence, cf. Gdf 4,65c; TL 3,2069; FEW 3,894a) is given glosses which suggest that it may lie anywhere between the abdomen and the throat (for this word, cf. *Moyen Français*, 39–41, 196–7). Under **gorle**, a *locus classicus* of OF lexicography, where Gdf's (4,313c) unsuccessful attempts to define the sense of the OF word (corrected in GdfLex) notoriously led Greimas to generate two spuriously distinct meanings (cf. DEAF G1 (1974), xii; ZrPh 97 (1981), 425n.6; TL 4,450; FEW 16,103a; DEAF G6 (1989), 1015 . . .), OFED follows suit with an undifferentiated string of glosses, some of which (to judge by Gdf, TL *et al.*) it might well be hard to find quotations for. Adjectives like **grief** (to which **grife** adj.f. should probably be attached) and **gros** have so many meanings that most readers will just have to guess which applies; **tenir** is sub-divided into four verbs (v.impers., v.i., v.r., v.t. – not itself a straightforward process – and occupies a third of a column of text. There is not much hope that readers, text in hand, will be able to work out which gloss applies. Another problem is that of the order in which senses are given, since readers may well assume that some sort of priority is accorded to the first of these. Under **cautele**, OFED glosses 'caution, cautiousness, precaution; ruse, trick'. Perhaps the editors do have quantitative evidence for the preeminence of 'caution'; but the material to hand in the major dictionaries suggests that the more common sense is OFED's second, with its first ('caution') surprisingly rare (cf. GdfC 9,11a; TL 2,73; FEW 2¹,546a; the first attestation for 'caution' is for the moment from 1287 [GouvRoisGauchyM, cf. DEAFBibl 1993]). Likewise, the first meaning given for **griété**, 'difficulty', is very rare in OF: see DEAF G,1378, which can supply only five references for this meaning (limited to the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and all from texts translated from Latin) against twenty-plus with the far more common sense, OFED's second one, 'pain, illness' (cf. Gdf 4,356a; TL 4,653; FEW 4,266a; DEAF G,1378). There is a serious risk that the non-specialist reader will be at best baffled, at worst *dérouté*. In some cases this extends to privileging rare meanings and omitting

Book Reviews

others. Thus, for **chanel**², the isolated sense of ‘shin-bone’ (seemingly found only in Bibbesworth and the related *Femina*, cf. AND 89b) is all that is suggested, overlooking the more frequent (though still not common) meaning of (anat.) ‘tube’, cf. GdfC 8,418a; GdfC 9,37b **chanel**, 66c **chenel**; TL 2,215 **chanel**, largely supported by Mondeville (cf. also TLF 5,92b; FEW 2¹,170a has no OF attestations); this sense goes back to CL and is present in Med.Lat. *canalis*: OLD 263c; TLL 3,225; MltW 2,142; DMLBS 254a, etc.).

Despite its claims to be ‘a reasonably compendious and comprehensive working dictionary’ (p. ix), OFED will be of no great use either to the non-specialist or the scholar.

REFERENCES

- AND = Rothwell, W. *et al.*, *Anglo-Norman Dictionary*, London: MHRA, 1977–92.
DEAF = Baldinger, Kurt (ed.), *Dictionnaire étymologique de l’ancien français*. Tübingen/Québec/Paris: Niemeyer/Presses de l’Université Laval/Klincksieck, 1971–.
DEAFBibl 1993 = Möhren, F., *Dictionnaire étymologique de l’ancien français, Complément bibliographique 1993*. Tübingen/Québec/Paris: Niemeyer/Presses de l’Université Laval, 1993.
DMLBS = Latham, R. E. and Howlett, D. R., *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British and Irish Sources*. Oxford University Press, 1975–.
FEW = Wartburg, Walther von, *Französisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Bonn/Leipzig/Basel: Zbinden, 1922–.
Gdf = Godefroy, Frédéric, *Dictionnaire de l’ancienne langue française et de tous ses dialectes du IX^e au XV^e siècle*. Paris: Vieweg, 1880–1902.
GdfC = complément to Gdf, in vols. 8–10 inclusive of Gdf.
GdfLex = Godefroy, Frédéric, *Lexique de l’ancien français*. Paris: Champion, 1901.
MltW = Prinz, O., *et al.*, *Mittelateinisches Wörterbuch bis zum ausgehenden 13. Jahrhundert*. Munich/Berlin, Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften/Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1959–.
OLD = Glare, P. G. W., *Oxford Latin Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968–82.
TL = Tobler, A./Lommatzsch, E., *Altfranzösisches Wörterbuch*. Berlin/Wiesbaden/Stuttgart: Steiner, 1915–.
TLF = Imbs, Paul *et al.*, *Trésor de la langue française*. Paris: CNRS, 1971–94.
TLL = *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1900–.

D. A. Trotter
Department of European Languages
University of Wales Aberystwyth
Aberystwyth SY23 3DY
UK
e-mail: dtt@aber.ac.uk

(Received 1 December 2000)

Jablonka, Franz, *Frankophonie als Mythos: Variationslinguistische Untersuchungen zum Französischen und Italienischen im Aosta-Tal.* (pro lingua 28.) Wilhelmsfeld: Gottfried Egert Verlag, 1997, xi, 348 pp. 3 926972 55 6

The Aosta Valley is a small autonomous region of Italy located in the Alps and squeezed between Savoy, Valais and Piedmont, with just over 110,000 inhabitants. Unfortunately the two maps provided (p. 3 and p. 5) are so indistinct that it is virtually impossible to identify the valley at all. The region experiences 'linguistic fermentation' – languages of culture, French and Italian, as well as dialectal varieties, of Italian and German and especially Franco-Provençal, as well as imported languages, such as English and Arabic, are used. Jablonka is particularly interested in the role still played by French in the valley. The first part of the book provides an historical perspective on the linguistic situation. This constitutes an intimate history of the role of French in the area and its conflict with Italian, until the twentieth century is reached, when the treatment of the fascist period seems rather problematical – resistance to Italianisation is mentioned, but little indication is provided of the degree to which attempts to undermine the French language were made – a whole generation was actively discouraged from using French, with obvious serious repercussions for the passage of the language to the next generation. Jablonka shows how the principal languages in competition enter into a hyperglossic relationship, with Italian as the high form, and French and Franco-Provençal together constituting the low form, with the former being higher than the latter.

The first chapter in the methodological section outlines the model of linguistic variation adopted for the study as a whole and the various vertical levels which need to be examined. The second chapter presents the fieldwork and the informants used. Only sixteen informants are actually interviewed, mainly drawn from three families – in statistical terms this provides a very limited basis for the investigation. In fact no statistical survey is attempted, which prevents a sense of the strength of feeling from being obtained. One wonders about the validity of isolated, uncontrolled statements from informants. The selection seems to have been made in large measure thanks to advice from the *Union valdôtaine*. But how representative they are and what weight is to be attached to their evidence is not clear. Their views are interesting *per se*, but whether they can be extended to the whole of the population is far from certain. To have seen official representations from the *Union valdôtaine* would have added another useful and interesting dimension to the analysis. The questions asked of the informants are presented in an appendix and stretch over fifteen pages. Many of the ninety-seven questions are subdivided, and some, especially those asking the informant to use their imagination, are extremely long, requiring extensive answers. The questions are designed to discover the linguistic competence of the informants in the three languages, their apprehension of the pragmatics of the current synchronic situation, their geolinguistic awareness, their attitudes towards various linguistic scenarios and the main languages in contact (French, Italian and Franco-Provençal) and finally their awareness of linguistic variation within the three languages in terms of phonetics, morphosyntax, lexis, syntax and discourse. These aspects are analysed in detail in Chapters 4 to 7. It is inconvenient not to have the questions repeated in the text, or at least a summary of the longer ones, as this would avoid the necessity of having to refer back to the appendix to discover the actual terms used. Many of the answers reported in the text are highly fragmented and elliptical – Jablonka deserves to be congratulated

Book Reviews

on the interpretations offered, which often seem to be in the realms of wishful thinking!

So, what does he discover? Principally that the regional identity of the Aosta Valley is constituted linguistically; that this identity is not based on a single historical language but is the result of the interplay of the three languages in use. It is plural and differential. However, the forces at play are not static but evolving – Italian is making further and deeper inroads into the area and influencing both the French and the Franco-Provençal used there. Speakers are aware of a collective and personal identity crisis. As far as the ‘myth of Francophonía’ is concerned, it seems to amount to very little – French has a social, almost elitist function in the valley and this confers a distinctiveness upon it. Indeed the book’s title is misleading – it is the subtitle, not the main one, which forms the substance of the research. One has the feeling at the end of the analysis and discussion that little new has been discovered, that a different methodology, that a more extensive choice of informants would have provided a fuller picture of the linguistic scene in the Aosta Valley.

Malcolm Offord
Department of French
University of Nottingham
Nottingham, NG7 2RD
UK

e-mail: malcolm.offord@nottingham.ac.uk

(Received 23 March 2001)

Jaffé, Alexandra, *Ideologies in action: language politics on Corsica*. Berlin: Mouton, Walter de Gruyter. 1999, 323 pp. 3 11 01644 2/ 3 11 01645 0

The publication of this interesting study about language planning strategies advocated by Corsican activists is, given the prominence of the political situation of the island in the French media throughout the year 2000, undoubtedly timely.

The book is based to a considerable degree on Jaffé’s experiences during a fourteen-month stay on the island in the late 1980s. During that time, she learned Corsican and took part in cultural activities associated with language activism, which she observed from an ethnographic perspective. The result is an honestly presented, intelligently organised and well observed study of the various approaches of Corsican language activism, which the author subsumes under three main streams:

- resistance of separation
- resistance of reversal
- radical resistance

While some would see the value of the minorised language in its capacity to convey intimacy and expressiveness in the private sphere (resistance of separation), others would wish it to break out of the L functions imposed by an externally imposed diglossic mould and (re)claim some of the H functions from which it has been systematically and persistently excluded (reversal). Yet others would like to do away with the diglossic carcan altogether and redefine Corsican identity in bilingual and bicultural terms (radical and Jaffé’s own recommended ‘third way’).

Chapter 2 deals with the problem of defining identity common to all regionalist movements in western Europe. How can one justify a pan-regional identity from a cluster of local village identities that have been lived out in the face of an overlaid national identity? Chapter 3 deals with the historical diglossic relationships with the two dominant languages – Italian and French. Chapters 4 and 5 seek to present an overview of Corsican language activism since such movements started to emerge in Europe in the 1960s and 1970s, first assessing the ideological underpinning and second summarising the main development in language revitalisation. The delicate balancing act of seeking to maintain a separate identity while revitalising a minority language made up of considerable diversity of practice is given an interesting focus by Jaffe's recounting of her own attempts to acquire Corsican in Chapter 6 and the analysis of an island-wide spelling contest held in 1988 in Chapter 7. Chapter 8 discusses the use of Corsican in the media, explaining first the relative failure of the print media because of their reliance on literacy in (more or less) a single pan-regional form and second the relative success of theatre and radio, which may/have to be more tolerant of everyday practices such as variation within Corsican and French–Corsican code-switching and code mixing. In the concluding Chapter 9, Jaffe summarises the findings of her case study. She claims, perhaps unsurprisingly, that the Corsican case of language revitalisation is more typical than unique, more interesting by its very ordinariness as a partial but by no means clear-cut success story.

The main value of the book is in its patient unpacking of what Corsicans say about their language and the insights brought by detailed analysis of the author's own evaluation of her language learning experience and astute unravelling of discordant voices heard during the spelling contest. I cannot help but admire her declared commitment to the survival of Corsican and moderate espousal of the sociolinguistic approach to identity, basing it on ethnographic observation of current practices.

Few would disagree that such practices have come about because of the socio-cultural situation created by the implementation of mainstream ideology. Nor do two of the three main streams of activism call into question the philosophical underpinning of that ideology. Nationalists, in particular, stress the unity of Corsican and the importance of promoting its status, but within a world view that accepts, first, the congruence between linguistic, cultural and political boundaries (one language, one people, one nation) and, second, the naturalness and impermeability of such boundaries. Against this, Jaffe opposes the 'third way' of enhancing the perception of all linguistic varieties used by Corsicans. But she has done so without referring to the regional language debate raised by the Jospin government decision in 1997 to take the Council of Europe's Charter on regional and minority languages seriously by commissioning what became the Poignant report of 1998. Moreover, to have focused on the doldrums of the late 1980s during the effervescence of the late 1990s and failed to anticipate the major political breakthrough of 2000 turns a perhaps tolerable omission into a serious lacuna. Events of the year 2000 have seen the proponents of 'reversal' rewarded by the promise of a degree of autonomy for a French region hitherto unthinkable in government circles for the year 2004. While due care and attention are needed to distinguish political recognition and the possible survival of the language, Jaffe has rather underestimated the success of Corsican language activism.

Book Reviews

REFERENCES

- Délégation Générale de la Langue Française (1999). 'Rapport au Parlement sur l'application de la loi du 4 août 1994 relative à l'emploi de la langue française'. Paris: Ministère de la culture et de la communication.
- Haugen, E. (1966). 'Dialect, Language, and nation', *American Anthropologist* 68, 922–35.
- Thiers, G. (1993). Language contact and Corsican polynomia, In: J. Green and R. Posner (eds.), *Bilingualism and Linguistic Conflict in Romance*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 253–70.

Tim Pooley
Department of Language Studies
London Guildhall University
Old Castle St
London E1 7NT
UK
e-mail: pooley@lgu.ac.uk

(Received 24 January 2001)

Jensen, Frede, *A Comparative Study of Romance*. (Studies in the Humanities. Literature-Politics-Society, 46.) Bern: Peter Lang, 1999. 446 pp. 0 8204 4253 4

Given that the author has written, among his fourteen books, informative treatises on the morphology and syntax of medieval Romance languages, it is disappointing to find that this handsomely produced (and expensive) work is almost wholly confined to phonological history. It is even more disappointing to find that the picture painted of Romance linguistic history hints that nothing of much interest has happened within the discipline since the author himself was, probably, a student, some forty years ago. The bibliography does contain a few works published in the last couple of decades, but I could find no explicit references to recent research. Doubtless this reflects Jensen's disdain for such research; it does not however mean that he believes that the problems posed by the Romance data have been already resolved. On the contrary, he not infrequently states that developments are 'unclear' or 'unexplained'; he seems however to renounce attempts at further explanation, and indeed sometimes exhibits a certain impatience with such attempts.

The tone of the work is down-to-earth and plain-man practical. Although he admits indecision on some points of detail, Jensen is unshakable in his fundamental belief that a comparative study of Romance must be based on the (relative) historical unity of the 'spoken' proto-language, Vulgar Latin, which he sees as stemming from a cultural unity. Diversification results from the breakdown of the cultural unity: 'The linguistic fragmentation of *Romania* is . . . attributable to a number of factors, but the exact role of each single agent cannot be determined' (p. 26). Following the classic view that phonological attrition is the most central feature of the fragmentation, he therefore concentrates on detailing the fate of Latin sounds and clusters in seven literary languages: Rumanian, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, Catalan, Occitan and French. A few references are made to dialectal variation. He also protests, in his Preface, that 'Words are not treated merely as elements in phonological equations', but, on the whole, phonological change is seen as independent of morphology or semantics.

Journal of French Language Studies

The first fifty-seven pages of the book are devoted to a brief survey of 'Problems, Methods and Early History'. The 'traditional' ten Romance languages are summarily characterised, and attempts at classification are discussed: though Malkiel's tone-setting (1978) article figures in the bibliography, it is not mentioned in the text, and no reference is made to recent work on dialectometry and the like, nor to Creole languages. A survey of 'Vulgar Latin' texts (with no mention of inscriptions or papyri) is followed by an inconclusive discussion of substratum and superstratum, and a cursory mention of the earliest Romance texts. 'Early history' briskly covers nineteenth and early twentieth century Romanist activity, ending, rather oddly and irrelevantly, with references to Saussurean semiotics. The importance of Romance for the historical-comparative method is stressed: only here 'the comparative method becomes truly historical', for here 'we are dealing with a scientific reality' (p. 45). Part I ends with short sections on analogy, vocabulary and semantics.

The major part of the book is a classic exposition of regular sound-changes ('spontaneous' and 'conditioned'), set out in tabular form, with commentaries on individual words that call for special explanation. The indices list these words. Traditional orthography is supplemented by diacritics. No attempt is made at explanation of most changes: for instance, it is merely stated that French diphthongises tonic vowels in free syllables (e.g. p. 71), but the process involved is not discussed. Similarly, we are told that French vowel nasalisation was 'precarious' (p. 104), and that in some positions (after 'an inceptive move') it was 'soon abandoned' (p. 105). Jensen likewise avoids speculation on how French goes to the 'extreme' in 'eliminating' most final vowels (p. 130). or, uniquely, palatalises K+A (p. 165 – though he does mention the divergent Picard development).

French specialists will look in vain for information on phonological history that would improve on that provided by Pope (1934). Nor does the listing of parallel developments in the other literary Romance languages add to our understanding of why and how French fits into the comparative picture. This may be because Jensen himself believes that the only thing that the Romance languages have in common is their origin. He is wary of generalisation and accepts the idea of regularity of sound-change only, perhaps, in so far as it has 'led to a more accurate knowledge of the processes' (p. 45). But he himself shows a lack of curiosity about these processes and their phonetic motivation, or perhaps he despairs of the possibility of explanation and believes we should confine ourselves to bare statement of (stylised) 'facts'.

REFERENCES

- Malkiel, Y. (1978). The classification of Romance languages. *Romance Philology*, 31, 467–500.
Pope, M. K. (1934). *From Latin to Modern French with Especial Consideration of Anglo-Norman. Phonology and Morphology*. Manchester University Press.

Rebecca Posner,
St Hugh's College
Oxford OX2 6LE
UK
e-mail:rebp@ermine.ox.ac.uk

(Received 28 March 2001)

Book Reviews

Kielhöfer, Bernd, *Französische Kindersprache*. (Stauffenburg Einführungen). Tübingen: Stauffenburg Verlag, 1997, 173 pp. 3 86057 273 3

This is as compact and clear a digest and synthesis of studies on the acquisition of language by French children as one could wish to meet. It forms part of a series of introductory books on linguistic, literary and media matters and, if it is a typical exemplar, augurs well for the series as a whole. It traces the development of language in French children from the beginnings through until age thirteen or fourteen and draws on major and less well known studies of the subject. By dealing with the written form as well as the spoken and continuing to chart developments into the teen years, it takes us much further into language acquisition than is normally the case. Its strength lies in its systematic treatment of topics, its clear and informative documentation, its balance between discussion and illustration. Each chapter ends with a number of exercises for the reader to indulge in, based on the issues raised there. These exercises emerge as the weak point of the book – they turn out to be much of a muchness and to expect very similar responses in most cases; this comes as rather a disappointment after the variety of material available on a particular stage of development demonstrated in the actual chapter.

In the first two chapters the scene is set – in the first the position of the study of children's language in language studies in general: the variability and instability of the phenomenon and the types of questions which the book seeks to answer are established. The second chapter looks at the prerequisites and conditions for the study – the nature versus nurture dilemma and internal and external factors acting upon the child. The nuts and bolts begin to be delivered in Chapter 3 and continue through the next nine chapters. The progression of the chapters matches the child's language acquisition as far as it is possible to separate out the various aspects of the process. Consequently, the first chapter focuses on the development of the child's vocal capacity, examining the acquisition of the basic vowel and consonant sounds and their combination into syllables and words. The importance of understanding the child's cognitive processes and social motivation, learning what it can or what it wants to learn, is stressed. First words and their meanings form the basis of Chapters 5 to 7. Most adults who have had contact with children will have their own fund of stories of lexical confusions to contribute. The highly personal and idiosyncratic nature of this pre-socialisation stage – resulting from exclusive use within the family – should perhaps have been more stressed. Variability of practice and experience is at its greatest here. Although many studies seem to be based upon the practice of a single, individual child (we become very familiar with Valentine), the features highlighted normally have universal application. Words to do with animals and toilet matters loom large in this early vocabulary. Morphology and syntax are covered in the next two chapters. The topics include the production of two- and three-word sentences, the formation of questions, commands and statements, the establishment of paradigms, syntactic relationships, the search for rules, construction of subordinate clauses, control of morphological variation (gender, number matters). Although the role of parents in correcting children's mistakes is mentioned, it should perhaps receive more prominence as a powerful factor in assuring the internalising of standard syntactic patterns. Story-telling, either initiated by the child itself or inspired by pictures, is the theme of the tenth chapter. Chapter 11 returns to the syntactic theme, namely the development and treatment of tenses. The final chapter deals briefly with the development of the written language, both physically and intellectually.

Journal of French Language Studies

Generally speaking the documentation is excellent, but on a few occasions one could wish for more illustration – the number of vocabulary items a child assimilates at certain stages is well known, but what they are and if they are the same in the various studies carried out on that aspect of acquisition is not revealed. It would also be refreshing to see a few ‘new’ examples (leaving ‘garçon/cochon’ out of the frame for once!). One could amuse oneself for a few hours producing a chart plotting age against linguistic feature acquired derived from material in the book. There are the beginnings of such an exercise, but it is perhaps a shame that Kielhöfer does not take the opportunity of taking it further. But these are minor criticisms of a book which provides an excellent starting point for anyone about to embark seriously upon investigating language acquisition by French children: its sociolinguistic and pedagogical aspects will undoubtedly be of great value to the beginner researcher. Not only will it save a lot of preliminary reading, but will also provide an indispensable reference tool and a critical evaluation of the state of the art.

Malcolm Offord
Department of French
University of Nottingham
Nottingham, NG7 2RD
UK
e-mail: malcolm.offord@nottingham.ac.uk

(Received 9 March 2001)

Labeau, Emmanuelle (ed.), *France-Belgique: des frères-ennemis de la langue de chez nous?* Québec: Centre international de recherche en aménagement linguistique. 2000, vi + 147 pp. 2 89219 276 5

For sociolinguists, especially those with a special interest in Belgium, this is a very welcome little book. Its nine papers are arranged in four sections covering (1) aspects of French in Belgium, (2) its interaction with its partner, Flemish, (3) attitudes to French, and (4) a section on literature. The papers were all given at a colloquium held at the University of Aston in Birmingham, UK (date not given), and the book was edited by the organiser of the colloquium (who also contributes a paper), supported by French and Belgian cultural agencies and published in Canada. The book is thus the fruit of international francophone cooperation.

The roots of the book have positive and negative effects: on the plus side, the register is pleasingly accessible, Marc Wilmet’s opening paper being a model of welcoming clarity in this respect. Also, one feels that this is a book without great pretensions: the papers are serious and well worth reading, but the feel of the book is ‘homely’, like an in-house publication by a confraternity of scholars, many of whom are living and working in the UK. On the downside, the book’s roots mean that its scope is necessarily limited – there is no paper by Michel Francard, for instance –; it also means that the papers are rather disparate in orientation and subject-matter, and finally, one must attribute the uninteresting cover and the very high number of misprints to the non-profit making vocation of the CNRAL in Quebec. I counted well over 20 misprints, *not* including gross incompetencies with regard to phonetic symbols (pp. 15 and 78), and one date given as 18930 (p. 52). I would advise putting page numbers on the first page of each paper, and running headers would be helpful too.

Book Reviews

The book portrays well the love-hate relationship that exists between francophone Belgians and standard French. Readers will have their memories refreshed regarding the specific features of Belgian French (Wilmet, Lemaire, Delforge); they will understand better the complexities that surround language choice, the practice of the Flemish family Dewaele being a good illustration of an educated family living in Flanders opting to speak *French* at home. And they will learn about the language laws that have resulted from rivalry and which prevent Francophone Belgians teaching French in Flanders and Flemish-speaking Belgians teaching Flemish in Wallonie! Might that be called shooting oneself in the foot? (See paper by J-M. Dewaele.)

The north-east tip of France, was, of course, Flemish-speaking at one time. Its particular dialect is now almost extinct, but there is renewed interest in it, perhaps rekindled by the *Charte européenne des langues régionales*. All things considered, that interest should be channelled into learning Flemish rather than the dead-end *West-Vlaams* dialect. (See paper by J-M. Trouille.)

Another sociolinguistic issue concerns the emergence of a Belgian norm: belgicisms are beginning to be judged not against the Ile de France norm, but against usage in Belgium by different social groups. The more a belgicism is associated with a poorly-educated social group, the more likely it is to be rejected by the educated group (Delforge.)

Other features of particular interest are Labeau's very useful discussion of linguistic insecurity (she goes on to look for traces of it in Masson and Pagnol); the discussion of *belgitude* in Van de Eecken's paper on Jean Muno; and above all, Piette's portrait of Fernand Crommelynck, French playwright of the nineteenth century who had family ties with Belgium and lived with a foot in each country. Crommelynck denied his Belgian links at the time, yet Piette shows how his work is infused with the Flemish simultaneous preoccupation with both realism *and* mysticism, as can be sensed in paintings by Breughel or Bosch.

The book finishes with a study of the links between Mallarmé and several Belgian poets, among them Rodenbach.

The last word will go to Piette's insight (p. 134) that Belgians suffer from a sort of inferiority complex (and we have learnt from Delforge that this may well now be self-generated and self-perpetuated), but that the French are equally to be pitied (it is implied) because they suffer from a superiority complex. Books like this help people to see how damaging and unnecessary such prejudice can be.

Penny Sewell
Department of French
School of Languages, Linguistics and Culture
Birkbeck College
University of London
43 Gordon Square
London WC1H 0PD
UK
e-mail: p.sewell@bbk.ac.uk

(Received 7 September 2000)

Mellet, Sylvie and Vuillaume, Marcel (eds), *Le Style indirect libre et ses contextes*. (Cahiers Chronos, 5.) Amsterdam/Atlanta, GA: Rodopi, 2000, iii + 130 pp. 90 420 0660 9

Cet excellent petit ouvrage nous montre que tout n'avait pas encore été dit sur le style indirect libre, une catégorie du discours rapporté que les linguistes et stylisticiens ont 'découverte' vers la fin du dix-neuvième siècle en tant que procédé littéraire employé par des écrivains comme Flaubert et Zola, mais qui a sans doute toujours existé quoique sous bien d'autres formes et dans bien d'autres contextes (dont celui de la langue parlée). Justement, c'est sur les contextes du style indirect libre (SIL) que se penchent cinq des six articles qui constituent cet ouvrage tandis que le premier, celui de Laurence Rosier, situe le SIL dans la perspective de l'étude du discours rapporté en général. Il s'agit là d'une synthèse de son livre récent *Le discours rapporté. Histoire, théories, pratiques*, lecture désormais indispensable pour tous les spécialistes du discours rapporté et que les auteurs du présent ouvrage citent fréquemment.

Dans 'Les faits d'hétérogénéité énonciative dans les textes grecs et latins de l'Antiquité', Michèle Biraud et Sylvie Mellet mènent une étude en profondeur de phénomènes où il y a mise en rapport entre un discours citant et un discours cité sans que ce dernier soit enchâssé ni introduit, phénomènes qui vont de la reprise en écho au SIL proprement dit. Elles détaillent les marques de ces procédés en grec et en latin (modes et temps verbaux, adverbes modalisateurs, etc.) ainsi que leurs rôles dans les stratégies énonciatives au sein desquelles ils apparaissent.

Dans 'Le discours indirect libre. Dire et montrer: approche pragmatique', Anna Jaubert inscrit d'abord le SIL dans le champ du discours rapporté, c'est-à-dire comme un 'report de voix' (p. 51) qui *dit* un contenu propositionnel et *montre* un degré d'adhésion de l'énonciateur à ce contenu; elle le différencie ainsi des pensées rapportées et monologues intérieurs qui, selon elle, ne sont pas des phénomènes énonciatifs. Basant son analyse sur des contextes plus discursifs que narratifs (théâtre de Marivaux, dialogues dans Rabelais ou chez La Fontaine), Jaubert examine ensuite les différentes valeurs illocutoires que le SIL peut prendre ainsi que les projets énonciatifs auxquels il peut contribuer grâce à l'altérité discursive qu'il permet.

Dans 'Les Huns sont-ils entrés dans la bibliothèque?', Michel Juillard analyse des exemples de SIL en littérature anglaise en insistant sur les libertés et les subversions que ce procédé, jamais totalement codifiable, permet aux écrivains. Cet article – contrairement aux autres qui l'entourent – n'apporte pas grand-chose de nouveau à notre connaissance du SIL, et ce malgré les quelques allusions à des théories du discours rapporté anglo-saxonnes (par exemple Fludernik, Leech & Short), qui sont les bienvenues dans un ouvrage qui ne mentionne en majorité que des ouvrages écrits par des linguistes francophones.

Dans 'A propos de deux marqueurs de bivocalité', Sylvie Mellet montre que si le SIL n'a pas de marques grammaticales spécifiques, son caractère ambigu fondamental fait qu'il entretient des affinités particulières avec l'imparfait et le pronom personnel *on*. En effet, la bivocalité intrinsèque de ces deux formes en font des indices particulièrement appropriés pour signaler le SIL.

Dans 'La signalisation du style indirect libre', Marcel Vuillaume se penche sur les signaux internes et externes du SIL. Il relève les démarcateurs qui indiquent l'ouverture et la clôture des SIL ainsi que les éléments internes (expressions lexicales, pronoms anaphoriques) qui empêchent l'intégration d'un segment au récit et le signalent donc comme SIL. Il souligne aussi que, même en présence d'un minimum

Book Reviews

d'indices, le repérage du SIL s'impose généralement d'emblée au lecteur parce qu'il est le moins coûteux en termes d'efforts d'interprétation.

Deux remarques plus générales pour conclure. Tout d'abord d'un point de vue terminologique, le terme 'style indirect libre' est employé par certains auteurs et celui de 'discours indirect libre' par d'autres mais les arguments utilisés pour justifier ces différents emplois ne me paraissent pas toujours du même ordre. De plus, certains semblent considérer à la fois les paroles et les pensées comme du discours rapporté (par exemple Juillard) et d'autres uniquement les paroles (par exemple Jaubert). Ces distinctions sont très intéressantes et auraient pu être le thème d'une discussion, peut-être en introduction. Enfin, d'un point de vue méthodologique, si l'article de Biraud et Mellet ainsi que celui de Jaubert se basent sur des corpus autres que celui de la littérature des dix-neuvième et vingtième siècles, les trois autres restent extrêmement traditionnels dans leur choix d'exemples. Ceci n'ôte rien à la qualité du présent ouvrage qui vient occuper une place de choix dans l'actualité de l'étude du discours rapporté.

RÉFÉRENCES

- Fludernik, M. (1993). *The Fictions of Language and the Language of Fictions: The Linguistic Representation of Speech and Consciousness*. London: Routledge.
- Leech, G. & Short, M. (1981). *Style in Fiction, A Linguistic Introduction to English Fictional Prose*. London-New York: Longman.
- Rosier, M. (1999). *Le Discours rapporté; Histoire, théories, pratiques*. Paris-Bruxelles: De Boeck-Duculot.

Sophie Marnette
Gonville and Caius College
Trinity Street
Cambridge CB2 1TA
UK
e-mail: sm209@cus.cam.ac.uk

(Received 11 September 2000)

Mosegaard Hansen, Maj-Britt, *The Function of Discourse Particles. A study with special reference to spoken standard French*. (Pragmatics & Beyond New Series. 53.) Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1998, xii + 417 pp. 90 272 5066 9

This book is an edited version of a 1996 PhD thesis for the University of Copenhagen. It contains an extremely wide-ranging theoretical discussion of all (more and less obvious) aspects of discourse and of the function of discourse particles and their description (part 1), followed by an analysis of the French particles over four chapters (*bon* and *ben*, *eh bien*, *puis*, and *donc* and *alors*) (part 2).

Of the 363 pages of actual academic discourse, 210 are devoted to theory and 134 to the description of the six French items (introduction, conclusion and blank pages accounting for the rest). This indicates that the author has given relatively greater priority to her various theoretical considerations, which she appears to acknowledge in the conclusion (p. 361):

Although I hope of course to have made an (sic) worthwhile contribution to the description of the French language . . . , the value of the study in a larger linguistic context may . . . be said to inhere in the detail of the argument, notably in the debate with other scholars, and in the bringing together of insights from various subdisciplines, which have so far mostly been pursued in relative separation from each other.

The latter half of this assertion, relating to the bringing together of various subdisciplines of linguistics, certainly rings true. The theoretical part of the book gives a rich insight into many facets of the (largely functional) linguistic literature (also reflected in the 24-page long bibliography). In nine chapters Mosegaard Hansen critically reviews (the literature on) discourse pragmatics, particle research in general, semantic theory, the difference between spoken and written language, the definition of discourse units, discourse structure, cohesion and coherence, and research methodology. The impetus for this broad discussion largely derives from her definition of discourse markers (pp. 73–75):

. . . non-propositional linguistic items whose primary function is connective, and whose scope is variable. By ‘variable scope’ I mean that the discourse segment hosting a marker may be of almost any size or form, from an intonational pattern . . . , through subsentential utterances . . . , to a segment comprising several utterances. . . . [T]hey function as instructions from the speaker to the hearer on how to integrate the host unit into a coherent mental representation of the discourse.

The ‘debate with other scholars’ largely consists of rejecting ‘certain . . . approaches’ for not being ‘as theoretically and empirically sound as they may initially appear to be’ whilst hanging on to ‘the numerous elements of existing approaches which I have felt were truly valuable’ (p. 361). This will be viewed as healthy eclecticism by some, but others may dismiss it as unprincipled. I have no problem with it, especially given the nature of the subject matter. Particles in general display a fair amount of fuzziness, as Mosegaard Hansen acknowledges in several places, and in a number of instances her argument leads to a sensible compromise between two unattractive extremes. This is particularly clear in her defence of polysemy in chapter 4.

For her descriptive methodology Mosegaard Hansen adopts Conversation Analysis, having rejected a number of other approaches that ‘all fall within the paradigm that Levinson (1983: ch. 6) calls Discourse Analysis’ (p. 127). She characterises her methodology as ‘essentially inductive and interpretive’, and as involving ‘a continuous interplay between theory and data, such that initial hypotheses are checked out against and possibly modified by evidence in the data’ (p. 214). She claims to have ‘adhered to a principle of accountability whereby the analyses seek to be compatible with *all* the uses of a marker found in the material’ (p. 217). The analysis itself essentially consists of a detailed discussion of each particle on the basis of a number of examples. The discussion of a particular phenomenon tends to start out with a fairly categorical statement of what the relevant discourse particle ‘means’ in a particular context. Any apparent deviations from this are then explained. Unfortunately, this means that the ‘interplay between theory and data’ is often lost in the structure of the text.

The data themselves come from a set of eight corpora ‘obtained from the archives of the UFR de linguistique française of the Université de Paris (Centre Censier)’

Book Reviews

(p. 201). All examples appear in context (one or two are over half a page long) and have English translations. Their presentation is clear. I am less keen on the presentation of the twenty pages of endnotes: they make reading difficult at times, whereas footnotes would have been easier. Value is added by the inclusion of author and subject indices.

This book is clearly an eminent academic study. It is the product of painstaking research and a great deal of thought about the nature of language and linguistics. It also provides some profound insights into the workings of French discourse markers.

REFERENCE

Levinson, S. (1983) *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Roel Vismans
Language Institute
University of Hull
Cottingham Road
Hull HU6 7RX
U K
e-mail: r.m.vismans@selc.hull.ac.uk

(Received 20 October 2000)

Offord, Malcolm, 'French words. Past, present and future', (*Modern Languages in Practice*. 14.) Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2001, viii + 125 pp. 1 85359 497 0 (hbk) 1 85359 496 2 (pbk)

The title of this book indicates its purpose very clearly: a description of how the lexicon of French has been and continues to be formed, that is from the diachronic and synchronic points of view. The book is organised using 'text-bites', presumably a term evoking the graphic equivalent of the sonic 'sound-bite' that hopes to escape the latter's negative connotations. The text-bite approach, reflecting the fact that the book is aimed at the undergraduate market, means that information is organised in a very clear, analytical way into explanation or definition, examples and then exercises, using typographical devices like boxes, borders and bullet-points to demarcate the stages of the presentation.

The author starts the book where any linguist would, with the lowest unit of meaning, the morpheme, working through the textbook issues that arise in a discussion of this level. Chapter 2 moves on to the word level as such: subjects looked at are the standard difficulties associated with the definition of the word, then the lexical structure of French, including the relations of polysemy, antonymy, synonymy and hyponymy. Chapter 3, entitled 'Words with a long history', looks at the principles responsible for the evolution of Latin words into French. The chapter gives a feeling of considerable compression, appropriately perhaps since it inevitably focuses largely on Latin. Pre-Latin influences are looked at briefly, and a good deal of space is devoted to sound changes from Latin to French. This section is very dense indeed, and one feels that a more extensive selection of further reading would be welcome to back it up, if only to mollify undergraduate insecurity. As it is, only one supplementary book is given, and that a French one.

Journal of French Language Studies

Chapter 4, 'Words with a foreign origin', looks at borrowing into French over the history of the language. This chapter is very compendious in view of the book's small compass, and concludes with a useful summary and table showing the proportions of foreign-language contributions to the French lexicon. Purists will have the satisfaction of seeing their worst fears confirmed – English is responsible for 30.5% of the imports.

Chapter 5, 'Words with a short history – neologisms', examines processes of coinage currently responsible for increasing the French word stock. The undergraduate who has survived the assault-course of vowel shifts in tonic blocked syllables is likely to turn eagerly to this chapter, and indeed this is the most enjoyable part of the book, unsurprisingly in view of the lively state of the contemporary French lexicon. The author very rationally, considering the ephemeral character of much current coining, concentrates on the principles responsible for innovation and change. Even this approach is problematic, of course, given the difficulty of applying to the lexicon the sort of analysis possible in grammar and phonology. The result is inevitably sprawling and list-based, but is compensated for by the interest of the examples.

As mentioned above, unsurprisingly no doubt in a text that sets itself the task of a many-faceted description of the French lexicon in 125 pages, the book is characterised by an impression of relentless progress, of desire to get on to the next point. This is welcome where a subject lends itself to little more than straightforward description, as in the sections on morphology, but fairly fierce concentration is required for more challenging sections. This unevenness is perhaps inevitable where a standard format has been imposed.

Errors of fact or interpretation were hard to find, although I did pause over examples such as *vélo* ~ *bicyclette* put forward as illustrating 'absolute synonyms in everyday French', i.e. synonyms interchangeable in every context. Synonyms of this type in formal French seem to come more easily to mind, and indeed the author points out the example of *e caduc*, *e muet*, etc. Absolute synonymy in formal French seems easier to explain, given there is less variation across informative texts along the register dimension. An index would have been useful, especially as the table of contents indicates only chapter headings. Answers to the exercises are in the back of the book – is there no way round this perennial problem, where a teacher's book is ruled out?

More positively, this book deserves to do well in the niche into which it settles. As suggested above, the lexicon is too big a subject in all of its aspects to lend itself to a truly compendious treatment in so few pages, so that this volume will be valuable in supplementing other, bigger ones. Alternatively, the book will be useful in offering a brief, clear treatment of topics discussed in the sort of depth that seems increasingly to be regarded as suitable at undergraduate level. At the same time, the teacher who wields this book will need to be aware of the bibliography on which it depends.

Nigel Armstrong
Department of French
University of Leeds
Leeds LS2 9JT
UK
e-mail: n.r.armstrong@leeds.ac.uk

(Received 22 March 2001)

Book Reviews

Paillard, Michel, *Lexicologie contrastive anglais-français: formation des mots et construction du sens*. Paris: Ophrys, 2000, 199 pp. 2 7080 0943 5

Readers familiar with Chuquet and Paillard's admirably accessible *Approche linguistique de la traduction* (1987), which focuses primarily on grammatical parallels and differences in English and French, will welcome this complementary volume on lexis. It contrasts succinctly all key aspects of the lexicology of French and English: affixation, compounding, conversion, abbreviation of different kinds, borrowing and polysemy. Resolutely synchronic, it relegates a brief history of the lexis of English to the penultimate chapter, highlighting the consequences of past developments for the modern language. The book is aimed primarily at French-speaking students of English, but their English-speaking counterparts will find much of interest here. In particular, the ten exercises (key provided) to be found at the end of every chapter will heighten awareness of major lexical differences between the languages and encourage the skilled use of dictionaries and other lexical databases.

The author would probably make no great claim to originality, and theoretical issues are not the focus of his book. However, the first chapter (*Où s'arrête le lexique?*) clearly situates the field of study and draws attention to the problems of dealing with idiomatic language and with habitual collocations. Material presented in subsequent chapters is informed by up-to-date research and the ample bibliography will direct more linguistically-minded students to the theoretical underpinnings of the subject.

Since semantic change is such a dynamic and pervasive influence in the lexis of both languages, one regrets the perhaps necessarily cursory treatment it receives in the final chapter on polysemy. Metaphor and metonymy may be interwoven. (*Lollipop man* is given as an example of metonymy, though surely the metaphorical element is dominant here?) The book is also rather thin on the topic of register. It is true that style labels are discussed briefly, and attention is drawn to the colloquial nature of many phrasal verbs in English. However, a more explicit discussion of the stylistic patterning of near-synonyms in English would have helped students of both languages to avoid the major pitfall of inappropriate use of Latinate translations in English.

These minor reservations aside, colleagues on this side of the Channel will find Paillard's book a lucid and highly readable addition to any course focusing on the comparison of English and French.

REFERENCE

- Chuquet, H. et Paillard, M. (2000). *Approche linguistique de la traduction*. Paris: Ophrys.
Hilary Wise
Queen Mary College
University of London
London E4 1NS
UK
e-mail: h.wise@qmul.ac.uk

(Received 28 February 2001)

Journal of French Language Studies

Picone, Michael D. 1996. *Anglicisms, Neologisms and Dynamic French. (Linguisticae Investigationes: Supplementa Vol. 18.)* Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 462 + xii pp. ISSN: 0165 7569 ISBN (USA) 1 55619 258 4

In this book, Michael Picone investigates the types of linguistic constructions found in modern Metropolitan French by describing those that have appeared during a heavy expansion of neological activity during the 1980s and 1990s.

The general structure of the book is as follows: Chapter 1 provides definitions and major issues including the: 1) problem of syntactic borrowing; 2) innovations in French derivation and composition morphologies; 3) analycity vs. syntheticity controversy; and 4) aspects of the neological legacy of French. The corpus used by the author is also explained in the middle sections of Chapter 1. Chapters 2, 3 and 4 provide a very substantial and elaborate number of lexical examples of neological activity in modern French.

Listed below are the types of neologisms that are specifically described:

- 1) Integral borrowing: a new element (i.e. word, morpheme, expression) of anglo-phone confection accompanies a new entity or concept in French as the receiving language.
- 2) Semantic borrowing: an existing French element shifts in meaning or either extends or becomes restricted in meaning due to a certain level of contact with English.
- 3) Structural borrowing: French imitates an English structure by creating morpho-syntactic innovative forms.
- 4) Pseudo-Anglicism: a hybrid process by which a neologism is created by using French processes, but composed of English constituents.
- 5) Hybrid: a neologism of French creation that combines elements from different languages (e.g. from English, French, Greek or Latin).
- 6) Graphological borrowing: replication in French of a graphemic element in English or an already existing element in written French is assigned a new function in French usage due to contact with English.
- 7) Phonological borrowing: a phone or sequence of phones is introduced into French due to contact with English.

In general, the French language is often considered to tend toward analycity along the analycity–syntheticity axis. The author takes the perspective of the synthetic imperative and refers to it as a ‘dominant and unifying theme’ (p. 2) and later states that the ‘analytical profile of French militates against native compounding and derivation since these . . . are synthetic processes.’ (p. 22). A recurring theme in the book is how French seems to be softening aspects of its analytic profile and is becoming synthetic-tolerant.

The author shows that French borrowing words from English does not mean that French has borrowed an entire language, but rather that it has borrowed base or raw elements that can then be customised and implemented according to specific needs of expression in French. A significant premise of this book is that modern society and culture are subject to change in all aspects of language. In this study, borrowing from English into French is demonstrated as just one avenue in the lexical enrichment process, and that the borrowing process contains complex and hybrid internal processes.

The reasons for linguistic borrowing: the notion of linguistic economy is mentioned

Book Reviews

as a sociolinguistic factor that greatly influences changes in language and culture (p. 15). Also, it is clear that neological activity is most intense in the media, advertising and technical domains. All three of these fields, according to Picone, are 'linguistically prominent in the life of the average French person' (p. 16).

As for the corpus, the author refers to many examples in existing literature on French neology and lexical creation. This is complemented by an abundant number of documented examples from French advertising during a several-year period of time. French advertising is in fact a significant source of examples in the book. The main unsupplemented corpus was collected from 1982 to 1987, forming a corpus of 6,000 attestations found in a variety of settings and circumstances from which samples are given in this book. Short trips made by the author to France during 1987–96 and examples extracted from French media provided additional data.

The author has well documented all examples by place and date. The citations come from a wide range of documents of French media and advertising, including magazines and journals (e.g., *L'Express*, *Temps de Vivre*, *Libération*, *L'Événement*, *Le Nouvel Observateur*, *Journal français d'Amérique*, *Radio Service*, *France Musique*, *Elle*, *Paris Match*, *Photo*, *Marie-Claire*, *Enfants*, *Le Figaro*), newspapers (*Le Matin*, *Le Quotidien de Paris*, *Le Monde*, *Le Parisien*), department store and mail order catalogues (e.g., 3 Suisses, La Redoute), bank and post office advertising (e.g. Flash du Lion, La Poste, etc.), vehicle insurance advertising (e.g., Mondiale Assistance) as well as political party posters, names of hotels, street names, company names, advertising in supermarkets and in fast-food restaurants, sports information, and posters in subway stations.

This book is certainly worth the investment for anyone conducting research on language change in modern French.

Jeff Allen

Mason Integrated Technologies Ltd (MIT2)

PO Box 181015

Boston, Massachusetts 02118 USA

e-mail: mit2ceo@aol.com

(Received 16 December 2001)

Pilard, Georges, Cronin, Gearóid, Larroche, Laurence, Stevenson, Anna, *Harrap's French Shorter Dictionary*. Sixth edition, Edinburgh: Chambers Harrap, 2000, XL + 1124 + A76 + B64 + 995 pp. 0 245 60660 2

Cette nouvelle édition du *Harrap New Shorter* a été enrichie de milliers de termes nouveaux, surtout liés aux nouvelles technologies et en particulier à l'Internet. On trouvera dans le supplément un article explicatif (fort bien fait) sur celui-ci ainsi que ses différents services (avec entre autre un passage fort utile sur l'énonciation d'une adresse électronique.)

Si la présentation est toujours en deux colonnes, les pages roses sont maintenant bleues, mais surtout, des 'notes d'usage' ont fait leur apparition. Ces notes (en encadré gris) situées en bas de certains articles ont pour but 'd'identifier les faux amis et les mots qu'il est facile de confondre.' A première vue, l'idée semble intéressante, mais ces notes se révèlent en fait superflues. A-t-on besoin d'une note d'usage stipulant qu'*actuellement* est un faux ami lorsqu'on vient de lire sa traduction? Ou encore (à *property*): 'Attention, ne pas confondre avec propriété'? Si cette nouveauté a certainement sa place dans un

dictionnaire pour débutants, le *New Shorter*, même s'il vise un large public, s'adresse plutôt à des étudiants déjà accoutumés à l'usage d'un dictionnaire bilingue.

Le vocabulaire de l'Internet est présent, mais on notera de nombreuses omissions: pour les abréviations, absence de *ABD*, *ABM*, *MAD*, *MCN*, *MF*, *MFRS* (anglais-français), *EAU*, *OECE*, *OM* (français-anglais).

Aspartam, *biocarburant*, *diaboliser*, *graffiter-eur*, *télévangéliste* sont présents, mais toujours pas *biomécanique*, *bureauticien*, *connecticien*, *diothérapie*, *se ringardiser* ou *sidologue*. Nombreux anglicismes également: *best-of*, *hard* (mais pas *soft*), *rafting*, *(re)looker*. *Roadie* (anglais-français) est traduit par *roadie* mais n'est pas dans la partie français-anglais. Parmi les autres absences notables on a: *biocapteur*, *biosynthèse*, *capilliculteur*, *cardiopathie*, *phthysiologue* (français-anglais), *abetter*, *abnegate*, *microcephalic*, *microcopy* (anglais-français).

Les mots anglais à l'orthographe francisée comme *fioul*, *oueb*, *mel* sont donnés uniquement dans le sens français-anglais.

Quelques archaïsmes comme *Az* ou *FR3* sont absents (alors que ces chaînes de télévision n'ont disparu que relativement récemment); on trouve cependant toujours *PTT*.

Outre l'anglais américain ou d'Angleterre on trouve plusieurs termes australiens (*Barbie*, *bathers*, *cobbler*, *Pom* mais pas *arvo*, *evo*, *snag* ou *sanger*) et écossais (*bairn*, *dram*, *to ken*, *scunner* mais pas *danner*, *dreich*, *to haver*) dans la partie anglais-français; la partie français-anglais comporte quant à elle de nombreux canadianismes (*gosses* (dans le sens familier), *magasiner*, *planche des neiges* . . .).

Certaines traductions sont plus ou moins exactes ou complètes: *Hallowe'en* (mais pas *Halloween*) est traduit par '*veille de la Toussaint*', l'usage du terme anglais n'étant donné que comme canadianisme. *Prof* n'a pas de genre et *Noël* est donné comme nom masculin, suivi de l'exemple '*à LA N*'. A *mile* on a '*mille*' sans indication de l'équivalence dans le système métrique alors qu'à *stone* (pas traduisible) celle-ci est donnée et qu'à *ounce* on trouve la traduction et l'équivalence en grammes. *Quiiff* est traduit uniquement par *touquet*, alors que la partie français-anglais donne ce mot pour *banane* (beaucoup plus courant).

Dans le registre familier on trouve les mots en verlan les plus courants (*ripou*, *keuf*, *meuf*) ou des termes encore plus récents comme *kiffer*. Certaines traductions sont cependant incomplètes ou erronées: *craignos* n'est pas forcément *hideous*, *ça craint*: *what a pain* et un *beauf* n'est pas un *narrow minded middle class type*.

La partie grammaticale, quant à elle, laisse un peu plus à désirer. Un dictionnaire n'est pas une grammaire, et celle qui figure dans le *New Shorter* se veut probablement simple et concise, mais une affirmation comme 'L'article défini "le", "la", "les" se traduit toujours par "the"' est inacceptable. Les prononciations ne sont pas données en alphabet phonétique (pourquoi alors en donner les symboles dans le supplément?) et certaines règles sont discutables: affirmer que les noms de personnes ou d'animaux sont masculins ou féminins en fonction de leur sens est un peu hasardeux. Oui, 'the butcher' est 'le boucher' et 'the maid' est 'la bonne' mais que fait-on de la sentinelle et du professeur? Comment expliquer anguille, corneille, morue ou belette?

Malgré cela, le *Harrap New Shorter* est un dictionnaire clair et agréable à lire, qui se révèle être un ouvrage d'honnête facture, tout à fait à même de remplir sa fonction pour des étudiants (on ne saurait cependant le recommander à des traducteurs professionnels). Si la présentation est excellente, un peu plus de rigueur l'élèverait certainement au rang de favori devant ses deux principaux rivaux que sont le *Collins-Robert* et l'*Oxford-Hachette*.

Book Reviews

RÉFÉRENCE

George, K. (1992). Review of *Harrap's Shorter French and English Dictionary*. *JFLS* 2:2, 126–128.

Pierre Labarbe
Department of Language and Linguistic Science
University of York
Heslington
York YO10 5DD
UK
e-mail: pl7@york.ac.uk

(Received 26 September 2000)

Poirier, Claude (éd.), *Dictionnaire historique du français québécois*. Québec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval, 1998, ix + 640 pp. 2 7637 7557 8

This handsome volume is a very welcome addition to dictionaries of Quebec French and is the fruit of twenty-five years' work (1972–97) by the researchers and lexicographers of the *Trésor de la Langue Française au Québec*, based at Laval and directed initially by Marcel Juneau, and, since 1983, by Claude Poirier. The main body of the *DHFQ* consists of detailed, often lengthy, articles on some 660 quebecisms. These include not only items that are specific to Quebec, but also words that have one or more senses that are not current in the French of France (for example, *breuvage* meaning 'beverage', and *liqueur* in the sense of 'fizzy drink'). In addition to many terms that can be traced back to the 'French' of earlier periods, or to one or more of the dialects or regional varieties of western and central France, there is a large number of loans from English and Amerindian languages. The principal objective of the dictionary is to try to ensure that the *Québécois* themselves are better informed about the origins of quebecisms, and the originality of their variety with regard to *le français de référence*, as exemplified in the dictionaries produced in France (p. xvi).

In addition to the articles of the dictionary proper, the *DHFQ* provides an extremely informative Introduction (28 pp.), a Bibliography of sources (94 pp.) and an Index of words and phrases (17 pp.). Following the Introduction, there is a short bibliography of works related to the *TLFQ* project, a *Mode d'emploi du dictionnaire*, a list of signs, abbreviations and typographical conventions, a list of usage markers (with invaluable definitions), a section on phonetic transcription and finally seven maps of Canada and France. In contrast with most dictionaries, the *DHFQ* gives a certain amount of allophonic detail in its phonetic transcriptions: for example, the affricates that occur before the close front vowels, as in *tu* and *dire*, and the lowered close vowels in words such as *vite*, *butte* and *poule*. (Diphthongisation of lengthened vowels, however, is not represented.)

The Index at the end of the work gives a list of about 3,000 lexical items, most of which are briefly explained or mentioned in one or other of the 660 articles of the main part of the dictionary. Needless to say, by no means all quebecisms have been covered in this first edition: among the semantic fields that have received particularly detailed treatment are food and cooking, money, fauna and names of the native communities. The structure of each lexical entry has all the expected ingredients, but

Journal of French Language Studies

it is the wealth of examples and quotations that is perhaps the most striking feature of the *DHFQ*. These have been drawn from an immense array of sources, including not only literary and scientific texts, but also periodicals, archive documents, radio and TV serials and the computerised corpora of several sociolinguistic surveys. The net result is that this is not 'just' a dictionary: it is also a tremendously rich mine of information on the history and culture of Quebec.

Aidan Coveney
Department of French
University of Exeter
Exeter EX4 4QH
UK
e-mail: a.b.coveney@ex.ac.uk

(Received 1 February 2001)

Sokol, Monika, *Das Zusammenspiel der Verbalkategorien und die französischen Futura*. (Linguistische Arbeiten. 409.) Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1999, ix + 218 pp. 3 484 30409 X

This volume is concerned with the grammatical categorisation of futurity in French, and as such will be of interest to scholars concerned with tense, aspect and modality, grammaticalisation, and corpus linguistics.

The first part of the book sets out a theoretical framework. A semantic model, drawing from sources as diverse as medieval scholasticism and generative grammar, uses a terminology adapted from Reichenbach (1947) for its four level representation of the link between speech content and its formal realisation. Verbal categories are defined on a scale of stativeness and progressivity. Literature on future tenses is discussed from the point of view of aspectuality/Aktionsart, temporality and modality.

The second, and longer, part of the book has as its objective the testing of this model on futurity in French. Sokol's corpus contains literary texts (two novels from 1985 and 1992), spoken language (conversational and media corpora published in 1984 and 1988), and journalistic language (editions of *Le Monde* and *Les Echos* from July 1996). Her overall percentages for *futur simple* and *futur périphrastique* distribution are very close to those found by Sundell (1991; reviewed in *JFLS* 3.1 1993: 124–5).

After a presentation of the corpus, Sokol analyses three forms which express futurity in French, from the point of view of semantics and the grammaticalisation process, supported by statistics from the corpus. The first form analysed is *présent futur*. Sokol finds that this form is not on the increase; it is typical only of spoken language, where it tends to replace *futur simple*. It is not at all common in literature and the press.

The grammaticalisation process of *futur simple* is compared with the development of *passé composé*, and the rise of *futur antérieur*. Corpus data would suggest, surprisingly perhaps, that *futur simple* frequently requires an additional marker of futurity in the immediate co-text. Its role seems to have changed very little over time. Third person is typical of this form, and it is noted (p. 168) that this reflects a general change in the grammaticalisation of periphrases to tense markers: there tends to be a quantitative shift from first to third person. *Futur simple* is particularly common in the press, where it signals announcements.

A detailed discussion of the development of the *futur simple/périphrastique* distinction is presented. In contrast to *futur simple*, *futur périphrastique* occurs more frequently in

Book Reviews

first person singular. Furthermore, the use of *futur périphrastique* without additional markers of futurity in the co-text is more frequent in spoken than in written language. This is not surprising: adverbials and other temporal markers need to be signalled more explicitly in the written form because of the de-contextualisation of the written word. Overall, Sokol finds that there has been a synchronic generalisation of *futur périphrastique* in all semantic verb classes.

From the point of view of grammaticalisation, there has been a functional separation of forms. *Futur simple* is a perfective which is decoded as a future where the context allows; otherwise it is interpreted as gnomic, transitional or modal. *Futur antérieur* has developed as a second perfective form with epistemic modal value. *Futur périphrastique* has become an imperfective future, so an aspectual opposition has developed. In the process, it has lost its original function of present relevance, and *présent futur* has been reanalysed to mark this relevance.

This volume, which for this reviewer is at its most interesting when analysing the corpus data and discussing the grammaticalisation process, is a useful addition to the literature on futures in French.

REFERENCES

- Reichenbach, H. (1947). *Elements of symbolic logic*. New York: Macmillan.
Sundell, L.-G. (1991). *Le temps futur en français moderne*. Uppsala: Almqvist and Wiksell.
Dulcie M. Engel
Department of French
University of Wales Swansea
Singleton Park
Swansea SA2 8PP
UK
e-mail: d.engel@swansea.ac.uk

(Received 8 August 2000)

Thomsen, Christa, *Stratégies d'argumentation et de politesse dans les conversations d'affaires: la séquence de requête*. (Sciences pour la communication, 60.) Berne/Berlin/Brussels/Frankfurt-am-Main/New York/Oxford/Vienna: Peter Lang, 2000, x + 298 pp. 3 906763 56 0, ISSN 0933 6079

This book is a reworking of a doctoral thesis submitted to the Aarhus Business School by its author. It consists of an Introduction followed by sections on Linguistic Analysis of Dialogues; on the Theory and Analysis, first of Argumentation, and then of Politeness; a sample Composite Analysis and a General Conclusion. Transcription conventions and a Bibliography are provided.

The brief Introduction explains the aims, methods and corpus used, and lays out the plan of the rest of the work. In the event, there were considerable difficulties in getting any large amount of genuine recorded material, with some fifty different firms refusing access. In addition, technical problems with recordings led to the discarding of much of what was obtained. The study is effectively based on four sequences involving only French native speakers, running all told to just over fourteen and a half minutes, and two involving French native speakers talking in French with Danes, totalling four

and a half minutes. Two of the first four were actually recorded for other purposes ten years or so before the study being reported. The author recognises the disadvantages of such limited and disparate material, but feels that any common elements found in it are perhaps even more interesting because of its nature.

The second section is a useful account of two principal analytic techniques, conversational analysis and discourse analysis, drawing out both shared features and differences between the two. The modified 'Geneva' model of discourse analysis is also discussed, being seen by the author as to some extent a middle way. The approach finally adopted is a synthesis of elements of these, generally hierarchical in ways compatible with the various versions of discourse analysis, but adopting some of the linear/sequential, adjacent-pair-based, views of conversational analysis.

The third section covers one of the two main topics mentioned in the title, argumentation. Starting with its origins in rhetoric and formal logic, the author gives an overview of more recent work on the topic, principally that of Moeschler and of Jackson and Jacobs. Exemplification from the corpus proves possible for a number of argumentation strategies used in making requests.

The fourth section looks into the question of politeness, the other of the two title topics. The author notes a range of paraverbal and verbal markers for relationships. Among the first would be loudness, timbre, speed of diction, accentuation and tone of voice. The second would include forms of address and register. There are also the questions of turn-taking, topic, types of speech act and organisation of the interaction. An explanation is given of face-threatening and face-flattering acts, and exemplification of these plus the markers mentioned above is provided from the corpus. Two interesting points made are that use of English or 'Franglais' often indicates a close and friendly relationship, equivalent to one permitting 'tutoiement', and that the degree to which French native speakers tolerate interruption of turns, in particular simultaneous speech, is greater than what is seen as polite by Danes. This higher regard for turns often means that Danes have difficulty in getting the proverbial 'word in edgeways' when speaking to French interlocutors.

The fifth section is a sample composite analysis, looking at both argumentation and politeness in a transcription whose hierarchic and functional structures are analysed, in terms of both macro- and micro-structures, after a context and participants have been identified. It would have been easier to follow the reasoning if the whole transcription had been provided in a single place, rather than parts of it scattered over the whole section, especially as the macro-structural chart of subsection 5.2.1 makes reference to the line numbers of the transcription.

This book provides several useful summaries of thinking in the areas on which it concentrates, and shows laudable ingenuity in getting round the problem of a very limited corpus of recordings.

W. Steven Dodd,
Language Centre,
UCC
The National University of Ireland
Cork, Éire
e-mail: s.dodd@ucc.ie

(Received 26 March 2001)

Book Reviews

Vogeleer, Svetlana, Borillo, Andrée, Vuillaume, M. and Veters, Carl (eds), *La modalité sous tous ses aspects*. Amsterdam/Atlanta, GA: Rodopi, 1999, 353 pp. 90 420 0531 1

This volume comprises a number of articles which are meant to follow up some of those presented at the *Deuxième colloque Chronos* held in January 1997 at the Institut Libre Marie Haps (Brussels) and published under the title *Regards sur l'aspect* in 1998. There is an obvious play on words in the title since *aspect* is to be interpreted both with its everyday meaning and in its linguistic sense. There is another play on words, which only becomes obvious when reading the volume, which centres on the word *modalité*. Modality is normally thought of as giving an indication of the attitude of the speaker or writer towards what is stated (usually in terms of probability, desirability or its hypothetical or virtual nature). *Modalité*, however, is also used here to refer to the stage reached by the action, which involves concepts such as the inchoative and the progressive, usually classified under aspect in English linguistics. This enables the book to cover a much broader range of topics than could be expected from the title alone, with quite enlightening results, many of the chapters being complementary to one another. The subjects covered come under three main headings: (i) mood proper, (ii) with modal, aspectual and temporal concepts expressed by non verbal forms, and (iii) with the manner in which the lexical content of the verb influences interpretation in relation to these concepts. Although all chapters are worthy of publication, a number of them are particularly interesting from the point of view of an English academic specialising in French. There are two very interesting chapters on various aspects of the use of the conditional (cf. P. Dendale and L. Gosselin). Another starts by reexamining the morphology of the French verb in a completely different manner from the norm, which led the author to a new interpretation of the *valeurs* of the imperfect and past historic, and an explanation, in particular, of the use of the imperfect in sentences such as *trois jours plus tard il mourait*. There is a useful study of Vengler's classification in terms of stative verbs (e.g. *savoir*), verbs referring to activities (e.g. *regarder*), verbs of achievement (e.g. *gagner la course*) and verbs implying a result (e.g. *construire une maison*). Various tests using the progressive and *pendant* are suggested to try and define these categories, and how they interrelate; the end product is a tree giving their hierarchy (C. Recanati and F. Recanati). Four chapters study the complex behaviour of certain verbs. Thus Ch. Marque-Pucheu's studies of verbs such as *commencer à* (e.g. why **Jean a commencé à acheter un jean à quinze ans* is unacceptable whereas *Jean a commencé à acheter des jeans à quinze ans* is acceptable). E. Saunier examines various uses of *se mettre à* in relation to *mettre*, among others. Both chapters add up to an in-depth study of the inchoative. There are also two chapters on the verb *transformer*, one of which examines various constraints to its use (see C. Schnedecker and M. Carolles), while the other examines *transformer* and *se transformer* purely in the context of the expression of metamorphosis, which raises some very interesting problems in respect of aspect; (see G. Achard-Bayle).

The other chapters, which may be of less interest to many of our readers, deal with similar problems applied to different languages. Thus one deals with the expression of the future (G.R. Marschall) and the expression of time in the nominal phrase in German (A. Rousseau); and another on the English BE+ING (G. Melis). Some have a strong typological dimension, such as those on the Latin gerund (A. Christol), on the perfect and stative in Tswana (D. Creissels), and one comparing the concept of *venir de* in English, Irish, Welsh and Spanish (P. Bourdin). The chapter on the use of *ou* (P.

Journal of French Language Studies

Kreutz) refers to French, but in mainly mathematical terms and may appear rather obscure to many.

Such publications have, by definition, encyclopedic qualities in that they are not meant to be read from cover to cover but are extremely useful to consult on particular points, but unlike an encyclopedia they are not exhaustive. They often give food for thought, showing how other researchers approach similar problems. In this particular case there is one regrettable unifying factor: all chapters adopt a 'micro' approach, i.e. they study a specific phenomenon in depth and with rigour, but there is no 'macro' dimension which would lead to a more global understanding of the expression of modality in French. Looking at other languages can of course be helpful on a comparative level, but this again remains at a purely 'micro' level. In other words an interesting book, but one in which knowledge advances only in very small steps.

Anne Judge

School of Language, Law and International Studies

University of Surrey

Guildford, GU2 7 XH

UK

e-mail: a.judge@surrey.ac.uk

(Received 2 March 2001)