BOOK REVIEWS

Ayres-Bennett Wendy, Carlier Anne, Glikman Julie, Rainsford Thomas M., Siouffi Gilles, and Skupien Dekens Carine (eds), *Nouvelles voies d'accès au changement linguistique*. (Histoire et évolution du français, 4.) Paris : Classiques Garnier, 2018, 548 pp. 978 2 406 06944 7 (softcover), 978 2 406 06945 4 (hardcover) doi:10.1017/S0959269518000352

By focusing on non-literary texts in its first part, historic texts representing deliberately or incidentally spoken language in the second, and differential rates of change in the third, this collection of 25 papers presents three broadly defined new approaches to language change, mainly throughout the medieval and early modern periods. Rather than attempt to review every contribution, I have chosen to sketch in broad terms the themes of each section, making a purely personal selection for slightly more detailed discussion.

The first part brings together studies involving a variety of genres ranging from legal and diplomatic texts to sermons and private correspondence, none of which have received much attention from linguists, even though they are greatly used by scholars in other disciplines, particularly historians. Several contributions report on initial or early samplings of large, increasingly digitised corpora in an effort to show how the latter can potentially benefit future research, provided sample sizes are further extended. Laurent Balon and Pierre Larrivée (23–38), for instance, provide evidence for the striking and relatively early decrease in null-subject forms in legal texts compared to literary writing. Carine Skupien Dekens' work on a sample of Protestant sermons (69–84) shows how, over a period of 200 years (1550–1750), archaisms characteristic of Calvin's translation of the Bible (dating from 1588) are increasingly modernised, even in relatively formal speech. Making sensitive use of historical and linguistic evidence (particularly relevant regional forms), Ralph Ludwig (143–177) builds a well-argued case for a two-stage emergence of Martiniquais Creole.

The second part focuses on texts in which speech representation is either deliberate (plays, courtly novels, comic texts, language teaching manuals) or incidental (accounting records of offences sanctioned by fines). Some of the studies in this section tackle questions of pragmatics such as thanking, diffamation, and evidentiality (i.e., assertion of truthfulness), while others look at discourse markers, including interjections and parenthetical constructions (*incises*). Corinne Denoyelle's contribution (253–278) considers the pragmatics of thanking, bringing to light how significantly medieval norms differed from those of the modern era. Daniéla Capin's investigation of interjections (297–316)

shows their multi-functionality, *inter alia* as discourse markers. Gerda Hassler's study of *ja/déjà* (355–370) shows how the full range of functions of Latin *iam* (adverbial and discourse marker) was not immediately reproduced in early French texts but instead 'reacquired' over time. Amalia Rodríguez-Somolinos (335–354) shows how the use of *si vraiement com* as an expression of evidentiality shifts from the purely ritualistic in medieval prayers to a more generalised assertion of truthfulness in later centuries.

Not that grammatical issues are ignored: Gabriella Parussa (181–199) discusses left and right dislocation and the expression of future time, and Laetitia Sauwala (201–220) and Évelyne Oppermann-Marsaux (221–237) consider *ne* omission in interrogative structures in medieval and 16th century texts, respectively. One of the perhaps unsurprising overall findings that emerges is that most linguistic changes appear earlier in texts that more closely represent speech (plays as opposed to novels, verse compared to prose).

Studies in the third part deal with differential rates of changes over various time periods, ranging from two millennia to just a few years. Of the two contributions taking the long view, Olga Scrivner's study (393–411) adapts variationist techniques to chart the shift from OV dominant word order in Latin to VO dominant word order in medieval French. Béatrice Lamiroy's study (373–391) takes a cross-language perspective tracing changes in the use of the subjunctive and the development of partitive constructions from Latin to modern French, Spanish and Italian, showing that, in both cases, contemporary French usage patterns differ more from those of the parent language than the patterns observed in Spanish and Italian.

Three contributors consciously take a shorter term perspective. Jaroslav Štichauer (457–474) discusses the productivity of the lexical morphemes *-age* and *-iste*, comparing data from the 16th and 17th centuries. Two studies of contemporary writing cover, in one case, a period of a few decades and, in the other, a mere matter of about a decade, largely the 1990s. Bernard Combettes and Annie Kuyumcuyan (439–456) demonstrate the recent emergence of *dû à* as a complex preposition, as opposed to an adjective participle phrase. Gilles Siouffi, Agnès Steuckardt and Chantal Wionet (421–437) focus on what they call an incomplete change: the use of *quelque part* as a discourse marker, as opposed to an adverbial of place, showing a brief peak of frequency, at least among certain authors, only, it would seem, to fall out of favour.

The latter studies could not have been undertaken without either electronic databases or computerised corpora. But the emergence of such tools has undoubtedly also injected new vigour into the study of language *history*, as demonstrated by the rich variety of this collection, which comprises studies of interest to scholars working on the history of French, in pragmatics and in discourse analysis. Despite its considerable volume, the collection does not purport to be an overview of the field, including as it does items peripheral to the general themes, such as the study of idiolectal material. Undeniably, however, it is testament to the vigour of research in the field of language history

and, in a number of cases, to the fact that much-studied data can yet yield worthwhile insights.

Tim Pooley
London Metropolitan University
Holloway Rd
London N7 8DB
United Kingdom
timjpooley@gmail.com

Dostie Gaétane, *Synonymie et marqueurs de haut degré : sens conceptuel, sens associatif, polysémie*. (Domaines linguistiques, 10.) Paris : Classiques Garnier, 2018, 229 pp. 978 2 406 07322 2 (broché), 978 2 406 07323 9 (relié)
doi:10.1017/S0959269518000376

Les marqueurs dont traite Gaétane Dostie sont des lexèmes du français québécois de tous les jours : *beaucoup, ben, très, vraiment, tellement, plein, pas mal, super, assez, gros, foul* (souvent orthographié *full*) et *ben ben* (dans un contexte de négation). Il s'agit des douze marqueurs de haut degré les plus fréquents relevés dans le *Corpus de français parlé au Québec* (CFPQ). Un mot d'abord sur ce corpus, élaboré à l'Université de Sherbrooke sous la direction de Gaétane Dostie : il regroupe 30 sous-corpus de conversations à bâtons rompus enregistrées pendant 45 heures sur support audiovisuel, les interlocuteurs étant cognitivement et affectivement proches, et d'âge et d'origine géographique divers ; les entretiens ont été transcrits et la base de données est accessible en ligne.

L'auteure traite les douze marqueurs retenus, non comme une collection mais comme un micro-système, et son étude a pour objet moins l'expression du haut degré en tant que telle que la problématique de la synonymie et de la polysémie et, au-delà, du sens même. Concernant la sémantique, l'auteure s'appuie sur le modèle de Leech (1981), qu'elle revisite ensuite. Il est posé d'une part que la plupart des mots sont polysémiques, d'autre part que la polysémie et la synonymie sont étroitement liées. Et surtout, « ce qui est ciblé, c'est la valeur communicative d'une *lexie*, c'est-à-dire le mot pris dans une acception donnée, et non pas d'un mot (ou d'un vocable) dans sa globalité » (59). Le modèle oppose le *Sens conceptuel* d'une lexie (et ses composantes : représentationnelle, présuppositionnelle, expressive et connotative) à son *Sens associatif*, lequel prend en compte les aspects socio-pragmatiques de l'énonciation. À partir de là, l'auteure distingue quatre types théoriques de synonymie : synonymie1 (deux lexies de deux mots sont identiques au plan conceptuel) ; synonymie2 (deux lexies de deux mots sont identiques aux plans conceptuel et associatif) ; synonymie3 (toutes les lexies de deux mots sont identiques au plan conceptuel) ; et synonymie4 (toutes les lexies de deux mots sont identiques aux plans conceptuel et associatif). Dans la suite de l'ouvrage, sur cinq chapitres, les différentes lexies des marqueurs retenus vont être comparées les unes aux autres de façon détaillée et systématique. Les lexies quantifieuses sont séparées des intensives ; les unes et les autres sont rapportées aux différentes