Gosselin   Laurent, *Temporalité et modalité*. (Champs linguistiques). Brussels: De Boeck & Larcier, 2005, 254pp. 2 8011 1366 2
doi:10.1017/S0959269507003055

This book is divided into three parts, preceded by an introduction. Overall, the book is approximately two-thirds theory and one-third application of the theory. The Introduction and Part One are an excellent way of entering the domains of temporality, aspect and modality, though not for the complete novice, as some of the theoretical considerations are quite complex. Among other important elements, the preface makes clear Gosselin's stance towards the future tense as temporal rather than modal (p. 5). The introduction is an efficient review of the various (historical) perspectives on the notion of 'representation', at the end of which the author proposes his understanding of it, which forms the basis for his semantic analysis.

In the first chapter of Part One, Gosselin immediately proposes his method for symbolising temporality, effectively replacing Reichenbach's three-point system (Speech-point, Event-point and Reference-point) with a system of four intervals: the utterance interval [01,02], the process interval [B1,B2], the reference interval [I,II] and the circumstantial interval [ct1,ct2] (pp. 32–33). He then, through the use of a few examples, demonstrates how these intervals work, and how they are more precise (if somewhat weighty) than the Reichenbachian coordinates. The second chapter is where the author presents his 'sketch for a global model of modality' (p. 41). Here, he is primarily interested in defining the necessary and sufficient characteristics which can be used to describe modality, with evidence from French. Gosselin settles upon three sets of parameters for working with modality from both a linguistic and computational point of view: the *conceptual* parameters, the *functional* parameters and a *metaparameter* (p. 44). The remainder of the chapter deals with each of the nine parameters, developed in detail, which follow from the aforementioned sets, thus describing efficiently the tools for understanding his model.

Chapter 3 goes over the relations between temporality and modality, criticising the traditional view that each is separate and distinct. Gosselin convincingly shows both how this view came to be and why it is erroneous (pp. 73–78); he follows up by presenting a few epistemic models and then a section each on how the temporal and aspectual dimensions affect modality, and how the modal dimension affects time and aspect, enabling the reader to grasp fully the interconnection between these dimensions. The final chapter is shorter and mainly describes Gosselin's perspective of linguistic time, seen in terms of two arrows, each going in an opposite direction: the 'ontological point of view' of the process(es) going from future to past and the subjective perspective going from past to future, reminiscent of Guillaume's or Lakoff's views on temporality (pp. 101–102).

Part Two crystallises the author's theory, providing the necessary junction to the subsequent applications. The first chapter explains the workings of semantic calculus – taking linguistic forms as input and associating them with semantic

structures for the output; in turn, these data serve as input for a logical–pragmatic calculation from which explicit and implicit information can be extracted (p. 105). For Gosselin, the major obstacle here is 'contextual polysemy' which affects temporal, aspectual and modal markers – where 'contextual polysemy' is defined as the fact that a marker may receive various meanings in context (ibid.). Furthermore, the author points out that markers themselves are often polysemic, leading him to call this double-level polysemy (*Polysémie Contextuelle Généralisée*; p. 106), recalling current work in lexical pragmatics, to which, unfortunately, Gosselin does not refer. Regrettably, he also chooses not to use the standard semantic and pragmatic (Gricean and post-Gricean) notions in his treatment of contextual dependence. Gosselin then evokes a few problems in detail, addressing atomism (which accepts compositionality but rejects contextuality) and holism (which accepts both principles) and then moves on to his proposed model, a 'hypothetico-deductive' approach in which he adopts a modified holistic compositionality (p. 118). The final pages of this chapter deal briefly with implementing this approach for computer usage.

The second chapter restates the author's goal (to have a predictive rules system to be implemented by computer: p. 130), and raises the problem of verification and falsification of hypotheses, posits the current state of the question of temporal coherence in texts (p. 132), and proposes a way of resolving the main conflict, between linguistic and pragmatic-referential constraints (pp. 133–136), before finally turning to coherence and chronology in texts. This last section is particularly worthy of mention: it is here that final considerations of the temporal–aspectual–modal interface are addressed and that the 'reference interval' (or 'window') is re-discussed, before moving on to deal with the formal treatment of how this window, 'anaphoric by nature, sets in motion a procedure that searches, in the context, the antecedent interval with which it must coincide' (p. 142). The remaining pages exemplify this with the French *imparfait* and *passé simple*, making this chapter an effective transition from theory to practice.

Part Three comprises four chapters, each an application of the theoretical aspects from previous chapters to a specific linguistic phenomenon (common in French, but also encountered in other languages), such as the historical use of the present tense or the use of the imperfect and conditional hypothetical utterances/sentences. For scholars of French linguistics, this last section will provide, at the very least, an original take on these phenomena, and what may prove to be one of the better models for dealing with them.

Overall, Gosselin's *Temporalité et modalité* presents a well–thought-out model, obviously the fruit of the author's longstanding research in this domain: as such, it is an important work for anyone researching modality. On the downside, it must be admitted that in order to grasp fully all Gosselin discusses, familiarity with a broad range of linguistic issues is essential. However, whatever his/her level or linguistic perspective, the reader will find this a

364

rich and thought-provoking work, whether or not one accepts Gosselin's model.

Patrick Morency
Institut des Sciences du Langage et de la Communication
Université de Neuchâtel
Espace Louis-Agassiz, 1
CH-2000 Neuchâtel
Switzerland
e-mail: patrick.morency@unine.ch

Il s'agit d'un gros volume qui a pour but de permettre au lecteur de mieux comprendre les divers problèmes inhérents à l'étude du style et de la stylistique. Aussi tout n'intéressera pas forcément tout lecteur, mais tous devraient y trouver matière à réflexion. Le responsable du volume et auteur du premier chapitre, J.-M. Gouvard, distingue quatre approches.

La première consiste à analyser ce qu'est la stylistique. Aussi le premier chapitre brosse-t-il un tableau de son évolution depuis la définition du terme en 1870 en tant qu'étude des procédés d'expression propres à une même communauté linguistique. Ce sera l'approche adoptée par Bally pour qui la stylistique portera exclusivement sur les faits du langage organisés du point de vue de leur contenu émotif. Ceci est en contradiction, bien sûr, avec la définition de la stylistique comme étant l'étude de styles d'écrivains (voir Spitzer). Gouvard montre cependant comment l'influence de Saussure sur Bally fera qu'en fin de compte, Bally finira par ne plus complètement séparer 'style' et 'stylistique', ou 'langue littéraire' et 'langue commune', voyant plutôt la source de l'un dans l'autre. Mais un des problèmes qui résulte de cette position mixte qu'occupe la stylistique entre linguistique et littérature, est celui de savoir comment l'enseigner, problème que ne semble pas avoir résolu l'université. Celle-ci, selon E. Bordas, tend à en faire d'une part un exercice de rhétorique déguisée et de grammaire, et d'autre part une interrogation sur la 'langue' en général, ce qui lui semble bien insatisfaisant. Il recommande, à la place de ce mélange peu cohérent, de partir de la langue pour aller vers le style, et de dépasser l'atomisation actuelle qui lui est caractéristique à ce niveau. A. Jaubert abonde dans le même sens: elle pense qu'il faut établir la solidarité entre les traits stylistiques d'une uvre et 'les règles de l'art', en se basant sur le principe que: 'il n'y a pas de style racines en l'air'. Elle se prononce donc pour une lecture pragmatique du discours littéraire, ce qui l'amène à faire la distinction entre 'un style', 'des styles' et 'des genres'. Finalement B. Buffard-Moret clôt cette première partie avec un article fort distrayant justement sur les rapports entre les genres différents que constituent

365