French Language Studies **14** (2004), 189–208, © Cambridge University Press

Book Reviews

Baldinger, Kurt (ed.), *Dictionnaire onomasiologique de l'ancien occitan: Supplément*, fascicule 8. *Redaktion*: Nicoline Winkler; *Mitarbeiterin*: Tiana Shabafrouz. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2003. pp. 561–641. DOI 10.1017/S0959269504211747

With the publication of fascicle 8 of the *Supplément*, the dictionary continues its coverage of domestic and farm animals (Hallig-Wartburg, 1275–1333), and the remarkable representation of the trilingual reality of Southern France in an everyday semantic domain (cf. *JFLS* 11 (2001), 260–262). This is a long way removed from the preciosity of *fin'amor*, and much closer to the lexis of ordinary life. Attestations are extraordinarily copious and (if the inference is legitimate) the amount of page-space each occupies in the DAO serves as a rough index to both the quantitative distribution of seemingly competing terms, and chronological shifts regarding which word was dominant at a given time. So, for example, sub **1276 ânesse**, the evidence presented here suggests that *sauma* is earlier (1100 Occ., 1268 mlt.) than *asina* (1170 mlt., 1290 occ.), and more extensively used. In French, though, *saume* looks like a rare borrowing (1458–1490), with the more genuinely French competitor *asnesse* only found from 1552. Whilst this is not unpredictable or even all that surprising, the overwhelming preponderance of the *sauma* < SOMNA form is here comprehensively proven for the first time. The fascicle also contains a range of words pertaining to sheep, a concept which is something of a *locus classicus* of Romance lexicology (Wartburg, 1918; Möhren, 1985). **Mouton 1317** of course dominates, with seven and a half pages of quotations across all three languages but the markedly less frequent *cibornus* is also documented in Latin (1247–1428) as well as in the curious (but certainly vernacular) plural *ciborç*, as an Occitan insertion in Latin matrix documents (1262; 1281). Well represented, too, is the somewhat imprecise *animal lanutum* and *bestia lanuta* (sub **1314**). The contrast between these generic designations and the diversity of terms for 'ram' and 'ewe' is striking. Against the expected *aret* < ARIES and *belier* compete, at least sporadically, *marra*, *colhart*, *spariador*, *moto cornut*, all isolated, but nonetheless present (**1320 bélier**). In the case of **1323 brebis**, the lemma form is far from the most common, being largely pushed out by *ovela* and by *seta*, both of which are chronologically and spatially (as well as numerically) widespread in a way that *brebis* is not.

In all these entries, then, there is abundant raw data for further study, and the need to tackle words of this type by semantic field is amply demonstrated. Languages are not static: words come and go, usually under either external or internal pressure. The DAO

presents an almost unique opportunity to examine, close up, the way in which a range of denominations for the same concept can jostle for semantic space: to put this together from traditional alphabetically-ordered dictionaries (even if any existed with the range and depth of coverage of the DAO) would be well-nigh impossible. The extensive array of quotations is in itself an important linguistic resource. The precision of dating of the predominantly non-literary documents quoted in the DAO is an important element in the usefulness of the data. The DAO is what a good research-based dictionary should be: exhaustively documented, carefully organised, and above all, perhaps, the starting-point for the further exploration which it positively encourages.

REFERENCES

Möhren, F. (1985). Analyse sémantique structurale et contexte. Les dénominations du mouton dans des textes techniques. In: A. Dees (ed.), *Actes du IV^e Colloque international sur le Moyen Français (22–24 septembre 1982)*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, pp. 119–142.

Wartburg, W. von (1918). *Zur Benennung des Schafes in den romantischen Sprachen*. Berlin: Akademie (Habilitation thesis).

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

(Received 21 March 2004)

Biloa, Edmond, *La langue française au Cameroun: Analyse linguistique et didactique*. Bern, Berlin, Bruxelles, Frankfurt am Main, New York, Oxford, Vienna: Peter Lang, 2003, xi + 342 pp. 3 906769 45 3. DOI 10.1017/S0959269504221743

Detailed studies of the French spoken in francophone countries outside Europe and Canada are still relatively rare, and the subtitle of the present volume hence promises a welcome addition to the literature.

It is composed of three sections. The first, entitled *La structure du français camerounais*, begins with a brief general introduction to Cameroon and its geography, including a table of its main ethnic groups (but not, alas, a map). The second chapter, on the linguistic landscape, classifies the over 240 African languages spoken and outlines the relations between these, the two official languages (French and English), and what are termed 'langues composites', viz. Cameroon Pidgin English (or Kamtok, widely used as a lingua franca) and *camfranglais*. Chapter 3 traces the history of French in Cameroon during the colonial period and after, and contains interesting insights into French linguistic policy. The following chapter, entitled *Le français camerounais: qu'est-ce que c'est?* outlines features which differentiate Cameroonian from central French and consists largely of a listing of the criteria to be used in determining the nature of Cameroon French. Phonology and lexis are the subjects of the following two chapters. The former is not always treated as clearly as one might wish, while chapter 6 contains useful lists of Cameroonian usage, though here, as elsewhere in the work,

there are a surprising number of examples which are hardly exclusive to Cameroon, e.g. *prof, kilo*, *car*, *parigo* (pp. 114–115). Chapter 7, *La morphologie du français du Cameroun*, mainly deals with word formation (though it also touches on questions of gender) and again contains examples which could equally well figure in a description of *hexagonal* French. *Interférences morphosyntaxiques des langues camerounaises dans le français* starts with a consideration of four of the African languages in contact with French and then examines the influence which each has had on Cameroonian French.

The second section consists of *Morceaux choisis*: chapters on oral French in the Tupuri region of Northern Cameroon, on the phonetics of French in contact with Fulfulde, on the syntax of French in Northern Cameroon (currently also available in a slightly amended version on the web at www.unice.fr/ILF-CNRS/ofcaf/15/biloa.html), on the enrichment of French in the Fulfulde-speaking area, and on *camfranglais*. While the chapter on *camfranglais* contains interesting information on what appears to be largely student slang, the material in the other chapters sometimes duplicates what has already been said in previous chapters or might more usefully have been incorporated into them.

The final section, entitled *Des stratégies didactiques du français*, considers the teaching of French in primary and secondary schools in the francophone part of the country and of FLE in the anglophone University of Yaounde. Anyone looking for new pedagogic insights, particularly in the sociolinguistic framework of Cameroon, where for many of the students French will be a second rather than a foreign language, is likely to be disappointed. The methods advocated tend to be very traditional, emphasising formal grammar and proposing strategies for teaching it which seem surprising in the era of communicative language teaching (see for example the model lesson on relative pronouns on pp. 323 ss).

The Introduction lists a varied target audience, including linguists and sociolinguists, teachers, and Cameroonian students. The needs of the latter may explain the sections of the text taken up with definitions of basic linguistic concepts (though these sometimes lack illustrations of how they operate in the Cameroonian context; e.g. *acrolect*, *mesolect* and *basilect* [pp. 65–66]); they do not excuse a certain lack of scientific rigour, such as the failure to explain the methods used for gathering data, to attribute many of the (frequently rather formal and literary) examples to their sources (are they made up by the author?), or to distinguish clearly between written and oral production.

More careful copy editing and proofreading might have avoided misprints, solecisms and inconsistencies, such as the assertion that Cameroon is in the southern hemisphere just after explaining that it lies between 2° and 16° north (p. 7); reference to closed [e] as 'lâche' on p. 80 and as 'tendu' on p. 81; or discrepancies between heading, text and examples, such as on p. 81, section 8.2, or p. 186. It should also have eliminated the frequent repetitions which, together with a rather schoolmasterly style (the verb *devoir* figures prominently), make the book less than compulsive reading. One hopes that a reliable, definitive study of Cameroonian French will follow before too long.

Gertrud Aub-Buscher
Language Institute
University of Hull
Hull HU6 7RX
UK
e-mail: g.e.buscher@hull.ac.uk

(Received 1 June 2004)

Delais-Roussarie, Élisabeth, and Durand, Jacques (eds), *Corpus et variation en phonologie du français. Méthodes et analyse*. Toulouse: Presses Universitaires du Mirail, 2003, 372 pp. ISBN 2 85816 707 4; ISSN 1264 0441. DOI 10.1017/S095926950423174X

Most of this volume issues from or refers to the large-scale ongoing corpus-based linguistic survey entitled *Phonologie du Français Contemporain: usages, variétés et structures* (PFC), based in Toulouse and directed by Jacques Durand, Bernard Laks and Chantal Lyche. The book is organised in three sections entitled '*Variation et phonologie*', '*Méthodologie*' and '*Description et théorisation*'.

The first section consists of a single, substantial chapter by the three PFC directors, entitled '*Linguistique et variation: quelques réflexions sur la variation phonologique*'. It is reminiscent of Durand's (1993) publication in looking at variation in French from multiple perspectives including the theoretical, and ten years on the present chapter includes consideration of how contemporary linguistic currents like Optimality Theory (OT) can deal with variation. Put the other way round, the intention here, as stated in the preface and blurb, is to describe and analyse French phonology while taking variation into account, as opposed to looking at the language as an '*objet normé et aseptisé*' as is often the case. This Janus-faced purpose has produced a long chapter, an eighty-page conspectus covering the origins of variationist sociolinguistics, later developments like social networks, examples of the Labovian method applied to French, and then, as stated above, some discussions looking at how variation can be accommodated in theoretical perspectives. A discussion of variable rules raises again the perennial question of what status they can have for speakers or groups; this is a question that seems to have been quietly dropped by some sociolinguists, since the talk is currently rather of 'variable constraints' (cf. the difference between Chambers and Trudgill 1980 and 1998), a formulation that at least sidesteps the mentalism raised by the older term.

The five chapters in the second section of the book (chapters 2 to 6) examine various methodological issues connected with the handling of spoken language corpora. Space is lacking to describe these in much detail, but it must be said that all show an impressive level of sophistication in their handling of the subject. Chapters 2 and 3, by Delais-Roussarie, deal with issues to do with assembling, transcribing and tagging a corpus, while chapter 4 (Delais-Roussarie, Abderrahim Meqqori and Jean-Michel Tarrier) describes the use of PRAAT, a software package that allows multi-level analysis of digitised speech. Chapter 5 (Tarrier) has the self-explanatory title '*L'enregistrement et la prise de son*'. In chapter 6, Durand and Lyche provide a very full description of the PFC methodology.

Section three has four chapters: the first (chapter 7 of the book), by Douglas Walker, is entitled '*Aperçu de la langue française en Alberta (Canada)*' but describes what the author calls le *français canadien populaire*, given the high degree of similarity between the French of Alberta and that spoken in Quebec. The description is of course confined to the phonology of these varieties, and points out that we need to wait for the PFC results for an account of how the variation outlined here is distributed socially. Chapter 8, by Georgi Jetchev, is the latest in a long line of analyses of variable schwa undertaken from a theoretical syllable-based perspective. Chapter 9 (Jean-Pierre Montreuil) examines vowel length in Basse-Normandie, using PFC data among other sources and employing an OT viewpoint. Lyche in chapter 10 discusses the mid-vowel distribution in Grenoble

using PFC data. This last chapter epitomises in pure form the commitment referred to above, to theorise French phonology using variable data.

The editors remark quite rightly in their preface that assembling a corpus does not in itself imply an interesting analysis of language; for this is necessary, as already indicated, a theoretical account that symbiotically both relies on empirical data and explains it. This is the French approach that perhaps so far has been exemplified most emblematically by Encrevé's work (1988) on variable liaison. One might contrast this with the strand of development characteristic of Anglo-American sociolinguistics, where currently one often sees an emphasis on theorising language variation and change in relation to extra-linguistic issues such as gender, dialect levelling and the construction of social identity. This is possibly just because there are more changes happening in dialect patterns in the UK and US and elsewhere – the talk is of levelling, which calls for social theorising as well as linguistic. But no doubt the empirical results issuing from PFC will soon start to show comparable trends that can be thought about in similar terms.

The book is attractively laid out, and the visuals cope well with the need to show reproductions of computer displays in the descriptions of corpus-handling software in the second section. Affiliations of authors are not consistently given, although almost all can be deduced. This is valuable reading, if heterogeneous like most edited volumes, and offers tantalising glimpses of what is to come from PFC.

REFERENCES

Chambers, J. K. and Trudgill, P. (1998). *Dialectology* (second edition; first edition 1980). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Durand, J. (1993). Sociolinguistic variation and the linguist. In: Sanders, C. (ed.), *French Today. Language in its Social Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 257–285.

Encrevé, P. (1988). *La Liaison avec et sans enchaînement*. Paris: Seuil.

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

(Received 30 March 2004)

Gadet, Françoise, *La variation sociale en français*. Paris: Orphrys, 2003, 135pp. 2 7080 1048 4. DOI 10.1017/S0959269504241746

For many readers this will be the course-book that they have been waiting for: a concise and lively account of variation in French. In six chapters Françoise Gadet gives an informative and stimulating overview of the main issues surrounding this field, examining first of all concepts and definitions of variation and variety and questions of methodology. She then deals with oral–written differences, variationist description, with 'diastratic' and with 'diaphasic' variation. Occasionally a section is followed by

a brief supplementary comment ('remarque') on an example or study cited, and after each chapter there are indications for further study and further reading. At the end there are some suggested exercises, a useful glossary and a final bibliography. Although the title places this volume firmly within the field of sociolinguistics, Gadet is keen to avoid any separation – or indeed opposition – between this field and that of theoretical linguistics, her aim being rather to demonstrate that the study of variation contributes to both theories and descriptions of language. While the study is rooted in multiple examples from French, the opportunity is never lost to examine the general principles and assumptions underlying a number of approaches to variation. In particular, the author is at pains to point out that some sociolinguistic research reduces variation to a number of supposedly homogenous varieties, thus falling into a similar trap to that of the theoretical linguist who postulates one idealised form. In order to capture the fluidity and dynamism of real-life variation, her perspective is a speaker-orientated one, with the 'norm' being defined as the variety that is recognised as such by those in the speech community, even if they do not produce it themselves. Thus, Gadet lists the various classifications of inter/intra-speaker use and of diastratic approaches ('what speakers are') versus diaphasic ('what speakers are doing') in order to highlight the permeability between categories and the dynamic, multidirectional interplay between, for example, social class and register. The study of oral–written differences is prefaced by a discussion of ethnological methodologies and of problems of transcription. In the same chapter questions also arise as to the nature of linguistic 'complexity' and 'simplicity'. Chapter 3 looks at the description of variation at all levels from the phonetic to the lexical and (briefly) the discoursal. Variation according to social group is dealt with in chapters 4 and 5, with notions such as language community, linguistic market and networks coming under scrutiny, as do issues relating to the standard and educational failure. Questions around the standard and social marginalisation, as well as linguistic complexity and language contact, are revisited in the discussion of '*la langue des jeunes*'. The concept of choice, and the ever-intrusive social value judgements of the linguist, recur in the sixth chapter on register variation, which is discussed with reference to the acquisition of register by both native and non-native speakers.

All the points and examples discussed by the author throughout the book lend support to her concluding remarks which anchor the factors affecting variation within the dynamic use of a language by its speakers in a specific social context. Within the scope of a slim volume the rich complexity of language is fully evoked; the pace is brisk but throws up some very important points for further consideration. An additional strength for English, French and other readers is the drawing on a wide range of studies and references from France, Britain, the US, Germany, among others. This is a volume that will appeal to a wide readership, but which is especially appropriate to the teaching of French linguistics in higher education. Highly recommended.

Carol Sanders
Department of Linguistic and International Studies
University of Surrey
Guildford
Surrey GU2 5XH
UK
e-mail: c.sanders@surrey.ac.uk

(Received 2 April 2004)

Landick, Marie (ed.) *Le français face aux institutions*. Paris: Editions l'Harmattan, 2003, 139 pp. 2 7475 4794 9. DOI 10.1017/S0959269504251742

This interesting addition to l'Harmattan's growing and increasingly valuable sociolinguistics series *Espaces Discursifs* is presented as the proceedings of a one-day conference held at Royal Holloway in late 2000. Although a rather slight volume containing only an introduction and six chapters, its presentation of the legal and constitutional aspects of language policy is certainly useful, although largely limited to France.

The first contribution by Henriette Walter (pp. 15–23) '*Les dictionnaires du français et de l'anglais et leur évolution*' is clearly a bit of an oddity (through its cross-Channel perspective and extending the notion of 'institution' to dictionaries) in an otherwise fairly coherent volume, as well as a disappointment. Although I can well imagine that the talk was entertaining, the editor would surely not have been so lenient on such a slight and underdeveloped piece from the hand of a lesser mortal.

The most substantial contribution is Jean-Marie Pontier's '*Le français et la loi*' (pp. 25–65), which is a three-part overview of language policy in France from a lawyer's perspective. The first part deals with language laws from 1539 to 1994. The second deals with the central role of the French language in the various constitutions since the advent of the First Republic. The third part tackles the issue of the regional languages with special emphasis on events in the 1990s.

Three of the other contributions develop themes mentioned by Pontier. The lawyer-linguist husband-and-wife team of Stephen and Anne Judge develop the issue of the incompatibility of the European Charter on regional and minority languages with the French Constitution in '*Les langues minoritaires, la Charte et le facteur corse*' (pp. 67–80). The choice of the term 'minoritaires' draws attention to the dilemma of a constitution that recognises the human rights of all individual citizens but not of sub-national groupings. One can only agree with the Judges' evaluation of the Corsican factor that the special status accorded to Corsica and its language in the Matignon agreements of 2000 opens up a breach in the constitutional edifice, since these proposals appear to reward violence and slap down regionalists who work through democratic means, setting a dangerous (or ground-breaking) precedent for other regions.

Emmanuelle Labeau's contribution '*Le français en Belgique: l'union fait la force?*' (pp. 81–93) provides an excellent and succinct exposé of linguistic factors in the Belgian constitution and their importance for national (dis-)unity. The chapter draws attention to the changing role of French, which for sound historical reasons Labeau divides into three periods: 1) from the creation and recognition (by foreign powers) of the Belgian state in 1830 when French was seen as a factor in national cohesion; 2) from the late 19th century or post-World War One onwards when francophone Belgium conformed to French models in matters cultural and linguistic; 3) developments of the last decade which appear to have their roots in the Gilson laws of the 1960s abandoning flexible linguistic boundaries in favour of fixed ones. Francophone Belgians, a minority in their own country and seeing themselves as different from the French, are seeking to develop their own identity.

The two remaining chapters, which happen to be in English, complement and develop Pontier's core chapter. Firstly, Malcolm Offord's '*The Role of Private Associations*' (pp. 95–109) does a competent job in categorising the 238 non-government associations formed to promote or defend the French language. Offord is to be commended for

making what is basically a list pleasantly readable, by throwing in some astute comments, e.g. regarding the lack of overlap in terms of the aims and activities of such organisations, and the relative lack of government support they receive. This lack of support is further illustrated by Marie Landick's '*French Courts and Language Legislation*)' (pp. 111–136). Landick evaluates the practical effectiveness of the Toubon Law and the *circulaire d'application* (February 1997) on the basis of a dozen legal cases which occurred in 1997. The author selects three types of case: 1) actions brought by the state alone; 2) actions brought by the state with parallel private action by associations; 3) actions brought solely by private associations. The diminishing degree of success, particularly in category 3, is striking. Although entitled to bring civil actions against offenders, private associations are in the cases cited presented as being careless in the preparation of their briefs and ending up with having to pay punitive fines and/or damages themselves. Part of the problem, however, is that the *circulaire*, although allegedly unambiguous, is being applied in unpredictable fashion.

While one may regret that certain aspects were not further developed, particularly other country profiles to complement Labeau's chapter on Belgium, this volume is most welcome, since it provides in accessible form useful clarification for both researchers and teachers on a number of important current social and linguistic issues.

Tim Pooley
Dept of Language Studies
London Metropolitan University
Old Castle Street
London E1 7NT
UK
e-mail: pooley@lgu.ac.uk

(Received 1 March 2004)

Le Guern, Michel, *Les deux logiques du langage*. Paris: Honoré Champion, 2003, 184 pp. 2 7453 0943 9. DOI 10.1017/S0959269504261749

Il convient d'aborder cet ouvrage comme un parcours à travers un large panorama de faits langagiers, guidé par un fil conducteur: celui d'expliciter les deux logiques à l'œuvre conjointement dans le langage, la logique de la langue et la logique de la parole. C'est donc dans un cadre logique que Michel Le Guern place son ouvrage. Le propos de ce qui est présenté comme un 'modèle' est de déterminer parmi les faits étudiés quels sont ceux qui relèvent de l'une et l'autre des logiques et comment elles s'articulent. La première, que l'auteur rapporte au lexique, i.e. aux traits de substance des mots que la langue sélectionne – les sèmes –, est nommée *logique intensionnelle* (désormais LI), tandis que la seconde, relative à la prise en compte d'un référentiel discursif est nommée *logique extensionnelle* (désormais LE). On reconnaît ici la distinction avancée par Benveniste (1974) entre les 'deux modalités de sens': le mode *sémiotique* et le mode *sémantique*, qui correspondent respectivement chez Benveniste au signe saussurien pour le premier, et à la mise en action, toujours circonstancielle, de la langue par un locuteur pour le second.

La bipartition proposée par l'auteur entre LI et LE répond au souci annoncé en avant-propos de redonner au *signifié* une place que le *concept* des sciences cognitives a

quelque peu éclipsée, et à celui, maintes fois réaffirmé dans les premiers chapitres de 'ne pas confondre les mots et les choses' – que ce soit dans la pratique lexicographique ou en assimilant lexique et classes d'objets, ou encore, ce qui est posé comme équivalent, lexique et terminologie. Cette bipartition est présentée selon les deux postulats suivants (p. 20):

1. La seule logique pertinente pour la langue est la logique intensionnelle.
2. La parole fait appel aux deux logiques dans une structure hiérarchique: les unités de rang inférieur relèvent de la logique intensionnelle, les unités de rang supérieur mettent en œuvre une logique extensionnelle [...].

Dans cette perspective, il convient de déplacer la manière dont la relation entre intension et extension sont habituellement envisagées. En effet, la logique classique associe ces deux termes en les situant dans un rapport inverse. Ce rapport, pertinent pour le discours, est ici jugé inadéquat, puisqu'il ne fait pas place à la langue elle-même – le lexique –, qui possède sa logique propre, indépendamment de toute référence en discours. En outre, il est nécessaire de compléter les termes réducteurs de la logique classique, qui échoue à rendre compte des valeurs de vérité dans des univers de discours différents, par le recours à une 'logique des mondes possibles', exploitée dans l'ouvrage sous le terme 'univers de discours'.

Par une mise en balance des couples 'langue et parole', 'logique extensionnelle et logique intensionnelle', 'lexique et classes', 'lexique et terminologie', 'signifié et référence', les premiers chapitres posent, en appréhendant le lexique essentiellement par le biais du nom, les bases théoriques qui sont illustrées par des analyses dans la suite de l'ouvrage. On résumera ici en quelques lignes directrices les postulats qui ressortissent au cadre logique de l'analyse. Le nom, envisagé en LI, est rapproché de l'adjectif, dans la perspective de la *Grammaire Générale et Raisonnée* de Arnauld et Lancelot, et considéré comme un prédicat: 'il dit des propriétés, et non des substances' (p. 32). Mais le nom par lui-même est inapte à référer. Il faut pour cela que, du statut de prédicat libre en langue, il passe, associé à un quantificateur – un article –, c'est-à-dire dès le palier du syntagme, à celui de prédicat lié, en tant que rapporté à un univers de discours.

Dans la suite de l'ouvrage, l'auteur s'attache à illustrer ce passage de la LI à la LE. Un détour par les notions d'*idée principale*, d'*idée accessoire* (qu'on peut rapporter à la connotation des linguistes) et d'*idée ajoutée* – emprunté à *La Logique ou l'art de penser* de Port-Royal – est destiné à décrire la part de la LI (l'idée principale) et de la LE (l'idée ajoutée) dans l'interprétation de la signification globale d'un énoncé: selon cette répartition des rôles, l'idée ajoutée opère en associant à ce qui provient du signifié lexical la part nécessaire de 'connaissances d'univers' (chapitre 'Signifié et référence').

C'est la perspective diachronique qui apparaît globalement dans l'ouvrage comme la meilleure illustration des parts respectives des deux logiques du langage. Ainsi, le chapitre 'Sens, référence et diachronie' montre de manière éclairante, en particulier à partir d'exemples d'analyses d'*enchaînements* par Darmesteter, comment le sens (LI) et la référence (LE) d'un lexème peuvent l'un et l'autre changer, dans des temporalités différentes. En voici une des modalités: 'Dans un premier temps le mot passe d'un objet A à un objet B parce que son sens lexical *m* correspond à un caractère commun à ces deux objets. Dans un deuxième temps, le mot, tout en gardant la même référence, change de sens: il désigne le même objet, mais la propriété caractéristique par laquelle il le signifie n'est plus la même'. (pp. 49–50). Cette perspective historique est illustrée également

dans les définitions successives de la notion de phrase discutées par l'auteur (chapitre 'Sur la phrase'): d'abord 'assemblage de mots' chez Vaugelas – on dirait maintenant phraséologie, ou encore locution –, relevant donc à ce titre de la LI, elle est envisagée dès le XVIIIème siècle comme 'un ensemble de mots interprétable référentiellement', et passe alors au champ de la LE.

Dans les chapitres d'analyse qui font suite à ceux-ci, il faut souligner l'appréciable richesse des domaines abordés, parmi lesquels on citera la question de la négation, de la présupposition, celle de la référence dans l'univers de fiction, les catégories syntaxiques de l'attribut et du verbe, les modes, l'aspect et le temps (les temps: imparfait, présent, infinitif . . .). Retenons de cette dernière catégorie l'analyse 'polysémique' de l'imparfait en 'imparfait de discours' et 'imparfait de récit': leurs significations sont différentes en ceci qu'ils prennent leurs valeurs de vérité respectivement de manière externe, en référence au moment de l'énonciation, ou de manière interne au récit. L'interface entre LI et LE est présentée de manière convaincante dans plusieurs développements, parmi lesquels nous choisirons celui consacré au syntagme nominal complexe. Considérons-le à partir d'un exemple: l'auteur oppose de manière éclairante le prédicat lié *un placard de cuisine*, où l'existence d'un placard, mais non pas celle d'une cuisine est présupposée, à *un placard de la cuisine* qui présuppose cette existence. Ainsi, le premier syntagme complexe ne construit dans l'univers de discours qu'un objet de discours – une classe d'objets – (*placard de cuisine*), tandis que le second, du fait de la présence de l'article *la* qui transforme le prédicat libre *cuisine* en prédicat lié (quantifié), en construit deux: *placard* et *cuisine* (chapitre 'Termes et prédicats', pp. 81–90). Etablissant par la suite un parallèle entre le syntagme nominal et le verbe, l'auteur distingue le niveau de la LI dont relève le sens lexical du prédicat nominal ou verbal, du niveau de la LE qui fait intervenir, en insérant les prédicats dans un univers de discours, respectivement les quantificateurs pour le premier et les mode, temps et personne pour le second. Au delà de ces cas, la distinction LI/LE permet de reconsidérer plusieurs faits, dont certains sont connus: ainsi, la question logique classique de la portée de la négation est reconduite par une distinction entre négation en langue (l'antonymie) et négation proprement dite, rapportée en LE à un univers de discours. Et on relèvera une proposition pertinente de typologie de l'attribut, reposant sur des distinctions de nature (terme ou prédicat) et d'extension de l'attribut lorsqu'il s'agit d'un terme.

On retiendra également des *Deux logiques du langage* l'éclairage réciproque de l'analyse sur et par les références léguées par l'histoire de la grammaire (Beauzée, Port-Royal principalement) et la description pertinente de plusieurs figures de discours. Qu'elles soient insérées dans des chapitres qu'elles participent à enrichir – l'hypotypose dans le chapitre sur 'Le présent' permet d'expliquer l'insertion du présent, 'par excellence temps du discours', dans un registre de récit; la litote complète le chapitre sur la négation . . . – ou qu'elles fassent l'objet de développements séparés (notamment la métonymie, la métaphore, la syllepse oratoire), elles illustrent avantageusement la possible et souhaitable complémentarité entre description sémantique et description rhétorique. Ainsi dans l'analyse de la métaphore, qui apparaît comme la figure de prédilection de l'auteur, le partage des deux logiques permet à l'auteur de poser des distinctions opératoires entre la 'similitude' (la comparaison), la 'métaphore-symbole' (la métaphore proportionnelle de Aristote) et la métaphore proprement dite. Cette dernière seule relève de la LI, puisqu'elle porte sur des prédicats: elle 'ne [retient] que les traits de similarité inscrits dans la structure du lexique' (p. 151). Retenons également l'exemple de la paradiastole

(*Vos héros sont des assassins*), figure de réfutation, donc figure argumentative, qui n'agit, ni sur le signifié lexical ni sur l'identité de l'objet désigné mais dans 'l'adéquation du prédicat à l'objet' (p. 60). Les distinctions entre la syllepse et l'allégorie d'une part, entre la syllepse et le calembour d'autre part, ainsi que la comparaison entre les trois figures offrent également une application des distinctions entre LI et LE: tandis que l'allégorie relève de la LE puisqu'elle 'est fondée sur un calcul de proportionnalité entre deux séries d'objets relevant de deux univers de discours séparés' (p. 165), que le calembour, simple jeu de mots entre signifiants (*vous lavez/vous l'avez*), échappe aux deux logiques, la syllepse, en unissant deux univers de discours (LE) par le biais d'un lien métaphorique entre deux signifiés (LI), relève de l'une et l'autre des logiques.

Pourtant, l'ouvrage laisse ouvertes plusieurs questions, auxquelles les développements, souvent essentiellement orientés vers l'illustration du modèle, ne fournissent pas de réponse explicite: on s'interroge en particulier sur le statut des éléments que l'auteur nomme 'sèmes', 'propriétés' ou encore 'prédicats élémentaires', susceptibles de permettre la description des lexèmes en LI, par opposition aux 'traits de substance' qui permettraient la description des objets. La place conférée à la syntaxe est également incertaine: celle-ci relève-t-elle nécessairement de la LE, comme le dit l'auteur en parlant de 'logique extensionnelle de la syntaxe' (p. 162), et en réfutant l'opposition phrase/énoncé posée par Ducrot? Doit-on considérer que le passage à la LE intervient dès qu'il y a présence d'un déterminant? L'analyse d'un article du *Code Civil* (p. 19) comme relevant de la LE dès le palier du syntagme laisse par exemple dubitatif: dans un énoncé manifestement générique et qui, en tout état de cause, se doit de l'être par prescription de genre textuel, on a du mal à construire une quelconque interprétation référentielle. Dès lors, l'assignation à la LE d'un tel énoncé en dehors d'une situation particulière paraît problématique. On éprouve vis-à-vis de l'analyse de la métonymie ou encore de l'antonomase quelques réticences fondées sur des questionnements du même ordre. Dans des développements un peu rapides, l'auteur rapporte la première à la LE; et un type de réalisation de la seconde (le nom propre en syntagme nominal pluriel – *les Maslon, les Frilair et les Castanèdes*), rapprochée trop hâtivement de la synecdoque du nombre, est également rapporté à la LE. La part qu'on peut pourtant accorder au signifié lexical dans la réalisation de la métonymie (en particulier dans le cadre des solidarités actancielles qu'entretiennent les lexèmes 'propre' et 'tropique'), la réalisation de patrons syntaxiques récurrents pour l'antonomase inviteraient pourtant à analyser ces figures de manière plus approfondie, et conduiraient sans doute à y constater un enchevêtrement complexe des deux logiques, si tant est qu'on puisse encore les y reconnaître.

Les limites soulignées sont manifestement liées à une approche logique, qui, lorsqu'elle n'est pas suffisamment étayée par des analyses linguistiques, peut paraître réductrice. En définitive, si l'explicitation du partage des deux logiques apporte assurément des propositions appréciables sur les rapports entre langue et parole, on hésitera cependant à qualifier ces propositions de modèle.

RÉFÉRENCES

Benveniste, E. (1974). *Problèmes de linguistique générale, 2*. Paris: Gallimard coll. Tel.
Frege, G. (1971). *Écrits logiques et philosophiques*. Trad. et intr. C. Imbert. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.

Martin, R. (1983). *Pour une logique du sens*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Michelle Lecolle
ERSS (Équipe de Recherche en Syntaxe et Sémantique)
Université de Toulouse-le-Mirail
5 allées Antonio Machado
31058 Toulouse Cedex 09
France
e-mail: lecolle@univ-tlse2.fr

(Received 30 April 2004)

Marcellesi, Jean-Baptiste, Bulot, Thierry and Blanchet, Philippe, *Sociolinguistique: Épistémologie, Langues Régionales, Polynomie*. Paris: Editions l'Harmattan, 2003, 308 pp. 2 7475 3918 0. DOI 10.1017/S0959269504271745

This collection of essays by Jean-Baptiste Marcellesi, a founding father of sociolinguistics in France, is compiled by two of his collaborators, Thierry Bulot and Philippe Blanchet. The fifteen papers selected, written between 1970 and 1999, are arranged chronologically within three sections: I *Épistémologie de la sociolinguistique* (chapters 1–2); II *Langues régionales et sociolinguistique* (chapters 3–8) and III *Polynomie et sociolinguistique du corse* (chapters 9–15). Perhaps inevitably, however, there is considerable thematic overlap, particularly between sections II and III, and the editors have been unable to avoid a degree of repetition, as recurrent concepts (e.g. *polynomie, satellisation*) are defined in different papers and familiar positions are rehearsed.

The book opens with a biographical interview, in which the background and influences which inform many of the subsequent papers are exposed: Marcellesi's modest origins in Corsica, his passion for the island and its language, and a political commitment to the *Parti Communiste* dating back to 1948. Section I introduces some of the key themes of Marcellesi's work, most notably his insistence on the primacy of sociolinguistic factors in defining a language. Marcellesi goes as far as to claim, with Labov, that 'il n'y a pas de véritable *linguistique* sans *sociolinguistique* [...] de ce fait la *sociolinguistique* est la linguistique véritable' (chapter 1). This perspective is developed in section II, which considers the position of France's regional languages, and in section III, which examines the specific case of Corsican. Regional language speakers, he argues, face two opposing dangers. On the one hand, acceptance of national language hegemony (a term Marcellesi defines with care in chapter 7) implies the subordination and devaluation of those varieties. On the other hand, what he calls 'affirmation exacerbée d'identité' leads ultimately to rejection of outside influence or change, and the creation of an artificial, 'fossilized' norm which reproduces the very elitist ideology it set out to oppose. Marcellesi's preferred model is that of *polynomie*, a concept which underpins many of the papers in this collection, and of which Corsican is offered as a paradigm. In a polynomic situation, a language is defined without reference to a normative variety and speakers accept a high degree of internal variability. Central to the identification and reification of a language (*reconnaissance-naissance* in Marcellesi's terms) are the speakers themselves: Corsican became a language, he argues, because its speakers collectively rejected its status as a dialect of Italian in the original *Loi Deixonne* of 1951. Thus the traditional

conception of language as a defining element in ethnicity is reversed: a variety *becomes* a language because, as a result of shared social, political and/or economic circumstances, a group of speakers identify it as such. In the Corsican case, these circumstances included geography (Corsica's island status), and a 'communauté sociolinguistique allergique aux États italiens' (chapter 15), whose efforts, Marcellesi argues, won recognition in 1974 for Corsican among the *langues régionales* officially sanctioned under *Deixonne*.

The identification of a language, by its own speakers, as distinct from another hegemonic variety is termed *individuation*; its opposite is *satellisation*, in which subordination to such a variety is accepted. Again Marcellesi stresses that sociolinguistic criteria (a speech community's perception of its own language) rather than linguistic criteria (major structural differences between varieties) are decisive in *reconnaissance-naissance*. The linguistic features judged by speakers to be criterial may in fact be relatively minor, and include optional as well as obligatory forms, as in the tentative set of forms drawn up in chapter 10 to define *corsité linguistique*. One might legitimately question the extent to which Marcellesi's 'polynomic' model fits other regional language situations, particularly where language loyalty conflicts with a greater degree of dialectal fragmentation and reduced mutual comprehensibility (e.g. Brittany), or where a 'spontaneous' norm of whatever kind can be identified (e.g. the Basque country): indeed, Marcellesi freely accepts that Corsica is 'un cas original' (chapter 15). But experience surely bears out his contention that artificial 'hybrid' standard varieties created from fragmented dialects are unlikely to advance the cause of threatened regional languages ('*personne ne voulait d'un esperanto corse*', chapter 15), and may even hasten their demise, as demonstrated by the fortunes of standardized Breton (cf. Kuter 1989: 85).

Inevitably in a retrospective work of this kind, many of the issues addressed are not new; nor are some of the positions adopted by Marcellesi necessarily original. Few will be surprised to learn, for example, that the question of language vs dialect is an ideological rather than linguistic one, and the critique of Bernstein outlined in chapters 1 and 2 will likewise be familiar to many readers. But Marcellesi's people-centred approach to language, and his refusal to accept the hegemony of standard or national varieties are refreshing, and indeed attest to what the editors call his 'vision souple, réaliste, et profondément humaine'.

REFERENCE

Kuter, L. (1989). Breton vs French: Language and the opposition of political, economic, social and cultural values. In: Dorian, N. (ed.) *Investigating Obsolescence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 75–89.

David Hornsby
University of Kent
Canterbury
Kent CT2 7NF
UK
e-mail: D.C.Hornsby@kent.ac.uk

(Received 2 April 2004)

Salhi, Kamal (ed.), *French in and out of France* (Modern French Identities, 18). Bern: Peter Lang, 2002, 487 pp. 0 8204 5859 7. DOI 10.1017/S0959269504281741

This book comprises an introductory note from the author followed by sixteen chapters focusing on elements of the French language that have historically and linguistically linked France to other French speaking countries.

Chapter 1, by Gabrielle Parker, traces the steps that led to the creation of the concept of *la Francophonie* and its development through the various phases of French presidencies. The chapter takes a historical perspective on the period from the Fifth Republic to the present. It focuses on the cultural and linguistic diversity inherent in the formation of this 'family', genetically so distant and historically so close and successfully points to the need for France to reinforce this linguistic, but also political force, if it is to survive the linguistic onslaught coming from the English language.

The contemporary issues in French linguistic policies discussed by Anne Judge in chapter 2 are again set in a rich historical setting. This chapter explains not only how *le françien* became a 'langue nationale' but also how regional languages have remained a controversial issue for successive governments, given the ambitions of France within Europe. It seems that tolerance, as in l'Abbé Gregoire's time, is volatile. Furthermore, Anne Judge underlines in an insightful way the deep currents surrounding French policies with regard to linguistic diversity and by the same token immigration. It certainly makes for very good reading. Any scholar with a particular interest in contemporary France, the French *malaise*, minority rights, minority languages, the break-up of a country built on equality rather than freedom will find that Anne Judge highlights their poignancy.

Stephen Judge deals with the same issues but from the viewpoint of the legal status of regional and minority languages on the one hand and their threat to national stability on the other. This analysis looks at both Constitution and Charter.

Armstrong and Jamin present a study of linguistic variation in the Paris *banlieues*. Their work gives a historical viewpoint of the *banlieues* and the ironic change of destiny that sees them now influencing the mainstream to some extent. A sociolinguistic methodology is applied that requires some phonetics background on the reader's part.

Salhi and Jeanjean's work develops from an interesting historical overview of the imposition of French on some regions dating back to the 15th and 16th centuries, with particular reference to Occitania, to the defence of the French language and the introduction of the various laws aimed at curbing the growth of English.

The *Suisse romande* situation is explored by Joy Charnley, who predicts rough times ahead for Switzerland, given its linguistic complexities. The Swiss model, which was the envy of many countries for its loosely confederated cantons and its liberal approach to language, seems to be struggling with its linguistic plurality which is now perceived by Charnley to be more of a hindrance than an asset.

The issue of feminisation in Canada, as raised by Maeve Conrick, seems to be well advanced. It is perceived as another aspect of French linguistic richness thus enhancing the morphological and syntactic resources with which to implement feminisation. However, this enrichment may give rise to conflicting views between the rigid Académie Française and its loose counterparts in Belgium and Quebec (see

also Rodney Ball on feminisation). *French in the Americas* is introduced by Conrick. Although the survival of French in the Americas is precarious, it remains nonetheless assured in Quebec where it plays an active role in both the private and public domains; its continuity in the DOM and TOM remains conditional on its official status.

Brown's chapter on French in Australia indicates that despite the promotion of Asian languages in Australia's language planning, the future of French is assured by its very history. On the North African front, both Marley for Morocco and Aitsiselmi for Algeria point at some signs of divided nations struggling between those who promote French and those who promote Arabic. On the one hand, there are those who, opposed to the continued use of French, promote the process of Arabisation. On the other, there are those like Benrabah who think that language policy has favoured the Arabic-educated Algerians at the expense of the French-educated elite. Both Marley for Morocco and Aitsiselmi for Algeria succeed in pointing out the emotional loyalties that grip both parties and the fear of being seen as 'unpatriotic' that haunts the promoters of French. Nowadays, Tamazight, the language of the Berbers or *Imazighen*, contributes another dimension to the linguistic complexities that are gripping Algeria. Sayah presents the Tunisian problem as less intense. This is due to the fact that after gaining independence, Algeria promoted Arabic with tenacity, particularly under Boumediene's regime which aimed at divorcing it from its French past. In contrast, the Tunisian President Bourguiba was one of the promoters of *la Francophonie* and one could say that here French was accepted as a 'butin de guerre'.

Finally, Badrawi's study of 'French in Egypt, Syria and Lebanon' sheds light on France's historical link with these countries dating back to the thirteenth century. It points out how linguistic orientations were driven by the political agendas of the colonial forces and how the rival languages English and French were in a perpetual battle for supremacy among the indigenous population in these countries. The historical background and fascinating statistics make for good reading in this chapter.

'French in and out of France' is a substantial addition to the literature on the French language. It represents a considerable step towards understanding not only the position of French in the world but also the dilemma some nations have inherited as a result of France's ambition to promote, and in some cases to impose, its language within other nations. While some of the chapters reiterate the same fundamental data, their complementary approach is illuminating. This book has been edited with a clear vision and provides a broad, comprehensive study of the French language in France and in the French-speaking world.

C. Belkacemi
Department of Languages
Manchester Metropolitan University
Mabel Tylecote Building
Cavendish Street
Manchester M15 6BG
UK
e-mail: c.belkacemi@mmu.ac.uk

(Received 13 October 2003)

Stempel, Wolf-Dieter, Kraus, Claudia, Peter, Renate and Tausend, Monika (eds), *Dictionnaire de l'occitan médiéval. DOM*. Ouvrage entrepris par Helmut Stimm. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1996–. Fascicule 1: **a** – **acceptar**, (1996); fascicule 2: **acceptat** – **adenan** (1999); fascicule 3: **adenan** – **afermat** (2001); fascicule 4: **afermetat** – **agreable** (2003), ix + 320 pp. Supplément 1 (1997), vii + 157 pp. 3 484 50509 5. DOI 10.1017/S0959269504291748

Occitan lexicography is on the march. After too many decades of having to rely on Raynouard and Levy, an *embarras de richesses* is emerging in the form, first, of the Heidelberg-based DAO/DAG (see *JFLS*, 11 (2001), 260–262) and now, the DOM from Munich. The history of the DOM goes back to Appel and then Stimm: first conceived of as a supplement to the Levy *Supplementwörterbuch*, under Helmut Stimm's direction it evolved towards its present autonomous dictionary status.

Already published are fascs 1–4 and a first [bibliographical] supplement which is fast becoming out of date as a guide both to Occitan texts (e.g. AlbucE is missing) and to the DOM's own abbreviation/siglum system (e.g. AND is absent though cited from fasc. 2 onwards). But this, presumably, is a matter of time, and something which a second supplement will correct. (*Avis aux éditeurs*: put the bibliography on line, as for the DEAF: http://www.rzuser.uni-heidelberg.de/~dx9/deaf.htm).

Whilst the DOM – unlike the onomasiological DAO/DAG – is in most respects a conventional, high-quality, dictionary, there are some features which call for comment. It is stated (1, vii) that it is 'informatisé', i.e. that the core data exist in an unspecified database. One question might be whether access may become available. Secondly, by and large the DOM has no quotations. What it does provide is very precise citations of sources; but how many users will have at their disposal the specialized library which is required if the quotations are to be sought? In this respect, the DOM is a map, not an image, of the language. Thirdly, in an interesting development, the available sources for a given word or sense are classified as one of T (troubadours), L (other literary texts), D (documents). In the absence of a mass of direct quotations, then, it is at least possible to get an (unquantified) idea of the range of text-type within which a given word or sense was prevalent. Any extension beyond the troubadour register is of course to be welcomed and in this respect, the DOM bibliography is very encouraging. A vast array of non-literary documents complements the better-known troubadour canon and ensures that the DOM offers a real attempt at comprehensive coverage. (Within the listings, aspiring editors please note numerous unedited, non-literary texts in need of attention . . .). Fourthly, and this is less satisfactory, editorial policy has been to comb glossaries, scholarly articles, and linguistic studies, rather than the texts themselves. In the light of the notorious inadequacies of a worrying proportion of 'critical editions', and especially given the total absence of any attempt at glossaries in any non-literary text prepared by (say) a historian, this is a disturbing, if inescapable, restriction. (Inescapable because, despite DFG support, the DOM has always struggled for money). But what it probably means is that despite the bibliography, much of the non-literary material will not have been gone through, or assimilated, to any great extent.

With these provisos, though, the DOM so far is most impressive and will clearly be the indispensable complement to the existing lexicographical resources for Occitan. The bibliography and the dictionary itself are convincing and patently scholarly. Substantial discussions incorporated in very many of the entries (e.g. *abassaz, ablome, acotar, afrest,*

agradar . . .) provide extensive evidence of the compilers' expertise and of the rigour and precision of the analysis. What is now needed, ideally, is for the underlying quotations themselves to be made available, perhaps in electronic format.

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

(Received 19 December 2003)

Whittaker, Sunniva, *La notion de gradation. Application aux adjectifs*. (European University Studies Series XXI, Vol. 237), Bern, Berlin, Brussels, Frankfurt, New York, Oxford, Vienna: Peter Lang: 2002, vii + 226 pp. 3 906768 17 1.
DOI 10.1017/S0959269504301742

As the title of this closely-argued book indicates, the main focus of the study is on gradation rather than on adjectives *per se*, adjectives being merely a useful domain in which to examine this phenomenon. As the author notes in chapter 5, § 12, gradation is evident in the senses of other lexical categories as well (she briefly examines verbs, adverbs and nouns in this connection); but adjectives manifest it prototypically, since unlike these other categories, adjectives form a homogeneous lexical class.

The scope of the book is theoretical rather than descriptive: in chapter 5, § § 6–9, the author examines in detail four adjectives (*français, gros, intelligent* and *adorable*) since they represent four classes of adjective from the point of view of gradability. She is concerned above all with the validity of theoretical categories and distinctions (whether adjectives have reference as well as sense, the distinction between 'quality' and 'property', between 'uni-' and 'multidimensionality' within gradable adjectives, 'truth-relational' and truth-conditional approaches to their analysis, lexical vs. syntactic vs. referential gradability, sub-classifying vs. qualifying or evaluative uses of adjectives, antonyms and contraries, lexicographical descriptions of adjectives, argumentation theory and the relevance of topoï). The book is extremely clearly written, and is well argued and often incisive in its criticisms of shortcomings in the various studies presented.

There are seven chapters, flanked by an introduction and a short conclusion. Each chapter concludes with a brief summary of its main points. The first introduces the topic of gradability, defines terms and sketches several applications of the notion within (mainly cognitive) linguistics. Whittaker points out the high degree of confusion in the use and application in the literature of the terms *gradable, gradation, scalar* and *scalarity*. The second chapter contrasts two landmark studies of gradability: those of Sapir (1949) and Rivera (1990). The third is concerned with whether adjectives have reference and develops a number of relevant theoretical concepts and distinctions. Chapters 4 to 7 then each develop differentiable aspects of gradability: referential (chapter 4), syntactic (chapter 5), lexical (chapter 6) and 'argumentative' (chapter 7).

The author's main point is that gradability of adjectives is not what it appears to be, i.e. what the mainstream of truth-functional semantic and structuralist lexical-semantic descriptions takes it to be in practice: the linguistic reflection of an ontologically gradable reality, certain divisions of which are denoted by a given set of 'gradable' adjectives. But

ontological gradability does not entail the linguistic (lexical and/or syntactic) gradability of an adjective whose denotation the concept at issue represents. An immediate example is colour adjectives, which denote points or regions of an intrinsically variable colour spectrum, but which may (normally) only function to sub-classify the noun which they modify or the subject NP of which they are the predicate – even though they may well be syntactically gradable (i.e. accept degree adverbs and/or comparative and superlative forms). Conversely, ontologically non-gradable concepts may be denoted by lexically-gradable adjectives, with or without syntactic gradability.

Whittaker underlines the crucial importance of clearly distinguishing which aspect of gradability one is dealing with, since as she indicates, there are frequent confusions of levels in the literature. Granted, there exists a hard core of adjectives which are gradable in all these senses (*syntactically* via their ability to be modified by a degree adverb and to take comparative and superlative forms; *referentially* in terms of the fact that they denote a point or region on a domain susceptible of division in terms of degrees of a given property; *lexically* as a function of the sense of a given lexeme and of contrasts with those of other lexemes in the same lexical field; and *argumentatively* in that a particular lexically- or syntactically-gradable adjective may well serve to indicate a higher or lower level of argumentative force than another on a given scale of gradability). However, other types of gradable adjectives may well not possess one or other of these particular properties.

In chapter 3, the author enquires whether adjectives have reference. Though she is aware that reference is a function which only NPs (and also clauses) have in context, in terms of a speaker's intention that his/her addressee should pick out an individual or a genus, she nonetheless uses (without attribution or definition) Milner's (1976) self-contradictory term 'référence virtuelle'. Now, either reference is effectively carried out by a speaker (in cooperation with his/her addressee(s) in a particular context of utterance), or it is not. By definition, reference is what a speaker does, by using a phrase- and not group- (X′) or lexical-level category. Whittaker (p. 55) acknowledges this fact, yet she sees no contradiction in writing of the 'reference' of adjectives (a lexical-level category), nor in using Milner's inappropriate term 'référence virtuelle' in place of the more conventional – and more appropriate – term 'denotatum'. And on page 58, she manages to compound the contradiction noted, in writing of 'les référents virtuels des SN de type *substantif + adj. graduable*' (my emphasis). It is interesting to note that the author also appears to go along with the traditional categorisation of certain determiners as types of adjectives ('demonstrative', 'possessive', 'numeral': pp. 37–38) – though she does also use the term 'determiner' in this regard (p. 37); nevertheless the habitual incisively-critical attention which she focuses on so many other categorisations, distinctions and technical terms throughout the book is not targeted on this important point. It is precisely the absence of a determiner in her allegedly 'NP' example of *substantif + adj. graduable* on p. 58 which both keeps this combination from constituting an NP, and from having a 'référence actuelle', to use Milner's (1976) complementary term here. Furthermore, on pages 45 and 105 and elsewhere, the author writes of 'la référence des substantifs', i.e. (common) nouns, a lexical and not phrasal category. And yet she argues elsewhere (and rightly so) that the sense, denotation and behaviour of adjectives cannot be properly characterised without taking into account their syntagmatic, phrasal dimension – in particular, the semantic nature of the noun (-phrase) with which they are in construction. This is particularly important in the case of gradable adjectives. The point is also made on p. 163, where the author claims that

'Seule une analyse qui tiendrait compte de la nature des substantifs modifiés, ainsi que d'autres facteurs collocationnels, permettrait de saisir les différences éventuelles entre ces adjectifs' (i.e. *magnifique, formidable* and *extraordinaire*). An approach to the formal description of the lexicon adopting just such a position is James Pustejovsky's *Generative Lexicon* (cf. Pustejovsky, 1995 for an accessible introduction). Whittaker would have done well to consult this work.

A related central point is that it is the way in which a given adjective 'presents' the concept which it denotes – either as a gradable or a non-gradable concept – which determines its properties. An example is 'ethnic' adjectives like *américain* or *français*. In their more basic (non-gradable) sub-classifying use, these contrast with other 'ethnic' terms: *Pierre est américain* entails that 'Pierre' is not French, Irish, German, and so on: but when used 'gradably', as when modified by a degree adverb, as in *Ce film est très américain*, then the concept denoted is presented in evaluative terms in a 'qualifying' use and may serve as a premiss in an argument (cf. chapter 7). Thus no contrast is implied with 'Frenchness', 'Germanness', etc., but rather a particular connotation (Whittaker says 'sense') is evoked in culturally-loaded terms depending on the interlocutor's conception of 'Americanness' in relation to films.

Chapter 4, on referential gradation, is very effective. Whittaker shows convincingly the limits of both truth-functional and 'truth-relational' (i.e. standard structuralist accounts of the lexicon in purely system-internal terms) approaches to meaning relations between adjectives (antonymy and entailment relations between sentences with a member of pairs of adjectives in predicate position). Truth-functional approaches, which purport to characterise a lexeme's sense in terms of the conditions it places on the truth of a sentence in relation to a state of affairs in some world, are unable to predict the entailment or contradiction relations holding between sentences containing 'multidimensional' or 'bipolar' gradable adjectives, precisely because the pair of contrary adjectives concerned does not exhaust a given semantic zone (for example *Pierre est grand* and *Pierre est petit*). First of all, the conjunction *Pierre n'est ni grand ni petit* is not a contradiction (since with these two multidimensional adjectives, there is a middle zone where neither property necessarily holds); and second, *Pierre est grand et petit* does not result in a contradiction (unlike the complementary antonyms *vivant* and *mort*, as conjoined thus: ! *Pierre est ni vivant ni mort*). The first conjunction is semantically well-formed, according to Whittaker, since each conjunct may be presented from the point of view of different people. Gradable adjectives thus pose a major problem for truth-functional and truth-relational accounts of lexical meaning.

Another effective chapter is the final one, chapter 7, on 'argumentative' gradability, examined within the framework of argumentation theory as developed by Anscombre and Ducrot. Whittaker's position is that it is the argumentative dimension of adjectives, i.e. the types of conclusion which they may be used with varying degrees of force in context to support, which provides the most effective framework for an accurate characterisation of gradability. Sub-classifying adjectives (e.g. *grand, rouge, américain*) are purely informative and as such do not have an argumentative dimension – though as we have seen, when modified by a degree adverb, they become qualifying, and hence may be used in context to indicate a particular conclusion; whereas qualifying, evaluative adjectives do have such a value inherently, potentially in addition to an informative one. Most of Whittaker's chapter is devoted to an exposition of the various stages of development of argumentation theory, as well as to its weaknesses. But she nonetheless sees it as potentially highly revealing of the properties and functioning of gradable

adjectives – in particular, the syntactic gradability of ontologically non-gradable, sub-classifying adjectives such as colour or ethnic adjectives.

It is this aspect of the book together with the author's convincing four-way distinction amongst ontological or referential, lexical, syntactic and argumentative aspects of gradability in adjectives and the well-argued criticisms of the shortcomings of truth-functional and structuralist 'truth-relational' approaches to the description of the lexicon which are, I believe, the principal contributions of this excellent book. In her always interesting discussions and analyses, the author raises a large number of important 'pistes' for further work – the hallmark of a monograph of quality such as this one.

There are, however, several problematic aspects of the book: the examples might have been numbered consecutively, which would have made for easier cross-reference. Sometimes they are numbered, but only for the duration of a single page. There are also a number of typos, punctuation errors and occasionally even errors in French syntax. There is no index, whether for subjects or authors cited. And there are some problems with the bibliography: several of the works mentioned in the text are not listed (e.g. Anscombre, 1987; Chaffin, 1992; Geach, 1972 and Ross, 1992). There is a more recent edition of at least one of the works listed: Cruse (1986; 1995), and an even more recent book by him not cited, but which is of relevance to the book's theme: Cruse, 2000. Moreover, several works by the same author published in the same year and listed as '. . . (a)' and '. . . (b)' are not distinguished in the citation in the text: e.g. 'Anscombre (1995)' is cited in footnote 172 on p. 185, but there are two works by Anscombre listed for this year in the bibliography; the same is true of 'Ducrot (1995)' cited twice on p. 189. In addition, there are some problems with the notation of examples. The symbol '?' is used as an indication that an example is semantically bizarre or unnatural. And yet, it is quite often the case that an example so prefixed is perfectly well-formed semantically, and occasionally that others which are not so prefixed are in fact unnatural.

REFERENCES

Cruse, D. A. (1995). *Lexical Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cruse, D. A. (2000). *Meaning in Language. An Introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Milner, J-C. (1976). Réflexions sur la référence. *Langue Française*, 30: 63–73.

Pustejovsky, J. (1995). *The Generative Lexicon*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Sapir, E. (1949). Grading. A study in semantics. In: *Selected Writings of Edward Sapir*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Rivara, R. (1990). *Le système de la conparaison*. Paris: Minuit.

Francis Cornish
Département des Sciences du Langage
Université de Toulouse-Le Mirail
5 Allées Antonio Machado
31058 Toulouse Cedex 09
France
e-mail: cornish@univ-tlse2.fr

(Received 15 March 2004)