

Kent Academic Repository

Full text document (pdf)

Citation for published version

Hall, Damien J. (2012) Atlas Linguistique et Ethnographique Normand, Volume IV. Review of: Atlas Linguistique et Ethnographique Normand, Volume IV by Brasseur, Patrice. Journal of French Language Studies, 22 (2). pp. 295-297. ISSN 0959-2695.

DOI

<http://doi.org/10.1017/S0959269512000051>

Link to record in KAR

<http://kar.kent.ac.uk/29506/>

Document Version

UNSPECIFIED

Copyright & reuse

Content in the Kent Academic Repository is made available for research purposes. Unless otherwise stated all content is protected by copyright and in the absence of an open licence (eg Creative Commons), permissions for further reuse of content should be sought from the publisher, author or other copyright holder.

Versions of research

The version in the Kent Academic Repository may differ from the final published version.

Users are advised to check <http://kar.kent.ac.uk> for the status of the paper. **Users should always cite the published version of record.**

Enquiries

For any further enquiries regarding the licence status of this document, please contact:

researchsupport@kent.ac.uk

If you believe this document infringes copyright then please contact the KAR admin team with the take-down information provided at <http://kar.kent.ac.uk/contact.html>

Book Reviews

Brasseur, Patrice, *Atlas Linguistique et Ethnographique Normand, Volume IV*, Caen: Presses universitaires de Caen, 2011. 978-2-84133-352-3. Hb €100.00.
doi:10.1017/S0959269512000051

This is the fourth of five planned volumes of the *Atlas Linguistique et Ethnographique Normand (ALN)*, containing the last 331 maps for lexical items. (The planned fifth volume will cover morphological and grammatical data.) Each map-page (51cm × 33cm, landscape orientation) contains a map of approximately A4 size (30cm × 21cm) relating to one word or set of words, and one or more text columns of ancillary data.

The aim of the whole *ALN* is succinctly summarised in the introduction to Vol. IV: ‘l’*ALN* permet de mieux percevoir les parlers normands dans leurs usages réels des années 1970’. It is therefore clear that this atlas surveys Norman, the autochthonous Romance variety of Normandy, and not local varieties of French. The atlas covers the whole Norman domain: Jersey, Guernsey, Sark and the whole of modern Normandy minus the Perche, where Norman has never been spoken.

FRONT MATTER

The useful Introduction to Vol. IV sets the *ALN* in its linguistic context, making the whole atlas more easily interpretable for people who are interested in French but not necessarily specialists on Normandy or Norman. It contains short paragraphs on ‘the notion of dialect’ and how to separate it from French (if at all); the selection of survey-sites; the selection of informants; the presentation of the data; and the ordering, titles, cross-references and interpretation of the maps.

The rest of the front matter of *ALN* Vol. IV is only slightly different from that of preceding volumes. Vol. IV adds one character to the Rousselot and Gilliéron phonetic notation used in the *Atlas Linguistique de France* (Gilliéron and Edmont 1902–12; Brun-Trigaud *et al* 2005: 27) and all the *Atlas Linguistiques de la France par régions*: unaccented <e> for ‘e moyen, entre é et è’. Unfortunately, in my copy of *ALN* Vol. IV at least, this addition coincides with a misprint, so that <e> is listed both for ‘e moyen’ and for schwa (‘e dit muet de *Grenoble* et *le*’). Maps (e.g. ‘bedeau’, ‘repu’) show that the actual symbol for schwa in the body of Vol. IV (as elsewhere where Rousselot-Gilliéron is used) is <e> with a superposed dot, <è>.

ALN Vol. IV also introduces a minor – but appropriate – change in the stated meaning of two consonant symbols placed one on top of the other. Previously this was

defined as ‘une consonne intermédiaire’ (between those of the two symbols); in Vol. IV, it is ‘une consonne perçue comme intermédiaire’. This acknowledgement of the role of perception in an atlas constructed from transcriptions (not recordings) made by a trained and experienced fieldworker is welcome.

The front matter of Vol. III contained demographic details of the Atlas’ interviewees, but the author has decided not to include them in Vol. IV, in order to avoid possible ethical difficulties not foreseen in the 1970s when the data was collected.

DATA

The maps in this volume follow the common *ALF par régions* style: they are two-colour (orange for borders and black for isoglosses, text and transcriptions – whether in the maps or surrounding them), and they include no other geographical information. Vol. IV’s maps were produced by software, however, which is possibly an innovation in the series.

As previously, maps are ordered here by approximate semantic fields. The Introduction states that these are often fairly arbitrary, as they were created after the aggregation of the data and do not reflect the order or priorities of the questionnaire. There is therefore no real unifying theme to Vol. IV (though there is no reason why there should have been one). Thematic grouping also means that there is no separation between linguistic and ethnographic maps: thus, for example, Map 1303 ‘Les Rameaux’ (‘Palm Sunday’), a map of pronunciations of *Rameaux*, is followed by 1304 ‘Buis et/ou laurier bénits’, a map of the plants used in Palm Sunday processions, and 1305 ‘Faire la collecte de Pâques’, a map of names for that tradition. The linguistic data here is often also covered in the *ALF* and/or in neighbouring series of the *ALF par régions*; where this is the case, cross-references are provided.

As also previously, some maps in Vol. IV contain isoglosses and others do not. Where isoglosses are drawn, the author states that they are meant as aids to comprehension, not analyses (so users could draw other, equally-valid ones). For example, phoneticians and phonologists might want to do this in maps like 1113 ‘Couches’ (‘nappies’), which charts Norman forms based on two distinct roots, /dʒa-/ and /kʊʃ-/. Isoglosses are drawn to separate these roots, but there are no isoglosses between forms of /kʊʃ-/ with a monophthong in the stem ([kʊʃɛt] *etc*) and forms with a diphthong ([kwɔʃɛt] *etc*).

Finally on the data, Vol. IV also contains a list of supplements to Vols I-III: data which should have been included in previous maps but was overlooked.

EVALUATION

As this is the latest volume in a series begun in the 1970s and continued (for consistency) with the original methodology, this is not the appropriate place for a detailed methodological breakdown. Nevertheless, a few remarks can be made. The author’s Introduction states that the lexical data here could be used more easily if it were able to be published as electronic data-files: the same could be said of the abundant phonetic and phonological information. As this is principally a linguistic atlas, an alphabetical index of the four volumes would also be very useful; at present, there is no way of investigating whether a given word or concept is mapped, or of searching for a given map, other than by browsing the tables of contents of the four volumes.

ALN Volume IV is a welcome addition to the literature for all the reasons stated above, and also because it is a valuable record of a culture and a linguistic variety which is now extremely threatened. We should applaud its publication, and welcome it as a major addition to our knowledge of the lexicon, phonetics, phonology and ethnography of Normandy and of France.

REFERENCES

- Brun-Trigaud, G., Le Berre, Y. and Le Dù, J. (2005). *Lectures de l'Atlas linguistique de la France de Gilliéron et Edmont: Du temps dans l'espace*. Paris: Éditions du Comité des travaux historiques et scientifiques.
- Gilliéron, J. and Edmont, E. (1902–12). *Atlas Linguistique de France, avec une Notice et une Table, ainsi qu'un Supplément*. Paris: Champion.

Damien Hall
Department of English Language and Linguistics
School of European Culture and Languages
Rutherford College
University of Kent
Canterbury CT2 7NX
e-mail: d.hall@kent.ac.uk

(Received 18 October 2011)

Cusimano, Christophe, *La polysémie – essai de sémantique générale*, Paris, Editions L'Harmattan, 2008, 232 pp. 978 2 296 06725 7
doi:10.1017/S0959269512000063

La position principale que prend Christophe Cusimano dans son 'essai de sémantique générale' est d'ordre théorique: c'est avant tout pour renforcer la validité de la description sémique des unités de langue que l'auteur propose un aménagement du statut des sèmes. Second credo, c'est à partir du système des signes que sont constitués les observables linguistiques en général, et plus particulièrement la propriété de polysémie de la plupart des lexèmes. Troisième credo, la description sémique doit tenir compte de la polysémie au lieu de la reverser à la contextualisation. Enfin, à travers le projet de validation de la description sémique, ce sont les principes de la sémantique référentielle que l'auteur contribue à valider.

Cette position se projette sur quatre débats précis:

- (1) Typologie des traits sémantiques: l'auteur propose de réduire la typologie à deux éléments. D'une part les *sèmes*, qui sont par définition « pertinents » (i.e. présents dans tous les emplois), d'autre part les *traits sémiques d'application* (TSA), qui sont eux « distinctifs ». Par exemple, le lexème *amour* comporte les sèmes /marquant une relation/, /de caractère euphorique/ et /d'intensité maximale dans l'application envisagée/. Les TSA, eux, enregistrent l'ouverture polysémique du lexème et donc la possibilité d'employer *amour* pour désigner des \contacts physiques\ (1^{er} TSA), des \liens affectifs ou psychologiques\ (2^{ème} TSA), ou la \nature des relations\ (3^{ème} TSA). Les TSA se subdivisent