



HAL
open science

46. Gallo-Romance I: Historical and etymological lexicography

Eva Buchi, Pascale Renders

► **To cite this version:**

Eva Buchi, Pascale Renders. 46. Gallo-Romance I: Historical and etymological lexicography. Gouws, Rufus H., Heid, Ulrich, Schweickard, Wolfgang & Wiegand, Herbert Ernst. Dictionaries. An International Encyclopedia of Lexicography. Supplementary Volume: Recent Developments with Focus on Electronic and Computational Lexicography, De Gruyter Mouton, pp.653-662, 2013, Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft, 987-3-11-023812-9. halshs-00421893

HAL Id: halshs-00421893

<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-00421893>

Submitted on 5 Oct 2009

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

46. Gallo-Romance I: Historical and etymological lexicography

1. General trends
2. The 'dizionario-tetto': FEW
- 5 3. French
4. Oil dialects
5. Occitan and Gascon
6. Franco-Provençal
7. French-based Creole languages
- 10 8. Conclusion
9. Select Bibliography
1. General trends

In a review published at the beginning of the 1990s, J.-P. Chambon voiced an opinion on French and Gallo-Romance (lexical) etymology that was not very optimistic: "depuis la fin des années 1970, les grandes 'aventures' étymologiques paraissent bien s'être détournées du domaine français et gallo-roman. [...] nos entreprises paraissent manquer quelque peu de souffle, voire de perspectives, vouées qu'elles sont à l'approfondissement sectoriel (DEAF), à la refonte (FEW) ou au peaufinage (notices étymologiques du TLF)" (Chambon 1991: 70).

This negative remark is closely linked to the increase in the philological requirements that emerge in the use of both textual (questions of publishing and attention to the semasiological description) and lexicographical sources. It is true that the attention

35 of this philological current is aimed at
 the speech act (the text) more than at
 the linguistic system and reinforces the
 tendency towards specialisation at the
 expense of the Gallo-Romance synthesis.
 40 However, its greatest inconvenience is
 without a doubt that it considerably
 slows down the process of publication:
 fifteen years after Chambon's
 assessment, the lexicographical ventures
 45 to which he alluded are still in
 progress.

Nevertheless, the systematic criticism
 of the sources resulted in a noteworthy
 improvement of the quality of the
 50 etymological work, which at once
 explains, and compensates for, this
 worrying situation: "Il est inutile de
 redire ici que la 'lenteur' de ces entre-
 prises de lexicographie scientifique
 55 [DEAF, DMF, DOM, DAO/DAG] est, compte
 tenu du petit nombre de collaborateurs,
 la rançon obligatoire de leur haute
 qualité" (Chambon 2006: 129, note 20).

Thus, in the field of French and, more
 60 generally, Gallo-Romance historical
 lexicography, we find ourselves facing a
 somewhat paradoxical situation. On the
 one hand, there is a negative
 observation of a certain lack of
 65 perspective of the work undertaken (but
 what process of innovation could one
 conceive apart from improvements to
 parts of FEW, which cannot be supplanted

by another project?). On the other hand,
 70 there is a positive observation of the
 exceptional quality of this same work,
 which has established itself as a model
 of critical rigour. It should also be
 mentioned that between 1991 and 2006,
 75 this work evolved and was joined by some
 other far-reaching projects, which give
 a place of honour to etymological and
 historical description while integrating
 it into the other methods of describing
 80 the lexicon.

2. The 'dizionario-tetto': FEW

It is known that FEW describes all of
 Gallo-Romance vocabulary (French,
 Franco-Provençal, Occitan and Gascon in
 85 all of their diatopic variations) from a
 genetic perspective, explaining the
 evolution of the different branchings of
 each lexical family which developed from
 the etymon (etymology-history of the
 90 word). Its spatial scope, its aim to be
 as exhaustive as possible and the
 rigorous method that characterises FEW
 made this dictionary a work of
 scientific reference in historical
 95 lexicography in the area under
 consideration: FEW operates at the same
 time as *lieu de synthèse* and as *tertium*
comparationis at the Gallo-Romance
 level. The topicality of FEW is to be
 100 considered from three perspectives: its
 compilation, its computerisation and its
 peristructure.

2.1. Compilation

After moving from Basel to Nancy
105 (INaLF, now ATILF) in 1993, the FEW team
continued to compile the dictionary
under the supervision of J.-P. Chauveau.
The beginning of the 21st century saw
the completion of volumes 21 to 23
110 (materials of unknown or uncertain
origin) and 24 and 25 (revision of the
alphabetical section A-), as well as the
well thought-out index (ATILF 2003).
This group of publications marked an
115 important step in the history of FEW,
that at last offered a complete coverage
of the whole alphabet. Currently (2008),
there is a reasoned choice of articles
under the letter B- that are being
120 revised. To begin with, this revision
keeps the Latin etymons which were
maintained through hereditary
transmission up to the present days in
the entire Gallo-Romance area, excluding
125 the substrate and onomatopoeic etymons.
As soon as each article is completed
(BĀJULĀRE, BASTUM, BIRRUS, etc.), it is
available for download from the FEW site
(<http://www.atilf.fr/few>). The
130 considerable increase in length of the
articles is a tangible consequence of
the innovations that characterise it.
Firstly, the new FEW project takes into
account the aspects of the lexicon that
135 were previously neglected (scientific
terminology, idioms, regional variations

of French, etc.). Secondly, it examines the word in its context by continuously returning to the sources. Thirdly, it
140 structures the materials more finely. At the same time, the new FEW focuses more closely on semantic and formal factors, following in this the practices initiated during the revision of the
145 alphabetical section A- (Chambon 1989a; 1989b; 2002). The publication of journal articles reporting on findings derived from the compilation of FEW (like Chauveau 2006a) is proof of the creative
150 force connected with this giant of Romance lexicology.

The revision is accompanied by other long-awaited ventures, in particular the update of the bibliographical complement
155 (*Beiheft*), as well as the compilation of cases of multiple etymologisations indexed in various journal articles (cf. Chauveau 2006b and Chauveau/Seidl 2003: 516). These projects are closely related
160 to the computerisation of FEW.

2.2. Computerisation

The fact that FEW is not used as much as it could, because of its structural complexity, is a well-known problem (cf.
165 Büchi 1996: 76-78). For some time, voices have been getting louder asking for the work to be computerised (cf. Wooldridge 1990: 239). Study for this project began in 2005 at ATILF. Several
170 steps were necessary: make the articles

of the revision of the letter *B*-
 searchable - they are already available
 in electronic form on the Internet -,
 study the possibilities of retro-
 175 conversion of the print volumes and,
 finally, digitize and make searchable
 the *Beiheft* and the various indexes. The
 success of such a project should
 simultaneously facilitate both the
 180 consultation and the update of the
 materials. The conditions for starting
 the retro-conversion of the 25 FEW
 volumes are currently being analysed in
 the framework of a University of Liège
 185 thesis carried out in close
 collaboration with ATILF (Renders,
 forthcoming).

2.3. Peristruktur

Additionally, FEW also lives on in the
 190 independent publications that critically
 take up some of its parts, e.g.
 Arveiller (1999) for words borrowed from
 Arab, Persian and Turkish. This is
 especially true for the 'purgatory' of
 195 FEW (volumes 21-23), to which Baldinger
 (1988-2003), in a collective work that
 also takes account of previous
 contributions, brings an indispensable
 addition.

200 3. French

3.1. General Language

3.1.1. DEAF

DEAF (<http://www.deaf-page.de>; Möhren
 2003) presented itself (G 1, ix) as a

205 "petit FEW pour le domaine et l'époque
de l'ancien français" (of the 9th
century to the middle of the 14th
century). Actually, this dictionary,
supervised by Th. Städtler after F.
210 Möhren retired in August 2007, is much
more than this. From von Wartburg, it
adopted the notion of the etymology-
history, which is revealed in its
macrostructure (regrouping the
215 vocabulary of Old French by etymological
families). It is also revealed in the
microstructure of the articles
(principle of classification by genetic
dependence of the forms and the
220 meanings; detailed and critical
etymological discussion). Nevertheless,
very quickly (as of the publication of
the second fascicle in 1973 and, above
all, under the impetus of F. Möhren),
225 the rigorous philological principles
that preside in the writing of the
articles led it to distance itself from
its model on various points. DEAF was
particularly concerned to offer a full
230 semasiological analysis of the units
described. Unlike FEW, DEAF separates
the level of expression from the level
of content. It is not satisfied with
offering approximate glosses but instead
235 systematically resorts to true
definitions. Finally, it completes the
definitions with quotations that have
encyclopaedic scope. Moreover, the

systematic return to the sources, as
240 well as the meticulous identification of
the texts and manuscripts cited
elsewhere under various abbreviations,
have helped create a bibliography that
has very quickly come to stand as a
245 reference. With its many indexes and the
Complément bibliographique (the
bibliographic complement, DEAFBibl,
'draft' version, continuously updated,
and available for consultation on the
250 Internet), DEAF does not only offer a
more detailed and more complete
examination of a diachronic sector
covered by FEW, but it also represents
an irreplaceable tool for the
255 linguistics and philology of Old French.
The use of information technology from
the outset of the project (publication
of the first instalment in 1971, the
alphabetical section G-) allows the
260 researchers to consider a series of
products derived from DEAF, including an
onomasiological dictionary. In 2007
computers started to be used more and
more consistently. From that point, the
265 project has envisaged, by means of a
compilation backed by an XML schema, the
publication of the Heidelberg file (1.5
million entries) in the form of a
database and its computer lemmatisation,
270 a publication of the articles (about
12,000) on the Internet of the
alphabetical section D-K and the

structured and annotated presentation of
 the materials from the alphabetical
 275 sections L-Z and A-C (approximately
 54,000 lemmas).

The relevance of the DEAF research for
 the history of the modern and
 contemporary French lexicon is
 280 undeniable. In relation to TLF(i), a
 survey from the I3-I4 instalment (2003)
 highlights thus 22 antedatings and seven
 retrodatings of lexemes, nine
 antedatings and three first attempts at
 285 datings of meanings as well as an
 etymological correction. These
 contributions foster the TLF-Étym
 project (cf. 3.1.4. below and the
 revised etymological notices *hypericum*,
 290 *hypocondre*¹, *hypocrisie*, *hypothécaire*,
invitatoire, *iota*, *irascible*, *ironie*,
*item*¹ or *ivrogne*).

3.1.2. AND

Etymology is not part of the research
 295 objectives of the *Anglo-Norman*
Dictionary (AND), and this philological
 dictionary of Old and Middle French
 written in England is only historical in
 the sense that it deals with a (broad)
 300 synchrony of the past (1066-1450). AND
 is nevertheless an essential link in the
 historical description of both the
 French lexicon in general and the Anglo-
 Norman French. In many ways, Anglo-
 305 Norman is nothing but Old French that is
 particularly well documented (cf.

Trotter 2000: 403). The dialogue with historical Gallo-Romance lexicography is not held in AND itself, but in certain
310 separate publications (like Trotter 1997).

Via 'The Anglo-Norman On-Line Hub' (<http://www.anglo-norman.net>; cf. Trotter 2000; 2005), a vast project
315 supervised by D.A. Trotter, AND has been freely accessible since 2006 (in a revised version for the alphabetical section A-F and in the shape of the original edition for G-Z).

320 3.1.3. DMF

In 1980, during the III International Conference on Middle French (Wunderli 1982), the project of a *Dictionnaire du Moyen Français* (1330-1500) was forged.
325 It was at once philological (use of a broad corpus) and linguistic (description taking into account the acquisitions of contemporary linguistics and lexicography). After an experimental
330 volume was published in 1998 (DMF⁰), which compiled the alphabetical section A-AH, the project, led by R. Martin, changed in form rather than in scope. The paper version was permanently
335 abandoned in favour of an electronic publication in successive steps in the form of an evolving database encoded in XML format. In this way, one needs to make a difference between DMF1
340 (available from 2003 on the Internet),

DMF2 (2007), DMF2009 (2009) and DMF2010
(in development). The first version
compiles thirteen independent searchable
lexicons thanks to a prior lemmatisation
345 (26,350 lemmas). A systematic referral
to FEW allows access to the data from
its etymon. The following versions
envisage several improvements: an
extension of the nomenclature
350 (approximately 60,000 lemmas for DMF2);
an enrichment of the corpus; and a
creation of syntheses (DMF3) compiling
under each term the data of different
lexicons which deal with it.

355 The contribution of DMF to the history
of the French lexicon cannot be
overestimated. Compared to FEW, for
example, the lexicon of the scientific
language provides 339 lexeme additions,
360 74 new etymons as well as hundreds of
antedatings of lexical units (cf.
Gerner/Martin 2005).

3.1.4. TLF-Étym

In 2004, the ATILF was able to equip
365 TLF with a computerised version (TLFi,
cf. article 47). This new format does
not only make it easier to consult the
materials of the dictionary, but also to
update them. To achieve this objective,
370 the TLF-Étym project was launched in
January 2005. It is a selective revision
of the etymological notes of the
dictionary (cf. Buchi 2005;
<http://www.atilf.fr/tlf-etym>). This

375 research programme is currently under
the leadership of Nadine Steinfeld.

It is known that TLF occupies the
middle ground between scientific
research and popularisation. Its
380 etymological sections, which make
critical use of the materials of FEW,
are the main sources (if not the only
one) of dictionaries for the general
public. The *Robert historique* (Rey
385 1998²), for example, has drawn broadly
from TLF, often without verifying any of
the data (cf. Thomassen 1997). And yet,
the latter is subject to many
corrections.

390 The TLF-Étym project grows on the
results of the research led by the
'*Linguistique historique française et
romane*' team of ATILF, to which belong
most notably FEW and DMF. It also
395 benefits from the ad hoc or regular co-
operation between French and foreign
researchers and accepts, after
verification, the proposals for
corrections that can be made by anybody
400 via a paper form (available for download
from the ATILF website:

http://www.atilf.fr/atilf/produits/Fiche_maj_tlf-etym.pdf). Proven working

methods effectively allow making many
405 corrections, whether they are related to
etymology or dating. In December 2005,
out of 63 revised notes, the project
thus contributed 16 etymology

corrections, 16 absolute antedatings, 33
 410 semantic antedatings, and 82 datings of
 linguistic phenomena previously undated.
 Beyond these concrete contributions, the
 strategic importance of the project lies
 in particular in the concentration of
 415 the research in the field of French
 etymology (cf. Buchi 2005/2006; 2006).

3.2. Diatopisms

At the dawn of the 21st century, three
 publications mark a turning point in the
 420 differential lexicography of the French
 language: DSR of A. Thibault, DHFQ of
 the TLFQ team (*Trésor de la Langue
 Française au Québec*), under the
 supervision of Cl. Poirier, and DRF, led
 425 by P. Rézeau. These three works merit
 being mentioned here because they
 demonstrate that "il est possible - et
 éminemment souhaitable - de faire de la
 lexicographie différentielle en
 430 respectant les exigences scientifiques
 qui se sont depuis longtemps imposées
 dans les meilleurs ouvrages de
 lexicographie générale (tel le TLF),
 historique (tel le DEAF), ou dialectale
 435 (tel le GPSR)" (Thibault 1998: 551). The
 high quality of this work results from,
 in particular, the co-operation between
 linguists trained in the requirements of
 historical lexicology and lexicography,
 440 who systematically attached importance
 to the historico-comparative description
 of the lexical units. The interest of

the approach is all the more commendable because FEW has taken little account of regionalisms (Lagueunière 1998), marked as such ('reg.') only since instalment 145 (~~ARCHITECTUS-ARGENTUM~~) of 1985.

The objective of DHFQ is clearly to explain "d'un point de vue historique et étymologique, les mots et les emplois caractéristiques du français du Québec" (www.tlfg.ulaval.ca/presentation.asp [05/06/2008]). It is the result of long *ab nihilo* work, undertaken in the 1970s under the supervision of M. Juneau with the compilation of an extensive lexical catalogue (1,300,000 records) and literary and metalinguistic databases. In its first edition, it includes 660 'lexicographical monographs', processing nearly 3,000 lexical units and giving information about the origin, evolution and current use of every expression used in Québec. The historical explanation, which closes every article by providing the uses of the word in the order in which they appear in the synchronic description, answers the expectations of Canadian speakers by confirming or correcting many common (mis)conceptions of the origin of the French lexicon across the Atlantic. However, it also provides essential information for the rest of the French-speaking world by regularly establishing older dates of appearance and giving information on the

linguistic situation of various regions of France in the 17th and 18th centuries.

DSR

480 (www.unine.ch/dialectologie/Presentation
_Dico.html), which describes the lexical
particularities of contemporary French
in French-speaking Switzerland, is first
and foremost synchronic. Nevertheless,
485 the author's training at FEW led him to
offer systematically historico-
comparative comments at the end of the
articles in which we find the first
attestation and precious information on
490 the vitality of the word in the rest of
the French-speaking world.

This fruitful dialogue between the
diachronic and diatopic dimensions is
pushed even further in DRF, which
495 describes "les principales variétés
géographiques du français, observées
dans la seconde moitié du 20^e siècle en
France" (DRF: 7). As in the case of DSR,
the first aim of this dictionary is
500 synchrony, but each article contains an
etymological comment that presents the
origin of diatopisms, whether lexical or
semantic, their first attestations and
(possibly) their ways of penetration and
505 dissemination in French.

These three works "ont concrétisé la
formation d'un nouveau canon", which
"s'impose aujourd'hui à tous les
professionnels de la recherche" (Chambon
510 2005a: 3). They bear comparison with

DEAF in the acuity of the philological analysis (which here considers the modern French era in particular). This is especially the case with the revision
 515 of FEW as far as the standard of the etymological treatment is concerned (in the etymological-historical meaning of the word). Compare, for example, DHFQ s.v. *soir*, Thibault in DSR s.v. *cougner*
 520 and especially Chambon/Chauveau/Rézeau in DRF s.v. *gadin*.

This troika should soon be joined by its Belgian equivalent. The project, which was started in Louvain-la-Neuve by
 525 M. Francard (<http://valibel.fltr.ucl.ac.be>, is expected under the title *Dictionnaire du français en Belgique* (Francard 2005: 48).

530 3.3. Other subsets of the lexicon

Among the lexicographical production of the last decade dedicated to a subset of the general French lexicon, three works stand out by their high scientific
 535 standard. The first, the *Dictionnaire de l'art culinaire français* (Höfler 1996), establishes, according to Höfler's 1982 proven methodology, the etymology and the history of about 500 names of
 540 dishes, most of which were of deonomastic origin. At its core, it is a "monument de méthode, de patience et de rigueur [...]. M. H., en grand professionnel qu'il était, nous invite à

545 un festin d'histoire et d'étymologie de
 l'art culinaire, à travers un ouvrage
 qui établit de manière durable
 l'histoire de tout un pan de ce
 vocabulaire" (Rézeau 1998: 555).

550 The inspiration for the *Dictionnaire
 des noms de cépages de France* (Rézeau
 1997) is very close to the preceding
 one. The idea was to offer a treatment
 as complete as that of the lexeme *vin* by
 555 general lexicography (etymology-history,
 old attestations duly semanticized,
 contextualized and referenced,
 syntagmatics) for lexical units like
chasselas, pinot or *riesling*. As a side
 560 effect, the numerous corrections that
 this work contributes to FEW ensure the
 cohesion with the Gallo-Romance
 framework (thus s.v. *cot*: transfer of
 17, 129a, *SKÖT to 2, 44a, CAHORS; s.v.
 565 *graisse*: addition to 2, 1276b, *CRASSIA;
 s.v. *malbec*: substitution of the toponym
 MAUBEC [6/1, 544a] by the patronymic
 MALBECK).

The *Dictionnaire des onomatopées*
 570 (Enckell/Rézeau 2003) is doubtless the
 most unexpected lexicographical
 production of the lot. It is worth
 including because of the authors'
 concern to determine systematically the
 575 first dating of each semiotic use of the
 units treated and because of the
 reliable character of the proposed
 etymologies.

4. Oil dialects

580 In historical lexicography relating to
Oil dialects, the first place belongs to
a publication that is not immediately
recognised as belonging to the genre
'dictionary', its title being *Atlas*
585 *linguistique de la Wallonie* (ALW).
Unlike French linguistic atlases, ALW in
fact not only gathers rich and reliable
data on dialects, but it also offers an
accurate etymological analysis. This
590 distinctive characteristic makes it a
fully-fledged etymological dictionary.
Moreover, in many cases, the
interpretation of the Belgo-Roman data
represents the key to analysing an
595 entire etymological family (cf., for
example, Boutier 1992, who corrects not
only the etymology for Walloon *tchawe-*
sori, but also that of French *chauve-*
souris) or contributes to the
600 reconstruction of the protoroman lexicon
(in this way, Boutier 2003-2006
demonstrates the existence of the
Hellenism **epidemia* in this language).
Furthermore, ALW contributes to the
605 collective effort to elucidate the
materials of FEW that are of unknown
origin. Volume 6 (2006), for example,
devoted to the first part of the section
'La terre, les plantes et les animaux'
610 (the Earth, plants and animals) by M.-G.
Boutier, M.-Th. Counet and J.
Lechanteur, contains - as we learn from

a list at the end of the volume - 34

etymological identifications of

615 'unknowns' (of which nine are hypotheses
that require confirmation).

For Oil dialects in France, the major
event of the period under consideration
is the publication of the *Trésor*

620 *étymologique des mots de la Franche-*

Comté (Dondaine 2002). This work

constitutes, in the best tradition of

volume 5 of the ALLy (Gardette/Durdilly

1976), the etymological synthesis of the

625 *Atlas linguistique de la Franche-Comté*.

Unlike Gardette's model, C. Dondaine

opted for a semasiological approach -

and thus for the dictionary as means of
presentation. Here again, the dialogue

630 with FEW is continuous, whether it is a
matter of specific corrections or

additions of new etymons. An index lists
approximately 100 lexical types of

material of unknown origin in FEW that

635 the author has etymologised. "Bref,

l'ouvrage de Mme Dondaine, qui prolonge,

enrichit et émende constamment l'œuvre

de von Wartburg, constitue à ce titre

une contribution de grande valeur à la

640 lexicologie galloromane" (Chambon 2005b:

246; cf. also Chambon 2003). It can only

be hoped that this model of the genre

will be followed by similar work bearing

on other domains in the Oil area.

645 5. Occitan and Gascon

5.1. DAO and DAG

DAO and DAG (cf. Winkler 2003) present the lexicon of old Occitan and old Gascon (cf. Pfister 1993; 1999; 2000) according to the onomasiological classification suggested by the *Begriffssystem* of Hallig/von Wartburg (1963). At the moment, they cover a good part of the first large section: the universe ('le ciel et l'atmosphère', 'la terre', 'les plantes' and 'les animaux' [partly]). Together, these two dictionaries represent a basic tool for medieval Southern Gallo-Romance linguistics. This is not only true for the vernacular languages (Occitan and Gascon, with all their diasystemic variations), but also for their rival *linguae francae* (Latin and French). They present a complex internal organisation: DAO's article '1317 mouton' (1317 sheep), for example, lists approximately 230 attestations of the 'motó' type, including personal names, five occurrences of 'gras motó' and three words of the 'çiborç' type. This information is specified by indications of DAO's *Supplément*, which presents the Occitan attestations in context, and by the corresponding DAG article, which only retains Gascon entries, but adds textual quotations. These two lexicographical projects, which all in all are only staffed by two part-time positions, are currently forced to limit

the scope of their study. It is conceivable that only DAG, which deals with the most pressing needs, will be continued, on account of either the
 685 specific nature of Gascon or the fact that this dictionary relies almost exclusively on a non-literary corpus.

5.2. DOM

The major event of the last quarter of
 690 a century in the field of Occitan lexicography - and even of Occitan linguistics - is the launch of DOM (<http://www.dom.dadw-muenchen.de>; Stempel 2003). This dictionary, started
 695 by H. Stimm and edited by W.-D. Stempel, sets out to reconsider, in a semasiological presentation, the entire Occitan lexicon of the Middle Ages (from its origins to 1550). In relation to its
 700 predecessors, DOM brings unquestionable benefits as regards broadening the nomenclature, better foundation and enrichment of the documentary basis, semantic and graphemic description,
 705 evidencing of phraseological turns and even syntax (through the articles devoted to grammatical words, "modèles de description syntaxique sous forme lexicographique" (Chambon 2000: 443).
 710 The references carefully differentiate the textual genres into lyrical troubadouresque ('T'), other literary sources ('L') and archive documents ('D'). The bibliographical supplement,

715 compiled according to rigorous
 philological principles, can be searched
 over the Internet; the abbreviations
 provided are destined to become
 canonical in the same way as those of
 720 DEAF in the French domain.

The editors of DOM maintain a
 particularly constructive and critical
 dialogue with scientific Gallo-Romance
 lexicography. Thus, to focus on
 725 instalment 5 (2005) alone, the many
 corrections made to FEW (in the first
 ten pages: s.v. [*agrefol*], *agrejar*,
agrenier, *agrest₂*, [*agret*], *agreu*,
agrimen) as well as proposals to remove
 730 articles from dictionaries and text
 editions (**agremat*, **[aguda]*, **agussa*,
**ai₂*, **aid*, **[aiga₂]*, **ainar*, **aira₂*)
 bear witness to the "niveau extrêmement
 élevé du DOM [...], un niveau presque
 735 idéal" (Pfister 1999: 157).

6. Franco-Provençal

The absence of an etymological and
 historical dictionary of Franco-
 Provençal is without doubt the most
 740 glaring deficiency of Gallo-Romance
 lexicography (and lexicology). It is the
 Helvetian area that is, by far, the best
 equipped. With GPSR, which is admittedly
 a dictionary that is first and foremost
 745 descriptive and synchronic, it has a
 historical treasury of varieties of the
 Franco-Provençal (as well as Franc-
 Comtois) lexicons of the Helvetian area.

The extremely concise nature of the
 750 etymological discourse of this
 dictionary contrasts with its long
 developments in the synchronic
 description. However, from the
 etymology-origin point of view - the
 755 etymology-history holds a more modest
 place - GPSR clearly constitutes the
 framework where the most up-to-date
 research in the Franco-Provençal field
 is carried out. Corrections and details
 760 added to FEW are legion; instalment 111
 (2005), for example, explicitly includes
 them: s.v. *fraîche, frais*¹, *franchise,*
fratsø, fratsi, frayer, frazè, fré,
frøbéyiø, frédona, frøgatsi et frøgølyø.

765 Beyond the dictionary itself, the team
 at GPSR also maintains a fruitful
 dialogue with the scientific community
 through its annual report (Rapport
 GPSR). Since 1964, this publication has
 770 in fact included a 'Datations nouvelles'
 category (in general, in relation to FEW
 or TLF) which is of greatest interest
 for research in Gallo-Romance historical
 lexicology/lexicography. In this way,
 775 the 2005 edition, dealing with 2003 and
 2004, makes an inventory of the
 antedatings for ten lexical types
 (*fourchon, fournoyer, fourragement,*
foutimasser, gerberie, germaison,
 780 *gibecier* [in two different meanings],
girarde, giron and *haut fourneau*). If
 some of the antedatings suggested do not

withstand detailed examination (cf. Evrard/Steinfeld in TLF-Étym s.v.

785 *diurnal* and *estagnon*), they constitute a very precious gateway to French scientific lexicography.

7. French-based Creole languages

The Gallo-Romance diachronician cannot
790 bypass an appeal to French-based Creoles, the lexical foundation of which indirectly gives information on the popular French of the colonial period.

The central lexicographical production
795 of this field of research, the *Dictionnaire étymologique des créoles français de l'Océan Indien* by A. Bollée, is conceived as an extension of FEW for the Creole of the Réunion Island,

800 Mauritius, Rodrigues and the Seychelles (DECOI I/1: 9). Even if the etymological treatment that it offers is somewhat elementary, this dictionary is doubtless useful, particularly thanks to its
805 systematic references to FEW.

8. Conclusion

Fifteen years after Chambon's review quoted in the introduction above, our general survey (cf. also Fryba-Reber
810 2003) leads us to a rather positive conclusion. We are in fact witnessing, in the French and Gallo-Romance fields, a revived interest in historical linguistics and etymology, which are
815 considered as an essential element in the description of language units. The

most striking example is without a doubt the successful integration of etymological information in specialised lexicography of French, whether 820 variational (essentially diatopic) or related to another specific part of the lexicon. Apart from FEW, which preserves an integral etymology, the various 825 lexicographical undertakings mentioned above put into practice an integrated etymology, in varied domains and for phenomena occasionally supralexical. A consequence of this successful 830 integration is the occasional abolition of the boundary between the 'pure' historical or etymological dictionary and the language dictionary. DHFQ, despite its title, is also a descriptive 835 dictionary; DEAF is just as much, if not more, linguistic as it is etymological; conversely, DSR and TLF (TLF-Étym project) grant a significant place to the historical description in spite of 840 their mainly synchronic perspective. This dialogue between synchrony and diachrony can only, ultimately, improve the quality of the lexicographical description.

845 Computer resources and, more specifically, the XML format, have been increasingly used in these projects. It is as much a matter of multiplying the possibilities of accessing the 850 dictionaries as of providing tools for

editing them. Information technology is in fact a solution that should decrease the time to produce these works while ensuring a high level of consistency.

855 Nonetheless, most of the time, the computer solutions do little to hide the failure of the projects as they were defined by their initiators: resizings which FEW, DEAF, DMF, DAO and DAG have
860 undergone, as successful as they may be, bear witness to a structural problem that objectively arises in all Gallo-Romance lexicography. Thus, while an intelligent use of the new media can
865 contribute to removing Gallo-Romance lexicography from the impasse that it has created for itself by continuously raising its requirements, the new technology itself is not a panacea. On
870 the contrary, the future of historical Gallo-Romance lexicography - one of the best in the world - consists of recruiting, within the various prestigious projects that are listed
875 within it, young Romanist linguists, trained at scientific centres of the discipline in Europe, who are capable not only of completing the work of their elders, but also of reviving and, if
880 necessary, reorienting it, taking into account the priorities of the sub-discipline and working fully with their network of peers.

9. Select Bibliography

885 9.1. Dictionaries

ALW = Remacle, L. *et al.* (1953-):
Atlas linguistique de la Wallonie.
Tableau géographique des parlers de la
Belgique romane d'après l'enquête de
890 Jean Haust et des enquêtes
complémentaires. Liège.

AND = Rothwell, W./Gregory, S./Trot-
ter, D. A. (dir.), 2005⁻² [1977-1992¹].
Anglo-Norman Dictionary. London.

895 ATILF (2003): Französisches
Etymologisches Wörterbuch. Index A-Z (2
vol.). Paris.

DAG = Baldinger, K. *et al.* (1975-):
Dictionnaire onomasiologique de l'ancien
900 gascon. Tübingen.

DAO = Baldinger, K. *et al.* (1975-):
Dictionnaire onomasiologique de l'ancien
occitan. Tübingen.

DEAF = Baldinger, K. *et al.* (1971-):
905 Dictionnaire étymologique de l'ancien
français. Québec/Tübingen/Paris.

DEAFBibl = Möhren, F. (2007³ [1974¹]):
Dictionnaire étymologique de l'ancien
français. Complément bibliographique.
910 Tübingen.

DECOI = Bollée, A. (dir.) (1993-
2007) : Dictionnaire étymologique des
créoles français de l'Océan Indien. 4
vol. Hamburg.

915 DHFQ = Poirier, C. (dir.) (1998):
Dictionnaire historique du français
québécois: Monographies lexicographiques
de québécismes. Québec.

- DOM = Stempel, W.-D. *et al.* (1996-):
 920 Dictionnaire de l'occitan médiéval.
 Tübingen.
- DMF = ATILF (2003-): Dictionnaire du
 Moyen Français (DMF). Site internet
 (<http://www.atilf.fr/dmf>). Nancy.
- 925 Dondaine, C. (2002): Trésor étymologi-
 que des mots de la Franche-Comté d'après
 l'*Atlas linguistique et ethnographique*
de la Franche-Comté. Strasbourg.
- DRF = Rézeau, P. (dir.) (2001):
 930 Dictionnaire des régionalismes de
 France. Géographie et histoire d'un
 patrimoine linguistique. Bruxelles.
- DSR = Thibault, A. (2004² [1997¹]):
 Dictionnaire suisse romand. Genève-
 935 Carouge.
- Enckell, P./Rézeau, P. (2003):
 Dictionnaire des onomatopées. Paris.
- FEW = Wartburg, W. von *et al.* (1922-
 2002). *Französisches Etymologisches*
 940 *Wörterbuch*. Eine darstellung des
 galloromanischen sprachschatzes. 25 vol.
 Bonn/Heidelberg/Leipzig-Berlin/Basel.
- GPSR = Gauchat, L. *et al.* (1924-):
 Glossaire des patois de la Suisse
 945 romande. Neuchâtel/Paris.
- Höfler, M. (1982): Dictionnaire des
 anglicismes. Paris.
- Höfler, M. (1996): Dictionnaire de
 l'art culinaire français. Étymologie et
 950 histoire. Aix-en-Provence.
- Rey, A. (dir.) (1998² [1992¹]):
 Dictionnaire historique de la langue

française. 3 vol. Paris.

TLF = Imbs, P. (dir.) (1971-1994):

955 Trésor de la langue française.

Dictionnaire de la langue du XIX^e et du
XX^e siècle (1789-1960). 16 vol. Paris.

TLFi = CNRS/Université Nancy2/ATILF,
(2004): Trésor de la Langue Française

960 informatisé (cédérom). Paris. (internet
version: <http://stella.atilf.fr>).

9.2. Other work

Arveiller, R. (1999): Addenda au FEW
XIX (Orientalia), edited by M. Pfister.

965 Tübingen.

Baldinger, K. (1988-2003) :

Etymologien. Untersuchungen zu FEW 21-
23. 3 vol. Tübingen.

Boutier, M.-G. (1992): Une question de
970 génétique: wallon *tchawe-sori* et
français *chauve-souris*. In: Travaux de
linguistique et de philologie 30, 7-36.

Boutier, M.-G. (2003-2006): Un « beau
type latin » d'origine grecque en

975 Wallonie: *EPIDEMIA. In: Les Dialectes de
Wallonie 31-33, 83-109.

Büchi, E. (1996): Les Structures du
'Französisches Etymologisches Wörter-
buch'. Recherches métalexigraphiques

980 et métalexicologiques. Tübingen.

Büchi, É. (2005): Le projet TLF-Étym
(projet de révision sélective des
notices étymologiques du *Trésor de la
langue française informatisé*). In:

985 *Estudis Romànics* 27, 569-571.

Büchi, É. (ed.) (2005/2006): Actes du

Séminaire de méthodologie en étymologie et histoire du lexique (Nancy/ATILF, année universitaire 2005/2006). Nancy
 990 (<http://www.atilf.fr/methodologie.htm>).

Buchi, É. (ed.) (2006): Actes de la Journée d'étude « Lexicographie historique française: autour de la mise à jour des notices étymologiques du Trésor de
 995 la langue française informatisé » (Nancy/ATILF, 4 novembre 2005). Nancy (<http://www.atilf.fr/atilf/evenement/JourneeEtude/LHF2005>).

Chambon, JP (1989a): Tradition et
 1000 innovations dans la refonte du FEW. In: Actes du XVIII^e congrès international de linguistique et de philologie romanes. Tübingen, VIII, 327-337.

Chambon, JP (1989b): Aspects philologiques et linguistiques dans la
 1005 refonte du FEW: utilité d'une approche métaphilologique des représentations linguistiques. In: Actes du XVIII^e congrès international de linguistique et
 1010 de philologie romanes. Tübingen, VIII, 218-230.

Chambon, JP (1991): Étymologie française (et gallo-romane): un bilan (1971-1991). In: Goosse, A./Klein, J.-
 1015 R./Pierret, J.-M. (ed.), Où en sont les études sur le lexique ? Bilan et perspectives, Travaux de linguistique 23, 69-89.

Chambon, JP (2000): Un événement dans
 1020 la lexicographie occitane: la

publication du DOM. In: Revue des
langues romanes 194, 439-458.

Chambon, JP (2002): Préface. In: FEW
25, iii-vi.

1025 Chambon, JP (2003): À propos du *Trésor*
étymologique comtois de Colette
Dondaine. In : Revue de linguistique
romane 67, 499-532.

1030 Chambon, JP (2005a): Après le *Dic-*
tionnaire des régionalismes de France:
bilan et perspectives. In: Glessgen, M.-
D./Thibault, A. (ed.), 3-29.

1035 Chambon, JP (2005b): Compte rendu de
Dondaine 2002. In: Bulletin de la
Société de linguistique de Paris 100/2,
242-248.

1040 Chambon, JP (2006): Réflexions sur les
glossaires d'éditions de textes. In:
Revue de linguistique romane 70, 123-
141.

Chauveau, JP (2006a): Sur l'étymologie
de fr. *baie* « petit golfe ». In: Revue
de linguistique romane 70, 409-427.

1045 Chauveau, JP (2006b): D'un site
informatique en chantier pour le FEW.
In: Schweickard (W.) (ed.): *Nuovi media*
e lessicografia storica. Atti del collo-
quio in occasione del settantesimo com-
pleanno di Max Pfister. Tübingen, 33-37.

1050 Chauveau, JP/Seidl, Chr. (2003):
Französisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch
(FEW). In: Städtler, Th. (ed.), 509-518.

Francard, M. (2005): La frontière
entre les langues régionales romanes et

- 1055 le français en Wallonie. In: Glessgen, M.-D./Thibault, A. (eds.), 45-61.
- Fryba-Reber, A.-M. (2003) : Étude et description étymologique et historique du lexique des langues romanes : le
- 1060 français et l'occitan. In : Ernst, G. et al. (eds), *Romanische Sprachgeschichte*. Berlin/New York, 1, 357-368.
- Gardette, P./Durdilly, P. (1976): Atlas linguistique et ethnographique du
- 1065 Lyonnais. Vol. 5: Commentaires et index. Paris.
- Gerner, H./Martin, R. (2005): Le lexique de la langue scientifique à l'aune du FEW. In: James-Raoul, D./Soutet, O.
- 1070 (ed.), *Par les mots et les textes*. Mélanges de langue, de littérature et d'histoire des sciences médiévales offerts à Claude Thomasset. Paris, 357-370.
- 1075 Glessgen, M.-D./Thibault, A. (ed.) (2005): *La lexicographie différentielle du français et le Dictionnaire des régionalismes de France*. Actes du colloque en l'honneur de Pierre Rézeau
- 1080 pour son soixante-cinquième anniversaire (Strasbourg, Université Marc Bloch, 20-22 juin 2003). Strasbourg.
- Hallig, R./Wartburg (W. von) (1963² [1952¹]): *Begriffssystem als Grundlage*
- 1085 *für die Lexikographie*. Versuch eines Ordnungsschemas. Berlin.
- Lagueunière, Fr. (1998): *Le traitement de la variation diatopique en français*

moderne dans le *Französisches*

1090 *Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. In: Ruffino, G. (ed.): Atti del XXI Congresso Internazionale di Linguistica e Filologia Romanza. Tübingen, 3, 387-395.

[Möhren, Fr.] (2003): Dictionnaire étymologique de l'ancien français (DEAF). In: Städtler, Th. (ed.), 183-194.

Pfister, M. (1993) : Rapport sur l'état de la recherche en lexicologie médiévale dans le domaine occitan. In: Gasca Queirazza, G. (ed.), Atti del secondo congresso internazionale della «Association Internationale d'Études Occitanes» (Torino, 31 agosto-5 settembre 1987). Torino, 923-954.

1105 Pfister, M. (1999): La lexicographie de l'ancien occitan. In: La France latine 129, 151-160.

Pfister, M. (2000) : Überblick über die altokzitanische Lexikologie 1986-1998. In : Rieger, A. (ed.), Okzitanistik, Altokzitanistik und Provenzalistik. Geschichte und Auftrag einer europäischen Philologie.

1115 Frankfurt, 73-96.

Rapport GPSR = 1898-. Glossaire des patois de la Suisse romande: n^{ième} rapport annuel. Neuchâtel.

Renders, Pascale (en préparation): Prolégomènes à l'informatisation du FEW (Französisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch). Modélisation d'un discours

étymologique. Thèse de l'Université de Liège.

1125 Rézeau, P. (1997): Dictionnaire des noms de cépages de France. Histoire et étymologie. Paris.

Rézeau, P. (1998): Compte rendu de Höfler 1996. In : Zeitschrift für
1130 romanische Philologie 114, 552-555.

Städtler, Th. (ed.) (2003):
Wissenschaftliche Lexikographie im deutschsprachigen Raum. Heidelberg.

[Stempel, W.-D.] (2003): Dictionnaire
1135 de l'Occitan Médiéval. In: Städtler, Th. (ed.), 163-170.

Thibault, A. (1998): Trois nouveaux dictionnaires différentiels de français: présentation et considérations méthodologiques. In: Actes du XXII^e Congrès International de Linguistique et de Philologie Romanes. Des mots aux dictionnaires. Tübingen, IV, 551-561.
1140

Thomassen, H. (1997): Zur Behandlung der Datierungen im *Dictionnaire historique de la langue française*. In: Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie
1145 113: 39-50.

Trotter, D. A. (1997): Les néologismes de l'anglo-français et le *FEW*. In: Le moyen français 39-41, 577-635.
1150

Trotter, D. (2000): L'avenir de la lexicographie anglo-normande: vers une refonte de l'*Anglo-Norman Dictionary*?
1155 In : Revue de linguistique romane 64, 391-407.

- Trotter, D. (2005): « Vinum novum in
utres novos » : la lexicographie
historique du français et
1160 l'informatique. In : Analele
Universității din Craiova 9/1, 43-50.
- [Winkler, N.] (2003): Dictionnaire
onomasiologique de l'Ancien Gascon.
Dictionnaire onomasiologique de l'Ancien
1165 Occitan. In: Städtler, Th. (ed.), 171-
182.
- Wooldridge, T. R. (1990): Le FEW et
les deux millions de mots d'Estienne-
Nicot: deux visages du lexique français.
1170 In: Travaux de linguistique et de
philologie 28, 239-316.
- Wunderli, P. (1982): Du mot au texte :
Actes du III^e Colloque international sur
le moyen français (Dusseldorf, 17-19
1175 septembre 1980). Tübingen.