

#### 46. Gallo-Romance I: Historical and etymological lexicography

1. General trends
2. The 'dizionario-tetto': FEW
- 5 3. French
4. Oïl 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  
entreprises de lexicographie  
55 scientifique [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).

60 Thus, in the field of French and, more  
generally, Gallo-Romance historical  
lexicography, we find ourselves facing a  
somewhat paradoxical situation. On the  
one hand, there is a negative  
65 observation of a certain lack of  
perspective of the work undertaken (but  
what process of innovation could one  
conceive apart from improvements to

parts of FEW, which cannot be supplanted  
 70 by another project?). On the other hand,  
 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  
 75 mentioned that between 1991 and 2006,  
 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  
 80 it into the other methods of describing  
 the lexicon.

## 2. The 'dizionario-tetto': FEW

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

peristruktur.

## 2.1. Kompilatsioon

105     After moving from Basel to Nancy  
 (INaLF, now ATILF) in 1993, the FEW team  
 continued to compile the dictionary  
 under the supervision of J.-P. Chauveau.  
 The beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century saw  
 110 the completion of volumes 21 to 23  
 (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).  
 115 This group of publications marked an  
 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 entries  
 120 under the letter B- that are being  
 revised. To begin with, this revision  
 keeps the Latin etyma which were  
 maintained through hereditary  
 transmission up to the present days in  
 125 the entire Gallo-Romance area, excluding  
 the substrate and onomatopoeic etyma. As  
 soon as each entry is completed  
 (BĀJULĀRE, BASTUM, BIRRUS, etc.), it is  
 available for download from the FEW  
 130 website (<http://www.atilf.fr/few>). The  
 considerable increase in length of the  
 entries is a tangible consequence of the  
 innovations that characterise it.  
 Firstly, the new FEW project takes into  
 135 account the aspects of the lexicon that  
 were previously neglected (scientific

terminology, idioms, regional variations of French, etc.). Secondly, it examines the word in its context by continuously  
140 returning to the sources. Thirdly, it 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  
145 initiated during the revision of the alphabetical section A- (Chambon 1989a; 1989b; 2002). The publication of journal articles reporting on findings derived from the compilation of FEW (like  
150 Chauveau 2006a) is proof of the creative force connected with this giant of Romance lexicology.

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

## 2.2. Computerisation

The fact that FEW is not used as much as it could, because of its structural  
165 complexity, is a well-known problem (cf. 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  
170 project began in 2005 at ATILF. Several

steps were necessary: make the entries  
of the revision of the letter *B*-  
searchable - they are already available  
in electronic form on the Internet -,  
175 study the possibilities of retro-  
conversion of the print volumes and,  
finally, digitize and make searchable  
the *Beiheft* and the various indexes. The  
success of such a project should  
180 simultaneously facilitate both the  
consultation and the update of the  
materials. The conditions for starting  
the retro-conversion of the 25 FEW  
volumes are currently being analysed in  
185 the framework of a University of  
Liège/University of Nancy 2 thesis  
carried out in close collaboration with  
ATILF (Renders, forthcoming).

### 2.3. Peristruktur

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

## 3. French

### 3.1. General Language

#### 3.1.1. DEAF

DEAF (<http://www.deaf-page.de>; Möhren

205 2003) presented itself (G 1, ix) as a  
"petit FEW pour le domaine et l'époque  
de l'ancien français" (of the 9<sup>th</sup>  
century to the middle of the 14<sup>th</sup>  
century). Actually, this dictionary,  
210 supervised by Th. Städtler after F.  
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  
215 macrostructure (regrouping the  
vocabulary of Old French by etymological  
families). It is also revealed in the  
microstructure of the entries (principle  
of classification by genetic dependence  
220 of the forms and the 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  
225 of F. Möhren), the rigorous philological  
principles that preside in the writing  
of the entries led it to distance itself  
from its model on various points. DEAF  
was particularly concerned to offer a  
230 full 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  
235 glosses but instead systematically  
resorts to true definitions. Finally, it  
completes the definitions with  
quotations that have encyclopaedic

scope. Moreover, the systematic return  
240 to the sources, as well as the  
meticulous identification of the texts  
and manuscripts cited elsewhere under  
various abbreviations, have helped  
create a bibliography that has very  
245 quickly come to stand as a reference.  
With its many indexes and the *Complément  
bibliographique* (the bibliographic  
complement, DEAFBibl, 'draft' version,  
continuously updated, and available for  
250 consultation on the 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 entries (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*<sup>1</sup>, *hypocrisie*, *hypothécaire*,  
*invitatoire*, *iota*, *irascible*, *ironie*,  
*item*<sup>1</sup> 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 (DMF<sup>0</sup>), 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  
lexica 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 (over  
350 60,000 lemmas for DMF2009); an  
enrichment of the corpus; and a creation  
of syntheses compiling under each term  
the data of different lexicons which  
deal with it.

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

#### 3.1.4. TLF-Étym

365 In 2004, the ATILF was able to equip  
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  
370 update them. To achieve this objective,  
the TLF-Étym project was launched in  
January 2005. It is a selective revision  
of the etymological notes of the  
dictionary (cf. Buchi 2005;

375 <http://www.atilf.fr/tlf-etym>). This  
 research programme is currently under  
 the leadership of Nadine Steinfeld.

It is known that TLF occupies the  
 middle ground between scientific  
 380 research and popularisation. Its  
 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  
 385 public. The *Robert historique* (Rey  
 1998<sup>2</sup>), for example, has drawn broadly  
 from TLF, in general without verifying  
 any of the data (cf. Thomassen 1997).  
 And yet, the latter is subject to many  
 390 corrections.

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  
 395 most notably FEW and DMF. It also  
 benefits from the ad hoc or regular co-  
 operation between French and foreign  
 researchers and accepts, after  
 verification, the proposals for  
 400 corrections that can be made by anybody  
 via a paper form (available for download  
 from the ATILF website:

[http://www.atilf.fr/atilf/produits/Fiche  
 \\_maj\\_tlf-etym.pdf](http://www.atilf.fr/atilf/produits/Fiche_maj_tlf-etym.pdf)). Proven working  
 405 methods effectively allow making many  
 corrections, whether they are related to  
 etymology or dating. In December 2005,  
 out of 63 revised notes, the project

thus contributed 16 etymology

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

### 3.2. Diatopisms

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

of the lexical units. The interest of  
the approach is all the more commendable  
445 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  
450 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](http://www.tlfg.ulaval.ca/presentation.asp)  
[05/06/2008]). It is the result of long  
455 *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.  
460 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  
465 in Québec. The historical explanation,  
which closes every entry by providing  
the uses of the word in the order in  
which they appear in the synchronic  
description, answers the expectations of  
470 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  
475 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 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> centuries.

480 DSR

([www.unine.ch/dialectologie/Presentation\\_Dico.html](http://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, the author's training at FEW led him to offer systematically historico-comparative comments at the end of the entries in which we find the first  
485  
490 attestation and precious information on the vitality of the word in the rest of the French-speaking world.

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

These three works "ont concrétisé la formation d'un nouveau canon", which "s'impose aujourd'hui à tous les  
510 professionnels de la recherche" (Chambon

2005a: 3). They bear comparison with DEAF in the acuity of the philological analysis (which here considers the modern French era in particular). This  
 515 is especially the case with the revision 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  
 520 s.v. *soir*, Thibault in DSR s.v. *cougner* and especially Chambon/Chauveau/Rézeau in DRF s.v. *gadin*.

This troika should soon be joined by its Belgian equivalent. The project,  
 525 which was started in Louvain-la-Neuve by M. Francard (<http://valibel.fltr.ucl.ac.be>), is expected under the title *Dictionnaire du français en Belgique* (Francard 2005:  
 530 48).

### 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  
 535 works stand out by their high scientific standard. The first, the *Dictionnaire de l'art culinaire français* (Höfler 1996), establishes, according to Höfler's 1982 proven methodology, the etymology and  
 540 the history of about 500 names of 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



545 professionnel qu'il était, nous invite à  
 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  
 550 vocabulaire" (Rézeau 1998: 555).

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  
 555 as complete as that of the lexeme *vin* by  
 general lexicography (etymology-history,  
 old attestations duly semanticized,  
 contextualized and referenced,  
 syntagmatics) for lexical units like  
 560 *chasselas*, *pinot* or *riesling*. As a side  
 effect, the numerous corrections that  
 this work contributes to FEW ensure the  
 cohesion with the Gallo-Romance  
 framework (thus s.v. *cot*: transfer from  
 565 17, 129a, \*SKÖT to 2, 44a, CAHORS; s.v.  
*graisse*: addition to 2, 1276b, \*CRASSIA;  
 s.v. *malbec*: substitution of the toponym  
 MAUBEC [6/1, 544a] by the patronymic  
 MALBECK).

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

etymologies.

580 4. Oil dialects

In historical lexicography relating to Oil dialects, the first place belongs to a publication that is not immediately recognised as belonging to the genre

585 'dictionary', its title being *Atlas 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

590 accurate etymological analysis. This distinctive characteristic makes it a fully-fledged etymological dictionary.

Moreover, in many cases, the interpretation of the Belgo-Roman data

595 represents the key to analysing an entire etymological family (cf., for example, Boutier 1992, who corrects not only the etymology for Walloon *tchawesori*, but also that of French *chauve-*

600 *souris*) or contributes to the reconstruction of the protoroman lexicon (in this way, Boutier 2003-2006 demonstrates the existence of the Hellenism *\*epidemia* in this language).

605 Furthermore, ALW contributes to the 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

610 'La terre, les plantes et les animaux' (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  
 615 etymological identifications of  
 'unknowns' (of which nine are hypotheses  
 that require confirmation).

For Oïl dialects in France, the major  
 event of the period under consideration  
 620 is the publication of the *Trésor*  
*étymologique des mots de la Franche-*  
*Comté* (Dondaine 2002). This work  
 constitutes, in the best tradition of  
 volume 5 of the ALLy (Gardette/Durdilly  
 625 1976), the etymological synthesis of the  
*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  
 630 presentation. Here again, the dialogue  
 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  
 635 material of unknown origin in FEW that  
 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  
 640 une contribution de grande valeur à la  
 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  
 645 on other domains in the Oïl area.

5. Occitan and Gascon

## 5.1. DAO and DAG

DAO and DAG (cf. Winkler 2003) present the lexicon of old Occitan and old  
 650 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  
 655 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  
 660 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  
 665 *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,  
 670 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  
 675 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  
 680 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 specific nature of Gascon or the fact that this dictionary relies almost exclusively on a non-literary corpus.

## 5.2. DOM

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

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

The editors of DOM maintain a  
 particularly constructive and critical  
 dialogue with scientific Gallo-Romance  
 725 lexicography. Thus, to focus on  
 instalment 5 (2005) alone, the many  
 corrections made to FEW (in the first  
 ten pages: *s.v. [agrefol], agrejar,*  
*agrenier, agrest<sub>2</sub>, [agret], agreu,*  
 730 *agrimen*) as well as proposals to remove  
 articles from dictionaries and text  
 editions (*\*agremat, \*[aguda], \*agussa,*  
*\*ai<sub>2</sub>, \*aid, \*[aiga<sub>2</sub>], \*aïnar, \*aira<sub>2</sub>*)  
 bear witness to the "niveau extrêmement  
 735 élevé du DOM [...], un niveau presque  
 idéal" (Pfister 1999: 157).

#### 6. Franco-Provençal

The absence of an etymological and  
 historical dictionary of Franco-  
 740 Provençal is without doubt the most  
 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  
 745 a dictionary that is first and foremost  
 descriptive and synchronic, it has a  
 historical treasury of varieties of the  
 Franco-Provençal (as well as Franc-

Comtois) lexica of the Helvetian area.

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

Beyond the dictionary itself, the GPSR  
 team also maintains a fruitful dialogue  
 with the scientific community through  
 its annual report (Rapport GPSR). Since  
 770 1964, this publication has 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  
 775 lexicology/lexicography. In this way,  
 the 2005 edition, dealing with 2003 and  
 2004, makes an inventory of the  
 antedatings for ten lexical types  
 (*fourchon*, *fournoyer*, *fourragement*,  
 780 *foutimasser*, *gerberie*, *germaison*,  
*gibecier* [in two different meanings],  
*girarde*, *giron* and *haut fourneau*). If

some of the antedatings suggested do not  
withstand detailed examination (cf.

785 Evrard/Steinfeld in TLF-Étym s.v.  
*diurnal* and *estagnon*), they constitute a  
very precious gateway to French  
scientific lexicography.

#### 7. French-based Creole languages

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

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

#### 8. Conclusion

Fifteen years after Chambon's review  
quoted in the introduction above, our  
810 general survey (cf. also Fryba-Reber  
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  
815 linguistics and etymology, which are  
considered as an essential element in



the description of language units. The most striking example is without a doubt the successful integration of

820 etymological information in specialised lexicography of French, whether variational (essentially diatopic) or related to another specific part of the lexicon. Apart from FEW, which preserves

825 an integral etymology, the various lexicographical undertakings mentioned above put into practice an integrated etymology, in varied domains and for phenomena occasionally supralexical. A

830 consequence of this successful integration is the occasional abolition of the boundary between the 'pure' historical or etymological dictionary and the language dictionary. DHFQ,

835 despite its title, is also a descriptive 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

840 the historical description in spite of their mainly synchronic perspective. This dialogue between synchrony and diachrony can only, ultimately, improve the quality of the lexicographical

845 description.

Computer resources and, more specifically, the XML format, have been increasingly used in these projects. It is as much a matter of multiplying the

850 possibilities of accessing the

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  
855 ensuring a high level of consistency.

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  
860 which FEW, DEAF, DMF, DAO and DAG have undergone, as successful as they may be, bear witness to a structural problem that objectively arises in all Gallo-Romance lexicography. Thus, while an  
865 intelligent use of the new media can contribute to removing Gallo-Romance lexicography from the impasse that it has created for itself by continuously raising its requirements, the new  
870 technology itself is not a panacea. On the contrary, the future of historical Gallo-Romance lexicography - one of the best in the world - consists of recruiting, within the various  
875 prestigious projects that are listed 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  
880 elders, but also of reviving and, if necessary, reorienting it, taking into account the priorities of the sub-discipline and working fully with their network of peers.

## 885 9. Select Bibliography

## 9.1. Dictionaries

ALW = Remacle, L. *et al.* (1953-):

Atlas linguistique de la Wallonie.

Tableau géographique des parlers de la

890 Belgique romane d'après l'enquête de

Jean Haust et des enquêtes

complémentaires. Liège.

AND = Rothwell, W./Gregory, S./Trotter, D. A. (dir.), 2005<sup>-2</sup> [1977-1992<sup>1</sup>].

895 *Anglo-Norman Dictionary*. London.

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

DAG = Baldinger, K. *et al.* (1975-):

900 *Dictionnaire onomasiologique de l'ancien gascon*. Tübingen.

DAO = Baldinger, K. *et al.* (1975-):

*Dictionnaire onomasiologique de l'ancien occitan*. Tübingen.

905 DEAF = Baldinger, K. *et al.* (1971-):

*Dictionnaire étymologique de l'ancien français*. Québec/Tübingen/Paris.

DEAFBibl = Möhren, F. (2007<sup>3</sup> [1974<sup>1</sup>]):

910 *Dictionnaire étymologique de l'ancien français. Complément bibliographique*. Tübingen.

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

915 vol. Hamburg.

DHFQ = Poirier, C. (dir.) (1998):

*Dictionnaire historique du français québécois: Monographies lexicographiques*

de québécismes. Québec.

920 DOM = Stempel, W.-D. *et al.* (1996-):  
Dictionnaire de l'occitan médiéval.  
Tübingen.

DMF = ATILF (2003-): Dictionnaire du  
Moyen Français (DMF). Site internet

925 (<http://www.atilf.fr/dmf>). Nancy.

Dondaine, C. (2002): Trésor étymologi-  
que des mots de la Franche-Comté d'après  
*l'Atlas linguistique et ethnographique*  
*de la Franche-Comté*. Strasbourg.

930 DRF = Rézeau, P. (dir.) (2001):  
Dictionnaire des régionalismes de  
France. Géographie et histoire d'un  
patrimoine linguistique. Bruxelles.

DSR = Thibault, A. (2004<sup>2</sup> [1997<sup>1</sup>]):

935 Dictionnaire suisse romand. Genève-  
Carouge.

Enckell, P./Rézeau, P. (2003):

Dictionnaire des onomatopées. Paris.

FEW = Wartburg, W. von *et al.* (1922-  
940 2002). *Französisches Etymologisches*  
*Wörterbuch. Eine darstellung des*  
*galloromanischen sprachschatzes*. 25 vol.  
Bonn/Heidelberg/Leipzig-Berlin/Basel.

GPSR = Gauchat, L. *et al.* (1924-):

945 Glossaire des patois de la Suisse  
romande. Neuchâtel/Paris.

Höfler, M. (1982): Dictionnaire des  
anglicismes. Paris.

Höfler, M. (1996): Dictionnaire de  
950 l'art culinaire français. Étymologie et  
histoire. Aix-en-Provence.

Rey, A. (dir.) (1998<sup>2</sup> [1992<sup>1</sup>]):

Dictionnaire historique de la langue française. 3 vol. Paris.

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

Trésor de la langue française.

Dictionnaire de la langue du XIX<sup>e</sup> et du XX<sup>e</sup> siècle (1789-1960). 16 vol. Paris.

TLFi = CNRS/Université Nancy2/ATILF,

960 (2004): Trésor de la Langue Française informatisé (cédérom). Paris. (internet version: <http://stella.atilf.fr>).

### 9.2. Other work

Arveiller, R. (1999): Addenda au FEW

965 XIX (Orientalia), edited by M. Pfister. Tübingen.

Baldinger, K. (1988-2003) :

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

970 Boutier, M.-G. (1992): Une question de 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  
975 type latin » d'origine grecque en Wallonie: \*EPIDEMIA. In: Les Dialectes de Wallonie 31-33, 83-109.

Büchi, E. (1996): Les Structures du 'Französisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch'. Recherches métalexigraphiques et métalexicologiques. Tübingen.

980 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.

- Buchi, É. (ed.) (2005/2006): Actes du Séminaire de méthodologie en étymologie et histoire du lexique (Nancy/ATILF, 990 année universitaire 2005/2006). Nancy (<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 995 des notices étymologiques du Trésor de la langue française informatisé » (Nancy/ATILF, 4 novembre 2005). Nancy (<http://www.atilf.fr/atilf/evenement/JourneeEtude/LHF2005>).
- 1000 Chambon, JP (1989a): Tradition et innovations dans la refonte du FEW. In: Actes du XVIII<sup>e</sup> congrès international de linguistique et de philologie romanes. Tübingen, VIII, 327-337.
- 1005 Chambon, JP (1989b): Aspects philologiques et linguistiques dans la refonte du FEW: utilité d'une approche métaphilologique des représentations linguistiques. In: Actes du XVIII<sup>e</sup> 1010 congrès international de linguistique et de philologie romanes. Tübingen, VIII, 218-230.
- Chambon, JP (1991): Étymologie française (et gallo-romane): un bilan 1015 (1971-1991). In: Goosse, A./Klein, J.-R./Pierret, J.-M. (ed.), Où en sont les études sur le lexique ? Bilan et perspectives, Travaux de linguistique 23, 69-89.
- 1020 Chambon, JP (2000): Un événement dans

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

1025 Chambon, JP (2002): Préface. In: FEW  
25, iii-vi.

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-  
1050 pleano di Max Pfister. Tübingen, 33-37.

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

Francard, M. (2005): *La frontière*

1055 entre les langues régionales romanes et  
le français en Wallonie. In: Glessgen,  
M.-D./Thibault, A. (eds.), 45-61.

Fryba-Reber, A.-M. (2003) : Étude et  
description étymologique et historique  
1060 du lexique des langues romanes : le  
français et l'occitan. In : Ernst, G. et  
al. (eds), *Romanische Sprachgeschichte*.  
Berlin/New York, 1, 357-368.

Gardette, P./Durdilly, P. (1976):  
1065 Atlas linguistique et ethnographique du  
Lyonnais. Vol. 5: Commentaires et index.  
Paris.

Gerner, H./Martin, R. (2005): Le lexi-  
que de la langue scientifique à l'aune  
1070 du FEW. In: James-Raoul, D./Soutet, O.  
(ed.), *Par les mots et les textes*.  
Mélanges de langue, de littérature et  
d'histoire des sciences médiévales  
offerts à Claude Thomasset. Paris, 357-  
1075 370.

Glessgen, M.-D./Thibault, A. (ed.)  
(2005): *La lexicographie différentielle  
du français et le Dictionnaire des  
régionalismes de France*. Actes du  
1080 colloque en l'honneur de Pierre Rézeau  
pour son soixante-cinquième anniversaire  
(Strasbourg, Université Marc Bloch, 20-  
22 juin 2003). Strasbourg.

Hallig, R./Wartburg (W. von) (1963<sup>2</sup>  
1085 [1952<sup>1</sup>]): *Begriffssystem als Grundlage  
für die Lexikographie. Versuch eines  
Ordnungsschemas*. Berlin.

Lagueunière, Fr. (1998): *Le traitement*



- de la variation diatopique en français  
 1090 moderne dans le *Französisches  
 Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. In: Ruffino,  
 G. (ed.): Atti del XXI Congresso  
 Internazionale di Linguistica e  
 Filologia Romanza. Tübingen, 3, 387-395.
- 1095 [Möhren, Fr.] (2003): Dictionnaire  
 étymologique de l'ancien français  
 (DEAF). In: Städtler, Th. (ed.), 183-  
 194.
- Pfister, M. (1993) : Rapport sur  
 1100 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  
 1105 Occitanes» (Torino, 31 agosto-5  
 settembre 1987). Torino, 923-954.
- Pfister, M. (1999): La lexicographie  
 de l'ancien occitan. In: La France  
 latine 129, 151-160.
- 1110 Pfister, M. (2000) : Überblick über  
 die altokzitanische Lexikologie 1986-  
 1998. In : Rieger, A. (ed.),  
 Okzitanistik, Altokzitanistik und  
 Provenzalistik. Geschichte und Auftrag  
 1115 einer europäischen Philologie.  
 Frankfurt, 73-96.
- Rapport GPSR = 1898-. Glossaire des  
 patois de la Suisse romande: n<sup>ième</sup>  
 rapport annuel. Neuchâtel.
- 1120 Renders, Pascale (en préparation):  
 Prolégomènes à l'informatisation du FEW  
 (Französisches Etymologisches

- Wörterbuch). Modélisation d'un discours  
étymologique. Thèse de l'Université de  
1125 Liège.
- Rézeau, P. (1997): Dictionnaire des  
noms de cépages de France. Histoire et  
étymologie. Paris.
- Rézeau, P. (1998): Compte rendu de  
1130 Höfler 1996. In : Zeitschrift für  
romanische Philologie 114, 552-555.
- Städtler, Th. (ed.) (2003):  
Wissenschaftliche Lexikographie im  
deutschsprachigen Raum. Heidelberg.
- 1135 [Stempel, W.-D.] (2003): Dictionnaire  
de l'Occitan Médiéval. In: Städtler, Th.  
(ed.), 163-170.
- Thibault, A. (1998): Trois nouveaux  
dictionnaires différentiels de français:  
1140 présentation et considérations méthodo-  
logiques. In: Actes du XXII<sup>e</sup> Congrès In-  
ternational de Linguistique et de Philo-  
logie Romanes. Des mots aux diction-  
naires. Tübingen, IV, 551-561.
- 1145 Thomassen, H. (1997): Zur Behandlung  
der Datierungen im *Dictionnaire  
historique de la langue française*. In:  
Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie  
113: 39-50.
- 1150 Trotter, D. A. (1997): Les néologismes  
de l'anglo-français et le *FEW*. In: Le  
moyen français 39-41, 577-635.
- Trotter, D. (2000): L'avenir de la  
lexicographie anglo-normande: vers une  
1155 refonte de l'*Anglo-Norman Dictionary*?  
In : Revue de linguistique romane 64,

391-407.

Trotter, D. (2005): « Vinum novum in  
utres novos » : la lexicographie

1160 historique du français et  
l'informatique. In : Analele  
Universității din Craiova 9/1, 43-50.

[Winkler, N.] (2003): Dictionnaire  
onomasiologique de l'Ancien Gascon.

1165 Dictionnaire onomasiologique de l'Ancien  
Occitan. In: Städtler, Th. (ed.), 171-  
182.

Wooldridge, T. R. (1990): Le FEW et  
les deux millions de mots d'Estienne-

1170 Nicot: deux visages du lexique français.  
In: Travaux de linguistique et de  
philologie 28, 239-316.

Wunderli, P. (1982): Du mot au texte :  
Actes du III<sup>e</sup> Colloque international sur

1175 le moyen français (Dusseldorf, 17-19  
septembre 1980). Tübingen.