

unabridged give a full picture of American English. Craigie has chosen the end of the 19th century as a *terminus ad quem*; but Mathews' record of 20th-century American usage is also incomplete, especially when lexicography borders on grammar. Neither includes *overly* ('not overly pleased') or *one ... his* ('one should do his duty'). Craigie registers *out*, n., *out*, a., and *out*, adv., but omits *out*, prep. ('out the door'). Mathews (unabridged) recognizes *out*, adv., prep. a., and n., but gives no example of *out* prep.; in the abridged edition *out* is left out altogether.

*A dictionary of selected Americanisms* is a valuable work, even though its value is necessarily limited.

'De Terp', B 30,  
Mr. Th. Heemskerkaan 37,  
Amersfoort, The Netherlands

R. W. ZANDVOORT

HENRI GUITER, *Atlas linguistique des Pyrénées Orientales*.  
Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Paris 1966.  
333 pp., 585 maps, F 200.—. HENRI BOURCELOT, *Atlas lin-*  
*guistique et ethnographique de la Champagne et de la Brie*, vol.  
I (le Temps - la Terre). Ibidem Paris 1966. 318 maps,  
10 drawings. Price: F 140.—.

After Gardette's *Atlas du Lyonnais*, Séguy's *Atlas de la Gascogne* and Nauton's *Atlas du Massif Central*, two new regional atlases of French dialects make their appearance, both published by the *Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique* in the by now traditional format of the series *Atlas linguistiques de la France par régions*. Guiter's *ALPyO*, however, does not officially belong to the series as it differs on many points from the other atlases; nevertheless its evident merits and its geographical connection with the other atlases have convinced the Commission of the *CNRS* to assume it under its auspices.

Curiously enough, Guiter had been personally invited in 1942 by Dauzat - the founder of the series of regional atlases, then called *Nouvel Atlas linguistique de la France* - to take charge of the atlas of Roussillon. In the Introduction the Author tells the story of the project and of the modifications it underwent before reaching its present form. Field work began in 1943, but owing to the war got

well under way only in 1947. Then in a relatively short period of time reached its completion in 1951.

The *ALPyO* differs from the other regional atlases mainly on the following points:

(1) The atlas consists of only one volume of 565 maps (size 50 × 32, the usual size of the atlases of the *CNRS*) arranged alphabetically (and not ideologically).

(2) It is an 'exhaustive' atlas: practically every village in the area has been covered. To give an idea of the significance of this one need only observe that Dauzat had suggested a survey of 12 villages (as compared to the 5 villages of Gillieron's *ALF*, the 5 of Griera's Atlas of Catalonia, and the 7 of the Atlas of the Iberian Peninsula) while the number of villages surveyed by Guiter and his *équipe* has been 382! It is worth remembering that the only atlas which aimed at an exhaustive survey of an object-area has been the *Deutscher Sprach-atlas*. But in that case the questionnaire was sent by mail to the almost 50 thousand correspondents, and the difficulties involved in handling the materials were those well known to dialectologists. The *ALPyO* is therefore unique in this respect and will not fail to exercise considerable influence upon any future organizer of a small linguistic atlas.

(3) The area covered by the *ALPyO* is a typical border area where three languages (French, Catalan, Spanish) and a variety of Occitan and Catalan dialects overlap. It is an area, therefore, characterized by great complexity. The exhaustiveness of the data offered by the *ALPyO* is, consequently, even more to be appreciated.

(4) The realization of the maps is impeccable and in certain respects original. As compared to the other atlases of the series these maps present data which are not, as it were, raw, but have undergone a certain amount of processing. The attested forms are not printed in correspondence with each point, but in correspondence with the whole of the area where they appear, and the body of the print is proportional to the largeness of the area. The effect is extremely clear: the maps provide at a glance an idea of the distribution of each type. The areas thus obtained are separated from one another by two different types of lines: a continuous line if the forms attested in the areas are radically different from each other, as for example lexically or morphologically; a broken line – apparently – if the differences are less important. Here also the visual effect is clear.

What is less clear is how the choice between the two types of lines has been made. For example why in map 15 'je vai' are the areas *baysə* and *badžə* divided by a broken line, in map 295 'jeudi' the areas *dižows* and *dižəws* by a continuous line? Or in map 304 'laisse' the area *dayšo* separated by a continuous line from *dayso* but by a broken line from *dišə*, *dešo* etc.? The cases which raise doubts are numerous. It could be that the underlying criterion is simple and effective enough, and that it has escaped us, but then one wonders why the Author has neglected to present his method in the Introduction.

(5) Other features that increase the value of the *ALPyO* are: the presence of maps that supply statistical data on the use of certain forms (a feature that is becoming increasingly frequent after the Rumanian dialectologists introduced it in their regional atlas of Oltenia); the presence of maps such as 345 'mêmes' where the place of the adjective in relation to the accompanying noun is also indicated; the twenty introductory maps that give a comprehensive view of the area with respect to geography, history, religion etc.; an index of the almost 5 thousand forms attested, in phonological transcription. Last but not least the use of phoneme representation, as against the more impressionistic 'ear' representation which is traditional in atlas making.

In the light of the special character of the area it might be of interest to give an indication of the main types of areal distributions which occur in the maps. A certain number of maps show the spreading of a single form in the whole area, thus both in the Catalan and in the Occitan area. See for example in map 84 *blat* 'blé', 93 *bosk* 'bois', 145 *sin* 'cinq', 236 *fa* 'fait', 250 *foĸ* 'feu', 286 *oli* 'huile', 336 *ma* 'main', 353 *mes* 'mois', 368 *new* 'neige', 401 *pa* 'pain', 549 *bi* 'vin', 556 *bist* 'vu' etc.

A very large number of maps show a more or less marked division between the two areas – Occitan and Catalan – along the traditional line, that is along the old political frontier between France and Spain, coinciding in large part with the present northern frontier of the Pyrénées Orientales. Some examples: 5 *ala* | *ələ* 'à la, au'; 42 *laržən* | *lə plətə* 'l'argent'; 61 *abən* | *tənim* 'nous avons'; 64 *sun* | *ən* 'ils sont'; 85 *blü*, *blö* | *blaw* 'bleu'; 88 *byow* | *bow* 'boeuf'; 112 *kupət* | *trenkət* etc. 'cassé'; 127 *kaws*, *karwžino* | *kałs* 'chaux'; 128 *kami* | *kəmi* 'chemin'; 140 *karwłət* (m.) | *koł* (f.) 'chou'; 149 *klabəl* etc. | *klaw* 'clou'; 153 *pr:l*

etc./*gal* etc. 'coq'; 183 *de/də* 'de'; 220 *e/i* 'et'; 246 *fəŋno* etc./*dəŋə* 'femme'; 265 *a gawtšo* etc./*əskəřə* 'à gauche'; 293 *žawno* etc./*grəgə* 'jaune'; 300 *žur*, *žun/djə* 'jour'; 309 *la/lə* 'la'; 338 *ustal/kazə* 'maison'; 526 *trop/məřə* 'trop'; 530 *tüə* etc./*mətə* 'tuer'; etc.

A third group of maps – to us the most important result of Guiter's atlas – shows an extremely broken up area, with isoglosses (phonological, morphological and lexical) moving in every direction (and not only in Capcir, a typical bilingual area). Some examples: 8 's'accroupir', 36–37 'après', 46 'assieds-toi', 50 'aubépine', 53 'avant'hier', 94 'bordé', 113 'ce', 114 'cette', 137 'chez nous', 154 'coquelicot', 189 'tu devrais', 263 'garçons', 448 'pourvu que', 504–505 'sur', 540 'ver luisant', etc.

A few maps show the spreading of 'modern' French words into the Catalan area, to the extent of the political frontier with Spain. See for example how in map 301 'journal' the line dividing the area *žurnal* and the area *diari* coincides with the political frontier.

Also in regard to the *Atlas de la Champagne*, Dauzat's original plan was abandoned. Dauzat had envisaged the realization of an atlas that would cover not only Champagne but also Lorraine. The decision to reduce the area to Champagne was taken by Robert Lorient, the linguist responsible for the Atlas within the Commission of the CNPS. A slight extension beyond the four *départements* of Champagne (Aube, Haute-Marne, Marne, Ardennes) namely to parts of Aisne and Yonne, the whole of Seine-et-Marne, and Bouillon in Belgium, was decided by the Author on the basis of historical and linguistic considerations.

Field work, entirely carried out by Bourcelot, began in 1957 and ended in 1961. There were 194 points covered, the ratio per *canton* being 1 or 2 points each. The questionnaire included about 1600 words or expressions.

The first volume consists of 318 maps arranged ideologically, and is illustrated. The transcription system is that of the ALF with adjustments to local speech. It is worth mentioning that also Bourcelot makes sporadic use of the method consistently used by Guiter: the printing of one form to indicate the whole of the area, rather than repeating the 'same' form.

At the end of the volume Bourcelot advances some conclusions on the basis of his experience. Among them we mention the following: the dialects of Champagne and Brie have been regressing for a

long time but only in the last few years the tempo of such a development has accelerated; the causes of such an acceleration are to be looked for much more in structural changes affecting the economy of the areas, than in the often mentioned introduction of communication media and the like. Despite such regression the dialects are still vital and lively within the farming community. In fact, contemporary words are still 'deformed' following traditional patterns (*pelicilline* instead of *pénicilline*) and dialect terms are still created to designate new objects (*torée-boutée* 'taureau-en-bouteille' to indicate the artificial inseminator). On the whole, the dialects spoken in the Haute-Marne, in Eastern Marne, Ardennes and even in Brie are still incomprehensible to the outsider. The dialects have preserved their characteristics more with respect to vocabulary and syntax than to morphology.

*Rijksuniversiteit van Utrecht,  
Instituut voor Italiaanse  
Taal- en Letterkunde,  
Lucas Bolwerk 16,  
Utrecht, The Netherlands*

MARIO ALINEI

AERT H. KUIPERS, *The Squamish language*. Janua Linguarum, Series Practica 73. Mouton & Co., The Hague 1967. 407 pp., map. Price: f 88,—.

This is the most thorough analysis of a Salish language yet to appear, and is superior to anything that has been published on Salish – Reichard's Coeur d'Alene is pre-structural, Vogt's very good Kalispel grammar has obvious gaps, my own Upper Chehalis is too abbreviated, and the very few others have even greater faults. Although there will be considerable disagreement with some of Kuipers' analyses, he can only be highly commended for this publication. He has obviously put in a tremendous amount of work on this book, and all other Salishists (who have themselves been extremely slow about publishing their own data and analyses) are and will continue to be grateful for *The Squamish language* and the wealth of data contained in it. Kuipers did his field work between 1951 and 1956 in Vancouver, British Columbia (where he was on the staff of the University of British Columbia from 1951 to 1954), where his