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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
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. 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 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 etymological work, which at once explains, and compensates for, this worrying situation: “Il est inutile de redire ici que la ‘lenteur’dé ces entreprises de lexicographie scientifique 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 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 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, 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, 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 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 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 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 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 considered from three perspectives: its compilation, its computerisation and its peristructure.
2.1. Compilation

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 21st century saw 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). 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 articles under the letter B- that are being 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 the substrate and onomatopoeic etymons. As soon as each article is completed (BÂJULÂRE, BÂSTUM, BÂRRUS, etc.), it is available for download from the FEW site (http://www.atilf.fr/few). The 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 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
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
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
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
(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
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.
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
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-
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 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 thesis carried out in close collaboration with ATILF (Renders, forthcoming).

2.3. Peristucture

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 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 addition.

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
“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. 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 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 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), 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 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 systematically resorts to true definitions. Finally, it completes the definitions with quotations that have encyclopaedic scope. Moreover, the
systematic return 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 quickly come to stand as a reference. With its many indexes and the Complément bibliographique (the bibliographic complement, DEA F Bibl, 'draft' version, continuously updated, and available for 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 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 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 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, 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 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 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 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, hypocondre¹, hypocrisie, hypothécaire, invitatoire, iota, irascible, ironie, item¹ or ivrogne).

3.1.2. AND

Etymology is not part of the research 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) 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-

3.1.3. AND

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

Via 'The Anglo-Norman On-Line Hub' (http://www.anglo-norman.net; cf. Trotter 2000; 2005), a vast project 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).

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. 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 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 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 (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 (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 (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.

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, 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 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, 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
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 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 1998), 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.

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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 (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, 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.tlfq.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 (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 articles in which we find the first 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 pushed even further in DRF, which describes “les principales variétés géographiques du français, observées dans la seconde moitié du 20e siècle en France” (DRF: 7). As in the case of DSR, the first aim of this dictionary is 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 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 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 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 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 M. Francard (http://valibel.fltr.ucl.ac.be, is expected under the title Dictionnaire du français en Belgique (Francard 2005: 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 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 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 professionnel qu'il était, nous invite à
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 general lexicography (etymology-history, old attestations duly semanticized, contextualized and referenced, syntagmatics) for lexical units like *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 of 17, 129a, *SKÔT* 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).

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' 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.
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 '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 accurate etymological analysis. This 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 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 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 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' (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 ‘unknowns’ (of which nine are hypotheses that require confirmation).

For Oïl dialects in France, the major event of the period under consideration 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 predecessors, DOM brings unquestionable benefits as regards broadening the nomenclature, better foundation and enrichment of the documentary basis, semantic and graphemic description, evidencing of phraseological turns and even syntax (through the articles devoted to grammatical words, “modèles de description syntaxique sous forme lexicographique” (Chambon 2000: 443).

The references carefully differentiate the textual genres into lyrical troubadouresque ('T'), other literary sources ('L') and archive documents ('D'). The bibliographical supplement,
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
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
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
articles from dictionaries and text
editions (*agremat, *[aguda], *agussa,
*ai2, *aid, *[aiga2], *ainar, *aira2)
bear witness to the “niveau extrêmement
elevé du DOM […], un niveau presque
idéal” (Pfister 1999: 157).

6. Franco-Provençal

The absence of an etymological and
historical dictionary of Franco-
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
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) lexicons of the Helvetian area.
The extremely concise nature of the etymological discourse of this dictionary contrasts with its long developments in the synchronic description. However, from the 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 is carried out. Corrections and details added to FEW are legion; instalment 111 (2005), for example, explicitly includes them: s.v. fraîche, frais\textsuperscript{1}, franchise, frats\textsuperscript{0}, fratsi, frayer, frazè, fré, frôbéyi\textsuperscript{0}, frédôna, frôgatsi et frôgôly\textsuperscript{0}.

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 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, the 2005 edition, dealing with 2003 and 2004, makes an inventory of the antedatings for ten lexical types (fourchon, fournoyer, fourragement, 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. 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

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. 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 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 useful, particularly thanks to its systematic references to FEW.

8. Conclusion

Fifteen years after Chambon's review quoted in the introduction above, our 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 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 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 an integral etymology, the various lexicographical undertakings mentioned above put into practice an integrated etymology, in varied domains and for phenomena occasionally supralexical. A consequence of this successful 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 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 their mainly synchronic perspective. This dialogue between synchrony and diachrony can only, ultimately, improve the quality of the lexicographical 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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.
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