

HISTORY OF LINGUISTICS 2002

AMSTERDAM STUDIES IN THE THEORY AND
HISTORY OF LINGUISTIC SCIENCE

General Editor

E. F. KONRAD KOERNER

Zentrum für Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft,
Typologie und Universalienforschung
Schützenstrasse 18/11, D-10117 Berlin

Series III – STUDIES IN THE HISTORY OF THE LANGUAGE SCIENCES

Advisory Editorial Board

Cristina Altman (São Paulo); Lia Formigari (Rome)
Gerda Haßler (Potsdam); John E. Joseph (Edinburgh)
Barbara Kaltz (Aix-en-Provence); Douglas A. Kibbee (Urbana, Ill.)
Hans-Josef Niederehe (Trier); Emilio Ridruejo (Valladolid)
Otto Zwartjes (Amsterdam)

Volume 110

Eduardo Guimarães and Diana Luz Pessoa de Barros (eds.)

History of Linguistics 2002
Selected papers from the Ninth International Conference
on the History of the Language Sciences,
27–30 August 2002, São Paulo – Campinas

HISTORY OF LINGUISTICS 2002

SELECTED PAPERS FROM
THE NINTH INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE
ON THE HISTORY OF THE LANGUAGE SCIENCES,
27-30 AUGUST 2002, SÃO PAULO – CAMPINAS

Edited by

EDUARDO GUIMARÃES

Universidade Estadual de Campinas

DIANA LUZ PESSOA DE BARROS

Universidade de São Paulo

JOHN BENJAMINS PUBLISHING COMPANY
AMSTERDAM/PHILADELPHIA



The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of American National Standard for Information Sciences — Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI Z39.48-1984.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

International Conference on the History of the Language Sciences (9th : 2002 : São Paulo-Campinas)
History of linguistics 2002 : selected papers from the Ninth International Conference on the History of the
Language Sciences, 27-30 August 2002, Sao Paulo-Campinas / edited by Eduardo Guimarães, Diana Luz
Pessoa De Barros.

p. cm. -- (Amsterdam studies in the theory and history of linguistic science. Series III, Studies in
the history of the language sciences, ISSN 0304-0720; v. 110)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

1. Linguistics--History--Congresses. I. Guimarães, Eduardo, 1948- II. Barros, Diana Luz Pessoa de. III.
Title.

P61.I57 2002

410.9--dc22

2007015636

ISBN 978 90 272 4601 1 (alk. paper)

© 2007 – John Benjamins B.V.

No part of this book may be reproduced in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm, or any other means,
without written permission from the publisher.

John Benjamins Publishing Co. • P.O.Box 75577 • 1070 AN Amsterdam • The Netherlands
John Benjamins North America • P.O.Box 27519 • Philadelphia, PA 19118-0519 • USA

CONTENTS

Part I

FROM THE LATIN GRAMMARIANS TO THE IDÉOLOGUES

- Some Problems in Transferring the Latin Model to the First French Grammars
Verbal voice, impersonal verbs and the –rais form* 3
Bernard Colombat
- Un exemple du transfert du modèle latin aux premières grammaires
du français: l'analyse des temps du passé* 17
Jean-Marie Fournier
- Linguistic Ideas and the Discourse about Languages in early
Brazilian History* 27
Bethania Mariani
- Grammaire générale et grammaire particulière:
Les Méthodes de Claude Irson* 41
Simone Delesalle & Francine Mazière
- Texts of Reference and Serial Texts in the Constitution of a Notional Paradigm:
The example of the french idéologues* 63
Gerda Haßler

Part II

LINGUISTICS IN THE 19TH AND 20TH CENTURIES

- The Brazilian Hyperlanguage Mark in the Traditional Grammar
of the 19th Century* 75
Marli Quadros Leite
- Revista Ilustrada: un document sur le langage des Noirs à la fin
du XIXe siècle* 87
Margarida Maria Taddoni Petter
- The “Arrested Evolution”: Notion, theories, myth?* 93
Ekaterina Velmezova

<i>On the Defense of von Kempelen as the Predecessor of Experimental Phonetics and Speech Synthesis Research</i>	101
Plínio A. Barbosa	
<i>Positivism and Neo-positivism in Linguistics and Language Philosophy</i>	107
Paul Laurendeau	
<i>From Universal Languages to Intermediary Languages in Machine Translation The work of the Cambridge Language Research Unit (1955-1970)</i>	123
Jacqueline Léon	
<i>The Presence of Absence in Saussure's Linguistic Theory</i>	133
T. Craig Christy	
<i>La création des cours de lettres au Brésil et les premières orientations de la recherche linguistique universitaire</i>	141
José Luiz Fiorin	
<i>The Portuguese Language in the Institutionalization of Linguistics</i>	149
Suzy Lagazzi-Rodrigues	
<i>Humor and Language Acquisition: Anecdotal data and their route in the history of language acquisition studies</i>	157
Rosa Attié Figueira	

Part III
PLENARY PAPERS

<i>Reflexions sur l'expérience grecque du langage</i>	171
Maria Helena de Moura Neves	
<i>Johann Jacob Reiske (1716-1774): Leading Force in the Establishment of Oriental and Classical Scholarship in Germany</i>	183
Kurt R. Jankowsky	
<i>The Context and Sense of Humboldt's Statement that Language 'ist kein werk (ergon), sondern eine tätigkeit (energeia)'</i>	197
Hans Aarsleff	
<i>On the Notion of Structure and Structuralism in Brazil</i>	207
Eni P. Orlandi	
<i>Les avancées de notre discipline</i>	223
Sylvain Auroux	

CONTENTS

vii

INDEX OF NAMES 235
INDEX RERUM 239

FOREWORD

The Ninth International Conference on the History of Language Sciences (ICHoLS IX), held from August 27 to 30, 2002, in Brazil, was an initiative of the Campinas State University (Unicamp) and the University of São Paulo (USP) Linguistic Departments. The interest in holding this Conference in Brazil was due to the existence of research on the History of Linguistic Ideas in Brazil since the 1980s.

Altogether, one hundred and six regular papers were presented at the meeting, covering a wide variety of themes in the history of language studies. In addition, the conference organizers invited six plenary speakers.

Given the wide interest in the history of linguistics in Brazil, in addition to those who presented the result of their investigations, a large number of professors and post-graduate students were in attendance. From the many presentations that were actually made by our Brazilian colleagues, we selected those that we thought represented best current historiographical research activities, especially those related to developments in Brazil. At the same time, given the diversity of the countries of the scholars from abroad and their varying research interests, ICHoLS IX provided a multiple and diversified contact for those interested in the history of linguistic studies, always important in the progress of good research projects, as can be seen in the works now brought together in this volume.

The papers presented at the Conference dealt with numerous domains of language study, involving the history of linguistic studies from Antiquity, the Middle Ages, the Renaissance and more recent periods. Many presentations were devoted to the 19th and 20th centuries. Among others, papers were dedicated to the history of concepts and terms, to aspects related to the history of the institutions, to language policies (including questions of prescriptive or normative attitudes). What was interesting about a number of them was the utilization of different points of view and different methodologies, thus providing stimulating discussions following both a good number of regular papers and several of the plenary lectures.

This volume brings together a selection of the papers given at ICHoLS IX, organized under three headings. In the first part, papers are presented dealing with studies ranging from the Latin model in post-Renaissance grammars until new scientific propositions at the turn of the 19th century; the second part carries articles devoted to a great variety of subjects; in the third section, are united five plenary presentations ranging from ancient Greek reflections upon language to developments in Brazilian

linguistics beginning with the implantation of structuralist work by Joaquim Mattoso Câmara (1904–1970) in the 1960s. In the concluding contribution, a survey of advances in the history of the language sciences is offered.

A glance at the table of contents of this selection, made from the many papers presented and discussed at ICHoLS IX, reflects quite adequately, we are inclined to believe, the diversity of topics that had been offered on the market of linguistic ideas. And those wanting to know more about developments in Brazil in linguistic science and its more recent state may also learn more from the altogether seven contributions by researchers in this country.

Despite the roughly chronological organization of the papers in all three sections, it is obvious that a thematic arrangement might also have been possible, such as strictly grammatical subjects, debates about language acquisition and language planning, general linguistic theory and language philosophy, the practical — and technical — analysis of language, and so forth. It is hoped that everyone interested in the history of the language sciences will find something of interest to their own work.

At the General Assembly toward the end of the Conference, the University of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign, with Douglas A. Kibbee as its director, was chosen as the venue for ICHoLS X. (In the meantime, this very successful meeting was duly held on 1–5 September 2005.)

Before closing, we would like to thank Unicamp and its Institute of Language Studies and the University of São Paulo and its College of Philosophy, Letters and Human Sciences for their all-important logistic support as well as the agencies of FAPESP, CAPES and the CNPq for providing the necessary financial assistance, thus ensuring for the successful realization of this internationally important Conference in Brazil.

January 2007

Eduardo Guimarães, Campinas

Diana Luz Pessoa de Barros, São Paulo

PART I
FROM THE LATIN GRAMMARIANS
TO THE IDÉOLOGUES

**SOME PROBLEMS IN TRANSFERRING THE LATIN
MODEL TO THE FIRST FRENCH GRAMMARS
VERBAL VOICE, IMPERSONAL VERBS AND THE *-rais* FORM¹**

BERNARD COLOMBAT
Ecole Normale Supérieure Lettres & Sciences Humaines

1. Introduction

The grammatical description of Latin has been used for elaborating linguistic descriptions of many languages, especially for European vernaculars. What has been called the “Latin mould” or the “Latin model” was transferred to first descriptions of European and “exotic” languages, what Auroux (1994) has called “grammaire latine étendue”: we can say “extended Latin grammar”. In this paper, I would like to study the transfer for two categories of French verb: voice and mood, with a special look at two problems: the question of impersonal verbs, which is connected to voice, and conditional forms in *-rais*. I have selected a few grammars that are representative of the French grammatical tradition (see Bibliography), but I will not do an exhaustive examination. In particular, I have not studied French grammars aimed at an English audience (about these grammars, see Kibbee 1979, 1991).

The corpus is:

- the first grammar of French: the *Donait françois*, written in England in 1409,
- Palsgrave’s *Eclaircissement de la langue française*, considered a very important grammar, but with little influence in France (1530),
- A *Grammatica Latino-Gallica* written in Latin, by Sylvius (1531),
- French grammars written in Latin for German pupils: Pillot (1550/1561), Garnier (1558), Cauchie (1586), Serreius (1598/1623),
- French grammars written in French: Meigret (1550), Estienne (1557), Ramus (1562/1572), Bosquet (1586).

I particularly would like to stress a few points:

- the differences between both structures to study,
- specific problems when grammarians wanted to use a Latin description for the French language,
- first solutions found by these early grammarians.

¹ I am grateful to Douglas Kibbee for advice and help in the translation of this paper.

2. *Latin heritage and problems for the French language*

2.1 *Latin heritage*

In the past as now, grammarians link grammatical categories to parts of speech. For example, according to Riegel, Pellat & Rioul (1999:244-245), morphological categories linked with French verbs are: person, number, mood, tense, aspect, voice or diathesis.

The Latin tradition used the terms *accidit*, *accidunt*, *accidens*, ‘accidents’ of verb: we mention only – to simplify – two authors considered to be the most important by the later tradition, that is Donatus and Priscian.

Donatus: seven accidents: *qualitas* (quality), *coniugatio* (conjugation), *genus* (gender), *numerus* (number), *figura* (‘figure’, that is composition), *tempus* (tense), *persona* (person): and Donatus subdivides *qualitas* into *modus* (mood) et *forma* (verbal suffixation).

Priscian: eight accidents: *significatio uel genus* (meaning or gender), *tempus* (tense), *modus* (mood), *species* (‘species’, that is morphological derivation), *figura* (that is composition), *coniugatio* (conjugation) et *persona* (person) *cum numero* (with number).

For general outlines, these models are still the same in Latin grammar of the sixteenth century: Donatus’ outline is rather more in Northern Europe (for example by Despauterius), and Priscian’s model is used by Italian grammarians (for example Perotti).

Accidentia, ‘accidents’ that interest us here, are gender (or meaning), person (in particular impersonal verbs) and mood.

‘Gender’

For ancient grammarians, there are five distinct genders of verbs:

- active: ending in *-o* and capable of passive transformation (*amo*, ‘I love’), constructed with an accusative or another case,
- passive: ending in *-or* and capable of active transformation (*amor*, ‘I am loved’),
- neuter: ending in *-o*, but not suffering passive transformation (*eo*, ‘I go’),
- common: *crimino te* ‘I accuse you’ and *crimino a te* ‘I am accused by you’,
- deponent: passive form, active meaning; some can be constructed with the accusative (*sequor* + accusative, ‘I follow’).

This classification is complex and combines three criteria, morphological, syntactic, semantic. In fact, there are semantic constraints: for example, according to Priscian (following Apollonius Dyscolus), *aro* ‘I plough’ is not an active verb, because it is not

possible to say *aror* ‘I am ploughed’, except *per figuram*, that is as a figure of speech. So, for Priscian, it is a neuter verb.

Voice and verbal construction are closely linked, but there are a lot of problems; for example, *sequor* ‘I follow’ has passive form, but it has an active meaning, it is constructed with an accusative, but cannot be transformed into a passive; *uapulo* ‘I am hit’ has an active form, but a passive meaning.

For us, a same verb can be active or passive, and we have only three categories (active, passive, deponent), but for ancient grammarians, there are five distinct categories. And because the problem is complex, nowadays grammarians of Latin separate voice (for morphological features) and ‘diathesis’ (for semantic analysis).

Impersonal verbs

In the sixteenth century, grammarians of Latin distinguish two categories of impersonal verbs:

- impersonal *actiuae uocis* ‘with active form’: ex. *pluit* ‘il pleut’, ‘it is raining’,
- impersonal *passiuae uocis* ‘with passive form’: ex. *amatur* ‘on aime’, ‘people love’.

Moods

Ancient Latin grammarians have five moods, indicative, imperative, optative, conjunctive (Donatus) or subjunctive (Priscian), infinitive (*infinitiuus* for Donat, *infinitus* for Priscian). Optative, inherited from Greek grammar, is morphologically mixed up with the subjunctive, but ancient grammarians (Serbat 1978:265-266) make a distinction by associating the optative with *utinam*, the subjunctive with the conjunctions *cum* or *si*. Moreover, the optative alone can form a complete sentence, but the subjunctive cannot (Serbat 1978:268). The form in *-ero* (for us today, future perfect of the indicative) is considered by ancient grammarians as a future subjunctive, because it always appears in a subordinate clause (Serbat 1978:271).

2.2 Problems for French

‘Genera uerborum’ vs ‘voix’, voice

In French, as in English too, nowadays, the category called *genera uerborum* (genders of verbs) by ancient grammarians is called ‘voix’ in French, ‘voice’ in English, and in French, we have two or three voices, that is: ‘voix active’, active voice; ‘voix passive’, passive voice; ‘voix pronominale’, pronominal voice. But, since 1975, the new official term has been “tourneure pronominale” (see Riegel, Pellat & Rioul 1999:245).

Impersonal verb

In French, we have:

- an impersonal, as in Latin: *il pleut*, similar to the Latin impersonal verb with active form *pluit*,
- and an expression with *on*, similar, for the translation, to the impersonal with passive form in Latin: *on aime = amatur*.

But nowadays, for French speakers, *on aime* is never felt as impersonal nor as passive, *on* “renvoyant à une personne ou à un ensemble de personnes d’extension variable, que le locuteur ne peut ou ne veut pas identifier de façon plus précise” (Riegel, Pellat & Rioul 1999:197).

Moods

We will stress only one problem: the disappearance of the optative and the appearance of a ‘conditional’. Nowadays, neither in French grammar nor in Latin grammar, grammarians recognize an optative mood, but, in French, we have specific forms for a ‘conditional’ (present: *-rais*: past: *-rais* + past participle). For a very long time, these forms were considered as a specific mood, but today, most grammarians consider the form in *-rais* as a tense of the indicative (Riegel, Pellat & Rioul 1999:315-316).

We can see that the differences between both languages are big enough to allow grammarians to elaborate different, and even conflicting descriptions.

In grammars of the XVIth Century, the presentation of features in terms of ‘accidents’ is general. In the *Donait françois*, a general treatment of ‘accidents’ precedes treatment of parts of speech. Sylvius follows Donatus’ model, but the other grammarians generally follow Priscians’ presentation.

A very important distinction for grammarians is the distinction between personal verbs and impersonal verbs: it is usually the first distinction. Most grammarians give specific paradigms for impersonal verbs.

Two very important verbs, *être* (to be) and *avoir* (to have) are given at the beginning. I guess (but I am not sure) that Pillot is the first grammarian (in the French grammatical tradition) to call these verbs ‘auxiliary verbs’.

3. *Verbal voice*

We will stress particularly general features and selected options.

1. The general distinction is between three ‘genders’ out of the five genders of the Latin tradition: active gender, passive gender, neuter gender. For example, at the end of the treatment of accidents, in the *Donait françois*:

Quantz genres est il des verbes? — Trois. — Qelx? — Le actif, c'est a dire faisant, come 'je ayme': le passif, c'est a dire seuffrant, come 'je suys amé': le neutre, c'est a dire ne le un ne l'autre clerement, sicome 'je dois'. (*Donait françois*:f.318^b)

Sylvius, who wanted to write a Latin-French grammar (the title of his book is *Grammatica Latino-Gallica*), thinks that French has three genders, that is three meanings: active, passive, neuter, “or, as Greek people say, middle (*mediam*)” (1531:115). He remarks, quite correctly, that these genders are distinguished, not by form (*uox*), but by meaning (*significatio*). Actually, French has, unlike Latin, no specific endings for passive.

He examines verbs known as *neutropassiva*: for example *exulo*, *uapulo*, and says that “they keep the same meaning in French”: *ge sui banni*, *batu*. But he doesn't notice that these verbs, in French, are normally passive.

Meigret, following Priscian, stresses the importance of the opposition between active and passive: “La signification consiste proprement en action ou passion” (1550:H.23.1). He accurately remarks that, although *aller* and *venir* are conjugated with *être*, they are not truly passive.

The tripartition into active, passive, neuter is generally well-admitted: we find it by Pillot (1561[1550]:72), R. Estienne (1557:32), who distinguishes three ‘sortes’ [sorts] (*sic*) of verbs: active, passive, neuter, plus substantive verb, and Bosquet (1586:78).

2. The previous presentation doesn't allow one to deal with pronominal constructions. On the contrary, Palsgrave's triple distinction into *actyves*, *meanes*, *passyves*, with his analysis of pronominal verbs as *meanes* “middle” (ed. Baddeley 2003:345, 348-350, 455-456, 460), allows him to solve this problem (see Stéfanini 1962:23 sq.):

The acte of the mean verbes passeth nat from the doar, but retourneth to the doars self agayne, or is done within the parsonne of the doars selfe. (Palsgrave 1530, *Introductyon of the Authour to his seconde boke*, f.C.ii”, ed. Baddeley 2003:(66)/349)

3. Others grammarians keep only two genders of the verb. Garnier says:

Genders, moods, tenses, numbers and persons of verbs are exactly the same in Latin and in French, except that French people have not passive verbs. (Garnier 1558:44-45)

It is not false if we consider that the sentence means that “French [unlike Latin] has no specific morphological marks to form the passive”.

Ramus (1562) only keeps two sorts of verbs: the active verb can form an entirely passive participle: the neuter cannot:

Lê verbê neutrê e' sêlui ci nê peut former un partisipê entierêment passif, comê *Aler*, *Vênir* formêt seulêment *Alant*, *Venant*: Car *Ale* e *Vênu*, nê son' point entierêment pasifz, combien c' ilz en eiêt lê semblant. (Ramus 1562:51)

The formulation is more elliptical, but clumsier in the 1572 edition:

Le verbe neutre cest celui qui ne peult former vng participe preterit: comme *Rire*, *Dormir*, *Mentir*, forment seulement *Riant*, *Dormant*, *Menant*. (Ramus 1572:79)

We don't know how Ramus would analyse the forms *ri*, *dormi*, *menti*.

Serreius in the 1598 edition says that there are two genders, active and neuter.

Passium non habemus sed circumscribere per verbum substantiuum & praeteriti perfecti vocem cogimur, quae uariatur iuxta casus, genera & numeros. [...]

Neutrum verbum est quod vnicum format participium in *ant*: vt, *dormir*, *dormant*: *aller*, *allant*: *venir*, *venant*. Quae licet formare videantur participia *allé*, *venu*: tamen quia accessione substantiui nulla passio significatur, actiua non habentur. Nam cum dicis, *le suis venu*, *ie suis allé*, participia vera non sunt, sed praeteriti temporis verba, nata ab infinitis *aller*, *venir*. (Serreius 1598:61)

“We have no passive, but we are forced to express it by circumlocution with the substantive verb and the form of perfect past, which varies according to case, gender and number. [...] Neuter verb is one which forms only a participle in *ant*, for example *dormir*, *dormant*: *aller*, *allant*: *venir*, *venant*. In fact, although they seem to form participles *allé*, *venu*, yet, because no passion is expressed by the adjunction of the substantive verb, they are not considered as active verbs. In fact, when you say *le suis venu*, *ie suis allé*, there are not real participles, but verbs at the past tense, born from the infinitives *aller*, *venir*.”

4. Last position: to exit out of verbal gender Cauchie (1586:f.34^r-35^v) considers that, except for the verb *être*, all verbs express an action. Variation of this action (transitive, reciprocal, absolute) allows a more syntactical subdivision of verbs into *transitiua*, *reciproca*, *absoluta* et *uariè accepta*.

But there is no passive verb in French, just a specific use of the verb with circumlocution:

In uocem passiuam nostra uerba non mouentur, sed illam periphrasticè explicamus, quod etiam quibusdam temporibus Latini Graecique factitant. (Cauchie 1586:f.35^v)

“Our verbs are not moved to *passive voice* [form], but we explain this <form> by circumlocution, what Latin and Greek people often use to do at certain tenses.”

Maupas talks, without other explanation, of ‘disposition’ of verbs: this disposition can be *active*, *reciproquee*, ou *reflechie*, *neutre* (Maupas 1618:f.98; see Stéfanini 1962:39 sq.). A very important idea is that the same verb can have different dispositions: there are not strict categories. There is another frame which will allow the creation of a syntax for the French verb.

4. *Impersonal verb*

4.1 *Dat*

[1] *Donait françois* 320^a-b: “L’ autre maniere [du verbe] est appellé verbe impersonel, pour ce qu’ il n’ a point de nominatif case du quel il prendroit nombre et personne. Et sçachéz qu’ il y a deux paires de verbes, c’ est assçavoir actif et passif. Mais le actif aura devvant luy ou après un de ces deux seignes ‘l’ en’ ou ‘on’, sicome ‘l’ en dit’, ‘on dit’: ou ainsi: ‘dit l’ en’, ‘dit on’. Et le passif impersonel aura devant luy ou après cest seigne ‘il’, sicome ‘il est dit’, ou ainsi ‘est il dit’. Aussi cest seigne ‘il’ peut estre actif, sicome ‘Il fait sçavoir que il y a grande joie en paradis’, et ainsi ‘fait’ et ‘a’ sont devant mis pour cest verbe ‘est’.”

[2] Palsgrave 1530 (*Seconde boke*, f.xxxvii; ed. Baddeley 2003:(138)/460): “Verbes imparsonalles be suche as through al theyr tenses have but the thyردة parson singular onely.”

[3] Sylvius 1531:113: impersonal is not a mood, but a verb: it is expressed by *hom* or *l’hom*: *curritur* = *hom ceurt*.

[4] Meigret 1550 (H.23.7) remarks that we can express passive by active with ‘réciproque’: *le vin se boêt*, so that there are ‘indeterminate passive’ verb (‘passifs indéterminés’), equivalent to the construction with an ‘indeterminate subject’ (‘surposé indéterminé’) as *on: on boêt le vin*. In chapter 7, devoted to person (H.28.6): impersonal verbs “are all of third person and have *il* or *on* for their subject” (“sont tous tierces personnes: et ont *il* ou *on* pour leur surposé”).

[5] Pillot 1561[1550]:72: “Impersonale rursum duplex, Actiuae uocis, cuius nota est *Il* [...]. Passiuae uocis verbi impersonalis nota est *On*.”
“The impersonal verb has two forms, of active voice, whose mark is *Il* [...]. The mark of impersonal verb of the passive voice is *on*.”

[6] R. Estienne 1557:32: “[Les impersonnels] sont de deux sortes en Latin: les uns finissent en *t*, pour lesquels expliquer & rendre en François, on prepose *il*, comme Oportet, *il fault* [...]. Les autres se terminent en *tur*: a tels pour les exposer en François, on prepose *on*: comme, Amatur, *on aime*.”

[7] Garnier 1558:77: “Habent [...] Galli etiam verba impersonalia, eaque duplicia, actiuae vocis scilicet & passivae, quemadmodum apud Latinos. Actiuus semper praeponimus hanc particulam *il*, passiuus verò *on*.” “French people [...] have impersonal verbs, and they are of two sorts, that is of active voice and passive

voice, exactly as for Latin people [*sic*]. Before the active <impersonal verbs>, we always put this particle *il*, and before the passive, <we put> *il*.”

[8] Ramus 1562:50: the impersonal is conjugated only in the third person singular: *Faut, çaut*. 1572:78: *idem*. *Syntaxe*, 1562:107-108, 1572:170: “Le verbe Latin impersonnel de voix [1562: *voes*: 1572: *voe / voix*] actiue est explicque par *Il*, et de voix passive par, *On*.”

[9] Bosquet 1586:68 [*sic*, for 72]: “De quantes sortes est l’impersonnel? De deux sortes, à sçavoir Actif (lequel a pour note, & indice-*Il*) comme il conuient. Et le Passif, ou passionné (quy aussy a sa notte-*on*) comme on chante.”

[10] Cauchie 1586:f.65^v: “Impersonalia tertiae personae singu. terminationem sequuntur, sed de certa persona non dicuntur. Sunt autem duplicia, Primitiua quorum nota est *il*, & Deriuatiua, quorum nota est *on*.”

“Impersonal <verbs> follow the ending of the third person singular, but they are not used for a specific person. There are two sorts, Primitive, for which the mark is *il*, and Derived, for which the mark is *on*.”

[11a] Serreius 1598:116: “Duplicia Gallis impersonalia sunt: actiua & passiuia. Actiuis praeponimus voculam *Il*, vt *Il faut, Il conuient*: passiuus *on* vel *l’on* vt *on aime, on lit*.”

“French people have two categories of impersonal verbs, active and passive. Before active impersonal verbs, we put the particle *il*, as *Il faut, Il conuient*: before passive <impersonal verbs> we put *on* or *l’on* as *on aime, on lit*.”

[11b] Serreius 1623:91: “Impersonalia vel sunt Activae significationis quibus in coniungendo praefigitur *Il* [...], uel Passivae significationis quibus praeponitur *On* uel *L’on*.”

“Impersonal <verbs> are either of active meaning (in the conjugation of which *il* is put before the verb) [...], or of passive meaning (in which case *on* or *l’on* is put before).”

[12] Maupas 1618:f.124^r: “Nous avons deux natures d’impersonnels, l’une de sens passif, qui est fait de cette syllabe *on* ou *l’on*, appliquee devant toute tierce personne singul. de quelque verbe que ce soit [...]. La seconde nature d’impersonnels, est de voix active, au moyen de cette particule *il*, preposee à plusieurs verbes, non pas à tous universellement comme la devant dite [...].”

4.2. Commentary

The question of the impersonal is considered important by all the grammarians, so that some give complete paradigms, for both ‘voices’.

The general position is to consider that the form with *on*, because it corresponds to the Latin passive form in *-tur*, is of the passive form of the impersonal voice, whereas there is nothing passive in *on*, at least morphologically speaking.

The forme with *Il* is considered as impersonal of the active form of the impersonal voice, because *il pleut* corresponds to *pluit*. Pillot [5] and Garnier [7] have both committed this mistake.

Bosquet [9] and Serreius 1598 [11a] don't use the term *uox*, but say only 'active and passive impersonals'.

Serreius 1623 [11b] uses the terms *Actiuae significationis* 'of active meaning', *Passiuae significationis* 'of passive meaning', which avoids the unfortunate term *uox*, but the meaning of *on aime* is passive only if you have the Latin model in mind. Latin structure is always the reference, and most of these books are written in Latin.

Nevertheless, the presentation was exactly the opposite in *Donait françois* [1]: the form *on dit* is called active, and the form *il est dit* is called passive. But *il* can be active too, as in the example: *il fait [fait] savoir*, so that criterion is not distinctive.

Some grammarians were more skilful: Estienne [6] clearly separates Latin data and French data and avoids using terms *actif* and *passif*. These terms are used by Ramus [8], for qualifying *voix* — it's probably one of the first occurrences for 'voix active / passive' in French —, but only for Latin verbs, not for French verbs.

Cauchie [10] says only 'impersonnels *primitif et dérivé*', but he doesn't justify this terminology: perhaps because the form with *on* is considered a more recent development than the form with *il*, or because it is considered more remote from the corresponding Latin form?

Maupas' presentation [12] is interesting: Maupas uses active voice (*voix active*) for *il*, but he avoids the term *voix* for *on*, and instead uses the term *sens* (meaning). His formulation shows that, at the beginning of the XVIIth Century, grammarians felt that using the term *voix* is inappropriate when it would be used for something different from a form.

5. *The -rais forms*

We will take for example the paradigm of verb *avoir* [to have] whose conjugation is generally the first given in the books we are studying. We will choose books that give clear paradigms, in a spelling that can be understood by a modern linguist.

In the sixteenth century, there are many spellings for the form of conditional *-rais* (*-roi*, *-rois*, *-roy*, *-roye*, and *-rée* [*réè*] by Sylvius and *-roê* by Meigret), but the form of conditional and the form of the future (*-rai*, or *-ray*) cannot be confused.

Many grammarians multiply forms and think that many forms are common for several moods. For example, Meigret thinks that “le subjonctif ou conjonctif [est], pour la plus grande part de ses temps, égal ou semblable à l’optatif” (1550: H.24.20), and he gives thirteen possible forms for the subjunctive, as Kibbee (1979:234-235) has noted.

Tenses of optative and con- / sub-junctive: *habeo, avoir* [to have].

Table 1: The situation in Latin, in the tradition inherited from Priscian

Mood	Present	Imperfect	Perfect	Pluperfect	Future
Indicative	Habeo	habebam	habui	habueram	habeam
Imperative	Habe				habeto
Optative	Utinam haberem		utinam habuissem		utinam habeam
Subjunctive	cum habeam	cum haberem	cum habuerim	cum habuissem	cum habuero

Table 2: Sylvius 1531:130-132

Mood	Present	Imperfect	Perfect	Pluperfect	Future
Optative	Haberem g'harée / g'hairée		Habuissem g'heusse heu		habeam g'haie
Conjunctive	Habeam g'haie	haberem 1. g'hairée 2. g'heusse	Habuerim g'haie heu	Habuissem g'heusse heu	habuero g'haurai heu

Table 3: Pillot 1561:76-82 (1550:f.22r-23v)

Mood	Present	Imperfect	Perfect	Pluperfect	Future
Optative	Dieu vueille que l'aye	Pleust à Dieu que l'eusse	Dieu vueille que l'aye eu	Pleust à Dieu que l'eusse eu	—
Conjunctive	1. <i>Veux que</i> l'ay 2. <i>Combien que</i> l'aye	1. Quand l'auois 2. <i>Veux que</i> l'auois 3. <i>Combien que</i> l'eusse	1. <i>Veux que</i> l'ay eu 2. <i>Combien que</i> l'aye eu	1. Quand l'auois eu 2. <i>Veux que</i> l'auois eu 3. <i>Combien que</i> l'eusse eu	1. <i>Quand</i> l'auray eu 2. <i>Quand</i> l'auray

Table 4: Estienne 1557:38-40

Mood	Present	Imperfect	Perfect	Pluperfect	Future
Optative	1. <i>O que</i> <i>volontiers</i> <i>i'Auroye</i> 2. <i>Pleust à Dieu</i> que i'Eusse	—	<i>O que volontiers</i> <i>i'Auroye eu</i>	<i>Pleust à Dieu</i> que, ou O si l'Eusse eu	<i>Dieu vueille que</i> i'Aie
Conjunctive	1. <i>Combien que,</i> ou <i>Comme ainsi</i> <i>soit que</i> i'Aye 2. <i>Veux que</i> i'AY	1. Quand i'Auroye 2. <i>Combien que</i> i'Eusse	1. <i>Combien que</i> l'AY eu 2. <i>Veux que</i> i'AY eu	1. Quand i'Auroye eu 2. <i>Combien que</i> l'eusse eu 3. <i>Veux que</i> i'Auroye eu	<i>Quand</i> i'Auray eu

PROBLEMS IN TRANSFERRING THE LATIN MODEL

Table 5: Cauchie 1586:f.41^r-42^r

Mood	Present	Imperfect	Perfect	Pluperfect	Future
Optative	1. <u>O que volontiers</u> <u>l'Auroye (l'Auroy, l'Auroi)</u> 2. <i>Pleust à Dieu que l'Esse</i>		1. <u>O que volontiers</u> <u>l'Auroy eu</u> 2. <i>Pleust à Dieu que l'Esse eu</i>		<i>Dieu vueille que l'Aye</i>
Subjunctive	<i>Combien que l'Aye</i>	1. <u>Quand l'Auroye</u> 2. <i>Combien que l'Esse</i>	<i>Combien que l'Aye eu</i>	1. <u>Quand l'Auroy eu</u> 2. <i>Combien que l'Esse eu</i>	<i>Quand l'Auray eu</i>

Table 6: Serreius 1623:55-57 (Serreius 1598 follows Estienne 1557 exactly)

Mood	Present	Imperfect	Perfect	Pluperfect	Future
Optative	1. <i>Pleust à Dieu que j'eusse</i> 2. sine optandi forma: <u>j'auroi</u>		<i>Dieu doint que i'aye eu</i>	<i>Pleust à Dieu que j'eusse eu (j'eusse volontiers eu)</i>	<i>Dieu doint que J'aille[s]</i>
Subjunctive	1. <i>Combien que j'aille</i> 2. <i>Combien que j'eusse</i>		1. <i>vu que j'aille eu</i> 2. <i>quand j'eu eu</i>	1. <i>Combien que j'eusse eu</i> 2. <u>Quand j'aurais eu</u>	<i>Quand j'aurai eu</i>
	3. <u>Quand j'auroi</u>				

1. When the *-rais* form is considered as an optative (**bold type, underlined**)

Sylvius [Table 2] isolates well the form *g'ha(i)rée*, but he does not have the form with the past participle, perhaps because *g'ha(i)rée* seems to correspond exactly with *haberem*, but *j'aurais eu* (that he would have written *g'ha(i)rée heu*) has no morphological correspondence in Latin. Likewise Cauchie [Table 5] has *j'auroi eu* as a conjunctive, but not as an optative.

Pillot [Table 3] alone (with Garnier, who is not in our tables) doesn't analyse the *-rais* forms as optative.

Estienne [Table 4] et Serreius [Table 6] show the optative meaning of the *rais* form by introducing them with *O que volontiers*. The *-rais* form is analysed by Sylvius, Cauchie and Serreius both as present and imperfect, but Estienne only considers it a present. In fact, our conditional 'present' corresponds both with potential and unreal present. Grammarians could have connected with *utinam sim*, but nobody did.

By Cauchie [Table 5], there is a very interesting remark that the *-rais* form does not inevitably correspond with a wish: "sine optandi forma", without form of wishing. He gives as examples: "j'auroi tort de lui faire déplaisir sans occasion. Pourquoi auroi-je tant d'envieux que vous dites? je n'ai garde, pauvreté n'apporte point d'envie", and he gives this explanation:

Cum optamus quippiam adiicitur voluntatis adverbium sic j'auroi volontiers, ich wolt gern haben. (Cauchie 1586:f.41^r)

“When we wish, an adverb of wishing is added, as *j’auroi volontiers, ich wolt gern haben.*”

So, he prepares the analysis of the conditional as not being inevitably connected with a wish.

2. When the *-rais* form is considered as a subjunctive or a conjunctive (**bold type, not underlined**)

All the grammarians think that the *-rais* form can be a subjunctive or a conjunctive, and they analyse it as an imperfect introduced by *quand* [when]. Cauchie alone considers this form as common to the present and to the imperfect: it’s a very good intuition, because this form corresponds to that we call a conditional (potential or unreal), in a quite rare use of *quand* with a concessive value (*quand j’aurais...*, that is *quand bien même j’aurais...*, *même si j’avais...*, ‘even if I had...’), already attested at the time (Fournier 1998:356).

But this use is relatively rare, and we can ask ourselves why it was given as the general example for the form in *-rais*. The only explanation that I can give is that the French form *quand j’aurais* seemed to correspond exactly to the Latin form *cum haberem*, whose use was very frequent, but whose meaning was much broader than that of the French form.

6. *Conclusion*

It was a long road from the Latin tradition to the description of French grammatical categories today. The first French grammars are interesting because they show how difficult the adaptation of the Latin model to another language was. Here we have emphasized three points.

1. It was difficult to give up Latin verbal gender. Most grammarians have trouble analysing the French periphrastic phrase *être* + past participle as a passive, because, for them, passive must be marked by a specific ending, as *-or* in Latin. The result is that many of them think that there are only two genders of verbs in French: active and neuter.

2. The invention of ‘voix verbale’ is certainly due to a misunderstanding. But this misunderstanding is double: firstly, because French is without ‘voice’, that is without specific form (*uox*) to express diathesis: nevertheless, it is this term ‘voix’ which will be used. And secondly, because the use of the term ‘passive’ for the expression *on aime* was inappropriate, since only Latin *amatur* is of passive form.

3. It was difficult to analyse forms of the conditional. At the beginning, the *-rais* form has been analysed only in two very limited uses: firstly, to express wishes, as an optative, secondly, after concessive *quand*, that allows the use of conditional, but whose frequency is very low. But the French conditional has many other uses.

In grammar (as in other fields), the transfer of terminology is not so easy and, in the sixteenth century, there are still much to do to provide a good description of the French language.

REFERENCES

Primary sources

- Bosquet, Jean. 1586. *Elemens ou Institutions de la langue françoise*. Mons: Charles Michel [Reprint: Genève: Slatkine, 1972.]
- Cauchie, Antoine Caucius, Antonius. 1586. *Grammaticae Gallicae libri tres. Argentinae* [Strasbourg]: Bernhardus Iobinus [Reprint: Genève: Slatkine, 1968]. See Demaizière 2001a.
- Donait françois*. See Städtler 1988.128-137 [DonatOxf] and Swiggers 1985.
- Estienne, Robert. 1557. *Traicté de la grammaire françoise*. [Genève]: L'Olivier de Rob. Estienne [Reprint: Genève: Slatkine, 1972].
- Garnier, Jean. 1558. *Institutio Gallicae Linguae, In usum iuuentutis germanicae*. Genève: Jean Crispin [Reprint: Genève: Slatkine, 1972].
- Maupas, Charles. 1618 [1607]. *Grammaire et syntaxe françoise*. Orléans: O. Boynard & J. Nyon.
- Meigret, Louis. 1980 [1550]. *Le Traité de la Grammaire française*. Paris: C. Wechel [Reprint: Genève: Slatkine, 1972]. See Hausmann 1980.
- Palsgrave, John. 1530. *Lesclaircissement de la langue francoyse*. London: Richard Pynson & Johann Haukyns [Reprint: Genève: Slatkine, 1972]. See Baddeley 2003.
- Pillot, Jean. 1561 [1550]. *Gallicae linguae institutio*. Paris: E. Groul[le]u, A. Wechel. See Colombat 2003.
- Ramus, Petrus. 1562. *Grammerê*. Paris: A. Wechel [Reprint: Genève: Slatkine, 1972].
 ————. 1572. *Grammaire*. Paris: A. Wechel [Reprint: Genève: Slatkine, 1972].
 See Demaizière 2001b.
- Serreius, Jo(h)annes. 1598. *Grammatica Gallica*. Strasbourg: A. Bertram.
 ————. 1623. *Grammatica Gallica Noua [...] Editio sexta*. Strasbourg: héritiers de L. Zezner.
- Sylvius, Iacobus Ambianus. [Dubois, Jacques]. 1531. *Isagùge and Grammatica Latino-Gallica*. Paris: R. Estienne. See Demaizière 1998.

Secondary bibliography

- Auroux, Sylvain. 1994. *La révolution technologique de la grammatisation*. Liège: Mardaga.
- Baddeley, Susan ed. 2003. *John Palsgrave, L'éclaircissement de la langue française (1530)*, texte anglais original, traduction et notes. Paris: H. Champion.
- Colombat, Bernard. 1999. *La grammaire latine en France à la Renaissance et à l'Âge classique: théories et pédagogie*. Grenoble: Ellug.
 ————. ed. 2003. *Jean Pillot, Institution de la langue française (1561)*, texte latin original, introduction, traduction et notes. Paris: H. Champion.

- Demaizière, Colette ed. 1998. *Jacques Dubois (Sylvius), Introduction à la langue française suivie d'une grammaire (1531)*, texte latin original, traduction et notes. Paris: H. Champion.
- . 2001a. *Antoine Cauchie, Grammaire française (1586)*, texte latin original, traduction et notes. Paris: H. Champion.
- . 2001b. *Pierre de La Ramée, Grammaire (1572)*, édition commentée. Paris: H. Champion.
- Fournier, Nathalie. 1998. *Grammaire du français classique*. Paris: Belin.
- Hausmann, Franz Josef. 1980. *Louis Meigret, humaniste et linguiste*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- . ed. 1980. *Meigret, Louis, Le Traité de la Grammaire française (1550). Le menteur de Lucien. Aux lecteurs (1548)*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- Kibbee, Douglas A. 1979. *The Establishment of the French Grammatical Tradition, 1530-1580*. Thesis (Ph.D). Indiana University.
- . 1991. *For to Speke Frenche Trewely. The French Language in England, 1000-1600, its Status, Description and Instruction*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins (SiHoLS 60).
- Riegel, Martin, Pellat Jean-Christophe & Rioul, René. 1999. *Grammaire méthodique du français*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Serbat, Guy. 1978. "Le 'futur antérieur' chez les grammairiens latins". *Varron, grammaire antique et stylistique latine* ed by J. Collart et al., 263-272. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Städtler, Thomas. 1988. *Zu den Anfängen der französischen Grammatiksprache. Textausgaben und Wortschatzstudien*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Stéfanini, Jean. 1962. *La voix pronominale en ancien et en moyen français*. Aix en Provence: Publications des Annales de la Faculté des Lettres, Ophrys.
- Swiggers, Pierre. 1985. "Le *Donait français*: la plus ancienne grammaire du français, éd. avec introduction". *Revue des Langues Romanes* 89.235-251.