

UNIWERSYTET IM. ADAMA MICKIEWICZA W POZNANIU

STUDIA ROMANICA  
POSNANIENSIA  
XLII/5

Themes and approaches in Romance  
and Latin diachronic linguistics

edited by  
PAULO OSÓRIO  
MIKOŁAJ NKOLLO



POZNAŃ 2015

Studia Romanica Posnaniensia. Editorial Board:

Editor-in-Chief

GRAZYNA VETULANI (Instytut Filologii Romańskiej UAM, Poznań)

Board of Editors

KATARZYNA KARPIŃSKA-SZAJ (Instytut Filologii Romańskiej UAM, Poznań) – Language Acquisition

MIROSLAW LOBA (Instytut Filologii Romańskiej UAM, Poznań) – Literary studies

JANUSZ PAWLIK (Instytut Filologii Romańskiej UAM, Poznań) – Linguistics

TERESA TOMASZKIEWICZ (Instytut Filologii Romańskiej UAM, Poznań) – Translation theory

Board of Consulting Editors

CARMEN BECERRA SUÁREZ (Universidad de Vigo)

KRZYSZTOF BOGACKI (Uniwersytet Warszawski)

FERNANDO CABO ASEGUINOLAZA (Universidad de Santiago de Compostela)

ANTONIO BUENO GARCIA (Universidad de Valladolid)

LUC FRAISSE (Université de Haute-Alsace, Mulhouse Colmar)

MARC-OLIVIER HINZELIN (Universität Hamburg)

GASTON GROSS (Université Paris 13)

HANNA JAKUBOWICZ BATORÉO (Universidade Aberta, Lisboa)

STÉPHANE LOJKINE (Université d'Aix-Marseille)

WIESLAW MALINOWSKI (Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza, Poznań)

DENISE MERKLE (Université de Moncton)

GLORIA MARÍA PRADO GARDUÑO (Universidad Iberoamericana, Ciudad de México)

CARMEN SERVÉN DÍEZ (Universidad Autónoma de Madrid)

Assistant to the Editor

ANNA GODZICH (Instytut Filologii Romańskiej UAM, Poznań)

Language Editor

AGATA LEWANDOWSKA (Instytut Filologii Romańskiej UAM, Poznań)

Associate Editors

WOJCIECH CHARCHALIS (Instytut Filologii Romańskiej UAM, Poznań) – Literary translation,  
Culture of Portuguese-speaking areas

TOMASZ CYCHNERSKI (Instytut Filologii Romańskiej UAM, Poznań) – Linguistics, Balkan studies

ANNA LOBA (Instytut Filologii Romańskiej UAM, Poznań) – French literature, Medieval studies

BARBARA ŁUCZAK (Instytut Filologii Romańskiej UAM, Poznań) – Iberian studies

Deklaracja o wersji pierwotnej:

Wersją pierwotną każdego tomu czasopisma Studia Romanica Posnaniensia jest wersja drukowana  
(ISSN 0137-2475), ukazująca się nakładem

Wydawnictwa Naukowego Uniwersytetu im. Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu

The present issue has been released as part of the research project funded by the National Centre  
of Science (decision: DEC-2012/07/B/HS2/00602)

© Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu im. Adama Mickiewicza, Poznań 2015

Wydawca: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu im. Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu,  
ul. Fredry 10, 61-701 Poznań

ISBN 978-83-232-2937-7

ISSN 0137-2475

eISSN 2084-4158

## (Meta)discursive Uses of Latin *HEUS*

Łukasz Berger

Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza, Poznań

lukberg@gmail.com

### Abstract

In the present paper the polemic status of the Latin interjection *heus* is discussed in the context of its attestations in the Plautine dialogues. After applying the methods of the conversational analysis to the data, we distinguish two different “particle” uses of the exclamation. On the level of the global organization of the dialogue *heus* is employed as a summons move, adapted also by Plautus to the conditions of the off-stage communication. Moreover, there are also examples of a “particle” use inside one utterance, where the interjection operates on the illocutionary force of the message. The results of the examination, confirmed by a short comparison with the language of Terence, provide more arguments for the exclusion of the so-called appellative interjection from the word class of interjections.

**Keywords:** interjections, discours particles, Plautus, Terence, *HEUS*, conversational analysis, Roman comedy

### 1. *HEUS* AS AN INTERJECTION: A NEVERENDING CONTROVERSY

The Latin monosyllabic *heus* presents a typical phonetic structure of a primary interjection (cf. Eng. *hey*, *ho*, Pol. (*h*)*ej*, Sp. *ey*, *eh*), which induced Hofmann (1926: 15) to accept as its possible etymology the unarticulated sound with which coachmen were hastening their animals (cf. Ger. *husch*, Eng. *hush*). When introduced to discourse, the word started to develop a more advanced interpersonal function of an attention-getter. Donatus (4<sup>th</sup> A. D.) in his commentary on the Terence’s comedies (2<sup>nd</sup> B. C.) confirms this function of *heus* explaining that it serves for calling people from afar (ad *Ad.* 281: *vox est de longinquo revocantis*). In doing so, he was glossing the verbal exchange between Ctesipho and Syrus in (1) with a rather unambiguous context:

(1) CT. Heus heus, Syre.  
SY. Em, quid est? (TER. *Ad.* 281)

CT. Harkye, harkye, Syrus. SY. Well now, what is it?<sup>1</sup>

Accordingly, in his grammatical treatise Donatus classifies *heus* as *adverbium vocandi* (*Mai.* 641.16), although, further on, he is well aware of that the syntactic criteria may indicate that this lexeme pertains rather to the group of interjections<sup>2</sup> (642.8-9: ‘*heus*’ et ‘*heu*’ *interiectiones multi non aduerbia putaverunt, quia non semper haec sequitur uerbum*)<sup>3</sup>.

This double status of the Latin monosyllable reappears later in the *lexicon* by Forcellini (1771: *s. v.*) where it is labeled either *interiectio* (when used independently) or *adverbium vocandi* (followed by a verb). In the posterior lexicographic tradition the problem was solved by merging those two categories as an interjection “used in calling attention” (LS. *s. v.*; see TLL. *s. v.*: *interiectio acclamantis*). This apparent simplification, in fact, coincides with the modern linguists’ approach, who define the class of interjections as a highly heterogeneous group of items that share the following features:

- i) lack of a conceptual lexical content
- ii) context dependence
- iii) grammatical invariability<sup>4</sup>

The lexemes which fulfill all of the above conditions, however, dispose of very different contextual functions: expressive (exclamations of joy, pain, etc), representative (onomatopoeic sounds) and impressive (interjections associated with directives)<sup>5</sup>. Hence the polemic proposals of their internal classification,

---

<sup>1</sup> All the passages from Terence, here and below, follow the edition and the translation by Barsby (2001).

<sup>2</sup> It is worth mentioning that the distinction of the interjections as a word class independent from the adverb is considered an achievement of the Roman grammarians (POMP. *G. L. V.* 135.16-17, DIOM. 1.419.19-21). In fact, lexemes like *heus*, according to the recent study by Moure Casas (2013: 147), could be one of the reasons to isolate a new word class, given their peculiar syntactic properties.

<sup>3</sup> Diomedes, another 4<sup>th</sup> century Roman grammarian (supposedly the source for the Donatus’ treatises) mentions the same classificatory problems for *heus*. First (1.404.14) he enumerates it among the adverbs used for calling (*invocatio*) but, later on, in the chapter dedicated to the interjections, Diomedes also expresses his doubts about this clean-cut classification (1.419.13-14: *sunt plurimae dictiones incertae inter aduerbia et interiectiones, ut est ‘heus’, ‘heu’, ‘eia’, ‘em’*).

<sup>4</sup> For a thorough description of the phonetic, morphologic, semantic and syntactic properties of the interjections (with French examples) see Świątkowska (2000). Daković (2006: 19-41) gives a general theoretic review, specifically oriented for the Slavic linguistic scholarship.

<sup>5</sup> It is worth noticing that those three distinct groups of interjections represent the three fundamental functions of the linguistic signs according to the classical work by Bühler (1934).

which, undoubtedly, depends on the criteria applied in each case<sup>6</sup>. According to the pragmatic perspective (e.g. Ameka, 1992: 113-114), the Latin *heus*, given its (impressive) function of an attention-getter, can be labeled as a *directive* or an *appellative interjection* (see Hofmann 1926: 15: *Interjektion des An- und Zurufs*; Müller, 1997: 102: *appellierende Interjektion*).

There is, nevertheless, another word class with similar properties (i-iii), which has lately received a great deal of attention not only from the so-called *parole-oriented* linguistics, namely the *discourse particles*. The interest for this evasive lexical items (see the review of terms and approaches in Schiffrin, 2001 and Trillo, 2009) is also present in the Classical scholarship, where the most influential theoretical background has been developed by Kroon (1995). Indeed, in her most recent broad definition of discourse particles (Kroon, 2011: 176) we find many common places with the grammatical description of the interjections:

The word *particle* [...] is used as a non-technical cover term for all those uninflected words which do not contribute to the propositional, truth-conditional content of a clause, but which help to organize the communication and to integrate the text segment they “act upon” (the *host*) into its particular communicative context.

Those characteristics, as one would say, fit easily to the Latin attention-getter *heus*, with functional rather than lexical meaning, formally invariable and contextually dependent. Therefore it seems that the ancient grammatical controversy, whether one should describe this monosyllable as *interiectio* or as a subclass of an adverb (*adverbium vocandi*)<sup>7</sup>, in the modern scholarship could be replaced with the choice between an (appellative) interjection/ exclamation or a discourse particle<sup>8</sup>.

As a matter of fact, the comedy corpus offers us more problematic testimonies of *heus* than the one already cited. Let us once again read Terence with the help of Donatus. In (2) Charinus is having an imaginary conversation with a dishonest old man who breaks marriage promises:

(2) CHA. [...] ibi tum eorum inpudentissima oratiost: / „quis tu es? quis mihi es? quor meam tibi? / **heus!** proxumus sum egomet mihi”. at tamen „ubi fides?” si roges, nil pudet / hic, ubi opus. (TER. *And.* 634-638)

---

<sup>6</sup> See, for instance, the semantic criteria in Daković (2006) or purely syntactic perspective in the classification of Grochowski (1997) – with further references.

<sup>7</sup> The modern approach to the Latin adverbs still stresses their heterogeneity as an open word class. According to the criteria set by Ricca (2010), however, the appellatives like *heus* are no longer members of this group: e.g. they do not modify the predication nor the truth values of the sentence.

<sup>8</sup> Dubois (1989: 345-346) reviews shortly a parallel controversy in the categorization of the English *hey!*, which was considered either interjection or discourse marker.

CHA. [...] Then their impudence knows no bounds: / “Who are you? What are you to me? / Why give you my girl? (**heus!**) I come first with me”. / Yet, if you ask “What about your word?” / they’ve no shame then, when shame is wanted.

The use of *heus*, significantly omitted in the English translation, is explained by Donatus as a way of making the interlocutor’s reflect upon the speakers’ message and his communicative intention (ad *And.* 636: ‘*heus*’ *significatio est modo nominis ad intentionem considerationemque revocandi*). Therefore, the lexeme previously denominated appellative interjection gets to “act upon” (as Kroon puts it) its hosting part of the discourse. Hence, in the dialogue quoted by Charinus the pragmatic function of *heus* is not merely of an attention-getter but becomes a device of conative, phatic and (meta)communicative procedures<sup>9</sup>.

This led some scholars to opt for a more restrictive classification of the interjections. Unceta Gómez (2012: 357-358) has recently argued for the exclusion of the Latin appellatives from the study of the exclamations *sensu stricto*, which he defines (2012: 359) as linguistic items (primary or derived – diachronically – by the process of subjectification) that express the contextually dependent emotional state of the speaker<sup>10</sup>. He claims moreover that the lexemes which are not tokens of this expressive illocutionary force should be rather treated as conversational markers (Sp. *marcadores conversacionales*), defined by Unceta Gómez (2012: 355) as follows:

[...] se trata de elementos encargados de regular el intercambio comunicativo y que establecen un control sobre el mensaje (inicio, mantenimiento o cambio del turno de palabra), [...] o que constituyen marcas de control del contacto con el interlocutor, por lo que resultan materializaciones de la función fática del lenguaje. Y aunque algunos de estos marcadores metadiscursivos poseen un cuerpo fónico muy restringido (como *eh*, *sí* o *ya*), se trata de una categoría funcional que ha de estudiarse por separado de las interjecciones<sup>11</sup>.

<sup>9</sup> It is worth noting that the English *hey!* has the same double function. Dubois (1989) in her analysis of the so-called pseudoquotation (e.g. *Hey, she didn't really say it!*) distinguishes between the discursive and the interactive (i.e. metadiscursive) function.

<sup>10</sup> Norrick (2009: 888-889) also admits that “many primary interjections function in the participation and information frameworks of discourse, rather than marking emotional involvement” but, on the other hand, he postulates to maintain the inclusive, open-ended nature of the class: “Interjections are too complex and multifunctional to be sensibly listed among the specific classes of pragmatic markers. [...] It is more expedient to treat primary interjections as a *sui generis* class with various functions generally emanating from their status as (certain kinds of) interjections along with various more or less formulaic meaning/ functions...”. This approach, however, makes the linguistic status of the interjection and its subgroups even more opaque and difficult to analyze.

<sup>11</sup> The conversational markers, as defined by Unceta Gómez, would be equivalents of the discourse markers *sensu stricto* mentioned in the study of Latin particles by Rosén (2009: 320) “in that they define transitions in discourse and in interactive communication, mark continuity and

In fact, the discourse analyst Kroon (2011: 178), in some specific communicative contexts, allows discursive use of some lexemes traditionally labeled as interjections. In consonance with those postulates, our aim is to trace the “particle” uses of *heus* in order to shed some light on its interactional meaning.

Due to the limitations of space, the results of the present study are based only on the corpus of the comedies by Plautus (3<sup>rd</sup>/ 2<sup>nd</sup> B. C.), the most extensive testimony for the (literary) dialogues in Latin (over 21.000 verses). While examining the data, we have classified 95 occurrences<sup>12</sup> of the lexeme *heus*, taking into account, above all, their pragmatic context of use. The main premise of this study is that the conversational environment of *heus* (its host) plays the crucial role in the reinterpretation of its discursive function. Accordingly we propose to analyze the interactional function of the item on the level of the global structure of the conversation – (re)openings, transitions of the speaker – as well as in the local scope of a single utterance<sup>13</sup>.

## 2. HEUS ON THE LEVEL OF A DIALOGICAL EXCHANGE

If we take into account the phonetic features and the possible etymology of *heus*, it may be regarded as a verbalization of a human scream, an exclamation *par excellence*. In the face-to-face communication, nevertheless, the meaning of *heus* is never merely expressive (ego-centered) but always addressee-oriented (impressive)<sup>14</sup>. The corpus of the Plautine comedy dialogues indicates that in most cases it serves as a device of getting the attention of the interlocutor either at the beginning of the conversation or during its progression, when the speaker-addressee configuration suffers some kind of change. Let us see into those dialogical exchanges in more detail.

---

sameness or switch and change (of theme, participant, setting...)). Although *heus*, according to this description, would be a clear example of that subcategory of particles, it does not appear in the list proposed by the author.

<sup>12</sup> In this survey we do not include the repetition of *heus* with the same function in the same sequence, as well as the dubious attestations and the fragmentary dialogues that give us no context of the verbal exchange (e.g. *Faen.* Fr. 1). In all the Plautine passages examined and cited in this paper we follow the edition and the translation of De Melo (2011-2013).

<sup>13</sup> A similar study of the interjections as pragmatic markers was carried out for the contemporary English by Norrick (2009). See also Dubois (1989).

<sup>14</sup> The directive context which accompanied *heus* was noticed already by Hofmann (1926: 16): „Auf *heus* folgen meist Imperative oder andere Sätze im Dienste des Befehls [...], weiter Fragesätze [...], seltener Aussagesätze, wobei sich die Aufforderung aus dem Zusammenhang ergibt“. Watt (1963) reinterprets later its syntactical environment with the tools of the speech act theory, but it does not lead him to indicate the relation between *heus* and the following illocution (see section 3 below).

## 2.1. CONVERSATION OPENING

The sequencing of the dialogue opening in the comedies by Plautus was briefly studied by Hoffmann (1983), who successfully applied the models developed by the modern conversational analysts (e.g. Schegloff, 1968) to the on-stage interactions in Roman comedy. The *heus* exclamation, according to her results, appears in the first pre-dialogical verbal exchange standing for the summons move. In this way the speaker announces his/her intention to start a conversation, expecting the interlocutor to take up the invitation to the actual dialogue<sup>15</sup>. Therefore the *heus* sequence tends to be the most immediate method for establishing contact with the (future) addressee, creating a base for further negotiations. In (3) Epidicus uses *heus adulescens!* as a means of transmitting his communicative intentions to Thesprio, who, being in a rush, seems not to notice his presence on the stage:

- (3) EP. **Heus** adulescens.  
 TH. Quis properantem me reprehendit pallio? / *summons-answer*  
 -----  
 EP. Familiaris.  
 TH. Fateor, nam odio es nimium familiariter. /  
 EP. Respice vero, Thesprio. *identification*  
 TH. Oh, / Epidicumne ego conspico? /  
 EP. Satis recte oculis uteris. /  
 -----  
 TH. Salve. *greeting*  
 EP. Di dent quae velis. / venire salvom gaudeo. (*Epid.* 1-6)
- EP. Hey there, young man! TH. Who is holding me back by my cloak when I'm in a rush? / EP. One of the family. TH. I admit it: you're being tedious in a very familiar way. / EP. But do look back, Thesprio. TH. Oh, / do I see Epidicus? / EP. Your eyesight is pretty normal. / TH. Hello. EP. May the gods give you what you wish for. / I'm happy you've returned safely.

Sometimes the mere sound of the voice of the summoning person suffices for the correct identification of the initiator. This time, however, Thesprio has to enter in an eye-contact with his interlocutor in order to recognize his friend-slave. Only then the summoned character accepts the invitation, signaled first by *heus*, and proceeds to the ritualistic part of the opening (the greeting exchange). In this sense, the interjection used in the summons position inaugurates the verbal interaction even before the participants manage to establish (inter)personal contact or enter in the phatic communication that marks the beginning of a dialogue.

<sup>15</sup> The summons move in the Plautine dialogues may also be accomplished by a Votive or non-verbally with the kinetic and proxemic code (see note. 26 below).



The summons-answer adjacency pair may also take place in a slightly different communicative situations – when the summoned person is either absent from the stage (4) or absent and unspecified whatsoever (5):

(4) STRO. **Heus** Staphyla, prodi atque ostium aperi.

STA. Qui vocat? (Aul. 350)

STRO. Hey, Staphyla, come and open the door. STA. Who's calling?

(5) THEO. [...] *occlusa ianua est interdus. / pultabo. heus, ecquis intust? aperitin fores? /*

TRA. Quis homo est, qui nostras aedes accessit prope? (*Most.* 444-446)

THEO. But what's this? The door's locked in broad daylight. / I'll knock. Hey there, is anyone inside? Won't you open the door? / TRA. Who is this who has approached our house?

The status of a lexicalized exclamation makes of *heus* a perfect token of summoning someone from inside of a house by knocking (Lat. *pulsatio*) and yelling at the door. In this type of conversational openings the summons may have more general meaning (“hey there!”) or be, just like in the case of a face-to-face interaction, more personalized (“hey, Staphyla!”). Accordingly, apart from being an invitation to a dialogue, *heus* functions – on a dramatic level – as a mechanism to call a character on stage.

In both cases it is interesting to notice that the exclamation tends to be followed by some form of a direct address: a Vocative case of a proper name, a common noun (e.g. *adulescens, uxor, amica*)<sup>16</sup> or a 2<sup>nd</sup> person pronoun<sup>17</sup>. It leads us to conclude that the *heus* summons forms, in fact, a bipartite conversational move, which consists of an appellative exclamation and an identification (Voc.), that at the same time is the first way of codifying the relation between the interlocutor (formal, intimate, familiar, ironic, etc.).

In the scenes where the negotiating of the interactional face through the identification exchange is not needed, *heus* will be used alone, in addition to some

---

<sup>16</sup> Thanks to the study of the pragmatic markers in Latin held by Dickey (2002: 44) we can consider the name identification as a default type of address, when the contact between the interlocutor does not include any indication of social hierarchy nor family relations. More generic or specific identification in the conversation opening (e.g. *heus amica* or *heus adulescens*) would lead to a different way of negotiating the interactional face of the addressee.

<sup>17</sup> The summons *heus tu!*, as seem to show all of the Plautine attestations, is a rather impolite and aggressive way of getting the attention of a (future) interlocutor. Most of the time this exclamation is used towards despicable characters like pimps (e.g. *Poen.* 1305, *Pseud.* 967, *Rud.* 1357). Other context of *heus tu!* are a conflict between a master and a disobedient slave (*Trin.* 1059) or a group of rude youngsters (*Most.* 939). In the private correspondence by Cicero, however, *heus tu!* may express intimacy with no place for aggression (e.g. *CIC. Epist.* VII 11.2, XVI 16.1).

directive act, in form of an order (e.g. *Epid.* 398-399) or a question-request (e.g. *Amph.* 1021, *Most.* 988):

- (6) AMPH. [...] aperite hoc. **heus**, ecquis hic est? ecquis hoc aperit ostium? (*Amph.* 1021)  
 PER. **Heus**, foras / exite huc aliquis. (*Epid.* 398-399)  
 PIN. **Heus vos**, ecquis hasce aperit? (*Most.* 988)
- AMPH. [...] open up. Hello, is anyone here? Is anyone opening this door? (*Amph.* 1021)  
 PER. Hey! Someone come out here. (*Epid.* 398-399)  
 PIN. Hey you, is anyone going to open? (*Most.* 988)

This is the case of the *pulsatio* sequences which imply that the character is not calling for any particular person but simply wants somebody to open the door or to step outside (6) – see (5) above. Accordingly, the only identification we find in these examples is a generalizing *vos* (*Cas.* 165, *Most.* 988)<sup>18</sup> or a non-definite *ecquis/ aliquis* (‘anybody’). Thus, we opt for treating those two types of summons separately as a proper exclamative *heus* + directive and, on the other hand, a strictly communicative move of *heus* + Vocative<sup>19</sup>.

The relative high-frequency of this particular use (56 out of 95) allows us to indicate some sociolinguistic variation, as it seems, closely related to the interactional meaning of *heus* and its further implications. According to the data this conversational move is used almost exclusively by male speakers, which seems to be a rule also for the Terentian corpus (Müller, 1997: 102). Supposedly *heus* still is associated with a high volume, unarticulated, exclamation that reappears in the *pulsatio* scenes. Even its “civilized” use in the conversation opening may be considered aggressive if not mitigated by a personalized address form. Between two male interlocutors it functions as a token of social dominance and hierarchy<sup>20</sup>, being used mostly in the interactions which imply marked differences of status (e.g. master-slave summons – *Curc.* 303, *Mil.* 178, *Rud.* 97, *Trin.* 1059)<sup>21</sup> or which display a certain amount of linguistic impoliteness (e.g. *Curc.* 391, *Most.* 939, *Pseud.* 967). This rule seems to be applicable also to *heus* on various positions inside the dialogical structure (see 2.2 and 2.3).

<sup>18</sup> The general meaning of *vos* (2<sup>nd</sup> person plural) becomes evident in the sequences that combine the plural mark with the nondefinite pronouns. Compare, for instance, *heus vos, ecquis hasce aperit?* (*Most.* 988) with *heus, foras / exite huc aliquis* (*Epid.* 398-399).

<sup>19</sup> See the combination of the two types of summons in *Most.* 937.

<sup>20</sup> Müller (1997: 23) gets to the same conclusion after analyzing the dialogue opening in the smaller corpus of Terence (see TER. *An.* 84-85, *Heaut.* 743).

<sup>21</sup> Also later attestations of *heus* in prose are generally the summons (in *oratio recta*) of masters towards their slaves (*Rhet. Her.* IV 65, *CIC. Mil.* 60 – see also PHAEDR. II 5.21). In the carnival reality of the Roman comedy many times the slave takes over his master. It is quite revealing to notice that in those cases the triumphant servant also uses the *heus*-summons (see *Cas.* 955, *Men.* 135, *Most.* 784). In *Trin.* 1057-1060 the ironic repetition of the *heus*-summons by a slave seems to be a means of marking his interactional (and social) independence.

On the other hand, a coarse type of exclamation is not considered appropriate for a woman in the world of Roman comedy<sup>22</sup>. The only cases of *heus*-summons employed by a female character is the wife Myrrhina (*Cas.* 163-164) calling a slave from inside the house or a young girl Ampelisca (*Rud.* 413) in a *pulsatio* scene. It seems, thus, very significant that both examples are no face-to-face situations and the “masculine” exclamation is justified either by a demonstration of power over a servant (Myrrhina) or by a conventional formula which accompanies knocking (Ampelisca)<sup>23</sup>.

The examination of the data we have presented above indicates, as we argue, that on the position of the conversational opening the *heus* interjection acquires two distinct metadiscursive functions which coincide with its syntactic variation (see Table 1).

Table 1. Syntactic variation of *heus*-summons

Summons type	Linguistic token	Communicative situation	
		both speakers on stage	one speaker on stage
proper exclamative use:	<i>heus</i> + directive	1	19
communicative use:	<i>heus</i> + Vocative address	24	14

Accordingly, the compound move of summons (*heus*) and identification (Vocative) serves as a signal of communicative intention on a more personal level, while the variant of the isolated *heus*, appearing in the immediate context of directive acts, is preferred in a formulaic expression of calling through a closed door (*pulsatio*).

## 2.2. CONVERSATION REOPENING

As a metadiscursive mark of a conversation opening, occupying turn initial position, the *heus* + Vocative segment may serve also to reinitiate a dialogue which is considered finished by one (or both) of the interlocutors. In her study of

<sup>22</sup> On feminine discourse in Roman comedy see Dutsch (2008), who identifies two types of communicational attitudes employed by Plautine women: the rhetoric of conversational empathy and intimacy combined with self-pity and (over)expressiveness. The authoritarian tone of *heus*, thus, seems not to fit any of those supposed feminine discourse models.

<sup>23</sup> Men, on the other hand, are fully allowed to summon female characters by the *heus* exclamation. It is used, in most of the cases, as a form of reproach (*Mil.* 420, *Poen.* 1305) or a display of social (masculine) dominance (*Aul.* 270, *Truc.* 115) – sometimes only implied in the interaction (*Truc.* 917, *Rud.* 677).

the linguistic and dramatic devices of the so-called delayed exits Roesch (2005) enumerates different strategies of reopening a conversation – one of the most efficient (Roesch, 2005: 925-926) is a directive act and an attention-getter<sup>24</sup>.

The cook Congrio in (7) shows how a typical summons sequence may be employed as a means to maintain (rather than establish) a contact when one of the interlocutors (in this case, the *senex* Euclio) decides to abandon the conversation:

(7) EUC. Intro abi, opera huc conducta est vostra, non oratio. /	<i>pre-closing #1</i>
CON. <b>Heus, senex</b> , pro vapulando hercle ego abs te mercedem petam. / coctum ego, non vapulatum, dudum conductus fui. /	<i>reopening</i>
EUC. Lege agito mecum. molestus ne sis. i [et] cenam coque, /aut abi in malum cruciatum ab aedibus.	<i>pre-closing #2</i>
CON. Abi tu modo. ( <i>Aul.</i> 455-459)	<i>closing</i>

EUC. Go inside. You were hired for your work here. Not for your talk. / CON. Hey, old boy! I'll demand compensation from you from the beating. / I was hired for cooking a while ago, not for getting a beating. / EUC. Take me to court. Don't be a nuisance. Go cook dinner, / or go away from the house and be hanged. CON. You go and be hanged yourself.

After a short exchange, the old man gives Congrio a very explicit signal to end up the dialogue sending him off to work. The cook, nevertheless, does not uptake the pre-closing move (a term used by Schegloff & Sakcs, 1973). On the contrary, he summons Euclio (*heus senex*) and introduces a new topic so as to prevent the interaction from ending. In his reply the *senex* brusquely cuts off the exchange (*molestus ne sis*) and once again tries to conclude the dialogue in order to get rid of the cook. Although Congrio finally surrenders expressing his approval for the closing move of his interlocutor, with the use of the *heus*-summons he has still managed to reinitiate the conversation, even if it was only for one dialogical exchange<sup>25</sup>.

In the conditions of the on-stage interaction the dialogue between two characters is considered interrupted also by the changes of the theatrical communicative configuration. The asides, a very common device in the Plautine comedies, not only break the dramatic illusion but, at the same time, interfere with the continuity of the on-going conversation. In such cases the audience, the actual ad-

<sup>24</sup> The analysis carried out by Roesch (2005: 925-926) does not include any interjections, although the scholar mentions attention-getters indirectly by citing Brown & Levinson (1987: 96): "When S speaks as if maximum efficiency were any important, he provides metaphorical urgency for emphasis. Good example of this are found in attention-getters, used in conversation". The examples of the means of reopening the conversation given by Roesch, nonetheless, are mostly (formulaic) imperative forms like *mane, audi, asta*, etc.

<sup>25</sup> See also *Curc.* 516-518, *Men.* 695-698.

dressee of the aside, becomes another participant in the on-stage communication of the characters, like the one presented in (8):

- (8) SYC. [...] mihi concrederet, nisi me ille et ego illum nossem probe? /  
CHARM. Enim vero ego nunc sycophantae huic sycophantari volo, / si hunc possum  
illo mille nummum Philippum circumducere, / [...] adgrediundust hic homo mi astu.  
**heus, Pax**, te tribus verbis volo. /  
SYC. Vel trecentis. (*Trin.* 957-964)

SYC. [...] Would he have entrusted it to me, if he didn't know me properly and I  
him? / CHAR. (*aside*) I really want to play the impostor for this impostor now, / on  
the chance that I can trick him out of those one thousand Philipppics / [...] I have to  
approach him with guile. (*aloud*) Hey, Presto, I want three words with you. / SYC.  
Three hundred, if you wish.

During the dialogue with a stranger who calls himself Pax, the old man Charmides realizes he is dealing with an impostor. Thus, the old man ignores his interlocutor for a moment and engages himself in a soliloquy (only heard by the public), by which he externalizes his intent to trick the trickster. When he decides to address Pax once again, Charmides will have to employ a summons move (*heus Pax*) in order to reestablish the contact, even if they were talking to each other no farther than 5 verses before<sup>26</sup>.

The need for reopening may be felt either by the speaker of the aside<sup>27</sup> or by his (previous) interlocutor who, for some time, is disregarded as a participant of the interaction. Lysidamus in (9), for instance, seems to have noticed the discontinuity of the conversation he was having with the maid Pardalisca:

- (9) PAR. [...] era atque haec dolum ex proxumo hunc protulerunt: / ego huc missa sum  
ludere.  
**LYS. Heus, Pardalisca.** /  
PAR. Quid est? (*Cas.* 687-689)

PAR. (*aside*) [...] My mistress and this woman from next door have hatched this  
trick, / and I've been sent to fool him. LYS. Hey there, Pardalisca! / PAR. What is it?

That is why he reclaims her attention, after Pardalisca finishes her aside, by calling on her with the segment *heus* + Vocative<sup>28</sup>. As a result, both characters

<sup>26</sup> Apparently a new attitude towards the interlocutor, and a new conversational strategy (*adgrediundust hic homo mi astu*) requires also a new dialogue opening devices like the *heus*-segment and the verbalization of the communicative intention (*te tribus verbis volo*, see *Mil.* 375, 1020). It is worth noting, moreover, that the metaphorical meaning of "approaching" (*adgredi*) the interlocutor with a new plan may also be understood as a verbalization of a proxemic and kinetic code employed in the actual summons scenes elsewhere (see the use of *adgrediar* in the dialogue openings of *Epid.* 126, *Persa* 481, *Stich.* 583).

<sup>27</sup> See also *Mil.* 215-219 (*heus... Palaestrio*), *Poen.* 275-279 (*heus [Milphio]*), *Pseud.* 986-990 (*heus*).

<sup>28</sup> See also *Persa* 670-672 (*heus tu*).

retake the previous conversation, in a way, acknowledging that there has been a break of the dramatic illusion.

The last variant of this phenomenon applies to a more complex dramaturgic configuration, when two dialoguing characters choose to overhear another<sup>29</sup>. Since Leonida and Libanus in (10) have been eavesdropping on the merchant's aside, they feel the need to reinitiate the interpersonal contact (*heus... tu*) before they carry on with their own conversation:

(10) MER. Perii hercle, iam hic me abegerit suo odio.

LIB. **Heus** iam satis **tu**. / audin quae loquitur?

LEO. Audio et quiesco. (*Asin.* 446-447)

MER. (*half aside*) I can't handle it! This chap will drive me off with his disgusting behavior in a moment. / LIB. Hey, enough now you. Can't you hear what he's saying? LEO. I can hear it and I'm calming down.

One has to emphasize, finally, that from the perspective of the audience all these sequences of false dialogue reopening gain an important function of metatheatrical marks of the transitions between the on-stage and the off-stage communication.

### 2.3. CHANGING OF THE ADDRESSEE AND TURN-TAKING

We have already implied that the use of the *heus*-summons after the aside sequences may be considered also a device of signaling the change of the addressee: from the external (the audience) to the internal one (the character). Indeed, this discursive function of the interjection is also used in the conditions of the on-stage communication. In the scene cited in (11), the young Phaedromus is passionately embracing his beloved Planesium and, at the same time, he is talking to his slave Palinurus, who is trying to separate the lovers and convince his master to finally go to sleep:

(11) PAL. [...] quin tu is dormitum?

PHAE. Dormio, ne occlamites. /

PAL. Tu quidem vigilas.

PHAE. At meo more dormio: hic somnust mihi. /

PAL. **Heus tu**, mulier, male mereri de inmerente inscitia est. /

PLA. Irascere, si te edentem hic a cibo abigat. (*Curc.* 183-186)

PAL. [...] Why don't you go home to sleep? PHAE. I am sleeping, so don't shout. /

PAL. No, you're awake. But I'm sleeping in my own way. This is sleep for me. /

---

<sup>29</sup> See also *Pseud.* 240-241 (*heus*), 952-959 (*heus tu*), 1123-1125 (*heus tu*).

PAL. Hey there, woman, it's stupid to treat a man badly who isn't treating you badly.  
/ PLA. You'll be angry if he drives you away from your food while you're eating.

When the servant addresses Planesium, who is still held in arms by Phaedromus, he uses the *heus tu* exclamation not because he is calling on her from afar but in order to focalize the change of the interlocutor and, in addition, to express his own indignation by a “masculine” summons<sup>30</sup>. In more complex polylogue situations like this one, the use of the interjection *heus* is one of the linguistic possibilities of marking the fluctuating speaker-addressee configurations<sup>31</sup>.

On the other hand, if the third party to an on-going conversation employs the same move, we may consider it a means of turn-taking. Such is the case of the dialogue between Daemones and Labrax in (12), which happens to be interrupted by the slave Gripus:

- (12) DAE. Vidulum istunc ille invenit, illud mancipium meum est; / ego tibi hunc porro servavi cum magna pecunia. /  
LAB. Gratiam habeo et de talento nulla causa est quin feras, / quod isti sum iuratus.  
GRI. **Heus tu!** mihi dato ergo, si sapis. /  
DAE. Tacen an non? (Rud. 1395-1399)

DAE. That man found that trunk: he's my slave; / I have preserved it for you further; with a great sum of money. / LAB. I'm grateful to you and I don't object to you getting the talent / that I swore I'd give him. GRI. Hey you! Better give it to me. / DAE. Will you be quiet or not?

The attention-getter *heus tu* is perceived here as an unexpected intervention of a constantly ignored character (see the same use of *heus tu* in *Rud.* 1369) usurping the speech turn for himself. Hence the violent reaction of Daemones (*tacen an non?*), which once again proves a rather brusque and impolite interactional meaning of *heus* + the 2<sup>nd</sup> person pronoun – see (11) above<sup>32</sup>.

The “particle” use of the appellative interjection in all of the exchanges we have cited so far consists not only in operating on the contact between the interlocutors (phatic meaning), but also in focalizing and controlling the structure of the conversation itself (metacomunicative meaning). The rest of the testimonies gathered from the Plautine corpus, however, will require other interpretation.

<sup>30</sup> See the emphasis on the Vocative *mulier* and the impolite use of the variant *heus tu* (compare n. 17 above).

<sup>31</sup> See also *Capt.* 591-594 (*heus*), *Men.* 378-379 (*heus mulier*), *Persa* 614-616 (*heus tu*), 842-846 (*heus vos*), *Rud.* 829-832 (*heus vos*).

<sup>32</sup> See the similar use of *heus tu* in *Cas.* 835-839, *Curc.* 516-517, *Persa* 666-670, *Poen.* 1317-1325, *Pseud.* 290-297, *Rud.* 138-143, 1367-1370, 1395-1400. In *Most.* 644-653 the banker Misargyrides employs *heus* with no identification because, while he is usurping his turn of speech, he is not indicating any particular addressee – instead he is making a general remark directed to both of the characters present on the stage.

### 3. *HEUS* ON THE LEVEL OF A SINGLE UTTERANCE

If we now take into account a narrower scope of analysis – a single utterance – we will notice slightly different uses of the *heus* interjection. In the previous sections we have seen cases in which the speaker was calling for the attention of the interlocutor whenever he intended to highlight the interpersonal contact between them or the global structuring of the dialogue. This time it is the illocutionary force of a single utterance that needs emphasis. See, for instance, the conversational behavior of the slave Chrysalus in (13):

- (13) CHRY. [...] nunc tibimet illuc navi capiundumst iter, / ut illud reportes aurum ab Theotimo domum. / atque heus tu.  
 NIC. Quid vis?  
 CHRY. Anulum gnati tui / facito ut memineris ferre. (Bacch. 325-328)

CHRY. [...] Now you have to take the ship there yourself / so as to get that gold home from Theotimus. / Oh, one more thing. NIC. What do you want. CHRY. Make sure you remember to bring along your son's ring.

He imparts instructions (*tibimet... capiundumst*) to his interlocutor, the old Nicobulus. The last recommendation, however, is added – supposedly after a brief pause – not in the same direct way. First, Chrysalus prepares a proper ground for the performing of the act: he explicitly calls on the addressee (*heus tu*) and waits for his agreement to proceed (*quid vis?*). Only then the slave formulates his last piece of instruction which, as is indicated by the whole discursive procedure, he himself must consider crucial in this context.

The conversational moves that forerun the conduct of an illocutionary act, mitigating or intensifying its interactional meaning, are treated by linguists as pre-sequences (see Levinson, 1983: 345-364). We have already commented on one Plautine example of such a device, while we mentioned the pre-closing sequence – see (7) above. The motivation for using *heus* in such contexts might be the phenomenon of the linguistic politeness, since most of the speech acts it introduces are the so-called face-threatening-acts (Brown & Levinson, 1987), such as directives (14), refutations (15), reactions to a compliment (16) and refusals (17).

- (14) SEN. Filia, **heus**!  
 MAT. Quid est? quid agimus?  
 SEN. Quid si ego huc servos cito? (*Men.* 844)  
 TR. \*\*\* et **heus**, iube illos illinc ambo abscedere. (*Most.* 467)  
 CAL. **Heus**, abit. quin revocas? (*Pseud.* 242)  
 SIM. **Heus**, memento ergo dimidium istinc mihi de praeda dare: / commune istuc esse oportet. (*Pseud.* 1164-1165)



SEN. Hey there, my daughter! MAT. What is it? What are we doing? SEN. What if I summon slaves here? (*Men.* 844)  
 TR. \*\*\* And hey, have those two go away from here. (*Most.* 467)  
 CAL. Hey, he's leaving. Why don't you call him back? (*Pseud.* 242)  
 SIMO. Hey, then remember to give me half of the booty; / it ought to be shared. (*Pseud.* 1164-1165)

Just like the utterance of Chrysalus in (15) the examples gathered in (16) represent different scale of directive acts: from hedged proposals (*Men.* 844, *Pseud.* 242) passing through an admonition (*Pseud.* 1164-1165) to a more direct request (*Most.* 467).

Another type of illocutions, interestingly enough, occupy a reply position being a defensive reaction to a reproach of the interlocutor. In (15) the old Theopropides rebukes his slave for being late. In order to refute that criticism, Tranio recurs to a gnomic justification, introduced and intensified by the segment *heus tu*<sup>33</sup>:

- (15) THEO. Antiquom optines hoc tuom, tardus ut sis. /  
 TRA. **Heus tu**, si voles verbum hoc cogitare, / simul flare sorbereque haud factu facilest. / ego hic esse et illic simitu hau potui. (*Most.* 789-792)
- THEO. You stick of your old habit of being slow. / TRA. Hey you, if you'd like to bear this saying in mind / whistling and drinking at the same time is a difficult thing to do. / I couldn't have been here and there at the same time.

When the slave Truculentus, well known for his rustic lack of manners, is being complimented in (16) for his unexpected manifestation of perspicacity, he also searches for some justification of this sudden improvement of his mental abilities:

- (16) AST. [...] sed dic mihi, / haben...  
 TRUC. Parasitum te fortasse dicere? /  
 AST. Intellexisti lepide quid ego dicerem. /  
 TRUC. **Heus tu**, iam postquam in urbem crebro comneo, / dicax sum factus. (*Truc.* 679-683)
- AST. [...] But tell me, do you have... TRUC. Perhaps you're saying a hanger-on? /  
 AST. You've understood perfectly what I wanted to say. / TRUC. Hey you! Now that I come into town often, I've become witty.

In his case the function of *heus tu*, however, is not to (humbly) deny the flattering words of Astaphium but, on the contrary, to reinforce them by proving that the moment of wittiness was not at all accidental. Both of the speakers, Tra-

---

<sup>33</sup> For *heus tu* in a similar context as a reaction to rebuking someone's delay see *Poen.* 511-528.

nio and Truculentus, using the interjection are trying to draw the interlocutor's attention to the following message itself and, in addition, to the rhetorical relations inside the whole exchange, creating, thus, adjacent pairs of reproach/compliment-justification.

This function also appears in the last example. The act of refusal in (17) does not get a direct form: the objection of Tranio is expressed by the segment *heus tu* which is followed by a reasonable excuse:

(17) THEO. Evocadum aliquem ocuis, / roga circumducat.

TRA. **Heus tu**, at hic sunt mulieres: / videndum est primum, utrum eae velintne a non velint. /

THEO. Bonum aequomque oras. i, percontare et roga. (*Most.* 679-682)

THEO. Do call someone quickly, / ask him to take us around. TRA. Listen, though, there are women here. / We have to see first whether they're willing to let us in or not. / THEO. What you ask is good and proper.

As we can see, this discursive device, used by the clever slave instead of a negative statement and a refusal<sup>34</sup>, proves to be successful and, if we consider the positive reaction of Theopropides, significantly polite.

After examining the above Plautine passages we may conclude that the interjection *heus* is employed to operate on the illocutionary force of the following message. In the turn initiation sequence it precedes various directive acts (proposals, recommendations, requests, orders, etc.), while in a reactive position it becomes a reply introducing a justification required for some previous conversational move of the interlocutor (reproaches, compliments and refusals).

#### 4. CONCLUSIONS. (META)DISCOURSIIVE USES OF *HEUS*

In the present study we have applied the methodology of the conversational analysis in order to explain some peculiar uses of the Latin *heus*, which is traditionally treated as an interjection. With the above examination we hope to have shown, however, that this lexeme never functions as a means of expressing the speakers emotional state, like, for instance, a very similar in its phonetic structure *heu* – the interjection *sensu stricto*, according to the classification of Unceta Gómez (2012)<sup>35</sup>.

<sup>34</sup> See also *heus* in *Vid.* 35-38. Although the passage is damaged, the whole verbal exchange between Dinia and Nicodemus indicates that the context is very similar to that of *Most.* 679-682, namely, introducing a justification for a refusal.

<sup>35</sup> According to Unceta Gómez (2012: 366-367), the exclamation *heu!* is an expression of an extreme pain, which in comedy bears traits of an elevated, paratragic, style (see *Bacch.* 251-252).

The Plautine corpus indicates, in turn, that the “particle” uses of *heus* consist on focalizing either (i) the contact between the interlocutors (by establishing, reestablishing or imposing it) or (ii) the message itself. In the first case (i) we deal with a mechanism of signaling the communicative intention of the initiator of the dialogue. From this basic function we derive other discursive devices either of reopening a pre-closed conversation, indicating a new addressee or struggling for a turn of speech. The conventions of the Roman theatre, in addition, have adapted *heus* to highlight the transitions between the on-stage and off-stage communication (aside, play-within-a-play), which imply that the audience is yet another full-fledged interlocutor. In this sense the lexeme becomes also a meta-discursive marker of the global structure of the conversation – of its initiation, retaking and the fluctuations of the interlocutor roles.

After what has been said already, it is clear that our analysis has given preference to this communicative perspective, emphasizing that summons is the primary and the most frequently represented function of *heus*. Whenever its use could not be explained by some change (either real, potential or conventionally acknowledged) in the speaker-addressee configuration of the dialogue, we argued for its (ii) discursive interpretation. Although this group of examples is not so well attested, we still tried to find some provisional pattern in its contextual variation. As a result, it may be concluded that in the data we have examined *heus* introduces directive acts and utterances which can be classified as justification. In both cases the “particle” use of the interjection consists either on intensifying or mitigating the illocutionary force of the following act. Therefore, this discursive function of *heus* must have been the one indicated by the commentary of Donatus, we cited at the beginning of this paper as a gloss to (2). In these cases the speaker, indeed, employs the interjection in order to focalize his *intentio* and, at the same time, to activate the *consideratio* of the addressee.

In order to corroborate some of the tendencies indicated in the language of Plautus, we offer, in the end, some comparison with the Terentian comedies (Table 2). In general, one can notice a significant correspondence between the two authors. Although *heus* appears only 33 times<sup>36</sup> in the much less extensive corpus of the younger playwright (circa 6.000 verses), it fulfills most of the functions we have found already in the Plautine dialogues.

It is worth noting, however, that there is an important disproportion between the metadiscursive and strictly discursive variants. Terence seems to prefer to employ *heus* as a device of modifying the illocutions (24% of all his attestations compared to only 11% in Plautus), while Plautus recurs to this rather brusque exclamations mostly to mark the diverse on-stage and off-stage communicative

---

<sup>36</sup> As in the case of the Plautine corpus, we do not include in the statistics the repetition of *heus* in one sequence or some dubious attestations.

Table 2. The “particle” uses of *heus* in Plautus and Terence

“Particle” use	Basic function	Derived function	Plautus	Terence	
(i) metadiscursive use	summons	conversational opening	<b>25</b> (26.32%)	<b>9</b> (27.27%)	
		indirect summoning (e.g. <i>pulsatio</i> )	<b>33</b> (34.74%)	<b>6</b> (18.18%)	
		conversational reopening	after pre-closing	<b>3</b> (3.16%)	<b>4</b> (12.12%)
			after asides	<b>6</b> (6.32%)	<b>2</b> (6.06%)
			after eavesdropping scene	<b>4</b> (4.21%)	–
		changing of the addressee	<b>6</b> (6.32%)	<b>4</b> (12.12%)	
		usurping the speech turn	<b>8</b> (8.42%)	–	
(ii) discursive use	pre-sequence	pre-directive	<b>5</b> (5.26%)	<b>3</b> (9.09%)	
		pre-warning	–	<b>2</b> (6.06%)	
		pre-justification	after reproach	<b>2</b> (2.10%)	<b>2</b> (6.06%)
			after refusal	<b>2</b> (2.10%)	<b>1</b> (3.03%)
			after compliment	<b>1</b> (1.05%)	–
		total (100%)	<b>95</b>	<b>33</b>	

modes (89% of the summons uses in Plautus and 76% in Terence)<sup>37</sup>. Interestingly enough, this – one could say incidental – pattern happens to coincide with the widespread opinion according to which the Plautine comedies are both more farcical in tone and metatheatrical in structure. Hence the frequent use of the “male” summons – sometimes disrespectful, sometimes authoritarian – in the many fluctuations of dialogues, polylogues and asides.

As a way of conclusion, we would like to stress that the “particle” uses of *heus* may explain the many controversies in the classification intents of other appellative interjections. Further studies, carried out on a greater number of authors and different types of data, are still needed, however, in order to claim with more emphasis that the lexemes like *heus* should no longer be counted in the group of Latin interjections, but, instead, described as a type of a pragmatic marker.

<sup>37</sup> The difference in proportions is not only quantitative but also qualitative, since in the Terentian corpus we will not find any example of *heus* in eavesdropping scenes nor as a means of usurping the speech turn. He employs the “particle” use, however, to operate on another type of illocution – the warning implied in assertive sentences.

## REFERENCES

- PLAUTUS. *Comedies*. Vol. 1-5. Edited and translated by Wolfgang de Melo. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2011-2013.
- TERENCE. *Comedies*. Vol. 1-2. Edited and translated by John Barsby. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001.
- AMEKA, F. (1992). Interjections: The universal yet neglected part of speech. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 18(2), 101-118. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(92\)90048-G](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(92)90048-G)
- BÜHLER, K. (1934). *Sprachtheorie, die Darstellungsfunktion der Sprache*. Jena: G. Fischer.
- BROWN, P. & LEVINSON, S.C. (1987). *Politeness: some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- DAKOVIĆ, S. (2006). *Interiekcje w języku polskim, serbskim, chorwackim i rosyjskim. Opis i konfrontacja*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.
- DICKEY, E. (2002). *Latin Forms of Address. From Plautus to Apuleius*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- DUBOIS, B.L. (1989). Pseudoquotation in current English communication: “Hey, she didn’t really say it”. *Language in society*, 18(03), 343-359. <http://dx.doi.org.cambridgeuniversitypressjournalscomplete-languagein.bu-169.bu.amu.edu.pl/10.1017/S0047404500013646>
- DUTSCH, D.M. (2008). *Feminine Discourse in Roman Comedy: On Echoes and Voices*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199533381.001.0001>
- FORCELLINI, E. et al. (1771). *Totius Latinitatis Lexicon*, ed. F. Corradini, J. Perin., 4 vol. Padua, 1864-1887 (reprint. 1940).
- GROCHOWSKI, M. (1997). *Wyrażenia funkcyjne. Studium leksykograficzne*. Kraków: Instytut Języka Polskiego PAN.
- HOFFMANN, M.E. (1983). Conversation Openings in the Comedies of Plautus. In H. Pinkster (Ed.), *Latin Linguistics and Linguistic Theory* (pp. 217-226). Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/slcs.12.20hof>
- HOFMANN, J.B. (1926). *Lateinische Umgangssprache*. Heidelberg: Carl Winters Univeritätsbuchhandlung.
- KROON, C. (1995). *Discourse particles in Latin: a study of nam, enim, autem, vero, and at*. Amsterdam: J.C. Gieben.
- KROON, C. (2011). Latin Particles and the Grammar of Discourse. In J. Clackson (Ed.), *A Companion to the Latin Language* (pp. 176-195), Oxford: Blackwell. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/9781444343397.ch12>
- LEVINSON, S.C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- LS = LEWIS CH. & SHORT, CH., et al. (1975). *A Latin Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press (first edition 1879).
- MOURE CASAS, A. (2013). La interjección en los gramáticos latinos. In J.A. Beltrán Cebollada; A. Encuentra Ortega; G. Fontana Elboj; A.I. Magallón García & R.M. Marina Sáez (Eds.), *Otium cum dignitate. Estudios en homenaje al profesor José Javier Iso Echegoyen* (pp. 137-148), Zaragoza: Universidad de Zaragoza.
- MÜLLER, R. (1997). *Sprechen und Sprache: dialoglinguistische Studien zu Terenz*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- NORRICK, N.R. (2009). Interjections as pragmatic markers. *Journal of pragmatics*, 41(5), 866-891. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2008.08.005>
- RICCA, D. (2010). Adverbs. In Ph. Baldi; P. Cuzzolin, (Eds.), *New Perspectives on Historical Latin Syntax. Volume 2: Constituent Syntax: Adverbial Phrases, Adverbs, Mood, Tense*, (pp. 109-192). Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

- ROESCH, S. (2005). L'échec des clôtures du dialogue dans les comédies de Plaute. *Journal of Latin Linguistics*, 9(2), 921-932. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/joll.2005.9.2.921>
- ROSÉN, H. (2009). Coherence, sentence modification, and sentence-part modification—the contribution of particles. In Ph. Baldi; P. Cuzzolin (Eds.), *New Perspectives on Historical Latin Syntax, Volume 1: Syntax of the Sentence* (pp. 317-441). Berlin – New York: De Gruyter Mouton.
- SACKS, H. & SCHEGLOFF, E. (1973). Opening up closings. *Semiotica*, 8(4), 289-327.
- SCHEGLOFF, E. (1968). Sequencing in Conversational Openings. *American Anthropologist*, 70(6), 1075-1095.
- SCHIFFRIN, D. (2001). Discourse markers: Language, meaning and context. In D. Schiffrin; D. Tannen; H. Hamilton (Eds.), *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (pp. 54-75). Oxford: Blackwell.
- ŚWIATKOWSKA, M. (2000). *Entre dire et faire. De l'interjection*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- TLL = *Thesaurus linguae Latinae* (1900- ). Stuttgart – Leipzig: Teubner.
- TRILLO J.R. (2009). Discourse Markers. In J.L. Mey (Ed.), *Concise Encyclopedia of Pragmatics* (pp. 191-194). Oxford: Elsevier.
- UNCETA GOMEZ, L. (2012). Cuando los sentimientos irrumpen: valores expresivos de las interjecciones primarias en las comedias de Plauto. In R. López Gregoris (Ed.), *Estudios sobre teatro romano: el mundo de los sentimientos y su expresión* (pp. 347-395). Zaragoza: Libros Pórtico.
- WATT, W.S. (1963). Heus. *Glotta*, 41, 138-143.

The paper is a part of the research project *Pragmatics of dialogue in the comedies by Plautus* financed by Narodowe Centrum Nauki – PRELUDIUM 5, No. 2013/09/N/HS2/02221.

## On the Lack of Agreement of the Participle in Compound Tenses in Old Non-Literary Catalan Texts\*

Tibor Berta

University of Szeged

tberta@hist.u-szeged.hu

### Abstract

The aim of this paper is to offer some new data with regard to the alternation of the agreement and the lack of agreement of the participle with the direct object in Old Catalan compound tenses (*he escrita la lletra* vs. *he escrit la lletra* 'I have written the letter'). Former studies showed the total predominance of the conservative agreement in an elevated literary language before the 16<sup>th</sup> century, but no information was provided about the situation in other linguistic variants. In this article we analyse the statistical frequency of the two syntactic alternatives in mainly epistolary texts from the 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> centuries written in private and official register by authors coming from different sociolinguistic layers. In this type of texts we expected the proportion of the innovative constructions without agreement to be higher than in literary works; our data confirm the leadership of the higher social layers in spreading this innovation. We also examine those syntactic structures that could favour the appearance of the variant without agreement and its spreading to almost all contexts. At this point we observe that the position of the direct object might have an influence on the alternation of the two syntactic variants, but the constructions with a masculine singular direct object also seem to be important.

**Keywords:** compound tenses, participial agreement, Old Catalan syntax, sociolinguistic variety, linguistic change

### 1. TOPIC AND STRUCTURE OF THE ARTICLE

The fading out of the old use of the perfect participle where there used to be an agreement in gender and number with the direct object in compound tenses is a topic widely studied in historical linguistics of Romance languages. This morphosyntactic feature interpreted as a sign of a more developed state of grammaticalization tends to spread in all these languages but the chronology of this pro-

---

\* We thank two anonymous reviewers for their useful comments and suggestions on the earlier version of this paper.

cess is fairly varied and at times hard to determine. On the Iberian Peninsula, Spanish was the most radically innovative in establishing the invariance as complete and mandatory in all syntactic contexts; this rule started to consolidate from the 15<sup>th</sup> century on. Modern studies, like Par (1928) and Russell-Gebbett (1965: 49) – cited by Smith, 1995: 272) –, based on written sources of literary character determined that this syntactic innovation in Catalan began to spread from the sixteenth century on, so it occurred later than in the neighbouring Spanish language (Badia i Margarit, 1955: 44). However, innovation must have begun in the spoken variety of the language, so presumably the diffusion of this change can be dated back even earlier than indicated above. The aim of this paper is to show evidence of the lack of agreement from this earlier period, taken from non-literary texts, some of which are closer to orality and give written evidence of the fact that the phenomenon discussed here had already been more or less in use in the 15<sup>th</sup> century.

The structure of the study is as follows: first, the essence of the syntactic change in question and its distribution in the various Romance languages are briefly presented; then the chronology based on studies of Romance languages of the Iberian Peninsula is summarized; then the entire corpus is analysed; finally conclusions are drawn.

## 2. THE AGREEMENT OF THE PARTICIPLE IN COMPOUND TENSES

Romance linguistics has extensively studied the rules of that in the verbal system of Romance languages which allowed the Latin transitive constructions of the type *litteram scripsi* ‘I have written a letter’ sometimes to be replaced by verbal periphrases such as *litteram scriptam habeo*, i.e. ‘I have a written letter’<sup>1</sup>. This construction was grammaticalized through a process that can be characterized by the following formula:

- (1) a. [*litteram scriptam*] habeo →
- b. *litteram* [*scriptam habeo*] →
- c. [*habeo scriptam*] *litteram* →
- d. [*habeo scriptum*] *litteram*

The formula presented in (1b) illustrates that the verb *habeo*, originally referring to possession, but then having lost any semantic value whatsoever, and

---

<sup>1</sup> This substitution might have occurred in order to avoid the ambiguity of the Latin perfect type *litteram scripsi*, which could refer to a past action as well as to a perfective action related to the present (Andres-Suárez, 1994: 33-35). The analysis of this question, however, lies further away from the circle of questions discussed in this paper.



the perfect participle – in this case, the form *scriptam* – started to form a single unit. Over the course of time, this was also shown in the establishment of a particular order, such as that in (1c) – and also in the syntactic innovation through which the agreement of the participle with the noun representing the direct object could be omitted, as shown in (1d). Thus, in the compound tenses of Romance languages the participle always appears to the right of the auxiliary that derives from *habeo* and in masculine singular, or at least, with a clear tendency to invariance.

The change from the state of periphrasis or small clause with variable order and a variable participle to the case of the compound tense with fixed order and invariable participle is usually interpreted as a structural reanalysis (Macpherson, 1967, Salvi, 1987, Pérez Saldanya, 1998 etc). This well-known phenomenon gradually took place in all Romance languages, although not at the same pace of evolution. In the medieval Romance languages the agreement of the participle was still the predominant form, while in some modern languages it is completely absent and in others it is restricted to certain specific syntactic circumstances. Thus, in this respect, the modern Romance languages can be divided into two big groups – Pompeu Fabra (1920), Solà (1993), Cardoso and Pereira (2003), Berta (2013) etc. In the first group, which can be called conservative, agreement is possible provided that certain syntactic conditions are fulfilled; French and Italian, for example, belong to this group. In the second group, which we can consider innovative, agreement is absolutely impossible or unacceptable; this group includes Spanish, Portuguese and further away, outside the Iberian Peninsula, Rumanian<sup>2</sup>.

As far as Catalan is concerned, we can say that theoretically it belongs to the first conservative group, because although in the standard variant the participle usually cannot agree with the direct object, the agreement is recommended when the object surfaces as a weak pronoun. So in this case Catalan behaves like Italian and French. This situation is illustrated by the Catalan, Italian, French, Spanish and Portuguese sentences given in examples (2) and (3). In the first group of sentences, the direct object is a normal nominal syntagm and the participle does not agree with it in any of the languages; in the other examples, the direct object is a weak pronoun – as it is shown in (3a-e)<sup>3</sup> – and in this case Catalan, French and Italian allow the agreement, whereas Spanish and Portuguese don't.

---

<sup>2</sup> Speaking about Portuguese and Rumanian, Solà (1993: 64) affirms that “along with Spanish, they represent the most innovative line in the sense of keeping the participle dependent of *haber* invariable; they present *habeo cantatu*”.

<sup>3</sup> In French it is more important that the direct object – *cette lettre* – is situated in a preverbal position.

- (2) a. Ct. La Maria **ha escrit** aquesta carta.  
 b. It. Maria **ha scritto** questa lettera.  
 c. Fr. Marie **a écrit** cette lettre.  
 d. Sp. Maria **ha escrito** esta carta.  
 e. Pt. A Maria **tem escrito** esta carta.  
 Mary **has written**-MASC.SG. this letter (FEM.SG.)  
 ‘Mary has written/wrote this letter’.
- (3) a. Ct. Aquesta carta **l’ha escrita** la Maria.  
 b. It. Questa lettera **l’ha scritta** Maria.  
 c. Fr. Cette lettre, Marie **l’a écrite** (hier).  
 This letter (FEM.SG.), **it**-FEM.SG. **has written**-FEM.SG. Mary  
 ‘This letter has been/was written by Mary (yesterday)’.  
 d. Sp. Esta carta **la ha escrito** María.  
 e. Pt. Esta carta **tem-na escrito** a Maria.  
 This letter (FEM.SG.) **it**-FEM.SG. **has written**-MASC.SG. Mary  
 ‘This letter has been written by Mary’.

It must be mentioned that the situation is more complex than exposed but its detailed analysis does not form part of the purposes of this paper. In any case, a common feature of French, Italian and Catalan is that under certain, different syntactic conditions, they have preserved the possibility of agreement between the participle and the direct object. So, if we look at the facts statically according to the rules of the standard literary language, it is clear that the classification of Catalan in the group of ‘conservative languages’ is justified<sup>4</sup>. Moreover, if different regional and stylistic variations are considered and the question is approached dynamically, it can be seen that in Catalan – as probably in the other languages as well – there is a tendency towards the complete elimination of the agreement. From the point of view of dialectal variation it is important to mention that in several regional variants of Catalan agreement of the participle is relatively well conserved. According to Badia i Margarit (1955: 44) and Smith (1995: 281-282) it shows a great vitality in the Balearic dialect but also in Valencian. Smith (1995: 272) mentions as well that in some Catalan dialects – especially in the Balearic variants – “agreement is still the norm with any direct object”, whilst in others – those in the North-West and the South of the Catalan speaking zone – “object-participle agreement in the compound past tenses has vanished completely”. Several linguists formulated remarks on agreement from the point of view of stylistic variability, as well. At the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> Lois (1990: 244-245), cited by Muxí (1995: 130-133), also divides Romance languages into two groups; however, she relates the possibility of agreement of the participle to the alternation of the auxiliaries *habere* / *esse*. In this respect, the classification of the standard variety of Catalan is quite problematic since agreement here is possible, while the alternation of auxiliaries is not.

century, the period of establishing the norms of the language, Pompeu Fabra (1912: § 105) still states that “many modern authors still allow the agreement in all cases” although the norm, which is based on common speech, only recommends it with the third person direct object clitic. At the same time, he also notes that, in the latter case, “people are using the agreement less and less every day and the writers help them not to practise it even in cases in which it is still alive” (Fabra 1946: 940). In the second half of the century, Solà (1993: 85) mentions that “in most places, the spoken language has dropped the agreement and in others it has suffered a setback”. Badia i Margarit (1995: 683-684) seems to agree with this statement, saying that the agreement of the participle with a weak pronoun is an elegant and distinguished feature and not a characteristic of the spoken language. It seems to him “as if the invariability of the participle, which was initiated at the very roots of the language today reached its completion”.

The observations cited above lend support to the view that the agreement of the participle restricted to cases where the direct object is a weak pronoun is becoming a characteristic feature of the high literary language, while the less polished variants – especially spoken language – prefer the innovative syntax that completely lacks agreement. On the basis of these references to the current situation of Catalan, from a diachronic point of view, we have to presume that the tendency to eliminate the agreement of the participle in other syntactic contexts also became widespread in spoken language earlier than in writing.

### 3. HYPOTHESIS AND INITIAL EXPECTATIONS

So far, diachronic research on the agreement of the participle has mainly been based on classical texts that follow the standards of written literature.

The extensive bibliography regarding Spanish confirms that the agreement had practically already disappeared from the literary texts in the language by as early as around the 15<sup>th</sup> century – Andres-Suárez (1994: 64), Azofra Sierra (2006: 154-155), Cejador (1905: 240), Hanssen (1966: § 578), Keniston (1937: 451-452), Yllera (1980: 283-284), just to mention the most important works<sup>5</sup>. As far as Catalan is concerned, no detailed corpus-based study sheds light on the diachronic facets of the question or on its exact chronology<sup>6</sup>. Cortés (1993), Smith (1995), Muxí (1996) and Culler (2002) offer important analyses of the participial agreement in Catalan. Yet, their works are not underpinned by sys-

---

<sup>5</sup> However, we also need to note that according to Lapesa (2000: 783) the agreement of the participle in Spanish “even in the fifteenth century offers no scanty remains”.

<sup>6</sup> Nor do we have much information regarding Portuguese. We can mention the observations of Harre (1991: 129-153), which in this case also reaffirm that in Portuguese the spread of the loss of agreement might have started after the 15<sup>th</sup> century.

tematic queries conducted on corpora. Other authors also do refer to how non-agreement was diffused in Old Catalan. Yet, the remarks they formulate are sometimes very general and insufficiently accurate

Moll (1952: § 486) says that “the lack of agreement could already be found in old Catalan, although in a very low proportion”; according to Solà (1993: 71) in Old Catalan “generally there is agreement with the direct complement”, which he considers “logical due to the fact that the verb *haver* still preserves the value of *possess*”. Only two studies by Par (1923 and 1928) provide more accurate data on the proportion of both syntactic alternatives; he observes the growing tendency of non-agreement in the participle in the works of Bernat Metge of the late 14<sup>th</sup> century; however, he notes that, in the novel entitled *Curial i Güelfa* of the first half of the 15<sup>th</sup> century the agreement seems to be obligatory (Par, 1928). We have also observed the almost obligatory presence of agreement (Berta, 2013) in the text of two legends, both anonymous, dating from the 15<sup>th</sup> century. All these data indicate the stability of the pro-agreement syntax of literary language even in that century. Relying on Pérez Saldanya’s reference (1998: 211), saying that “the loss of agreement with the full postpositional nominal syntagm already appears, although only in the minority of occurrences, in the works of Metge [...], or in the modernizations that the Valencian editor Joan Bonllavi introduced in the 1521 edition of *Blanquerna* [...]” we can assume that by the third decade of the following century the innovation of the loss of agreement of the participle had already become widespread in literary texts.

All these references, however, rely on literary, and perhaps also archaic, register of the literary works analysed without providing information about what the situation was in common language and in the spoken modality. There are obvious technical barriers that make the examination of ancient oral varieties difficult, but non-literary texts can provide us with more information in this regard. And, indeed, non-literary texts have received some attention from researchers; however, scholarly studies have focused on issues concerning phonology, morphology and vocabulary, while the issue of syntax, and particularly the chronology of the decline of the agreement of the participle in compound tenses only appears in a small number of studies.

In this regard, the important contributions made in texts of acts of complaints and lawsuits should be mentioned, which, due to their nature, more or less faithfully represent orality of the period. Dièguez Seguí (2001: 220), examining the language of acts of complaints and other legal documents of Valencia of the 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> centuries refers, albeit very briefly, to the case of agreement, saying that in the texts analysed “the past participle is used in agreement in compound tenses, as is normal in Old Catalan”. Farreny i Sistac (2004) examined this issue in more detail in the text of acts of judicial proceedings of Lleida from the late fifteenth and the sixteenth centuries, and recorded a rising percentage of the loss

of agreement until the late sixteenth century, when a balance between the two syntactic alternatives can be observed. Martí Mestre (1994) analyses the language of the *Libre de Antiquitats de la Seu de València*, a non-literary narrative work by several authors which embraces a period of about 150 years from the second quarter of the sixteenth century and he finds that the agreement “of the past participle with its direct complement is very rare [...]” and concludes that by then the “agreement must have sounded outdated” (Martí Mestre, 1994: 196).

The results of these studies, carried out on the basis of texts written in a register that is closer to real speech and is less influenced by literary standards, indicate that, in this modality of the language, the syntax of the loss of agreement does not start to spread until the mid-fourteenth century, while the sixteenth century already sees it as predominant. However, the details of the evolution of both syntactic alternatives, i.e. agreement and the non-agreement, are not clear; the 150 years that span these two synchronous stages remains impenetrable. This lack of data has been diminished with the results of our already mentioned work (Berta, 2013), where we compared the language of two legends dated in the fifteenth century with the language of acts of judicial proceedings of Lleida of the 15<sup>th</sup> century, not analysed before from the point of view that we are interested in here. According to this analysis concerning fifteenth century literary language, the agreement is preserved with the same strength and remains practically exclusively observed in medieval classical authors like Lull and Desclot, while in of witnesses’ statements the lack of agreement shows a significantly higher percentage. Although this examination of texts that are closer to real speech has offered some data on the situation of non-agreement in everyday language, the small size of the corpus justified the need to extend the research to other texts with similar features in order to deepen our knowledge regarding the advancement of the innovative trend in the 15<sup>th</sup> century, which in many ways represents the transition between the medieval situation and the more modern stage.

Based on these considerations, we have selected a heterogeneous corpus formed by non-literary texts, some of which, supposedly, are closer to orality than literary works, dating from the period between the 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> centuries. Our main aim was to deepen our knowledge about the advancement of non-agreement of the participle in different (social and stylistic) varieties of Old Catalan. In order to reach this goal, we analysed the statistical frequency of the presence or the absence of agreement of the past participle with the direct object in transitive structures involving compound tenses. We expected that the proportion of the constructions without agreement in this type of texts would be higher than in literary works analysed from this point of view in previous studies. We also wanted to offer evidence of those syntactic structures that would favour the appearance of the non-agreement. At this point our expectation – based on Fabra

(1912: § 105), Company (1983: 248), Smith (1995: 278-279), Pérez Saldanya (1998: 211) and other authors – was that the position of the direct object might have an influence on the alternation of the two syntactic variants.

#### 4. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE CORPUS EXAMINED

The selected corpus is thus constituted by several non-literary texts from the period encompassing 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> centuries, but especially the former one. This chronological boundary is justified by the fact that according to the results of previous studies, non-agreement already appears to be consolidated in non-literary Catalan of the 16<sup>th</sup> century; however, the analyses of texts from the previous century still show a strong tendency towards the conservative syntax of agreement.

We have included official and private letters published in different collections of historical documents. Representation of different social strata and different regions of the linguistic domain of Catalan was among the criteria that we have taken into account. As far as orality is concerned, we have also used some data as points of reference, provided in witnesses' statements of the 15<sup>th</sup> century. The detailed contents of the corpus are as follows:

The corpus is composed of five texts, each between nine thousand and twenty five thousand word tokens in size. Two of the partial corpora are built from private letters written by persons of a great variety of social levels; the first one (MAR) represents to the 15<sup>th</sup> century and is based on the volume of private letters published by Francesc Martorell (1926), while the second (CAH) is the epistolary published by Max Cahner (1977-1978), which contains letters of the second half of the 15<sup>th</sup> century and the first half of the 16<sup>th</sup>. Another partial epistolary corpus (BOR) is formed by private letters that are part of the correspondence of the Borja family, written at the end of the 15<sup>th</sup> century and published by Miquel Batllori (1998); these authors represent a serious but non-official language of the end of the 15<sup>th</sup> century. The next partial epistolary corpus (VAL) is a selection of official letters of the councillors of the city of Valencia, which were written by professional writers during various periods of the 15<sup>th</sup> century; Agustín Rubio Vela's edition has been used (1998). Finally, we have used the text of the testimonies given orally at the court of Lleida (LLE) published by Farreny i Sistac (1986).

From a sociolinguistic point of view, the corpus is quite heterogeneous because it includes texts produced by persons that belong to different sociocultural strata. BOR and VAL represent clearly the cultivated strata of the society: members of the Borja family, cardinals, archbishops and the governors of the city of Valencia are signatories of the documents of these subcorpora. In this respect,

the three other subcorpora are even more heterogeneous since several socio-economic and sociocultural groups appear in them. MAR and CAH, however, seem to be representative mainly of the middle classes; indeed, in some cases a merchant, a bishop or a captain are identified as authors of the letters. At the same time, in several cases no information about the social rank of the author of the letter is available. LLE has also a mixed sociocultural profile, but it basically represents lower strata – merchants, apothecaries, farmers, shoemakers, slaves, tailors and furriers are the most frequent professions mentioned in the corpus.

With regard to the register of these non-literary texts we have distinguished private and official documents; MAR, CAH and BOR belong to the first group, whilst VAL and LLE to the second one. As for the texts retrieved from the latter corpus, it should be stressed that they contain, although indirectly, some of the features of the then<sup>7</sup> spoken language. We are led to such a supposition by the fact that they used to be noted by scribes that had the mission to copy faithfully the words of the witnesses.

The concrete data on the texts that form the corpus are summarized in the following table<sup>8</sup>.

Table 1. The corpus examined

Text	Period	Size (words)	Register	Sociocultural level
MAR	1444-1495	12.000	private	heterogeneous
CAH	1476-1576	17.000	private	heterogeneous
BOR	1473-1494	9.000	private	cultivated
VAL	1412-1471	16.000	official	cultivated
LLE	1402-1499	25.000	official	heterogeneous (low)

It must be noted that our partial corpora also tend to evince some principled geographic distribution, although we were unable to be entirely consistent in treating this point. As for MAR and CAH, sometimes the regional origin of the authors is extremely difficult to pin down. Therefore, these subcorpora may be considered heterogeneous also from the point of view of their regional characteristics. Things are different with BOR, VAL and LLE: the former ones, categorized as inherent to a high sociolinguistic level, come from the Valencian area. By contrast, the latter one, sociolinguistically diversified, yet predominantly

<sup>7</sup> Some of these features mentioned by Farreny i Sistac (2004: 167) include: the use of paratactic sentences and the presence of some discursive connectors like *ara*, *però*, *leshores* etc.

<sup>8</sup> The more exact data on the editions used can be found in the bibliography at the end of the article.

exhibiting a lower social level, is supposed to represent the North-West dialect. These factors should not be disregarded, as they are likely to affect the interpretation of the data, as well as ensuing conclusions. Summarizing, BOR and VAL can be said to represent the cultivated strata of Valencia, whereas LLE tends to depict the language of the lower classes of the North-West region of the Catalan speaking area.

Regarding the determination of the proportion of the structures examined it must be mentioned that four different cases have been distinguished, which are as follows:

- a) evident agreement of the participle with the direct object;
- b) no agreement, i.e. the obvious lack of agreement;
- c) doubtful agreement when the direct object includes a singular masculine noun and thus it cannot be really seen whether the participle does agree or not;
- d) the cases when the direct object is not a normal nominal syntagm but a subordinate clause and thus the participle automatically remains unaltered.

The example sentences in (4) illustrate the four cases mentioned above. In (4a-b) it can clearly be seen that the participles *rebuda* and *tramesa* agree with the feminine syntagms *una vostra lletra* and *la vostra lletra*; in the examples (4c-d), however, the participles *donat* and *buydat*, formally masculine and singular, do not agree with the syntagms *dos colps* and *la dita ciutat*, respectively; in the examples (4e-f) the participles *hagut* and *visitat* can agree (but need not) with the syntagms *gran plaer* and *al virrei* respectively; and finally, in (4g-h) the participles *dit* and *sabut* have a subordinate clause as complement, introduced by the conjunction *que*, and, because of the lack of a syntagmatic direct object, the agreement cannot be established<sup>9</sup>.

- (4) a. La present és per avisar-vos com *he rebuda una vostra lletra* (MAR, XXV.68, 26-28)  
This [letter] is to inform you that I *have received*-FEM.SG. **a letter of yours** (FEM.SG.)
- b. e jo *he tramesa la vostra lletra* a Perot Bernat (CAH, 138)  
and I *have sent*-FEM.SG. **your letter** (FEM.SG.) to Perot Bernat
- c. ab un gavinet havie **donat dos colps** en los pits del dit Miquel Cortés son amo (LLE, 63)  
with a knife, he *had given*-MASC.SG. **two hits** (MASC.PL.) on the chest of the mentioned Miquel Cortés, his owner
- d. [...] e molts *han buydat la dita ciutat* [...] (VAL, 64.205, 60-61)  
and many [of them] *have left*-MASC.SG. the city mentioned (FEM.SG.)
- e. de la qual *he hagut gran plaer* (MAR, IV.29, 22)  
for which [fact] I *have had*-MASC.SG. **great pleasure** (MASC.SG.)

---

<sup>9</sup> The glosses we apply are simplified and nearly literal offering. Grammatical information about gender and number is given only when relevant.



- f. Dit senyor duc *ha visitat* après **al virrei** [...] (BOR, 55)  
 the lord duke mentioned *has visited*-MASC.SG. later **the viceroy** (MASC.SG.)
- g. jo li *he dit* **que** no tinc tal cossa. (BOR, 44)  
 I *have said*-MASC.SG. to him **that I** don't have such thing
- h. *Havem sabut*, senyor molt alt, **que** per la dita ciutat de Xàtiva se deuen precisament dirigir missatgers al legat apostolical (VAL, 18.116, 11-13)  
 we *have known*-MASC.SG., milord, **that** exactly by the mentioned city of Xàtiva messengers will be sent to the apostolic legate

We consider it necessary to emphasize the importance of the proportion of cases classified as doubtful, with a masculine singular direct object, in our analysis. Since in these structures it cannot be established whether there is an agreement or not, generally they are not taken into account in specialized studies. Romani (2006: 286-287), however, highlights that the occurrence of this structure in many medieval Castilian texts examined by her is higher than that of the evident cases of agreement and non-agreement, and she reaffirms that this “probably contributed to the debilitation of the connection between the participle and the NP and to the acceleration of the loss of the agreeing syntax”. We agree with this statement and thus we have taken into account the case of the doubtful examples in the analysis of the occurrence of the constructions. Furthermore, we also need to mention that the case of the constructions with a subordinate clause as complement, which leave the participle invariable, may also have a similar effect on the doubtful agreement, and this is what justifies its inclusion.

## 5. ANALYSIS OF THE CORPUS

### 5.1. PROPORTION OF CASES OF AGREEMENT AND NON-AGREEMENT

Taking into account the above-mentioned conditions, 608 transitive structures with compound tenses have been found in the five texts. Table 2 confirms the presence of all four alternatives in the corpus and presents its distribution in the texts selected<sup>10</sup>.

The table shows that in the whole of the corpus, built from 608 constructions, the proportions for unambiguous and straightforward agreement are higher than for the evident non-agreement: 162 cases of agreement stand opposite 133 cases where there is no agreement of the participle; in the rest of the examples with 313 occurrences, which constitute the vast majority of the structures collected, it is impossible to determine whether the agreement is realized or not.

---

<sup>10</sup> [+Agr]=evident agreement, [±Agr]=doubtful agreement, OC=subordinate clause as direct object, [-Agr]=evident lack of agreement.

Table 2. Distribution of agreement of the participle in the corpus

Texts	[+Agr]	[±Agr]	OC	[-Agr]	Total
MAR	41% (20)	35% (17)	12% (6)	12% (6)	100% (49)
CAH	36% (71)	37% (73)	13% (25)	14% (29)	100% (198)
BOR	8% (7)	45% (38)	13% (11)	34% (29)	100% (85)
VAL	17% (14)	24% (20)	27% (22)	32% (26)	100% (82)
LLE	26% (50)	42% (82)	10% (19)	22% (43)	100% (194)
Total	27% (162)	38% (230)	13% (83)	22% (133)	100% (608)

As far as the detailed data of the partial corpora are concerned, it should be said that the partial corpora are divided into two big groups. In the first one, constituted by MAR, CAH and LLE, the syntax of agreement predominates. There are 20, 71 and 50 cases of agreement, compared with 6, 29 and 43 cases of non-agreement respectively. The proportion of the lack of agreement does not exceed 22% of the total of the collected examples in any of the three corpora. This indicates the still strong predominance of the agreement syntax throughout the 15<sup>th</sup> century, which in general coincides with the results of the specialized bibliography (see above). In the second group, however, constituted by the two remaining corpora, i.e. BOR and VAL, the absolute predominance of the lack of agreement can be observed: 7 and 14 cases of the agreed participle stand opposite 29 and 26 examples without agreement, respectively. In these corpora the lack of agreement in the compound tenses can be observed in about 30 – 34% in the first group and 32% in the second one. These data show a more advanced spread of the innovation of the lack of agreement of the participle than that in the first group and that observed in literary texts analysed by the bibliography. We have to note that the data suggest that the preference for non-agreement is based on geographic factors. Indeed, both of the texts evincing higher ratios of non-agreement to agreement (BOR and VAL) come from the Valencian region, a curious fact given that today's Valencian is considered one of the most conservative dialects from the point of view of the agreement of the participle with clitic direct object (see above). In the case of BOR, the high frequency of the innovative solution can be explained by the chronology of the sources used, i.e. that almost all of them date from the last years of the 15<sup>th</sup> century (1493-1494); however, in the case of the VAL corpus, constituted by documents that date back to different periods of the century, the chronological factors are not enough to offer an explanation. Thus it seems that the causes of the difference between the two text groups lie in their social and stylistic characteristics. So the texts of the first group represent different sociolinguistic and stylistic levels; it seems that the conservative variety predominates there. In the second group, however, the

serious and formal modalities are evidently reflected, and the innovative construction seems to have assumed primacy. The preference for non-agreement in texts of higher sociocultural level may seem quite strange since literary works of the same period favour agreement. Still, we also have to bear in mind that our corpus does not belong to this type of texts. The fact that the language used by the cultivated strata of society preferred the lack of agreement can explain how this innovation, still less strongly represented than in texts with other characteristics, becomes the model to follow and extends rapidly also into the later period.

Furthermore, we think that in case of texts, written by persons with an elevated social and sometimes official status and who sometimes happened to have won national and international renown in a society where Spanish was becoming increasingly prestigious, the influence of this language should not be underrated. However, passing on to the data of doubtful agreement, where the direct object is represented by a normal nominal syntagm with a singular masculine nucleus, as in (4e-f), it can be seen that the average proportion of this type of constructions reaches 38% in the whole corpus, and that its frequency in the concrete subcorpora is between 24% and 42%. It is important to emphasize that the proportion of these doubtful cases of agreement exceeds the proportion of the evident agreement in all the partial corpora, with the exception of the subcorpus MAR. As for the data of occurrence of the constructions that contain a direct object represented by a subordinate proposition introduced by a conjunction, as in the examples (4g-h), we can observe that the average proportion of these structures is 12% in the whole corpus and in the partial corpora it can be found, generally, between 10% and 13%. The only exception is the VAL subcorpus, where we can observe that in 27% of all the examples the direct object is a subordinate proposition, which is a fairly significant part of the total of the constructions. This curiously high figure of the constructions with a subordinate clause as complement can be explained with the official register and the high level of abstraction of those texts, characterized also by a more complex syntactic structure. Thus we can conclude that the high occurrence of the doubtful agreement and of the constructions with the subordinate clause as complement, which coincide in that the participle is automatically identical with the singular masculine, together with the of non-agreement could have increased the proportion of the apparently unalterable forms of the participle. This way, if we compare the total of the data in the three columns where the participle has a singular masculine form – doubtful agreement with a singular masculine direct object, subordinate clause as complement and lack of agreement – evident agreement is in minority in all the partial corpora. So we need to suppose that by the end of the century, the agreement was already in transition to an archaism, and apart from literary texts, was not part of the written norm for the elite any more.

## 5.2. THE AGREEMENT AND THE STRUCTURE OF CONSTRUCTIONS

It is also important to say something about the structure of the examples since, as it can be inferred from studies specialized in this topic (Company Company, 1983: 248; Pérez Saldanya, 1998: 211), the innovative syntax, in which the participle does not agree, appears mainly in the canonical position, i.e. to the right of the verb, and only later did it extend to other syntactic contexts. Smith (1995: 278) mentions that during the development of the language, the agreement is preserved with greater stability when the syntagm with the function of a direct object is situated to the left of the verbal construction and especially when the direct object is a weak pronoun. Old Spanish data adduced by Company (1983: 248) support this affirmation, but Par (1923: § 855) and Romani (2006: 290-295), on the basis of Old Catalan and other Old Spanish data, deny any palpable or obvious relationship between the agreement and the syntactic structure. The fact that these scholars have different opinions on the topic justify the need for the analysis of this question to be conducted also on our texts. If we focus on our corpus, we can see that the lack of agreement alternates with the agreement with a syntagmatic direct object situated to the right as well as to the left of the verbal construction.

The examples given in (5) illustrate the agreement and those that are cited in (6), the lack of agreement with the direct object situated to the right. We need to note that the examples are syntactically and semantically parallel as far as the type of the direct object is concerned: in (5a) and (6a) *resposta*, in (5b) and (6b) *una vostra lletra* and *una lletra de vostres prestàncies*, in (5c) and (6c) *los diners del senyor mossèn Pere* and *els diners de l'almes* have this function, respectively. As it can be seen, the same nucleus noun allows the agreement as well as its absence – cf. (5a-c) and (6a-c).

- (5) a. que per altra lletra vos he escrit, de què no m'haveu feta **resposta** (MAR, XXII.65, 21-22)

that by another [letter] (FEM.SG) I have written to you to which you *have* not *given*-FEM.SG. **answer** (FEM.SG)

- b. La present és per avisar-vos com *he rebuda* **una vostra lletra** (MAR, XXV.68, 26-28)

This [letter] is to inform you that I *have received*-FEM.SG. **a letter of yours** (FEM.SG)

- c. E més, vos prec m'aviseu si *haveu rebuts* **los diners** del senyor mossèn Pere Tosset (MAR, XVIII.58, 9-10)

and, furthermore, I ask you to let me know if you *have received*-MASC.PL. **the money** (MASC.PL.) from Fr. Pere Tosset.

- (6) a. que mai no n'he hagut **resposta** sinó de una (MAR, IV.31, 18-19)

from whom I *have* never *received*-MASC.SG. **answer** (FEM.SG.) but one

- b. Per En Jaume de Soldevila *he rebut* **una lletra** de vostres prestàncies feta a 20 del present mes (BOR, 39)

By Jaume de Soldevila I *have received*-MASC.SG. **a letter** (FEM.SG.) from your excellence written on the 20th of this month

c. Molt me són meravellat com no m'*haveu tramès els diners* de l'almesc (MAR, XXIII.66, 21-22)

I am very surprised that you *have* not *sent*-MASC.SG. me **the money** (MASC.PL.) for the musk

The examples provided in (7) and (8) show the alternation of the syntax of agreement and the lack of agreement with the syntagmatic direct object positioned to the left of the verbal construction. In (7), examples with agreement and in (8) cases with the lack of agreement of the participle are demonstrated through sentences where the direct object can be found to the left of the construction of compound tenses situated in a relative subordination. The participles *feta*, *vista*, *jugats* and *llançats* agree with the syntagms *la resposta*, *butlla de fructibus in absentia* and *alguns diners* in (7a), (7b) and (7c), respectively. However, the participles *escrit*, *concebut* and *mostrat* in compound tenses do not agree with the feminine syntagms *de les altres*, *sa prava e corrupta intenció* and *per la voluntat* which are positioned before the verb in (8a), (8b) and (8c), respectively.

(7) a. Sabuda **la resposta que** Sa Altesa m'*havia feta*, així per mi com per lo senyor rei, tots se són alegrats. (CAH, 61)

Knowing the **answer** (FEM.SG) that his Highness *had given*-FEM.SG. me, both for me and for the king, everyone is happy about it.

b. [...] jo tinc privilegi e **butlla** de fructibus in absentia, la qual *ha vista* lo reverend mossèn el prior e oficial [...] (BOR, 40)

I have privilege and a **bull** (FEM.SG.) of “fructibus absentia” that the reverend prior and official *has seen*-FEM.SG.

c. que hauríeu deixats pendre al duc de Gandia **alguns diners** els quals ell s'*hauria jugats e llançats* vanament en Barcelona [...] (BOR, 73-74)

that you let the Duke of Gandia take **some money** (MASC.PL.) which-MASC.PL. he *had gambled*-MASC.PL. away and *frittered away*-MASC.PL. senselessly in Barcelona

(8) a. Ara, ab la present tornar-vos he recitar la major part de **les altres** [que] vos *he escrit*. (CAH, 55)

Now, in this present [letter] I summarize again the main parts of **the others** (FEM.PL.) I *have written*-MASC.SG. to you.

b. [...] lo dit patró, demostrant per obra **sa prava e corrupta intenció** que *havia concebut* [...] (VAL, 124.322, 24-25)

[...] the patron mentioned attesting by his acts **the wild and corrupt intention** (FEM.SG.) that he *had conceived*-MASC.SG. [...]

c. En veritat, fins a hui, reste a tots en obligació, per **la voluntat** que m'*han mostrat*. (BOR, 59)

Really, until today, I am still obliged to them for **the benevolence** (FEM.SG) that they *have shown*-MASC.SG. to me.

The examples that are added in (9) and (10) show that in the constructions where the direct object is a clitic pronoun, the alternation of the syntax of agreement and the lack of agreement also occurs. The participles *fets*, *presa* and *desonrada* agree with the pronominal clitics *els* and *l'* in (9a), (9b) and (9c), respectively. Although in (9b-c) the form of the pronouns – represented by the apocopated clitic *l'* – does not clearly indicate its gender, it is clear that these are feminine clitics that have *una bóta oli* and *la muller del dit barber* as antecedents. The participles *rescatat*, *tengut*, *aproffitat* and *rebut*, however, do not agree with the pronouns *los*, *ns*, *ls* and *l'* in examples (10a), (10b) (10c) and (10d), respectively. We also have to mention here that in (10d) the weak pronoun *l'* represents the syntagm *la qual lletra*, of feminine gender and thus the participle *rebut* does not agree with it.

- (9) a. car no **els** *he fets* bells des que escriguí (MAR, IV.30, 13-14)  
because I haven't *made*-MASC.PL. **them**-MASC.PL. so nice since I wrote
- b. ver es que esper quatre carretells e una bóta oli, e no sé ab què se carregaran; així, digau-ho a qui **l'***ha presa*, [...] (CAH, 129)  
the truth is that I am waiting for four carriages and one barrel (FEM.SG.) of oil and I don't know what they will be loaded with; so tell it to whom *has taken*-FEM.SG. **it**-FEM.SG. [...]
- c. e axí com stave allí veu que la muller del dit barber dehia que en Senta Ffe studiant **l'***avia desonrada* [...] (LLE, VII, 53, 75-76)  
and so while he was there he overheard that the wife (FEM.SG.) of the said barber was saying that a student *had raped*-FEM.SG. **her**-FEM.SG. in Santa Fe.
- (10) a. [...] e ultra que els han robat, los tenen per presoners i **los** *han rescatat* com millor han pogut. (CAH, 160-161)  
besides having gone as far as to rob them, they have them as captives and they *have rescued*-MASC.SG. **them**-MASC.PL. as well as they could.
- b. Aquesta art, senyor, han servada, e així **ns** *han tengut* a noves [...] (VAL, 64.204, 32-33)  
they have preserved this art, sir, and thus they *have introduced*-MASC.SG. **us**-PL. to new ones
- c. E tots els remeys que han pogut lestar, no **ls** *han punt aproffitat*. (VAL, 67.212, 41-42)  
and all the possibilities (MASC.PL.) that could have remained, they *have not exploited*-MASC.SG. **them**-MASC.PL.
- d. la qual lletra remetí per lo banc de Vernegol, dreçada a ventura del banc de Spannocchi; crec **l'***haurà rebut*. (BOR, 45)  
which letter (FEM.SG.) I sent via bank Vernegol, addressed to the bank of Spannocchi; I think you *have received*-MASC.SG. **it**-MASC.SG.

The examples provided in (10) are especially interesting because, as we have already mentioned, the constructions with pronominal clitics represent the only syntactic setting where the agreement of the participle has remained up to these

days although it seems to be restricted to the serious and elegant language (see above), Badia i Margarit (1995: 683-684). As for the extension of the lack of agreement also in such cases into modern language, Fabra (1912: § 105) mentions that the absence of the agreement is more common with a weak pronoun in masculine plural, whereas according to Badia i Margarit (1995: 682), the omission of agreement with this pronoun is a characteristic feature of the language spoken in Valencia. What we are interested in now is that this radical modality of the lack of agreement is already documented in one of our subcorpora, although in a distinct minority<sup>11</sup>.

Examples (5-10) show that both variants of the participle, with and without agreement, are documented in our corpus in all three syntactic contexts mentioned. However, the extension of the occurrence of the two alternatives, in fact, is very different in it. Thus, as it is shown by the data in Table 3, when the direct object is situated to the left, the agreement is preferred almost in all of the corpus; the only exception is the partial corpus BOR, where, apart from the case of the clitic direct object, the occurrence of the lack of agreement always exceeds that of the agreement. Although the lack of agreement with a clitic direct object can be considered exceptional in the corpus, it is also documented.

Table 3. Data of agreement according to the position of the direct object

Texts	Object on the right		Object on the left		Clitic object	
	[+Agr]	[-Agr]	[+Agr]	[-Agr]	[+Agr]	[-Agr]
MAR	11	5	5	1	4	0
CAH	28	21	21	7	22	1
BOR	1	20	2	8	4	1
VAL	9	22	5	2	0	2
LLE	25	33	11	9	14	1
total	74	101	44	27	44	5

All this reaffirms the results of the previous studies carried out on other corpora, which maintain that the post-verbal position is more convenient for the appearance of the lack of agreement. At the same time, the detailed data of the subcorpora indicate that BOR and VAL, where the general proportion of the lack of agreement is higher, also tend to accept this syntactic alternative in all the contexts examined, while the rest of the partial corpora document it principally

---

<sup>11</sup> It is worth mentioning that according to Company (1983: 248) feminine direct objects, in general, are more affected by the loss of agreement. In our corpus, however, it seems that there is no essential difference between the two grammatical genders.

with a post-verbal direct object<sup>12</sup>. The evolution of the lack of agreement seems to be in a phase that is more initial in the heterogeneous corpora, and in a more advanced phase in the serious subcorpora.

## 6. CONCLUSIONS

Based on this analysis we can draw conclusions which, on the one hand, reinforce previous studies and, on the other hand, offer new perspectives.

The starting point of our study was the opinion based on the analysis of literary texts, namely that before the 16<sup>th</sup> century the non-agreement of the participle appears as a syntactic alternative in the Catalan language with a relatively low frequency. From a broader comparative aspect, this conclusion coincides with the well-accepted opinion according to which this syntactic innovation had developed in Spanish earlier than in Portuguese and in Catalan; the latter ones would retain the conservative structure for a longer period. Our analysis, however, which has primarily examined private and official epistolary texts, can lead us to the presumption that in the non-literary language the innovation in question could already be relatively habitual in the 15<sup>th</sup> century. It seems that it characterized especially the language of the intellectuals, where the tendency to omit the agreement is documented practically without syntactic constraints. In the language of other social strata and in other domains of life, the agreement of the participle reaches a lower proportion and has some syntactic restrictions. The data gained from the analysis show us what were the factors that, later, made the elimination of sociolinguistic and structural limitations of this innovation possible. From a sociolinguistic point of view, the high occurrence of this syntactic alternative in the language of serious authors probably contributed to the fact that it could convert into a model to be followed also at other social levels in the subsequent periods of time. Nevertheless, the ratio of conservative to innovative constructions may be traced back to differences between regional varieties and a putative influence of Spanish, as well, although this analysis could not offer any clear-cut evidence of these questions. The interesting fact, though, is that our Valencian texts show a higher proportion of non-agreement than those of Lleida, while today's North-West dialect is considered much more advanced on its way towards losing agreement. Thus, this question would need some more analysis. From a structural point of view, the predominant proportion of constructions that contain a participle that is apparently singular and masculine in cases of doubtful agreement and in cases of subordinate clauses as complements made it possible

---

<sup>12</sup> Calzado Roldán (1997) offers an interesting interpretation of these factors along the lines of the Theory of the Transitivity.



for the formally agreeing structures to find themselves in minority and for the invariable form to spread.

It must be admitted, however, that the scope of the corpus analysed is limited, and therefore the results presented are not sufficient to consider the statements made here to be completely established. In order to confirm the results shown above and to elucidate the question of factors such as dialectal differences and a presumed language contact, there is an obvious need to examine a wider corpus including texts representing several sociocultural strata of the same geographic region, applying the same method.

## TEXTS ANALYSED

- BOR* = BATLLORI, Miquel (Ed.) (1998). *De València a Roma. Cartes triades dels Borja*. Barcelona: Quaderns Crema.
- CAH* = CAHNER, Max (Ed.) (1977-1978). *Epistolari del Renaixement*, vol. I. València: Clàssics Albatros.
- MAR* = MARTORELL, Francesc (Ed.) (1926). *Epistolari del segle XV. Recull de cartes privades*. Barcelona: Ed. Barcino.
- LLE* = FARRENY I SISTAC, Maria Dolors (Ed.) (1986). *Processos de crims del segle XV a Lleida: transcripció i estudi lingüístic*. Lleida: Institut d'Estudis Ilerdencs.
- VAL* = RUBIO VELA, Agustín (Ed.) (1998). *Epistolari de la València medieval*, vol. II. València/Barcelona: Institut Interuniversitari de Filologia Valenciana/Publicacions de l'Abadia de Montserrat.

## REFERENCES

- ANDRES-SUAREZ, I. (1994). *El verbo español. Sistemas medievales y sistema clásico*. Madrid: Gredos.
- AZOFRA SIERRA, M.E. (2006). Situación del paradigma de perfecto entre los siglos XIV y XVI. In M. Villayandre Llamazares (Ed.), *Actas del XXXV Simposio Internacional de la Sociedad Española de Lingüística* (pp. 152-168). León: Universidad de León.
- BADIA I MARGARIT, A.M. (1955). *Fisiognómica comparada de las lenguas catalana y castellana*. Discurso leído el día 27 de noviembre de 1955 en la recepción pública del Dr. don Antonio M. Badia Margarit en la Real Academia de Buenas Letras de Barcelona: Barcelona.
- BADIA I MARGARIT, A.M. (1995). *Gramàtica de la llengua catalana*. Barcelona: Edicions Proa.
- BERTA, T. (2013). Sobre la manca de concordança del participi dels temps compostos en textos catalans antics. In C. Bartual, B. Déri, K. Faluba, I. Szijj (Eds.), *Catalanística a Hongria (1971/72-2011/12). Actes del Simposi Internacional de Catalanística (Budapest, 24-26 d'abril de 2012)* (pp. 49-56). Budapest: Universitat Eötvös Loránd, Facultat de Lletres, Estudis d'Iberoromanística.
- CALZADO ROLDAN, A. (1997). La pérdida de la concordanca del participio con el objeto en los tiempos compuestos medievales. *Interlengua*, 6, 23-26.
- CARDOSO, A. & PEREIRA, S. (2003). Contributos para o estudo da emergência do tempo composto em português. *Revista da ABRALIN*, 2(2), 159-181.
- CEJADOR, J. (1905). *La lengua de Cervantes*. Madrid: Establecimiento tipográfico de Jaime Ratés.
- COMPANY COMPANY, C. (1983). Sintaxis y valores de los tiempos compuestos en el español medieval. *Nueva Revista de Filología Hispánica*, 32(2), 235-256.
- CORTÉS, C. (1993). Catalan participle agreement, auxiliary selection, and the Government Transparency Corollary. *Probus*, 5(3), 193-240. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/prbs.1993.5.3.193>
- CULLER, V. (2002). *Observations on the optionality of modern Catalan participle agreement and hypotheses as to its implications for the future of Romance languages*. Senior Thesis. Bryn Mawr College.
- DIEGUEZ SEGUI, M.À. (2001). *El Llibre de Cort de Justícia de València (1279-1321). Estudi lingüístic*. Barcelona: Institut Interuniversitari de Filologia Valenciana / Publicacions de l'Abadia de Montserrat.
- FABRA, P. (1912). *Gramàtica catalana*. In J. Mir & J. Solà (Eds.), *Obres completes*, vol. 1. Barcelona: Institut d'Estudis Catalans 2005.

- FABRA, P. (1920). *Article 161*. In J. Mir & J. Solà (Eds.), *Converses filològiques. Obres completes de Pompeu Fabra, vol. 7*. Barcelona: Proa/Edicions 62/Edicions 3 i 4/Editorial Moll, 288.
- Fabra, P. (1946). *Article 909*. In J. Mir & J. Solà (Eds.), *Converses filològiques. Obres completes de Pompeu Fabra, vol. 7*. Barcelona: Proa/Edicions 62/Edicions 3 i 4/Editorial Moll, 939-940.
- FARRENY I SISTAC, M.D. (2004). *La llengua del processos de crims a la Lleida del segle XVI*. Barcelona: Institut d'Estudis Catalans.
- HANSEN, F. (1966). *Gramática histórica de la lengua castellana*. París: Ediciones Hispano-americanas.
- HARRE, C.E. (1991). *Tener + past participle: a case study in linguistic description*. London – New York: Routledge.
- KENISTON, H. (1937). *The Syntax of Castilian Prose. The Sixteenth Century*. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- LAPESA, R. (2000). *Estudios de morfosintaxis histórica del español*. Madrid: Gredos.
- LOIS, X. (1990). Auxiliary Selection and Past Participle Agreement in Romance. *Probus*, 2(2), 233-255. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/prbs.1990.2.2.233>
- MACPHERSON, I. (1967). Past Participle Agreement in Old Spanish: Transitive Verbs. *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies*, 44(4), 241-254. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1475382672000344241>
- MARTÍ MESTRE, J. (1994). *El Libre de Antiquitats de la Seu de València. Estudi i edició a cura de Joaquim Martí Mestre*. València – Barcelona: Intitut Interuniversitari de Filologia Valenciana/Publicacions de l'Abadia de Montserrat.
- MOLL, F. DE B. (1952). *Gramática histórica catalana*. Madrid: Gredos.
- MUXÍ, I. (1996). Optional participial agreement with direct object clitics in Catalan. *Catalan Working Papers in Linguistics*, 5, 127-145.
- PAR, A. (1923). *Sintaxi catalana segons los escrits en prosa de Bernat Metge*. Halle (Saale): Verlag von Max Niemeyer.
- PAR, A. (1928). *“Curial e Guelfa”*. *Notes lingüístiques y d'estil*. Barcelona: Biblioteca Balmes.
- PÉREZ SALDANYA, M. (1998). *Del llatí al català. Morfosintaxi verbal històrica*. Valencia: Universitat de València.
- ROMANI, P. (2006). Tiempos de formación romance I. Los tiempos compuestos. In C. Company Company (Ed.), *Sintaxis histórica de la lengua española. Primera parte: La frase verbal* (pp. 243-346). México D. F.: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México – Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- RUSSELL-GEWBETT, P. (1965). *Medieval Catalan Linguistic Texts*. Oxford: Dolphin Book.
- SALVI, G. (1987). Syntactic Restructuring in the Evolution of Romance Auxiliaries. In M. Harris & P. Ramat (Eds.), *Historical Development of Auxiliaries* (pp. 225-236). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/9783110856910.225>
- SOLA, J. (1993). La concordança del participi passat. In: *Estudis de sintaxi catalana 2. Capítol VI* (pp. 57-86). Barcelona: Edicions 62.
- SMITH, J.CH. (1995). Agreement between past participle and direct object in Catalan: the hypothesis of Castilian influence revisited. In J. Fisiak (Ed.), *Linguistic Change under Contact Conditions* (pp. 271-289). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- YLLERA, A. (1980). *Sintaxis histórica del verbo español: las perífrasis verbales*. Zaragoza: Pórtico.



# EL TEXTO TRADUCIDO COMO FUENTE DE DATOS HISTÓRICO-LINGÜÍSTICOS: ESTUDIO DE UN CASO EN EL PORTUGAL DE QUINIENTOS

Translated text as a source of data on language's history.  
A case study in 16<sup>th</sup> century Portugal

Ana María García Martín

Universidad de Salamanca

amgm@usal.es

## Abstract

This paper argues that translations represent a legitimate instrument for conducting the analysis of a synchronic state of a language, to the extent that they provide relevant data about structures that are accepted or rejected outright by the translator. This methodological decision seems to be especially productive in the case of Spanish and Portuguese whose linguistic structures are frequently parallel and follow the same historical development, albeit not always with identical chronology. Thus, the paper aims to assess the linguistic options chosen individually by the translator to complete the translation of *Crónica Troyana* from Spanish to Portuguese as a way to distinguish some aspects of the linguistic situation of Portuguese language around the mid-16<sup>th</sup> century.

**Keywords:** translation, Spanish, Portuguese, 16<sup>th</sup> century

La historia de la traducción entre las lenguas española y portuguesa no es suficientemente conocida a día de hoy. La escasez de investigaciones en este ámbito ha sido ya destacada en algunos trabajos (Verdelho & Verdelho & Horster, 2003: 671-724 y Santoyo, 2005: 13-15), si bien el reciente interés y dedicación por parte de varios estudiosos promete ir colmatando el desconocimiento que aún poseemos sobre un campo de investigación insoslayable para el estudio de las relaciones literarias y lingüísticas entre los dos países ibéricos.

Si nos referimos específicamente a los siglos XVI y XVII, el estudio de la traducción entre ambas lenguas puede aportarnos claves fundamentales para entender los flujos y reflujos de la literatura hispánica de los siglos de Oro, así

como fenómenos de la magnitud del denominado bilingüismo literario en Portugal. Sin duda, la proximidad estructural de ambas lenguas, portuguesa y castellana, mayor aún en ese periodo histórico que hoy, propició que muchas obras circularan en territorio portugués en lengua castellana, y que en ella fuesen leídas e integradas en la cultura portuguesa. La historiadora Ana Isabel Buescu menciona varios casos significativos de circulación de obras escritas en castellano, o traducidas a esta lengua, en el Portugal de los siglos XVI y XVII, las cuales no precisaron de ser vertidas al portugués para ser masivamente consumidas (Buescu, 2000 y Buescu, 2004). Durante el periodo histórico mencionado, los libros en castellano no sólo eran leídos en Portugal, sino también con frecuencia editados y aun escritos en esta lengua por los propios portugueses.

Pero incluso así, no faltan traducciones del español al portugués en esos siglos. Y ello porque verter a la lengua propia no tenía apenas por objetivo posibilitar la lectura de una obra extranjera, sino que, sobre todo a lo largo del siglo XVI, el ejercicio de la traducción se concebía como el mejor medio para enriquecer las lenguas en pleno proceso de expansión funcional. Así lo reclama en 1540 el gramático y humanista João de Barros, en su famoso *Diálogo em louvor da nossa linguagem*, donde reivindica la traducción como medio necesario y urgente para enriquecer la lengua portuguesa, como ya antes hicieran toscanos, franceses y españoles, según el humanista, mientras que los portugueses se daban más a la conquista de tierras lejanas que a la creación de un imperio de papel. El ejercicio de la traducción en esta época representa, por tanto, un medio idóneo para proveerse de una lengua rica y maleable, al tiempo que se integra la cultura universal en el propio patrimonio.

La situación que acabamos de referir muy sumariamente justifica la importancia que deberán conceder los investigadores a las traducciones del castellano al portugués, especialmente a aquellas producidas en los siglos referidos. En este contexto se explica nuestro interés por una de esas traducciones, la *Coronica Troiana em Limguoagem Purtugesa*, ejercicio singular de versión al portugués de un texto largamente editado en España desde finales del siglo XV: la denominada *Crónica Troyana* impresa. Esta versión de la *Crónica Troyana* fue determinante para la difusión del tema troyano en la Península durante el siglo XVI. Constituyendo una refundición de la *Historia destructionis Trojae* de Guido de Columna y las *Sumas de Historia Troyana* de Leomarte, la *Crónica Troyana* impresa ve la luz en Burgos en 1490. Desde esa edición incunable hasta finales del siglo XVI, la versión de la historia troyana impresa en castellano conoce nada menos que otras 14 ediciones. De una de esas ediciones, concretamente la de Sevilla de 1527, se realizará hacia mediados del siglo XVI la traducción portuguesa de la obra, que quedará truncada, pues lo que ha llegado hasta nosotros son apenas los dos primeros libros de la obra en castellano.

En trabajos anteriores (García Martín, 1998) analizamos en pormenor diversos aspectos de la traducción portuguesa de la *Crónica Troyana* impresa española, entre los cuales la intervención del traductor anónimo en el texto base. Lo que sobresale de la comparación de ambos textos es la evidente semejanza entre ellos. El traductor portugués siguió muy de cerca la edición castellana, de manera que no encontramos grandes interpolaciones de texto ni tampoco supresiones importantes del contenido de la *Crónica Troyana*. Ello no significa que entre los dos textos no encontremos un número considerable de discrepancias, algunas de ellas intervenciones propositadas por parte del traductor y otras que resultan más bien de su interpretación errónea del texto en castellano. Así, a modo de sistematización de las principales divergencias entre ambos textos, pudimos establecer los siguientes tipos de intervenciones del traductor en el texto base, mostrándolos por orden de frecuencia: a. sustitución de palabras; b. cambio de construcción y traducción libre; c. supresión de una o más palabras; d. interpolación de una o más palabras; e. alteración del orden de las palabras; f. cambio de tiempos verbales; g. cambio de género nominal; h. cambio de persona verbal; i. cambio de concordancia de género; j. divergencias en los nombres propios; k. incompreensión del original (cfr. García Martín, 1998: 67-74).

Nuestro propósito en este artículo es, en cambio, analizar dicha traducción como ejercicio de saber lingüístico que nos puede proporcionar datos valiosos sobre el estado de la lengua portuguesa hacia mediados del siglo XVI. La traducción de la *Crónica Troyana* se produce en un momento de transición de la lengua portuguesa, justamente al final del denominado por algunos lingüistas portugués arcaico medio, cuyos límites cronológicos se discuten, pero que se puede extender hasta mediados del siglo XVI<sup>1</sup>. Ya por esas fechas se habían completado las principales evoluciones que distinguen al portugués moderno del antiguo, siendo, sin embargo, muchas aún las estructuras lingüísticas que se encuentran en evolución, dando lugar a fenómenos de variación y sustitución lingüística cuya cronología no ha sido en muchos casos suficientemente precisada. El análisis de las opciones lingüísticas escogidas por el traductor de la *Coronica Troiana* puede proporcionarnos, así, valiosos datos cuantitativos que contribuyan a evaluar la situación de diferentes formas y estructuras en la lengua portuguesa de hacia mediados del siglo XVI, sumando datos a los que puedan existir o surgir de otros estudios de corpus lingüísticos del mismo periodo. La observación de las opciones lingüísticas evidenciadas por la *Coronica Troiana* nos permite además comprobar los paralelismos o divergencias formales

---

<sup>1</sup> Esta baliza cronológica de cierre del segundo periodo arcaico del portugués es defendida, por ejemplo, por Bechara (1991), Maia (1995) y Mattos e Silva (1994). Discusión reciente de tal periodización puede encontrarse en Silva & Osório (2008: 74 y siguientes), Carvalho (2002) o Cardeira (2005).

y estructurales entre las dos lenguas en el periodo en que se sitúa la traducción estudiada. La relevancia de este tipo de análisis lingüístico de una traducción la avalaremos con las siguientes palabras de la profesora Clarinda Maia, que a este respecto reflexiona en su trabajo sobre el estado del portugués evidenciado por la versión en esta lengua del *Tratado de Tordesillas*:

[...] mas essa vantagem vê-se ainda acrescida pela circunstância de um original conter o texto do Tratado em português e outro em castelhano. É óbvio o interesse que para uma investigação histórico-contrastiva entre as duas línguas em questão oferecem os materiais contados nesses textos. A sua comparação, apoiada numa análise lingüística estrutural, com o fim de estabelecer correspondências de estruturas ou a sua ausência, adquire particular significado para a Linguística Românica. Embora não seja nosso objectivo, neste momento, proceder a esse estudo contrastivo de carácter histórico, vale a pena salientar o interesse de uma análise dessa natureza para o estudo da história das línguas ibero-românicas. (Maia, 1994: 44)

Haciendo nuestras esas palabras, nos proponemos evaluar las opciones lingüísticas escogidas por el traductor de la *Coronica Troiana* como medio para discernir algunos aspectos de la situación lingüística del portugués hacia mediados del siglo XVI. No menos importante nos parece la oportunidad que nos brinda la traducción analizada de poner en contraste histórico dos lenguas que se hallan en pleno proceso de evolución.

1. Resultan especialmente elocuentes aquellos casos en que el traductor rechaza sistemáticamente o con suficiente frecuencia una forma o estructura lingüística que, presente en la lengua castellana de la *Crónica Troyana*, escrita – recordemos – a finales del siglo XV, tuvo su paralelo en la gramática del portugués antiguo, pero ya no es sentida por el traductor como adecuada a su época. Así ocurre en los siguientes casos.

1.1. El traductor sustituye el demostrativo *aqueste* del texto español por *este* en 5 ocasiones<sup>2</sup>:

τ segun deximos aqueste quiso noe mucho } E segundo dixemos, este amou Noe muito (l. 1, cap. 2)

De aqueste rey Nino decendio Saturno } Deste rrei Nino desemdeo Saturno (l. 1, cap. 5)

Como a Mida se le tornaron las manos de oro y de la explanacion de aquesto. } Como a Mida se lhe tornaram as mãos d'ouro e da decaraçam disto (l. 2, cap. 4)

τ yo fazerlo he pieças y echarlo he en aquesta caldera } E eu faloe y em pedaços e deytalloey nesta calldeyra (l. 2, cap. 16)

<sup>2</sup> Los ejemplos del texto español corresponden a la edición sevillana de 1527, en la que intervenimos apenas desdoblado en itálico las abreviaturas y separando o uniendo palabras. El texto portugués es citado a partir de la edición de nuestra responsabilidad, indicando el libro y capítulo donde se encuentra la cita ofrecida. Subrayamos las formas o estructuras en causa.



Mas de aquestas a mi solamente era la injuria } Mas destas a *mim* somente faziala emjuria (l. 2, cap. 37)

En cambio, lo respeta en otras 4 ocasiones:

Y aqueste membrot assi como fue grande de cuerpo } E aqueste Membrot, asy como foi grande de corpo (l. 1, cap. 3)

E aqueste caso con vna donzella *que* llamaron Semiramis } E aqueste casou *com* hũa donzela que chamaram Semiramis (l. 1, cap. 4)

τ aqueste fue Neptuno } E aqueste foi Neptuno (l. 1, cap. 5)

Aqueste moço des que ouo doze años } Aqueste moco, des *que* foi de doze anos (l. 1, cap. 7)

Por tanto, el traductor parece vacilar respecto a la aceptación del demostrativo reforzado, que, muy probablemente, había perdido ya en el siglo XVI su valor enfático original. Resulta significativo, sin embargo, que la forma larga aparezca apenas en los primeros folios de la traducción, siendo posteriormente sustituida de modo sistemático por la corta, aquella que el traductor seguramente sentiría como más adecuada al portugués de su tiempo<sup>3</sup>.

1.2. Casi sistemáticamente (en 25 ocasiones), el traductor opta por *porém* para traducir la conjunción adversativa castellana *pero*, aunque en otras 7 ocasiones mantiene idéntica forma del portugués:

Pero el entrañable desseo *que* oue a complir vuestro mandado } Pero ho emtranhavell desejo *que* tiue de *comprir* voso mandado (prólogo)

Pero por no fazer prolixa obra τ gran volumen } Pero por não fazer proluxa obra e gram volume (prólogo)

Pero dizen que ayunto dios los quatro vientos τ sacudieron la torre τ la derribaron } Pero dizem que ajuntou *Deus* os quatro ventos e sacudiram a torre e derribaramna (l. 1, cap. 3)

---

<sup>3</sup> Según P. Teyssier, la forma *aqueste* sobrevive aún en el portugués del siglo XVI con el mismo significado que *este*, si bien con connotaciones arcaicas o enfáticas. Cfr. Teyssier (1990: 184-185). En los textos notariales estudiados por Clarinda de Azevedo Maia, las formas reforzadas son frecuentes en los siglos XIII y ya raras en el XIV, mientras que las formas no reforzadas son las únicas que se documentan en los siglos XV y XVI. Cfr. Maia (1986: 688). Cfr. también Nunes (1989: 248) y Coutinho (1976: 258). Para el español, Alvar y Pottier señalan que a fines de la Edad Media las formas largas tienden a desaparecer, puesto que no aportaban ningún valor semántico distinto al de las formas cortas. Cfr. Alvar & Pottier (1992: 107-108). Girón Alconchel apunta que en el siglo de oro aún se mantiene el uso de *aqueste*, y en menor medida de *aquesse*, formas que habían tenido un valor enfático en la lengua medieval. Por ejemplo, Cervantes emplea las formas largas para caracterizar registros arcaizantes. Cfr. Girón Alconchel (2008: 864).

Pero como quier *que* fuesse o por el padre o por el hijo aquel por quien fue fecho belo lo llamaron } Pero como quer que fose, ou polo pai ou polo *filho*, aquele por quem foy feyto Belo lhe chamaram (l.1, cap. 4)

fallo que auia de auer en aquella muger *quatro* fijos y el vno dellos que le auia de matar o desterrar. Pero no fallo qual de los *quatro* } achou que avia d'aver em aquela molher quatro filhos e *hum* deles que ho avia de matar ou desterrar, pero nam soube quall dos quatro (l. 1, cap. 5)

fazia se le de mal dela conquistar enel su parto. Pero penso como la induziesse a ello τ a lo que el queria:} *nam* na queria desconsolar no parto, pero cuidou como a emduziria ao que elle queria (l. 1, cap. 5)

Pero avn *dizen* las historias *que* tomo *aquella* piedra } Pero jmda dizem as estorias que tomou aquela pedra (l.1, cap. 6)

Sin embargo, como se observa, de nuevo la forma *pero* surge apenas en los primeros folios de la traducción, siempre en el primer libro, optando el traductor luego por otras formas, lo que vendría a demostrar el decrecimiento en el uso de la conjunción adversativa *pero* en el portugués de mediados del siglo XVI<sup>4</sup>.

1.3. El traductor opta casi sistemáticamente por la eliminación de estructuras partitivas, como se aprecia en los siguientes casos:

tantas ouo *de* las ayudas > tantas ajudas ouve (l. 2, cap. 2)

tomando de las ramas > tomando as rramas (l. 2, cap. 3)

tanto ouo *de* dolor > tamanha dor dele teue (l. 2, cap. 6)

el mejor hombre delos mancebos > o mylhor omem mançobo (l. 2, cap. 8)

Sólo muy raramente mantiene el uso partitivo, como en:

alcançauan *de* las ramas } travava da[s] ramas (l. 2, cap. 4).

Aunque el portugués antiguo conoció, al igual que el castellano, este tipo de estructuras partitivas, la opción recurrente del traductor parece indicar que hacia mediados del siglo XVI su uso es mucho menos frecuente<sup>5</sup>.

1.4. Igualmente, el traductor tiende a eliminar la doble negación, como muestran los siguientes ejemplos:

ya *que* ninguno no osaua prouar > ja nhum ousaua prouar a vemtura (l. 2, cap. 7)

mas ni ella no sera segura del falso amador } Mas nem ell[a] sera segura do fallso amador (l. 2, cap. 14)

<sup>4</sup> Ali afirma que los escritores del siglo XVI que emplean esta forma lo hacen sólo por una tendencia arcaizante. Así ocurre, por ejemplo, en João de Barros. Cfr. Ali (2001: 170). Cfr. igualmente Barreto (2002: 173).

<sup>5</sup> Aunque no falten ejemplos en autores quinientistas, como Gil Vicente o incluso en Camões. Cfr. Nunes (1989: 268-269).

y *que ningun reyno no auia de ayudar al otro }* e que *nhum dos rreinos avia d'ajudar hum ao outro* (l. 2, cap. 21)

que *ninguno no la demando pues el la demandaua }* e *nhum mais a pedio, pois a elle pedia* (l. 2, cap. 25)

Rara vez, en cambio, la mantiene o la introduce, como ocurre en:

por *ninguna guisa no se podian concordar* > por *nhũa maneyra nam se podiam comçertar* (l. 2, cap.7)

que sino el mejor hombre del mundo no lo pudiesse desatar sin morir. } que se *nam* fose ho mylhor caulleiro do mundo que *nhum outro nam* pudese la emtrar sem morrer (l. 2, cap. 7)

El traductor parece mostrar, por tanto, un claro rechazo de la doble negación. Esta estructura, aunque frecuente en portugués antiguo, habría perdido vigencia ya en la época en que la traducción fue hecha. Ana Maria Martins considera esta pérdida, de hecho, como uno de los fenómenos sintácticos delimitadores del portugués antiguo y del moderno<sup>6</sup>.

1.5. El traductor procede también eliminando la negación expletiva del texto en castellano, como se aprecia en estos ejemplos:

y era mayor de dias *que no el* } e era mais velho em dias *qu'ele* (l. 2, cap. 8)

mas podria ser que se fizo en ella algun edificio mas que en otra *que fasta entonces no fuesse fecho* } Mas podia ser que se fizese nela allgum hedeficio mais que em outra *que te emtomçes fose feito* (l. 2, cap. 13)

1.6. La sustitución de los frecuentes pronombres personales tónicos del texto castellano por los átonos correspondientes en portugués es una opción frecuente por parte del traductor, como se observa en los siguientes ejemplos:

E con este tan loable τ virtuoso desseo mandastes *a mi* que escriuiesse } E com este tamto de louvar e virtuoso desejo *me* mandastes *que* escrevese (prólogo)

Y *quieras* tu dar *a mi* aquello *que* yo cuytada tan sin precio τ sin deudo a ti di } e *me* queiras dar aquello que eu tam sem preso e sem diuado a ti dei (l. 2, cap. 11). Cfr., en cambio, a ti di } a ti dei.

a la qual tu *a mi* prometiste tornar en la mi ysla } a quall *me* tu prometeste tornar a minha ylha (l. 2, cap. 14)

pues la su nobleza *a mi* fazia daño ? } poys a sua nobreza *me* avia de fazer dano? (l. 2, cap. 37)

---

<sup>6</sup> Comenta esta lingüista que ya en el siglo XVI la doble negación apenas se encuentra en escritores arcaizantes, como Gil Vicente, pero pocos ejemplos aparecen en escritores más clásicos, como João de Barros, “mostrando o carácter residual da construção”. Cfr. Martins (2002: 271-284).

ni los dioses tanta alabança quisieron otorgar a mi } *nem* os deoses tall gloria me quiseram otorgar (l. 2, cap. 39)

El traductor moderniza así el uso de los pronombres complemento, pues ya hacia mediados del siglo XVI había decrecido la frecuencia de uso de las formas tónicas, característica de los siglos anteriores, a favor de las átonas<sup>7</sup>.

1.7. La conjunción causal/explicativa *que* del texto en castellano es sistemáticamente traducida por *porque* (25 ocasiones). Así, por ejemplo, en:

Este fue el primero que despues del diluuiio fiziesse ydolo: τ fizolo segun algunas historias lo cuentan por su padre: que hizo vna estatua a su figura τ fizo que la adorassen } E este foi o *primeiro* que depois do diluuiio fez ydolo e felo, segundo allgũas estorias comtão, por seu pay, porque fez hũa estatua a sua figura e mandou que a adorassem (l. 1, cap. 4)

y entonces fizo priamo renouar todos (sic) las obsequias de los muertos que tanto auia sido el mal que no auia *quedado quien* lo fiziesse } E emtão fez Priamo renouar totalas oxequias dos mortos, porque tamto fora o mao que não escapou *quem* nas amtes fizese (l. 2, cap. 27)

Así, aunque polifuncional en el portugués antiguo, la conjunción *que* en su uso explicativo parece ser rechazada por el traductor de la *Coronica Troiana*.

1.8. Igualmente, la conjunción *ca* del texto castellano es traducida siempre bien por *que*, bien por *porque*. Así en:

para restaurar el humanal linaje. Ca este era nieto de Enoch } para rrestaurar ho linhagem vmanall, que este era neto de Enoch (l. 1, cap. 1)

acogiose a vn nauio: ca no oso mampararse en ninguno de los lugares de la ysla } acolheose a hum navio, que nam ousou mampararse em nhum dos lugares da ylha (l. 1, cap. 8)

y enseñauanlo los padres a los hijos: ca por alli se enseñoreauan ellos de los otros } e emsinavamno os pais aos filhos porque por estas artes e gram saber se emsenhoreavão elles dos outros (l. 1, cap. 5)

mas esto no puede ser ca ya las mares de antes desto se andauan } mas isto não pode ser porque ja os mares amtes se navegavão (l. 2, cap. 13)

Esta sustitución sistemática vendría a confirmar la desaparición de la conjunción *ca* de la gramática portuguesa de mediados del siglo XVI (cfr. Barreto, 2002: 175).

2. Frente a los casos mostrados de rechazo de formas o estructuras, el traductor también nos da testimonio, a través de la aceptación de otras, de su

<sup>7</sup> Sobre este empleo en los textos antiguos y en los del siglo XVI, cfr. Delille (1989: 33-45).

vigencia en la lengua portuguesa de mediados del siglo XVI. Así ocurre en relación a los siguientes fenómenos.

2.1. El traductor elimina en sólo 3 ocasiones el pretérito anterior que aparece en el texto en castellano. Así en:

La reyna despues que esto ouo fecho assi } A rrainha, depois que isto fez (l. 1, cap. 6)

Despues que sus fiestas τ alegrías los griegos ouieron fecho } Depois que os gregos fizerão suas festas e alegrías (l. 2, cap. 13)

Dizen las historias *que* este puerco ouo echado alli por maldicion la diosa diana } Dizem as estorias que este porco lamcou alli a deosa Diana por malldição (l. 2, cap. 19)

En cambio, lo mantiene frecuentemente, como en:

iupiter reyno en creta despues *que* ouo desterrado a su padre } Jupiter rreinou em Creta depois que teve desterrado seu pay (l. 2, cap. 17)

Hercules desde ouo puesto a su muger monja } Depois que Ercoles teue posto a sua molher no mosteiro (l. 2, cap. 25)

τ quando esto ouo dicho cayo muerto } E como isto teue dito cayo morto (l. 2, cap. 25)

τ des *que* ouo acabado torno a consolar su gente } E des que isto teue acabado tornou a consolar sua gente (l. 2, cap. 27)

Despues que esto ouo fecho hercules fuesse empos de Gerion } Depois que Ercoles isto teue feito foy apos Geriom (l. 2, cap. 34)

Observamos en los ejemplos citados que el tiempo es usado a lo largo de toda la obra, documentando su vigencia en el portugués de mediados del siglo XVI, si bien se observa también una tendencia incipiente a sustituirlo por el pretérito perfecto simple, forma que compartía los mismos valores temporales y aspectuales, y que, de hecho, acabó por sustituirlo completamente<sup>8</sup>.

2.2. El traductor mantiene las construcciones en que el clítico está interpolado en el texto en castellano<sup>9</sup>, como en:

si me lo no traeys } se mo *nam* trazeis (l. 1, cap. 7)

que lo no dixesse } que o *nam* dixesse (l. 2, cap. 3)

que te yo pido } que te eu peço (l. 2, cap. 11)

les yo pedi } lhes eu pedia (l. 2, cap. 11)

que vos yo dare } que vos eu darei (l. 2, cap. 12)

<sup>8</sup> Cfr. Ali (2001: 124), quien da apenas ejemplos de Fernão Lopes y Diogo do Couto.

<sup>9</sup> La interpolación es aún muy frecuente en el texto base castellano, a pesar de que Eberenz apunta que su desaparición se produciría hacia 1450. Cfr. Eberenz (2008: 617).

La vigencia de esta construcción en el portugués de la época se evidencia además porque el traductor introduce la interpolación en casos en que no la presenta el texto en castellano (8 ocasiones), como en los siguientes ejemplos:

que no *tan* solamente fizo curso la luna a la qual tu a mi prometiste tornar en la mi ysla }  
Que *nam* tam somente fez curso a luma, a quall me tu prometeste tornar a minha ylha  
(l. 2, cap. 14)

ninguno no la *demando* pues el la demandaua } *nhum* mais a pedio, pois a elle pedia  
(l. 2, cap. 25)

E quando la vio hercoles } E quando a Ercolles vio (l. 2, cap. 36)

En el portugués del traductor parece predominar, por tanto, la construcción del clítico interpolado, es decir, su colocación inmediatamente a la derecha de una conjunción y antes de un adverbio o del sujeto de la oración subordinada. Es este otro de los fenómenos sintácticos que Ana María Martins considera delimitadores del portugués antiguo y el moderno, pues se documenta ampliamente hasta el siglo XVI, desapareciendo de la gramática del portugués ya en el periodo clásico (cfr. Martins, 2002: 262-271). La *Coronica Troiana* muestra, sin embargo, una alta productividad de esta colocación del clítico aún a finales del periodo arcaico medio.

2.3. En relación a la traducción del pretérito perfecto compuesto de indicativo del texto en castellano, el traductor raramente opta por el pretérito perfecto simple del portugués, como ocurre en el ejemplo siguiente:

Señor ves a *que* por la crueldad *que* contra tu generacion has mostrado: los dioses son muy ayrados } *Senhor*, vedes a que pola cruelldade que contra vosa geração tiuestes os deoses sam mui yrados (l. 1, cap. 6)

Por el contrario, muy frecuentemente el traductor opta por mantener el empleo del pretérito perfecto compuesto, forma que presenta en el portugués de la época un valor similar al del tiempo simple, indicando acción perfectiva en el pasado. Así en:

Mida como auemos dicho *que* era muy escasso τ codicioso } Como temos dito de Mida que era *muito* escaso e cobioso (l. 2, cap. 4)

y *que* la ayuda *que* auemos dicho *que* le pidio Mida a libero padre } E que hajuda temos dito *que* lhe pedio Mida ha Libero Padre (l. 2, cap. 4)

τ quiero te fazer saber que esto cumple a ti. Ca tu as començado tal fecho *que* tu no podras escusar la muerte } E façote saber que isto cumple a ti, que tu tens começado tall feito que tu não poderas escusar a morte (l. 2, cap. 11)

mas agora nueuamente me han dicho que tornado eres en tu tierra: τ muger has tomado } Mas agora novamente me am dito *que* tornado es em tua terra e molher tens tomado  
(l. 2, cap. 14)

En estos ejemplos se observa la opción clara por parte del traductor de mantener el pretérito perfecto compuesto, demostrando la vitalidad del uso de esta forma verbal como equivalente del perfecto simple en el portugués de mediados del siglo XVI.

2.4. Los tiempos compuestos con los auxiliares *ter* o *haver* presentan con frecuencia en la *Coronica Troiana* la concordancia en género y número del participio pasado con el complemento directo. Así ocurre indistintamente del tiempo compuesto de que se trate, como en:

fijo dos vezes te di al mundo: τ grandes miedos he passado porque tu llegasses a este estado } Filho, duas vezes te dei ao mundo e grandes medos tenho passados por te ver neste estado (l. 1, cap. 7)

E quando Hercoles vio que aquella estada alli les era vergonçosa por no seguir el viaje que auian començado } e quando Ercolles vio que aquela estada ali lhes era vergonhosa por nam fazerem a viagem que tynhão comesada (l. 2, cap. 10)

τ avn este hombre era el que menos injurias auia recebido de los Dardanos } E ajmda este homem era o que menos emjurias tinha rrecebidas dos dardanos (l. 2, cap. 2)

E sabed que assi como trous ouo cercado la ciudad } E sabei que como Trou teue cercada a çidade logo lhe mudou o nome (l. 2, cap. 5)

E mas los de la parte de la nouia auian conbidado a vnas gentes } E os da parte da noiua tinham convidados a hñas gemtes (l. 2, cap. 23)

Despues que hercoles ouo sojuzgado a los egyptianos: } Depois que Ercoles teue sogigados os egeçianos (l. 2, cap. 31)

Resultan muy interesantes estos ejemplos, pues podrían indicarnos una mayor lentitud en la gramaticalización de los tiempos compuestos en portugués que en castellano<sup>10</sup>, una vez que dicha gramaticalización suele asociarse a la pérdida de la concordancia referida.

2.5. El traductor respeta el empleo de *como* completivo del texto castellano, usado muy frecuentemente con verbos de lengua y pensamiento (11 ocurrencias registradas). Por ejemplo:

τ dixole que fuesse alla y le dixese como era fijo del rey τ dela reyna } e dixelhe que fose la e que lhe dixese como era filho del rrey e seu (l. 1, cap. 7)

y este sileno dixo a mida como libero padre era cerca } E este Sileno dixे a Mida como Libero Padre era perto (l. 2, cap. 3)

<sup>10</sup> Según Eberenz, en castellano los últimos testimonios de concordancia entre el participio de los tiempos compuestos y el complemento directo se encuentran en el siglo XV. Cfr. Eberenz (2008: 626-627). Para el proceso en portugués, cfr. Mattos e Silva (1993: 62-65).

no fue sino que libero padre oyendo del como era escasso } não foi senam que Libero Padre, ouvindo dizer como era escasso (l. 2, cap. 4)

Además, en otras ocasiones, lo introduce, como en:

E supo que vno que se llamaua su fijo andaua sojuzgando la tierra } E soube como hum que se chamaua seu filho amdaua sogigamdo a terra (l. 1, cap. 7)

τ quando a el allego el lo supo primero τ saliola a receber } E amtes que chegase soube como vinha sua may e sayoa a rreçeber (l. 1, cap. 7)

considerandolo no ser de tanta auctoridad como su padre } e consiraram em si como o filho nam era de tanta autoridade como o pay (l. 2, cap. 1)

Y ella des que supo que los caualleros venian recibio los muy honrradamente } E ella, sabendo como os cavaleiros vinhão, rreçeebos omrradamente (l. 2, cap. 10)

Y muy raramente lo elimina, como en el ejemplo siguiente, que surge pocas líneas después de un caso en que lo introduce:

τ oyo dezir del como era de tan alta sangre } e ouvio dizer dele que era sobrinho del rrei Peleo (l. 2, cap. 10)

En consecuencia, la aceptación y empleo abundante del *como* completivo por parte del traductor parece demostrar que su empleo estaba aún generalizado en el portugués de mediados del siglo XVI.

2.6. El traductor mantiene también la conjunción *como* con valor temporal, respetando su uso en el texto castellano, como en:

E sabed que assi como trous ouo cercado la cibdad assi le mudo el nombre } E sabeí que como Troux teue çercada a çidade logo lhe mudou o nome (l. 2, cap. 5)

E como lo vio abraçolo y besolo } E como ho vio abraçouo e beyjouo (l. 2, cap. 11)

τ como deyamira esto oyo: por poco no se torno loca } E como Deyamira isto ouvio por pouco não emdoudeçeo (l. 2, cap. 37)

Además, en 6 ocasiones traduce *quando* por *como*, como en:

En muy gran tristeza era esta reyna rea por las muertes de sus fijos: τ quando vino a ser encinta del quarto fijo } Mui triste era esta rrainha Rrea polas mortes de seus filhos e, como foi prenhe do quarto filho (l. 1, cap. 6)

τ quando el rey fue pensando en ello entendio que arte le fuera fecha } E como el rrey cuidou naquilo emtemdeo o emgano que lhe era feito (l. 1, cap. 7)

mas quando las culebras llegaron a las cunas } Mas, como as cobras chegarão aos berços (l. 2, cap. 18)



mas el *leon que* solia salir a los hombres quando los veyá } Mas o liam, que costumava sair aos homens como os via (l. 2, cap. 19)

mas quando vio a maniple vencida enflaquecio } Mas como vio a Maniple vencida emfraqueço (l. 2, cap. 29)

mas quando acordo echose mano a las vestiduras τ despedaçolas todas } Mas como acordou deitou mão as vestiduras e trsgouas todas (l. 2, cap. 40)

También en otras ocasiones traduce *después que* y *des que* por *como*, demostrándose la productividad del uso de esta forma con valor temporal en el portugués de mediados del siglo XVI:

τ despues que el fue de edad dieronle todos el reyno } E como foi em ydade deramlhe todos ho rreino (l. 2, cap. 7)

y des que fuere dormido degollado } E fazeyo dormir, e como dormir degolayo (l. 2, cap. 16)

2.7. El traductor respeta igualmente el empleo de *porque* con valor final del texto en castellano, como en:

Acostumbrase muy magnifico señor cerca de los antiguos poner en escripto los fechos de los altos hombres τ grandes señores porque dellos quedasse memoria para los que despues dellos subcediessen } Custumavão os antigos, mui manifico *senhor*, por os feitos dos alltos homens e grandes *senhores* em escripto porque deles ficase memoria para os que deles sosedesem (prólogo)

y *que* traya todavia la cabeça cubierta porque no se le pareciesse aquella verguença } e que trazia todavia a cabeça cuberta porque nam lhe parecese aquela vergonha (l. 2, cap. 3)

mas *que* lo dixera con arte porque sus encantamentos (sic) falleciessen } mas que ho dixera manhosamente porque seus emcantamentos desfaleçesem (l. 2, cap. 18)

El uso de *porque* con valor final, de hecho, mantiene su vigencia aún en el portugués clásico.

3. En otras ocasiones, el rechazo o aceptación de las formas o estructuras portuguesas equivalentes a las del texto en castellano no son tan claros en el traductor, evidenciando una situación de variación lingüística en el portugués de mediados del siglo XVI.

3.1. Así, la traducción evidencia la alternancia entre el uso del pronombre dativo *lhe/lhes* con valor plural. En 7 ocasiones el traductor opta por el pronombre de complemento indirecto plural *lhe* para traducir el castellano *les*, prefiriendo *lhes* en otras 13 ocasiones. Esa proporción indica la vigencia del uso

de *lhe* con valor plural aún a mediados del siglo XVI<sup>11</sup>. Transcribiremos apenas algunos ejemplos:

Confundamosles el lenguaje porque vean *que* los sus cuydados vanos son } Confundamoslhe a limgajem porque vejam que os seus cuidados sam vãos (l. 1, cap. 3)

τ vieron el niño *tan* fermoso entendieron *que* aquello no era al sino *que* dios les embiaua rey } e viram o menino tam fremoso, dyxera[m] que aquilo não era all senão *que* Deus lhe mandaua rrei (l. 2, cap. 7)

ouieron buenos vientos τ arribaron en grecia. E todos los reyes τ altos hombres de la tierra les faziam mucha honrra: τ loauan la gran proeza de Jason } tueram bons vento[s] e em pouco tempo chegaram a Greçia. E todolos rreis e grandes *senhores* da terra lhe faziam grande omrra e louvaua[m] sua gram cavalaria (l. 2, cap. 13)

Mas ya esto no podra ser: ca los embiare yo a los celestiales dioses a les dar mis querellas: y seran ellos testigos de los mis amargos dolores } Mas ja isto *nam* podera ser porque os mandarey eu aos çellestriaais deoses a darlhe minhas querellas e serão elles testemunhas dos meu[s] trabalhos e dores (l. 2, cap. 15)

3.2. Similar situación de variación lingüística refleja el uso del artículo definido ante determinante posesivo. El traductor respeta con frecuencia el uso del artículo ante determinante posesivo que encuentra en el texto base<sup>12</sup>. Así por ejemplo:

E cam assento en la su partida alli } E Cam asemtou a sua partida ali (l. 1, cap. 1)

porque vean *que* los sus cuydados vanos son } porque vejam que os seus cuidados sam vãos (l. 1, cap. 3)

Assi *que* el su amo } Asy que ho seu amo (l. 1, cap. 7)

En cambio, en 16 ocasiones el traductor suprime el artículo que presenta el texto castellano, como en:

a vna parte τ a otra fasta que fue llena la su partida } por hũa parte e por outra ate que foi chea sua partida (l. 1, cap. 1)

τ los sus malos pensamientos ponianlos por obra } e punham seus maos pemsamentos por obra (l. 1, cap. 3)

<sup>11</sup> En algunos textos del siglo XVI es más frecuente *lhe* que *lhes* para plural. Cfr. Verdelho (1994: 746). Este uso también se documenta ampliamente en el portugués clásico y aún hoy en la lengua popular. Cfr. Nunes (1989: 239) y Said Ali (2001: 75, nota 14).

<sup>12</sup> Este uso, que serviría para distintos tipos de focalización, según Eberenz, abunda aún en textos castellanos de la primera mitad del siglo XIV. En la segunda mitad de ese siglo es menos frecuente, faltando ya en obras quattrocentistas como la *Cárcel de amor* o *La Celestina*. Cfr. Eberenz (2008: 617).

τ los dioses no sean en la mi ayuda } E nunca os deoses sejam em mynha ajuda (l. 2, cap. 9)

Mientras que lo introduce en otras 15 ocasiones en que no aparece el artículo en el texto castellano, como en:

τ hizole Mida mucha honrra en su cibdad } E fezlhe Mida muita omrra em a sua cidade (l. 2, cap. 3)

τ vaya mi cuerpo a vos } e va o meu corpo a vos (l. 2, cap. 6)

restaurando su cibdad } rrestauramdo a sua cidade (l. 2, cap. 8)

nunca mas alegria llego en su coraçon: } nunca mais emtrou alegria no seu coração (l. 2, cap. 15)

Observamos, por tanto, que se mantiene un equilibrio en la *Coronica Troiana* entre aquellos casos en que se introduce el artículo ante adjetivo posesivo y aquellos en que se elimina, correspondiendo esta variación a la situación normal en el portugués del siglo XVI. Said Ali ofrece una estadística de la frecuencia de uso del artículo ante posesivo en textos literarios portugueses. Así, en Fernão Lopes sólo se da en un 5% de las ocasiones posibles, mientras que en *Lusíadas* ya ha ascendido al 30% y en el padre Vieira al 70% (cfr. Said Ali, 2001: 77). La *Coronica Troiana* evidencia ese avance en el uso del artículo ante posesivo producido a lo largo del siglo XVI.

3.3. Otra situación de variación viene dada por la alternancia de los pretéritos pluscuamperfectos de indicativo simple y compuesto en la *Coronica Troiana*. El traductor opta con frecuencia (22 ocurrencias registradas) por el pluscuamperfecto simple de indicativo para traducir el pluscuamperfecto compuesto del texto en castellano<sup>13</sup>. Así en:

*quitose de todo quanto* con el auia puesto no le *queriendo* pagar su afan τ *despensa* que *auia fecho* } *faleceolhe com* tudo o que *com* elle ficara, *nam lhe queremdo* pagar nada (l. 2, cap. 5)

τ los *que* con el auian venido } e os que *com* elles vierão de Greçia (l. 2, cap. 23)

<sup>13</sup> Este pluscuamperfecto compuesto es el único posible en la norma moderna del español y el único que surge ya en el texto base de la traducción. Sin embargo, en el castellano medieval también se usó la forma de Pluscuamperfecto en –ra, heredada del latín con ese valor, existiendo variación entre el uso de los dos pluscuamperfectos de indicativo, simple y compuesto. Según apunta Eberenz, tal vez entre ellos existiese alguna diferencia de focalización. En todo caso, según explica este lingüista, ya en textos narrativos del siglo XV se aprecia un claro decrecimiento en el uso de la forma simple. En la gramática de Nebrija no se refiere ya tal valor de la forma en –ra, mientras que Valdés lo considera un uso anticuado. Cfr. Eberenz (2008: 627-628).

fallo a caco *que* el auia vencido en esperia } achou a Caco, que ele vemçera em Espera (l. 2, cap. 35)

Esto uso alterna, sin embargo, con el mantenimiento del pluscuamperfecto compuesto que el traductor encuentra en el texto en castellano:

diolo a vn hombre que lo criasse como que lo auia fallado y que no sabia cuyo era } deu o a *hum* homem que o criase como que o avia achado e que não sabia cujo era (l. 1, cap. 6)

y *penso que* sus encantamentos (sic) auian perdido la fuerça } e cuidou que aviam seus encantamentos perdido a força (l. 2, cap. 17)

E *dizen que* muchos la auian prouado τ los auia ella muerto } E dizem que muitos aviam provado e ella os tinha mortos (l. 2, cap. 20)

E desta guisa auia muerto muchos altos hombres } E desta maneyra tinha morto muitos *senhores* (l. 2, cap. 30)

Esta alternancia muestra la productividad de la forma verbal en *-ra* en el portugués de mediados del siglo XVI, cuyo empleo compite, sin embargo, con una forma compuesta cada vez más productiva.

3.4. Muy interesante es la situación de alternancia entre los verbos *ter* y *haver* evidenciada por la traducción portuguesa. Muy frecuentemente (en 57 ocurrencias) el traductor sustituye el castellano *haber* por *ter* como verbo de sentido pleno para indicar posesión. Por ejemplo:

E assi todos los Griegos como los de la ysla auian gran manzilla τ infinito dolor por la partida } e asy todolos da ylha tinham grande dor pola partida (l. 2, cap. 10)

y no ha edad para regir reyno } e não tem ydade para reger rreino (l. 2, cap. 14)

Con menos frecuencia (en 22 ocurrencias), mantiene *haver* con ese valor:

Como Noe ouo el quarto hijo } Como Noe ouue o quarto filho (l. 1, cap. 2)

τ ouo en este comedio medea dos fijos } E ouue neste meio tempo Medea dous filhos (l. 2, cap. 13)

Esta clara preferencia por el verbo *ter* da cuenta de cómo este verbo se iba imponiendo a *haver* como verbo pleno al final del periodo arcaico medio (cfr. Mattos e Silva, 2002: 119-142). En cambio no ocurre lo mismo respecto al empleo de *haver* y *ter* como verbos auxiliares de los tiempos compuestos, pues ambos conviven con parecida productividad en la *Coronica Troiana*. Así, constatamos abundantes ejemplos donde el verbo español *haber* se traduce por *ter*:

*que* como quier *que* arriba aya fecho mencion } Que, como *que* arryba tenha feito mençam (l. 1, cap. 3)

membrándosele del mal *que* su padre τ su cibdad auia passado } lembrándose[h]e do mall que seu pay e a sua cidade tinhão pasado (l. 2, cap. 2)

Hercoles des que ouo puesto a su muger monja } Depois que Ercoles teue posto a sua molher no mosteiro (l. 2, cap. 25)

Pero también con frecuencia similar se produce el mantenimiento de *haver* como auxiliar:

auia mucho engrandecido } avia muito acresentado (l. 1, cap. 4)

Asi como auays oydo arribo frixo a la ylha de colcos en el su carnero } Asy como aveis ouvido chegou Frixo a ylha de Colcos no seu carneiro (l. 2, cap. 7)

ca estauan los de la cibdad de la obra muy cansados τ muy menesterosos por las grandes despensas *que* en ella auian puesto } porque estavam os da cidade cansados da obra e mui pobres das grandes despensas que nela aviam feito (l. 2, cap. 5)

La *Coronica Troiana* muestra, por tanto, cómo fue mucho más lento el proceso de sustitución de *haver* por *ter* en el caso de la auxiliaridad de los tiempos compuestos.

3.5. La sustitución de la estructura pasiva con *ser* + participio, muy frecuente en el texto en castellano, se produce frecuentemente en la traducción portuguesa. Así en:

τ tomo la ymagen τ pusola entre las piernas de la reyna y ensangrentola de aquello de guisa que parescia que parido era } E tomou a ymagem e pola amtre as pernas da rrainha e emsangoemtoua daquilo de maneira que parecia que a parira (l. 1, cap. 6)

y el *quando* supo que diulgado era que auia fijo en Allcumena y *que* se lo embiaua } E elle, *quam* soube que se sabia que tinha filho d'Allcumena e que lho mandauão (l. 2, cap. 18)

τ como podra ser que sea devamira dexada τ contada por manceba } Nam sey como podera ser que deixes Devamira e a contes por mançeba (l. 2, cap. 37).

El traductor no duda, por tanto, en actualizar un uso que considera arcaizante, como también lo sería ya en el castellano de la misma época. En cambio, es distinto el tratamiento que recibe la construcción *ser* + participio cuando tiene valor activo. Ocasionalmente la sustituye por un tiempo simple de indicativo, como en:

τ *quando* la reyna fue parida tomaron al fijo *que* auia nacido } E *quando* a rrainha pario tomarão ao filho que pario (l. 1, cap. 5)

*que* mas valia tornar otra vez en Troya pues sabia que el ylion era escapado } que milhor era tornar outra vez a Troia, pois sabia que escapara o Iliom (l. 2, cap. 27)

Sin embargo, en otros casos mantiene el uso del texto en castellano<sup>14</sup>, como en:

Loados sean los dioses: *que* mi señora es parida } Louuados sejam os deoses, que minha *senhora* he parida (l. 2, cap. 17)

mas como medea supo como jason era ydo a la ysla de lemos } Mas como Medea soube como Jasom era ydo para a ylha de Lemos (l. 2, cap. 15)

La *Coronica Troiana* nos permite observar, por tanto, cómo la estructura *ser* + participio con valor activo se mantiene en el portugués de finales del periodo arcaico medio, si bien ya en competencia con su sustitución por diferentes tiempos verbales.

3.6. Es vacilante en la traducción portuguesa el empleo del artículo definido ante topónimos. El traductor introduce en varias ocasiones el artículo definido ante un topónimo, como en:

E cam assento en la su partida / alli cerca de Asia } E Cam asemtou em a sua partida ali açerca da Asia (l. 1, cap. 1)

E *dizen* algunas historias *que* es tanto *aquella* ysla como la tercera parte de Europa } he tamanha aquela ylha como a terçeyra parte da Europa (l. 2, cap. 28)

*porque* auia tres reynos. Assi como el andaluzia: y estremadura: τ las montañas de galizia τ portugal } *porque* tinha tres rreinos, .s. Amdaluzia e a Estremadura e as momtanhas de Galiza e Purtugall (l. 2, cap. 33)

Sin embargo, este uso, aún poco frecuente estadísticamente en el portugués del siglo XVI<sup>15</sup>, alterna en la *Coronica Troiana* con la ausencia del artículo, coincidente en general con el texto español.

4. Finalmente, la *Coronica Troiana* nos sirve para analizar la conciencia contrastiva de las dos lenguas, portuguesa y castellana, en el traductor. Este demuestra poseer un profundo conocimiento de las diferencias entre las dos lenguas, algunas de las cuales aún lo son a día de hoy. Las intervenciones más significativas por parte del traductor en este sentido son las siguientes:

4.1. En dos ocasiones el traductor altera el tratamiento de *tu* que aparece en el texto castellano sustituyéndolo por *vós*. En el primer caso en boca de Medea al dirigirse a Jasón y en el segundo en boca de Daimira al dirigirse a Hércules:

<sup>14</sup> Esta estructura con valor activo decrece en uso en castellano desde el siglo XV ante la competencia de *haber* + participio, que se generaliza a los verbos intransitivos de movimiento o cambio de estado que en los primeros siglos seleccionan preferentemente la estructura con *ser* + participio. Cfr. Eberenz (2008: 626-627).

<sup>15</sup> En el caso de los topónimos acabados en *-a* átona, Ali considera que sólo en el siglo XVII se tienden a usar frecuentemente precedidos del artículo *a*. Cfr. Ali (2001: 100).

pero con el gran amor *que yo a ti* he forçare la su ley } *porem, com o grande amor que vos tenho, forçarey a sua ley* (l. 2, cap. 13)

mas mi señor marido recibeme *que a ti* me vo } *Mas, meu senhor e marido, recebeime que a vos me vou* (l. 2, cap. 40)

Afirma Lindley Cintra que tanto el tratamiento por *tu* como por *vós* eran posibles entre esposos en el siglo XVI. Así, Gil Vicente puede escoger entre ambos con la intención de caracterizar al personaje (Cintra, 1986: 55). En la *Coronica Troiana* se usan ambas formas de tratamiento, en general reflejando el mismo uso del texto base:

por cierto señora yo *vos* he *a vos* por sabia muger τ muy cuerda: *en quanto yo fazia erraua mas yo agradezco vos lo que fizistes* en escapar a tan noble hijo como este *que* en las montañas anda } *Por çerto, senhora, eu vos ey a vos* por discreta molher e mui sesuda, porque em quanto eu fazia erraua. Mas eu *vos* agardeço o que *fizestes* em escapar a tam noble filho como este que em as montanhas amda (l. 1, cap. 7)

E *piensas tu* desconocido y faso jason *que* porque *venciste* los toros no domables del dios mares: y *quebrantaste* las fuerças de los sus brauos leones } E *cuidas tu*, desconheçydo e fallço Jasom, que porque *vemceste* os touros não domados do deos Mares e *quebramtaste* as forças dos seus brauos liões (l. 2, cap. 15)

Junto a los primeros ejemplos mencionados, también interviene el traductor en el tratamiento al introducir la forma nominal *dona*, en referencia a una reina, en un fragmento donde tal tratamiento no aparece en el texto en castellano:

E *la reyna juno* con mal zelo alabando los fechos de hercoles } E *a rainha dona Juno*, com mao zelo gabamdo os feitos d'Ercoles (l. 2, cap. 19)

Coincide este uso con la tendencia demostrada por el traductor a intervenir en el texto base para ascender socialmente a algunos personajes de la narración y a integrarlos en el estamento aristocrático<sup>16</sup>. Junto a ello, las alteraciones realizadas podrían tener que ver con la diferente pragmática de la cortesía en ambas lenguas.

4.2. El traductor elimina con frecuencia determinantes posesivos del texto en castellano, como en:

E *fizoles fazer ladrillos* τ *cal* y *començaron a fazer su obra* } E *fezlhe fazer ladrilho e call e comesaram a fazer a obra* (l. 1, cap. 3)

Faziasele de mal de la conquistar en *el su parto* } *nam* na queria desconsolar *no parto* (l. 1, cap. 5)

<sup>16</sup> Por ejemplo: El infante } o *principe*; hombre } *caualleiro*; y muy muchos altos hombres } *Muitos senhores e reis*. Es significativo el fragmento en que, en referencia a un rey, traduce *puso* lo por *mandouo por*. Cfr. García Martín (1998: 75).

considerandolo no ser de tanta auctoridad como su padre } o filho *nam* era de tanta autoridade como o pay (l. 2, cap. 1)

τ començo su guerra con el τ matolo } E começou a gera com elle e matouo (l. 2, cap. 22)

E quando Hercoles vino a su casa τ fallo a su muger casada } E quando Ercoles veio a sua casa e achou a molher casada (l. 2, cap. 24)

τ començaron su batalla muy de rezio } E começaram a batalha mui rriio (l. 2, cap. 29)

quierote dar galardón del trabajo de tu camino } querote dar o galardam do trabalho do caminho (l. 2, cap. 38)

τ recontaua alli en el su llanto la manera de salua *que* fazia } E comtaua ali no pramto tudo o que lhe aqueçeo (l. 2, cap. 40)

Observamos en esta intervención que el traductor respeta la tendencia del portugués al ahorro de los posesivos, en comparación con su uso más abundante en castellano, mostrando una clara y sutil conciencia de las diferencias entre ambas lenguas.

4.3. El traductor elimina con frecuencia el pronombre de algunos verbos pronominales del texto castellano, como en:

descubriose } descubrio (l. 1, cap. 1)

se multiplicasse } mulltiplicase (l. 1, cap. 1)

casose } casou (l. 2, cap. 1)

tornandose } tornando (l. 2, cap. 4)

se lauo } lavou (l. 2, cap. 4)

se murio } morreo (l. 2, cap. 7)

fuesse } foi (l. 2, cap. 16)

se fueron } forão (l. 2, cap. 18)

La conjugación pronominal es aún hoy menos frecuente en la lengua portuguesa que en la española. Es la conciencia de esta divergencia lingüística la que demuestra el traductor en las intervenciones referidas.

5. Podemos concluir que la observación demorada de las opciones lingüísticas tomadas por el traductor anónimo de la *Crónica Troyana* nos ofrece un elevado caudal de datos valiosos que puede contribuir al conocimiento de la situación evolutiva del portugués hacia mediados del siglo XVI. Si muchas de las formas y estructuras lingüísticas referidas en este trabajo merecen, por su importancia en la evolución histórica del portugués, un análisis más demorado, el presente análisis de conjunto nos permite aportar nuevos datos cuantitativos a la discusión de la cronología propuesta para esas evoluciones en diferentes estudios.



## REFERENCIAS

- ALI, M.S. (2001<sup>8</sup>). *Gramática histórica da língua portuguesa*. São Paulo – Brasília: Melhoramentos, Editora Universidade Brasília.
- ALVAR, M. & POTTIER, B. (1992). *Morfología histórica del español*. Madrid: Gredos.
- BARRETO, T.M.M. (2002). Observações sobre as conjunções no século XVI. In R.V. Mattos e Silva & A.V.L. Machado Filho (org.), *O Português Quinhentista. Estudos Lingüísticos* (pp. 161-193). Salvador/Feira de Santana: EDUFBA – UEFS.
- BECHARA, E. (1991). As fases da língua portuguesa escrita. In D. Kremer (Ed.), *Actes du XVIII<sup>e</sup> Congrès International de Linguistique et de Philologie Romanes*. vol. III (pp. 68-75). Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- BUESCU, A.I. (2000). ‘Y la Española es fácil para todos’. O bilinguismo, fenómeno estrutural (séculos XV-XVIII). In *Memória e Poder. Ensaio de História Cultural (séculos XV-XVIII)* (pp. 51-157). Lisboa: Edições Cosmos.
- BUESCU, A.I. (2004). Aspectos do bilinguismo português-castelhano na época moderna. *Hispania*, 64, 216, 13-38.
- CARVALHO, M.J. (2002). Periodização da língua portuguesa num contexto social: uma contribuição para a Sociolinguística histórica. *Revista Galega de Filoloxia*, 3, 11-27.
- CINTRA, L.F.L. (1986). Tratamento de intimidade e tratamento de cortesia nas obras de Gil Vicente. In *Formas de tratamento na língua portuguesa* (pp. 38-62). Lisboa: Livros Horizonte.
- COUTINHO, I.L. (1976<sup>7</sup>). *Pontos de Gramática Histórica*. Rio de Janeiro: Ao Livro Técnico.
- DELILLE, K.H. (1989). Aspectos do pronome pessoal no português antigo e no século XVI. A questão do duplo emprego das formas oblíquas tónica e átona. *Separata do Boletim da Comissão Nacional da Língua Portuguesa*, 33-45.
- EBERENZ, R. (2008). Cambios morfosintácticos en la Baja Edad Media. In R. Cano (Ed.), *Historia de la lengua española* (pp. 613-641). Barcelona: Ariel.
- GARCIA MARTIN, A.M. (1998). *Corónica Troiana em Língua Portuguesa: edición y estudio*. Salamanca: Luso-Española de Ediciones.
- GIRON ALCONCHEL, J.L. (2008). Cambios gramaticales en los Siglos de Oro. In R. Cano (Ed.), *Historia de la lengua española* (pp. 859-893). Barcelona: Ariel.
- MAIA, C.A. (1986). *História do Galego-português. Estado lingüístico da Galiza e do Noroeste de Portugal desde o século XIII ao século XVI (Com referência à situação do galego moderno)*. Coimbra: INIC.
- MAIA, C.A. (1994). O tratado de Tordesilhas: Algumas observações sobre o estado da língua portuguesa em finais do século XV. *Biblos*, 70, 33-91.
- MAIA, C.A. (1995). Sociolinguística histórica e periodização lingüística. Algumas reflexões sobre a distinção entre português arcaico e português moderno. *Diacrítica*, 10, 3-30.
- MARTINS, A.M. (2002). Mudança sintáctica e História da Língua Portuguesa. In F. Head *et alii* (Eds.), *História da Língua e História da Gramática (Actas do Encontro)*. Braga: Universidade do Minho, 271-284.
- MATTOS E SILVA, R.V. (1993). *O português arcaico: Morfologia e sintaxe*. São Paulo: Contexto.
- MATTOS E SILVA, R.V. (1994). Para uma caracterização do período arcaico do português. *D.E.L.T.A.*, 10, 247-276.
- MATTOS E SILVA, R.V. (2002). Vitórias de *ter* sobre *haver* nos meados do século XVI: usos e teorias em João de Barros. In R.V. Mattos e Silva & A.V.L. Machado Filho (Eds.), *O Português Quinhentista: estudos lingüísticos* (pp. 119-142). Salvador/Feira de Santana: EDUFBA – UEFS.
- NUNES, J.J. (1989<sup>9</sup>). *Compêndio de Gramática Histórica Portuguesa*. Lisboa: Clássica Editora.

- TEYSSIER, P. (1981). Le système des deictiques spatiaux en portugais aux XIV<sup>e</sup>, XV<sup>e</sup> et XVI<sup>e</sup> siècles. *Cahiers de linguistique hispanique médiévale*, 6, 4-39.
- SANTOYO, J.-C. (2005). Prólogo. In C. Castilho Pais (Ed.), *Apuntes de historia de la traducción portuguesa* (pp. 13-15). Vertere. Monográficos de la Revista Hermeneus, 7.
- SILVA, J.F. & OSORIO, P. (2008). *Introdução à História da Língua Portuguesa. Dos factores externos à dinâmica do sistema linguístico*. Lisboa: Edições Cosmos.
- VERDELHO, E. (1994). *Livro das Obras de Garcia de Resende*. Lisboa: Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian.
- VERDELHO, E. & VERDELHO, T. & HORSTER, M.A. (2003). A tradução para português na História da língua e da cultura: Elementos para uma síntese. *Revista Portuguesa de Filologia*, 1, 671-724.

# SUR LA PLACE DES NOMS D'ÉMOTION DANS LES ÉTUDES CONTRASTIVES

The status of emotion-denoting terms in contrastive research

Anna Krzyżanowska

Uniwersytet Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej, Lublin

aekrzyzanowska@gmail.com

## Abstract

For quite some time now, names denoting emotions have attracted interest of linguists specializing in contrastive research. Methodological apparatus of structural linguistics alongside recent findings in cognitive studies enabled scholars to carry out more comprehensive analyses of the observed phenomena. Comparative studies in lexical semantics inherent in structural research rely on the componential analysis of meaning, with a special emphasis being laid on matching structures of semantic fields of selected terms. By contrast, cognitive-based linguistic inquiry tends to reconstruct how emotions are perceived and understood in a cross-linguistic perspective (taking into account both genetically related and typologically remote languages). Thus, similarities and differences in how emotions are conceived of in various societies are unveiled. Numerous works demonstrate that while similarities might ultimately be traced back to some background of common experiences, differences are underlain by diverging, socially or culturally-induced, perceptions of a given phenomenon. Some of the facets of this research are raised in the present paper, offering an illustration of how sorrow is construed in French and in Polish.

**Keywords:** contrastive studies, semantics of emotion terms, conceptualization, semantic invariants, transcultural analysis

## 1. L'INTRODUCTION

L'étude linguistique des émotions menée dans une optique contrastive connaît depuis un certain temps un regain d'intérêt remarquable. Les recherches consacrées à cette problématique suivent plusieurs options et visent à décrire les noms d'émotion sous un angle syntaxique, lexico-sémantique et discursif (Bresson, Dobrovol'skij, 1995, Grzegorzczkowska, 1999, Blumenthal, Novakova, Siepmann (éds.), 2014). On accorde aussi une attention particulière à l'analyse

des phénomènes affectifs au niveau de l'acte de langage lui-même (Cislaru, 2010), ce qui permet de traiter l'émotion comme une expérience intersubjective, intégrée dans des processus relationnels, ces derniers étant souvent marqués par les valeurs socio-culturelles.

La recherche s'articule en gros autour du paradigme d'analyse de la sémantique structurale et de celui de la sémantique cognitive. Les travaux réalisés dans la première optique s'intéressent à la délimitation et la structuration interne des champs sémantiques des émotions (Krzyżanowska, 2008) ou mettent en évidence les facteurs déterminant leur combinatoire lexico-syntaxique (Koselak, 2005, Novakova, Tutin, 2009, Blumenthal, 2011). D'autres proposent de nouvelles typologies et classements permettant d'affiner les distinctions à l'intérieur de la classe des noms d'affect dont les contours sont flous et imprécis (Tutin et al., 2006). Du point de vue diachronique, on tente par exemple d'établir des parallèles chronologiques entre les évolutions du sens des noms d'émotion équivalents (Siatkowska, 1991, Mikołajczuk, 2004). Les approches d'orientation anthropologique et cognitive, quant à elles, visent à décrire les structures conceptuelles des émotions encodées par la langue et les modes de conceptualisation des émotions et des sentiments, fixés dans le langage métaphorique (Kövecses, 1995, Będkowska-Kopczyk, 2009, Adamiczka, 2012). S'inscrivant dans une réflexion générale sur les mécanismes cognitifs sous-jacents aux catégorisations opérées par différentes langues, ces études débouchent sur une quête des universaux et des invariants du langage (Harkins, Wierzbicka (eds.), 2001, Wierzbicka, 1999). Un autre point mérite encore d'être souligné, à savoir l'importance de l'emploi des corpus multilingues pour l'analyse contrastive<sup>1</sup>. Les travaux déjà effectués montrent en effet que la comparaison des textes parallèles ou des textes-paires favorise la découverte des choix récurrents, associés aux spécificités du langage des émotions (Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, Wilson, 2010, Wilson, Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk et Njiya, 2013).

## 2. L'ANALYSE CONTRASTIVE EN SÉMANTIQUE LEXICALE

Les postulats principaux de la linguistique cognitive (Fusch, 2004) ont eu un grand impact sur le développement des études contrastives. Parmi les enjeux majeurs de ce courant, on peut mentionner :

- le caractère central de la sémantique,

---

<sup>1</sup> Par exemple, le projet franco-allemand « Le lexique des émotions dans cinq langues européennes : sémantique, syntaxique et dimension discursive », réalisé dans les années 2009-2013 par les équipes française et allemande a permis d'améliorer les applications logicielles existantes pour la recherche d'occurrences et de structures syntaxiques renvoyant aux émotions dans de grands corpus multilingues (<http://emolex.u-grenoble3.fr/emoBase/>).

- l'existence des mécanismes cognitifs généraux régissant l'activité de langage,
- la conception du langage envisagé comme instrument de conceptualisation,
- la question de la relativité linguistique.

Ainsi, Grzegorzczkova (2004) et Waszakowa (2009) soutiennent que les analyses contrastives en sémantique lexicale devraient rendre compte de la façon dont chaque langue conceptualise et catégorise les éléments de la réalité extra-linguistique. Autrement dit, il s'agit de comparer les différentes images linguistiques du monde fixées dans les différentes langues. Les recherches menées dans cette optique devraient donc tenir compte du fait que la signification des expressions linguistiques constitue une interprétation de la réalité extra-linguistique, liée aux facteurs psychiques et culturels. Une grande importance devrait être accordée aussi aux phénomènes de la métaphore et de la métonymie, considérés comme des mécanismes linguistiques généraux qui permettent d'appréhender, dans les langues respectives, des concepts abstraits à travers l'expérience physique (sensorio-motrice). Les notions telles que « profilage », « prototype », « stéréotype » qui jouent un rôle crucial dans la définition cognitive du sens lexical s'avèrent très utiles si l'on se place dans une optique contrastive. Le profilage permet de focaliser l'attention sur les différents éléments de la structure conceptuelle. Il serait donc intéressant de voir la prédominance de tel ou tel élément structurant pour chaque langue. Le prototype, défini soit comme le meilleur représentant d'une catégorie qui constitue la base de généralisation le plus souvent choisie par les sujets, soit comme un faisceau de traits typiques d'une catégorie, constitue un pivot autour duquel s'organise la catégorie. Enfin l'étude des stéréotypes, entendus le plus souvent comme des représentations schématiques socialement figées qu'une communauté linguistique associe aux noms d'objets, permet de dégager les traits typiques des référents. Selon l'avis de deux linguistes, il est important aussi, lorsqu'on se place dans une perspective contrastive, de prendre en compte la dimension historique du lexique (l'étymologie des mots comparés).

Waszakowa propose en outre d'explorer quelques axes des recherches contrastives, inscrits dans la problématique de la reconstruction de l'image linguistique de l'homme. Il s'agit notamment de décrire le champ lexico-sémantique présentant l'image linguistique des parties du corps (en particulier celles qui participent à la perception physique), celui des activités corporelles (mouvements), celui des états psychophysiologiques (douleur, soif) et enfin le champ sémantique des états mentaux (émotions, attitudes, facultés cognitives). Cela permettrait non seulement de déceler les ressemblances et les différences dans la conceptualisation du monde et les systèmes de valeurs partagées par des communautés linguistiques différentes, mais aussi d'approfondir les connaissances sur ces communautés et sur les langues mises en contraste.

La problématique abordée ci-dessus fait l'objet d'études attentives menées par certains linguistes français. Par exemple, Picoche, Remi, Demont (1992) soutiennent qu'une comparaison entre deux langues différentes permet de détecter des constructions conceptuelles réalisées dans l'une et absentes de l'univers mental de l'autre, ainsi que de voir à quelles métaphores on a recours pour exprimer dans des langues différentes telle ou telle construction conceptuelle.

### 3. LES ÉMOTIONS SONT-ELLES UNIVERSELLES ?

3.1. À l'heure actuelle, deux points de vue opposés se dessinent dans l'étude des affects et de leurs corrélats linguistiques. Selon la première position, certaines émotions sont universelles et transculturelles, propres à la nature humaine en général. Il s'agit d'un nombre déterminé d'émotions appelées « émotions primaires », telles la tristesse, la peur, la colère, la joie / le bonheur, le dégoût, la surprise qui sont exprimées dans chaque langue à l'aide de lexèmes différents. Leur expression qui se fait grâce à l'utilisation de mimiques faciales spécifiques est reconnue de façon universelle à travers les cultures. Les tenants de la seconde position, dont Wierzbicka (1992) et les chercheurs de son orientation, considèrent que les émotions en tant que constructions culturelles sont conceptualisées différemment dans différentes cultures. Les concepts d'affects ont des structures très complexes et devraient être expliqués sous la forme de descriptions faites à l'aide de primitifs sémantiques, c'est-à-dire de concepts que l'on retrouve dans toutes les langues du monde comme par exemple 'sentir', 'bon', 'mauvais', 'vouloir', 'penser', 'faire' (Mikołajczuk, 2001).

3.1.1. Les études contrastives qui se situent dans la première optique cherchent à démontrer qu'il existe des mécanismes linguistiques et cognitifs communs (universels) entre des langues différentes. Ainsi Strugielska (2008), partant du postulat de l'universalité de certains patterns expressifs des émotions, relève dix réactions physiologiques relatives à la peur qui ont été lexicalisées dans des phraséologismes et des collocations anglais, espagnols et polonais<sup>2</sup>. Elles sont les suivantes : la fuite, la transpiration, l'accélération du pouls, la tension musculaire, l'incapacité de bouger, les cheveux dressés sur la tête, la baisse de température du corps, le reflux du sang dans les parties supérieures du corps, la position penchée du corps, l'agitation motrice. Il en résulte que les mêmes aspects de l'expérience émotionnelle sont fixés dans des langues différentes. Comme le remarque l'auteur, les approches effectuées confirment bien que

---

<sup>2</sup> L'hypothèse selon laquelle les structures cognitives et linguistiques tirent leurs sens de l'expérience corporelle, physico-perceptive peut être appuyée par la notion de *substrat cognitif commun* défini d'une part comme une expérience perceptive partagée par tous les humains, et d'autre part – comme un développement cognitif incluant des étapes similaires (Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, 1996).

l'ensemble des manifestations physiologiques et somatiques accompagnant les émotions constitue une expérience privilégiée qui génère des domaines sources potentiels. Les mêmes domaines sources peuvent être exploités dans des langues différentes. Bon nombre des langues partagent aussi les mêmes métaphores conceptuelles : HAUT (UP), LUMIÈRE (LIGHT), UN LIQUIDE DANS UN CONTENANT (A FLUID IN A CONTAINER).

3.1.2. En revanche, les approches qui s'inscrivent dans la seconde optique partent du postulat que les affects ne recouvrent pas des classes d'expériences identiques. Duszak et Pawlak (2003 : 17) soutiennent que les émotions deviennent « des artefacts culturels, des attitudes ou des comportements face à des événements, situations, contextes déterminés, acceptés socialement ». Ainsi, le mot *gniew* (colère) ou *szczęście* (bonheur) expriment et transmettent des modèles culturels déterminés. En étudiant l'expression de la colère chez des locuteurs anglo-australiens, français et italiens, Mrowa-Hopkins et Strambi (2008 : 94) arrivent à la conclusion que la façon dont les émotions se manifestent ou sont contrôlées est spécifique du fait que celles-ci renvoient à des représentations et à des attentes en matière de comportements, partagées par une collectivité sociale et culturelle. Les différents groupes culturels varient les modalités de contrôle de la colère selon le degré de manifestation émotionnelle jugé acceptable dans la culture d'origine.

De nos jours, les sémanticiens s'accordent généralement sur le fait que l'analyse contrastive devrait rendre compte tant de ce qu'il y a de commun que de culturellement spécifique dans la conceptualisation des émotions dans les différentes langues (Grzegorzczkowska, 1999). Il est aussi important de révéler quelles connaissances expérientielles sont à la base des images-schémas et quels concepts principaux sont partagés par les langues mises en contraste. Un autre enjeu de la sémantique contrastive est d'observer si, dans des approches différentes, les domaines conceptuels sont structurés selon un mécanisme cognitif bien attesté qui va généralement du plus concret au plus abstrait (Mikołajczuk, 2001).

#### 4. LA CONCEPTUALISATION DE LA 'TRISTESSE' EN FRANÇAIS ET EN POLONAIS

Dans la présente section, nous nous proposons de signaler ce qu'il y a de commun et de culturellement spécifique dans la conceptualisation de la TRISTESSE en français et en polonais. Pour ce faire, nous examinerons certaines expressions métaphoriques<sup>3</sup> que les Français et les Polonais utilisent pour parler

---

<sup>3</sup> Les exemples cités proviennent de sources diverses. Premièrement, ce sont des occurrences sélectionnées dans Frantext et dans le Corpus de la Langue Polonaise PWN (datant de 1950 à 2007). Par ailleurs, d'autres attestations d'emploi ont été tirées de la presse française et polonaise (2004-2014). Enfin, plusieurs dictionnaires de langue ont été aussi consultés.

de cette émotion. La métaphore est donc considérée comme un outil cognitif servant à la compréhension des concepts abstraits, et entendue comme un transfert de structure du domaine-source vers le domaine-cible (Lakoff, Johnson, 1980). Nous espérons que notre analyse bien qu'elle soit fragmentaire apportera quelques éléments de réponse à la question soulevée ici<sup>4</sup>.

#### 4.1. TRISTESSE

*Tristesse* est un nom à structure biactancielle : le premier actant est un siège (ou un expérienceur) et le second, qualifié de facultatif, a un rôle sémantique de cause. Pour Blumenthal (2006), ce mot tend vers le pôle circonstanciel en privilégiant l'expression de la manière. En tant que « manière d'être », la tristesse semble plus « objectivable » que la mélancolie. La preuve en est que *tristesse* entre dans des constructions avec les verbes *éprouver* et *ressentir* dont la signification présuppose que l'être humain parvient à isoler et à identifier un sentiment, « donc en quelque sorte à le détacher du fond de sa propre vie psychique ».

Les domaines-sources majeurs associés à la TRISTESSE sont les suivants :

- UNE SUBSTANCE (*quelqu'un plonge dans la tristesse*)
  - UN LIQUIDE (*quelqu'un est submergé, inondé de tristesse*)
  - UN CORPS GAZEUX OPAQUE (*une brume de tristesse*)
- UN CONTENANT (*quelqu'un tombe dans une profonde tristesse, au fond de la tristesse, un abîme, gouffre de tristesse, un océan, lac, marai de tristesse*)
- UN CONTENU (*les yeux de quelqu'un s'emplissent de tristesse*)
- UN ESPACE BORNÉ (*une immense tristesse*) ou ILLIMITÉ (*une tristesse sans bornes*)
- UN OBJET (*une grande, énorme tristesse*)
  - UN OBJET QUI PÈSE (*la tristesse accable quelqu'un*)
  - UN OBJET QUI COUVRE (*une chape de tristesse s'abat sur quelqu'un, les yeux de quelqu'un sont voilés de tristesse, la tristesse enveloppe quelqu'un*)
- UN ÊTRE VIVANT (*la tristesse renaît, revient, touche, saisit quelqu'un, quelqu'un est habité par la tristesse*)
  - UN ADVERSAIRE (*la tristesse s'empare de quelqu'un, envahit quelqu'un*)
  - UN ANIMAL DANGEREUX (*quelqu'un est en proie à la tristesse*)
- UNE FORCE
  - DESTRUCTIVE (*quelqu'un s'effondre, est consumé de tristesse*)
  - EXTÉRIEURE (*le cœur de quelqu'un se serre de tristesse*)

---

<sup>4</sup> Pour l'analyse détaillée des métaphores, voir Krzyżanowska (2011).



- UNE DOULEUR (*une tristesse douloureuse, lancinante*)
- UNE MALADIE (*une tristesse malade, mortelle, la tristesse hante quelqu'un*)
- UN ALIMENT (*quelqu'un remâche, rumine sa tristesse*).

Les types de représentation que nous venons d'évoquer mettent en évidence les aspects de la tristesse parfois difficilement vus dans le cadre de l'étude traditionnelle. Au sein de la communauté française, cette émotion est vue comme une substance, une masse pesante, un espace borné ou illimité ou quelque chose d'extérieur qui soit entoure l'expérimenteur de manière à le soustraire à la vue, soit gêne la visibilité limitant par conséquent la perception de l'environnement. Par ailleurs, elle peut être conceptualisée comme une force active (et même hostile) agissant dans l'espace intérieur du corps et prenant possession du sujet. L'émotion en question est aussi liée au schéma du contenant et du contenu ou considérée en tant qu'une entité pouvant causer la douleur et la maladie.

#### 4.2. SMUTEK

Le mot *smutek* renvoie à un affect actuellement ressenti ou au sentiment rétrospectif orienté vers le passé. Sa structure argumentale est biactancielle : le premier argument désigne l'expérimenteur [+ animé], le deuxième correspond à une cause. Le faisceau de prédicats primaires représentant la situation où l'expérimenteur éprouve cette émotion peut être illustré comme suit : *un événement z arrive, et, x considère z comme mauvais, et, x ressent passivement quelque chose* (Nowakowska-Kempna, 1986 : 74). Un autre paramètre différentiel du prédicat est l'élément volitif qui se laisse paraphraser par : *z n'a pas été voulu par x*. La composante 'intensité' sert à distinguer les prédicats rassemblés dans la même classe (*smutek* 'tristesse' et *rozpacz* 'désespoir').

Les domaines-sources qui s'appliquent au concept SMUTEK sont les suivants :

- UNE SUBSTANCE (*ktoś pogrąża się w smutku*)
  - UN LIQUIDE (*ktoś tonie w smutku, fala smutku, smutek rozlewa się po czyjejs twarzy, odmęt smutku*)
  - UN CORPS GAZEUX EN MOUVEMENT (*coś jest ulotne jak dziewczęcy smutek, powiew smutku, ktoś jest owiany smutkiem, od kogoś wieje smutkiem*)
  - UN CORPS GAZEUX OPAQUE (*czyjeś oczy są zamglone smutkiem, ktoś, coś rozprasza czyjś smutek, chmura smutku*)
- UN CONTENANT (*kto popada w głęboki smutek, bezdenny smutek, morze, ocean smutku*)
- UN CONTENANT FERMÉ (*ktoś zamyka się w swoim smutku*)

- UN CONTENU (*smutek wypełnia kogoś, ktoś jest pełen smutku, ktoś ma smutek w duszy, w sercu, w czyimś sercu gości smutek*)
- UN ESPACE ILLIMITÉ (*bezgraniczny, bezbrzeżny smutek*)
- UN OBJET (*wielki, ogromny smutek*)
  - UN OBJET QUI PÈSE (*kogoś ogarnął przygniatający smutek, ciężar smutku*)
- UN ÊTRE VIVANT (*smutek nadchodzi, obejmuje kogo, przemawia przez kogoś*)
  - UN ADVERSAIRE (*smutek napada, opanowuje kogoś, smutek atakuje*)
  - UN ANIMAL DANGEREUX (*czyjeś serce toczy robak smutku*)
- UNE FORCE
  - DESTRUCTIVE (*smutek trawi kogoś*)
  - EXTÉRIEURE (*smutek ściska czyjeś serce*)
- UNE DOULEUR (*bolesny, dotkliwy smutek*)
- UNE MALADIE (*coś jest lekarstwem na czyjś smutek*)
- UN ALIMENT (*ktoś przetrawia swój smutek, coś napawa kogoś smutkiem*).

L'observation des exemples ci-dessus permet de mettre en évidence certains aspects des domaines expérientiels utilisés en polonais lors du processus de métaphorisation. SMUTEK est conceptualisé comme un objet lourd, un être vivant (homme ou adversaire ; animal dangereux), un liquide, un contenu, un aliment, un espace illimité ou une force destructive. Un autre type de structuration métaphorique est fondé sur le concept de 'maladie' et celui de 'douleur'.

Certaines métaphores appliquées à SMUTEK, en particulier celles qui font appel au domaine des phénomènes naturels mettent en valeur des traits spécifiques de cette émotion. Celle-ci est vue comme quelque chose d'extérieur qui entoure de toutes parts l'expérienteur et lui fait sentir sa présence (*ktoś jest owiany smutkiem* c'est-à-dire se sent comme s'il était couvert de brume, ou comme si un vent léger soufflait sur lui). Lorsque SMUTEK s'associe à une douce agitation de l'air, comme dans *powiew smutku* ('vent léger et agréable'), la notion en question se trouve dotée de connotations positives. L'intensité faible avec laquelle le vent souffle correspond alors au degré d'intensité faible de l'émotion. Notons que ce type de métaphore conceptuelle est capable de générer en polonais toute une série de constructions (*powiew miłości, radości, nadziei, melancholii, tęsknoty*). En revanche, SMUTEK comparé à une fumée a des connotations péjoratives. Deux domaines expérientiels (sensation visuelle et olfactive) entrent alors en cooccurrence pour structurer un même domaine abstrait (ressenti affectif) : [...] *siedzieli cicho przed ekranem, a smutek wpelzał pomiędzy nich jak podstępnie wznoszące się warstwy trującego dymu*.

Enfin, associé au brouillard, cette émotion est envisagée comme un facteur qui réduit la visibilité, et par conséquent, empêche la perception des informations venant du monde environnant.

## 4.3. LA CONCEPTUALISATION MÉTAPHORIQUE : ANALYSE CONTRASTIVE

L'étude des principales métaphores renvoyant à TRISTESSE et SMUTEK permet de cerner les ressemblances et les différences dans la conceptualisation de ces deux émotions. Ainsi, des domaines-sources tels que : CORPS GAZEUX EN MOUVEMENT et UN CONTENANT FERMÉ, associés au concept de SMUTEK, ne sont pas applicables en français. Par contre, les domaines expérientiels : UN ESPACE BORNÉ, UN OBJET QUI COUVRE, ENVELOPPE restent spécifiques à TRISTESSE.

Dans d'autres expressions construites selon des procédés de métaphorisation différents la tristesse est représentée comme un principe actif agissant sur l'expérienteur de l'extérieur et de l'intérieur (*la tristesse pénètre, submerge quelqu'un*), tandis qu'en polonais, c'est plutôt l'expérienteur « plongeant dans l'émotion » (*ktoś tonący w smutku*) qui est visé.

Ce qui est commun, c'est que les deux noms sont associés à la métaphore de *spatialisation* et à celle du *poïds*. La tristesse et son correspondant polonais (*smutek*) sont également vus comme un facteur qui empêche la visibilité. Il en découle que les métaphores conventionnelles sont structurées de la même façon dans les deux langues en mettant en valeur certains aspects de l'expérience émotionnelle.

En français et en polonais, des concepts communs créent aussi le SCÉNARIO DE LA DESTRUCTION : TRISTESSE / SMUTEK EST UN ÊTRE VIVANT HOSTILE, UN ADVERSAIRE DANS LA LUTTE, UNE DOULEUR et UNE MALADIE.

Il est aussi intéressant de noter que la même image – celle d'un liquide troublé motive la signification de la construction métaphorique *quelqu'un a les yeux brouillés par le chagrin* et le sens étymologique des lexèmes polonais *smutek* et *smucić się*, qui ont été construits à partir de *smęcić*, *smętek*. Ces derniers proviennent à leur tour du verbe *męcić* qui contient la racine de langue slave ancienne *-ment* signifiant l'idée de brouiller un liquide. C'est cette idée qui a été associée métaphoriquement à *smutek* vu comme un état de confusion (fait de troubler la sérénité d'esprit, d'âme)<sup>5</sup>.

Les convergences dans la conceptualisation des deux émotions en question résultent probablement du fait que les Français et les Polonais partagent la même base expérientielle (par exemple : notions d'espace et de temps, position et mouvements du corps, sensations physiologiques), alors que les divergences semblent être liées aux divers systèmes de valeurs partagées par les communautés française

<sup>5</sup> L'étymologie de *tristesse* n'est pas claire. Ce nom a été construit à partir de l'adjectif *triste* qui provient du latin *tristis* (les autres dérivés : *attrister*, *tristement*). Le mot latin rappelle *tratum* ('triste'), forme venant de l'arménien dont *t* suggère la consonne *d*, présente en indo-européen [Ernout, Meillet (éds.) (1959 : 703)].

et polonaise, ainsi qu'à l'encodage de l'expérience affective dans les deux langues.

Comme le remarquent Peeters et Wierzbicka (1993 : 4), « toute langue a sa propre structure unique et son propre lexique qui incorpore une structure sémantique unique elle aussi », et « même en comparant des langues qui sont génétiquement, géographiquement et culturellement très apparentées [...], on rencontre constamment des instances d'écart lexical profond ». Ainsi, les mots portugais *saudade* et roumain *dor* sont difficilement traduisibles en français ainsi que le mot russe *toska* en polonais. D'autre part, si l'on rapproche les langues romanes et slaves, on observe que certains mots du polonais ne trouvent pas leurs équivalents en français comme *tęsknota*, et inversement *affection* n'a pas son équivalent en polonais.

## 5. EN GUISE DE CONCLUSION

De nos jours, les études contrastives appuyées par les apports des sciences connexes (telles l'anthropologie, la sémantique cognitive, la sociolinguistique) revêtent une dimension interdisciplinaire. D'un point de vue méthodologique, elles tentent de fournir une base pour les notions de *comparabilité* et de *tertium comparationis* en empruntant des modèles d'analyse aux grands courants linguistiques. Quant à la recherche en sémantique contrastive, elle semble être marquée par une double démarche : la quête des invariants sémantiques et l'explication de la manière dont les langues spécifient le sens des lexèmes en fonction de leur structuration interne et de caractéristiques culturelles et anthropologiques.

Dans cet article, nous avons tenté de montrer que l'analyse contrastive située dans un contexte interculturel permet de rendre compte de la variation des émotions selon les sociétés et de pénétrer dans la mentalité des locuteurs parlant des langues différentes.

## RÉFÉRENCES

- ADAMICZKA, J. (2012). Metaphorical conceptualization of HAPPINESS and JOY in Spanish as compared to other languages. In A. Gład, H. Kowalewski & A. Weremczuk (Eds.), *What's in a text. Inquiries into the textual cornucopia* (pp. 205-216). Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- BĘDKOWSKA-KOPCZYK, A. (2009). W "pojemniku uczuć". Analiza wybranych konstrukcji przymikowych w języku polskim i słoweńskim. In I. Generowicz, E. Kaczmarska & I.M. Doliński (Eds.), *Świat ukryty w słowach, czyli o znaczeniu gramatycznym, leksykalnym i etymologicznym* (pp. 27-44). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.
- DOBROVOL'SKIJ, D. & BRESSON, D. (1995). Petite syntaxe de la "peur". Application au français et à l'allemand. *Langue Française*, 105, 107-119. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3406/lfr.1995.5297>
- BLUMENTHAL, P. (2006). De la logique des mots à l'analyse de la synonymie. *Langue Française*, 150, 14-31. [http://www.persee.fr/web/revues/home/prescript/article/lfr\\_0023-8368\\_2006\\_num\\_150\\_2\\_6851](http://www.persee.fr/web/revues/home/prescript/article/lfr_0023-8368_2006_num_150_2_6851)
- BLUMENTHAL, P. (2011). Essai de lexicologie contrastive : comment mesurer l'usage des mots ?. In E. Lavric et al. (Eds.), *Comparatio delectat: Akten der VI. Internationalen Arbeitstagung zum romanisch-deutschen und innerromanischen Sprachvergleich*, Teil I (pp. 61-83). Bern: Peter Lang.
- BLUMENTHAL, P., NOVAKOVA, I. & SIEPMANN, D. (Eds.) (2014). *Les émotions dans le discours. Emotions in discourse*. Frankfurt a. M.: Peter Lang.
- CICHMIŃSKA, M. (2002). Comparative Analysis of the Language of Negative Emotions in English and Polish : Cognitive Semantics. *Acta Neophilologica*, 4, 13-28.
- CISLARU, G. (2010). Code(s) et tabous sur l'internet. Étude contrastive de quelques énoncés malédicatifs en français et en anglais. *French Studies*, 20, 47-60. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0959269509990445>
- DUSZAK, A. & PAWLAK, N. (Ed.) (2003). *Anatomia gniewu Emocje negatywne w językach i kulturach świata*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.
- ERNOU, A. & MEILLET A. (Eds.) (1959). *Dictionnaire étymologique de la Langue latine Histoire des mots*. Paris : Klincksieck.
- FUCHS, C. (Ed.) (2004), *Linguistique cognitive*. Paris : Ophrys.
- GRZEGORCZYKOWA, R. (1999). Z badań nad porównawczą semantyką leksykalną: nazwy tęsknoty w różnych językach. In Z. Greń & V. Koseska-Toszewa (Eds.), *Semantyka a konfrontacja językowa*, Vol. 3 (pp. 199-204). Warszawa: Slawistyczny Ośrodek Wydawniczy – Instytut Slawistyki PAN.
- GRZEGORCZYKOWA, R. (2004). Idee kognitywizmu jako podstawa badań porównawczych w zakresie semantyki. *Etnolingwistyka*, 16, 75-84.
- HARKINS, J. & WIERZBICKA, A. (Eds.) (2001). *Emotions in crosslinguistic perspective*. Berlin : Mouton de Gruyter. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/9783110880168>
- KOSELAK, A. (2005). Mépris/dédain, deux mots pour un même sentiment ? *Lidil*, 32, 21-34.
- KÖVECSES, Z. (1995). The "Container" Metaphor of Anger in English, Chinese, Japanese and Hungarian. In Z. Radman (Ed.), *From a Metaphorical Point of View A Multidisciplinary Approach to the Cognitive Content of Metaphor* (pp. 119-145). Berlin – New York: De Gruyter. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/9783110867831-008>
- KRZYŻANOWSKA, A. (2008). Pole semantyczne pojęcia smutku w języku polskim i francuskim. In R. Grzegorzycykowa & K. Waszakowa (Eds.), *Pojęcie, słowo, tekst* (pp. 61-78). Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.

- KRZYŻANOWSKA, A. (2011). *Aspects lexicaux et sémantiques de la description des noms d'affect en français et en polonais*. Lublin : Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- LAKOFF, G. & JOHNSON M. (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- LEWANDOWSKA-TOMASZCZYK, B. (1996). Uniwersalizm a relatywizm na tle nowych teorii kognitywnych. In R. Grzegorzczakowa & A. Pajdzińska (Eds.), *Językowa kategoryzacja świata* (pp. 49-70). Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- LEWANDOWSKA-TOMASZCZYK, B. & WILSON, P. (2010). A contrastive perspective on emotions: surprise. *Review of Cognitive Linguistics*, 8(2), 321-350. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/rcl.8.2.04lew>
- MIKOŁAJCZUK, A. (2001). Badania porównawcze nazw uczuć (na przykładzie „gniewu”). In J. Vankova (Ed.), *Obraz sveta v jazyce* (pp. 122-157). Praha: Filozofická fakulta.
- MIKOŁAJCZUK, A. (2004). ANGER in Polish and English. A semantic comparison with some historical context. In Ch.J. Kay & J.J. Smith (Eds.), *Categorization in the History of English* (pp. 159-178). Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/cilt.261.09mik>
- MROWA-HOPKINS, C. & STRAMBI, A. (2008). La dimension de la communication en situation interculturelle : L'expression non-verbale de la colère chez des locuteurs anglo-australien, français et italiens. *Les Cahiers de l'Acedle*, 3, 89-113.
- NOVAKOVA, I. & TUTIN, A. (Eds.) (2009). *Le lexique des émotions*. Grenoble : ELLUG.
- NOWAKOWSKA-KEMPNA, I. (1986). *Konstrukcje zdaniowe z leksykalnymi wykładnikami predykatów uczuć*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.
- PEETERS, B. & WIERZBICKA, A. (1993). Présentation. *Langue Française*, 98, 3-8. [http://www.persee.fr/web/revues/home/prescript/article/lfr\\_0023-8368\\_1993\\_num\\_98\\_1\\_5830](http://www.persee.fr/web/revues/home/prescript/article/lfr_0023-8368_1993_num_98_1_5830)
- PICOCHÉ, J. & DEMONT, P. & REMI, G. (1992). Un essai de lexicologie comparative. *Cahiers de Lexicologie*, 60, 141-173.
- SIATKOWSKA, E. (1991). Nazwy uczuć pozytywnych i negatywnych w języku polskim i czeskim (Analiza porównawcza materiału historycznego i współczesnego). *Studia z Filologii Polskiej i Słowiańskiej*, 27, 219-225.
- STRUGIELSKA, A. (2008). Motywacja konceptualna metaforycznych wyrażeń językowych w świetle badań porównawczych. *Bulletin de la Société Polonaise de Linguistique*, 64, 97-107.
- TUTIN, A., NOVAKOVA, I., GROSSMAN, F. & CAVALLA, C. (2006). Esquisse de typologie des noms d'affect à partir de leurs propriétés combinatoires. *Langue Française*, 150, 32-49. [http://www.persee.fr/web/revues/home/prescript/article/lfr\\_0023-8368\\_2006\\_num\\_150\\_2\\_6852](http://www.persee.fr/web/revues/home/prescript/article/lfr_0023-8368_2006_num_150_2_6852)
- WASZAKOWA, K. (2009). Perspektywy badań porównawczych w zakresie semantyki leksykalnej w świetle językoznawczych teorii kognitywnych. *LingVaria, Rok IV, 1(7)*, 49-64.
- WIERZBICKA, A. (1992). *Semantics, Culture, and Cognition Universal Human Concepts in Culture-Specific Configurations*. New York – Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- WIERZBICKA, A. (1999). *Emotions across languages and cultures: Diversity and universals*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- WILSON, P., LEWANDOWSKA-TOMASZCZYK, B. & NJIYA, Y. (2013). Happiness and contentment in English and Polish 1. In J. Fontaine, K.R. Scherer & C. Soriano (Eds.), *Components of Emotional Meaning. A Sourcebook* (pp. 477-481). Oxford: Oxford University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199592746.003.0037>

ANNEXE

Les modes de conceptualisation de la TRISTESSE en français et en polonais

Types de représentation exploités	Polonais	Français
La TRISTESSE EST		
UNE SUBSTANCE	+	+
UN LIQUIDE	+	+
UN CORPS GAZEUX (EN MOUVEMENT)	+	-
UN CORPS GAZEUX OPAQUE	+	+
UN CONTENANT	+	+
FERMÉ	+	-
UN CONTENU DANS UN RÉCIPIENT	+	+
UN ESPACE		
BORNÉ	-	+
ILLIMITÉ	+	+
UN OBJET QUI PÈSE	+	+
ACCABLE	+	+
COUVRE	-	+
ENVELOPPE	-	+
UN ÊTRE VIVANT	+	+
UN ADVERSAIRE	+	+
UN ANIMAL DANGEREUX	+	+
UNE FORCE		
DESTRUCTIVE	+	+
EXTÉRIEURE	+	+
UNE DOULEUR	+	+
UNE MALADIE	+	+
UN ALIMENT	+	+





# Quirks in Old Spanish Noun Paradigms: A case-study in inflectional morphology and its interfaces

Mikołaj Nkollo

Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza, Poznań

mikon74@amu.edu.pl

## Abstract

The research objective of the study is to explain why some common nouns documented in Old Spanish codices have defective paradigms, featuring mostly singular, and virtually no plural forms. The hypothesis is that this inflectional quirk arises in the wake of correspondences occurring between morphology and other language subsystems. Four concurrent parameters are taken into account: type of inflection, text genre characteristic, NP status and syntactic environment. All these criteria show that formal documents provide a favourable locus for non-canonical paradigms to arise. The conclusion is that rather than falling within the scope of so-called ‘pure morphology’, the phenomenon under discussion represents an instance of interface easily observable in ‘distance-pole’ texts.

**Keywords:** inherent inflection, distance-pole texts, morphological interfaces, non-specific NP, non-canonical paradigms, defectiveness

## 1. PRELIMINARY DATA

The empirical problem is the morphological behaviour of some common nouns in Old Spanish (see examples below, retrieved from the *corpudelespanol*). The point is that in determined circumstances, they exhibit only singular forms, thus behaving as if plural were absent from their paradigms. The aim of the present paper is to pin down the exact prerequisites for this quirky inflectional property. Therefore, the underlying mechanisms that interact with inflectional morphology and that are ultimately responsible for the emergence of defective paradigms in medieval Spanish are going to be identified.

*Si fidalgo ha su enemiztat con otro fidalgo. non deue Robar luno al otro* (Anónimo, *Fuero General de Navarra*; Versión B) ‘If a nobleman is in enmity with another nobleman, they should not rob one another’

*Esto es por fuero de Castiella que sy vn fijo dalgo baraia con otro fijo dalgo...* (Seudo-Fernando III, *Libro de los fueros de Castilla*) ‘The Fuero of Castile orders that if a nobleman quarrels with another nobleman...’

*Otrosi si fidalgo ouiere quereylla de otro fidalgo & fiador non podiere auer fagua le atal drecho como sobrescripto es...* (Anónimo, *Fuero General de Navarra*; Versión B) ‘Furthermore, if a nobleman wants quarrel with another nobleman and there can be no guarantor, he should do it the way it is written’

*Si algun ombre de linage enuayere o feriere o matare a otro ombre de linage...* (Anónimo, *Fuero General de Navarra*; Versión B) ‘If a man of lineage invaded or injured or killed another man of lineage...’

*Si algun ombre peyndrare su deudor o fiador quando el Rey issiere en huest deue pechar por colonia Lx. sueldos* (Anónimo, *Fuero General de Navarra*; Versión B) ‘If a man captured his debtor or his guarantor when the king served in the army, he should pay as punishment 60 sou’

*Si algun ombre peyndrare a otro. por deuda o por alguna cosa quel yaze en tuertos...* (Anónimo, *Fuero General de Navarra*; Versión B) ‘If a man captured another one, because of a debt or anything that causes offence’

*Otro tal deue fazer quando vn ombre fuere obligado a otro por carta de fazerle alguna cosa sana* (Alfonso X, *Siete Partidas*) ‘He should do the same when a man were obliged by letter to another (man) to do him a benefit’

*Si algun omne se querella al iuyz de otro omne el iuyz deue lamar a aquel por su carta, o por su seyello que uenga a responder* (Alfonso X, *Fuero Juzgo*) ‘If a man quarrels with another man’s judge, the judge should call the latter man by letter or by his seal so that he comes to respond’

*Ningun omne si ad contienda con otro omne por amor de traer contjenda e barayja entre eillos dales alcalde...* (Anónimo, *Fuero General de Navarra*; Versión B) ‘No man, if quarrelled with another man because of causing quarrel and dispute between them, the mayor gives them...’

*Otrosi dezimos que hermano por hermano no pueda testimoniar en iuyzio mientras que amos estuuieren en poder de su padre* (Alfonso X, *Siete Partidas*) ‘Furthermore, we say that brother cannot testify for brother in court as long as they are both in their father’s power’

It is going to be demonstrated that this kind of defectiveness can be straightforwardly accommodated within the perspective of so-called ‘morphological interfaces’. This field of research has arisen from the claim to the effect that in order to explain some mismatches between morpho-syntactic features and morpho-phonological realizations a purely morphological level must be delimited (‘Let us call the level of such purely morphological functions *morphomic* and the functions themselves *morphomes*’, Aronoff, 1994: 25). It hosts

various inheritance hierarchies accounting, for example, for how syncretic cells are patterned inside paradigms representing a given conjugation class. This level represents a locus where the mapping between syntax and phonology operates and it is presumed to be independent of both these grammatical subsystems. Instead, its hierarchies are the result of paradigm-internal partitions. Our proposals switch over to such phenomena where inflectional morphology is in correspondence with other levels of language analysis. Therefore, the fact that the paradigms of some common nouns such as ‘fidalgo’, ‘ombre’, ‘hermano’ exhibit merely one value inside the category of number is thought of as externally-induced. This implies that the reasons for their defectiveness should be sought in syntax and semantics.

Since different frameworks formalize such interfaces in their own ways, this particular evolutionary path will be couched in terms of logically-based theories of description alongside their more properly linguistic extensions. Furthermore, some views on the exact nature of objects that can be said to ‘have’ their inflectional paradigms, as outlined by G. Gross (1998), are going to be discussed. Finally, given that examples above appear in texts exhibiting a very peculiar genre status, some theoretical remarks on how textual characteristics interact with morphological features may also be worth adding.

## 2. ENVIRONMENTAL PROPERTIES

A number of constraints are needed to circumscribe nouns lacking plural forms in Old Spanish. The first prerequisite for their accurate selection has to do with the distinction between ‘inherent inflection’ (not required by the syntactic context, i.e. where a given inflectional form is chosen according to the communicative intentions and needs of the speaker) and ‘contextual inflection’ (dictated by syntax, i.e. where a former choice is reduced to no choice; Booij, 1996: 2; Spencer, 2006: 108). Only nouns representing the former can be said to have defective paradigms with singular and virtually no plural forms. Importantly, this constraint shows that plurals: *fidalgos*, *ombres*, *hermanos* are not ruled out altogether. They do appear, but their presence hinges on the syntactic requirements of another element in the same sentence. For example, if it expressly meant that a given norm applies to a given number of individuals, a numeral is needed. If its cardinality is two or higher, the numeral triggers agreement and coerces neighbouring nouns into taking a particular number value: the plural, thus providing a perfect illustration of what ‘contextual inflection’ actually is. That is how syntactically-induced influences are likely to alter inflectional properties of items representing a variable lexical class. Cf.:

*Si.ij. ombres uienen a iuyzio diguan coales Razones quieren el uno al otro ante que uenguan ante el alcalde o en cort* ‘if two men are coming to a judge...’

*Sj dos ninnos barayaren que non sean de edade & el uno al. otro con piedra o con cochiello iure el padre por su cabeça que su fijo non lo ferio (Fuero de Salamanca, fol 54r)* ‘If two children that are under age hurt each other with a stone or with a knife...’

The second constraint upon the nouns under discussion is their non-specific use. The puzzling thing here is that in classical Latin non-specifically used common nouns in comparable syntactic settings surface either as singular or as plural forms. Therefore, they may be thought of as having out-and-out regular paradigms with both number values evenly distributed. The evidence comes from bipartite reciprocal clusters. Contrary to reiterated sequences with anaphorically bound pronouns *alius alium* and *alter alterum*, clusters juxtaposing two forms of the same noun denote timeless states of affairs and contain non-specific NPs (with no existential presupposition). Singular and plural forms are distributed with no observable semantic difference.

*Cives civibus prodesse oportet* ‘It behoves citizens to be helpful to each other’ (plural – plural; my own example)

*... placet Stoicis, quae in terris gignantur, ad usum hominum omnia creari, homines autem hominum causa esse generatos, ut ipsi inter se aliis alii prodesse possent* Cic., *Off* 1, 7, 22 ‘the Stoics believe that everything that the earth produces is created for man’s use; and as men, too, are born for the sake of men, that they may be able mutually to help one another’ (plural – plural)

*... milites militibus, centurionibus centuriones, tribuni tribunis compares collegaeque iisdem {in} praesidiis, saepe iisdem manipulis permixti fuerant* Livy, *UC* 8, 6, 15 ‘They had been colleagues and comrades, as soldiers, centurions, and tribunes, often stationed together in the same posts and side by side in the same maniples’ (plural – plural)

*Vir viro, armis arma conserta sunt* Q. Curtius, *Hist* 3, 2, 13 ‘(in a phalanx), people and pieces of weaponry are placed very close together’ (singular – singular; plural – plural)

*Manus manum lavat* Sen *Apocol* 9 ‘one hand washes the other (singular – singular)’

The third criterion for the emergence of the morphological class under discussion is going to be defined on the basis of the structural properties of clauses (alongside their meanings) where items exhibiting one-cell paradigms are most documented. A closer inspection reveals that singular forms are pervasive either after conditional *si* or in temporal clauses (*quando*). Additionally, many of these nouns appear as reiterated parts of reciprocal constructions embedded within the scope of the conditional or temporal subordinator (e.g. *Si algun ombre de linage enuayere o feriere o matare a otro ombre de linage...*). As for the semantic

function of the nouns featuring this inflectional quirk, they denote participants subject to certain legal norms.

Finally, the query is expected to produce conclusive results if an additional parameter is taken into account, namely the characteristics of text genre (according to the distinction between the ‘proximate pole’ and the ‘distance pole’, as defined by Koch and Oesterreicher, 2001: 586). Indeed, common nouns with paradigms that have the singular, but no plural, are predominantly evidenced in Old Spanish codices (13-14<sup>th</sup> centuries).

### 3. NON-CANONICAL INFLECTION AND GRADIENT INFLECTIONAL OBJECTS

To find out why the behaviour of some common nouns in Old Spanish is so changeable, the concept of ‘non-canonical’ inflection (Corbett, 2007) is going to be evoked here. Ideally, a paradigm of a given lexical unit is built in accordance with the following principles (Clahsen, Avelado & Roca, 2002: 593-594): (i) the shape of the stem is recurrent from one cell to another; (ii) different cells do not exhibit recurrent endings (yet, the same endings are expected to recur across paradigms of expressions belonging to the same word class); (iii) no cells can be left empty; (iv) each cell should be filled with exactly one form (the uniqueness of realization). Violations of these criteria surface as suppletive (Börjars & Vincent, 2011) or syncretic forms or, otherwise, produce defective paradigms. Deviations from the last constraint lead to overrepresented cells: there are at least two forms (‘cell-mates’) with different shapes, which happen to fill a single cell (Thornton, 2011: 360-361). As a consequence, cell-mates can be used interchangeably, at least in some cases. Although canonical paradigms may well not be the most frequently encountered ones, they have the advantage of fixing a point against which various inflectional phenomena can be measured and analysed. Likewise, ‘the canonical approach allows the linguist to handle gradient phenomena in a principled way’ (Corbett, 2005: 26).

Yet, the use of this conceptual tool relies on an even more fundamental assumption, which sheds light on what objects can be actually said to ‘have’ their paradigms. The quotation below should be helpful in this respect (Gross, 1998: 106):

The fact is that customary approaches to conjugation, by means of describing verbal paradigms (e.g., l’Art de Conjuguer de *Bescherelle*), strongly overrate the regularity of verbal inflection. Indeed, not all of the verbs have all tenses or all moods. The oft-quoted example is the verb *gésir* (‘to lie, to be in a horizontal position’). But it is far from being the unique type. In point of fact, the verb *regarder* ‘to watch’ fails to appear in compound past in two of its previously mentioned uses: *?Cela a regardé Luc* ‘It has concerned

Luc', ?*Le clocher a regardé la falaise* 'The steeple was opposite the cliff'. [...] Thus, it becomes obvious that defectiveness can only be dealt with felicitously if verbal uses are taken into account. It is not verbs that lacks some of the inflectional forms for tense or for mood. Instead, it is a concrete use thereof that fails to exhibit them (translation & emphasis – MN)<sup>1</sup>.

Rather than being seen as descriptive patterns characterising, whether canonically or not, expressions (or 'lexemes', or 'lexical units') representing variable parts of speech, paradigms will be more closely associated here with distributional properties of these expressions. This decision runs athwart the general concept of how the domain of inflectional morphology works. Yet, the mapping of the distributional properties onto paradigms is a necessary step here. Failing that, we would not be able to account for why certain inflectional forms, exclusive of others, are recurrent throughout some syntactic environments. Of course, this method should be applied with moderation. Paradigms must not be multiplied out as soon as a slight distributional peculiarity is found. Yet, this difficulty can be easily circumvented – as a matter of fact, common nouns in Old Spanish have been delimited in the present paper on the basis of a set of clustering parameters that have an empirical confirmation: inherent inflection, non-referential NP status, textual characteristics and structural environments defined in terms of syntactic and semantic types of clauses hosting these nouns. Taken together, these parameters are believed to provide sufficient basis for an inflectional 'emploi' to be delimited.

#### 4. TEXT GENRE, NON-REFEREENCE AND INFLECTIONAL PATTERNS

The linkage between inflectional properties of nouns and genre characteristics of Old Spanish codices is presumed to explain conveniently some of the intrinsic aspects of the morphological quirk under discussion. Indeed, the fact that general textual characteristics exert their influence on the specific / non-

---

<sup>1</sup> 'Il se trouve que la façon habituelle de présenter la conjugaison des verbes en décrivant les paradigmes (cf. l'Art de Conjuguer de *Bescherelle*) surestime la régularité de la conjugaison verbale. Tous les verbes n'ont pas tous les temps ni tous les modes. On cite traditionnellement le verbe *gésir*, mais c'est loin d'être un cas unique. Ainsi, le verbe *regarder* n'a pas de passé composé dans deux des emplois que nous avons indiqués : ? *Cela a regardé Luc*, ? *Le clocher a regardé la falaise* [...] Il est clair que la défektivité des verbes ne peut être sérieusement étudiée que dans le cadre des emplois. Ce n'est pas tel ou tel verbe qui n'a pas tous les temps mais certains de ses emplois'. NB. the verb *gésir* is traditionally held to provide a canonical example of verbal defectiveness in French; on the other hand, much in the same vein, *regarder* is quoted as a perfectly regular verb with an out-and-out complete paradigm.

specific status of NPs has been a long-standing finding (Topolińska, 1977: 64-66). At present, this interrelationship is taken for granted in linguistics (Bhat, 2004: 85).

Various text genres are going to be construed here as points scattered along the cline extending from the proximate to the distance pole (Koch and Oesterreicher, 2001: 586-588 and 2011: 135, 148-152). The latter encompasses texts devised for public communication, with unknown addressees, featuring a minimal emotional load and appearing in planned communicative acts. By contrast, the proximate pole is usually associated with the following characteristics: intimate and spontaneous communication, known addressees, a high incidence of emotions. Non-specific NPs are supposed to occur above all in texts representing the distance pole of this continuum. By contrast, in more subjective narratives forming a dramatic plot, specifically used nouns are more easily available. Accordingly, their paradigms exhibit a regular distribution of number values. Even in syntactic settings similar to those that have been identified for legal codices, singular and plural are no longer neutralized. Below two illustrations drawn from Spanish medieval chronicles are provided, where the semantics – morphology equilibrium is restored.

*Desde los vieron bien acerca dexaron se yr a ellos **caualleros a caualleros & peones a peones**: & herieron los tan de rezio que los vencieron a todos: & murio alli mucha caualleria delos de antiocha & los mas delos peones que trayan* (Anónimo, *Gran conquista de ultramar*) ‘Since the moment they saw them very close, they headed towards them, gentlemen towards gentlemen and peons towards peons, and they injured them so seriously that they defeated all of them. And many cavalrymen from those from Antioch, and most of their peons, died there’.

*Et plaze nos con cauallerias de aquellas serpientes ouo y este mal que se mataron **hermanos a hermanos** / mas en esta de antonjo & delos griegos que eran con el mataron se **hermanos a hermanos** & fijos a padres & padres a fijos* (Alfonso X, *General Estoria* V).

Additionally, the distinction advocated above helps shed light on how this instance of impoverishment in Spanish noun morphology might have been triggered. Texts representing the distance pole (scholarly treaties, official documents and decrees) are claimed to provide a favourable locus for externally induced grammatical changes (Lindschouw, 2013: 126-127). It might be hypothesized, then, that the defectiveness found in medieval codices is reminiscent of grammatical patterns found in (very) late Latin distance pole texts.

Finally, it remains to be seen how the non-referential status of NPs is correlated with the defectiveness of inflectional paradigms. The first hints on mechanisms responsible for this correlation can be found as early as in logically-based theories of description (Russell, 1905). Rather than concentrating on textual

characteristics of NPs, scholars were haggling over suitable formulae to represent possible truth-values of whole problematic sentences (*The current Emperor of Kentucky is grey-haired*). The moot point was whether odd sequences such as ‘The current Emperor of Kentucky’ are non-referential at all or correspond to a set that happens to be empty, considering that things are the way they are. Only later was agreement reached on the role of circumstances accompanying the act of utterance. Speakers can mean various things while using such sentences in different situations (Donnellan, 1966: 295-298).

Logical debates were soon given a more properly linguistic extension which had the advantage of showing that non-referential sentences are frequently not in keeping with temporal interpretation. This incompatibility is very conspicuous in universal deontic judgements, sentences evoking possible truths or in habitual constructions. Moreover, it is not uncommon for timeless sentences to go hand in hand with non-specific NPs, which comes as no surprise: potential events and states of affairs are paired with no real participants. Specificity, as it is introduced in texts, results from judgements formulated in terms of whether the referent in question corresponds to a unique token of a given, possibly collective, referent, or whether the referent could be replaced with another token of the same type without affecting interpretation (Schwenter, 2014: 245-246).

That is exactly what is evidenced by Latin reciprocal clusters quoted above. By no means is the existence of citizens, pieces of weaponry, men, etc. presupposed by the very fact of such sentences being uttered. Instead of committing themselves as to whether any identifiable individuals or objects exist, speakers simply assert their properties. For inflectional morphology, non-specificity of this kind implies that number values are neutralized. In other words, irrespective of what particular paradigmatic cell is instantiated the sentence continues to convey the same meaning regardless. The principle here is that if no specific participants are involved, it no longer matters how many they can be (Rusiecki, 1991: 364-366). Such relations are only required to hold for any couple of individuals (or any couple of sets thereof) who have properties signified by NPs (e.g. the property of being a citizen, of being a human, a piece of weaponry, etc.).

By contrast, the situation found in Old Spanish codices is slightly different. Number values are no longer entirely neutralized. Instead, one of them is pervasive, whereas the other is confined to appear only as a by-product of syntactically-induced operations (agreement). Be that as it may, the fact remains that, unlike in Latin, singular and plural are no longer freely interchanged in medieval Spanish codices. One important reason why preference is given to singular at the expense of plural might be discovered. Individuals subject to legal regulations are conceived of as distributively represented sets (Kemmer, 1997: 232). Rather than being extended at once to all persons who happen to commit a specified kind of infringement, the norm is designed to apply to individual cases. As



a consequence, each culprit can be dealt with individually. If this hypothesis is correct, it is no longer astonishing that plural forms are outnumbered by singular ones in this kind of ‘distance pole’ texts.

## 5. CONCLUDING REMARKS

Two major conclusions can be drawn from the foregoing study: (i) non-specificity and the timeless status of sentences do not always coerce NPs into having their number value neutralized; (ii) morphological interfaces should not be restricted to language-internal mechanisms (syntax – inflection, semantics – inflection, etc.). On the contrary, morphology can sometimes be shown to interact with other domains of life; e.g., the peculiar construal of legal regulations.

Rather than coming up with an in-depth analysis, the present paper has a character of a programme statement, where some lines of future investigation, conducted in terms of multi-faceted ‘morphological interfaces’, have been provisionally defined. Besides providing an empirical, corpora-based, material for upcoming research, non-canonical paradigms in Old Romance constitute an open-ended topic for more comprehensive cross-linguistic comparisons. Yet, some detailed problems related to the defective paradigms in medieval Spanish common nouns are still in the need of clarification. It should be ascertained, first, in what other contexts, defined in terms of the four parameters mentioned above, analogous idiosyncrasies can be discovered. In a more diachronic perspective, it should be interesting to observe how singular and plural were patterned in late Latin texts representing the ‘distance pole’. The significance of a diachronic inquiry consists in that ‘distance pole’ texts are presumed to provide a favourable locus for externally motivated grammatical changes to take place. At present, the conjecture is that defectiveness found in medieval paradigms must have had its antecedents, instead of constituting a Spanish innovation.

The paper is part of the research project funded by the National Centre of Science (OPUS4, decision: DEC-2012/07/B/HS2/00602).

## REFERENCES

- ARONOFF, M. (1994). *Morphology by Itself: stems and inflectional classes* [Linguistic Inquiry Monographs 22]. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.
- BHAT, D.N.S. (2008). *Pronouns*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199230242.001.0001>
- BOOI, G. (1996). Inherent versus contextual inflection and the split morphology hypothesis. In G. Booij & J. van Marle (Eds.), *Yearbook of Morphology 1995* (pp. 1-16). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-3716-6\\_1](http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-3716-6_1)
- BÖRJARS, K & VINCENT, N. (2011). The preconditions for suppletion. In A. Galani, G. Hicks & G. Tsoulas (Eds.), *Morphology and its Interfaces* (pp. 239-266). Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/la.178.13bor>
- CLAHSEN, H., AVELEDO, F. & ROCA I. (2002). The development of regular and irregular verb inflection in Spanish child language. *Journal of Child Language*, 29(3), 591-622. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0305000902005172>
- CORBETT, G. (2005). Suppletion in personal pronouns: theory versus practice, and the place of reproducibility in typology. *Linguistic Typology*, 9(1), 1-23. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/lity.2005.9.1.1>
- CORBETT, G. (2007). Canonical typology, suppletion and possible words. *Language*, 83(1), 8-42. Retrieved Nov. 14 2014, from <http://epubs.surrey.ac.uk/1313/>
- DONNELLAN, K. (1966). Reference and Definite Descriptions. *Philosophical Review*, 75, 281-304.
- GROSS, G. (1998). Pour une véritable fonction « synonymie » dans un traitement de texte. *Langages*, 131, 103-114. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3196/003581213805393405>
- KEMMER, S. (1997). Collective and Distributive Marking, or: Where unity meets multiplicity. In A.K. Melby (Ed.), *The twenty-third LACUS Forum* (pp. 231-249). Brigham: Brigham Young University.
- KOCH, P. & OESTERREICHER, W. (2001). Langage parlé et langage écrit. In G. Holtus, M. Metzeltin & Ch. Schmitt (Eds.), *Lexikon der Romanistischen Linguistik (LRL)*. Band 1/2 (pp. 584-627). Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- KOCH, P. & OESTERREICHER W. (2011). Die einzelsprachlichen Merkmale des gesprochenen Französisch, Italienisch und Spanisch in diachronischer und synchronischer Perspektive. In P. Koch & W. Oesterreicher (Eds.), *Gesprochene Sache in der Romania: Französisch, Italienisch, Spanisch* (pp. 135-272). Berlin: De Gruyter. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/9783110252620.135>
- LINDSCHOUW, J. (2013). Evolution and Reagrammation in the Mood System: Perspectives from Old, Middle, Renaissance and Modern French. In D.L. Arteaga (Ed.), *Research on Old French: The State of the Art* (pp. 123-148). Springer: Dordrecht. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-4768-5\\_7](http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-4768-5_7)
- RUSIECKI, J. (1991). Generic sentences, classes of predicate and definite generic noun phrases. In M. Grochowski & D. Weiss (Eds.), *Words are Physicians for an Ailing Mind* (pp. 363-370). Munich: Otto Sagner.
- RUSSELL, B. (1905). On Denoting. *Mind*, 14, 479-493.
- SCHWENTER, S.A. (2014). Two kinds of differential object marking in Portuguese and Spanish. In P. Amaral & A.M. Carvalho (Eds.), *Portuguese-Spanish Interfaces. Diachrony, synchrony, and contact* (pp. 237-260). Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/iHLL.1.12sch>
- SPENCER, A. (2006). Morphological universals. In R. Mairal & J. Gil (Eds.), *Linguistic Universals* (pp. 101-129). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- THORNTON, A.M. (2011). Overabundance (Multiple Forms Realizing the Same Cell): A Non-canonical Phenomenon in Italian Verb Morphology. In M. Maiden, J.Ch. Smith, M. Goldbach & M.-O. Hinzelin (Eds.), *Morphological Autonomy. Perspective from Romance Inflectional Morphology* (pp. 358-381). Oxford: Oxford University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199589982.003.0017>
- TOPOLIŃSKA, Z. (1977). Wyznaczoność (tj. charakterystyka referencyjna) grupy imiennej w tekście polskim. Argumenty niescharakteryzowane, grupy generyczne. *Polonica, III*, 59-78.

Corpora

- DAVIES, MARK (2002-) *Corpus del Español: 100 million words, 1200s-1900s*. Available online at: <http://www.corpusdelespanol.org>.
- GAGO JOVER, FRANCISO (Ed.). 2013. *Spanish Legal Texts. Digital Library of Old Spanish Texts*. Hispanic Seminary of Medieval Studies. Available online at: <http://www.hispanicseminary.org/t&c/lex/index-en.htm> [Dec., 14, 2014].



# CONCESSIVE CLAUSES IN *LI LIVRES DE CONFORT DE PHILOSOPHIE* BY JEAN DE MEUN: A CASE STUDY OF AN IDIOLECTAL PERFORMANCE<sup>1</sup>

Ondřej Pešek

Jihočeská Univerzita v Českých Budějovicích

onpesek@seznam.cz

## Abstract

The aim of our study is to analyze thoroughly subordinate concessive structures in the translation of *De consolacione philosophiae* by Jean de Meun. To achieve this aim, the typology of concessive relations proposed by R. Martin is applied. In doing so, we are also able to conduct a more comprehensive quantitative and qualitative analysis of these structures. Special attention is paid to the argumentative dimension of different concessive clauses identified within our analysis. The quantitative data of the text of *De consolacione* are compared to those of the *Romance of the Rose*, which reveals the significance of the generic factor for the interplay of particular types of subordinate structures. Our study is also presumed to show some specificities of Old French subordinating concessive devices.

**Keywords:** concessive clauses, syntactic subordination, concessive markers, universe of belief

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The aim of our paper is to analyze thoroughly the concessive subordinate structures in the translation of *De consolacione philosophiae* by Jean de Meun. Hence our study can be regarded as a partial contribution to the general issue of the rise and the formation of subordinate structures in Old French. We work on the assumption that an analysis of one concrete old text is substantially relevant to our knowledge of the past evolutionary stages of a language. Actually, the unavailability of competence in Old French (since there is no “native speaker” of the language) radically limits the role of introspection as the uppermost empiri-

---

<sup>1</sup> This study was realized thanks to the financial support of the Czech Science Foundation (project GAČR 14-03643S).

cal principle in linguistics. The only way to verify our hypotheses is the corpus, i.e. the sum of texts produced in a particular period by particular speakers; in other words the corpus represents a sum of performances. Even if nowadays we have access to quite a huge sample of Old French texts, it is nothing but a minuscule fraction of the real language production (oral and written) of the period in question. With regard to the diatopic, diastratic and diachronic diversity of texts that form the corpus, we can consider it an aggregate of strongly gen-rebound idiolectal fragments. In this way, an exhaustive philological analysis of one complete text can provide scientifically relevant data: it brings a testimony of a particular performance based on one concrete competence, which is directly inaccessible for us<sup>2</sup>. *Sensu stricto*, our study is not a diachronic but a synchronic one. The results it has produced, however, may be compared to other studies on the matter, in order to apprehend the evolutionary tendencies of the concessive system in Old French.

## 2. THE ISSUE OF SUBORDINATION FROM THE DIACHRONIC POINT OF VIEW

The history of subordination in modern European languages is generally described in terms of the progressive rise, complication and stabilization of morpho-syntactic means that build subordinate structures of these languages (e.g. Bauer, 1960: 351-355). The old evolutionary stages of these languages are characterized by a rather poor system of subordinate conjunctions: quantitatively, they prefer parataxis to hypotaxis, and the relation of the subordinate clause to its main clause is syntactically lax. The recent research has shown, however, that the issue of the evolution of subordination has to be regarded in a less superficial way. First of all, we have to distinguish between structural capacity of a language to form and to integrate subordinate clauses on one hand, and the quantitative occurrence of these structures in a text on the other. As it was demonstrated by le Goffic (2001: 52):

le mythe « Au début était la phrase simple ; la phrase complexe est venue ensuite » est alors dénué de fondement : un état historique de langage qui ne connaîtrait que des phrases à une seule prédication (des propositions simples), non seulement n'est pas attesté, mais est impensable.

---

<sup>2</sup> In practice, the lack of competence in a historical form of a language can be compensated for to a certain extent by the actual competence of contemporary speakers, so that introspection can play a certain role in the analysis, though one must be very circumspect when using it: all our conclusions should be systematically verified in the corpus.

We share this point of view completely and we claim that in any evolutionary stage of modern languages, subordination as a structural principle has always been operational, i.e. it has never emerged nor disappeared. This means that, at least since the moment when the human cognitive and communicative capacities attained the level of modern man, natural languages have always had a set of morphemic means functioning as operators of predicative integration and have always evinced some syntactic constraints that typically characterize the process of clause subordination (binding, tense-mood dependency, etc.). In the precise case of Romance languages, the changes which occurred since Latin till the emergence of vernaculars concern the quantitative and qualitative aspects of the set of integrating morphemes and, to some extent, the particular parameters of syntactic constraints linked with the operation of predicative integration<sup>3</sup>.

Since it has been shown that subordination has to be regarded as a stable principle that neither emerges, nor disappears, the quantitative and qualitative variation undeniably observed in the texts cannot be imputed to a profound structural shift, but must be explicated by other factors. The most important one resides in the “oral language/written language” dichotomy and hence it is closely linked to the socio-historical background of a particular linguistic community. As it was shown by Glickmann (2009), some specificities of the syntax of Old French subordination, which have often been presented as characteristic of the old evolutionary form of the language, are very common and live in present-day spoken French. The preference of the written language for subordinate structures can be easily explained by the interplay of factors that characterize this domain of language usage and that were ingeniously formulated by Koch, Oesterreicher (2001).

NB: If we claim that there is a relation between language structures and society, we consider this relation mainly on the level of discourse. We absolutely do not share the point of view of some authors<sup>4</sup> who made a link between the character of linguistic structures and the qualitative level of thinking. For example, concession as a cognitive principle exists in the human mind independently of the set of morphological devices that can represent this relation.

The study of the evolution of the morpho-syntactic marks of subordination in French is therefore inseparable from the study of the evolution of text genres emerging throughout the history of the French language. In this regard, the role of French translations of Latin scientific treaties played a very important role. These Latin originals presented all the characteristics that a complex written

---

<sup>3</sup> This assumption is confirmed by the relevant studies on the matter of diachrony of Romance subordinate systems (Herman, 1963; de Dardel, 1983).

<sup>4</sup> E.g. Lerch, as quoted by Soutet (1990: 24-25).

text, addressing an intellectually complex matter, should have: elaborated concise periods, multi-level subordinate and coordinate structures and a rich set of textual and argumentative markers.

### 3. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Our study deals with only one aspect of the text-structuring devices present in the text by Jean de Meun – the concessive subordinate structures. Our goal is to describe their formal, semantic, pragmatic and textual properties in order to provide a complex analysis of the phenomenon. Our attempt must be regarded as an analysis of a concrete performance, realized under particular pragmatic conditions. In order to evaluate the specificities of the translation and the generic factors that can influence an idiolectal performance, we will compare, mainly from the quantitative point of view, the results of the analysis of the *Consolation* with data coming from the text of Jean de Meun's part of the *The Romance of the Rose*. Thus, we will obtain a richer material that will support some of our hypotheses and conclusions.

Before presenting the actual results of our research, we will briefly mention the recent approaches to concession that have been applied so far in the French linguistic tradition. We will also specify our methodological and theoretical choices.

The issue of concessive structures has been explored thus far by numerous studies and monographs that have dealt with the general or specific aspects of these relations, considered from the synchronic point of view as well as from the diachronic one. The descriptive frameworks chosen by particular authors naturally conform to the general theoretical background that a given author opted for, and hence the variety of approaches is very rich and reflects the evolution of linguistic research. The traditional grammatical analysis (Grevisse, 1986) was complemented by studies focusing on syntax (Fradin, 1977), or on distributional and pragmatic features (Morel, 1996). In the early '80s, two influent currents, which represent a considerable contribution to the study of concession, marked the specificity of the French linguistic tradition. The first one gives priority to the logico-semantic model of concession, analyzing this relation in terms of the universe of belief (Martin, 1982, 1983; Soutet, 1990, 1992). The second one is based on the theory of argumentation in the language-system by Anscombre and Ducrot (1997). In this perspective, the key notions of the theory (argumentative orientation, argumentative scale, polyphony, etc.) were applied to describe specific argumentative properties of concessive structures. In parallel, concessive relations were treated within different models of discourse structure (e.g. Roulet et al., 1985), these relations being considered to be constitutive parts of dis-



course units (move, central act, subsidiary act, etc.). Last but not least, concession was approached from the point of view of modern cognitive linguistics, including e.g. works by Moeschler (1989) and his fellows (the theory of optimal relevance) or studies by Verhagen, (2000), who applies Fauconnier's theory of mental spaces to the analysis of concession.

#### 4. METHODOLOGICAL CHOICES

Our analytic method of concessive structures in the Jean de Meun's text could be considered an eclectic synthesis of the approaches reviewed above. Even if we do not reject *a priori* any of the above-mentioned approaches, believing that each of them can impart a relevant knowledge from its own perspective, we ground our study on Martin's logico-semantic model as it was applied by Soutet in his masterly monographs (1990, 1992).

In conformity with Soutet, we consider that "concession" is a universal (psycho)logical mechanism that may adopt a certain semiotic form in a particular language. The concessive relations all have a common semantic ground, but differ in further particular parameters. It is on the basis of these semantic specificities, regarded as primary, that Soutet (1990: 8-19) constructs the classification of concessive relations. He models his typology using the key notion of Martin's semantics<sup>5</sup>: "universe of belief" (U) and "anti-universe of belief" ( $\bar{U}$ ). According to Soutet, all the concessive relations are based on the implication *if q, not p* which logically represents the intuitive notion of inefficient cause. The different types of concessive relations (simple, scalar extensional, non-scalar extensional, restrictive, hypothetical, negative) operate on this basic principle and receive their proper semantic representations within Soutet's model. For each type, the model specifies:

1) the status of the implication *if q, not p* in relation to the universe of belief/anti-universe of belief,

2) the status of *q* and *p* in relation to presuppositions, to probability or to a scale of efficiency  $q \rightarrow p$ .

The semantic specificities represent the primary distinctive factor. Subsequently, the different types of concessive relations are assigned a particular status within the argumentative dimension of language. In this perspective, *q*, which is the subordinate member in the complex subordinate concessive clauses, represents the weak, anti-oriented argument in relation to *p*: the argumentative orientation of the whole sentence is always identical to that of *p*. From the point

---

<sup>5</sup> See Martin (1983).

of view of discourse structures,  $q$  represents the subsidiary act, and  $p$  the central one: the syntactic hierarchy is reflected on the argumentative and discourse level.

In our study, we will apply Soutet's conception as well as his logico-semantic representations of different types of concessive clauses<sup>6</sup>. For us, this model represents a powerful onomasiological principle that serves as a basis for identification and classification of different linguistic structures revealed in a text. For each revealed concessive subordinate structure we take into account a set of parameters specified as follows:

- 1) morpho-syntactic characteristics of the connective devices;
- 2) morpho-syntactic characteristics of the subordinate clause (position, verbal mood);
- 3) the role of the concessive clauses within the argumentative structure of the text;
- 4) translational aspects (Latin equivalents).

These items serve as guidelines for our research. The point of departure for our analysis was the text of the translation. There we researched all the morpho-syntactic markers of the subordinate concessive structures<sup>7</sup> and we analyzed them from the point of view of the factors mentioned above. Then, we made a summary quantitative research in the text of the *The Romance of the Rose* (only the Jean de Meun's part) in order to examine the potential generic constraints that are, in this case, free of the idiolectal variable.

## 5. SUMMARY: QUANTITATIVE DATA

In Table 1, we present the quantitative results of our analysis. In the sections that follow, we include a commentary that details the specificities of each subordinate structure observed in the texts of our corpus.

We can observe that the text of *Consolation* contains altogether 65 occurrences of subordinate concessive clauses. 64% of them are anteposed, 23% postposed and 12% are interposed in relation to their principal clause. The prevailing mode is the subjunctive; the indicative occurs only in 6 cases, four of them belonging to the hypothetical type. By far the most frequent type is the simple concessive clause introduced by the conjunctive locution *ja soit ce que*.

---

<sup>6</sup> Let us point out once again that our study concerns only subordinate concessive clauses. Paratactic and adverb-based concessive structures were not included in our analyses.

<sup>7</sup> We made an exhaustive counting of all the subordinate structures that figure in Soutet's list of Old French subordinating concessive devices (Soutet, 1992).

Table 1. Types of concessive clauses and their combinatorial properties in *De concolatione philosophiae* by Jean de Meun

	<i>quelque... que</i>	<i>comment que</i>	<i>combien que</i>	<i>ja soit ce que</i>	<i>neis se</i>	Total
Total number of occurrences	2	3	1	53	6	65
Anteposition of <i>q</i>	0	2	0	35	5	42
Interposition of <i>q</i>	1	0	1	7	0	8
Postposition of <i>q</i>	1	1	0	11	1	15
Subjunctive	2	3	1	50	2	58
Indicative	0	0	0	2	4	6
Latin equivalents	ubique rararum; aliquo modo	quoquo modo 2; utcumque	quantalibet	licet 18; quamvis 12; tametsi 10; etsi 3; quamquam 4	etiam si 3; si etiam 1	
Type	extensional non scalar	extensional non scalar	extensional scalar qualitative	simple (52); rectificative (1)	Hypothetical	

## 6. COMMENTS AND ANALYSES

### 6.1. QUELQUE... QUE

We found two occurrences of this structure:

(1) *Mais se honneur et reverance fust naturex dons aus dignitez, elles ne cessassent jamés entre nulle genz en nul lieu, en nulle maniere de faire leur office, si comme li feus en quelque terre qu'il soit toutevois ne laisse il pas a eschauffer.* III, 4p

(2) *L'engendreure de toutez chosez et touz li avenemens des muablez naturez et tout quenque est meü en quelque maniere que ce soit, tout prent ses causez, son ordre, ses formes de l'estableté de la divine pensee.* IV, 6p

The concessive clauses introduced by the locution *quelque... que* belong to the extensional non scalar type of clauses. Their inner semantic structure corresponds to the following scheme (cf. Soutet, 1990: 15):

U:  $q, p$ .

$\bar{U}$ :  $q \in Q$ , (if  $q$ , not  $p$ )

The relation  $q, p$  belonging to U (universe of belief) refers in  $\bar{U}$  (anti-universe of belief) to a set of propositions Q, where one of these propositions  $q$  allows verifying the relation (if  $q$ , not  $p$ ).

The argumentative strategy mobilized by this type of sentence can be modeled as follows: by asserting *ConCon*<sup>8</sup> *q, p*, the speaker invites the receiver of the text to pass through all the elements *Q* (*terre, maniere*) about which it is supposed that at least one does not normally induce *p*. Simultaneously, s/he anticipates an objection that could be brought in order to weaken the argumentative force of *p* and that could be paraphrased as follows: “mind you, there is one place (one manner) where *p* is not valid”. The concessive structure refutes this argument *a priori* and thus reinforces the validity of *p*.

In the translation we have no occurrence of the patterns *quel... que* or *quelconque... que* that represent a concurrent variant for the substantive extensional non scalar concessive clauses in Old French. Jean de Meun’s preference for the structure *quelque... que* seems idiolectal, since in *The Romance of the Rose*, we find seven occurrences of the structure *quelque... que* for only one *quel... que* and two *quelconque... que*. This proportion corresponds to the figures that Souzet (1992: 165) shows for the tendency characteristic of the 14<sup>th</sup> century rather than to his data for the 13<sup>th</sup> century, when the structure *quel... que* still clearly prevailed. In this aspect, Jean de Meun’s language evinces certain innovative tendencies that will be confirmed during the 14<sup>th</sup> century.

## 6.2. COMMENT QUE

The structures introduced by *comment que* found in our text represent the extensional non-scalar type of concessive clauses. We have counted three occurrences of these clauses in total:

(3) *Mais ceste chose, **comment que** il en soit, je la laisse a preisier au jugement de toy et des sages.* I, 4p

(4) *Et je pri, dis je, que elles se aherdent ; car tandis comme elles durront, **comment que** les choses se portent, nous nous noerons oultre.* II, 4p

(5) *Mais a ce demonstrer ne nous esforçons nous pas ore que, **comment que** se port li ordres des causez, il couvient que li avenemens des chosez devant seues soit neccessairez, neis se il ne semble pas que la prescience mete nulle neccessité de avenir es chosez qui avendront.* V, 3p

The semantic and pragmatic mechanisms that underlie these structures are the same as in the case of *quelque... que*. We can even observe a certain synonymy between *comment que* and *en quelque maniere que ce soit* (cf. example 2), but in spite of their semantic proximity, their syntactic properties are different:

---

<sup>8</sup> The abbreviation *ConCon* stands for a subordinating concessive device.

*comment que* is not a noun phrase and hence it cannot function as a nominal complement of a VP.

Moreover, *comment que* is strongly functionally bound: all the occurrences we revealed in the text of *Consolation* confirm the well-known tendency of *comment que* to appear in stereotypical sequences constructed with verbs belonging to a closed paradigm (cf.: *comment qu'il en soit*<sup>9</sup>, *comment que les choses se portent*). We find the same stereotypy in *The Romance of the Rose*. For 42 occurrences, 10 can be said to employ the closed verbal paradigms (*aller, être, prendre*), hence presenting a high degree of idiomaticity.

In all the occurrences in the translation (and in the text of *The Romance of the Rose*) we can observe the adverbial nature of *comment* – it is incident to the VP and the element *que* represents the adverbial in the subordinate clause. For Soutet (1992: 194), this semantico-syntactic property of *comment que* explains why it remains only an extensional relative, whereas *combien que*, thanks to the inner semantics of *combien*, could evolve towards the purely conjunctive (i.e. non-relative) usage.

### 6.3. COMBIEN QUE

In the text of *Consolation*, we found only one occurrence of *combien que*:

(6) *Se aucuns fruiuz des chosez mortieuz puet avoir aucun pois ou quelque valeur de beneurté, pourras tu oublier, pour nulz faiz de maulz qui t'aviennent **combien qu'**il soit grans, la remembrance d'ycelui jour, c'est a savoir quant tu veis tes deuz filz, faiz conseilliers, issir ensemble de ta maison avec l'assemblee des peres et la leesce du peuple et quant il furent assis ou lieu commun en la cort es siegez de leurs dignitez ?* II, 3p

According to O. Soutet, the clauses introduced by *combien que* can be of two sorts, scalar and non-scalar (simple concessive)<sup>10</sup>. The difference between scalar and non-scalar concessive clauses resides in the fact that in the case of scalar clauses, Q is an ordered set of propositions that constitute a scale. The concessive structure refers to the most favorable proposition (*q* maxi) that verifies the if *q*, not *p* implication. Formally (Soutet, 1990: 15):

$$\begin{aligned} \text{U: } & q (\in \text{Q}), p. \\ \bar{\text{U}}: & \left[ \begin{array}{l} q \text{ maxi} \in \text{Q} \\ \text{if } q \text{ maxi, not } p \end{array} \right] \end{aligned}$$

<sup>9</sup> It can be considered an idiomatic formula equivalent to Modern French *quoi qu'il en soit*.

<sup>10</sup> The non-scalar usage of *combien que* is, according to Soutet, the source of the modern concessive conjunction *bien que*.

In the example (6), the scalar qualitative<sup>11</sup> function of the subordinate clause is evident: the concessive meaning arises around the adjective *grans*. The value *maxi q* in the formula corresponds to the most favorable degree of *grans* that induces non *p* in the  $\bar{U}$ . The implication of (6) that operates within  $\bar{U}$  can be formulated as follows: “If the mass of misfortune attains a certain degree (*q maxi*), it erases the remembrance of lucky events”. Within  $U$ , this implication is not validated.

The argumentative dimension of this scalar type of concessive clauses is analogous to those we could observe in the two previous sections (*quelque... que, comment... que*): by asserting *ConCon q, p* the speaker anticipates an objection that could be raised in order to weaken the argumentative force of *p*. In the particular case of the scalar concessive clause (6), this “anti-argument” could be paraphrased as follows: “mind you, in the case of the *maxi* degree of *q* (*faiz de maux : grans*), *p* is not valid”. The concessive structure refutes this anti-argument a priori and thus reinforces the validity of *p*.

In Jean de Meun’s *The Romance of the Rose*, the structure *combien que* represents a very frequent concessive structure (51 occurrences). The absolute majority of the clauses with *combien que* are scalar and qualitative. Only one can be considered scalar and quantitative<sup>12</sup>:

(7) *ç’a l’en bien esprové de maint / qu’au mains en la fin leur remaint / usage et sen pour le cheté, / **combien qu’il l’aient acheté.** 12791-12794*

and one of the instances seems to be non-scalar, simple:

(8) *Sanz faille, des vilains gloutons / ne donasse je .ii. boutons ; / **combien que bon queurs leur fausist, / de tel faute ne me chausist.** 9635-9638*

The proportions (50 scalar qualitative – 1 scalar quantitative – 1 concessive simple) revealed in *The Romance of the Rose*, confirm the overall 13<sup>th</sup> century data which Soutet (1992: 189) presents for the French structures with *combien que*.

#### 6.4. JA SOIT CE QUE

*Ja soit ce que* is by far the most often used concessive conjunctive locution in the translation (53 occurrences, i.e. 82%). Finally, almost all the occurrences are to be ranged as concessive simple, for example:

<sup>11</sup> *Combien que* can operate on the qualitative scale as well as on the quantitative one. The qualitative scale concerns the degree of quality prototypically expressed by an adjective, the quantitative one, much less frequent, concerns the quantity of a countable or uncountable entity (“whatever the quantity of X could be”).

<sup>12</sup> This example illustrates quite a stereotypical usage of quantitative *combien que*: it accompanies verbs that take as complement the price to pay (cf. Soutet, 1992: 188).

(9) *Et ja soit ce que ces chosez soient diversez, toutevois depent et descent l'une de l'autre.* IV, 6p

(10) *Et ja soit ce que tu les voies toutez descorder en diversez formez, toutevois leur encline face puet aggrever leurs reboichez sens si que il ne se peuent pas eslever aus chosez souverainnes.* V, 5c

The mechanism of the simple concessive clauses is the following (Soutet, 1990: 15):

U:  $\left[ \begin{array}{l} \text{presupposed: } q \\ \text{posed: } p \end{array} \right]$

$\bar{U}$ : (if  $q$ , not  $p$ )

In other words, the speaker rates both  $p$ ,  $q$  to be valid,  $q$  is presupposed,  $p$  is posed. The relation (if  $q$ , not  $p$ ) belongs to the speaker's anti-universe of belief. Using the concessive structure, the speaker does not deny the validity of  $q$ , but devalues its argumentative force in favor of that of  $p$ . The argumentative conflict between  $p$  and  $q$  can be resolved in terms of polyphony and may induce interesting rhetorical effects. For example, in the specific argumentative strategy developed by speaker A, the argument  $q$  could be imputed to another individual speaker B (possibly the partner in the dialogue). A, by enouncing  $q$ , accepts its veracity, but by enouncing  $p$ , he invalidates  $q$  in terms of its argumentative force. The concessive structure allows the speaker to construct a specific rhetorical ethos: that of a kindly man capable of listening to other people's arguments.

Soutet (1992: 216) states a strong correlation between postposition of  $q$  and the indicative mood of the verb in  $q$  on the one hand, and the rectificative interpretation of the structure on the other. In our corpus, we had no occurrence that would jointly satisfy both of the criteria /postposition + indicative/. Almost all of the postposed clauses<sup>13</sup> are to be interpreted as simple concessive, for example:

(11) *Yeux avoit ardans et regardables oultre la commune puissance des hommes ; vive couleur ot et vigueur que nulz ne pot oncques espuisier, ja soit ce que elle fust plaine de si grant aage que on ne creait en nule maniere que ele fust de notre temps.* I, 1p

(12) *Car la pourveance embrace toutez chosez ensemble, ja soit ce que elles soient diversez et sans fin;* IV, 6p

Similarly, the two occurrences of the indicative are also simple concessive (we find both of them within one sentence):

(13) *Mais tu pourras dire que, ja soit ce que la prescience n'est pas cause de la neccessité des chosez a avenir (ou que ja soit ce que neccessité d'avenir n'est pas par la*

<sup>13</sup> Exactly all but one: (14).

*prescience es choses a avenir), toutevoiz est elle signe que les choses avendront par necessité.* V, 4p.

Only one occurrence in the text can be considered rectificative:

(14) *Mais certez maint homme qui tres noble furent en leur temps sont mis en oubli par faute d'escripvains. Ja soit ce que li escript ne leur vailent niant, les quiex ancienneté longue et obscure efface avec leurs aucteurs.* II, 7p.

This type of concessive clauses differs from the types discussed above by the fact that the implication (if  $q$ , not  $p$ ) belongs to the speaker's universe of belief, and not to the anti-universe of belief as was previously the case. The concessive movement is realized in two points in time. At time  $t_0$ , the speaker asserts  $p$ , then at  $t_{0+k}$  he asserts  $q$  and assumes at the same time its validity as well as the validity of its implications. The pragmatic effect of this construction is obvious: by asserting *ConCon*  $q$ , the speaker limits or even suspends the validity of  $p$ <sup>14</sup>. Soutet (1990: 15) represents the semantics of this type of concessive clauses as follows:

$$U: \left[ \begin{array}{l} t_0 : p \\ t_{0+k} : \diamond q \wedge (\text{if } q, \text{ not } p) \end{array} \right]$$

In the example (14), the rectificative mechanism could be paraphrased like this: “many noble men have been forgotten because nobody wrote about their lives. But after all, the fact that nobody wrote about them is not a relevant argument, because the written documents, since they disappear with their authors, have no value”. The negated implication (if  $q$ , not  $p$ ) valid in  $U$  is hence: “If the written documents have no value, many noble men have not been forgotten because nobody wrote about their lives”. It is important to remark that only the segment /”because nobody wrote about their lives”/ falls into the scope of the negation; thus, the rectification concerns only a part of the semantic content of  $p$ .

The French conjunction *ja soit ce que* from (14) translates the Latin *quamquam*, which very often occurs in this rectificative function (Spevak, 2005: 209). It is also interesting to observe that the concessive clause (14) forms an independent utterance. It is postponed to  $p$ , and even if it presents the subjunctive mood, between  $p$  and  $q$  there is a very weak syntactic dependency: *ja soit ce que* functions more as a textual connective device here.

In *The Romance of the Rose*, we find only 13 occurrences of *ja soit ce que*: from the quantitative point of view, this conjunctive locution is not very fre-

<sup>14</sup> The suspension can concern different entities of  $p$ : elements of its propositional content, its argumentative or illocutionary force.



quent. This disproportion between the *The Romance of the Rose* and the translation of Boethius' text can be explained by the generic difference – in spite of a certain thematic proximity, *The Romance of the Rose* is a poetic, rhymed text and thus it presents different constraints than the prose text of the translation<sup>15</sup>.

When analyzing thoroughly the occurrences of *ja soit ce que* in our corpus, we revealed several indicators which show that the structures introduced by this device had a specific character, at least within the idiolect in question. It seems that *ja soit ce que* was not felt as a completely fixed, non-decomposable conjunctive locution. In some of its occurrences, actually, this locution could be interpreted as a quasi-independent predicative unit commanding its own subordinate clause. Naturally, in these cases the semantics of its parts could be evaluated separately in their plain original meaning: *ja* preserved its primitive extensional signification “at whatever moment of time<sup>16</sup>”; *soit* received the primitive subjunctive interpretation of “let be” and *ce* “it” was a cataphoric element referring to the subordinate clause introduced by *que* “that”.

Let us observe the following example:

(15) *Ja soit ce que tu entendes bien le latin, mais toutevois est de moult plus legiers a entendre le françois que le latin.* (preface)

The problem is that the concessive structure introduced by *ja soit ce que* is linked to its “principal” clause by the coordinating conjunction *mais*. If we transposed this complex sentence into Modern French, we would receive the following structure:

(15') ??*Bien que tu comprennes bien le latin, mais il est plus simple de comprendre le françois que le latin.*

which would be considered ungrammatical. To make it acceptable, it would be necessary to take out either the locution *bien que*, or the conjunction *mais*. Although this double marking (15, 15') is unacceptable for Modern French subordinate structures, it is not exceptional in Old French. Let us mention the excellent study by Combettes (2002), who observes the analogous phenomenon in the case of temporal clauses. When analyzing the sentence:

(16) *Et quant ils s'en vont vers le chastel, et uns escuiers leur vient devant d'eux.* (Lancelot du Lac)

<sup>15</sup> The meters of the Boethius' text are also translated in prose by Jean de Meun.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Soutet (2008).

Combettes affirms that in relation to the predication, the “subordinating” *quant* seems to play the role of a circumstantial adjunct. He considers the initial subordinate clauses to be weakly integrated and suggests that in Old French, the functioning of adverbials and subordinating conjunctions was quite similar, namely on the discursive level.

We can explain structure (15) in this manner. The locution *ja soit ce que* represents a predicative unit<sup>17</sup>; it integrates itself syntactically into the clause (*tu entendes bien le latin*), which is also its semantic argument. The whole functions as a quasi-independent structure, which that can be coordinated by *mais* with another independent clause.

In our analysis of the concessive structure, we have insisted on the necessity of taking into account the textual and argumentative dimension of these constructions (cf. item 3, section 4). Let us consider the following example, which illustrates clearly the role that different concessive devices can play within the argumentative strategies set up by the speaker:

(17) *Dont il apert que toutez les chosez qui sont tendent a bien* (final resuming sentence of a paragraph). (beginning of a new paragraph) ***Mais toutevois ja soit ce que il soit ainsi, li lignages humains en ce se descorde molt des autres chosez qui sont, car les autres chosez qui sont requierent determineement et sens erreur et ensuivent leur bien.*** (preface)

We can observe here an accumulation of concessive connectives<sup>18</sup> *mais*, *toutevois*, *ja soit ce que*, which may seem redundant. Further analysis will show, however, that each of them has its specific role and hence their accumulation is perfectly acceptable. First, from the syntactic point of view, *ja soit ce que* does not have the same argument structure as *mais* and *toutevois*. Its left-side argument<sup>19</sup> corresponds to the segment *li lignages humains en ce se descorde molt des autres chosez... et ensuivent leur bien*; its right-side argument is represented only by the segment *il soit ainsi*. By contrast, the left-side argument for *mais* and *toutevois* is represented by the final sentence of the preceding paragraph, while their right-side argument corresponds to the whole segment *ja soit ce que il soit ainsi, li lignages humains... ensuivent leur bien*. *Mais* and *toutevois* share the same arguments, but their combination is possible because of the sufficient semantic difference that exists between these two connectives. From the argumentative point of view, the role of *ja soit ce que il soit ainsi* is to block the refuta-

<sup>17</sup> Like “soit” used as a discourse particle in the modern French: *Soit, tu comprends bien le latin*.

<sup>18</sup> For the issue of accumulation of connectives see Pešek (2011) and Rubattel (1983).

<sup>19</sup> Note: the status /left-side x right-side/ is attributed within the formal structure *p, conn q*: *p* is the left-side argument, *q* is the right-side argument whatever the surface order of the clauses could be.

tive interpretation that could be induced by *mais + toutevois*<sup>20</sup>. The subordinate concessive clause marks explicitly that, for the speaker, the preceding sentence (i.e. the left-side argument of *mais + toutevois*) is held true and, therefore that the right-side argument of *mais + toutevois* does not serve to prove the untruthfulness of *p*. The whole structure, whose syntactico-semantic configuration could be represented as follows:

$p, \text{ mais toutevoies } q \text{ [ja soit ce } q', p \text{ ]},$

is to be regarded as an example of the so-called argumentative function of *mais* (Adam, 1990: 206-209).

### 6.5. NEIS SE

The last type of the concessive structures that we find in the text of the translation is the so called hypothetical concessive clauses. This type is particular because its subjacent semantic mechanism mobilizes not only the core concessive relation (negation of an implication) but also the hypothetical relation. This mechanism is basically controlled by two markers “M” and “S”<sup>21</sup>. The role of the marker S is to signal that the relation *q, p* has to be regarded as conditioned, the role of the marker M is to signal the passage from the less probable hypothesis *q'* to all the hypotheses *q* that belong to the same class as the less probable *q'*. This relation is formalized by Soutet (1990: 16) as follows:

$(\text{if } q', p) \rightarrow \{\forall q \in Q, (\text{if } q, p)\}$

The concessive mechanism based on this implication, which is valid in U, arises only with reference to  $\bar{U}$ , in which two implications are considered and compared for their probability: the implication (if *q', p*) is the less probable one, whereas the negation of this implication (not (if *q', p*)) evinces the highest degree of probability. Formally:

$U: (\text{if } q', p) \rightarrow \{\forall q \in Q, (\text{if } q, p)\}$

$\bar{U} \exists q' \left[ \begin{array}{l} \text{PROB. (if } q', p) = \text{the weakest} \\ \text{PROB. not (if } q', p) = \text{the strongest} \end{array} \right]$

In Old French, the operator “M” is materialized by the adverb *neis*, and the operator “S” by the conjunction *si* (*se*). In our text, the semantics of all the six

<sup>20</sup> In the refutative structures, the role of *q* is to show that *p* is not true. Cf. in Modern French: A: *Pierre est malade*. B: *Mais je l'ai vu hier dans un bar !*

<sup>21</sup> In modern French, M is prototypically *même*, S *si*.

occurrences that we found can be described in terms of Soutet's mechanism mentioned above. Four of them are the translation of the Latin structure *etiam si* or *si etiam*:

(18) *Par ceste manière donques, neis se la prescience n'eust onques esté, toutevois seroit ce certaine chose par ce signe que li avènement des chosez a avenir seroient neccessaire.* V, 4p  
*Hoc igitur modo, etiam si praecognitio non fuisset, necessarios futurorum exitus esse constaret.*

(19) *Et qui neis se elle semble joieuse a celui qui en use toutevois ne puet elle pas estre retenue que elle ne s'en aille quant elle voudra.* II, 4p  
*Quae si etiam fruenti iucunda esse uideatur, tamen quo minus cum uelit abeat retineri non possit.*

Two of them correspond to the Latin condensed structures (ablativus absolutus, passive participle) whose concessive/hypothetical meaning is signaled by the markers *tamen* or *etiam*.

In the *The Romance of the Rose* we find 9 occurrences of the structure *neis se*, which functions in the same way as described above. But we found there one interesting occurrence, which can be considered concessive hypothetical even if it does not contain the operator *se*:

(20) *mout fet a prodome grant honte / et grant damage qui l'escoille ; / car qui des coillons le despoille, / ja soit ce neis que je tese / sa grant honte et sa grant mesese, / au mains, de ce ne dout je mie, / li tost il l'amour de s'amie.* 20008-20014

The structure is introduced by the locution *ja soit ce neis que*, which presents the same unbound composite character as we observed in section 6.4.

The argumentative movement of this structure is very complex, because it is to be identified on the level of the enunciation of *p*, *q* and not on the level of the propositional content of *p*, *q*. Nevertheless, the semantic mechanism launched by the operator *ja soit ce neis que* is fundamentally the same. The concessive clause *q* introduces an argument for the truthfulness of "it is a big damage for a man to have his testicles cut off". This argument ("it is a shame and a torment for him") is involved in the *verbum dicendi* structure ("tese" *q*' = not say*q*'), and the implication is hence shifted to the enunciative level. It takes the following form:

$$U: (\text{if not say}q', \text{say}p^{22}) \rightarrow \{\forall \text{ not say}q \in \text{not say}Q, (\text{if not say}q, \text{say}p)\}$$

The complex argumentative mechanism put into effect in (20) can be paraphrased as follows: I can assert *p* ("it is a big damage for a man to have his tes-

---

<sup>22</sup> By say *p*, we actually mean the rightfulness of the speaker to say *p*. For technical reasons we do not represent it within the proposed formal structure.

ticles cut off”) even if I do not say  $q$  (“to have his testicles cut off is a shame and a torment for this person”). I know that normally<sup>23</sup> (if not say  $q$ , say  $p$ ) is the less probable hypothesis, while (if not say  $q$ , not say  $p$ ) is the most probable one.

It appears that the most important role belongs to the marker *neīs*. It is *neīs* that induces the obligatory passage throughout the set  $Q$  ordering  $q' \dots q_n$  on the scale of probability. The role of *ja soit ce* is to refer to an anti-universe of belief within which (if  $q'$ ,  $p$ ) is the less probable implication while (if  $q'$ , not  $p$ ) is the most probable one.

### 7. CONSOLATION VS. THE ROMANCE OF THE ROSE: A QUANTITATIVE COMPARISON

Having presented the detailed properties of the concessive structures found in our corpus, we constructed Table 2 below, which summarizes and compares the quantitative data revealed for Jean de Meun’s two texts we analyzed: the translation of Boethius’ *De consolacione* (number of words: 49 000) and *The Romance of the Rose* (number of words: 102 000)<sup>24</sup>. The data in the column *Percentage 1* correspond to the proportion “concessive structure/number of words in the text”<sup>25</sup>, the data in the column *Percentage 2* correspond to the proportion “concessive structure/total number of concessive subordinate structures”. As mentioned above, for both texts, we did an accurate count of all the subordinate structures that figure in Soutet’s list of Old French subordinating concessive devices.

The data presented in Table 2 allow us to make the following summary statements for the quantitative representation of the subordinate concessive structures in Jean de Meun’s two texts:

1) The total proportion of the subordinate concessive structures in relation to the global size of the text is almost the same. However, the total figure has very little relevance, since the individual types of subordinate concessive clauses are very different from the functional point of view.

2) In the text of *The Romance of the Rose*, the clearly predominant type of concessive clauses is the extensional one. It represents nearly 85% of all cases. By contrast, this type is in minority in the text of *Consolation* (9%), in which 82% belong to the simple concessive type, and 9% to the hypothetical concessive one. This difference can be easily explained by the generic factors. First, the

<sup>23</sup> The sequence “I know, that normally” is, in our paraphrases, a reference to the anti-universe of belief ( $\bar{U}$ ).

<sup>24</sup> The numbers of words of both texts are rounded to thousands.

<sup>25</sup> Hence, these data show the proportion of the subordinate concessive clauses in relation to the global size of the text.

Table 2. The occurrences of concessive markers in Jean de Meun's two texts: the translation of Boethius' *De consolacione* and *The Romance of the Rose*

Structure	<i>Consolation</i>			<i>The Romance of the Rose</i>		
	Total	Percentage 1	Percentage 2	Total	Percentage 1	Percentage 2
<i>quelque... que</i>	2	0,004	3,1	7	0,007	4,5
<i>quel... que</i>	0	0	0	1	0,001	0,6
<i>quelconque... que</i>	0	0	0	2	0,002	1,3
<i>qui que</i>	0	0	0	9	0,009	5,8
<i>que que</i> (relatif)	0	0	0	15	0,015	9,7
<i>ou que</i>	0	0	0	6	0,006	3,9
<i>comment que</i>	3	0,006	4,6	42	0,041	27
<i>combien que</i>	1	0,002	1,5	51	0,05	32,9
<i>ja soit ce que</i>	53	0,108	81,5	13	0,013	8,4
<i>neis se</i>	6	0,012	9,2	9	0,009	5,8
In total	65	0,132	100	155	0,152	100

extensional type is often realized by highly automatized structures that evince a strong degree of idiomacity: among the extensional type of clauses we count structures like *ou que soit*, *qui que soit*, *comment qu'il aille*, etc., which often serve as a pure rhythmic device whose role is to support a rhyme structure, e.g.:

(21) *il n'i donroit pas une escorce / de chesne, comment qu'il en soit / Sachiez qu'a nul mal n'i pensoit.* 12194-12196

Second, the simple concessive structure often supports a complex argumentative movement demanding a longer development, which is thus rather incommode for the octosyllabic versed poem.

## 8. CONCLUSION

Our analysis has showed that the system of subordinate concessive clauses, as actualized in the writings by Jean de Meun, exploited a rich variety of structures allowing multiple argumentative strategies to be put into effect. The morpho-syntactic specificities of different concessive devices do not represent any functional obstacle and serve to support the concessive mechanisms in their full complexity. The quantitative data that we revealed, when compared with other similar sources, can bring some relevant information on the idiolect of Jean de Meun. We also proved that every analysis of a corpus of Old French texts necessarily must take into account the generic aspects: actually, it is often the most important factor that allows explaining the variability of collected data.

## REFERENCES

## Corpora

- JEAN DE MEUN, *Li Livres de Confort de Philosophie* : Dedeck-Héry Venceslas-Louis (1952) : Boethius' De consolatione by Jean de Meun. *Mediaeval Studies*, 14, 165-275.
- JEAN DE MEUN, *Roman de la Rose*. Texte établi par F. Lecoy, (Paris, Champion, 1965), Base de français médiéval, <http://txm.bfm-corpus.org>.
- ADAM, J.-M. (1990). *Éléments de linguistique textuelle*. Liège : Mardaga.
- ANSCOMBRE, J.-C. & DUCROT, O. (1997). *L'argumentation dans la langue*. Liège : Mardaga.
- BAUER, J. (1960). *Vývoj českého souvětí*. Praha: Československá akademie věd.
- COMBETTES, B. (2002). Aspects de la grammaticalisation de la phrase complexe en ancien et en moyen français. *Verbum*, XXIV(4), 109-128.
- DARDEL, R. DE (1983). *Esquisse structurale des subordonnants conjonctionnels en roman commun*. Genève : Librairie Droz.
- FRADIN, B. (1977). *Les concessives extensionnelles en français moderne* (Ph.D. Thesis). Université de Paris VIII-Vincennes.
- GLIKMAN, J. (2009). *Parataxe et subordination en ancien français. Système syntaxique, variantes et variation* (Thèse de doctorat en Sciences du langage. Paris 10, Université de Potsdam).
- GREVISSE, M. (1986). *Le Bon Usage*. Paris – Louvain-la-Neuve : Duculot.
- HERMAN, J. (1963). *La formation du système roman des conjonctions de subordination*. Berlin : Akademie Verlag.
- KARLIK, P. (1995). *Studie o českém souvětí*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita v Brně.
- KOCH, P. & OESTERREICHER, W. (2001). Langage parlé et langage écrit. In G. Holtus, M. Metzeltin & Ch. Schmitt (Eds.), *Lexikon der Romanistischen Linguistik (LRL)*. Band 1/2 (pp. 584-627). Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- LE GOFFIC, P. (2001). Sur les sources et le développement de la subordination dans le langage : l'exemple de l'indo-européen. *Recherches en Linguistique et Psychologie cognitive*, 16, 25-56.
- MARTIN, R. (1982). Relation concessive et univers de croyance, *Modèles linguistiques IV*(2), 27-39.
- MARTIN, R. (1983). *Pour une logique du sens*. Paris : Presses universitaires de France.
- MOESCHLER, J. (1989). *Modélisation du dialogue. Représentation d'une inférence*. Paris : Hermès.
- MOREL, M.-A. (1996). *La concession en français*. Paris : Ophrys.
- PESEK, O. (2011). *Argumentativní konektory v současné francouzštině a češtině. Systémové srovnání a analýza okkurenční respondence*. České Budějovice: Acta Philologica Universitatis Bohemiae Meridionalis.
- POUNTAIN C.-J. (2011). Latin and the structure of written Romance. In M. Maiden & J. C. Smith & A. Ledgeway (Eds.), *The Cambridge history of the romance languages. Volume I, Structures* (606-659). Cambridge, Cambridge University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CHOL9780521800723.015>
- RIEGEL, M & PELLAT, J.-C. & RIOUL, R. (2004). *Grammaire méthodique du français*. Paris : Quadrigé.
- ROULET, E. et al. (1985). *L'Articulation du discours en français contemporain*. Berne : Peter Lang.
- RUBATTEL, C. (1983). Sur la position et le cumul des connecteurs pragmatiques : syntaxe et forme logique des adverbiaux. *Cahiers de linguistique française*, 5, 153-167.
- SOUTET, O. (1990). *La concession en français des origines au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle. Problèmes généraux. Les tours prépositionnels*. Genève : Librairie Droz.
- SOUTET, O. (1992). *La concession dans la phrase complexe en français des origines au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle*. Genève : Librairie Droz.

- SOUTET, O. (2008). Des concessives extensionnelles aux concessives simples : Contribution à l'étude de la genèse sémantique et historique des locutions conjonctives concessives du français. *Linx*, 59, 115-132. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4000/linx.629>
- SPEVAK, O. (2005). *La concession en latin*. Bruxelles : Éditions Latomus.
- VERHAGEN, A. (2000). Concession Implies Causality, Though in Some Other Space. In E. Couper-Kuhlen & B. Kortmann (Eds.), *Cause – Condition – Concession – Contrast: Cognitive and Discourse Perspectives* (361-380). Berlin : Mouton de Gruyter. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/9783110219043.4.361>



## Table of contents

Łukasz Berger, <i>(Meta)discursive Uses of Latin HEUS</i> .....	3
Tibor Berta, <i>On the Lack of Agreement of the Participle in Compound Tenses in Old Non-Literary Catalan Texts</i> .....	23
Ana María García Martín, <i>El texto traducido como fuente de datos histórico-lingüísticos: estudio de un caso en el Portugal de quinientos</i> .....	45
Anna Krzyżanowska, <i>Sur la place des noms d'émotion dans les études contrastives</i> .....	67
Mikołaj Nkollo, <i>Quirks in Old Spanish Noun Paradigms: a case-study in inflectional morphology and its interfaces</i> .....	81
Ondřej Pešek, <i>Concessive Clauses in Li livres de Confort de Philosophie by Jean de Meun: a case study of an idiolectal performance</i> .....	93



## REVIEWING POLICY

1. Each paper is refereed by two mutually independent reviewers reputed for their extensive knowledge of matters dealt with in SRP's given issue. The affiliation of both of them is outside of AMU's Institute of Romance Studies. Since papers are submitted in languages not spoken in Poland, one of the referees is affiliated to a foreign academic institution. The requirements that should be met are specified in "refereeing templates" available at: <http://neo.amu.edu.pl/ifrom>  
Please, notice that each review results in an eventual statement as to the acceptance / lack of acceptance of the paper.
2. Reviews have a written form and are prepared in compliance with double-blind peer review model. It implies that both referees and authors do not know each other's identities. Assisting staff will, then, take care of removing authors' names from the metadata (document properties). Temporarily, for the purposes of reviewing process, authors' names, addresses and e-mails, will be deleted also from submitted files that are sent to reviewers.
3. If two conflicting opinions are issued by reviewers, the article is declined. However, its author may apply to the Board of Editors for an extra-referee. His / her opinion is decisive.

Abstracted / Indexed in:

Index Copernicus International – IC Journals Master List, EBSCO Publishing, CSA  
Linguistics and language Behavior Abstracts, Central European Journal of Social  
Sciences and Humanities (CEJSH)

International Medieval Bibliography, Linguistic Abstracts, Scopus, European  
Reference Index for the Humanities (ERIH)

Webpage:

<http://neo.amu.edu.pl/ifrom>

(includes guidelines for authors, style sheet and requirements related to ethics in  
publishing)

Online version (eISSN 2084-4158):

<https://repozytorium.amu.edu.pl/jspui/handle/10593/1741>



## GUIDELINES FOR AUTHORS / STYLE SHEET

**Languages:** Catalan, French, Italian, Portuguese, Romanian, Spanish.

**Ethics in publishing:** For ethical guidelines for publications in *Studia Romanica Posnaniensia* see Subection: *Ethics and Integrity in Publishing* at <http://neo.amu.edu.pl/ifrom> (Section “Studia Romanica Posnaniensia”). Authors are requested to disclose any present, past or potential conflict of interests (in terms of financial, personal or other relationships) with other people or institutions that could negatively influence their work. Submitting your paper implies acceptance of principles stated in that document.

**Author names and affiliations:** Author’s names: Times New Roman 12 block capitals. Author’s affiliation: Times New Roman 12.

**Original scholarly studies:** All the articles, reviews and contributions presented will have to be original and cannot have been previously published in any other language or in other journal, including online ones.

**Length:** Please do not exceed 40,000 characters (including spaces, author’s name, email address, keywords, abstract and references).

**Typeface:** Times New Roman 12 for article’s main texts. Italic style for titles, examples and expressions in foreign languages. Articles should be double-spaced throughout.

**Sections and subsections:** Divide your paper into clearly defined and numbered sections. Subsections should be numbered 1.1 (then 1.1.1, 1.1.2, ...), 1.2, etc. (the abstract remains out of section numbering).

**Format: rtf and doc** are preferred. Not editable files are disallowed. Please, take care of removing your name, address, affiliation from the metadata (peer reviewers work anonymously). If you include graphics, please join them as separate files (jpg, tiff, eps, pdf) and state clearly where each of them is to be inserted.

**Quotations:** Short verbatim quotations should be enclosed within « ... ». Longer quotations (5 lines and more) should be included as a separate paragraph with 0.7 cm indentation.

All citations in the text should refer to: 1. Single author: the author’s name (without initials, unless there is ambiguity) and the year of publication; 2. Two authors: both authors’ names separated by *and* in respective Romance languages and the year of publication; 3. Three or more authors: first author’s name followed by “et al.” and the year of publication. Citations may be direct or parenthetical. If quoting from a reference, page numbers should also be indicated. E.g. (Sag, 1996: 21).

## TEMPLATES

“as demonstrated (Manzini, 1996a, 1996b, 1999; Manzini and Jones, 1995), ....”  
or “Kramer et al. (2000: 421-423) have recently claimed ....”

**Footnotes:** Please, use your footnotes sparingly. Number them consecutively throughout the article, using superscript Arabic numbers. Times New Roman 10.

**Acknowledgments:** Please, insert your acknowledgments as a separate section at the end of the article before the references. Do not place them on the title page, as a footnote to the title or otherwise. List those individuals and / or institutions who provided substantial help during the research (e.g., providing language help, writing assistance, financial support, etc.).

**Abstract:** Times New Roman 12. 150-200 words in English. Please, check whether your spelling is correct. The abstract should state briefly the purpose of the research, its methodological framework and major conclusions. As it is often indexed or presented separate from the article, please take care of writing it so as to render it able to appear alone.

**Keywords:** 4 to 6 in English.

**Special Issues:** Persons interested in submitting a special issue (monographic, consisting of a series of max. ten articles, written in a single language) should contact the Editor at the address: [mink@inea.pl](mailto:mink@inea.pl).

**Title and sub-title:** Times New Roman 14, bold. Succinct and informative. Keep on mind that titles are often used in indexing and information-retrieval programs.

**References:** Times New Roman 12. Please ensure that every reference cited in the text is also present in the reference list (and vice versa).

## TEMPLATES

### **a. Book (one author):**

DUMITRU, Bejan (2001): *Gramatica limbii române: compendiu*. Cluj-Napoca: Echinox.

### **b. Book (two or more authors):**

ÁLVAREZ, Rosario; MONTEAGUDO, Henrique; REGUEIRA, Xosé Luis (1986): *Gramática galega*. Vigo: Galaxia.

### **c. Chapter in an edited book:**

CHAROLLES, Michel (1994): «Anaphore associative, stéréotype et discours». In: Catherine SCHNEDECKER, Michel CHAROLLES, Georges KLEIBER & Jean DAVID [ed.], *L'anaphore associative: Aspects linguistiques, psycholinguistiques et automatiques*, (Recherches Linguistiques, XIX). Paris : Klincksieck, 67–90.

**d. Review article:**

WEBER, Clifford (1989): «Egeria's Norman homeland». *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 42: 437-456.

**e. Webpage:**

URL: <[http://www.seelrc.org:8080/grammar/pdf/stand\\_alone\\_romanian.pdf](http://www.seelrc.org:8080/grammar/pdf/stand_alone_romanian.pdf)>. (Last accessed at: date: day, month, year).

Web references can be listed separately (after the reference list proper) under a different heading if desired, or can be included in the reference list.

## Reviewers

KRZYSZTOF BOGACKI (Uniwersytet Warszawski)  
KLAUS GRÜBL (Ludwig-Maximilians Universität, München)  
MARC-OLIVIER HINZELIN (Universität Hamburg)  
EVA-MARIA REMBERGER (Universität Wien)  
GRAŻYNA VETULANI (Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza, Poznań)  
JORGE VERGA VILANOVA (Universität Hamburg)  
MARZENA WATOREK (Université de Paris 8 & CNRS)

Adres redakcji:  
Instytut Filologii Romańskiej UAM  
Al. Niepodległości 4  
Collegium Novum  
61-874 Poznań  
Poland

Redaktor: *Elżbieta Kostecka*  
Redaktor techniczny: *Dorota Borowiak*  
Łamanie komputerowe: *Eugeniusz Strykowski*  
Projekt okładki: *Ewa Wąsowska*

WYDAWNICTWO NAUKOWE UNIWERSYTETU IM. ADAMA MICKIEWICZA W POZNANIU  
61-701 POZNAŃ, UL. FREDRY 10  
[www.press.amu.edu.pl](http://www.press.amu.edu.pl)

Sekretariat: tel. 61 829 46 46, faks 61 829 46 47, e-mail: [wyd nauk@amu.edu.pl](mailto:wyd nauk@amu.edu.pl)  
Dział sprzedaży: tel. 61 829 46 40, e-mail: [press@amu.edu.pl](mailto:press@amu.edu.pl)

Ark. wyd. 7,50. Ark. druk. 7,50

DRUK I OPRAWA: UNI-DRUK, LUBOŃ, UL. PRZEMYSŁOWA 13