PhD 19655

Medieval Occitan grammatical writings: the adaptation of Latin linguistic analysis to vernacular languages.

Andrew Charles Anthony Woode.

Queens' College.

Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Cambridge University.

March 1995.

UNIVERSITY

Medieval Occitan grammatical writings: the adaptation of Latin linguistic analysis to vernacular languages.

Andrew Charles Anthony Woode.

Summary.

The thesis discusses theoretical issues arising from Occitan grammatical writings. The principal text studied is the *Leys d'amors* of Guilhem Molinier. Attention is also given to the *Donatz proensals* of Uc 'Faidit', the *Razos de trobar* of Raimon Vidal and the *Regles de trobar* of Jofre de Foixà, and to Iberian texts influenced by the *Leys*, particularly the *Torcimany* of Luys d'Averçó, the *Art de trobar* of Francesch d'Olesa, and the *Arte para ligeramente saber la lengua arauiga* of Pedro de Alcalá.

Occitan grammarians worked from the Latin grammatical model. A contemporary view held that all languages had the same core grammar, though features based on phonetic form (*vox)* varied from one language to another. In addressing the issues where Occitan and Latin diverged in morphology and syntax, the grammarians show diverging strategies in describing the vernacular. Raimon is unsophisticated and partial, Uc largely conservative over the whole grammar, while Jofre is highly innovative. Molinier attempts to maintain core grammatical unity between the vernacular and Latin, while allowing for linguistic diversity affecting the *vox*. He explains some theoretically aberrant forms by exempting them from *gramatica* to be explained by *uzatges.*

The grammarians' strategies are examined with reference to a number of issues. One of these is the presence of the definite articles and of certain prepositions before nouns, where no such forms occurred in Latin. Jofre's use of the terms *article* and *preposicio,* which is similar to modern understandings, represents a break with tradition and destroys grammatical unity with Latin. Molinier describes both categories without departing from the Latin model by adapting the Modistic term *habitudo casualis,* 'case-relationship'. This term is adopted by Luys d'Averçó and Pedro de Alcalá.

Elsewhere within the core grammar, Molinier uses a Latinate analysis with some informal additions. This is seen in the treatment of tense and mood, where Jofre is more radical, and in word division. On issues attributed to the *vox,* he shows greater independence, as in the treatment of verbal voice *(gendres),* nominal gender, inflection-classes, comparison, and all issues concerned with sounds and accent. Nominal inflection, of great practical importance, is also treated by the other Occitan grammarians. Their rules are not close to Latin except in Uc, who makes some use of Latin-derived declensions. Uc's analysis of verbal inflection, the sole comprehensive attempt to address this issue in the tradition, is also Latinate in preserving the traditional conjugations.

Acknowledgement

I would like to express my thanks to my supervisor, Dr V. A. Law, for her help and guidance during my research.

This dissertation is the result of my own work and includes nothing which is the outcome of work done in collaboration.

Andrea Woode.

Table of contents

1. Introduction to the texts studied and the linguistic background.

1. 1. Introduction

1. 2. Texts.

1. 2. 1. The *Razos de trobar* and the *Regles de trobar.*

1. 2. 2. The *Donatz proensals.*

1. 2. 3. Purpose of the early works.

1. 2. 4. The origin of the *Leys d'amors.*

1. 2. 5 The text of the *Leys d'amors.*

1. 3. The language described by the grammarians.

1. 4. Sources.

1. 4. 1. Latin sources.

1. 4. 2. Vernacular sources.

1. 4. 3. Representatives of vernacular tradition.

1. 5. 0. Iberian vernacular grammars.

1. 5. 1. The *Torcimany.* and the *Art de trobar.*

1. 5. 2. Pedro de Alcalá.

1. 5. 3. Castilian reception of the *Leys.*

1. 5. 4. Note on citations.

1. 6. The names and territory ascribed to Occitan.

1. 7. Note on some previous studies.

2. The Latin theoretical background and the structure of the gram mars.

2. 0. Introduction.

2. 1. 1. Medieval views on the universality of grammar

2. 1. 2. Pedro and the relationship between languages.

2. 1. 3. The Occitan grammarians and the relationship between languages.

2. 1. 4. General theoretical views of Jofre and Uc.

2. 1. 5. Molinier's general theoretical views.

2. 2. 1. The parts of speech in the Latin tradition.

2. 2. 2. The parts of speech in the Occitan writers.

2. 3. Reduction and expansion of the scope of the grammatical model in the *Leys*

2. 4. Terminology

2. 4. 1. Terminology in the *Leys.*

2. 4. 2. Terminology in the *Regles.*

2. 4. 3. Derivation and etymology of technical terms.

2. 5. The concept of usage in the Occitan tradition

2. 5. 1. Usage in Latin writers.

2. 5. 2. Usage in the Occitan grammarians.

2. 5. 3. The geographical limits of usage.

2. 5. 4. The usage of the troubadours.

2. 5. 5. Usage and the restricted occurrence of grammatical forms.

2. 5. 6. Usage and the discussion of complex regular patterns.

2. 5. 7. The contrast of usage with *artz.*

3. The articles, the prepositions, and the understanding of case.

3. 1. 1. The Occitan linguistic situation.

3. 2. 1. Prepositions and articles in Latin and Occitan.

3. 2. 2. Medieval opinions on the article.

3. 2. 3. Priscian on the Greek article

3. 2. 4. The *articulus* as a marker of case in medieval Latin grammars.

3. 3. 1. The prenoun forms in the Occitan grammars.

3. 3. 2. The concept of the *habitutz* in Molinier.

3. 3. 3. Inconsistent application of the *habitutz* system.

3. 3. 4. The forms of the *habitutz comunas*

3. 3. 5. The *habitutz proprias.*

3. 3. 6. The semantic and syntactic use of the article.

3. 3. 7. The origin of the term *habitutz.*

3. 3. 8. The *habitutz* and the relationship to gender.

3. 3. 9. The *habitutz* and the article.

3. 4. 1. Articles and *(h)abitutz* in the Iberian grammars.

3. 4. 2. The *abitut* in the *Torcimany.*

3. 4. 3. The *habitut* in the *Art de trobar.*

3. 4. 4. The noun, article and case-marking in Pedro de Alcalá.

3. 4. 5. The category of the *abitud* in Pedro de Alcalá.

3. 4. 6. Distinctions between the *abitudines.*

3. 4. 7. The *abitudines* of the ablative.

3. 5. 1. Syntactic government based on case in the Occitan writers.

3. 5. 2. Syntactic case-distinction in the *Regles.*

3. 5. 3. The concept of *regimens* in the *Leys.*

3. 5. 4. The metaphor of *regimens* in the *Leys.*

4. The grammatical analysis of the verbal system.

4. 1. The structure of the treatment of the verb in the Occitan grammars.

4. 2. The analysis of voice *(genus verbi).*

4. 2. 1. The linguistic situation.

4. 2. 2. The Latin analysis.

4. 2. 3. *Gendres* in the *Leys.*

4. 3. Tense in Occitan grammarians.

4. 3. 1. The Latin tense system.

4. 3. 2. General features of the Occitan analysis.

4. 3. 3. Tense in the *Leys.*

4. 4. The moods.

4. 4. 1. The Latin analysis.

4. 4. 2. The subjunctive/ optative distinction in Latin.

4. 4. 3. The subjunctive/ optative distinction in Occitan grammars.

4. 4. 4. The extension of the optative in the *Leys.*

4. 4. 5. The conjunctive marker *cum:* Occitan or Latin?

4. 4. 6. The treatment of 'ungrammatical' Occitan uses of the moods.

4. 5. 1. The moods and tenses in the *Regles de trobar.*

5. The inflection-classes of Occitan.

5. 1. 1. The Latin theoretical background.

5. 1. 2. Occitan noun morphology.

5. 2. 1. The practical need to discuss Occitan nominal inflection.

5. 2. 2. The analysis of nominal inflection in the *Razos, Regles* and *Donatz.*

5. 2. 3. Noun-inflection in the *Leys.*

5. 2. 4. Nouns with sibilant stems.

5. 2. 5. Imparisyllabics.

5. 2. 6. Molinier's rejection of declension.

5. 2. 7. Uc on declension.

5. 3. Verb inflection.

5. 3. 1. Linguistic background and practical issues.

5. 3. 2. Verb rules in the *Razos* and the *Regles.*

5. 3. 3. The *conjugaços* of the *Donatz proensals.*

5. 3. 4. Verb inflection in the *Leys.*

5. 3. 5. Molinier's rejection of *conjugatios.*

5. 3. 6. Conjugational distinctions and the *Leys'* concept of *pronuntiatios.*

6. The analysis of nominal gender in the Occitan grammarians.

6. 1. The linguistic and theoretical background.

6. 2. Gender in the Occitan grammarians.

6. 3. The explanation of the basis of gender.

6. 3. 1. The theoretical background.

6. 3. 2. The analysis of the *Leys.*

6. 3. 3. The recognition of *gendres vocals* in the *Leys.*

7. The word divisions of Occitan.

7. 1. 1. Words in Latin and Occitan: the linguistic and theoretical background.

7. 1. 2. Word division in Jofre.

7. 2. The analysis of the *Leys.*

7. 2. 1. Terminology.

7. 2. 2. Word division in contractions and clitics.

7. 2. 3. Word division in the verbal system.

8. Comparatives and superlatives.

8. 1. 1. Introduction.

8. 1. 2. The Latin analysis.

8. 1. 3. The Occitan linguistic situation.

8. 2. Molinier's analysis of comparatives and superlatives.

8. 2. 1. The comparative and the marker *mays / plus.*

8. 2. 2. The treatment of the superlative.

8. 2. 3. The contrast of form and meaning in comparatives and superlatives.

9. Conclusions.

6. The analysis of nominal gender in the Occitan grammarians.

6. 1. The linguistic and theoretical background.

6. 2. Gender in the Occitan grammarians.

6. 3. The explanation of the basis of gender.

6. 3. 1. The theoretical background.

6. 3. 2. The analysis of the *Leys.*

6. 3. 3. The recognition of *gendres vocals* in the *Leys.*

7. The word divisions of Occitan.

7. 1. 1. Words in Latin and Occitan: the linguistic and theoretical background.

7. 1. 2. Word division in Jofre.

7. 2. The analysis of the *Leys.*

7. 2. 1. Terminology.

7. 2. 2. Word division in contractions and clitics.

7. 2. 3. Word division in the verbal system.

8. Comparatives and superlatives.

8. 1. 1. Introduction.

8. 1. 2. The Latin analysis.

8. 1. 3. The Occitan linguistic situation.

8. 2. Molinier's analysis of comparatives and superlatives.

8. 2. 1. The comparative and the marker *mays / plus.*

8. 2. 2. The treatment of the superlative.

8. 2. 3. The contrast of form and meaning in comparatives and superlatives.

9. Conclusions.

1.

1. 1. Introduction

This thesis will seek to address a number of issues arising from the medieval Occitan grammatical tradition, with particular reference to the way in which the writers of the relevant texts adapted the Latin grammatical tradition in order to achieve their perceived goals. It will also address the application of some Occitan solutions to the study of vernacular grammar within the Iberian peninsula. The focus of my work will be on the theoretical issues which arise from the attempt to write vernacular grammars in the absence of an accepted grammatical model for this enterprise. Since all the writers studied base their solutions on Latin grammar where Latin and the vernacular are similar, the main methodology will be an examination of the strategies used by the grammarians where there is a clash between the two languages.

The areas studied are the following:

The handling of the definite article and those prepositions which were equivalent to Latin case-endings, along with a general account of the understanding of nominal case (Chapter 3).

The analysis of verbal morphology, with reference to voice and moods and tenses (Chapter 4).

Inflection and inflection-classes in the noun and verb (Chapter 5).

The analysis of nominal gender (Chapter 6).

The issue of word division (Chapter 7).

Comparison (Chapter 8).

The fundamental issue involved is that of whether all languages conformed to one particular grammatical model (the only candidate for such a model being the various contemporary developments of normative Latin grammar); and, if so, what constitutes the core of the grammar which must be present whatever the surface forms may be. Unlike the situation in contemporary Latin grammar, where differences of o-

pinion on these issues had little practical effect on the grammars' description of Latin, the solutions chosen have immediate practical consequences when applied to the vernaculars. Some of the grammars would be highly misleading if applied mechanically and the more inappropriate analyses in them are generally caused by the constraints of a Latin model. The study of vernacular texts thus displays the practical results of those theoretical Latin discussions in which there is some awareness of linguistic diversity and of the possibility of giving a grammatical account of European vernaculars.

This issue is introduced in Chapter 2, with reference to the Latin background and the policies of the vernacular grammarians, particularly with reference to their understanding of Latin treatments of the parts of speech. I discuss some of the ways in which the grammarians adapted their theoretical models to combine fidelity to Latin with a description of the surface features of Occitan.

While most of the discussions assume that the main grammatical background of the Occitan works is provided by Latin sources, it will also be argued that, on a number of issues, the texts show a common background, in which particular Romance forms were used to gloss the Latin forms which served as examples of grammatical categories. Particular examples of this will be provided under the discussions of the article and the subjunctive and optative markers, and in the section on the comparative and superlative (Chapter 8).

Most stress will be given to the *Leys d'amors* (Gatien-Arnoult 1841; Anglade 1919), with reference where relevant to the *Razos de trobar* and *Regles de trobar* (Marshall 1972), and the *Donatz proensals* (Marshall 1969)[1]. These editions (except Gatien-Arnoult) should be consulted for detailed information on manuscripts, authorship, and sources beyond that provided here. I shall concentrate on grammatical is-

[1] These will be abbreviated in this thesis as *Leys, Razos, Regles* and *Donatz* respectively.

sues, to the exclusion of literary theory[2], and shall be addressing material thematically according to theoretical interest and general applicability to the Occitan language. No systematic attempt will be made to expound the total doctrine of any text on grammatical issues or compare details of form with attested forms elsewhere; for these details, insofar as they are not addressed in the course of this study, see Marshall 1962 and the editions.

1. 2. Texts.

1. 2. 1. The *Razos de trobar* and the *Regles de trobar.*

Chronologically, the first of these works was the *Razos de trobar,* probably written around 1200. It was the work of Raimon Vidal de Bezaudun (Besalú), a Catalan, and was addressed largely to his compatriots. It was known to the authors of both the *Regles* and the *Leys.* The *Regles de trobar* was written between 1286 and 1291 by Jofre de Foixà, also a Catalan, at the request of Jacme II, the king of Sicily, and is based to some extent on the *Razos* (on which it generally improves). See Marshall (1972, lxvi-lxxv).

1. 2. 2. The *Donatz proensals* .

The *Donatz proensals* of Uc 'Faidit' was written at some period between 1225 and 1245, with the latter part of the period being most likely. It was commissioned by two Italian noblemen, Giacomo di Mora, and Coraduccio di Sterleto, at the court of the emperor Frederick II. (See *Donatz* 62.) The text was thus composed in Italy, from which country all the extant MSS derive. For an identification of the author with Uc de St. Circ see Janzarik 1989.

1. 2. 3. Purpose of the early works.

Raimon Vidal's *Razos* have the stated aim of 'far conoisser et saber qals dels trobadors an miels trobat et mielz essenhat, ad aqelz qe·l volen apenre, con devon se-

---

[2]While this exclusion naturally gives an unbalanced picture of the impression of the works as wholes on their readers, the grammatical portions can generally be satisfactorily explained in terms of the grammatical tradition alone.

gre la dreicha maniera de trobar' (*Razos* 2). Jofre sees Raimon's work as giving 'doctrina e ensenyamen' to troubadours and others, and sees his own role as supplemental. He states that Raimon's book is something that cannot be understood without knowledge of the *art de gramatica,* while *trobar* is something which pertains to lay people. Therefore he has decided to write 'alcuna manera de doctrina en romanç' so that people may better learn 'lo saber de trobar' (*Regles* 56).

Uc's work is described in two manuscripts as intended 'ad dandam doctrinam uulgaris prouincialis et ad discernendum inter uerum et falsum uulgare' (*Donatz* 88). It consists largely of a grammar structured around the Latin parts of speech. One feature found in the *Donatz* alone among the Occitan works is a list of rhymes, in which different qualities of the vowels *e, o* and *a* are explicitly distinguished. A list of verbs by conjugation, another useful grammatical resource, is probably also intended to be of use in finding rhymes.

1. 2. 4. The origin of the *Leys d'amors.*

The *Leys d'amors* were originally commissioned by the Consistori del Gay Saber, a literary society which under the title of the Académie des Jeux Floraux subsists to the present day. The *Leys* describe the foundation of the society as follows:[3]

Per so, en lo temps passat, foron en la reyal nobla ciutat de Tholoza .VII. valen, savi, subtil e discret senhor, liqual hagro bon dezirier e gran affectio de trobar aquesta nobbla, excellen, meravilhosa e vertuoza dona Sciensa, per que lor des e lor aministres lo gay saber de dictar, per saber far bos dictatz en romans, am losquals poguesso dire e recitar bos motz e notabbles, per dar bonas doctrinas e bos essenhamens, a lauzor et honor de Dieu nostre senhor e de la sua glorioza Mayre, e de totz los Sans de Paradis, et ad estructio dels ignorens e no sabens, e refrenamen dels fols e nescis amadors, e per viure am gaug et am l'alegrier dessus dig, e per fugir ad ira e tristicia, enemigas del Gay Saber.

E finalmen li dit senhor, per miels atrobar aquesta vertuoza dona Sciensa, lor gran dezirier e lor bona affectio mezeron ad execucio. E tramezeron lor letra per diversas partidas de la Lenga d'Oc, afi que li subtil dictador et trobador venguesso al jorn a lor assignat, per so que·l dig .VII. senhor po-

---

[3] See also Anglade 1919, IV, 15-39.

guesso auzir e vezer lor saber, lor subtilitat e lors bonas opinios, e que apenre pogues la us am l'autre, e la dita nobla poderoza e vertuoza dona trobar.

E per que miels venguesso, promezero donar certa joya de fin aur [...].' (Anglade 1919, I, 8).

The letter was sent out in 1323, and the first meeting began on the 1st of May, 1324. After the account of the occasion, and the award of the prize to Arnaut Vidal de Castelnoudari, the text continues (14-15):

Quar li dit .VII. senhor jutjavan ses ley e ses reglas que no havian, e tot jorn reprendian e pauc essenhavan, per so ordenero que hom fes certas reglas, a lasquals haguesson recors et avizamen en lor jutjamen. Et adonc comezero de bocca a mestre Guilhem Molinier, savi en dreg, que el fes e compiles las ditas reglas, am cosselh de l'honorabble e reveren senhor mossen Bortholmieu Marc, doctor en leys; e si casian en alcus doptes que aquels reportesso al cosselh de lor Gay Consistori. E cant las ditas reglas foron faytas en partida, li dit .VII. senhor volgro que fossan appelladas LEYS D'AMORS.

This work was finally promulgated in 1356. Given the circumstances of its commissioning, the text may be the work of others beside Molinier, and the numerous corrections which are found in the Toulouse manuscripts (according to Anglade 1919, IV, 31) may bear witness to this. Nevertheless, the attitudes and methodology found in the work, and the explicit and implicit internal connections, do display sufficient consistency to be ascribed to one author, and it will be assumed here that the work as a whole is the responsibility of Guilhem Molinier.

1. 2. 5 <u>The text of the *Leys d'amors.*</u>

(See Anglade 1919, IV, 129-142, and Gonfroy 1980, 49.)

The *Leys d'amors* exists in a number of versions.

(a). A longer redaction, represented by the Toulouse MS (Académie des Jeux Floraux, no. 263 printed by Gatien-Arnoult (1841)) and by a Barcelona MS (Arxiu de la corona d'Aragó, MS 13 S. Cugat del Vallés). Anglade states that the latter generally abbreviates the former. This version was produced between 1330 and 1340. Its constituent parts deal broadly with the definition of *trobar;* definitions of the elements of speech, from letter to word, and a discussion of accent; versification; the eight parts

of speech; vices and figures; and a basic guide to putting material into verse.[4] These six subjects are treated in six books in the Barcelona MS; the Toulouse version has five, with its first book corresponding to the first two of the Barcelona version. Gatien-Arnoult's edition, from which I quote, is to be used with caution. It will be referred to henceforth simply as *Leys.* The parallel-text French translation is highly unreliable in its treatment of technical terms.

(b). An entirely versified redaction, highly abridged in comparison with the earlier version, from which it is apparently derived. Some of the verse definitions found in it are also integrated into the longer prose versions. Location: Biblioteca de Catalunya, no. 239, f 160-184v. The composition of the text is dated around 1340. Edition: Anglade 1926 (extracts in *Romania,* 1919, 161-178). It is usually referred to as the *Flors del gay saber.*

(c). A second prose version, Toulouse, Académie des Jeux Floraux, no. 500.006.[5] It was composed no earlier than 1355. This manuscript abbreviates the substance of the first redaction into the latter two of its three books, while giving in its first book an account of the historical background of the production of the Leys, and a general discussion of the preliminary issues involved in literature, moving through the theological and philosophical background, the various sciences, a discussion of rhetoric in particular, and of its foundation on *locutios*, truth, justice, good judgement, prudence and good counsel. It is the manuscript printed by Anglade (1919).

All four manuscripts are thought to have been written in the fourteenth century.

---

[4]See Anglade 1919, IV, 138 for the summary of contents in the two MSS. Note that the final book consists merely of a simple guide to putting things into verse, finding rhymes by going through the alphabet, and avoiding padding; a rather more extensive amount of material is promised in the summary.

[5]My letters to the Académie about the MSS have been answered evasively or not at all. This reference is from Anglade 1919.

The wish to provide rules for the Occitan literary language is the ultimate motivation for the production of the texts, even in those works which are more narrowly concerned with grammatical issues. The *Leys* are consequently concerned with any issue which might influence the composition of a poem and provide a standard for judging it; orthography and pronunciation (important for rhymes), the technicalities of verse; the rhetorical figures; acceptable subject matter; and the grammar of the language used.

1. 3. The language described by the grammarians.

The descriptions of Occitan given in the writers often do not tally with what is known about the common practice of the troubadours. Various reasons may be given for this, including ignorance, but it would appear this is in part because the grammarians did not simply accept the written tradition as the source of a 'correct' Occitan. Both Raimon Vidal and Molinier claim that some forms used by troubadours are incorrect (*Razos* 18; *Leys* II, 370). (Raimon simply reproves the troubadours; Molinier provides an excuse for the offending forms in older troubadours, but rejects them for his own day.)[6] Jofre de Foixà is reluctant in theory to criticise the consensus of troubadour usage, and is happy to recognise more than one form as valid, but his rules would imply that commonly used forms (such as the article forms *lo* and *la* in the nominative) were incorrect. Uc does not address the issue of potential errors by writers, and it remains unclear what he regards as standard. To quote Marshall (1962, 159): 'The *Donatz* cannot be absolutely relied on as a guide to either the spoken or the written usage of its time, since it appears to mingle elements of both in a personal combination the elements of which cannot be exactly gauged'. All the writers are confident of their own ability to legislate on the literary language which they describe, and the spoken language influences most of them to some degree. Nevertheless, the hallmarks of the literary language, such as the ancient case-system, are carefully

[6]References in the *Leys* to the older troubadours are minimal, and the usage in 'antics dictats' is rarely a grammatical issue. But even N'Ath de Mons, who is frequently quoted, usually with approval, is not exempt from criticism.

maintained (despite 'mistakes' in detail), and they are not intentionally describing the vernaculars of their own day.

While the narrowly literary aspects of the texts will not generally be discussed here, it is important to distinguish between the ethos of this whole tradition and the very different one of much contemporary Latin grammar, a discipline of some relevance particularly to the *Leys d'amors;* in the speculative grammarians, it is the study of grammar itself which is paramount, and there is a considerable input of philosophical thought and terminology. Of course, the standard texts which had remained in use since the late classical age, such as the *Institutiones grammaticae* of Priscian, show a similar interest in codifying, explaining and in some cases reproving the usage of an established corpus of literature, and this had remained part of the tradition. The Occitan emphasis is consequently hardly revolutionary; but it is none the less significant.

Another similarity to the standard pedagogical texts is seen in the interest in codifying the morphological system of Occitan, at least to the extent that was perceived to be useful to the readers. However, neither in morphology nor in syntax can the texts be described as attempting complete coverage, although sections occur (notably on noun inflection, which is almost the only feature shared by all the texts) where most of the relevant issues are treated. The *Leys* is the longest work and in many respects the most detailed, but its coverage is varied both in its completeness and the degree to which it is concerned, both explicitly and implicitly, with issues relevant to the needs of the aspiring poets to which it is addressed. For instance, the discussion of the sounds of Occitan contains frequent references to versification and rhyme, and neglects a number of theoretical issues potentially valid in Occitan but not needed to discuss the issues raised. By contrast, much of the discussion of the parts of speech introduces consistent grammatical distinctions, based on the Latin equivalents, for single elements or categories of Occitan; mention of Occitan poetry becomes rare and grammatical examples are generally in prose.

1. 4. Sources.

This study will not attempt to list all the grammatical sources actually or potentially used by the grammarians. For a general guide see Marshall 1962 and Anglade 1919. Some attributions missing from those works will be made in the course of the thesis. For the more well known sources (particularly those of the classical and early post-classical period) I cite relevant texts without constant reference to earlier identifications of sources, principally by Marshall and Anglade, to whom all succeeding generations of students owe a debt.

1. 4. 1. Latin sources.

The following Latin works will be cited in this study, many in connection only with the study of the *Leys d'amors.*

The classical sources are the works of Donatus (*Ars minor, Ars maior,* see Holtz 1981) and the *Institutiones grammaticae* of Priscian (texts in Keil 1855). These are the primary sources for the whole grammatical tradition of this period and are potentially relevant to all the texts; Molinier uses all three. The relevance of these texts is already well-known, although this thesis will present some new interpretations of their use by Occitan writers. Another commonly known early work is the *Etymologiae* of Isidore of Seville (560-636); it is an important source for the first book in the three-book version of the *Leys,* but is of only slight relevance to the linguistic sections.

Among the medieval works, the following are of interest.

The work of Petrus Helias, who was active between the 1120's and 1150's. His *Summa* on Priscian's *Institutiones grammaticae* was widely circulated and used by later writers. Some features of the *Leys* derive ultimately from him, though in most cases via a known intermediate source, the *Catholicon* (see below).

The works of Alexander de Villa Dei (*Doctrinale,* 1199 (Alexander 1893)), and Eberhardus Bethunensis (*Graecismus,* probably 1212 (Eberhardus 1887)). These were versified texts intended as reasonably elementary guides to aspects of grammar. Both were widely circulated. The *Graecismus* is an acknowledged source for the

Leys; the *Doctrinale* is not mentioned, but must have been known to Molinier. By his time it was among other things a set text at the University of Toulouse.[7] A minor source for the *Leys* is the *Elementarium* glossary of Papias; Anglade (1919) noted the reference in *Leys* III, 212 to Papias (1966: 67).

The major medieval grammatical source used in the *Leys* was the *Catholicon* of Johannes Balbus or John of Genoa, dated to 1286 (Balbus 1971). This consisted of a grammar followed by an alphabetic dictionary; both sections were extensively used by Molinier, who occasionally refers to the source explicitly. The *Catholicon* proves to be of great importance to the Molinier, who derives several discussions from it with minimal adaptation; the details of this influence have not generally been observed.[8]

The *Leys d'amors* also shows signs of contact with the Modistic writers, from whom Molinier derives the characteristic term *maniera de significar,* which represents *modus significandi.* The use of this term is not however particularly similar to that of the Modistae, and it is used infrequently, inconsistently and sometimes in ways not found in those writers. No interest is shown in using the complete system of the *modi*, and on some occasions Modistic solutions are rejected. There are a number of other parallels between elements of these texts and several important discussions in the *Leys,* although it is impossible to prove verbal dependence on any one source; some of Molinier's terms, such as *habitutz,* cannot correctly be understood without reference to this tradition. Relatively few of these Modistic links have previously

---

[7]Thurot (1964, 102)quotes *Statuta universitatis Tolosanae:* 'Scholares, antequam ad determinandum in artibus admittantur, congrue sint in grammatica edocti, et Doctrinale et Grecismum audiverint, dummodo in studiis aut aliis locis ubi grammaticalia didicerint dicti libri legantur'.

[8] Anglade (1919, IV, 85) mentions the text but notes only the occasions (*Leys* I, 80; III, 330) where Molinier names his source. Other examples of its influence are seen in *Leys* I, 14; I, 58 etc. (Balbus 1971, 13 etc); II, 22, 24, 26; II, 68 (Balbus 1971, 49); II, 88 (Balbus 1971, 56); II, 238 (Balbus 1971, dictionary entry *tempus)* . Not all of these will be discussed, as some are irrelevant to specifically Romance issues, and Molinier frequently takes over Balbus' work without major change.

been noted. I shall be citing from the following texts, without wishing to imply that they were directly known to Molinier. The editions cited should be consulted for further details about the texts in question.

The *Modi significandi sive quaestiones super Priscianum maiorem,* by Boethius de Dacia (Boethius 1969), written before or around 1270. It enjoyed a considerable circulation in France, Germany and Italy.

Martinus de Dacia, *De modis significandi,* written before 1288 (Martinus 1961). This is structured as a manual and was widely used and commented.

Johannes de Dacia, *Summa grammatica* (Johannes 1955), written around 1280. This was conceived on a large scale but remained highly incomplete. Two manuscripts survive.

Radulphus Brito, *Quaestiones super Priscianum minorem* (Radulphus 1980), written before 1317 (probably around 1300). Two manuscripts survive.

Sigerus de Cortraco or Siger de Courtrai, *Summa modorum significandi* (Sigerus 1977), dated between 1305 and 1341.

Thomas of Erfurt, *Grammatica speculativa* (Thomas 1972), dated between 1300 and 1310, and widely circulated.

From a slightly earlier period than that of the Modistae, I cite also from the Priscian *maior* commentary ascribed to Robert Kilwardby (MS 191, Peterhouse, Cambridge – see also Kilwardby 1975) and from the commentary on the *Doctrinale* known as *Admirantes* (Orléans, Bibliothèque Municipale, Cod 299, pp 1-185[9]).

1. 4. 2. Vernacular sources.

Raimon Vidal and Uc give no overt sign of having used an earlier vernacular grammatical source. For Jofre de Foixà the major and acknowledged source is Raimon Vidal.

The *Leys'* only source for vernacular grammar is the *Razos de Trobar* of Raimon Vidal, who is explicitly quoted in connection with the authority he ascribes to the speech of Limousin. The *Leys* claim that this authority is not all-encompassing,

[9]I would like to thank the Bibliothèque Municipale for permission to use a microfiche copy of this text.

extending only to points of grammar in the forms of the noun and verb rather than the language as a whole.[10] Little however in the *Leys* is specifically derived from Raimon, largely owing to the lack of detail of the *Razos* and its restriction to a few features of grammar.[11] Raimon's use of traditional grammar is occasionally unorthodox and therefore less likely to be followed.[12] In the forms discussed in both, it is difficult to prove a connection given that there are no obvious examples where similar rules would not arise naturally from shared knowledge of the language. On one point, where both discuss the use of *cre* as a first person form despite the example of the troubadours (Bernat de Ventadorn and At (N'Ath) de Mons respectively[13]) there may be a connection, though the treatment is diverse (see Chapter 5). The unquestioning use of the six cases of Latin as basic categories, and the distinction (rather limited in Raimon) of several different patterns of case endings is shared but is again so universal that it is likely to represent a shared background rather than indicating depend-

[10]As is well known, there is in fact a misunderstanding here based on problems of terminology. The *Leys* interpret *Lemozi* as referring narrowly to the speech of the geographical area so named, while Raimon uses *Lemosy* to refer to Occitan in general. See *Leys* II, 402; *Razos* 6; Marshall 1962: 363.

[11]Marshall points out (1962, 367) that while a number of passages appear to recall Raimon's opinions (which are often rejected) it is doubtful that Molinier really needed the treatise to remind him of these points, and several passages expand on the presumed source. Examples in the *Leys* concern: *leyau* etc. (II, 208), the languages suitable for poetry (II, 392), the common gender of *verges* (II, 72), the confusion of first and third person forms (II, 266), preterites in *-i* and *-ic* (II, 372), *midons* and *sidons* as both nominative and oblique forms (II, 186, 214).

[12]This is the case for his basic grammatical division of words into substantives, adjectives and those which are neither (8). In traditional terms, the first two classes include nouns (*boneza, cavals* vs. *fortz, vils*) and verbs (*sui, estau* vs. *am, vau)* as well as pronouns (*ieu* as a substantive). This shows a difference of emphasis in elevating the substantive/adjective feature to great importance, while neglecting by comparison the more basic distinction of parts of speech; in addition, the substantive verbs here quoted go beyond the standard three.

[13]*Razos* 20, *Leys* II, 370.

ence. One text almost certainly not available to the *Leys* is the *Regles de trobar* of Jofre de Foixà, whose pioneering use of the term *article* in a vernacular grammar to refer to the forms which moderns regard as the definite article would surely have had an impact on the *Leys'* extensive discussion of and completely different interpretation of the same forms, even if his solution had been rejected.

The issue of whether Molinier knew the *Donatz Proensals* is hard to decide. (See Marshall 1962, 370; Anglade 1919, IV, 97-98.) A number of similar rules as to forms are given, but the possibility that much of this similarity is due to treatment of the same issues must be admitted, and the result is not conclusive. (No other evidence exists of the text being known at all outside Italy.) There is an interesting parallel in that both show similar translations for *utinam: per* or *am mo vol* and *volunters/ volontiers.* Since the need for a simple translation of *utinam* is seldom met outside a grammatical context, this is not simply a matter of their describing the same language. The use of *cum* with the subjunctive, however it be interpreted, is also not an idea which is unavoidably imposed by the language. A grammatical link therefore seems assured, but it may not be a vernacular one; a common tradition as to the oral translation of Latin grammatical terms into Occitan for teaching purposes would answer the case as well. If Molinier did have a knowledge of the *Donatz*, he largely ignored its structure even when he had no ready replacement of his own, (as in the paradigms of the verb and the concept of conjugation), a fact which might seem to invite some explanation. And he disagrees with Uc on a number of formal issues; no echo of doubt or of the presence of alternative views occurs on this account.

1. 4. 3. Representatives of vernacular tradition.

It is my contention that aspects of the grammatical analyses, especially in Uc and Molinier, are derived from conventions current in the vernacular exposition of Latin grammar. No texts are available which represent how this was carried on in the period previous to the Occitan grammars, or how it was practised in Occitania in particular. Some light is however shed on the topic by the French-language texts in Städtler (1988). The majority of these texts are elementary accounts of Latin gram-

mar, with French glosses of some of the Latin forms, and French examples occasionally replacing Latin ones. The texts range in date from the late thirteenth to the fifteenth century. Those texts quoted in this thesis are from the fourteenth century and thus represent opinion contemporary with Molinier.

1. 5. 0. Iberian vernacular grammars.

Molinier's works were widely used in Catalonia, where poets still maintained an approximation to the Occitan language as the linguistic norm. (Catalan was the medium of prose.)

Martí de Riquer (1984-88, II, 23) comments on the *Leys:*

Aquesta important obra gramatical i poètica es divulgà extraordinàriament per Catalunya, no tan solament mitjançant còpies manuscrites que hi foren executades, ans encara mercès a l'obra d'alguns tractadistes que esmentarem a llur lloc. És obra que té gran interès per a l'estudi dels aspectes formals de la poesia catalana de mitjan segle XIV i fins ben entrat el XV.

Writers like Johan de Castellnou and Johan Blanch were involved with the Consistory at Toulouse. In 1393 and 1395, and more regularly from 1398, the Consistory of Barcelona met, with Jacme March and Luys d'Averçó as 'rectors, mantenidors i defensors'. This institution was intended to further the same traditions as its namesake in Languedoc; a 1398 document signed by Martí I, as part of the process of establishing the Barcelona Consistory, informs us that writers had previously been in the habit of sending their poetry to Toulouse.

1. 5. 1. The *Torcimany* and the *Art de trobar.*

The first Catalan work discussed will be the *Torcimany,* composed by Luys d'Averçó (Averçó 1956), one of the *mantenidors* mentioned above. Since it lacks any reference to the Barcelona Consistory, it was probably composed before this period. The *Leys* and the *Flors* are major and acknowledged sources in this work wherever material is discussed that Molinier had also treated.

The second Catalan text which I shall discuss, of lesser extent and importance, is the *Art de trobar* of Francesch d'Olesa (Llabrés y Quintana 1909). Written in 1538, it belongs to a time when the tradition of the *Leys* had ceased to be dominant in the

Catalan regions. The author however looks back in time for his inspiration; he laments (51) that 'aquesta art que'ls antichs anomenavan **Gaya scientia**, estigues sepultada y quasi en vniversal oblivio'. He talks of disinterring an ancient art, and of needing to refer to works in the Limousin (Occitan) language to do so. In conformity with this attitude, several aspects of his grammatical doctrine are clearly derived from the tradition of the *Leys,* though much is based on other sources.

1. 5. 2. Pedro de Alcalá.

A third Iberian text is somewhat exceptional in being concerned neither with the writing of poetry nor with the description of a Romance vernacular. It is provided by two books produced by the Spaniard Pedro de Alcalá: the *Arte para ligeramente saber la lengua arauiga,* and the *Vocabulista arauigo en letra castellana* (1505; see Pedro 1929). These were intended for those wishing to learn the colloquial Arabic language of Spain for the purpose of working among Arabic-speakers newly 'converted' to Catholicism. They consist of a grammar of Colloquial Arabic, along with liturgical and confessional texts, and a Spanish-Arabic vocabulary. The language of instruction is Castilian, but it is stated that some knowledge of Latin grammar is expected of readers: 'qualquiera que tenga a vn mediano entendimiento con alguna noticia a vn que sea muy poca dela lengua latina. ligera y mas que ligeramente pueda alcançar noticia della [la lengua arauiga]' (Pedro 1929, *Arte,* a2v). The intention is stated to be 'hablar y enseñar la lengua de la gente comun. y no los primores dela gramatica arauiga' (Pedro 1929, *Arte,* a5r). In accordance with this, a number of important features of the Classical language are excluded from grammatical consideration, though they appear to varying degrees in the liturgical texts.

While some knowledge is displayed of Arabic grammatical terms and procedures, the grammar forces the Arabic language into a Latinate framework. As I hope to show, one element in the European sources consists of material from Molinier, most probably from the *Flors del gay saber.*

My analysis depends for the knowledge of Colloquial Spanish Arabic on the work of Corriente (1977), in whom Alcalá's work is one of the texts used as sources.

(Corriente however only discusses Alcalá's own analyses where they shed light on issues not fully able to be addressed on the basis of textual evidence and other primary sources; none of these issues are discussed below.) This has to be used in conjunction with information about the classical language (for instance in Wright 1974). Alcalá's use of the Arabic grammatical tradition has been addressed in part by Cowan (1983), whose article identifies most of the technical terms used; for some further idea of their original context, see for instance Shirbini (1981). It is my contention that in the analysis of case, the only area discussed in this thesis, the Arabic terms are entirely subordinated to a Latin-Romance analysis, and the Arabic tradition will not therefore be discussed in detail.

Both studies above cite from Alcalá according to the edition of Lagarde (1883). It should be noted that this edition is exceedingly misleading, both in its transcription of diacritics and attempts at correction of the text, though this is partly mitigated by an extensive apparatus. The original editions and their facsimile (Pedro 1929) are to be preferred.

1. 5. 3. Castilian reception of the *Leys.*

By contrast with the wide distribution in Catalonia, there is relatively little evidence of the *Leys'* currency in regions of Castilian speech. Given that Pedro's work is written in Castilian, it may be worth summing up what is known of the use of the work in this region.

The main attestation is in Enrique de Villena (1384-1434). A bilingual, he was at one stage involved in running the Catalan Consistory, as he details in his *Arte de Trobar* (Menéndez y Pelayo 1927). This text also includes a misleading account of the history of the Consistory of Toulouse, with a reference to Guilhem Molinier and the *Leys.* Some terminology used by him is from the tradition of the *Leys;* examples are the terms *plenisonante, semisonante,* describing vowels. The text is known only in a fragmentary form, so there are many areas of the grammar where no comparison can be made with Molinier's works.[14]

[14]This applies for example to the markers of case.

The dedicatee of the *Arte de Trobar,* the Marqués de Santillana, also gives the impression of having some knowledge of the work, since in his *Prohemio de los proverbios* he makes a statement about what it does not contain (Santillana 1988, 220-21). His information may however simply be derived from Villena, since elsewhere (Santillana 1988, 444) he classifies writers on the basis of second-hand information.

1. 5. 4. Note on citations.

The texts in Marshall (1969; 1972) are quoted as printed; where two MSS are printed I have cited one text only unless major issues arise from a comparison of the two. The *Leys* quotations come mainly from the Gatien-Arnoult edition, which I have respected. It will be noted that the edition differs from modern practice in the details of its distinction of ‹u v› and ‹i j›, which represent single graphemes in the manuscript. The word divisions of the edition do not correspond in all details to the MS practice (see the reproduction of the first page facing I, 2), and certainly not to the theoretical distinctions made in the text. Quotations from Pedro de Alcalá are from the facsimile edition (Pedro 1929). The Arabic citations from this text follow Pedro's transcription.[15] Technical terms are usually cited in a form derived from the text in question[16]. Generally, Occitan terms are quoted in the nominative, in order to achieve consistency with the texts' own practice of quoting words in that form; this also tends to maximise the difference between the Latin and Occitan versions of the same term.

---

[15]In this transcription, normal Castilian graphemes are pronunced as in contemporary Castilian. The diacritic ˘ marks accent. To transcribe "letras [...] cuyos sones no tenemos en nuestro a.b.c. latino" (Pedro 1929, *Arte,* c3v-c4v) Pedro places diacritics derived from the Arabic forms on the Castilian letter to which they are closest; thus ċ renders ش and ḋ renders ذ. خ is transcribed by ح• on h, ع by ء on any vowel. In this thesis, the diacritics ح• and ء are replaced by • and ‘ respectively for typographical convenience.

[16]Spelling has not been adjusted to any external norm, but choices have been made between competing forms from the same text.

1. 6 The names and territory ascribed to Occitan.

The geographical extension ascribed to the language under discussion, and the names it receives, have been well studied by Gonfroy (1980) and Lafont (1966/7). Here I will note simply that the *Leys* restricts the area to politically French territories with a potentially similar language, excluding from its purview not only Gascony but also Provence. The names given to the language in the earlier texts use regional names to express the whole Occitan area; Raimon (*Razos* 4) gives the name *lemosy* to a language spoken in 'Franza [...] Lemosi [...] Proenza [...] Alvergna [...] Caersin'. Both Jofre and Uc, writing for an Italian public, talk of Provençal (*Proensales, provençhal),* again meaning a wider area, defined by Jofre as 'lengatges de Proença, de Vianes, d'Alvernya, e de Limosi, e d'altres terres qui llur son pres, las quals parlen per cas' (*Regles* 64). Molinier refers to his language most normally as *romans* in the body of the text, especially when the contrast, explicitly or implicitly, is with Latin; he is of course the only writer who is describing the local vernacular of his intended readers, rather than that of a foreign country. However, Romance forms from other languages are on occasion specifically criticised. In the three-book prose version, he adopts the relatively new term of *lenga d'Oc* for the language under discussion, when comparing it with foreign languages like French, Norman, Picard, Breton, Flemish, English, Lombard, Navarrese, Spanish, and German (Anglade 1919 II, 178); the only acknowledged territory of those who '*Oc* oz *o* dizon' which still remains excluded is Gascony. It has therefore seemed appropriate, in a discussion generally focused on the *Leys d'amors,* to use the term Occitan for the language under discussion, following the preference of modern scholarship.

1. 7. Note on some previous studies.

It should be noted that much earlier study of the texts is related to issues that will not come to the fore in this thesis. This includes all the elements of purely literary theory in the tradition, including those which derive from Donatus' *Ars maior.* In the field of metrical and literary terminology, Molinier's work remains one of the bases of the modern analysis; note for example a modern discussion of versification in Riquer

1983, where the medieval treatises are described as an 'ayuda eficaz' (I, 34) and there are repeated references to the rules given in the *Leys.*

Considerable attention has been devoted in previous literature to using the texts, in particular the *Leys,* as sources of particular forms and as shedding light on the phonology and morphology of their period. This is the main interest of Lienig (1890), and of the citations in Anglade's grammar (1921) and in the modern account of the dialects in Ronjat (1930-41). Interpretation of the texts is thus confined to a few issues of detail, though even here not all the interpretations are necessarily correct. (It should also be noted also that not all the external evidence used by Lienig and Ronjat to interpret particular phonological issues is completely accurate or relevant.[17]) While these issues of detail shed light on the authors' background and competence, they are not of great interest grammatically, and will not generally be addressed here.[18]

Grammatical issues are raised frequently in Marshall 1962, which addresses, among other works, all the Occitan grammatical texts studied here. This thesis is very

---

[17]Unfortunately, Marshall (1962, 976; 1969, 299-300) gives a spurious credibility to Lienig in citing him as a source of dialect evidence on the pronunciation of the derivative of Latin *-ll-.* in Molinier. Lienig's claim, based on a reading of a vague statement in Mistral (1879-86, II, 173) is contradicted by the evidence of Ronjat (II, 150), Gilliéron 1902-09 and Ravier 1978, and is any case not primary evidence from the dialects.

Molinier refers to the sound in question as the *l* which 'sona suaumen', as distinguished from the *l* which 'sona fortmen' derived from a single Latin *l* (*Leys* I, 38). Both sounds are presumably distinct from those shown by the graphemes ‹lh› (<Latin l + yod), and ‹ll› in *sillaba* and *ellumenada.* While the *Leys* give no indication as to its phonetic value, making it a minor issue for the study of the text, it should be noticed that the opinion of Lienig and Marshall, according to whom it is a geminate, and the opinion of Ronjat (1930-41, II, 149), who sees it as [λ], are both difficult to square with the modern Toulouse dialect evidence (where both sounds of Molinier's ‹l› have merged unconditionally) and with the fact that Languedoc geminates do not derive from Latin ones (Ronjat II, 150).

[18]On similar grounds, no use has been made of Gonfroy 1981 which, being concerned with the first three books of the Barcelona prose version of the *Leys,* does not handle the core grammatical issues.

valuable in assembling the data relevant to many of the important grammatical issues, but does not investigate all such issues in great theoretical detail; most stress is given to the texts' sources and their accuracy as grammars of Occitan. An introduction to some of the most important theoretical issues involved in the Occitan tradition is given by Law (1986); Swiggers 1989 discusses the basic issues arising from the *Razos* (and its immediate successors) and the *Donatz*.

2.

The Latin theoretical background and the structure of the grammars.

2. 0. Introduction.

All the vernacular grammarians studied in this thesis were acquainted with the standard Latin grammatical paradigm, derived from the works of Priscian and Donatus, and appear to have accepted this tradition without question as being the normal method of describing Latin grammar. Their analyses of the vernaculars are based very largely on the Latin model; this is especially noticeable in issues such as the use of the six Latin cases, which no modern analysis would accept as useful categories in the analysis of Occitan, Catalan or medieval Arabic. None, however, is wholly faithful to the details of the Latin system; a simple example is provided by the formal expression of the 'cases', where vernacular forms naturally replaced the Latin case-endings. To some extent, this qualified adherence to the Latin model can be explained practically. There was an absence of alternative grammatical models,[1] and the Latin tradition had provided a detailed analysis of one language only. In such circumstances, less sophisticated analysts would naturally use the familiar model as far as possible, modifying it only when they were aware of major difficulties.

This chapter investigates the theoretical dimension of this issue, starting from medieval Latin views on the relationship between languages and on which elements of the grammar were universal or particular to individual languages (2. 1. 1). It will then be shown how such issues are addressed, both explicitly and implicitly, by the vernacular grammarians. The general position of individual grammarians is sketched in 2. 1. 2-5. There follows an analysis of Occitan treatments of the parts of speech, which were regarded as the most basic and universal elements of grammar (2. 2.).

---

[1] The only substantially different tradition was that of Arabic, which was at least partially known to Pedro. Among the Occitan grammarians a direct knowledge of Greek (allowing some greater understanding of the references to Greek in the Latin grammatical tradition) is not *a priori* excluded historically, though in most cases unlikely on the basis of their work.

Section 2. 3. discusses the way in which Molinier balances theoretical conservatism about the relationship between languages with strategies which effectively restrict the relevance of Latin grammar to Occitan. Section 2. 4. studies the way in which the theoretical decisions of the Occitan grammarians are expressed in their use of terminology. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the concept of 'usage' (2. 5.), a traditional concept of Latin grammar which is used by the Occitan grammarians to define their language in terms of space, time, and literary level, but is also employed as a strategy to permit the acceptance of forms which would otherwise have to be rejected as ungrammatical in terms of the Latinate theoretical paradigm.

2. 1. 1. Medieval views on the universality of grammar

The Occitan grammarians and their associates operated in a period in which much attention was given by grammarians to the issue of whether all languages shared one grammar.[2] (See Lusignan 1986, Fredborg 1980.) Petrus Helias represents the view that the grammars of various languages were *species* of grammar, giving them a certain autonomy from one another. This allows him to refer to separate Greek, Latin, Hebrew, and 'Chaldean' grammars, and to look forward to a possible grammar of French and other languages.[3] For other writers, this distinction of different species is unacceptable. Guillaume de Conches states that 'sunt enim artes generales et eaedem apud omnes, quamvis diverse Graecus eas per diversas expliceret vo-

[2]In the classical texts read by these grammarians, this issue had not been addressed as a matter of theoretical importance. However, Priscian makes frequent comparisons between Latin and Greek, making it plain that the two languages have much, but not everything in common in terms of their standard grammatical analysis.

[3] Helias 1993, 63-64: 'Species cuiuslibet artis sunt qualitates quas artifex per artem attribuit materie. Cum enim species pluribus modis accipiatur, hic pro forma vel pro qualitate ponitur. Sunt ergo species artis gramatice linguarum genera in quibus ars gramatica tractata est et composita. Vocem enim format artifex in diversa linguarum genera secundum artem gramaticam. Est autem gramatica composita in lingua greca et latina, hebrea et caldaica. Et possunt huius artis species crescere, hoc est plures esse, ut si gramatica tractaretur in gallica lingua, quod fieri posset, sive in aliqua alia in qua nondum tractata est.'

ces' (Fredborg 1980, 71). This became a normal Modistic view. Boethius de Dacia devotes his second *Quaestio* (Boethius 1969, 10) to the proposition that 'Omnia idiomata sunt una grammatica'. His positive argument for this is that *scientia* and logic were the same in different languages and among different peoples ('apud diversos'); hence 'scitur eodem modo in diversis idiomatibus'. Were this not the case, logic and the essential concepts of *scientia* would differ from language to language.

This claim of unity could obviously not be extended to every detail of the language. Boethius concedes the clear difference in sound between equivalent utterances in different languages, leading to mutual incomprehension:

Sicut [...] graecus aliquem conceptum exprimit, sic et latinus eundem conceptum exprimit quantum ad omnia, quae sunt essentialia grammaticae, licet orationes eorum differant in figuratione vocum (1969, 12).

Sciens grammaticam in uno idiomate non loquitur in alio idiomate nec intelligit hominem loquentem in alio (1969, 13).

This difference is due to the 'diversitas vocum et figuratio diversa earundem' (1969, 14), which is *accidentalis* to the grammar.

This view is in full accordance with his basic linguistic model. The ultimate source of grammar is the qualities of objects. These give rise to the modes of being, understanding and signifying, and only at the lowest level to the modes of speaking.

Cum tota grammatica accepta sit a rebus [...] et quia naturae rerum sunt similes apud omnes, ideo et modi essendi et modi intellegendi sunt similes apud omnes illos, apud quos sunt illa diversa idiomata, et per consequens similes modi significandi, et ergo per consequens modi constituendi vel loquendi. Et sic tota grammatica, quae est in uno idiomate, est similis illi, que est in alio idiomate (1969, 12).

This argument assumes a one-to-one relationship between the modes at every level, deriving ultimately from the things themselves. From the identity of the modes comes the identity of the parts of speech, or at least the major ones (see below for qualification):

Ponatur nomen vel verbum, quod est apud graecos, unum oportet esse in specie cum nomine vel verbo apud nos. Modus enim significandi unus est, qui reponit partem in specie partis; et si differentiae speci-

ficae sunt eaedem in specie, ergo et ea, quae construuntur, sunt eaedem in specie; et sicut dictum est de nomine et verbo, eodem modo dicendum est de aliis partibus orationis et de tota grammatica, quae non est diversa apud diversa idiomata. Ipsa enim una est necessario in specie, solum diversificata secundum diversas figurationes vocum, quae sunt accidentales grammaticae (Boethius 1969: 13).

The *vox,* or phonetic form, is marginalised from the grammar. As Radulphus Brito says (1980, I, 135; compare Boethius 1969, 40-42) 'grammaticus non habet considerare vocem per se, sed ut accidit sibi esse habilius signum ad exprimendum mentis conceptum'. The actions of the *instrumenta naturalia* are not within the grammarian's province at all. He is interested in it 'secundum quod ipsa est subiectum modorum significandi et secundum quod ex ea constituitur pars orationis per superadditionem modorum significandi'. Thus it is the modes of signifying, rather than the *vox,* which are the real subject of the grammarian's attention. The *vox* is merely 'habilius signum inter omnia signa ad exprimendum mentis conceptum'. This mention of other potential signs confirms that the *vox* as such is peripheral to the grammar. However, it still retains a one-to-one relationship, via the modes, with the concepts of the mind, and therefore with reality. This further denies the possibility that grammar might vary, at any level, from simple correspondence to reality and hence from one language to another.

There are signs that the Modistae at some points assume identity of practically the whole of the grammatical system between languages, or at least those sections of it which are commonly described using the modes. (Issues requiring explicit reference to the *vox,* such as inflection-classes, tend to be absent from their works.)

This is not however the explicit claim of these writers. Rather, they make a weaker claim that 'partes orationis in diversis idiomatibus sunt eaedem essentialiter et diversificatae accidentaliter' (Boethius 1969, 14). This qualification arises from the need to explain why, for instance (Boethius 1969, 10) 'graeci habent articulum pro una parte orationis, nos autem non'. Hence it becomes necessary to claim that this difference is accidental: 'hoc totum accidit, non autem est essentiale' (14).

The understanding of the article will be analysed in detail below. Here we need note only that in this tradition, the article is regarded purely as a marker of case, number and gender, with case being primary. As such it can be regarded in the same light as these grammatical features. Following Priscian's description of these as accidents of the noun, the Modistae ascribe them to *modi significandi accidentales.* (The more basic units, the *modi significandi essentiales,* vary slightly between the authors.[4] They are most usually confined to the most basic definitions of each part of speech.)

The underlying wish is to claim as much identity as possible for the grammar as expressed in different languages. The *vox* has obviously to be explained away; its status as *accidentalis* is consistent with the grammatical model, which accords little importance to issues of phonetic form even when they are crucial to aspects of Latin grammar, such as the voices of the verb *(genera verbi).* The concession that the identity of grammar is confined to essential differences is limited to specific issues like the problem of the article. It does not mean that other *modi accidentales* can simply be reanalysed according to individual languages. Were this the situation, the cases, tenses, moods and genders could differ thoroughly from language to language. In fact, the discussions of such accidents in the Modistae bear little sign of an awareness that they might be limited to one language.

2. 1. 2. Pedro and the relationship between languages.

The most explicit statement by one of the vernacular grammarians studied concerning the relationship between the grammars of different languages comes from

---

[4]Martinus de Dacia regards the *modi significandi essentiales generales* as being the basic definitions, such as for the noun, *modus habitus et quietis et determinatae apprehensionis,* for the verb, *modus fieri distantis a substantia* (Martinus 1961, 10, 13). These would also be *essentiales* for Boethius. Martinus also regards the majority of the *species* of the noun, such as the appellative, proper, substantive, general, special, etc., as *modi speciales* which also appear to be *essentiales* (19-26); the later list of nominal *modi accidentales* includes *species* (primitive/ derivative distinction), *genus, figura, numerus, casus, persona* (33-43).

Pedro de Alcalá. In his case, the issue was much more pressing, and the solution far from obvious. He was describing a language which diverged from the Latin models more comprehensively than the Romance vernaculars. In addition, he had several grammatical models available. As well as the general Latin tradition, and Occitan grammar in particular, he had some acquaintance with Arabic grammar, from which he quotes technical terms, procedures, and on one occasion an entire sentence (Pedro 1929, *Arte,* b4r). He states unequivocally:

Las mesmas difiniciones y declaraciones que ay en una lengua quanto ala comunicacion delos terminos en su manera. essas mesmas son en todas las otras [...]. Ca por la mesma razon que este nombre pedro es nombre proprio enla lengua latina. por essa mesma lo es enla arauiga. Pero porque algunos no piensen. que ansi como la lengua arauiga es defetuosa de tiempos y modos enla materia del verbo. assi lo sea en defeto de todas las partes. dela oracion. porne de cada vna dellas algo. porque es verdad que las ay todos complidamente en especie. a vn que no ansi en numero. como enla lengua latina (*Arte,* a3r).

His practice is correspondingly Latinate. The Latin eight parts of speech are distinguished, instead of the (Classical) Arabic three. The six cases are imported from Latin; there is no more morphological justification for this than for the same procedure in Romance vernaculars. Bizarrely, Pedro quotes six Arabic terms as the names of the cases, equivalent to the Latin ones. In fact they are an artificial list drawn from unconnected areas of the Arabic grammatical analysis. Assimilating Arabic terminology to Latin is in itself not surprising; what is strange that Arabic technical terms should have been introduced, in what is avowedly not a technical grammar, when they make no distinctions not already present in the Latin ones.

In the verbal system, Pedro does not attempt to claim complete identity between the Arabic and Latin systems. He is however firmly Latinate in his presentation of the paradigms, and in the recognition of several constructions as simple verbs when other analyses might have been more appropriate. This might be less surprising were it not that he shows awareness of Arabic analyses which would have been far easier even for a Castilian reader to assimilate.

Pedro de Alcalá. In his case, the issue was much more pressing, and the solution far from obvious. He was describing a language which diverged from the Latin models more comprehensively than the Romance vernaculars. In addition, he had several grammatical models available. As well as the general Latin tradition, and Occitan grammar in particular, he had some acquaintance with Arabic grammar, from which he quotes technical terms, procedures, and on one occasion an entire sentence (Pedro 1929, *Arte,* b4r). He states unequivocally:

> Las mesmas difiniciones y declaraciones que ay en una lengua quanto ala comunicacion delos terminos en su manera. essas mesmas son en todas las otras [...]. Ca por la mesma razon que este nombre pedro es nombre proprio enla lengua latina. por essa mesma lo es enla arauiga. Pero porque algunos no piensen. que ansi como la lengua arauiga es defetuosa de tiempos y modos enla materia del verbo. assi lo sea en defeto de todas las partes. dela oracion. porne de cada vna dellas algo. porque es verdad que las ay todos complidamente en especie. a vn que no ansi en numero. como enla lengua latina (*Arte,* a3r).

His practice is correspondingly Latinate. The Latin eight parts of speech are distinguished, instead of the (Classical) Arabic three. The six cases are imported from Latin; there is no more morphological justification for this than for the same procedure in Romance vernaculars. Bizarrely, Pedro quotes six Arabic terms as the names of the cases, equivalent to the Latin ones. In fact they are an artificial list drawn from unconnected areas of the Arabic grammatical analysis. Assimilating Arabic terminology to Latin is in itself not surprising; what is strange that Arabic technical terms should have been introduced, in what is avowedly not a technical grammar, when they make no distinctions not already present in the Latin ones.

In the verbal system, Pedro does not attempt to claim complete identity between the Arabic and Latin systems. He is however firmly Latinate in his presentation of the paradigms, and in the recognition of several constructions as simple verbs when other analyses might have been more appropriate. This might be less surprising were it not that he shows awareness of Arabic analyses which would have been far easier even for a Castilian reader to assimilate.

In the Arabic verbal paradigm, it had been traditional to start from the third person singular masculine of the past tense (i.e. the perfective in general Semitic terms), since this is the form showing only the consonants of the root (e.g. ضَرَبَ **ḍa-raba**). Pedro shows awareness of the practice, though not perhaps of its rationale, when he says that 'de costumbre los arauigos comiençan el verbo enel. preterito perfecto. y bien razonablemente. ca primero fue lo passado que lo que tenemos de presente' (Pedro 1929, *Arte,* b4r). However, he himself starts his paradigms from the first person singular present indicative, and uses this as the citation form, precisely as in Latin. Thus when he conjugates the verb for 'to drink', he starts from *naxarŏb,* 'yo beuo'. [5]

The influence of Latin grammar is also seen his exclusion of gender-distinctions from the verbal paradigms, despite their importance in the third person singular. The most extreme manifestations of the Latinate analysis are seen in his citation of pronominal forms as the present tense of a putative verb 'to be' and of the presentation of an Arabic possessive construction (in origin a locative construction) as being a verb 'to have' without any indication of the different syntax between the languages.

2. 1. 3. <u>The Occitan grammarians and the relationship between languages.</u>

The Occitan grammarians do not make explicit statements about their view of the grammatical relationship between Latin and the vernacular. Their treatment of a number of specific issues does however make it possible to discover their underlying

---

[5] However, Pedro in practice analyses several features of Arabic in ways contradicting the Latin grammatical model. This is notable in his restriction of the verb system to two moods (*Arte,* 62v-b3r), the indicative and the imperative. The former has two tenses, 'presente y preterito perfecto', while the second is confined to the present tense and the second person. The tense names are clearly linked to Arabic forms, and suppletive constructions corresponding to other Latin tenses and moods are not dignified with the Latin analysis. Thus the equivalent of the Latin 'preterito imperfecto del indicatiuo' is conveyed by 'el presente del indicatiuo con este adverbio o nota qui'. Similarly, the pronominal suffixes (*damires)* are regarded as suppletive in their use as possessive pronouns and as the 'persona paciente' of verbs (*Arte,* b1v).

assumptions. It is not however clear if these formed part of a coherent and conscious analysis of the issues involved, though this is almost certainly true for Jofre and Molinier.

An assumption that the vernacular is not random, and can be described grammatically, is of course common to all, since it is implied by the process of producing the texts.

Common too is the assumption that at least some of the analyses of Latin grammar, such as the noun/ verb distinction, are applicable to the vernacular.[6] The Latin features adopted by all include some whose relevance to Occitan is not incontrovertible, such as the six Latin cases. While their adoption is in part a consequence of assumptions that such a basic feature of grammar is universally found in languages, it may in some writers testify merely to a lack of knowledge that any other possibility existed.[7] On the other hand, all the texts recognise surface differences between Latin and Occitan; all for instance give rules about types of noun inflection that recognise groups unknown to Latin.

2. 1. 4. General theoretical views of Jofre and Uc.

Beyond these common features, several of which are imposed by the subject-matter, the Occitan writers reveal several differences in their views about the applicability of the standard grammatical system to the vernacular.

While Jofre reveals little of his theoretical opinions, study of his treatment of a number of issues (see Chapters 3 and 4) shows a readiness to provide an account of Occitan which is sharply different from that of Latin and cannot be reconciled with it. The resulting system adapts the Latin model to its own purposes. While success is

---

[6]The absence of particular issues in a text does not of course imply that they were not considered true of the vernacular; Jofre implies that he suppresses some valid grammatical doctrine in the interests of simplicity.

[7]Raimon Vidal may have given little thought to the matter, while Jofre shows sufficient freedom from Latin in other areas that one might have expected him to use an analysis more suited to Romance forms if such had been available.

variable, and some otiose Latinisms are retained (no doubt for want of an obvious alternative), Jofre clearly ascribes different grammars to different languages.

Uc assumes that Occitan can basically be described according to Latin models. Some innovations are made, but much material of no practical usefulness for Occitan is maintained. There is little evidence of awareness of the issues involved in the theoretical claim of the unity of all languages. Both where such unity was claimed, as over case, tense and mood, and where it was not (as in those issues based on the *vox,* such as the declensions and conjugations), he is much more conservative than is consistent with the practical needs of his readers, though prepared to change some rules that are clearly based on form. There is no obvious sign that he attributed any grammatical autonomy to Occitan, but he is not always successful in producing an analysis which is fully consistent with that of Latin. Occasional lack of clarity, such as over the precise status of the case-markers, may flow from theoretical difficulties, which otherwise surface only when he describes a construction as 'contra gramatica' (*Donatz* 120, see 4. 4. 6). The only major innovation lies in his generalisations on nominal endings, which largely lie outside the Latin grammatical framework.

2. 1. 5. Molinier's general theoretical views.

Molinier similarly does not address the issue of the universality of grammar directly, but his opinions on this issue can be gauged from discussions of issues where Latin and Occitan showed incompatible behaviour.

Molinier shows considerable freedom in departing from Latin models, sometimes without explanation or any acknowledgement that he is doing so, when the subjects under discussion relate to the *votz* (Latin *vox,* 'sound', 'form'), as in the description of the sound-values of the letters and the accentual system.

The analysis of the letters (*Leys* I, 14-44) shows a recognition that some letters have more than one sound, and that distinct letters may have the same sound in some positions. These issues had been addressed by the Latin tradition, though Molinier's examples are naturally based on Occitan. Since he is identifying sounds well known to his audience, his descriptions of their nature are vague and limited. Terminologi-

cally, the section is limited in practice, if not in theory, by Latin. While Molinier uses the term *diptonges* for a wider number of examples than those found in Latin, he restricts it to falling diphthongs only, regarding the rising diphthongs as 'doas sillabas ajustadas en una' and 'diptonge contrafag' (I, 22). The description of accent (*Leys* I, 56-92) is more illuminating from a theoretical point of view, since it gives a full account of the accentual systems of both Latin and Romance. While the rules for the placing of the accent are as one would expect, the distinctions of types of principal accent (acute and circumflex in Latin, acute and *lonc* in Occitan) differ both from each other and from all obvious sources including the classical grammarians, Alexander and the *Catholicon*, though the last-named is Molinier's direct source for those elements of the traditional account he did retain. Among the innovations are a claim that all principal accents in Latin medial syllables are circumflex rather than acute, and the statement that accented vowels in both languages are pronounced long. Molinier thus indicates not only that Occitan is not bound by the same rules as Latin, but also that the traditional analyses of Latin are not binding on him.

Similar licence to reject the classical analysis when describing Occitan occurs when a Latin category is based on the *vox (votz)* rather than the *res (cauza)* or meaning.[8] The common and deponent voices (*genera verbi)* are dismissed because they are defined by a contrast between word-form (*votz)* and meaning which is specific to Latin and thus inapplicable to Occitan. Similar reasons appear to be responsible for the abandonment of the *omne* nominal gender.

---

[8] The distinctions involved are usually ultimately from Priscian. The extensive use of the *res/vox* dichotomy is reminiscent of Petrus Helias. In a number of examples, aspects of Latin grammar attributed by these writers to the *vox* were regarded by Modistae as deriving from modes of signifying, thus making them a more integral part of the universal grammatical model. Molinier's use of this analysis (especially when it contradicts not only the Modistae, but also the *Catholicon)* may be partly due to the fact that by attributing more importance to the *vox,* he gained more freedom to interpret Latin and Occitan in differing ways.

Molinier treats more basic parts of the grammatical model, such as the parts of speech and most of their major *acciden,* as inviolable parts of grammar, and extends the same respect even to some concepts whose Latin definitions rely on features of the *vox,* such as declension and conjugation (which the Modistae tended to exclude from their discussions). This leads to potential conflicts between the predictions of the grammar and normal Occitan. While Molinier shows independent judgement in ascribing particular Occitan forms to particular grammatical categories, he does not arrogate to himself the right to alter the categories' syntax. Each Occitan form or category is thus constrained to correspond only to one Latin equivalent form or category; where an Occitan form shows a distribution departing from this principle, the construction is regarded as in some sense incorrect. [9]

2. 2. 1. The parts of speech in the Latin tradition.

The parts of speech were of fundamental importance to the standard analysis of Latin grammar, and were explicitly claimed by several of the Modistae to be the same – at least 'essentialiter' – in all languages. As such, they were the most likely elements to be retained unchanged in vernacular grammars. However, a number of Occitan forms (such as *le, la* etc.) were hard to fit into the Latin paradigm and could potentially be used to justify modifying the treatment of this area of the grammar.

The parts of speech recognised by the medieval Western tradition showed some variation but were largely a matter of consensus. The usual list and order was that of Donatus, who recognised eight parts of speech: *nomen, pronomen, verbum, adverbium, participium, coniunctio, praepositio, interiectio* (Holtz 1981, 585). These categories were also found in Priscian, in a different order: *nomen, verbum, participium, pronomen, adverbium (interiectio), praepositio, coniunctio.* Priscian refrains from actually giving a number for the parts of speech. He recognises the *interiectio* [10]

---

[9]Examples where such conflicts arise are: partitive genitive for Latin nominative (*Leys* II, 114), accusative for genitive in *Per l'arma ton payre* (II, 390), wrong tense/mood usage (e. g. II, 286) etc.

[10]Priscian I, 54-55 'his [partibus] alii addebant etiam vocabulum *et interiectionem* apud Graecos, *quam nos adhuc servamus,* apud Latinos vero articulum addebant, quem purum per se non inveniri supra do-

but does not include it in the list of parts of speech where each part is assigned its *proprium* (Priscian I, 55). It was possible therefore to read Priscian as supporting seven parts of speech; hence Petrus Helias (1993, 880): 'interiectionem non reputat partem orationis per se [...] Queritur autem quare magis dicantur esse septem partes quam octo vel decem'. Most syntheses followed Donatus' clear lead in recognising all eight, though the choice of order and of precise definitions remained open.

The grammarians also disclosed that various other analyses, with differing numbers of parts of speech, had been attempted in the past. Of these, the only one which caused theoretical concern was the standard Greek one, which had no separate interjection but recognised the ἄρθρον, Latin *articulus* (in modern terms the Greek definite article and relative pronoun), as a part of speech. Even here, the issue was how one regarded the relationship between the Greek list and the Latin one, not whether either of them might be placed in doubt.

The membership of the classes was also largely agreed between grammarians. The *nomen* included the modern categories of noun and adjective, for which the terms *nomen substantivum* and *nomen adiectivum* were in common use by the time of the Occitan writers. The *substantivum/ adiectivum* distinction is seldom made where it is not obviously relevant. The *pronomen* includes the demonstrative and possessive adjectives; the modern relative and interrogative pronouns are placed under the *nomen* by Priscian, but under the *pronomen* by Donatus (Holtz 1981, 589). The *participia* are excluded from the verb, but the infinitive, gerund and supine remain within it, despite their ability to behave syntactically as nouns. The *praepositiones* include a number of prefixes; some are identical in form to other, separable, *praepositiones*, while others are exclusively used as inseparable prefixes. [11]

---

cuimus' (emphasis mine); Priscian II, 90: '*Romanarum artium scriptores* separatim hanc partem ab adverbiis accipere' (emphasis in Keil).

[11] Latin and Occitan terms will be used where necessary in this study to refer to the terms as distinct form the modern ones. In the interests of avoiding confusion, however, 'noun' will never be used in its narrower modern use, for which '(noun) substantive' will be used.

2. 2. 2. The parts of speech in the Occitan writers.

Of the Occitan grammarians, the majority adhere strictly to the usual model. Molinier starts his grammatical section with the information that there are eight parts of speech, and quotes an etymology for *partz* which is actually based on the number: 'podon esser dichas partz de *paritat* quar son en nombre par. per so quar son. viij.' (*Leys* II, 4).[12]

The same unquestioning allegiance to the parts of speech is found in the *Donatz.* and the *Razos* (*Donatz* 88; *Razos* 6, 7). The *Razos* supplement this in an unusual manner by treating another distinction as equally basic; that between the *aiectivas, substantivas* and those words which are neither. The *aiectivas* consist of *nomen, verb* and *particip;* the *substantivas* of *nomen, verb* and *pronomen.* The remaining, generally uninflected parts of speech are relegated to the third category.[13] The joint definition of *aiectivas* and *substantivas* is as 'acellas qe an pluralitat et singularitat, et mostron genre et persona et temps, e sostenon e son sostengudas, aisi con son sellas del nomen et del pronomen et del particip et del verb.'

The *Regles* has a rather different structure. It starts from a list of 'quantes causes deven esser guardades en trobar' (*Regles* 56); these are nine in number, and do not contain a part of speech among them as far as the Latin tradition is concerned, being in order 'rayso, maneyra, nombre, linatge, temps, rima, cas, lengatge, article' (roughly equivalent to consistency of theme, consistency of versification, number, gender, tense, rhyme (which leads on to accent), consistent use of one language, and articles). Only after these have been addressed in order is there a section which addresses the parts of speech to some extent, under the general area of giving an understanding of the cases. This does include a sort of list of parts of speech, but only in a negative

---

[12]His other etymology derives *partz* from '*partir* quar tug li mot … son enayssi partit… que son de la una o lautra daquestas'.

[13]I follow MS B and the examples here; the list in MS H appears less consistent.

sense; and even here the list is non-standard in both order and the possession of a ninth category, the *nomen verbals* (*Regles* 66):

> E per ço com seria causa greu donar a entendre a home no sabent gramatica que es nomen, pronomen, particip, nomen verbals, verbs, coniunccions, preposicions, interieccions, adverbis, per aquesta raho no havem volentat de parlar sino de aquells per los quals [hom] conesca lo cas; car per los uns enten hom puys los altres.

In the following text, the third person simple pronouns are called 'noms demostratius' and the possessive adjectives (*pronomina* in the classical analysis) are 'noms possessius' (76). Such uses would prevent the naïve reader of the text from grasping the Latin analysis. The total effect is to show that whatever opinion Jofre has about the parts of speech, he does not think that their systematic use is appropriate in his text. Consequently his own views are hard to gauge. The apparent autonomy given to the *article* would seem to elevate it almost to a part of speech, which would be a considerable breach with tradition. But this is perhaps a side issue, the important one being Jofre's refusal to address the issue at all, dismissing without discussion the elements of the grammatical paradigm for which he has no use.

The order of the parts of speech used in the *Leys* follows Donatus: *noms, pronoms, verbs, adverbis, particips, conjunctios, prepositios, interjectios*. The details of the definitions by contrast owe more to Priscian, with an admixture of Modistic terminology, and include a lot of material from the *Catholicon* (which follows Priscian's order).

2. 3. Reduction and expansion of the scope of the grammatical model in the *Leys*

As seen above, (2. 1. 1), medieval views did not make strong claims about the grammatical unity between languages at levels subordinate to the parts of speech, especially when the *vox* was a factor in the Latin analysis. Where such features are concerned, all the Occitan grammarians can be seen to have innovated with respect to Latin at some point in their works; however, the theoretical issues involved are seldom explicitly addressed, except partially in the *Leys*. As mentioned above (2. 1. 5), Moli-

nier is generally conservative in his attitude to the Latin model throughout his treatment of the parts of speech and their *acciden.* However, he has a number of strategies by which some of the more problematic consequences of this conservatism are mitigated, allowing Occitan to be described in ways that owe little to the Latin model or are objectively in conflict with it.

One of the most striking of these strategies is represented by a straightforward denial that a particular traditional category is present at all in Occitan. This is notable in the handling of inflection, where Molinier uses definitions of 'declension' and 'conjugation' which tie the terms to the specific forms of Latin; since these do not exist in Occitan the category as a whole is claimed not to exist. In their place, a relatively full account of noun morphology is inserted under the treatment of case, while some information on verb classes is implicit in the section on the *pronuntiatios* of the verb (see Chapter 5). Paradigms are avoided in both sections, and those classes which do emerge are frequently different from the Latin ones. The practical result both of this manoeuvre and that of invoking *uzatges* is to set up separate rules for the two languages while simultaneously affirming (or failing to deny) that the Latin rules are part of the core grammar theoretically shared by all languages. Had he maintained the classes, he might have been able to vary the criteria for membership (as Uc did), but might have felt obliged to produce classes similar in total membership to those of Latin.

In other areas, such as in the description of certain verb tenses and their uses, the Latin model provided insufficient distinctions. In this context, Molinier does not dispute the traditional analysis; rather, he supplements a broadly Latinate treatment of the verb with an additional section, for which originality is claimed, describing the 'ajustamens dels mozes e dels temps'. This section attempts an exhaustive analysis of the possible combinations of two finite verbs in one sentence, and manages to encompass a large amount of useful information about permissible and impermissible constructions, although the section is anything but clear and rigorous in its analysis. Its inclusion represents an innovation, though Molinier is careful within it to use only

terms and analyses which are consistent with his authorities or too vague to clash with them overtly.

The most obvious example of Molinier's attempts to preserve conformity with Latin is shown in his handling of Occitan definite articles and those prepositions which translate Latin case-relationships (rather than Latin prepositions). In order not to have to recognise a new part of speech, Molinier regards all these forms as fundamentally markers of case and treats them under that heading. This does not however prevent the recognition of the articles' inflection for gender and number, and some partial attempts to give rules for the presence and absence of the article on semantic and other grounds (see Chapter 3). Here, without invoking usage, Molinier attempts to preserve the underlying unity of grammar without misrepresenting Occitan, while disguising his own originality.

Elsewhere Molinier sometimes treats grammatical issues as being subject to practical considerations, thus undermining the status of the grammatical model even though he does not suggest an alternative for it. A number of issues which should theoretically have the same importance in both Latin and Occitan are downgraded on what can only be practical grounds. Thus both government and the difference between the ablative and accusative prepositions are first affirmed as existing and then thrust into the background as being of little practical importance, while some technical terms appear irregularly as need arises.

Occasions even arise when Molinier appears to regard grammar solely as a practical labour-saving device for acquiring competence in a particular language (an attitude which, consistently held, would render much of his text redundant). In an important passage, in the context of the discussion of case-endings (*Leys* II, 152-4), it is claimed that many lay people have a knowledge of the cases superior to that of the clerks, their *sciensa* being achieved by reading and memorising the works of the *antics dictadors*. Indeed, even among Latinists, many people exist who 'sabon parlar lati per uzatge. ses que non saubrian defendre. i. mot per gramatica'; this statement implies similarity in the learning processes between Latin and the vernacular, and is par-

ticularly subversive of the grammatical tradition. Those who cannot understand 'nostras leys' are counselled not to despair but to read, or have read to them, the works of the ancient and *aproatz* troubadours, though their inability to understand grammatical doctrine means they will have to work harder.

In the end, Molinier's attempts to subscribe to the unity of grammar and to describe Occitan cause inconsistencies sufficient to undermine the theoretical basis of his work. In its practical aspects, the work is surprisingly successful, though the exigencies of the theoretical framework cause important information to be found in unsuspected places. This is particularly true of the treatment of the *habitutz* (see Chapter 3) and the distinctions of the tenses of the verb (see Chapter 4).

2. 4. Terminology

One of the ways in which the Occitan grammarians reveal their theoretical views about the grammatical relationship between Latin and the vernacular is in their attitude to traditional terminology. Their general adherence to a Latinate model means that the majority of terms used are employed in ways fully consistent with Latin tradition, but there are a number of innovations, particularly in Molinier and Jofre.

2. 4. 1. Terminology in the *Leys.*

Molinier behaves in a way consistent with his understanding of the Latin model, narrowly interpreted, as providing the normative grammatical system. We may divide his innovations into the following categories:

a). Changes of name which clarify Latin distinctions, without deviating from them in any way. In one instance Molinier provides a list of names for a number of 'motz variables no legutz ni permezes a dire' (*Leys* II, 200 ff.). Most of these are listed as types of *barbarismus* by Donatus (Holtz 1981, 653-55), but the Latin writer gives them no special names, and nor do Molinier's usual sources. In Molinier they form a clear contrast with the 'mots diversificats legutz' (*Leys* II, 190 ff.), which are similarly provided with names specifying each category. These names by contrast are traditional; the use of 'us motz [...] per autre' is described following Donatus (Holtz 1981, 658) as 'us vicis ques apelatz *acirologia'*, while the 'diversificamens [...] per

sengles dictios' is described using terms derived from Donatus' *species metaplasmi* (Holtz 1981, 660).

Of somewhat more practical value is Molinier's distinction under *species.* Both Priscian and Balbus (a very major source in this section) had been content to use *species* in two meanings. The first covered the major division between the 'species [...] principalis, ut "Iulus", "mons"' and the '[species] derivativa, ut "Iulius", "montanus"' (to quote Priscian's initial distinction, I, 57). The second covered a host of minor distinctions, such as the four *species* of the proper noun; there is indeed a long list of those which cut across the earlier, primary distinction by being common to both principal and derivative nouns. Molinier reserves *especia* for the major distinction, and uses *maniera* (a word highly overworked in his grammar) for all the subdivisions (*Leys* II, 22 ff.).

b). New concepts within the framework of the Latin parts of speech. In a number of areas of the grammar, most grammarians identify Latin and Occitan concepts despite certain, largely formal obstacles, while Molinier refuses so to do (contrast the attitudes of Molinier and Uc to declension and conjugation, 5. 2. 6, 5. 2. 7., 5. 3. 3., 5. 3. 5.), causing him to reject a number of Latin concepts and the terms attached to them. In addition, Molinier attempts to address some of the distinctions found in Occitan for which no part of the standard Latin analysis was obviously relevant. He thus introduces terminology which is innovatory both in form and, to some extent, in its grammatical implications. He is however reluctant to challenge the Latin grammatical system by using terminology which is clearly incompatible with it. This leads to exploitation of a few key terms, such as *pronuntiatios* and *significatz,* to refer to a wide range of issues.

(i) In the verbal system, a section on the *pronuntiatios* of various forms of the verb allows Molinier to cover variant forms, some of which are based ultimately on membership of different inflection-classes. *Significatz* is used to describe the difference between differing forms of the verb (e. g. *amey, hay amat)* which happen to correspond to one Latin category. In neither case is the concept entirely spurious, since

all forms have a pronunciation and a meaning; but the use of these terms as though they were the most appropriate analyses derives from the need to avoid a clash with Latin.

(ii) One term borrowed from speculative grammar, *maniera de significar (modus significandi)* is similarly used, not on all occasions when it might be possible, but only when an extra distinction is thought necessary by Molinier. It is used to render 'meaning' when the meaning is in contrast with, or unexpressed by, the form. As such it contrasts with the Latin use, where the *modi significandi* usually correspond to the *accidentia* of Latin grammar, many of which are expressed by the word-form. In the handling of verbal voice (*gendres)* Molinier's use contradicts totally the Modistic one.

(iii) Another borrowing from the same tradition, *habitutz,* represents a different situation. In the most probable Modistic sources, *habitudo casualis* means 'case-relationship', potentially relevant to all *casuales,* but invoked in practice only when the formal expression of case was deficient. Molinier, or some intermediate source, transmutes this into a technical term for a number of Occitan forms which he regards as principally markers of case. The term is then used for these forms even when accidents other then case are at issue, while the original, more abstract use of the concept is absent.

c). This avoidance of a clash between Latin and Romance uses of terms is not a factor in the phonological-prosodic sections. Here Molinier makes a number of changes, some subtle, some obvious and very clearly deliberate given his general competence in understanding his sources. Examples are the subordination of quantity to accent, and the complete reanalysis of the Latin accentual system. Molinier here ascribes important differences to the two languages' accentual systems, showing that there are limits to the identity of the linguistic systems. But his actions can also be seen, not just as an assertion of the independence of the vernacular, but as an assertion of independence even in analysing Latin; the lack of importance given to the *vox* (phonetic form) means that even Priscian can be ignored on this issue.

2. 4. 2. Terminology in the *Regles.*

The attitudes of Jofre de Foixà to the issues raised by terminology are dramatically different. He feels himself under no obligation to keep the same analysis for Latin and Romance. On one level, this allows for the retention of classical terms while they are endowed with new meaning. Thus *article* can be used to describe the descendants of *ille,* without worry that this implies an extra part of speech; while the term *preposicions* can be used to describe *de* and *a* at all times, even when no preposition occurs in Latin.

This innovation, permitting old words to be used in modern meanings, is accompanied by an unconnected feature permitting the reverse. This is Jofre's attempt to make his grammar more accessible to the uneducated by using translations of grammatical terms alongside the usual assimilated Latin loans. Thus he uses *desirans* alongside *optatius*, *aiustans* alongside *coniunctius*, and *esdevenidor* for future (*Regles* 82-83; 86-7). While Jofre's understanding of these terms is not always very Latinate, it seems clear that in meaning, though not in form, these are not intended to be major innovations with respect to Latin.

2. 4. 3. Derivation and etymology of technical terms.

A notable feature of the treatment of terminology in many common grammatical works, from Priscian to the *Catholicon,* was the citation of etymologies for the technical terms of grammar and for other words. Molinier's handling of etymology follows the *Catholicon* in most particulars, and seldom raises any issue which is distinctively Romance. In the grammatical treatment of etymology, and of the relationship between languages (notably that of *translatios,* Leys II, 26[14]), Molinier rarely strays from Balbus' work.

---

[14]This section appears at first sight to address an issue of considerable interest, since Molinier derives a number of Romance words directly from Greek ones without a Latin intermediary. However, the section clearly derives from the *Catholicon* with the simple substitution of Romance for Latin words, thus

His etymologies for grammatical terms usually derive from the same source. Molinier supplemented the information in the grammatical portion with material from the dictionary. This was occasionally problematic, since Balbus, not wishing to duplicate his references, tends to exclude much grammatical doctrine from his dictionary. Hence definitions such as that of *tempus* often exclude the grammatical sense of the word, making Molinier's derivative definition more problematic. A number of these etymologies will be discussed in the course of the work.

2. 5. . The concept of usage in the Occitan tradition

The Occitan grammarians were forced, in pursuance of their goal of describing a literary language, to adopt a number of strategies to defend particular forms and constructions while rejecting others. In a number of examples, they were defending vernacular forms which were in some sense 'ungrammatical' according to the model employed by the author (almost always because the apparent Latin equivalent behaved differently); here the issue is that of the grammatical relationship between Latin and the vernacular. At the same time, they needed to differentiate acceptable Occitan from unacceptable forms associated with particular regions or with particular historical periods; here the issue is that of the distinction between different forms of the vernacular. In addition, all the writers (with the possible exception of Uc) decline to attempt to write a complete grammar, leaving some information to be supplied from other sources.

These issues are to some extent addressed by the important concept of usage (*usus, uzatges),* contrasted where appropriate with more 'rational' principles such as *natura, ars/ artz, ratio, analogia.*

2. 5. 1. Usage in Latin writers.

Usage had been a theme of grammatical discourse from Roman times.

Quintilian, (1920, I, 112 (1. vi. 1-3)) states that 'sermo constat ratione vel vetustate, auctoritate, consuetudine' and describes *consuetudo* as 'certissima loquendi

---

reducing the likelihood that Molinier had given much thought to the issue of a relationship between Greek and Occitan.

magistra'. In his work, usage is pre-eminent over the principles of *analogia,* to which a secondary place is assigned (1920, I, 113 (1. vi. 16)):

Non enim, cum primum fingerentur homines, analogia demissa caelo formam loquendi dedit, sed inventa est postquam loquebantur, et notatum in sermone quid quomodo caderet. Itaque non ratione nititur sed exemplo, non lex est loquendi sed observatio, ut ipsam analogiam nulla res alia fecerit quam consuetudo.

This usage is not however a wholly permissive concept. The term *consuetudo* is not extended to popular activities which 'non care[n]t reprehensione', and it is stated that whole theatres-ful of people can speak barbarously. Rather, *consuetudo* is the *consensus eruditorum* (1920, I, 132 (1. vi, 43)).

Classical views of the importance of usage were transmitted to the Western medieval tradition through Priscian's work, in which there is repeated mention of *usus.* This term on the one hand describes the modern usage which the *Institutiones grammaticae* regard as correct; on the other, it is also used to refer to the older usage of the *vetustissimi,* which is no longer regarded as correct (though it is clearly regarded as more worthy of note than contemporary errors). Thus:

sunt alia, quorum nominativus in usu non est, obliqui autem sunt, ut 'Iovis Iovi Iovem a Iove", quamvis vetustissimi nominativum quoque 'hic Iovis' proferebat' (Priscian I, 189).

itaque non solum 'una unius uni', sed etiam 'huius' et 'huic unae' et similiter 'ullae, 'nullae', 'solae', 'totae', 'aliae', 'alterae' in usu antiquiore invenimus (I, 197).

Some restrictions on the use of words and forms missing from paradigms are explained by reference to *usus* where no other feature gives a more satisfying explanation. For example:

Sunt quaedam nomina singularia vel natura vel usu: natura, ut propria, quae naturaliter individua sunt: 'Iuppiter', 'Venus, [...] 'Sol', [...] 'Italia', [...]: usu, quae singulariter proferri tradidit usus, ut 'sanguis', 'pulvis'.

One such section (Priscian I, 310) is of particular interest in that it draws a theoretical contrast between *usus* and *analogia* which is picked up directly by the

Catholicon (Balbus 1971, dictionary entry *usus)* and probably underlies statements by Petrus Helias (1993, 733):

Sunt quaedam nomina, quorum aliqui casus in usu deficiunt: quos quamvis secundum analogiam possumus proferre, tamen, quia apud auctores non invenimus, recusandos puto, ut 'huius tabi huic' et 'ab hoc tabo'. [...]

ceteri vero casus in usu non facile inveniuntur. 'maria', 'aera', 'vina', 'mella', 'hordea' genetivos et dativos plurales in usu raro habent nisi apud vetustissimos, apud quos multa praeterea deficientia invenies. oportet igitur scire quidem analogiae rationem, usum tamen auctorum magis aemulari.

These references to *usus* underline its status as a primary source of grammatical doctrine and show it being advanced as the sole explanation for apparent anomalies. However, it is mainly used to justify the absence of expected forms rather than to justify forms which might be considered incorrect by other criteria.

Rather more extensive use of the concept is seen in Petrus Helias, where the contrast between *usus* and other sources of authority can be a little more pointed:

'Facio' tamen et 'noceo' neutri dicuntur generis qua non faciunt ex se passiva in *or* licet significent rem transeuntem in hominem ut 'Facio te doctum', 'Noceo tibi', et hec quidam activa sunt significatione sed usu sunt neutra (Helias 1993, 456).

Illud quoque dicit adverbia quedam sunt hortativa ut 'age', quod videtur, inquit, pluralem habere, scilicet, 'agite'. Bene autem inquit 'videtur'. Non enim ita verum est, sed quia 'agite' de verbo translatum est in adverbium, licet ibi proprietatem verbi amittat, tamen non significatione sed usu exigente, pluralibus tamen adiungitur personis ac si verbum ibi proprie esset (Helias, 1993, 799).

Medieval writers, however, did not generally need to posit strong contrasts between the claims of *usus* and the less flexible demands of *analogia* and respect for their authorities. Unlike Molinier in the vernacular, the Latinists regard the usage of their own day as possessing an authority equivalent to that of Priscian's, and are prepared to disagree with the late classical writers, as being antiquated, in the same way that Priscian dismissed the *vetustissimi.* Thus *Admirantes* (Thurot, 1964, 113):

Dicit Priscianus: Nullum nomen prime et quinte declinationis invenitur neutri generis. Sed ista sunt prime declinationis. Ergo et cetera. Solutio. Quando dicit Priscianus: Nullum nomen..., non excludit gre-

ca et barbara nomina, quin bene possint esse neutri generis... vel aliter et melius. Priscianus dabat regulas de nominibus in tempore suo usitatis. Sed cum illa tunc non essent usitata et modo sunt, non obstat quia bene sub neutro genere reponantur. Et hoc est quod dicit Horatius in poetria sua: Multa renascentur, que iam cecidere, cadentque que nunc sunt in honore vocabula. Sic volet usus.

On occasion, however, writers record a contrast between *usus* and *analogia* where *usus* is to be followed, but where it is not thereby recorded as unambiguously correct.

Videtur ergo nobis regulariter dicendum 'delonge', 'alonge' et similia ut super penultimam ponatur accentus. Analogia tamen, ut sepe diximus, scienda est, usus vero sequendus. Magister enim locutionis est. Et velle quidem inter insanos videri doctum species quedam furoris est (Helias 1993, 733).

Et potest queri cur dicatur 'animabus' cum premissa exceptio non fiat nisi in nominibus animalium. Sed quicquid sit de cetero, sequendus est usus (Helias 1993, 430).

2. 5. 2. Usage in the Occitan grammarians.

Raimon, Jofre and Molinier explicitly refer to usage as one of the criteria relevant to grammatical decisions; Uc does not, but refers on occasion to issues which contradict *gramatica* or which seem to refer obliquely to usage. Some of the issues discussed are fully consistent with the Latin tradition, ancient and medieval, but there are also issues which display the consequences of writing a vernacular grammar. Among these are the issue of the usage on which descriptions of the language should be based. To some extent this was addressed, as in the classical grammarians, by reference to a prestigious literary tradition. An important role was also attributed to ordinary spoken usage in specified geographical areas. Geographical limitations of this sort were not an element of the normative Latin tradition, for obvious reasons; and while contemporary Latinists reflected the usage of their own day, this affected only peripheral issues within a learned language. To this extent, the description of the vernacular produced new criteria for normative usage. In addition, the relatively infrequent theoretical clashes between grammar and usage recognised in the Latin tradition became more numerous when the grammatical system was transferred almost un-

changed to the vernacular, but grammarians held back from condemning the numerous forms and constructions which thereby became technically incorrect.

2. 5. 3. The geographical limits of usage.

All the Occitan grammatical writers give some indication of the geographical limits of the language they describe, indicating at least partially that the spoken usage of the region in question has some relevance to the description and definition of the literary medium for which they legislate. For Raimon (*Razos* 4), the native speakers of the language of 'Franza [...] Lemosi [...] Proenza [...] Alvergna [...] Caersin' are authoritative:

Et tot l'ome qe en aqellas terras son nat ni norit an la parladura natural et drecha.

Generally, however, the earlier Occitan grammarians content themselves with defining the total regional extent of the language, and do not draw internal distinctions about preferred usage (even though it may be possible to read regional biases into their works). Molinier, however, is concerned to establish objective criteria making the acceptability of variant forms dependent on widespread, non-parochial spoken usage. His geographical definition of Occitan usage occurs on a number of occasions, most clearly in a lengthy discussion of At (N'Ath) de Mons' dictum '*quar us acostumat escuza fals parlar*' (*Leys* II, 388, cf At 1887, 120), where he defines *us acostumatz* as 'so es que sia acostumatz en una diocezi daquelas que son aptas per dictar en romans e no pas de las autras estranhas coma frances engles e li altre lengatge sobredig' (*Leys* II, 390). 'Aquelas que son aptas per dictar en romans' refers to the Occitan area in Molinier's definition, emphasis being placed on the fact that Gascon is regarded as *estranh* and therefore irrelevant.

Similar criteria are mentioned elsewhere (*Leys* II, 206):

Donx cant hom pauza. i. mot per autre. o alonga o abrevia alcunas dictios. o en lo comensamen. o en lo mieg loc. o en la fi. deu gardar aytan can pot que aytals motz sia acostumatz de pauzar. per aquel per loqual lo pauza. segon ques estat dig dessus. e quel alongamens el abreviamens sia ysshamens acostumatz. segons ques havem pauzat e mostrat dessus per ysshemples. e que aytals costuma no sia particu-

lars so es duna vila. o de motas. an sia be acostumat de pauzar e de dire aytals motz per una diocezi so es. i. avesquat et en mays de locz que no es una dyocesis.

Forms typical of the Toulouse region are thus not privileged, in theory at least, and are occasionally condemned if they fail to be dominant within the diocese; this is the case with the verbal endings in *-gui* (*Leys,* II, 388).

2. 5. 4. The usage of the troubadours.

Given their literary origins, all the Occitan grammars are to some extent concerned with codifying the literary language. The position of the troubadours' own usage is however somewhat complicated in their work. Both Raimon and Molinier on occasion condemn particular troubadours unambiguously[15]. Jofre implies that the consensus of the literary tradition can be regarded as correct usage, but does not regard all such usages as correct according to *artz,* while Molinier frequently distinguishes between the *antic* troubadours and the usage of his own day. However, Molinier is on occasion reluctant to condemn earlier usage even when it would be incorrect by later criteria, and is happy to see the *antic* as reliable guides on many issues. E.g. (*Leys* II, 210):

et en ayssi de trops autres los quals hom pot haver per uzatge de parlar. e cant es doptes sis podon dir en una maniera o en doas. doncx deu hom recorre als dictatz dels anticz. si aytal mot han pauzat coma *val* per *valor* o per *valensa.* e si per aquela maniera no sen pot hom enformar. hom deu recorre a la maniera de parlar acostumat cominalmen per tota una diocezi.

---

[15] Molinier describes the use of masculine *habitutz* for feminine in examples like *quel flors es mot bela* unambiguously both as wrong ('se son pecat' [...] 'lo reproam') and as being 'trobars anticz', therefore denying the claims of older usage to be correct. Even here, however, he feels the need to point out that the usage is wrong despite the troubadours' practice: 'E ges per so si il han pauzadas las dichas habitutz per aquela maniera. nos no aproam aytal parlar'. This would seem to imply that under normal circumstances, some vestige of authority still attaches to older literary usage (*Leys,* II, 114). Note also the criticism of At de Mons for wrong tense usage (*Leys,* II, 256. See also Marshall 1962, 562 and At 1887, 71).

Here authority is ascribed both to older literary usage and to contemporary spoken usage. A similar observation is made for the alternative endings *-eza* and *-essa,* (II, 196) where both are usually possible ('quar es acostumat'), although the latter ending, being 'quaysh gasconil', is tolerated mainly because 'tant trobador antic los han pauzatz per esta maniera. que nos noy volem contradir'[16]. However, since *-essa* is not always possible, 'deu hom gardar en aytals vocables uzatge acostumat. lo qual hom pot haver per los dictatz dels antics'. It is clear that in Molinier's view, both modernity and regularity are on the side of *-eza,* which is recommended as less ambiguous ('enpero en dupte ja no falhira. qui los pronuncia en *eza:* coma *blanqueza'*), but that the usage of earlier writers is still potentially important to the *Leys.*

2. 5. 5. Usage and the restricted occurrence of grammatical forms.

Among the ways in which the Occitan writers employ usage is one which is entirely in keeping with the Priscianic, namely as an explanation why a form correct in some circumstances cannot be extended in ways that one might have expected. This is seen in the *Leys* (II, 214), where *mi dons* and *si dons* are quoted as involving the pronouns *mi* and *si* which 'no sajusto mas ab aquesta dictio *dons* quar es acostumat'. An obvious analogical extension, *ti dons,* is mentioned only to warn the reader against thinking that it can be used, 'quar no es acostumat'. In this case, of course, the issue involves an isolated form not amenable to general rules. Similarly, the recognition (*Leys* II, 132) that *al* and *del* can be seen as deriving from *a lo* and *de lo* requires an explanation as to why the latter forms are not found except with *entrepositios,* as in *a tot lo mon.* Here too the text merely states 'li qual *a lo.* ni. *a los.* no son acostumat entre nos. si no ab las entrepositios sobredichas'.

2. 5. 6. Usage and the discussion of complex regular patterns.

In the Latin grammarians, usage had generally been invoked to describe sporadic and irregular features of the language; regular patterns, even ones of considerable complexity, were provided with a regular and normative grammatical description.

---

[16]According to Marshall (1962, 462), the *-essa* ending is in fact virtually unknown in the literary tradition.

Unable simply to adopt Latin solutions without change, the Occitan writers do not generally attempt to emulate their Latin models in providing a complete account of every regular pattern of their language. In order to offer some guidance to readers, it is not uncommon for them to hold up usage, spoken or written, as a model. Molinier employs the concept of usage in this way on a number of occasions.

In one case, usage is invoked to explain issues arising from the endings of different verb conjugations, which are not categories recognised by Molinier. In the discussion of the third person plurals of the present indicative active (*Leys* II, 372), two groups are distinguished: those verbs ending either in *-o* or *-an,* like *crido/ cridan,* and those like *crezo* where only the *-o* ending is possible. (In both types *-o* is preferred, though *-an* may be used in the first group 'quar entre nos es acostumat de dire'.) The second group is described as including, as well as some specified verbs, 'trops autres delsquals no pot hom saber nombre. ni dar certa regla. si no uzatge. Quar per uzatge de parlar. los pot hom saber.' The point at issue, the distinction between descendants of the Latin first conjugation and all others, could in fact potentially have been addressed by rules in Occitan.

Molinier's description of nominal inflection is generally far more subject to rule, but it too on occasion abdicates the legislative role to defer to usage. One example is provided by the *nom integral* and *nom parcial* (*Leys* II, 160-62, see 5. 2. 4.), both of which divide between those which are normally *alongat* by *-es* in the oblique plural and those which usually retain their nominative singular form. For the latter group, some of which are *alongat* according to *particular lengatges* or *alqu,* the reader is on both occasions counselled to follow 'bon uzatge et acostumat'.

One area where grammatical description had to break fresh ground entirely with respect to Latin was in the rules for the presence and absence of the definite article. When Molinier addresses an issue which involves this (see 3. 3. 6), there is some attempt to appeal to readers' usage in order to avoid a potentially long and complex account:

E si diziam quoras deu hom pauzar habitut. ni coras no. en aquestz dos cazes. aysso seria trop lonc. quar assatz o pot hom haver per uzatge (*Leys* II, 122).

However, this apparent retreat from grammatical description is followed by an extensive, if not perhaps exhaustive, discussion of factors that affect the issue in question.

Molinier is not the only writer to relegate potentially explicable morphology to usage, especially in the verb. The same process can be observed in Raimon (*Razos* 23):

Las autras paraulas del verb, per ço cor eu no sabria dir totas aquellas sens gran affayn, totz homs prims las deu gardar be et usar com auzira las gens parlar d'aquellas terras; e que deman a aquells qe an la parladura regoneguda e que esgar los bons trobadors com los han dichas, car yl no podon haver sauber gran meyns de gran us, si tot se saben l'art.

The candid admission that a full description of verbal forms would be 'gran affayn' is perhaps the real reason for its absence, while the recommendations to observe spoken and written usage display Raimon's ultimate source of grammatical authority, if at the cost of abdicating the grammarian's responsibility to codify that usage. However, the denial that one can acquire the forms 'meyns de gran us, si tot se saben l'art' (the last clause is less well-attested) appears to cast doubt on the possibility of a theoretically acceptable Occitan verb morphology.

2. 5. 7. <u>The contrast of usage with *artz.*</u>

The major issue of theoretical importance in the Occitan concept of usage is its application to explain and potentially to excuse elements of the vernacular which the grammarians wish to defend but which for various reasons are theoretically regarded as ungrammatical, generally because they offend against Latin grammatical norms. This possibility is employed on one occasion by Raimon (*Razos* 13):

Autras paraulas i a qe hom pot abreuiar, car son acusatiu singular, et en aqest cas mezeis pot los hom alongar per us de parladura, aisi com qui volia dir *ieu mi fas gai* o *ieu mi teng per pagat;* et en aisi es dig per cas. Et dis hom ben *ieu me fas gais* o *ieu mi tenc per pagatz;* et en aisi ditz los homs per us de parladura, et toz aqels d'aqest semblant.

Here the more Latinate construction is regarded as correct, producing a contrast between correct grammar ('dig per cas') and the less formal authority of *us de parladura,* which nevertheless produces correct Occitan.

Jofre's treatment of grammar and usage is informed by a grammatical theory which is less inclined to subject Occitan to Latin norms. Consequently, he addresses the issue of *eu me tench per pagatz* (*Regles* 72) without hinting at any contrast between grammar and usage, merely noting that *mostri, tenc, sembli, pari* and *iatz* behave 'examen' like *suy* and *estau* as verbs which 'han autra natura, car tuyt li nom qui detras o denan lor van s'alongon en singular e·s abreuion en plural.' Nevertheless, Jofre too contrasts *art* and *us* on occasion. Where Raimon (*Razos* 18-21) had simply condemned the use of forms like *cre* when used in the first person, even when perpetrated by troubadours of note, Jofre concedes that this might be an error at the level of *art,* but regards it as fully acceptable on the grounds of *us.* Authority in this case is ascribed not to *art* but to the *us del lengatge e la costuma*, and to the consensus of the troubadour's works:

> E eu altrey li que segons art el [En Ramon Vidals] dix ver e que·ls deu hom axi pausar: mas no li altrey que li trobador errason, per ço car us venç art, e longa costuma per dret es haüda tant que venc per us[17]. E con sia us en algunes terres on le lengatges es covinentz e autreyatz a trobar que tuyt cominalment diguen aytant o plus en la primera persona *eu cre* com *eu crey,* e en la terça persona diguen aytant *ausi* com *ausic,* per aquesta raho dic eu que li trobador no·y falliron, car ill seguiren lo us del lengatge e la costuma. E pus tuyt li trobador ho han ditz en llurs trobars, es us e confermamentz de lengatge; mas si us o dos ho haguessen ditx, assatz pogra dir que fos enrada. Per que dic eu que cascus pot dir quals que mes li plasia (*Regles* 84).

It is not wholly clear why Jofre concedes that the form is erroneous according to *art,* unless it be to avoid an overt clash with the opinion of Raimon. While morphological distinction of the first and third persons was clearly theoretically desirable, it was absent completely in a number of Occitan tenses; one might imagine rigid

---

[17]In MS R (*Regles* 85): longua costuma per dret es haüda., tant que veyls us soven torna en natura.

grammarians insisting on a distinct form wherever possible, but this is a minor issue compared with others where Jofre ascribes great autonomy to the vernacular.

Uc does not explicitly employ a concept of usage in the *Donatz proensals,* partly no doubt since his fuller morphological treatment meant that it was less needed to explain gaps in the paradigm. Nevertheless, he is prepared to describe as 'contra gramatica' (*Donatz* 120) the fact that 'lo preteritz non perfeiç del conjunctiu es semblans al preterit non perfeiz del indicatiu a la vengada'. Similarly, while the verbal morphology is relatively fully treated, an appeal to usage — though not under that name — is made with respect to the choice of tense and mood:

Inspiciat lector in huius modi modis et temporibus et consideret qualia verba debet profere in vulgari suo et quod intellectum habet, quia in vulgari provincialis lingue eundem sensum habent ista verba quem sua in suo vulgari (*Donatz* 121-23).

The clash between the demands of grammar and usage is a very important feature of Molinier's concept of *uzatges.* Generally, Molinier assumes the conformity of Occitan to an essentially Latinate theoretical model. Where this is unproblematic, he is willing to claim that Occitan rules conform to the 'artz', the 'actor' (authors) and their 'ditz gramaticals' (*Leys* I, 50; I, 50; I, 46). This conformity is usually assumed, however, rather than stated. Where Latinate rules threaten to disallow normal Occitan, *uzatges* and similar concepts are employed to deflect the demands of the grammatical model. Ostensibly, many of the examples cited are permitted with some grammatical reservation; pragmatically, however, it is clear that they are fully acceptable (which is not always true of the theoretically more grammatical alternatives). *Uzatges* comes to denote correct Occitan, allowing Molinier to permit non-Latinate Occitan constructions without actually ascribing an autonomous grammatical system to the vernacular.[18]

Most of these issues are syntactic. Molinier appears not to have great theoretical difficulty in attaching Romance forms to Latin categories; potential discrepancies in word division and agreement are the major complication, but these are successfully

[18] See Marshall 1962, 461-469 for a general account of usage outside this particular function.

explained away, on the rare occasions that they are discussed, by reference to comparable complexities in Latin. At no time, either, does the existence of more than one form corresponding to a single Latin category cause obvious theoretical qualms, though the use of one form for more than one Latin category appears to be more problematic. However, once each Romance form has acquired a grammatical category, any use of that form to correspond to a different Latin category becomes an irregularity requiring explanation. *Uzatges* is thus invoked to explain the use of active for passive in *tostemps gleyza se deu obrar delicadamen* (*Leys* II, 236), the use of the *preteritz perfachs del conjunctiu* instead of the *futur del conjunctiu* (the modern future perfect) in *decequieu haia manjat e dormit. yeu iray deportar* (Leys II, 344), and the use of the present indicative instead of the present conjunctive with *si* (Leys II, 262). In all of these Latin grammar would insist on the second possibility as the sole acceptable form.

Similarly, while the use of various pre-nominal *habitutz* where Latin has case-endings appears to be theoretically unproblematic (see 3. 3. 2); however, having analysed *de* as one of the *habitutz* of the genitive (as well as a *prepositios* taking the ablative), Molinier is obliged to regard *bestia dome* (*Leys* II, 114) as one of 'granre de locutios que han aquesta habitut. *de.* que no son de genitiu cas. cant al significat. ans son del nominatiu. o dautre cas'. Usage is invoked once more to address the issue: 'aytals locutios sufertam. quar son acostumatz. e quar hom nespremish be. son entendemen' (116).

One issue where conformity with Latin is assumed to be the rule is provided by the issue of gender. While Molinier is clear that 'nos deu hom meravilhar si nos no havem o no pronunciam lo gendre per aquela maniera que es en lati' (*Leys* II, 72), he does not claim fundamental grammatical autonomy for the vernacular on this issue, referring instead to the 'autra pronuntiatios' in each language, and to the fact that following the Latin usage would mean that 'layssharíam nostre uzatge acostumat'. In the words in question, *amors, paretz, fons, flors,* the identification with Latin originals is clear. It is not clear how this assumed relationship extends to Romance vocabulary of

non-Latin origin. The implicit assumption here that gender is sufficiently fundamental to be part of the grammar universally applicable to all languages is of course in conformity with much medieval thought, though it arises slightly less naturally from the less semantic views of gender espoused by Molinier himself (see 6. 3. 2.).

Another significant section in this connection is provided by Molinier's discussion of a number of clashes between the *votz* and the *significat* associated with number. On the issue of *cascus* (*Leys* II, 82), he notes the contrast between singular *votz* and plural *significat,* but does not regard this as ungrammatical, no doubt because similar contrasts existed in Latin. (Cf. Petrus Helias 1993, 367 on *omnis,* where a similar distinction is made.)

He also addresses two other issues where a similar clash does not form part of the accepted grammar of Latin. In the first, the use of *vos* as a singular pronoun, (II, 88) he follows the *Catholicon* (Balbus 1971, 56) in regarding the construction as happening ('fals. so es. no propriamen.', cf 'falso [...] et incongrue'), and as an abuse ('uza hom mal huey' cf. 'Sed hoc in abusionem maximam devenit'), but contrasts this with usage ('tant es acostumat' cf. Balbus' reference to an 'usuali locutione'). His treatment is almost identical on a purely Romance issue (92), the use of plural forms of 'one' to singularise words occurring only in the plural such as *us toalhos/ unas toalhas,* 'one napkin'. Here, while the contrast between *votz* and *significat* is reminiscent of *cascus* (though the other way round), this feature is described as 'mot grans contrarietatz' of which 'uzam mal', though, because it is accustomed, 'se pot dir e sostener'. This section clearly displays Molinier's assumptions. He recognises usage as a reason for the acceptance of ungrammatical forms, though not of their full grammaticality, in both Latin and Occitan; while *uzatges* is clearly of more importance in his treatment of Occitan, where more conflicts between it and the model occur, it is not exclusively tied to vernacular issues. This example also shows Molinier accepting clashes between form and meaning as fully grammatical only if they already form part of the Latin model; this reluctance to concede full grammatical status to Romance features, even when they are comparable to Latin ones, recurs elsewhere in the *Leys d'amors.*

The lengthy discussion of the 'ajustamens del mozes e dels temps' of the verb introduces a number of examples where a syntactic combination of two tenses fails to agree with the corresponding Latin version. An example is the following:

Le prezens del indicatiu nos pot ajustar am lo preterit perfag de conjunctiu jaciaysso que semble be dig. *yeu vos pagui cant o deceque haia hagut argen.* pero miels es tot dig en futur. coma *yeu vos pagaray cant o deceque hauray argen o hauray hagut argen.* Jaciaysso que lonx uzatges sufferte la locutio primiera (*Leys* II, 280).

A few formal issues also give rise to problems. Here the problem is not so much the formal difference between the vernacular and Latin, which is taken for granted in the whole enterprise, but the failure of the vernacular to make formal distinctions which reflect the theoretical (and formal) distinctions of Latin. Consequently the use of *el. cel.* etc. as nominative plurals is potentially a 'pecatz' (though not a great one as 'lonx uzatges o requier' (II, 218)); this is evidently because the forms in question are regularly singular. The same issue lies behind the first person use of *cre,* which Molinier (II, 370), Raimon, and Jofre are all ready to condemn grammatically (although Molinier is ready to accept the form as apocopated from *crezi,* and Jofre ascribes it to the *us* which 'venç art'). While the confusion of first and third persons is regular in several Occitan tenses, it appears to be regarded as ungrammatical when it can be avoided: it is notable that Molinier is rather more lenient about avoidable ambiguities between verb forms and other parts of speech (*Leys* II, 358).

A rare use of Latin as a justification for specific morphology is provided by a section (*Leys* II, 210-12) which attempts to provide theoretical support for the distinct nominative/ vocative endings of both numbers of the *nom* (the endings of the consonantal masculines being taken as the basic type). While no specific reason is given for the inclusion of this section which 'red cauza ad alqunas questios quom poyria far', the background is clearly the loss of all but the oblique forms in much popular speech. The initial claim is that while some *nom* do not show different endings in these cases (as opposed to the obliques) 'es cauza covenabla que en aquels hom fassa differensa. en losquals se pot far. per variamen de terminatios en la fi. quar enayssi

vezem ques fay leumen en lati'. The assumption that case distinctions should be made, and that endings are suitable to make them, both derive from Molinier's acceptance of the basic Latin grammatical model; they are unsurprising, but at the same time quite limited in scope, since case-endings provide only two distinct forms, if that, to correspond to the Latin cases, and since the major task of case-distinction is borne by the pre-nominal *habitutz.* Less expected, given the autonomy usually ascribed by Molinier to matters affecting the *votz,* is the justification of the ending *-s* in the nominative singular. The rationale is as follows:

En aquesta sciensa deu hom segre art. en so que pot. que ges totas vetz hom no pot. E quar en lo lati. vezetz que comunalmen atroba hom mays de termenatios en. *s.* en aquestz dos cazes singulars. Quar no trobaras deguna declinatio en lo nom que no haia termenatios alqunas en. *s.* e pauzat que deguna declinatios del nom no agues termenatio deguna en. *s.* en aquestz dos cazes. mas solamen la segonda e la tersa. encaras trobaras mays de termenatios en. *s.* entre adjectius e sustantius. que de las autras ses. *s.* perque li nominatiu singular e li vocatiu regularmen termeno en. *s.*

In the plural, however, a Latinate justification is lacking and Molinier has recourse to other sources of authority:

E per semblan razo. li plural ses. *s.* majormen. quar enaysi vezem que li antic trobador o han tengut. et enayssi parlo cil que han bona et adreyta parladura e bon lengatge. coma en Lemozi. et en la major partida dAlunha [Alvernha].

Usage, whether literary or contemporary, would of course have been relevant in both numbers; its exclusion from the discussion of the singular suggests that this is one more example of the subordination of the vernacular to the Latin grammatical model[19]. In fact the situation is somewhat more complex. The apparent deference to Latin is in fact highly selective: while *-s* nominatives can indeed be quoted from every declension in the singular, the opposite claim cannot be made for the plural[20]. In

---

[19]See Marshall 1962, 463.

[20]Only the first and second declensions have nominatives without *-s* contrasting with accusatives in *-s*. Third and fourth declension neuters show nominatives without *-s* and *-s* in some oblique cases. No examples at all would have been forthcoming from the fifth declension.

addition, there are significant differences in distribution of the *-s* ending, which Molinier chooses to ignore, between the two languages. Of Molinier's other cited authorities, the reference to usage in Limousin and the greater part of Auvergne is equally selective, since Molinier elsewhere denies that Limousin has any special status as a source of correct usage generally. The reference to the 'antic trobador' is the least qualified; although even here, it is probable that not every attested usage would have been deemed acceptable by the *Leys*. The passage is an attempt to justify, by a range of arguments, forms whose acceptability rests on issues within Occitan and the Occitan literary tradition. Conformity to Latin is naturally welcomed where it can be discerned but is not, at the morphological level, a deciding factor.

3.

The articles, the prepositions, and the understanding of case.

3. 1. 1. The Occitan linguistic situation.

One particular challenge for the Occitan grammarians was posed by the nominal phrase and the elements corresponding to Latin case. Where Latin *casualia* had six morphological cases expressed by endings, their Occitan equivalents had a maximum of two distinct endings. At the same time, the Occitan forms were preceded by elements which had no close parallel in Latin. Many Occitan nouns are preceded by forms of the definite article. Its frequency and usage are similar to the modern Iberian vernaculars, so many nouns are neither preceded by it nor by the indefinite article, which was regarded merely as a numeral and attracts little attention. Morphologically, the definite article was inflected for two cases, two genders, and two numbers, though the feminine forms do not generally distinguish case. Consequently, when present, it provides an additional marker of these categories; and before certain types of nouns, it may be the sole such marker, as with the nouns ending in *-s* in their root form. In addition, the use of prepositions before the oblique case(s) was much more extensive than in Latin. Of particular importance are the prepositions *de* and *a.* Originally Latin prepositions meaning 'from' and 'towards', taking the ablative and accusative respectively, and still retaining some elements of their spatial meaning, they are the common expression of the genitive and of the indirect object respectively. Thus they come to be the translation-equivalents of the Latin simple genitive and dative cases. The simple Latin ablative is conveyed by a variety of Occitan prepositions corresponding to its different functions.

Several forms of the article show elision of the vowel when closely combined with other words. Such elision is universal for the masculines after certain prepositions, resulting in forms such as *al, als, del, dels.* This fact may have encouraged some grammarians to regard such forms as units, since they were phonologically (and

orthographically) single words[1]. Such a solution was however problematic in that the two elements could regularly be separated by other words, and would then revert to their basic form; thus *del mon,* 'of the world', but *de tot lo mon,* 'of all the world'.[2] In addition, similar contractions occurred where the two elements concerned were regarded as separate parts of speech, such as *be·t,* Latin *bene te* (see 7. 1. 1., 7. 2. 2.).

An additional set of forms that might precede the noun was provided by the proper noun honorifics *En (N', ·n), Na (N').*Most of the texts ignore these forms as a grammatical issue, but Molinier includes them in the category of the *habitutz,* to which the definite articles and some prepositions are also assigned.

Strictly, a belief in the identity of Latin and Romance grammar should lead one to regard a sequence such as preposition + article + noun as being entirely equivalent to a Latin *nomen.* In practice, the terms *noms* and *cazuals* were applied to the lexical element (the noun in modern analysis) leaving the prepositions and articles as the categories to be explained.

These 'prenoun' forms presented a potential difficulty for grammarians. Generally, Occitan words are attributed to the part of speech associated with their literal Latin equivalents. A *nomen* like *patris,* however, might be represented in Occitan by the sequence *del payre,* in modern terms a combination of preposition, article and noun. Strictly, if Occitan and Latin possessed the same underlying grammar, the whole group should be equivalent to a Latin *nomen.* None of the Occitan grammarians however took this view. They reserved the terms *noms* and *cazuals* for the lexi-

---

[1]The analysis of polysyllabic groups like *de la* were less obviously constrained phonologically, but a single-word analysis would have been possible for these as well.

[2]This issue is addressed in the *Leys* II, 132. Here, it is suggested that the ***habitutz*** *del* and *dels* can be seen as apocopated or syncopated forms, respectively of *de lo, de los,* 'laquals no es en nostre uzatge de parlar [...] si no am enterpositio coma *de tot lo be* o *de totz los bes*'. This analysis displays the problem but remains peripheral in this text; it is not introduced as being definitely correct, and the main treatment of these forms starts from a completely different set of assumptions as to the nature of forms like *del.*

cal element, such as *payre,* leaving the prepositions and articles in need of a different analysis. The grammarians were left with two theoretical possibilities: to recognise these forms as separate parts of speech outside the *nomen,* or to find an analysis which contrasted with Latin on the surface but could be regarded as identical with it on another level, in which the forms could be regarded as representing accepted *accidentia* of the *nome.* A third possibility existed for the practical writer of grammars: that of leaving the issue unclear.

One issue on which all the grammarians agreed was the need to maintain the six Latin cases. On this issue, contemporaries agreed in regarding the cases as basic categories of the grammar. Even Petrus Helias, less prone to claim basic status for concepts than the Modistae, refers to the cases as marking *diversitates loquendi,* which are defined syntactically and semantically. The nominative (1993, 386) 'loquitur de re ut ipsa est vel agit vel patitur', the genitive 'ut eius aliquid esse dicitur' and the dative 'ut aliquid designatur ipsi conferri'.[3] There is no hint that these categories are other than obvious and universal: 'Sex ergo sunt diversitates loquendi de una et eadem re. Ideoque sex casus inventi sunt nec plures necesse fuit invenire'. Monoptotes (1993, 388) have case at least by *significatio* and *officium,* if not by *vox.* The categories of case are thus seen to depend on reality rather than form and are consequently not negotiable, unlike some other aspects of the grammatical model. The link of cases to function rather than form, noted by Law (1986, 51) as an important feature of the *Leys,* is thus a mark of conformity to the dominant theoretical model, rather than showing innovation or independence.

3. 2. 1. Prepositions and articles in Latin and Occitan.

The forms such as *de* and *a* were not difficult to identify formally. Molinier recognises that one use of the forms is as *prepositios; de* is cited among the *prepositios* taking the *ablatiu,* presumably translating Latin *de, ab, ex,* while *a* takes the *acuzatiu,*

[3]Petrus Helias' views may be directly relevant to Molinier, who echoes the earlier writer's use of 'loquendi diversitas' in his statement (*Leys* II, 104) 'La cauza perque divers cas foro trobat es la diversitatz del parlar.'

translating *ad* (*Leys* II, 424). He does not however consider this sufficient argument to identify the genitive and dative uses of these forms as belonging to the category of prepositions. Jofre de Foixà analyses the genitive and dative uses as *preposicions,* while removing the forms from the list of *preposicions* taking the accusative and ablative respectively, no doubt to avoid the confusion which would follow from analysing identical forms in different ways, when the distinction could only be understood by reference to Latin (*Regles* 74-77).

With the definite articles the situation is more complicated. The forms themselves have more than one use in Occitan; as well as definite articles they can be third person pronouns (particularly as accusatives as in *mena* ***lo;*** also in a nominative use with the relative: ***le*** *que vay primiers es plus joves* (*Leys* II, 222)). Molinier notes this formal coincidence, and cites these sentences as showing *habitutz* (his word for all the 'prenoun' forms) 'used instead of pronouns'. However, no grammarian who mentions the issues appears to have let this formal similarity influence their basic analysis.

3. 2. 2. Medieval opinions on the article.

The existence of the term *articulus* as a grammatical concept was known to the Latin grammatical tradition at this period. (See, with some reservations, the discussions in the first two chapters of Lusignan 1986.) All were aware that such a category existed in Greek and had there the status of a part of speech. Equally, they were aware that it was not a feature of Latin, though the pronoun *hic* ('this') might loosely be called *articulus.* Not everyone seems to have understood that *le, la* etc. were the correct translations of the Greek articles; there was no way of learning this simply from the most basic grammatical texts. The equation between the articles of Greek and Romance, obvious enough to the rare students of Greek, was however relatively widely known. Roger Bacon's Greek grammar equates the Greek *articuli* with the French ones (Bacon 1902, 13[4]), while Guillaume de Moerbeke made use of the

[4] 'Sciendum igitur quod articulus est pars oracionis apud grecos quia habet casus, genera et numeros; sed latini non habent articulos licent omnes fere naciones habeant eos, et lingua gallica habet eos ut *li le la* et huiusmodi, que distinguunt casus, genera et numeros.'

French articles, in a Latin text, to translate the Greek equivalents (Lusignan 1986, 76). A number of other texts refer to French articles as a category parallel to Greek but absent from Latin, though they do not always identify the words that they consider to belong to this category. Some of the fourteenth century French texts in Städtler 1988 show a possible citation of the French article. For example, DonatM^2, (110), describes *hic hec hoc* as *articles.* The *articles* are here only explicitly linked to gender among the grammatical accidents, though the text also uses them as part of the case-paradigm in the participle (123): 'Le nominatif, si comme *hic* et *hec* et *hoc legens,* le genitif, [si comme] *huius -ti,* le datif, si comme *huic -ti'* etc. The same practice is seen in the paradigms of irregular nouns (113). The list of the nominal cases however uses a French list rather than a Latin one, involving French forms such as *le* (with or without accompanying prepositions) (110): 'Le nominatif *le maistre,* le genitif *du maistre,* le datif *au maistre,* l'accusatif *le maistre,* le vocatif *o tu maistre,* li ablatif *dou maistre* et *par le maistre* et *o le maistre* et *sanz le maistre.*' The simplest assumption is that these forms are the supposed equivalent to the *articulus*. There can here be no question of forms like *le* being the translation-equivalents of *hic;* rather, they are identified directly with the *articulus*, and thus inherit its use in marking cases and genders.

While the equation between the Greek and Romance forms was common, the analysis of their function was variable, and carried out largely on the basis of Priscian's sparse information on the subject; understanding of the anaphoric role of the *articulus* is rare in the Latin tradition, and leaves no provable mark on the Occitan grammars.[5] Even where the existence of the *articulus* is conceded, a difference remains from the modern analysis. Greek oblique forms of the article, such as τοῦ, were among the forms known in the Latin tradition; in this case, any Romance translation had to include the preposition, giving a form like *del.* With few exceptions, analyses of the *articulus* assume that such compound forms are legitimate parts of the Romance article paradigm.

---

[5]Molinier's partial recognition of anaphora may well be independent (see below). Jofre de Foixá is tantalisingly silent on the semantics of his 'articles'.

A final difficulty of theory had to be confronted by the Occitan grammarians, whatever their views on the similarity between the Greek and Romance articles. Grammarians writing in Latin did not have to provide a coherent theory of vernacular parts of speech, into which their casual references to the *articulus* might be incorporated. Writers such as Uc and Molinier, by contrast, had to provide such an account. Both of these grammarians assume that the parts of speech of the Latin analysis are those of Romance as well[6]. This has the side-effect of denying the potential recognition of the *articulus*, a part of the standard list only in Greek. It is likely that Molinier's denial of the existence of the *article* (see 3. 3. 2., 3. 3. 8., 3. 3. 9) flows largely from this consideration.

3. 2. 3. Priscian on the Greek article

To understand the background of the majority of medieval Latin writers on this issue, it is necessary to start from the one source they all read, Priscian's *Institutiones Grammaticae.* While there are a number of references to the *articulus* in this work, they are strictly incidental; Priscian was writing a Latin grammar for native speakers of Greek, who had the Greek grammatical tradition available to them. Consequently, while accurate, his statements do not represent a full account of the *ἄρθρον/ articulus* as he understood it.

Priscian's information may be summarised thus.

No *articulus* exists in Latin. The Greek category distinguishes a *praepositivus* variety (ὁ) and a *subiunctivus* variety (ὅς). The *praepositivus* is replaced by *hic* (meaning in Latin *'this')* when used by the grammarian to show genders and cases; Greek nouns are often presented in a citation form with the *articulus*, and translated by the Latin noun with the pronoun; thus (Priscian I, 156) 'ὁ χάρτης "haec charta"'. In Priscian this was merely a convenience. He states (II, 124): 'deficit autem praepositivis articulis lingua Latina. nam pronomen 'hic', quod grammatici in declinatione nominum loco praepositivi, ut dictum est, ponunt articuli, numquam in oratione sensum articuli habet.' Others were not so careful to insist on the distinction between the

[6]Uc states this directly (*Donatz* 88)

Greek and Latin words. Whereas Priscian referred to *hic* in this use as the *articulare pronomen,* Donatus used the Greek term directly of the Latin word, labelling it *pronomen vel articulus* in the *Ars maior* (Holtz 1981, 619).

This usage of *hic* to mark gender, number, and case remained standard throughout medieval grammar, following Donatus' extensive use of it in the *Ars minor.* Medievals did not always attempt to hold apart the understanding of the form as an article from its known meaning of 'this'. This emerges from a number of texts. In Luys d'Averçó's *Torcimany*, a discussion of gender involving the Latin articles says directly: 'l'article masculí, qui es *hic,* vol dir «aquest»' (Averçó 1956, I, 213). Such an attitude would obviously prevent the analysis of *le, la* as *articles.*

Elsewhere in Priscian the *articulus praepositivus* is omitted in translation without comment: '"supra caelum" ὑπερ τὸν οὐρανόν' (Priscian II, 31). This was one indication that the meaning or function of the *articulus* was not always expressed by a separate word in Latin.

A number of examples relate a Greek combination of two words, of which one is the *articulus*, to single Latin words. Thus *idem* translates ὁ αὐτός and *qui* ὅστις (Priscian I, 54). Similarly, the construction *οἱ μὲν ...οἱ δὲ* is glossed by *hi ...illi* and *alii...alii* in the following example: ' "τῶν ἀνθρώπων οἱ μέν εἰσιν ἀγαθοί, οἱ δὲ πονηροί " [...] "hominum hi sunt boni, illi mali" vel "alii sunt boni, alii mali" ' (Priscian II, 125).

The most important of these equations in the reception of the tradition was that in which the Latin gerund, the verbal noun with case-endings, was assimilated to the Greek construction of the article and infinitive.

Priscian's statements assimilate the *articuli* of the various cases to the case-endings of the gerund, giving the impression that, in this context, the sole function of the article is to mark case:

> Gerundia quoque vel participalia, cum participiorum vel nominum videantur habere casus obliquos nec tempora significent, quod alienum est a verbo: 'legendi, legendo, legendum', 'lectum, lectu', infiniti vice tamen funguntur, quod solet apud Graecos articulis coniungi. itaque pro infinito, qui

coniungitur genetivo casui articuli apud Graecos, nos utimur in 'di' terminatione, quae similis est genetivo nominis, 'legendi' [...] τοῦ ἀναγινώσκειν' καὶ 'τοῦ ἀναγινώσκεσθαι'. pro eo autem, qui dativo articuli adiungitur, infinito apud Graecos antecedente ἐν praepositione, nos in 'do' utimur terminatione, quae similis est dativo vel ablativo nominis - nisi quod verbum hoc existimantes quidam etiam corripiunt o finalem eius. [...] ut 'legendo' [...] 'ἐν τῷ ἀναγινώσκειν' καὶ 'ἐν τῷ ἀναγινώσκεσθαι'. pro eo quoque, qui accusativo adiungitur, in 'dum' terminatione utimur, quae similis est accusativo nominis [...]. huic tamen frequentius solet etiam praepositio 'ad' praeponi, ut 'ad legendum', ex quo ostenditur, magis nomen esse quam verbum (Priscian I, 409-10).

It is unlikely that Priscian would have regarded all *articuli* as markers of case. The sole other link between *articuli* and case is in the context of monoptotes (Priscian I, 184), where he states that 'videntur casus fieri non vocis, sed significationis dumtaxat. itaque articulis diversis utimur pro varietate significationis nec non etiam structurae rationem servamus.' This group however represents a minority of Latin *nomina*, including the numbers from *quattuor* to *centum,* forms like *gummi* and letters of the alphabet (*hoc alpha huius alpha).*

Priscian makes the following reference to the semantics of article usage (II, 124):

Articulus secundam notitiam suppositorum demonstrat. si enim dicam, ἄνθρωπος ἦλθεν, primam notitiam ostendo; sin, ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἦλθεν, secundam.

Priscian's original Greek readers would have understood easily this reference to the anaphoric use of the article, a use which had been noted by the Greek grammatical tradition. As will shortly be seen, the fact that the European vernaculars had similar rules did not prevent the misunderstanding of this passage by mediaeval grammarians.

3. 2. 4. <u>The *articulus* as a marker of case in medieval Latin grammars.</u>

Among medieval sources, the *articulus* is not a particularly major issue, but statements are to be found on the difference between the list of the parts of speech in Latin and Greek, while the relationship of the gerund with the articular infinitive is invoked relatively often when the status of the gerund is at issue. I examine later how some of the specific discussions concerned with the *articulus* are relevant to the ter-

minology of the *Leys d'amors.* One may note however in general terms that in many writers the notion of the *articulus* as a marker of case, derived largely from Priscian's views on the gerund, is extended to a general principle, to which even the concepts of *prima* and *secunda notitia* can be assimilated.

Thus Johannes de Dacia (1955, 55), states:

> Juxta quod est notandum, quod Greci habuerunt vnam partem orationis, quam vocauerunt articulum, ad distinguendum modos significandi et modos construendi, propter quod vocauerunt quosdam articulos esse articulos constructionis, et quosdam vocauerunt esse articulos declinationis. Ipsas enim voces habuerunt confuse representantes suos modos significandi, vt hoc nomen antropos[7] equivoce et confuse importat omnes casus. Significat enim in Greco quod homo apud nos. Et ad distinctionem casuum addebant voces quasdam ad denominandum determinatas habitudines casuales, quemadmodum adhuc Gallici faciunt, et illas additiones vocales vocauerunt articulum, propter quod Priscianus dixit in minori volumine, quod articulus est secundam notitiam suppositorum demonstrans, id est modorum significandi. Sed nos Latini vt plerumque habemus nomina distincta distinctas habitudines casuales importantia, propter quod non indigemus articulo [...]. [8]

3. 3. 1. <u>The prenoun forms in the Occitan grammars.</u>

The Occitan grammars vary in their coverage of this issue. Raimon makes no reference to the prenoun forms. Uc links them to case, since he uses them to make the case distinctions, but refrains from defining their rôle closely. Referring to the masculine singular, he says that 'lo nominatius se conois per *lo* [...] genitius per *de* [...] datius per *a* [...] acussatius per lo' (*Donatz* 92). None of these forms can be found assigned to any part of speech in the remainder of the text. (One would expect *de* and *a* to be mentioned as being *prepositios,* even if that were not regarded as their role here, but the *Donatz* does not have an authentic section on the prepositions.)This text therefore gives partial information on the use of the forms (the variation of the article

---

[7]Greek ἄνθρωπος, which of course does have distinct case endings.

[8]Cf Kilwardby, in Lusignan 1986 (27), who links *notitia* in similar fashion to the articles and explicitly cites the French forms *maistre, li maistres* and *le maistre.* (He does not however use the term *habitudo.)*

forms for gender and number is not mentioned) but no theoretical explanation of their status among the parts of speech .

Their status is by contrast an issue which very much concerns Jofre de Foixà. He adopts an analysis agreeing almost wholly with a modern solution. For him, the forms *li, le, lo, la, las, los* are *article* (*Regles* 64). The attribution of the forms to the genders and numbers is made clearly. No semantic rôle is mentioned for the *article*, but neither is any such rôle denied. There is no hint that they are supposed to mark cases. This is evident from the fact that they is not mentioned in distinguishing the nominative and accusative cases. That is done instead by appealing to the position of the nouns before and after the verb — at least the order 'segons rayso e entendimen', as the nouns may in fact be placed in other positions from those assumed to be the underlying ones (68-70). The vocative is recognised by the fact that 'es posatz en cas que apella' (MS H) 'aquel noms es vocatius a cuy hom sona' (MS R) (74). *O* is <u>not</u> used, corresponding to the normal practice of the language, but contradicting the Latin grammarians. The examples make the situation clear: *en reys, anatz,* etc.

The markers of the other cases are assigned to a separate category from the articles. Jofre states that the genitive is recognised by the fact that 'tots temps li vay denan aquesta preposicio *de'* (74). The dative equally has the *preposicions a.* The combinations such as *al* are regarded as being composed of two separate entities: 'E deves entendre que can hom ditz *a lo rey* o *al rey,* o *a los baros* o *als baros,* totz es un, mas que per abreuiar lo mot gita hom aquella letra o' (74).This category of *preposicions* is not theoretically distinguished from the traditional *praepositiones*. Jofre cites *preposicions* also to serve as methods of recognising the accusative and the ablative (74-77). The lists translate relevant prepositions of the Latin cases; while some of the ablative ones could also translate simple ablative constructions, the examples of usage which are cited correspond to Latin prepositional ones. Jofre differs from other analysts in confining each individual *preposicions* to one case only, so that it is possible to determine the case on the basis of the Occitan form (in other works, identical forms are attributed to more than one case, reflecting the analysis of the Latin equivalent(s)). He

ascribes no *preposicions* to both ablative and accusative, while *a* and *de* are linked to neither of these cases and are thus identified only with the dative and genitive.

This analysis has far-reaching implications. Jofre handles combinations such as *al* without compromising the separate analysis of the two constituents, *a* (dative *preposicions),* and *lo* (*article*), both of which are distinct from the noun. Thus, while no rules for the presence or absence of the *article* are given, the implication is clear that *al* is to *a* is as *lo* is to zero. This would seem logical and confirmed by Occitan texts, but Molinier later fails to see it owing to an analysis which takes *al* as one word. The case-element, dative or genitive, is seen as depending entirely on the *a* or the *de,* as is correct, though these elements may commonly be combined with other forms; and the nominative and accusative are not seen as defined by the *article,* so its absence does not invalidate their distinction. In addition, the distinction made between prepositions and forms used to express cases (a distinction which in the *Leys* extends to different uses of the same word) is absent completely, to the ease of the vernacular reader.

In theoretical terms this analysis is revolutionary. As we have seen, the recognition that certain forms in the Romance languages were equivalent in some way to the Greek ἄρθρα/ *articuli* was not unknown at this period, so that Jofre was not the first to admit the category into Romance, although he was the first to integrate it into the context of a vernacular grammar. Nor was the existence of the article in Romance any more of an obstacle to identity with Latin grammar than the existence of the Greek article, so long as it could be explained as simply marking features of number and case which Latin expressed in other ways; an element- for -element substitution between Romance, Latin, and Greek was still theoretically possible. (Such a substitution remains possible in the *Leys d'amors.)* However, this model still possessed no way of distinguishing between the prepositional and article elements; there is no hint than anyone would have disagreed with the proposition that *del,* the translation of τοῦ, was simply the genitive case of the *articulus.* Nor of course did the Greek article encourage this division, since it inflected directly for case and required both preposi-

tion and article in Romance translation. Jofre's analysis innovates by restricting the term *article* to only one type of prenoun forms. He removes from it the function of marking case, and presumably gender and number as well. This implies that the article, rather than marking Latin accidents in a simple substitution for case endings, marks something different, absent from a Latin sentence. As for the elements which **are** said to mark case, *de* and *a* are regarded as *preposicions;* unlike the article, this part of speech did not have any recognised ability to substitute for case-endings. Nor, of course, could Latin *praepositiones* take the genitive and dative under any circumstances. Thus while Latin has one part of speech, and Greek two (but allegedly reducible to one), Occitan has three, and conformity to the Latin system has been abandoned.

In addition, the limitation of individual *preposicions* to particular cases means that an Occitan construction would frequently use a case different from that of Latin. *De* meaning 'from', *a* meaning 'towards', and *per* meaning 'by' (passive agent) would be genitive, dative and accusative respectively, rather than the Latin ablative, accusative and ablative (using *de/ab, ad, ab).* This too sets up serious conflicts between the linguistic systems, and seriously undermines the assumption that the functions of the cases are universal. Jofre however avoids citing examples which would make the contrast clear.

3. 3. 2. The concept of the *habitutz* in Molinier.

Molinier displays no knowledge of Jofre's analysis or anything similar. His only mention of the word *article* is in the context of gender (*Leys* II, 68):

segon lati alcus gendres es apelatz *articulars.* quar hom lo conoysh al article. que lis donatz[...] e son apelatz article aquest trey pronom. *hic. haec. hoc* [...] nos no havem aytal conoysshensa de gendre en romans.

There is no hint that he accepts the existence of the article, in any function, in Occitan. The category into which the *le, la* forms fall, along with the prepositional prenoun forms, is called the *habitutz,* which is introduced as one of the three ways in which case is expressed in Romance: 'cas es variamens de dictios cazuals. per habi-

tutz. o per votz o per la maniera del significar' (*Leys* II, 102). Contrast Priscian's 'casus est declinatio nominis vel aliarum casualium dictionum, quae fit maxime in fine'[9] (Priscian I, 183-84). The mention of *votz* and of *maniera de significar* can be paralleled in Priscian's statement, quoted above, on the monoptotes: 'videntur casus fieri non vocis, sed significationis dumtaxat. itaque articulis diversis utimur pro varietate significationis necnon etiam structurae rationem servamus (Priscian I, 184).' This provides a Priscianic context for *vox* being part of the definition of normal case, though not obviously of the monoptotes. The mention of *significatio* is also a possible motivation for Molinier's *maniera de significar,* which is itself only invoked to cover the monoptote *'noms integrals'*.

Of the three expressions of case, that by *votz* refers to the endings with and without *-s* (Leys II, 106). The *maniera de significar* is the catch-all class; it covers those nouns which have no distinct case endings, such as the *noms integrals,* and the feminines in *-a* when they are not accompanied by the *habitutz* which would indicate their case in another way. The text notes that 'solamen aytals noms conoysh hom a la maniera de significar'. Theoretically, of course, one would expect it to be possible to use the *maniera de significar* in contexts where case is also marked by endings or *habitutz.* Molinier here shows a clear preference, whether for theoretical or practical reasons, for the use of explicit markers of case where they are available. One may contrast this with Jofre's presentation of the relationship of noun and verb, rather than the article, as the basis of the nominative/accusative distinction (3. 3. 1.).

The *habitutz* are introduced in the supplemented definition thus: 'vezer podetz que las dictios en romans se varian mays per habitutz en lo comensamen. que per autra maniera' (*Leys* II, 104). The cases are then cited in a way very reminiscent of a Latin declension starting from the masuline nominative *le:*

---

[9] The derivation of *cas* (*Leys* 11, 104) is as follows: '*Cas* es ditz de *cazer*. quar la us cay e disshen de lautre.' This explanation is traditional. (Priscian I, 184; 'quod a generali nomine in specialia cadit, casus appellatur [...] vel quod cadens a sua terminatione in alias facit obliquos casus.').

se forma labitutz del genitiu per esta maniera. Ajustatz denan *le. de.* et ostatz ne. *e.* et hauretz *del.* En labitut del datiu havetz. *al.* e forma se de labitut del genitiu. so es daquel. *del.* ostatz ne. *de.* et ajustatz. *a.* hauretz *al.* Lacusatius se pot formar del nominatiu singular per mudamen de. *e.* en. *o.* et havetz. *lo.* o del genitiu. per removemen de. *de.* e per ajustamen de. *o.*

Only some of the *habitutz* later cited are given. While the procedures here seem to recognise them as made up of different elements, this is illusory, as is demonstrated by the derivation *del<de le.* If one were to recognise the different elements synchronically one would have to derive it from *de+lo,* but that is not Molinier's intention. He is deriving one case from another in traditional Latin fashion.[10] The equation of the *habitutz* with the Latin declension is also seen in the dismissal of the concept of declension (in which the only argument against *habitutz* representing declension is that they have only one paradigm), and the words that follow it (II, 112): 'donx cove que vejam ayssi de las habitutz pusque autra declinatio no havem (see 5. 3. 5.).

The *habitutz* thus replaces all forms preceding the noun whose Latin equivalent is either zero or a case-ending. It includes the descendants of *ille* when used as articles (when the same forms are used as third person pronouns the term *habitutz* is used, but the fact that they are described as being used 'en loc de pronoms' and distinguished from the *verays habitutz* implies that they are not real members of this class). It also includes *o,* neither a *praepositio* nor an *articulus*, though familiar from its use, alongside the *pronomen vel articulus hic*, in the *Ars Minor* nominal paradigm. The status of prepositions is entirely dependent on their relationship to a potential Latin sentence. They are *prepositios* only if they correspond to expressed Latin *praepositiones*, in which case they are cited as taking the accusative, ablative, or both, according to the Latin equivalent. The same forms may be regarded as *habitutz* if they correspond merely to a Latin case-ending, leading to completely different analyses, in terms of both 'part of speech' (if such a term is appropriate to the *habitutz)* and in

[10]Cf Donatus, (Holtz 1981, 626) and Priscian, e.g Priscian I, 205-06: 'in o correptam ...mutant o in i et accepta -nis faciunt genetivum'; Priscian I, 297 'Dativus et ablativus... fit a genetivo mutatione extremae i in o productam'; Priscian I, 299 'Accusativum quoque a genetivo fit mutatione i in 'um'.

terms of case, for different uses of the same terms (see below). This analysis of prepositional forms was of course exceedingly complicated for the reader. However, it would never have been necessary for the user of the grammar to distinguish between the *habitutz* and the prepositions, nor to distinguish which case of the noun they indicated in any individual sentence, since all the potentially ambiguous forms were combined with the Occitan oblique case-forms. Consequently, the practical difficulties raised by this distinction were few.

3. 3. 3. Inconsistent application of the *habitutz* system.

The fundamental distinction between *prepositios* and *habitutz* is as described above, and this is consistently maintained where the grammatical analysis of case is the focus of concern, as in the section on nominal case or that on the *prepositios*. However, there are occasions within the *Leys* where the distinction is compromised in the ablative. This was the most obvious point of weakness of the system. The other five *cas* each have a single basic *habitutz* construction to mark them; some of the forms used, such as *de* and *a,* do also function as prepositions in other *cas,* but no difficulties seem to have resulted from this fact. In the ablative, there was a wider choice of forms, most of which could be either ablative *prepositios* or ablative *habitutz*. A failure to distinguish these two classes in the ablative did of course threaten the identical grammatical analysis of Latin and Occitan sentences, but did not involve the confusion of two separate *cas* (as a confusion between the accusative and dative uses of *a* would have done). The long, though necessary list of ablative *habitutz* might also have de-emphasised the status of such forms as markers of case.

The main occurrences of the breakdown of the system may be observed in the section 'del syncopamen, appocopamen e del sinalimphamen de las habitutz' (*Leys* II, 128-144), where the grammatical analysis of the forms is not in the foreground. Here there are several breaches of the system. Within the context of the ablative *habitutz* (II, 132), Molinier quotes the sentence 'Yeu vau amb Arnaut et ab Ermengau'. This is clearly the equivalent of a Latin prepositional sentence involving *cum,* and one would have expected *ab/ am/ amb* to be analysed as a preposition. Shortly afterwards (II,

134), the combinations *ab lo, am lo, en lo* are discussed as follows: 'Pauzam motas vetz alcunas habitutz am prepositios. coma *ab lo. am lo. en lo.* Quar *ab. am. en* podon esser prepositios et es miels que sian prezes per prepositios. que per habitutz. quar no es semblans de vertat. que ad una dictio. hom deia pauzar doas habitutz.' The analysis of the syntagms as *prepositios* plus *habitutz* is of course logical for some occurrences. Nor is the use of *ab, am, en* as *habitutz* altogether denied. However, a preference has emerged for seeing them as *prepositios*. This in its turn arises from a novelty: the separation of *ab lo, am lo, en lo* into two elements, as in the prepositional analysis. If there are two elements, they clearly cannot both be markers of case, the sole official function of the *habitutz.* Consequently the analysis of the group as *prepositios* plus *habitutz*, in which the division into two elements is legitimised, becomes dominant. The division into two elements arises from the context of the discussion. Similar forms, like *de... lo,* have already been discussed (*Leys* II, 132), where a single *habitutz* is divided into two as in *de tot lo be,* though on that occasion no change was made to the system. Thus the emphasis is on the phonological divisibility of the forms, an undeniable feature of the vernacular, and the one- to- one relationship with Latin grammar, elsewhere so important, is momentarily sacrificed.

3. 3. 4. The forms of the *habitutz comunas*

The full list of the *habitutz* (*Leys* II, 114 and following), may be tabulated thus:

	singular		plural	
	masculine	feminine	masculine	feminine
nom.	*le*	*la*	*li*	*las*
gen	*del, de*	*de, de la*	*de, dels*	*de, de las*
dat.	*a, al, ad*	*a, a la, ad*	*a, ad, als*	*a, ad, a las*
acc.	*lo*	*la*	*los*	*las*
voc.	*o*	*o*	*o*	*o*
abl.	*per, ab, am, ab ab lo, am lo, en en lo, siquel, lo.*	*per, ab, az, ab la, am la, en, en la, siquela, la*	*per, ab, am, ablos, am los, en en los. siquels. los*	*per, ab, am, ablas, amlas, enlas, las, siquelas*

The ablative *habitutz* show a variety of prepositions, intended to correspond to uses of the ablative alone in Latin. The base 'article' forms *lo. la. los. las* represent the ablative as used after *praepositiones* taking the ablative, as well as one possible translation of the ablative absolute. The consequent difference between *de (prepositios) la (habitutz),* 'from the', and *de la (habitutz),* 'of the', reflects the different Latin forms.

The list here represents Molinier's basic analysis. In fact, the issues are a little more complicated, as he regards a number of uses of *de,* seen here as a genitive *habitutz,* as really nominative. Examples are '*mays de vertutz son en la Verges Maria que en santa que sia'* and '*aquesta bestia d'ome'*. These are tolerated 'quar son acostumadas. e quar hom nespremish be. son entendemen'. The issue here is that words like *granre* take a partitive *de* where Latin equivalents would use a nominative (*Leys* II, 114-16).

The consistent differentiation between the *habitutz* and the prepositions is confirmed by the examples of the *habitutz* (*Leys* II, 118 etc). and by the list which precedes them of 'habitutz [...] pauzadas alcunas vetz per prepositios'. It is conceded that 'no fam gran diversitat sian pauzadas per habitutz cazuals. o per prepositios. quar la pronuntiatios. es tota una'. This reasonable admission as to form in no way undermines the distinction.

The forms which can occur in more than one category are:

	habitutz	*prepositios*
de	genitive (abl/nom)	ablative
a	dative	accusative
per	ablative	ablative/ accusative
am/ab	ablative	ablative
en	ablative	ablative/ accusative

De is cited as an *habitutz* thus: *'le libres es del maestre'*. (This would be a simple genitive in Latin[11].) It also cited, just before this section of the text (*Leys* II, 118), as an ablative *habitutz,* as in *'yeu soy ples de vertutz. e de gracia'* (cf. Latin *gratia plena).* In addition (*Leys* II, 56), *de* is cited as an ablative, though not specifically as an *habitutz* or *prepositios*, under the alleged comparative *'yeu ami la plus bela de totas'*. Here the Latin equivalent would show a superlative followed by a genitive; but Molinier is thinking of the comparative construction which took an ablative. This would be an *habitutz* use by the general logic of the work.

The explicitly prepositional uses of *de* which are exemplified show meanings which would correspond to Latin *ab, ex: 'yeu veni de la gleyza. aquest margues es devori.*[12] *yeu hay receubut aysso de vos'*.

The dative *habitutz* uses of *a* are exemplified by a list of nouns all connected to *'...me recommendatz e/o donatz lor aquestz juels'*. The second clause is not so directly relevant, since while *lor* is a true dative it is not here cited with a dative *habitutz.* Both verbs are of the type to take a true dative in Latin.

The prepositional use of *a* to mean 'towards', generally translating Latin *ad,* is seen in the example *'vau a la plassa'*.

The ablative *habitutz,* like the datives, show a long list of *habitutz*-plus-noun constructions, all of which are apparently to be taken with the following group: *'vivetz e donatz bon ysshemple als autres'*. What is noticeable here is that personal animate nouns only occur in the constructions translating the Latin ablative absolute: *'Sant Miquel angel de Deu ajudan', 'si quel angel de Deu ajudan.'* Otherwise they are all abstracts. *Per* and *ab* are clearly used in an instrumental sense: *'per bona conversatio. per bon captenemen. ab oratio... ab lialtat'*. (Cf. Jensen 1986, 330: *'ieu per lonc esperar ai conquista gran doussor;* 336: *'ap servir et ab honrar conquier hom de bon*

---

[11]Cf. Woodcock (1959: 46) 'Illius duae fuere filiae' and Kühner (1966: II, 452) 'praeter Capitolium atque arcem omnia haec hostium erant'.

[12]Compare the Latin material ablative with *ex* (Woodcock 1959: 27): *ex animo constamus et corpore, faber faciat... pilas ex lapide.*

senhor don.') The reading of *en* is harder. *En lo gaug de Dieu* seems more like a figurative locative; *en bona diciplina* is more like an instrumental. True instrumentals, of a type to be equivalent to a Latin ablative, are rarely expressed by this word. However, it appears that this instrumental use is meant to account for most of the forms here.

The prepositional uses of these words show *per* meaning 'through'/ 'by' (in spatial terms) as in *yeu soy passatz per vostra carriera* and *per* meaning 'for' in *yeu fau be per mon pro* and *yeu compari per mo maestre. En* is used as a locative preposition literally in *en aquest hostal vuelh estar* and figuratively in *yeu estau en patz. Ab* is used comitatively like Latin *cum: Dieus sia am nos et am vos.* The list is not complete, since the Occitan use of *per* as the passive agent (Jensen 1986, 330) is not seen here.

The *habitutz* of the ablative are intended evidently to correspond to the different senses of the simple Latin ablative. The logic of the system therefore indicates that all should be cited without any preference, as takes place in the section on the *noms*. This is not however maintained throughout the text. In the section on the *pronoms* (*Leys* II, 212-230), each *pronoms* is declined throughout the six cases by means in part of the *habitutz*. The ablative however is quoted merely with *ab*. The decision to choose one representative form is explicable in order to avoid repetition, but it is probably not a coincidence that the *habitutz* chosen is identical in form, though not in meaning, with the preposition used to mark the ablative in Latin. The Latin *ab* could be translated *per* or *de* in Occitan, but would in any case be represented by a preposition in Molinier's analysis. It is notable that while the Latin paradigm uses two extraneous elements in the ablative, a *praepositio* and a pronominal '*articulus*', the Occitan equivalent presents forms which are theoretically equivalent to the case-inflected Latin noun alone, however formally reminiscent of prepositions and pronouns/ articles.

3. 3. 5. The *habitutz proprias.* (*Leys* II, 126-28.)

The final element in the discussion of the *habitutz* is provided by a category called the *habitutz proprias.* While they are mentioned before the case-forms of the other *habitutz* are cited, they do not appear to be entirely integrated into the system. The normal *habitutz,* properly *habitutz comunas,* are often referred to merely as *habitutz,* and the limits on their occurrence are usually treated as involving a choice between the *habitutz comunas* and zero. Thus when the presence and absence of the *habitutz* in the nominative and accusative is discussed, *le Peyres* is stated to be wrong, and *Peyres* right; no mention is made of the form with the *habitutz propria,* namely *En Peyres.* Nevertheless, the category appears to be intended to relate to singular proper nouns in a similar way to that in which the *habitutz comunas* relate to common nouns. The text states that the uses are restricted to the singular, as 'noms propris no deu haver plural'; uses such as *tug li Guilhem* (with a plural noun and an *habitutz comuna)* are glossed as *tug aquel que son apelat d·aquest* [...] *nom Guilhem.*

These *habitutz* are described as *honorablas,* 'honorific', as according to 'nostra maniera de parlar' one gives 'alcuna honor' by saying *En Garnier* rather than *Garnier.* Against a possible objection to their proper status, since they can be combined with common nouns (*en figuiers, en lebriers)*[13], it is stated that this, like any address to a 'cauza irrational', is 'fincha e non propria'. The forms themselves are as follows:

	masc.	fem.
nom.	*En*	*Na*
gen.	*Den*	*Dena*
dat.	*An*	*Ana*
acc.	*En*	*Na*
voc.	*En*	*Na*
abl.	*Per En, Ab En, SiquEn*	*Per Na, Am Na, Sique Na*

---

[13] E.g *Vos en lebriers ades seretz batutz.*

The addition of these honorifics to the category of the *habitutz* produces yet another member of a group already heterogeneous in modern eyes. However, there is a certain degree of logic in the attribution, and it should be borne in mind that the text does not entirely equate the *comunas* and the *proprias.* The former's presence or absence is linked to *relatios* and various other features discussed earlier; the latter's is linked exclusively to the feature of honour. The extent to which there is perhaps a logical difficulty is that before e. g. *rey* the alternation between *a* and *al* is one between different *habitutz comunas;* that between *a* and *an* represents a choice between *proprias* and *comunas.* Strictly of course *a* should be a *propria* when preceding a noun like *Peyres.* This problem is another consequence of the lack of distinction between prepositions and articles in the *habitutz.*

The logic in defining these forms as *habitutz* for the proper nouns is however considerable. Later grammarians would object to the use of articles before proper names. The *habitutz* are however not simply articles, and their potential absence is a feature solely of the nominative and accusative of the *comunas,* rather than of the *habitutz* as a class, and is related to a disparate set of criteria. There is thus no *a priori* reason to expect them to be absent before proper nouns. Quite the contrary; since the *habitutz* mark case, a feature of proper nouns just as much as common ones, any gap is an oddity requiring explanation. No *habitutz* could be found for certain nominative and accusative uses in the common nouns, short of having a zero exponent of the category, not apparently an option for the *Leys.* The gap could however be filled, at least when one was being polite, for the proper nouns. And the *habitutz proprias* do pass the apparent underlying qualification for being an *habitutz:* that of being a prenominal form with no Latin surface equivalent.

3. 3. 6. The semantic and syntactic use of the article. (*Leys* II, 122-4.)

Molinier does not make any distinction between alternative forms of the *habitutz* where both exist in his system; thus *del* and *de* are merely alternative forms of the genitive singular masculine *habitutz. De* occurs also in the other gender and the other number, but nothing is made of this. However, there is in the nominative and accusa-

tive what to us, and to Jofre de Foixà, would be an entirely parallel distinction, namely that between *le/ la/ li/ lo/ los/ las* and zero. This, no doubt because it involves the complete suppression on the surface of this category, does cause Molinier to make an observation: 'Item devetz saber que ges tug li nom pronom e particip no han tostemps habitut en nominatiu et acuzatiu singulars o plurals.'[14] Molinier does not attempt to give a full account of the reasons for the presence and absence of these forms since it would be 'trop lonc' to do so, and further that one can determine it from usage. Two examples of error are simply introduced with the formula 'be vezetz que si yeu dic ... yeu falhi'. Thus *maestres lieg* and *le Peyres lieg* are wrong, while *le maestres lieg* and *Peyres lieg* are correct. A number of sentences are said to be correct in both forms, thus:

(Li) monge van per (la) vila. (Li) mercadier gazanho ara.

This leads to his first principle for the distinction between presence and absence of the *habitutz,* which is that of previous knowledge:

Las habitutz daquestz dos cazes quaysh fan relatio ad aquo que lentendemens daquel que parla enten e porta en son coratge. quar si yeu e tu havem vist. j. caval, yeu poyray dire a te. *le cavals es vendutz.*en ayssi que aquesta habitutz *le.* quaysh fay relatio a la cauza quom enten. que si aquel. *le* no era aqui aquela locutios seria cofuza. e generals, quom re non entendria, quo si hom dizia *cavals es vendutz.*

Molinier's distinction is not parallel to Priscian's above concerning the use and suppression of the (Greek) *articulus*, since the semantics are different. The Greek distinction, between ἄνθρωπος ἦλθεν and ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἦλθεν, is formally parallel since the contrast is between the use and the omission of the form under discussion. But the Greek distinction of meaning, in this context, is between indefinite reference 'a man came' and definite reference 'the man came'; and it is to this distinction that Priscian's *prima notitia* and *secunda notitia* refer.

The Occitan form with the *habitutz,* as in *le cavals es vendutz,* does provide a close parallel to the Greek use of the definite article. And Molinier's explanation of

---

[14]All other cases of the noun require *habitutz* except the ablative absolute: ' *Dieu ajudan aysso farem'.* (*Leys* II, 124).

this usage, 'quaysh fan relatio ad aquo que l'entendemens daquel que parla enten e porta en son coratge', would also explain the Greek article. In fact, it is quite sophisticated, since it attributes the use of the article to knowledge which the participants in the discourse share due to a similar experience (having seen the horse), rather than making it depend on an explicit first mention in speech. This description of the article's function may well be an independent insight, since there is no reason to believe that Molinier was any better an interpreter of Priscian than those of his contemporaries who wholly misunderstood the concept of *notitia.*

By contrast, the use of the *cazuals* without an *habitutz* (which tacitly, if illogically, excludes occasions where the noun is preceded by *us* [15]) differs from the referential indefinite usage in ἄνθρωπος ἦλθεν . Most of Molinier's examples involving sentences place the *cazuals* initially, either as a subject or as a significant predicate or object; this to some extent influences the frequency of article usage, and the types of constructions represented. Quite a wide range of uses had no article of any kind in Occitan, especially in the earliest literature, and this extends even to referential indefinites (especially when they are objects[16]). This use of no article was common with partitives and plural indefinites. Among uses which would often stand initially, it was common with generic and non-referential values, as well as with definite reference in the case of those *unica,* like proper names and heavenly bodies, where no confusion could arise and hence 'definiteness' did not make a definite article necessary. Abstract nouns also are without articles. (See Jensen 1986, 70-71.)

---

[15]This form, the Occitan indefinite article, is regarded merely as a numeral by Molinier. It is not discussed at all in this section (a deficiency, from a modern perspective). It is worth emphasising this in view of our modern association of the indefinite and definite articles, and in view of Marshall's bald statement (1962, 396) 'the *habitutz* being the definite and indefinite articles', for which an application of modern habits of thought can be the only explanation. He later gives a more accurate definition of the category's membership (1962, 498).

[16]This category does not occur in any of Molinier's examples, probably as a result of its lesser frequency in preverbal position.

It is in this context that Molinier says that *cavals es vendutz* is a 'locutios [...] cofuza e generals. quom re non entendria.' An initial nominative subject usage need not have been unacceptable in all contexts; cf. Jensen (1986, 61) for the proverbial '*cors oblida c'uoills non ve'*. But while *cavals es vendutz* might have been a part of a larger grammatical sentence, it is not, as Molinier indicates, a clear sentence as it stands.

The other statements on the omission of the *habitutz* attempt to give specific explanations, some of them semantic, for omissions. (The presence of the *habitutz* is regarded as the norm.) They refer to nouns with the exception of *demonstratios,* which refers to pronouns; no reference is made to the different parts of speech. The text initially cites five other reasons for the omission of the *habitutz:* 'interrogatios, enfinitatz, generalitatz, demonstratios, certanetatz.' The discussion is only claimed to be partial: 'entre las cauzas que tolo habitut [...] son aquestas .v.'. On the other hand, since it regards the scope of the discussion as including all nouns, pronouns and participles, it includes a few examples which modern writers would never have expected to take an article.[17]

---

[17]Marshall claims (1962, 502) that the first and second categories involve pronouns. In modern terms he is of course right; but the interrogatives, infinites and relatives are all *nomina* in Priscian, and this is the analysis followed elsewhere in the *Leys.* As such they had to be dealt with at some point. Nor should the presence of real pronouns (in the view of the text) be a surprise from any perspective. The section may be part of the information on the noun, but the specific context is case; and the *habitutz* are regarded as case-markers. As such they apply to pronouns as well as to nouns (and participles too) unless specifically excluded. Even the true pronouns on occasion took the *habitutz* under discussion here, as did *quals* among the relatives. Thus the presence and absence of the *habitutz* with these forms had to be discussed. Marshall claims that a better way would have been to concentrate in the pronouns on those few times when the pronoun is preceded by an article (*le qual, lo mieu).* However, since the discussion involves true nouns as well, in other categories, the choice of the default category did not depend on these 'pronouns' alone. But in any case, the whole framework of Molinier's theory imposed this solution. For him, clearly, the *habitutz* were an integral part of his understanding of the case of

Interrogatios covers the interrogatives *quanhs, quinhs, quals.*

Enfinitatz covers the infinitive nouns like *qui,* e.g. *'Qui be fara be trobara'.*

Generalitatz is stated to remove the article 'motas vetz'. The examples are abstracts and nouns used in a generic, non-referential way. *'Grans gaugz es en terra' 'Gran tristor ha. qui pert sos amix.'* A sub-class, called *sobregenerals,* seems to consist of predicate nouns, as in *aybres es. Generalitatz* here covers the generic/ proverbial uses which are mainstream in Occitan. Interestingly, it is specified that 'aytals locutios generals can son a comensamen de razo o de locutio. no requiero habitut', linking this usage to preverbal position. In fact such a general use might well occur without *habitutz* elsewhere in the sentence. Molinier's qualification appears thus to arise from his basic (unexplained) concentration on initial noun phrases.

Molinier's emphasis on the preverbal position is also clear in the *sobregenerals 'aybres es. mayzos es'.* This predicate usage is common in association with *esser,* but he only quotes it in a grammatical but less common initial placing.

Demonstratios covers those 'primitive'[18] pronouns which show *demonstratios* or first mention, thus *'yeu. tu cel. nos. vos. cil. aquest.'* etc.

Certanetatz is the final category, and refers to 'demonstratio e·ls noms propris' It covers what in our terms are personal names like *Peyres ('Peyres lieg'),* place names like *Narbona ('Yeu veg Narbona'),* and also some uses of what we might call unique entities: *solelhs fay, lugana fay.* However, the latter use is regarded as only being valid 'alcunas vetz'; one also has *'le solelhs raia'* and *'la luna appar'.* The category of *certanetatz* is in many ways the reverse of *generalitatz.* Such diversity of reasons for the omission of the *habitutz* may be why Molinier does not attempt to ex-

---

nouns. The undeniable fact of their absence on occasion was faced, but this had to be regarded on systematic grounds as the departure from a norm. Anyway, the treatment found in the *Leys* does not prevent the recognition of *le qual* (*'quals* can es relatius'), and the general fact that the primitive pronouns cannot take the article. Admittedly, no mention is made of the derivative (possessive) pronouns, thus implying that they take these *habitutz;* in fact, in their adjective use, they usually do not.

[18]As opposed to 'derivative' pronouns, the possessive adjectives.

plain the omission by a single principle. The citation of *solelhs* and *luna* would be reasonable historically, since they could freely be used without articles, in a way resembling proper nouns (Cf. Jensen (1986, 69) quoting Giraut de Bornelh's *'tro sai on sol es colgans')*. The examples cited however are apparently meteorological expressions, using the heavenly bodies as non-referential names for sorts of weather and could well represent a different principle.

3. 3. 7. The origin of the term *habitutz.*

The Latin word of which *habitutz* is an adaptation is clearly *habitudo.* The word originally meant 'custom' but acquires in the Middle Ages the meaning 'relationship', providing the abstract noun to the verb *se habere ad, 'to relate to'.* As such, it is a ubiquitous term in grammatical and philosophical writing. Boethius de Dacia, for instance, refers to the *habitudo contrarii ad contrarium,* the *habitudo generis ad speciem,* the *habitudo partis ad totum,* and the *habitudo universalis ad particulare.*

The term is linked to various features of case in various grammarians. Only a few of these uses are potentially relevant to the *Leys.* They are to be found for example in the works of Boethius de Dacia, Martinus de Dacia, Johannes de Dacia, and Radulphus Brito. The relevant uses of the term occur in the combination *habitudo casualis.* This phrase has two translations, both of which are correct at different points in the works involved: 'the relationship of a case-inflected part of speech (*casuale),* and 'the case-relationship'. It is used in a variety of ways to refer to the syntactic connection between words on the basis of the case proper to one of them, and for the elements which express that connection. However, since it is most commonly invoked when there is a potential problem in relating syntax to case, it is more difficult to pick out its basic meaning in these writers.

One basic use is to express the relationship between prepositions and nouns, between verbs and subjects and between verbs and objects; in all three contexts, the relationship is that between *dependens* and *terminans* in contemporary terminology, or between *regens* and *rectum* in the analysis in terms of government.

Thus Boethius of Dacia (1969, 267) says that the preposition 'significat habitudinem alicuius casualis ad actum'. We may paraphrase Boethius' teaching (268) as follows. The construction between *praepositio* and *nomen* in *venio de ponte, venio ad montem* is one of those constructions which 'non fiunt sine habitudine casuali'. The *habitudo* of case is also possible where the second element, the governed item or the *terminans* (neither term is used by Boethius here), is itself a *praepositio*, which unlike the noun does not have the mode of signifying of case. Thus '*venio ad super montem excelsum*' has a *habitudo* of case providing the construction between *ad* and *super,* as well as the one providing the construction between *super* and *montem.* The sentence '*vado ad prope Romam*', is glossed in such a way as to make the separate constructions clear: '*vado ad locum, qui est prope Romam*'. Similarly, in Quaestio 95 (1969, 221-2) the *habitudo casualis* is used to present the relationship between *verba* and *nomina.* The equivalence of the infinitive *legere* with the verbal noun *lectio* is used to prove that the infinitive can have case in the sentences *legere est bonum* and *desidero legere.* Here too, the term *habitudo casualis* is used to refer to an apparently normal case relationship which applies to a word with morphological case.

The *habitudo casualis* was invoked by other authors to provide a category of case-distinctions which might be expressed by case-endings or by a distinct word. As such it was particularly useful to those who were attempting to explain the references in Priscian to the *articulus* in Greek, without running the risk of saying that the two languages have different grammars.

Thus Martinus de Dacia 1961, 65) refers to the *habitudo casualis* in the context of the gerund and the supine (two kinds of verbal noun). He claims that 'non differunt substantialiter ab infinitivo, sed accidentialiter [...] penes habitudinem casualem. Nam infinitivus non habet casum determinatum. Gerundium vero et supinum habent casus determinatos.' For confirmation that the gerund and the supine have determined cases, and thereby also the *habitudo,* Martinus appeals to Priscian: 'hoc enim est quod dicit Priscianus quod gerundium idem significat quod infinitivus cum articulo toy [τοῦ]'.

Martinus explains this in terms of the *habitudo casualis:* 'Per hunc articulum intelligo determinatam habitudinem casualem.' The determined case-relationship, expressed in the Latin word by case endings, is thus a separate word in Greek, but the whole feature is regarded as an accident in both languages. The views of Johannes de Dacia, already cited in 3. 2. 4., linked the *articulus* exclusively to case. The expression of the reason for their absence in Latin follows the other writers in referring to *habitudines casuales* rather than simply *casus* in the context of the distinction which in Greek is allegedly carried by the article: 'Sed nos Latini ut plerumque habemus nomina distincta distinctas habitudines casuales importantia, propter quod non indigemus articulo [...]'.

3. 3. 8. The *habitutz* and the relationship to gender.

Much confusion has been caused by the relationship between the *habitutz* of case, the nominal accident of gender, and the Latin use of the *'articulus' hic* to mark gender. Much of this, though not all, derives from some ambiguities in Molinier's employment of the term.

The *habitutz* in Molinier is introduced in the main discussion under case rather than gender, indicating the primacy of the relationship to case. It is invoked in the definition of case in the *Leys,* while only occurring peripherally under the discussion on nominal gender. The historical derivation of the category from the term *habitudo casualis* also seems assured; the Modistic sources employing this term do not refer to any *habitudo generis* where nominal gender is at issue.

However, the use of the term *habitutz* for (among other items) the descendants of *ille* required a recognition that these forms not only varied for case, but also agreed with their nouns in gender and number. Hence it is unsurprising, and by itself not very significant, that the *habitutz* are listed not only by case but by these two accidents as well.

No grammatical consequences are drawn for the link to number, despite the fact that for some words the sole indication of number might be made by the *habitutz.* The situation with regard to gender is more complicated.

On the one hand Molinier sees nothing in Occitan which can be regarded as equivalent to the Latin use of the article to mark genders, though he does mention the Latin construction:

Segon Lati alcus gendres es apelatz articulars. quar hom lo conoysh al article. que lis donatz. coma *hic magister. hec musa.* E son apelat article aquest trey pronom *hic. hec. hoc. Hic* fay senhal de masculi. *hec* de femini. *hoc* de neutri. *hic* et *hec* del comu. *hic* et *hec* et *hoc* de omne. Pero nos no havem aytal conoysshensa de gendre en romans. quar nos solamen conoysshem lo gendre a la natura de la cauza o a la votz' (*Leys* II, 68).

No connection is made between this Latin use and any form in Occitan, and the articular use of *hic* is not translated into Occitan. (This did not prevent the translators in the Gatien-Arnoult edition from rendering as *article* both Molinier's *article* and his *habitutz.)* A link of the *habitutz* to gender does however occur a little later (*Leys* II, 74), when he chooses to discuss people's gender errors (specifically the treatment of masculines in *-a,* like *papa, propheta,* and the word *orde)* as errors made in placing the *habitutz (le, la,* etc.), using a feminine *habitutz* instead of a masculine.[19] Admittedly, here the misuse of the *habitutz* is the consequence of a wrong gender attribution: 'hom deu pronunciar aytal mot ab habitut del masculi. quar segon Romans tug li mot denan dig son de masculi.' (The reason for the gender in these words would appear to be the *cauza,* while the errors are based on the *votz* — see 6. 3.) The *habitutz* are therefore affected by gender, but not said to be signs of it like the articles.

The etymology of the term *habitutz* represents the greatest extension of the concept of the *habitutz* as a marker of gender. The section in question ('De las habitutz e per que son dichas habitutz', *Leys* II, 112-14) follows immediately after the denial of declension in Romance and indeed begins with the statement that 'cove que vejam ayssi de las habitutz pusque autra declinatio no havem'. The general context of the link to case is therefore still strong, since the discussion of declension is couched

---

[19] 'Encaras devetz saber que nos no havem certas habitutz alcunas del masculi et alcunas del femini. enayssi que motas vetz se pecca hom pauzan aquela ques del masculi. en femini. e pel contrari [...] Aquelas del masculi pauzon alqu en femini perque se pecco. can dizo *las ordes. la papa. la propheta.'*

entirely in terms of case. The etymology itself however is hard to relate to case. 'E vol dire *habitutz*. aytant coma *habit*. quar habitz es senhals que dona conoysshensa dome. e de femna.' If, he says, men, women, and the various religious orders wore the same clothing, they could not easily be distinguished. Thus far the image of the *habit(ut)z* as a *senhals* is reasonably general; but Molinier then takes the image of the distinction of sex and applies it narrowly to the distinction of gender:

enayssi quel habitz dome non es competens covenables appropriatz ni be estans a femna. ni pel contrari. ayssi meteysh las dictios masculinas han lors proprias habitutz. e las femininas aquo meteysh. enayssi que las habitutz de las dictios masculinas. no son covenablas a las femininas. ni pel contrari.

The link to gender here is not intended to be taken exclusively. For many of the *habitutz,* such as *de* and *a,* the gender of the noun is irrelevant, a fact which could hardly have escaped Molinier's attention. It seems most likely that Molinier concentrated on gender within the limited context of the etymology of the name because it offered an attractive and easily-understood analogy, even if it only partially explained the term. It would be a mistake to regard this as a definition of the term, and it is clear enough from other statements that it is the role as a case-marker which is fundamental to its grammatical understanding.[20]

Another use of the same image of the *habitutz* as clothing is seen in the three-book version in the discussion of whether a number of constructions consist of one word or two (Anglade 1919, III, 75), where it is stated that in the combination of the *habitutz* and its *cazual,* the *habitutz* is to the *cazual* as the clothing to a man. Without the habit(ude) the man or the *cazual* is naked, but when they are both together, the whole represents one man or one *dictio.*

The link of *habitutz* to *habitz* in the sense of clothing makes more sense in Occitan, where the term refers to a form, and one that can display gender on occasions,

---

[20]Marshall (1962: 498-99) takes the etymology seriously as an indication of the function of the *habitutz,* which he describes as 'Molinier's term for articles', while stating that 'both the term and the conception seem to be the grammarian's own'. Consequently he regards both the vocative *o* and the prepositions as elements which do 'not accord with the definition quoted'.

than it does in Latin; although the clothing image might conceivably be used, by a less close metaphor, of a marker of case, the majority of *habitudines* are still relationships of some kind, and the *determinata habitudo casualis* represented by a form like the Greek article remains a peripheral use of a term with a wider meaning. It is overwhelmingly probable that the link is therefore Molinier's own. It may in part have been suggested by the dictionary section of the *Catholicon* (Balbus 1971), where the word *habitudo* '*aptitudo* uel proprietas habendi uel conuenentia' occurs in close proximity to *habitus* 'uestimentum, ut "iste monachus habitum gerit monachalem" ', though no link is there made between the words and other senses of *habitus* are also cited.

3. 3. 9. The *habitutz* and the article.

While the fundamental understanding of the *habitutz* is clear, as a marker of case, the careful distinction of this concept from that of the *article* still requires explanation. Clearly, Molinier regards the behaviour of the two categories in relation to the gender of nouns as in some way different, despite the apparent similarities. Even more strangely, he never refers to the *article* in the context of case, where it would seemingly provide a close parallel to his *habitutz*. This is the case even though most contemporary discussions of the *habitudo casualis* are in the context of explaining the link between the Latin accident of case and the Greek article, and Johannes de Dacia has no objection to articles in Romance vernaculars. Equally, there is no sign of awareness of the common equation of Romance articles with the Greek articles and its Latin substitutes. [21]

---

[21] Contrast the texts in Städtler 1988, which show uses of forms from the definite article to serve as markers in explaining the cases. E.g. 99, DonatM[1] declines thus: *le mestre, du mestre, au mestre, le mestre, o tu mestre, par le mestre/ o le mestre/ sanz le mestre/ du mestre.* (Note the multiple ablatives, though they translate mainly prepositional usages.) This text does not indicate the grammatical analysis of these elements, but it uses *hic* in its essentially similar list of the cases of the participle, where Latin forms are found. In DonatS (127, dated before 1436) the forms *li maistre, du maistre, au maistre, le maistre, o tu maistre, du maistre, de par le maistre, ensemble le maistre, avec le maistre, le maistre*

Two potential explications may be given. The first is that Molinier, like Luys d'Averçó after him (see above, 3. 2. 3.), regarded the proper translation of *hic* as *a-quest,* 'this'. The refusal to identify it with the prenoun forms such as *le, la* would then be comprehensible. The bald identification of the category 'article' with the three forms *hic haec hoc*, without any hint that the Latin words do not have the meaning of true articles, would be consistent with this interpretation

The other potential explanation is to relate the issue to Molinier's conduct elsewhere. He is capable of rejecting classical terms if there is the slightest difference between Latin and Occitan, especially when these terms have a direct relevance to form (see chapter 5 on the concepts of *declinatios* and *conjugatios).* In the context of case, recognising the article might well have implied recognising it, as in Greek, as a part of speech, thus breaking the link to the Latin analysis used elsewhere. Nevertheless, some recognition had to be made of the forms in question, while retaining their equivalence to the nominal accidents expressed in the case-endings of Latin. The concept of *habitudo casualis* would have offered a way of squaring the circle; it was a *bona fide* feature of Latin grammar, and covered the case-endings, while at the same time being applicable to forms preceding the nouns in other languages. As a feature of the Latin *nomen*, or the case-relationship between two parts of speech, it was not a part of speech itself, and its recognition therefore would not disturb a system based on Latin grammar.

3. 4. 1. Articles and *(h)abitutz* in the Iberian grammars.

The *habitutz* was adopted by a number of writers in Iberia (see first chapter for account of the texts). In Catalan and Castilian, the use of prepositions and articles was essentially identical to that in Occitan.[22]

---

are attached to the paradigm *hic magister* etc, implying equivalence of the 'article' *hic* and the Romance forms, but the same glosses are also used for *magister* etc. without *hic*.

[22] The main difference in this part of the grammar was that there were no case-distinctions in Iberian languages, though they were maintained in the poetic tradition for which Averçó legislates.

Two potential explications may be given. The first is that Molinier, like Luys d'Averçó after him (see above, 3. 2. 3.), regarded the proper translation of *hic* as *a-quest,* 'this'. The refusal to identify it with the prenoun forms such as *le, la* would then be comprehensible. The bald identification of the category 'article' with the three forms *hic haec hoc*, without any hint that the Latin words do not have the meaning of true articles, would be consistent with this interpretation

The other potential explanation is to relate the issue to Molinier's conduct elsewhere. He is capable of rejecting classical terms if there is the slightest difference between Latin and Occitan, especially when these terms have a direct relevance to form (see chapter 5 on the concepts of *declinatios* and *conjugatios).* In the context of case, recognising the article might well have implied recognising it, as in Greek, as a part of speech, thus breaking the link to the Latin analysis used elsewhere. Nevertheless, some recognition had to be made of the forms in question, while retaining their equivalence to the nominal accidents expressed in the case-endings of Latin. The concept of *habitudo casualis* would have offered a way of squaring the circle; it was a *bona fide* feature of Latin grammar, and covered the case-endings, while at the same time being applicable to forms preceding the nouns in other languages. As a feature of the Latin *nomen*, or the case-relationship between two parts of speech, it was not a part of speech itself, and its recognition therefore would not disturb a system based on Latin grammar.

3. 4. 1. Articles and *(h)abitutz* in the Iberian grammars.

The *habitutz* was adopted by a number of writers in Iberia (see first chapter for account of the texts). In Catalan and Castilian, the use of prepositions and articles was essentially identical to that in Occitan.[22]

---

are attached to the paradigm *hic magister* etc, implying equivalence of the 'article' *hic* and the Romance forms, but the same glosses are also used for *magister* etc. without *hic*.

[22] The main difference in this part of the grammar was that there were no case-distinctions in Iberian languages, though they were maintained in the poetic tradition for which Averçó legislates.

A feature common to the Iberian writers is a failure to observe the full complexities of the distinction between *habitutz* and *prepositios*, a fact which creates important theoretical divergences from Molinier's system in these writers. While this may in part be due to a conscious wish to innovate with respect to Molinier, it may equally be due to factors in the transmission and understanding of Molinier's work.

The logic of the distinction between homophonous *habitutz* and prepositions is nowhere clearly explained even in the full version of the *Leys,* and is even there occasionally abandoned (see above, 3. 3. 3.). Misunderstanding may have been more frequent where the verse abridgement, the *Flors,* was used as a basis. In this work, the section on the *habitutz* (also spelt *abitutz* in the surviving MS) is consistent with the longer versions but significantly less full. Notable absentees are the *habitutz proprias.* In addition, while the preposition/ *habitutz* distinction is obviously intended to exist, it is somewhat less clear to the casual reader:

> Motas d'aquestas abituts
>
> Vezem que son mantas vegadas
>
> Per preposicios pauzadas [...]
>
> O sian preposicios
>
> Os abituts, car entre nos
>
> Gran diversitat no·y trobam (Anglade 1926, 44).

There is no section on the prepositions as such, so that neither the accusative prepositions, nor those ablative prepositions which never serve as *habitutz,* are mentioned. Adapters working principally from this version might well fail to reconstruct Molinier's full system.

3. 4. 2. The *abitut* in the *Torcimany.*

Luys d'Averçó (1956) uses a category *senyal* or *abitut* clearly derived from the *Leys;* some of the detail is directly copied. However, the understanding is different; he concedes that (I, 181) 'alguns d'elhs [los senyals] sien de natura preposicional o adverbial' but states nevertheless that 'deuen eser apelatz *abitut'*. In the accusative, the distinction is still clear between the ***senyals/ abituts*** *lo la los las,* (178-80) and a

large number of forms belonging to the category of 'preposicions del cas acusatiu', which are described (I, 193) as *senyals* but not as *abituts,* since they mark the case when the *abitut* is not present. All of these are at least potentially translations of Latin accusative prepositions. In the ablative (179), the singular *senyals* (for no obvious reason, a longer list than the plurals) include *per, ab, am, am lo, en lo, si que·l, senes, de, lo, devant, sens, menys, en.* Of these only *si que·l* and *lo* clearly translate Latin bare ablatives. *Sen(e)s, devant,* and *menys* are clearly the equivalent of Latin prepositions (*sine, pro* etc.); no separate category of ablative prepositions is recognised. The rest of the list consists of ambiguous forms, and here Averçó reveals in his examples that he understands them at least partly as prepositions; thus '***Ab** dona vulh estar*', '***En** la belha casa del temple*', '***Per** fembra ve tot mal*', corresponding respectively to Latin *cum, in, per.* By contrast, '*am lo poder divinal*' is more like an instrumental ablative. The occurrence of *de* on the ablative list should correspond to Latin *de, ab, ex,* but this is shown not to be the case by the rule for the ablative *de*, that it be placed after verbs, participles or proper names, and by the examples. '*Aquelh ve **de** la casa*' is equivalent to Latin *ex*, but '*Lo marit **de** Costança*' would be a genitive, *maritus Constantiae.*

3. 4. 3. The *habitut* in the *Art de trobar.*

Francesch d'Olesa's *Art de Trobar* provides another use of the term *habitut.* It first appears in the section *Dels articles y habituts* (Llabrés y Quintana 1909, 66). The preliminary definition implies a distinction between these two concepts: 'Article se refereix al linatge y habitut als casos'. This might imply a distinction between (modern) articles as signs of gender and prepositions as signs of case. However, he then gives an undifferentiated list: 'son doncs articles y habituts *lo, la, los, las, a, als, dels, de, i, e, o, ab, per, en,* y altres semblants', and later (68) refers to 'las habituts ab sos casuals' as including both *lo lop* and *de Deu. Dels* is described, in full accordance with Molinier's analysis, as 'habitut del genetiu y ablatiu del nombre plural' (70). The text seems therefore to be operating mainly within the tradition of the *Leys.* The link of *habituts* to case picks up on their main structural function in the *Leys;* the link of

articles to gender, though present for instance in Nebrija (1909, e5v), who restricts the term to the descendants of *ille,* may also derive from medieval sources.

3. 4. 4. The noun, article and case-marking in Pedro de Alcalá.

Pedro de Alcalá approached the description of the nominal system of Colloquial Arabic from a basis that was broadly Latinate and specifically influenced by Molinier's analysis. The linguistic data he sought to explain had some broad similarities to Romance in their pattern, making an adaptation of the Occitan system possible without much theoretical innovation.

In order to set Pedro's grammatical analysis in context, it will be helpful to summarise, from a modern perspective, the linguistic data which he seeks to analyse by means of the concept of the *abitud.* These data are largely drawn from the Colloquial Arabic of the period.[23] In addition, he includes in his grammatical analysis a number of forms belonging to higher registers of Arabic.[24]

The relevant background information can be summarised as follows.

1. The noun was inflected for number, but not for case.[25]

2. There is a definite article, invariable for number, gender, and case. Its basic form is *al.* Before a number of dental, alveolar and palatal sounds, this is reduced in Pedro's transcription to *a.* Classically, this *a* would have been followed by a geminate

---

[23] An objective account of this dialect is difficult to achieve in this context since Pedro's work is one of the major sources from which it is known; it can be hard to distinguish, on specific issues, whether he represents accurately an Arabic affected by Romance interference, or whether he misrepresents the language in accordance with his Castilian background.

[24] In addition, some of the liturgical texts which form part of the *Arte* use Classical forms which are not explained in the grammatical sections.

[25] The three definite case-endings of Classical Arabic, the nominal *i'rab,* make no appearance in Pedro's grammar, though they are inconsistently used in some of his liturgical texts. For the fate of the *tanwin* (indefinite endings) see Corriente 1977, 121; note that they no longer conveyed case-distinctions or indefiniteness, and that even a secondary use to link constituents is moribund in Pedro's normal usage.

consonant. Such consonants are rarely written by Pedro, although he recognised the existence at least of /rr/ in this position.[26] (The distinction /r/ versus /rr/ had a parallel in Spanish.) There is at least a possibility that this reflects a real loss of gemination in some registers of Spanish Arabic (Corriente 1977, 66). The letters requiring *a* did not include ج in classical usage. In Alcalá, where this letter is transcribed ‹g/j›, both forms of the article are found before it.

When the article occurs postvocalically (for instance, after a preposition), the colloquial language maintained the /a/ of the article but might delete the preceding vowel; e.g. *fi+al>fal* (cf Corriente 1977, 85). The classical language did the reverse, thus *fi+al>fil.*

The article is thus written variously in Pedro as *al, a, l,* and zero.

3. The prepositions *li* ('to') *mita* ('of'), *min* ('from'), *fi* ('in'), *bi* (glossed as 'con', 'with'), and *ma'a* ('with') are regarded by Pedro as *abitudines.* (A number of other prepositions are cited as *preposiciones* taking the accusative. See 3. 4. 5.) Since the articles are also included in this category, combinations of prepositions with articles are not distinguished coherently from the simple forms. The following table, following Pedro's orthography but not his grammatical analysis, is offered as a guide to the underlying linguistic situation.

---

[26]He once shows awareness both of this sound and its grammatical origin in the assimilation of l, 'yo ando conel ombre. Anĭ namxĭ măa rajŭl... porque aquella .l. que se avia de poner con este nombre rajŭl que comiença en .r. se mudo en otra .r. en manera que dize .rra. y no .ra.' (Pedro 1929: *Arte* c1v). This fact is not however mentioned in connection with any other form.

α	β	γ	δ	ε
li	*lil*	*lal*	*li*	*la*
mĭta	*mităl*	*mităl*	*mĭta*	*mĭta*
fi	*fil,*	*fal*	*fi*	*fa*
bi	*bil*	*bal*	*bi*	*ba*
min	*minal*	*minal*	*(mina)*	*(mina) (not cited)*
măá	*măál*	*măál*	*măá*	*măá*

(Key:

α. Basic form.

β. Combined with the article, no assimilation, classical vowels.

γ. Combined with the article, no assimilation, colloquial vowels.

δ. Combined with the article, assimilation to following consonant, classical vowels.

ε. Combined with the article, assimilation to following consonant, colloquial vowels.)

4. The nominative and accusative are commonly expressed without any preposition or particle, so that the sole preposed form is the definite article.

5. In the genitive there is an important difference from Romance in that there are two constructions. One is the use of *mita,* mentioned above. This derives from what Bergsträsser (1983: 196) calls the 'most widespread [genitival locution]' in Colloquial Arabic, deriving from 'the substantive **matā'un**, *property'* . Its function in Spanish Arabic is as a possessive relative (Corriente 1977, 125), since it may stand alone, without a head noun, meaning 'the one with/of'. In the examples used by Pedro, however, it can be regarded as similar to the Romance preposition *de.* In the other genitive construction, the simple form of the noun (with or without article *a al)* is used as the possessor. The forms associated with it are thus identical with those of the nominative.

6. The vocative markers *ya* and *a* are attested in Spanish Arabic. (Corriente 1977, 128), and are quoted by Pedro. The use of the article as a vocative marker was also possible; it is not represented in Pedro's analysis.

The general lack of any indication of gemination means that forms written identically had different functions. This is particularly true with the inclusion of the Classical forms in column δ. Pedro at no point shows awareness of this.[27] He is also unable to give an account of the varying vowels of *bal/bil*, etc. The *al/a* alternations, by contrast, are understood if not always clearly explained.

Theoretically Pedro could have made use of both the Arabic grammatical system (of which he displays some knowledge) and of the Arabic writing system as sources of his analysis. Both might have encouraged him to recognise the article as an entity. However, this would have been complicated by the fact that one of the most salient differences between 'grammatical' and Spanish Arabic was the syntax of the article. Pedro would have had to revise his texts wholesale to achieve conformity with the grammatical doctrines. It is also probable that he preferred to use Latinate models whenever possible, whatever the consequences.

His actual solution is to adopt an analysis which owes nothing whatsoever to the Arabic grammatical tradition. Like Molinier, he regards the fused forms of articles and prepositions as forming a single category, whose main, though not sole, designation is *abitud.*

3. 4. 5. <u>The category of the *abitud* in Pedro de Alcalá.</u>

Pedro's first reference to the *abitudines* is as follows (1929, *Arte,* a6r): Los casos son seys. s. mubteḏ,.muḏăf. maxrŏr. mafʿŭŭl. munedĕ. darf. los quales corresponden alos seys casos dela lengua latina que son. Nominatiuo. genitiuo. datiuo. acusatiuo. vocatiuo. ablatiuo. § Empero porque todos los nombres arauigos son invariables y monoptotos. asi enel numero singular como enel

---

[27]Of the colloquial forms, only *mĭta* and *măʿa* show an ambiguous spelling. Pedro however also writes *mĭta a* for 'of the' and once writes *măʿal* as *măʿaal.* This implies that the spoken distinction would have been /mitaʿ/ vs. /mitaʿa/ and /maʿ/ vs. /maʿa/. Hence, while the spelling remains ambiguous, the colloquial system could make the necessary distinctions without the gemination of the following consonant.

plural.[28] es necessario conocer algunas abitudines o conocimientos que hazen la diferentia entre los casos.

The *abitudines* are then cited, forming a system that may be summarised thus:

mubtedĕ	*a , al*
mudăf	*a, al, mĭta, mităl*
maxrŏr	*la, la, li, lil*
mafu̓ŭl	*a, al* ('los del nominatiuo')
munedĕ	*a, ya.*
darf	*ba, bal, bi, bil , fa, fal, fi, fil, măa̓ , măa̓l, min, minal*

The other reference to the *abitudines* is in the context of the *preposiciones* (Pedro 1929, *Arte,* b8v). Pedro lists a number of accusative *preposiciones*, translating a list of Latin *praepositiones* and *adverbia*, not all of which take the accusative in Latin. Then the 'doze preposiciones' of the ablative are cited. These are the same forms as were originally cited as the *abitudines* of the ablative, and include combinations with the definite article (which the accusative *preposiciones* do not). Pedro states: 'Nota porque ay algunas abitudines en cada vno delos casos. que en alguna manera parescen preposiciones. porque se preponen alos casos. a vn que en verdad no lo sean. Las quales puse arriba tratando delos casos'.

This statement is followed by a second, fuller list of the forms listed originally as *abitudines* of the various cases. Here the terminology is even more variable. The nominative and genitive have *notas,* the dative, accusative and vocative have *abitudines,* while the ablative has *preposiciones* once more, with the same list recurring.

No distinction is therefore made between *abitudines, conocimientos,* and *notas,* while the category unites with the *preposiciones* in the ablative only. Of these terms, *conocimiento* is also used with another function in the grammar; it describes the possessive/ object suffixes, (also called *damĭres,* an Arabic term) and the subject elements *na, ta, ya,* etc. (Pedro 1929, *Arte,* a7v).

---

[28] This is not intended to imply the absence of inflection corresponding to other features, such as number, for which Pedro gives some rules (1929, *Arte,* a5r-a5v).

Molinier had been unusual among early Romance grammars in quoting several different forms as markers of each of the first five cases. Pedro too quotes a number of forms, including examples with and without the article. One may compare the dative ***abitudines*** *la, lal, li, lil* with the ***abituts*** *a, ad, al* (masculine) and *a, ad, ala* (feminine) of the *Flors* (Anglade 1926, 43). In the ablative, the use of different forms is more usual, especially where (as in Pedro), an attempt is made to render several Latin prepositions and/or meanings of the ablative. However, each individual preposition has more than one form corresponding to it, in a way that is once more reminiscent of Molinier.[29] (Contrast early French writings, where no attempt is made to quote prepositions with and without the article.)

For most of the cases the coverage of Molinier and Pedro is identical, subject only to obvious differences between the two languages described, and some variation in the citation of indefinite forms. Thus while gender and number are features of both languages, they have no effect on the Arabic article and consequently are not cited by Pedro in this connection, thus making the *abitudines* a closer approximation to pure markers of case than the *habitutz.*

3. 4. 6. Distinctions between the *abitudines.*

While Pedro shows a similar procedure to Molinier in citing several *abitudines* for each case, he does provide considerable information relevant to the choice be-

---

[29]The several alternatives are real ones in the ablative. Pedro makes some attempt to give rules for the alternatives in the other cases. While his explanations are not models of clarity, it is clear that he is aware of the phonological consequences of the lunar and solar letters, and has some awareness of the issues affecting the presence and absence of what we call the article, though he has difficulty in providing a theoretical account of them. The distinction between *lil* and *lal* etc. is not apparently understood. Thus, while the first list of the *abitudines* gives many forms with no criteria for distinction, it appears that Pedro would regard each case except the ablative and the genitive as having a basic form and conditioned variants. Ironically, he comes closest to distinguishing the function of the article in the dative, ignoring it elsewhere, while the *Leys* comes close only in the nominative and accusative.

tween them. The two *abitudines* quoted for the vocative, *a* and *ya,* 'sirven indiferentemente'.

The four genitive forms *a, al, mĭta, mităl* are reducible to the two basic constructions outlined earlier. Pedro makes what seems to be an attempt to distinguish semantically between them: 'al. mayormente & mas comun sirve a cosas razonablas que a otras. non obstante que se puede bien hallar con otras'. The implied contrast is with *mital.* However the point that any typical use of *al* applies also to *a* is not actually stated, though it may be implied. The two cited examples are *dar albăyda* and *beit allah,* 'the house of God' (Pedro 1929, *Arte*, c1r. Pedro takes the *al-* of *allah* to be an *abitud).*

As in Molinier, the structure adopted by Pedro offers no easy way of distinguishing between forms with and without the article (in the modern sense). Molinier's account of the omission of the nominative and accusative *habitutz* was probably not known to Pedro (it does not appear in the *Flors).* Nevertheless, Pedro confronts issues that are relevant to the use of the article on two occasions, under the accusative and the dative; he does not however note any common factor.

In the accusative, as in Occitan, the issue was between the appearance or absence of an *abitud.* Pedro comments:

> Las [abitudines] siruen dela mesma manera que enel nominatiuo saluo si el nombre fuese puesto infinita & no determinadamente. Ca en tal caso no le ponemos abitud alguna. Enxemplo. Trae pan. çoq hobç. compra vino. Acharĭ xarăb.' (Pedro 1929, *Arte*, c1r.)

These partitives, and other uses which might be described as 'infinito y no determinado' are valid examples of use of an anarthrous noun in both Arabic and Castilian. What is absent is a treatment of occasions where an anarthrous construction corresponds to Castilian *un* or *algun,* as in 'Ouistes ayuntamiento con alguna muger o con algun hombre Anjamăa̓t măa̓ mară au măa̓ rajŭl' (*Arte,* d7v).

In the dative, Pedro attempts to distinguish between different *abitudines* (something Molinier did not attempt). However, the lack of a concept of the article caused him to have difficulty in making the distinction. He first gives rules for the

choice between *la* and *lal* (which of course both include the article) depending on the following letter. For the other forms, *li* and *lil,* he makes the following observation (Pedro 1929, *Arte,* c1r):

Li. lil. Mayormente las hallamos ayuntadas a cosas razonables o nombres proprios y a vn appellativos, como quiera que mas comun lo hallamos con los proprios. Exemplo yo doy el pan a fulano. An ĭ naa̓tĭ al ḣobç li fulĭn. yo doy el dinero a Pedro. anĭ naa̓tĭ al catăa̓ li Pedro.

Here, the main distinction is between ordinary definite nouns which usually have the article, and (definite) proper nouns that do not. The vagueness of 'a vn apellativos' leaves open what other types are seen as taking these forms. However, the citation of *lil* is clearly erroneous (interestingly, he provides no examples); since *lil* includes the article it can never occur with proper names. The concentration on proper nouns is no doubt due to the fact that indirect objects are likely to be definite, so that proper names were the most obvious class of anarthrous nouns.

The same limitation to *cosas razonables* is found under the ablative with reference to *măa̓* and *măa̓l.* Pedro states that these prepositions 'aponen se siempre a cosa razonable' which is reasonable since the preposition is typically used with such nouns. However he is only really concerned with articular forms; the rule he gives for the choice of the two forms is the same as that for the choice of *a* and *al.* Anarthrous forms (such as proper names) which would always take *măa̓* are implicitly excluded.

No reference is made to the presence and absence of the article (in the narrow sense) before a genitive noun. Here, when the non-prepositional construction was used for a proper name or other anarthrous noun, there is effectively a zero marker of case for which Pedro does not provide. The texts show several examples, e.g. *bi amr Pŏncio Pilăto,* 'under the command of Pontius Pilate'; *ḣŏbzane cŭlli yăumi,* 'our bread of every day'. (Pedro 1929, *Arte,* c6v; c6r). No such gap exists when the *mita* construction is used, since *mita* may represent the simple form or the form with assimilated article. However, only the use with an article is actually cited in a grammatical example, in *al moftăh mĭta dăr,* 'the door of <u>the</u> house'. The anarthrous form is seen in Pedro's texts in *agimĭe̓ al mucăddeç* ***mĭta*** *roma,* 'the holy church of Rome'.

(Pedro 1929, *Arte,* f1r). And the rules for the choice of the forms also ignore the anarthrous use: '*mĭta* se pone para donde *a* enel mubtedĕ, *mităl* para donde *al.*'

Apart from the existence of the anarthrous genitive, the distinctions above involving the use of articles could equally well have been made with reference to Spanish, which may explain Pedro's partial success in identifying them.[30]

3. 4. 7. The *abitudines* of the ablative.

The situation is a little different for the ablative. In the *Leys,* the use of the ablative *habitutz* is to represent the non-prepositional uses of the ablative, leaving the translations of the Latin prepositions to the ablative *prepositios*. Similarly, the accusative *habitutz* consist of the 'article' forms, while the accusative *prepositios* translate the Latin accusative prepositions. This system thus requires *en* and *ab* to appear both as *habitutz* and as *prepositios* according to the relevant Latin equivalent. Pedro separates the two categories in the accusative. In the ablative, however, he uses *abitud* and *preposicion* interchangeably, although he elsewhere denies that the two terms are synonymous.

The members of the ablative group (Pedro 1929: *Arte,* b8v) are interesting in that they do not include all the Latin ablative prepositions; *dun* and *bilĕ,* which are claimed to be the translations of Latin *sine,* are listed as accusative prepositions. Of those which are listed, six are equated to *con,* 'with': *ba, bal, bi, bil, măá, măál. Fa, fal, fi* and *fil* are equated to *en,* 'in', while *min* and *minal* correspond to *de* in the sense of 'from'. (This meaning is made clear by the explanation 'por manera de tornar o dexar algo de algun lugar o persona', since *de* can also mean 'of'.)

---

[30]In Classical Arabic, and most colloquial dialects, there are several compulsory constructions involving the article which differ markedly from Spanish syntax. These include deletion of the article on a noun governed by a genitive, and its presence before both nouns and qualifying adjectives. In Colloquial Spanish Arabic, however, neither rule is consistently observed (Corriente 1977, 124), so that the application of Spanish rules would not give rise to unacceptable forms. Pedro's failure to mention these issues, though it may derive from the difficulty of doing so within his chosen paradigm, is thus of limited practical importance.

The uses cited turn out to be equivalent both to uses of the Latin ablative alone and to those requiring a preposition in that language. Thus the equivalents of *con* show an instrumental use (cf. Latin ablative):

yo hago el arca con la açuela *anĭ naăměl a çunduq bal caydŭn.*

and a use meaning 'in company with' (Latin *cum* + ablative):

yo ando conel ombre *anĭ namxĭ măă rajŭl*

yo como conel caballo *anĭ nacŭl măăl fĭriç.*

The equivalents of *en* and *de* are only cited in contexts where Latin would require prepositions:

creo en la santa yglesia catholica *nŭminu bil o fil jimĭă al mucădeç al haq*

delo blanco *minal abiăd.*

When the noun *faquĭ* is declined with only one *abitud* in each case, it is *măă* which is used to represent the ablative.

This selection of ablative uses is inexplicable if Pedro were comparing Latin and Arabic directly; he would either have made the distinction between bare ablative and prepositional uses, or he would have behaved like Averçó in admitting all ablative forms indiscriminately. It is however entirely explicable if Pedro was working within the tradition of the *Leys,* particularly if he knew the *Flors*. In that text he would have come across the concept of the *abitut* (so spelt in many cases in the *Flors).*

The list of *(h)abituts* of the ablative in the *Flors* is reduced from the *Leys.* The forms admitted are (in the masculine singular, which is representative): *ab, am, amlo, enlo, siquel, lo* (Anglade 1926, 43).[31] *De* is introduced after the paradigm is basically complete:

> 'Encaras l'ablatius fay *de*
>
> En singular ez am plural.
>
> Coma *tu yiest tots ple de mal*

[31]Lo masculi fay per *ab, am,/ am lo* motas vetz hi trobam./ Ez *en lo, siquel,* e soen,/ *Lo* pauzat absoludamen.

Ez hieu de bes e de vertuts . (Anglade 1926, 44)

The sole additional marker is *per,* which occurs first as an example of the use of *abituts* as prepositions (*E **per** mon pro las leys decori,* 44). It then occurs in the section entitled 'Del liamen de la abitut ab son casual, lo qal prendem per declinatio en romans.' where the example is *per Dieu.*

There are a number of differences between Pedro's list and that of the *Flors.* Most notable is the absence of the ablative absolute equivalents, *siquel, lo.* These may well have been deleted for want of an Arabic equivalent. There was little incentive to translate *si quel,* since the *Flors* comment that 'gayre non es *si quel* en us' (Anglade 1926: 43). The lack of an equivalent for *per* is more problematic if Pedro knew the *Flors* directly, though it does not occur in the initial list. However, Pedro may have preferred to omit it entirely, since he does not quote any form as the equivalent of *per* at any stage of his text.

The remaining forms are *ab, en, de* (Spanish *con, en, de).* Pedro translates these without regard to their analysis as *abituts* or prepositions, although the two possible analyses of *anb/con* translated as two separate Arabic forms. Here he could have taken his cue from *Flors* (Anglade 1926, 44): 'O sian preposicios/ Os abituts, car entre nos/ Gran diversitat no·y trobam.' The text makes clear neither the basis or the importance of the distinction. The translation of *de* as *min* is reasonable, though the texts emphasise different aspects of the meaning of the word. Pedro indicates the meaning 'from', while the *Flors* quote the partitive and material uses, *ple de mal,* 'full of evil', and *d'evori* . However, both words shared both meanings.[32] Evidently the sole real concern of Alcalá at this point is to distinguish ablative uses of *de* from genitive ones.

The *Flors,* unlike the *Leys,* offered no explicit guidance on those ablative prepositions which could never be used as *abituts.* Pedro appears to have concluded that the list of *abituts* used as prepositions exhausted the category of ablative prepositions, since he does not attempt to add to them.

---

[32]For the partitive use in Alcalá, see for instance *munlŭatem min a nĭema,* 'full of grace' (*Arte,* c6r).

His solution for the words in question is to make use of a category about which the *Flors* have nothing at all to say, the accusative *preposiciones.* Pedro provides this class with a membership that bears little resemblance to Latin sources, despite the fact that he glosses each Arabic word cited with a Latin equivalent (rather than a Spanish one, as is his general practice).

Of the Latin words cited, *ad apud circa ante contra praeter inter intra propter ultra supra usque* are standard *praepositiones* associated with the accusative in Donatus, though they represent only a part of the Latin grammarian's list (Holtz 1981, 600). Of those which take both cases in Latin, *super* is confined to the accusative by Pedro, while *in* (Sp. *en,* Arabic *fi* فِي) is confined to the ablative. The ablative preposition *sine* is removed from the ablative (for want of a mention in the *Flors),* and becomes an accusative preposition (Arabic *dun, bilĕ).* The rest of the category is made up of forms, mainly adverbial, which are not *bona fide prepositiones* in the standard Latin analyses: *unde, inde, foris, foras, subtus, procul, longe, longius, sicut* (a conjunction in modern analysis).[33]

This confusion of adverb and preposition cuts both ways. The only Arabic word to occur on both lists of *preposiciones* is the form *min,* rendering Spanish *de* (Latin *ab/ex)* in the ablative and Latin *unde* as an accusative *preposicion.* On pages c1v-c2r, *min* appears as part of a mixed list of 'pronombre[s] o adverbio[s] demostratiuo[s]'. It is thus regarded at this point as an adverb, although the example cited, 'de lo blanco. min al abiad', is clearly prepositional.

The effect of Pedro's innovations in the *abitudines* is to weaken the link between Latin and Arabic analyses, despite his general view that the same grammar is applicable to both languages. This is largely due to his simplifications, notably the loss of the distinction between ablative *preposiciones* and ablative *abitudines,* and the

---

[33]Some of these do have prepositional uses, notably *subtus,* which may replace one notable absentee, the accusative/ ablative preposition *sub.* Others have more marginal uses, such as *procul* in *procul dubio.* Such uses do not explain all the Latin glosses, since some (e.g. unde) have no prepositional uses.

modified list of accusative *preposiciones*. The net effect of these changes is to reduce greatly the number of forms to which several grammatical functions are attributed. The practical result is a greater economy and simplicity in the description of Arabic, but there is little evidence that this was in fact a major concern of Pedro's.

3. 5. 1. Syntactic government based on case in the Occitan writers.

Theories of syntactic government played an important part in the medieval Latin grammatical tradition. The Occitan grammarians however devote little attention to it, and when they do so there is little conflict with Latin ideas. Both Jofre and Molinier make reference to the issues related to the syntactic government of case; but, except for a supererogatory section in the *Leys* which is swiftly retracted as irrelevant to the vernacular, their interest is in one issue only.

All Occitan grammarians needed a way of distinguishing nominative from accusative. Unlike the distinction between most oblique 'cases', which merely represented a borrowing from Latin grammar, this distinction was morphologically important. Moreover, it had no single formal marker; there were no prepositions involved, and even if one used the definite article to mark case, there were situations where it was ambiguous (the feminines) or wholly absent. The morphological case-endings[34] could also be ambiguous; even where they were not, the reader could not be guaranteed to know them, this being a major reason why the grammars were written in the first place. Consequently it was necessary to base this distinction at least partly on the structure of the sentence.

3. 5. 2. Syntactic case-distinction in the *Regles*.

Jofre's distinction of the two cases involves a definition of the concepts of *verbs* and *paraula* ('sentence' in this text). The paraula 'no pot haver entendimen si no ha nom e verb' (*Regles* 68). The verb 'nays del nom' and represents 'so que·l nom fay'. The noun placed before the verb 'segons raso' is nominative, while that placed after the verb is accusative. (The names of the cases are mentioned, although the exposition usually refers instead directly to the morphological endings involved.)

---

[34]See the paradigms in 5. 1. 2.

The qualification 'segons raso' is explained thus (70):

Per ço t'ay dit que·l nom sia pausatz denant lo verb o detras 'segons raso', car a les vetz aycells noms qui segons rayso e entendimen es pausat denant lo verb sera, per raho de rima o per autra causa, pausatz detras lo verb.

Jofre then exemplifies this with reference to a number of examples, including *Ans volgra ley pus que gatla espervers* and *tot be pert qui·s part de Deu;* in all cases he rephrases the examples to a more normal SVO order. In the case of *Q'una vets la vences merces,* the substitution of a noun for a pronoun is required to make this order possible: *merces vences la dona.*

He handles the syntax of the substantive verb in the following rule: 'Empero son alguns verbs qui han autra natura, car tuyt li nom qui detras o denan lor van s'alongon en singular e·s abreuion en plural; e li verb son aquests: *suy, es, so, era, fuyst, ffos, eres, ffuy, ffora, seran, seras, sera, er, esser, ffo'* (72). In order to simplify the exposition for his grammatically untrained readers, he refers to the nominative by its endings and refers to the various forms of the verb 'to be' as several verbs, though later stating that 'non es mas us verbs' (73). The rule is then extended to a number of other verbs; no distinction is however made between those which have this syntax compulsorily *(estau, sembla, par)* and those which do so in the reflexive, as in the examples *eu me tench per pagatz, eu me sent sas* and *eu me mostri gays.* All the examples show adjectives in the predicate position.

The first type (the transitive verbs) are described thus: 'mostron lo faytx que le nome[n]s fay'. The verb is described as showing 'generalment' the 'faig o la volentat' of the preceding noun, and showing it 'specialment' in the following noun, this being the basis of the accusative case of the latter. The second category 'no mostron so que·l nom fay mas aiuston als nom[s] qui denan llur van e han sustancia altres noms ac cidentals'. Such verbs 'mostren lo estament e·ll esser dels primers noms (i.e the subjects)'.

3. 5. 3. The concept of *regimens* in the *Leys.*

Molinier's use of syntactic government, *regimens,* is similarly limited in application. He describes the grammatical understanding of *regirs* as being 'per exegir so es per requerir. quar aytals regimens requier que la una dictios sia pauzada en cert loc. en cert cas. en cert nombre. et en certa persona' (*Leys* II, 8). However, the use of *regirs* is presented as being a grammatical expedient, invoked to explain morphological differences where all else fails; hence he states:

daquest regimen nos gayre no uzam,en romans, si no solamen. entr el nom el verb. quar sil noms es de nominatiu. requier esser pauzats e regitz del verb. de la part denan. coma *Peyres lieg.* e sil acusatius es pauzatz en aytal locutio. tostemps requier esser pauzatz. apres lo verb. et esser regitz. coma *Peyres lieg la lesso* (II, 8).[35]

However, it is conceded that while this is true according to the 'dreyta ordenansa de las paraulas', the words can be moved round (*'la lesso lieg Peyres'),* though the existence of words such as feminines in *-a* and 'nom integral coma *bras. pers. vers. fals'* and some pronouns where one cannot 'assignar differensa' between the cases is used to justify the rule that the standard nominative-verb-accusative word order should be followed (10). Other types of *regimens* are dismissed. A few observations nevertheless follow, e.g. that the nominative must agree with its verb in number and person. This is relevant as it provides an extra distinction between nominative and accusative where morphological criteria are lacking (see *Leys* II, 10).

Verbs requiring accusatives 'aprop lor' are stated to be either 'veray actiu' (*'yeu ami Bernarda.'*) or 'neutri transitiu' (*'Hucz manja carn.'*). Verbs which 'quel

[35]Marshall (1962: 558) implies that this limitation of *regimen* to the noun-verb relationship and to the nominative and accusative is reasonable in the vernacular. In fact, while one can defend Molinier's attitude on practical grounds, neither a medieval nor a modern syntactician would accept such a limitation. Molinier's reluctance to use an important element of the grammatical model is a mark of independence, though he refrains from denying its relevance entirely as that would cause an overt clash with his grammatical models.

fag que significo. reman en lor meteysshes [...] son apelat neutri absolut. coma *yeu vau'*, taking accusatives only with prepositions (*'vau a vos.'*). The verbs *soy, estau* and *soy faytz* (the last of which may be seen in *romans* as the passive of *yeu fay*), are defined as *sustantiu*, as they 'volon e requiero aprop lor aytal cas. coma denan. coma *yeu soy bos.*' While other verbs are also regarded as ones which 'requiero aytal cas apres. cum denan' (Leys II, 12), these three are evidently regarded as a standard list. An obvious comparison is with the *Graecismus* (Eberhardus 1887, 238): 'Ars substantiua tria fert tantummodo uerba,/ *Sum* simul *exsisto, fio*, nil amplius addo.' Evidently, *soy* renders *sum, estau* translates *existo,* while *soy faytz* acts as the equivalent of *fio.* The latter correspondence, semantically reasonable, provides Molinier with formal difficulties 'jaciaysso que aquest. *soy faytz.* enpropriamen sia ditz segon romans. us verbs. quar miels sembla. le *soy.* verbs. el *faytz.* particips.'[36]

3. 5. 4. The metaphor of *regimens* in the *Leys.*

The most striking section on *regimens* in the *Leys* is one consisting of a set of metaphors, comparing grammatical with political government (*Leys* II, 6). It occurs before the definition of *regirs* quoted above, which itself appears to start from first principles. It differs from the later definition in that it is not restricted to the determination of the nominative and accusative. In addition, while Molinier recognises position ('loc') and agreement of person and number to be relevant to that Occitan distinction, this discussion is apparently restricted (as far as one can interpret it) to issues narrowly linked to case. The section runs as follows:

Alcunas daquestas partz doratio han maniera demperador. o de gran princep. que vol comandar e regir e no vol estar per sobira mandatz ni regitz. e daquesta natura es le verbs que vol regir. e no vol esser regitz. Alcunas autras partz trobaretz que han maniera de savi home. qui vol regir. e esser regitz e governatz. e daquesta natura son li nom el particip. Alcunas autras son ques han maniera descudier e dome gentil azaut e cortes. que tostemps vol servir. E desta natura es la prepositios. Alcunas autras son ques

---

[36] Given Molinier's analysis elsewhere, it is hard to see why he does not link it to the passive (recognised as a valid, if suppletive category in Occitan), making this verb either the simple passive of *far* or a deponent.

han maniera o natura defan o dome fat que no sap ni pot regir. ans cove que sia regitz e governatz. e desta natura es le pronoms. que tostemps vol esser regitz. Alcunas autras son quez han maniera dome fol. quar no riejo ni son regidas. Et aquestas son laverbis. la conjunctios e la enterjectios.

This states standard doctrine of the period; *regere* is used by Petrus Helias and others as an extension of Priscian's *exigere*. Thus Petrus Helias: 'Ubi gramatici huius temporis dicunt quod dictio regit dictionem, ibi Priscianus dicit quod dictio exigit dictionem' (Helias 1993, 1049). This shows the same connotations of human rule, though perhaps not quite so elaborated as here: 'Sicut enim dux regit exercitum sic verbum regit nominativum positum in constructione' (1050).

The definition in the *Leys* is not elaborated in such detail as to allow us to decide quite what position is being followed on some of the details. Government by the noun will refer at least to the most widely accepted type, namely one noun governing another by virtue of case (*cappa Sortis,* etc). It is not clear what view is taken about other issues, such as whether the substantive governs the adjective (or vice versa). On a number of issues the position is relatively clear. The adverb is described as not ruling or being ruled, showing that the adverb-verb relation is not included, probably because *regimens* is being linked only to parts of speech possessing case. One issue that had divided opinion was the preposition; while logically the preposition governs its substantive noun,[37] in the same way that the verb governs its object or its subject, it was often not felt appropriate that the 'worthier' part of speech, the noun, should thus be ruled, and the term *servire* or *deservire* was employed. It is this opinion which is followed here.

One may compare this with the position in *Admirantes* (Orléans MS, 77). Here there is a distinction between *regere* 'large sumpto vocabulo', and four subdivisions. *Regere* in the narrow sense is restricted to government involving case: 'nulla vox vel dictio regitur nisi casualis', and more narrowly still to the verb-noun relation-

---

[37] This view is taken by Alexander de Villa Dei (1893: 89): 'debet vox *praepositiva/* praeiungi *quarto* vel *sexto* [casui] , quem regit illa', and by Johannes Balbus (1971: 106): 'Item regitur accusatiuus a prepositione transitive. ut uado ad urbem'. Petrus Helias (1993: 1053) takes the same view.

ships: 'Regere attenditur inter nomina et verba'. *Exigere* covers government of one noun by another such as *capa Sortis. Determinare* 'attenditur inter adverbia et dictiones quas determinant, ut *Sortes currit bene'. Deservire* 'attenditur inter prepositiones et casum cui serviunt'. In these terms the *Leys'* understanding of *regere* includes the subdivisions *regere* and *exigere,* but not the other two, while insisting on the link to case. Another view cited in Thurot (1964, 243-44) is different in that the noun-noun relationship (which is not in fact mentioned) is not explicitly removed from *regere,* which is described as 'conferre dictioni poni in tali casu in quo stare debet ut in hac oratione *Sor vidit Platonem'.* Different words are used when the action of 'conferre' is not 'in casuali proprietate', as in the adverb-verb relationship; in *Sor currit velociter, currit* 'exigit' *velociter,* while *velociter* 'determinat' *currit.* A separate category is formed by *servire,* 'conferre dictioni ut cum alia ordinetur cum qua per se ordinari non poterat, ut *vado ad templum'.* All the uses of government recognised in the *Leys* would potentially be in the same category here, namely *regere,* but the use of *exegir* as a synonym of *regir* suggests a link to the terminology represented in *Admirantes.*

4.

The grammatical analysis of the verbal system.

4. 1. The structure of the treatment of the verb in the Occitan grammars.

The Occitan grammarians devote varying amounts of attention to the verb, which was evidently regarded as posing fewer practical difficulties than such matters as noun morphology. Nevertheless, they raise a number of issues arising directly from the contrast between the Latin grammatical system and Occitan morphology and syntax. Raimon Vidal (*Razos* 16-22) merely makes a few observations about errors in verbal forms perpetrated by the troubadours. He uses a certain amount of traditional terminology, without generally explaining it· Jofre de Foixà, Uc and Molinier all devote sections to a reasonably systematic account of the verb, with varying fidelity to Latin models. In the latter two the verb appears as the third part of speech, following Donatus' order.

In Jofre and Uc, the organisation of the material is of secondary importance. In the *Leys,* the structure of the treatment of the verb is itself of theoretical interest, and one needs to understand it to be able to appreciate some of the discussions below.

Molinier divides his discussion of the verb into several sections, with differing relationships to the Latin grammatical models and different purposes.

The first (*Leys* II, 230- 248) takes its cue from the Latin models. The main emphasis is on the 'accidents' of the verb, gender, tense, mood, species, *figura,* person and number, following Priscian's list. The text innovates on a number of issues in this section, but always in reaction to the Latin model, as when two of the *genera verbi* (voices) are rejected. More than one form is cited for several tense/ mood combinations (where only one would occur in Latin) but no distinction between them is made at this point.

The text then goes on to provide two sections which have no equivalent in the model. First is a long section on the 'ajustamens dels mozes e dels temps', the construction/combination of the moods and the tenses. This claims with justification to be

a complete innovation, provided 'jaciaysso ques aysso no sia declarat per los actors'. The rationale for the section (and for the following one on *pronuntiatios,* see below) is avowedly pragmatic; as 'se pecca hom soen segon romans' the text wishes to give 'alcuna doctrina' (II, 248).

Consequently it is doubtful whether the section is intended to answer all the theoretical questions which could have been formulated about Occitan forms. Certain distinctions are made once, only to be neglected elsewhere; but it could be argued that many of the issues which actually required discussion from a practical point of view are addressed. Indeed, much appears here which native speakers of Romance languages would not have found to cause any difficulty.

The section is long compared with the earlier treatment of tense and mood, covering about 50 Occitan pages in the Gatien-Arnoult edition (*Leys* II, 248-348), and has a wealth of examples, generally consisting of reasonably semantically probable prose sentences. No obvious literary quotations appear.The theoretical organisation of the section is not easy to follow, and to some extent represents little more than a framework to order the examples.

This framework consists of the recognition of a number of *claus,* 'keys', an all-purpose word used to describe the elements which are used to form constructions between the moods and tenses. Only occasionally does Molinier point out what part of speech they are; on the basis of the *Leys'* analyses elsewhere, one can say that *conjunctios*, *adverbis*, and *nom* are all represented. Usually they connect clauses containing the verbs in question, but this is not always the case (especially when the *claus* are *e* and *o).* Many are cited without any further comment as to their syntax and semantics; but a number of homophonous forms are distinguished by technical descriptions of their function or of their part of speech[1]. Thus *que* (250-52) is split into several cat-

---

[1]The grammatical analysis used is largely traditional, but occasionally conflicts with Priscian and Donatus (and sometimes with other sections of the *Leys).* Apparent innovations include '*que* subjunctiu'/ 'dubitatiu' and '*quan* adverbis'.

egories. '*Que* subjunctiu en autra maniera dig dubitatiu' can cover doubt, as in *yeu no say que·m fassa* (278), but is more usually found describing sentences such as *yeu vuelh que anes a la gleyza,* where it is in a final clause. '*Que* comparatiu' is exemplified in *yeu escrivi miels que tu,* while '*que* enterrogatiu' appears in '*que fas?'*. Further we have '*que* aprobatiu' as in *yeu say que Dieus es drechuriers'*, '*que* relatiu' as in *yeu fau so que tu vols* and '*que* per *quar', i.e. 'que* in the meaning of *quar'*. *Si* is cited in sentences like *si Dieus o vol tug haurem be* (252) and as an equivalent of *quar*[2]*; si yeu fau mon dever nom blasmes* glossed as *quar yeu fau mon dever.* No distinction is made between *si* meaning *whether* and *si* meaning *if*, despite the precedent of Latin *utrum* and *si,* again probably because of the absence of a syntactic differentiation correlated with this distinction. Thus the combination of the future and present indicatives (272) has the sentence *yeu espiaray sil reys es a Paris.* The reverse combination (270) shows the other use of *si: si·l reys va en la vila. punira los malfachors.*

The status of these distinctions is not entirely clear as it is nowhere explicitly stated. Some homophonous *claus* have clearly differing syntax, making separate treatment a necessity, while the influence of Latin would tend to encourage a distinction between identical Occitan forms which corresponded to different Latin words. Not all the Latin distinctions are reflected, however; '*que* dubitatiu' would sometimes be equivalent to *quid,* sometimes to *ut,* etc; in this case, the theoretically possible distinction is abandoned, probably because both uses have the same syntax, requiring a following subjunctive mood. The grammatical terminology is thus being used to make a number of useful practical distinctions, rather than defining each usage in detail.

The list of the *claus* is almost immediately followed by sample sentences in which they are exemplified.

There then follows the main list of the main list of the 'ajustamens dels mozes e dels temps', which presents a number of combinations of forms, ordered primarily by mood and tense and secondarily by the individual *claus* used. The moods are usu-

---

[2]See also 4. 4. 6.

ally kept carefully apart, even when identical forms belong to more than one mood, but tenses within the same mood which share forms are not distinguished in the lists.

The impact on the unprepared reader can be overwhelming, the more so as the ordering by tense combinations means that similar constructions such as conditional clauses can be widely separated, leaving a mass of different constructions adjacent in the same section. Similarly where two or more forms of a tense exist, the individual sections may quote them without distinction, distinguish the use of the two (but usually only within the immediate context), or simply omit one of the two. When only one is quoted, the reader is left to infer that the other one is unacceptable or abnormal in this context. But the distinctions cannot be seen as general, since they occur only within the context of specific tense-combinations, even when the same principle might be relevant to several combinations. The result may resemble an incipient recognition of the formal units on a level not far down the hierarchy from the tenses themselves; but it is not certain Molinier was thinking like this, and even less that typical contemporary readers would have come away with that impression.[3]

So while readers would begin to learn the patterns of the language, aided by the cornucopia of examples, many of the most interesting issues of the section would not force themselves on them.

The basic unit of analysis is the verb, not the clause. The latter is prominent to the modern eye in the examples only because some of the *claus* naturally link clauses. Thus verbs linked by *e* and *o* are as much at issue as verbs linked by *si*, 'if' or *can,* 'when'. The present indicative is linked with itself in the sentences such as *yeu vau o sezi* (260). The slightly more complicated type involving these same *claus* in different tenses is exemplified in the present indicative/past imperfect indicative combinations *yeu amava e ami* and *yeu parlava o parli* (264). There are however some examples of

[3]This section was indeed largely eliminated from the later revision and reduction in the three book version. It nevertheless deserves attention as the first attempt towards a comprehensive verbal syntax of a Romance language, and as an example of Molinier's procedures where he was to some extent working outside the constraints of Latin grammar.

an apparent confusion of the *claus*. In a number of examples, a first clause shows two examples of the same tense, combined by *e* or *o*. Simultaneously, the first clause is linked to a second clause in a different tense/mood by means of a different *claus*. However, the whole complex is presented as showing the combination of tenses which are found in the first clause, while the only *claus* cited is that linking the two clauses. Examples of this are the following combinations, ostensibly of the present subjunctive with itself, but in reality linking the present subjunctive to the present/ future imperative:

jassiaysso quel desplassia oy contradiga. [...] mena lo (*Leys* II, 336, under *jassiayssoque).*

masque. [...] o vuelha el plassia. fay aquo (*Leys* II, 336, under *masque).*

Such oddities are usually only found in the combinations which are hard to fill with more genuine examples, so they are evidently not regarded even by the author as the most obvious instances. They therefore probably represent an attempt to make the lists exhaustive, even though elsewhere the text does declare certain combinations impossible.

Following the above (352-406) is a section on the *pronuntiatios* of various verb forms. It is concerned only with those forms allegedly likely to be subject to error, and as such as is not exhaustive. Most of the variation concerned is not significant in the Occitan paradigmatic system, and information is only rarely provided which is relevant to the verbal paradigms of the Romance tongue. Hence the use of a term like *pronuntiatios* which does not imply the existence of inflection. See the discussion in 5. 3. 6.

These two sections, as we shall see, are key innovations. They provide information which cannot be incorporated in the Latin framework. In the case of the verb combinations, this is because no comparable analysis existed. Priscian's syntax is in many ways less full.

In both sections, the fact that there is no Latin doctrine on which to be built allows Molinier to develop new ideas, and to supplement to some extent the information given in other areas. Thus some information on Occitan tense usage, inexpress-

ible within the Latin framework of the treatment of tense, can be discovered by careful reading of the *ajustamens.* Similarly, on the rare occasions when the section on *pronuntiatios* generalises from one form to another, thus creating a fragment of a paradigm, it does so in ways that a Latinate system of conjugation might well have obscured.

4. 2. The analysis of voice (*genus verbi).*

4. 2. 1. The linguistic situation.

The category of *genus verbi* in Latin (modern 'voice') was based ultimately on the need to describe the difference in form between verbal endings such as *amo* and *amor,* the prototypical actives and passives. Occitan possessed no synthetic passive inflection, though it could combine the verb 'to be' with the passive participle to provide an equivalent to the passive. (In use, this was somewhat rarer than the Latin passive had been.)

4. 2. 2. The Latin analysis.

The common Latin analysis distinguishes five *genera,* active, passive, *neutrum,* common and deponent, which are distinguished in the classical grammarians by a mixture of formal, syntactic and semantic criteria.

Priscian defines the actives as possessing a form in *o* which can be made into a passive by adding *r* and as showing transitivity (I, 374):

Haec autem verba proprie activa vel recta vocantur, quae in o desinentia et assumpta r facientia ex se passiva, confestim cum dicuntur, possunt transire in quem fit actus et coniunguntur vel genetivo vel dativo vel accusativo casui.

The passive has a form in *-or* which 'ex activis nascitur' (I, 374) and its syntax is treated immediately after that of the active. The *neutra* are defined on the basis of form:

In verbis etiam sunt quaedam voce activa, quae ex se passiva non faciunt, quae generali nomine neutralia vocamus, quamvis diversas habent significationes (I, 376).

These different meanings include actives (*facio),* passives (*fio),* the *absoluta (spiro)*[4], and the non-personal actives like *percurro, ceno,* of which Priscian says that 'quamvis activam habeant significationem, passiva tamen non habent, quia nec in homines eorum actus **transit'**[5] (I, 375). The different meanings are only held together by the formal definition. The common and deponent are distinguished from the other types on the basis of their shared peculiarity of form: 'alia verba, quae quamvis non ab activis proficiscentia tamen passivam habent formam' (I, 378), though Priscian also uses the criterion of meaning to distinguish these two classes:

ex his quaedam eadem voce utrumque significat, id est actionem et passionem, ut est 'osculor te' et 'osculor a te', 'criminor te' et 'criminor a te'. haec communia nominamus. alia vero, quae similiter eandem terminationem habentia nec ab activis nata unam dumtaxat habent significationem, sed non omnia eandem, haec deponentia vocamus (I, 378).

Significatio is here an elastic term. On the one hand it refers to the distinct active and passive meanings as in the deponent and neutrals, which is why Priscian says that these two have 'variam [significationem]'. On the other the common *genus,* which has both meanings, is described as having a 'certam et praefinitam significationem' rather than two *significationes* (I, 374). Admittedly the presence of the two subsidiary meanings means that all *communia* belong to the same class and have the same varieties of behaviour.

The Priscianic system therefore relies partly on form to distinguish its main categories, but distinguishes two of them by meaning and syntax, while referring to active and passive force or meaning when discussing different types of *neutra.* There

---

[4]'haec enim non egent supra dictis casibus ad complendam sententiam, unde iuste passivis quoque carent' (Priscian I, 375).

[5]The lack of transitivity in respect of people and rational animals causes passives to be limited to the third person with respect to 'muta et carentia anima'. The impossibility of having a passive in the first person, the citation-form for verbs, appears to be important in the attribution of this type to the *neutra.* (The word *transitiva* itself does not occur here, though it is found elsewhere in Priscian, e.g. 'verba quoque transitiva similiter variis solent casibus coniungi' (Priscian II, 212).)

is thus an interplay of form and meaning. The main features of this system were retained by Petrus Helias and others, and are the basis of Molinier's understanding of Latin grammar. Modistic analyses attempted to downplay form, though Martinus' attempt to ignore it completely succeeded only in restating the names of the *genera* in Modistic terms (1961, 55). Boethius de Dacia (1969, 187) distinguished most of the *genera* by reference to their syntactic behaviour, but was constrained to mention that *passiva vox* was a feature of the deponent. Their views are not followed in the *Leys* as far as the Latin *genera* are concerned.

4. 2. 3. *Gendres* in the *Leys.*

The link of the category to form is affirmed in the *Leys* as far as the Latin system is concerned. The description of Occitan however prefers to make other criteria dominant, showing either a reluctance to use formal features where they are avoidable, or a conviction that, unlike other categories, Latin form-based distinctions are so intimately linked to the Latin endings as to resist transference into the vernacular.

The basic definition in the *Leys,* 'gendres es variabla significatios de far e de sufertar', represents Priscian's 'Significatio vel genus, quod Graeci affectum vocant verbi, in actu est proprie, ut dictum est, vel in passione' (Priscian I, 373). He quotes the five Latin *genera* with examples and translates into Occitan:

lactius coma. *amo. yeu ami.* le *passius* coma *amor. yeu soy amatz.* le *neutris* coma. *dormio. yeu dormi.* le *comus* coma *amplector. yeu abrassi* e *soy abrassatz.* le *deponens.* coma *loquor. yeu parli* (*Leys* II, 232).

He describes Occitan as having three *gendres*, active, passive and neutral. The active is not defined as having any specific *votz,* even though such a *votz* is referred to under the neutrals; the mention of the specific form may be inhibited by the fact that it is not the familiar Latin one in *-o*. Rather the definition is that it 'significa alqun fazemen et ha passiu'.

The passive too is defined without the characteristic *votz.* According to Latin, 'le passius se forma tostemps del actiu', but Molinier claims that the **form** of the passive is not found in Romance: 'laqual forma nos no havem en romans' (*Leys* II,

232). However, he is able to retain the category in Occitan, first saying that the passive is 'ditz en respieg del actiu' (232) (and vice versa), and secondly linking the active to 'far' and the passive to 'suffertar' (234). He refers to the possibility of claiming that 'segon romans nos no havem passiu. quar tug li passiu son supplit daquestz vers *sum. es. fui*'[6] (*Leys* II, 236). He counters this by pointing out that 'en granre de locz ysshamens vezem quel passius es supplitz segon lati' .

The reference to suppletion is problematic in that Molinier does not attempt to argue that the Occitan suppletive forms constitute a valid *forma* or *votz,* although he can hardly wish to imply that the Latin suppletive forms (which admittedly do not constitute the whole passive paradigm) are similarly invalid.[7] It also represents a difference from the discussion of the tenses, in which the auxiliary forms of the perfect tenses are not generally an occasion for remark. When the issue of direct object agreement is addressed, the suppletive forms of Latin deponents are invoked to **maintain** the place of the Occitan forms like *yeu hay fayt* in the verb paradigm, avoiding both the Scylla of denying gender agreement (since Latin perfects active do not have it) and the Charybdis of regarding the sequence merely as pronoun, verb and participle (see 7. 2. 3.).

The issue does not make any great difference in the context of the number of *genera*, since even if the passive were regarded as having a *bona fide* form, it is hard to see that deponents and common verbs would be forthcoming; but it displays some of the difficulty in deciding to what degree formal differences could invalidate grammatical comparability between Latin and the vernacular.

The *neutris* is defined thus: 'no es de la .i. ni de lautre,' 'it is neither of the one nor of the other' (i.e. active and passive), while it has the same *votz* as the active (*Leys* II, 234). The denial of the passive *votz* means that the Priscianic definition, based on

---

[6] The substantive verb is quoted in its Latin form despite the Romance context, and described as 'these verbs' ('aquestz vers').

[7] The section on number however provides a precedent for accepting anomalous Latin uses as grammatical more readily than anomalous Romance ones. See 2. 2. 7.

the lack of a corresponding passive form, no longer applies. The statement 'no es de la .i. ni de lautre' must therefore refer to the meaning involved; here too, this marks a departure from Priscian, whose *variae significationes* associated with the neutral forms include true actives and true passives (see above).

Molinier divides the category into two *manieras,* with an implication that more are known in Latin: 'doas manieras [...] quar de pus no curam en romans'. Both are different in meaning and syntax from both actives and passives, and represent two of the Priscianic meanings. The first is the *neutris absoutz* 'can le faytz roman en aquel que fay. et enayssi nos pot adordenar regularmen ab acuzatiu' (e.g. *yeu vau, yeu vivi),* and the *neutris transitius* which take accusatives[8] and have third person passives (*yeu mangi bon pa; le pas es manjatz).*

Both of these represent types found in Priscian, though the actual combination 'neutra transitiva' does not occur in his text (as Marshall notes, 1962, 409). Naturally, to be consistent, references to the passive must be of relevance to the passive meaning rather than the *votz.* Marshall is thus wrong to regard the categories as innovations (he appears to believe that Priscian did not subdivide the *neutra,* despite the Latin grammarian's various *significationes).* Molinier's abandonment of the active and passive meanings of Priscian's *neutra* is explicable in that, like the common and deponent *genera,* they are based on a simple contrast between meaning and form.

The two remaining *gendre* are abolished (*Leys* II, 234-36):

Be vezetz que comu ni deponen no havem. quar le comus es ditz segon la votz del lati e la maniera del significar. Quar una votz coma *largior.* ha doas manieras de significar. so es *yeu doni* e *soy donatz.* e quar en romans no havem una votz passiva que haia doas manieras de significar. so es activamen e

---

[8]The link of this group specifically to the accusative is logical given that the main issues of the active/neutral distinction relate to the possibility of passive formation, which is confined to those verbs taking accusatives in their active use. The recognition of such a restricted type of transitivity is not seen in Priscian, where the active verbs are seen as being linked to the genitive, dative or accusative (see above).

passivamen. per so no havem verb comu. quar en romans diversas votz son. e diversas manieras de significar.

Ysshamens pot hom vezer que en romans no havem deponen quar deponens vol dir que depauza lo significat que deuria haver. quar el ha votz de passiu. donx deuria segon la votz significar passivamen. et enpero significa a maniera dactiu o de neutri coma *precor. yeu pregui. loquor. yeu parli. nascor. yeu nayshi.* E quar en romans aytal verb no han votz de passiu. ans o han be segon que podetz vezer dactiu o de neutri. per so nos no havem en romans deponens.

The argument here can be seen as working in two ways. On one level, Molinier is denying the existence of a proper passive form which could then be contrasted with its meaning after the Latin pattern. It is in this context that Molinier himself points out that this procedure would lead to the loss of the passive itself; and he avoids that consequence by insisting on the reciprocal relationship between passive and active rather than mounting a consistent defence of the Romance passive forms' equivalence to the Latin passive forms. Such an equivalence is however hinted at by the observation that both languages make some use of suppletion.

However, the most probable reading of the discussion of the commons and neutrals does not in fact appeal to the lack of a passive form in Romance, merely to the lack of one which is out of step with its meaning. The crucial feature of the procedure is that suitable examples of each Latin category are translated into Occitan. Naturally, this translation reflects the meaning of the Latin verb rather than its form. Indeed, this is their function; the two translations of the *common* verb *largior, yeu doni* and *[yeu] soy donatz* are meant to embody the two meanings of the Latin verb and point up the contrast with its form. The Occitan doctrine is then derived by looking at the verbs in question, not as translations of the Latin meaning, but as Occitan verbs with both form and meaning. Since, however, these two concepts are not in contrast, any category based simply on their opposition disappears. As Molinier points out, the Latin common verbs have one form and two modes of signifying (this latter term simply reclothes *significatio* in apparently more up to date language, rather

than representing the normal use of the Modistic term[9]). In Occitan, there is more than one form and more than one mode of signifying; therefore, one is meant to infer,

---

9 While those Modistae who treat the difficult issue of *genus* are far from unanimous in their opinions, there is a general reluctance to describe the two *significationes* of *actio* and *passio* as *modi significandi;* this term is reserved on the one hand for the *accidens* of *genus* itself, and on the other hand conveys lower-level subdivisions which are more than two in number. In Martinus de Dacia (1961, 55), these subdivisions are identical with the conventional five *genera* adapted from Priscian and Donatus, while the active and passive meanings are simply called *actio* and *passio.* For instance, the common verb is the 'modus fieri cum distantia' which 'significat et actionem et passionem simul', while in the case of the deponent it is again the *modus* which 'deponit passionem remanente actione solum'. Thomas of Erfurt (1972, 216) divides the *modus specialis* of the *verbum adiectivum* into four *modi specialissimi,* namely *actionis, passionis, neutri* and *utriusque,* while refraining from regarding the *genera* as *modi* (1972, 230-31), no doubt because of the need to refer to the *vox* in distinguishing the *genera.* The concepts of *actio* and *passio* are not clearly linked to the *modi significandi;* the one possible exception is when the link of the active *genus* to *actio* is qualified (1972, 232): 'dicitur frequentius, propter ista verba, *timeo, liceo, metuo* et huiusmodi, quae sub voce activa modum passionis significant'. This is either an isolated link of the binary opposition *actio:passio* to the modes, or a reference to the fourfold system established earlier. In either case, the word *modus* is not applied to other contrasts between form and meaning in this section. Similar avoidance of the term *modus significandi* for the binary opposition is seen in Siger de Courtrai (Sigerus 1977, 16-18).

Molinier, by contrast, clearly ascribes the status of *modus significandi* to the active and passive meanings. He distinguishes himself further from some Modistae by combining this with an unashamed use of the classical contrast between meaning and ending to explain *gendres.* Martinus had rejected the ascription of any importance to the endings in this area of the grammar, while Thomas had separated the *genera* from the modes. (Siger, by contrast, uses both endings and modes to discuss the same category.)

Molinier's position is further illuminated by his use of *significatz* to refer to the meaning of the deponents, in the same sense in which he uses *maniera de significar* here. Evidently, he was not

the two categories correspond on a one-to-one basis. The argument concerning the deponents is similar. The Latin category has passive form but active or neutral meaning. The Romance verbs cited to translate typical deponents all show active or neutral form; presumably they also retain their active or neutral meaning. Consequently, the implication would run, there is no contrast and hence no deponent category. [10]

What apparently does not take place in the consideration of either category is an attempt to scan Occitan to see if a common or deponent could be found outside the field of translations of Latin exponents of these categories. One might have identified a potential candidate for the deponents in *yeu soy faytz,* which the text uses elsewhere as the translation for *fio* when discussing the substantive verbs, although it does also say that *soy faytz* looks more like a verb plus a participle (*Leys* II, 12). Common verbs, by contrast, would certainly be hard to envisage in Occitan.

---

particularly concerned to make a distinction between the two terms. In view of this, one might suggest that Molinier's positive views are close to those of Priscian, which were largely followed by Petrus Helias, who described the *genus verbi* as a 'qualitas verborum contracta ex terminatione et significatione' (1993, 455). In addition to this, he has picked up the term *modus significandi,* but regards it merely as a synonym for *significatio;* a view that one might compare with Petrus Helias' statement that *significatio* is 'equivocum ad tria: ad significatum, ad modum significandi, ad accidens quod hic vocatur genus' (1993, 457), although that statement is intended to make a distinction between the three senses (Helias uses the term *modus significandi* rarely and it is not used in any sense to apply to *genus verbi).* The claim by Law (1986) that the distinction made here between *votz* and *modus significandi* shows an awareness of Modistic ideas is thus in need of some qualification (although links to Modistic arguments are indubitably close elsewhere).

[10]In glossing the different meanings of the *genera verbi,* Molinier was obviously following the practice of vernacular accounts of Latin. Cf. Städtler (1988, 120) DonatM^2: 'Le deponent? A ceu qu'il a la leitre du passif et le sens de l'auctif tantseulement, si comme *loquor,* 'je parole'. Le commun? A ceu qu'il [a] la leitre du passif et le sens de l'auctif et du passif ensemble, si comme *criminor* 'je blasme' ou 'sui blasmé'.

After the main discussion of the voices, the text returns to the issue of the active/passive distinction being necessary, although the forms are suppletive. Molinier attempts to establish the necessity of the distinction by an example of the confusion which would be caused by exchanging them. Unfortunately for the consistency of his analysis, the example is not quite to the point, but it does address an important issue in the vernacular. The example chosen is one in which a passive is replaced by an active verb but — and this Molinier does not pick up — a reflexive pronoun also make its appearance, thus:

si hom ditz *tostemps gleyza se deu obrar delicadamen.* ayssi es pauzada locutios activa per passiva quar hom deu dir *tostemps gleyza deu esser obrada delicadamen.* quar cant hom ditz *gleyza se deu obrar delicadamen.* semblans es que la gleyza ela meteyssha se deia obrar. laquals cauza far nos pot. Enpero quar loncz uzatges o requier. aytals locutios se pot sostener (*Leys* II, 236).

In Latin the use of the reflexive would imply a sentient church building, as Molinier claims. This is not however true in Occitan. While the normal active, as in **gleyza deu obrar,* would have such an implication, the use with the reflexive pronoun, as in many other languages, is equivalent to a passive, especially when, as is of course most normal in such sentences, no agent is mentioned. And Molinier uses it himself, even in the very clause which denies its logic, *laquals cauza far nos pot,* rather than the more 'correct' but unidiomatic **laquals cauza no pot esser fayta.* In any case this expression is allowed as 'usage' permits it, following the dictum of At de Mons 'quar us acostumatz. escusa fals parlar'. The difficulty which remains is that the text does not recognise the special status of actives used with reflexives, and cannot therefore distinguish between true actives, with a real contrast with the passive, and the reflexives, which vary freely with it.

The lack of recognition of the role of the reflexive pronoun is also demonstrated when Molinier explains *segon ques cambia luzatge de las gens* as *segon ques cambiatz luzatge de las gens,* with '*cambia* per *cambiatz* so es actiu per passiu' (*Leys* II, 236). The effects of elision here mask the true division, which is between *se cambia* and *es cambiatz.* Following *que,* the distinction between *se* and *es* is neutralised,

leaving *ques (que·s, qu'es).* Of course, even given the elision, the grammatical structure should be obvious, since *cambia* and *cambiatz* are not equivalent parts of speech.

The treatment of the reflexives shows that while Molinier could recognise and reject the voices based on complicated relationships between Latin meaning and form, he could not recognise the reflexive as anything more complicated than the simple active it represented in Latin, despite the distinct syntax (and even morphology in the perfect tenses) of the Occitan category. While the negative precedent of Latin is obviously important in this respect (an adaptation of Greek, with its middle voice, might have produced different results), it is not clear that Molinier's own theoretical model precluded such a novel analysis. The deficiency is more simply a lack of recognition that the reflexives provided even an incipient group worthy of separate discussion.

4. 3. Tense in Occitan grammarians.

4. 3. 1. The Latin tense system.

The normative Latin analysis made a primary division into three tenses, present, past and future. This remained standard in the vernacular adaptations. The past tense was divided further into three categories, the *imperfectum, perfectum* and the *plusquamperfectum*. The future is left undivided, leaving no place in the indicative for what moderns (and the Roman grammarian Varro) call the future perfect, which appears instead as the future subjunctive.

In the indicative, one form was matched with each of the five categories. In other moods, several forms were ascribed simultaneously to different moods and different tenses. In no instance, however, were two forms ascribed to one category (except for variants that were fully semantically equivalent).

Some of the Occitan forms of the verb could be equated with Latin forms (except for a small number of syntactic differences), allowing the same analysis to be used in each language without complications. Such tenses are the present indicative (*ami= amo),* future indicative (*amaray= amabo),* imperfect indicative (*amava= amabam),* present subjunctive/future optative (*ame= amem),* perfect subjunctive (*haia amat= amaverim),* future subjunctive (*hauray amat= amavero).*

The Latin perfect indicative *(amavi)* and pluperfect indicative *(amaveram)* had two equivalents in Occitan. For the perfect, the synthetic form *amiey* had the function of a past perfective (Greek 'aorist', Romance 'past historic' etc.), while the analytic *hay amat* rendered a perfect (stative) relating the past action to the present.[11] Similarly the Latin pluperfect was also represented by two forms, both analytic: the modern 'pluperfect' and 'past anterior', which used the imperfect and aorist forms respectively of the perfect auxiliaries. The past anterior is typical of temporal clauses where the main clause has an 'aorist' verb. Despite its common use in literature, none of the grammarians appears to have noticed its existence, since they cite only the pluperfect as an equivalent of the Latin tense. In Molinier, who freely cites several forms for the perfect indicative and other tenses affected by a similar situation, this neglect is inexplicable.

The form represented by Latin *amarem* (see below for the names given to this form in the Latin analysis) were represented by at least three forms in Occitan:

-*amaria,* a conditional rendering the apodosis of an open condition.

-*amera,* a conditional rendering the apodosis of a counterfactual condition.

-*ames,* a subjunctive, used also on counterfactual indicative protases.

In open conditional protases, where Latin also had *amarem,* Occitan used *amava,* the same form as the imperfect indicative. No Occitan grammarian regarded this as a legitimate equivalent to *amarem.*

In similar fashion, the Latin form *amavissem* is represented by Occitan at least by *hagues amat* and *hagra amat* and *hauria amat* (the perfect equivalents to *ames, amera* and *amaria).* [12]

---

[11]There is less of a clear distinction between these tenses (and the historic present) in narrative in troubadour poetry (Jensen 1986, 270). A distinction is clearly implied however by the statements and usage of the *Leys,* which had no theoretical reason to invent it (rather, indeed, every reason to suppress it.)

[12]The *Leys* largely confirms in practice the distinction between the two conditionals' counterfactuality, and their association with different moods in the protasis. The *-s -ra* type occurs at least seven times;

4. 3. 2. General features of the Occitan analysis.

The Occitans faced the task of adapting a foreign analysis of a foreign verbal system to their own. One of the important assumptions made by both Uc and Molinier (Jofre's practice is not easy to discern and will be addressed later) was that the categories were fixed. Neither grammarian, for instance, assumes the right to reduce or increase the number of past tenses. Similarly the moods are regarded as fixed. The climate of opinion of the period was probably partly responsible for this; the contemporary grammarians regarded all the grammatical categories as universal to all languages, while formal differences were not seen as important. Formal differences were however hardly likely to be seen as paramount in this particular section of the grammar even if one knew little about the Modistae; the fact that a Latin form like *amet* could in Priscian's analysis span three moods and two tenses would encourage grammarians to imagine that Occitan might show equally little correlation between form and grammatical category. Where Molinier does try to reflect vernacular formal distinctions where Latin had only one tense, he can do no better than to use the vague term *significatz* (see 4. 3. 3).

The way in which the Occitans do differ among themselves is in the degree to which the grammatical categories are exploited to provide a place for all the distinct forms of Occitan. Uc appears content to fill the paradigm; for each Latin slot in the tense/ mood system one form is provided, while those slots that share forms in Latin do not necessarily do so in Occitan. This has the disadvantage that some forms do not make any appearance; as well as the past anterior, Uc fails to cite the analytic form of the perfect indicative active, since that slot is taken by the synthetic form (*Donatz* 110). Elsewhere, the division of forms between the subjunctive and optative also fails

---

the type involving the imperfect indicative and *-ria* is only found once. There is one possible example of *-s* combined with *-ria,* thus a potential counterexample to the rules: '*volontiers te hauria ajudat si o volguesses*' (*Leys* II, 330). In addition there is a mixed example (II, 262): '*si Bernads fos rix* o *si Bernads havia M. liuras. totas las despendria.*' The status of the semantic difference between the two constructions is not easy to demonstrate conclusively in the text given the paucity of examples.

to note the range of usage of some Occitan forms. Molinier has a different system. He takes each Latin form and translates it in (almost) all the ways it can be translated; then each time a specific Latin form would occur in the paradigm, the Occitan ones all appear. The process is carried out with some disregard for the context, since a number of the forms would never in fact occur in all the tenses and moods to which this process would extend them.

4. 3. 3. Tense in the *Leys.*

Tense is defined twice in the *Leys d'amors.* The first definition makes it the 'mezura del movemen de las cauzas movablas' (*Leys* II, 238), which resembles Petrus Helias' 'tempus est dimensio more et motus mutabilium rerum' (Helias 1993, 484). The second has the simpler 'proprietatz de significar prezen o passada o endevenidoyra'. Thus the verb is linked both to action and to time.

The etymology of the term is non-Priscianic and did not originally refer to the grammatical use of the word:

> Temps es ditz de *tempransa* o de *temprar* quar la us temps tempra lautra coma vezetz que naturalmens le temps freytz tempora lo caut. el cautz lo freg. el humitz lo sec el secz lumit (*Leys,* II, 238).

This reads like a reasonable etymology, in the medieval sense of the word, for *temps* in the sense of 'weather', but extends less obviously to the sense of 'time'/ 'tense' which the grammatical term involves. One might wonder how, extending the analogy, the future tense would be expected to *temper* the present or the past. The most probable source is in the dictionary section of the *Catholicon* (Balbus 1971), where the entry on *tempus* begins: 'Tempus. a tepeo tepes dicitur hoc tempus [...] quia tepeat et temperetur vicissim humore. siccitate. calore. frigore.' (See also Papias' (1966, 347) use of the humours to describe the *tempora anni.)* The section does not mention the grammatical use of the word, unsurprisingly since grammatical comments in the *Catholicon* are generally reserved to the grammatical sections at the beginning.

The definitions of the tenses in the same section are generally consistent with those of Latin. The three tenses are distinguished, with the past subdivided into three *membres.* These three are distinguished in ways that are close to Priscian. The prete-

rite imperfect 'mostra e significa cauza ques passada e comensada mas non ges acabada', cf. ' "praeteritum imperfectum" tempus nominantes, in quo res aliqua coepit geri necdum tamen est perfecta' (Keil, II, 406). (In this case the Latin and Occitan tenses are identical in almost every way, so the applicability of the definition does not change.)

The two other *membres* of the tense are the perfect and the pluperfect. The perfect is given the form '*yeu amiey* et *hay amat*' (=*yeu amiey/yeu hay amat;* the first is aorist, or past perfective; the second is a perfect). The pluperfect is given the form *yeu havia amat* (the normal pluperfect form; one might in addition have expected the past anterior form, also equivalent to the Latin pluperfect, to be cited here). Both perfect and pluperfect are described as meaning something *passada* and *complida* (compare Latin *perfectum).* The difference between them is stated however not in relative terms but in absolute terms, between what has passed 'non ha gayre' and 'trop ha'. This appears to contradict Priscian's definition of the pluperfect as happening *iam pridem* (Priscian I, 406 ' "praeteritum plusquamperfectum" [nominantes] in quo iam pridem res perfecta ostenditur'. Elsewhere though he seems to consider the difference as one of absolute time; in attempting to set up a systemic (though not formal) distinction between the perfect and pluperfect optative, he provides examples distinguished only by length of time elapsed: *utinam legissem ante horam* and *ante quinquaginta annos* (Priscian I, 408).

Molinier does make a theoretical distinction between different forms associated with a single tense. This is done exclusively under his innovative syntactic section, the *ajustamens dels mozes e dels temps.* Under a few combinations, but by no means all where it could be relevant, a tense is quoted with two or three *significat.* Literally this is of course 'meaning', but it is associated with specifically quoted forms. While their use is conditioned by meaning, the details of the semantic differences are not discussed, and are therefore left to the intuition of the reader.

The choice of term is no doubt conditioned by the fact that it introduces a distinction unknown to Latin. No inherited terminology can thus be applied, and in Moli-

nier's system there can be no question of setting up new categories with a grammatical status equivalent to that of the Latin tenses. Thus the only solution is to subdivide the existing categories with a term sufficiently vague not to imply any novel grammatical analysis. The lack of specificity of *significatz* allows it to become the carrier of a new distinction.

The use of this to describe the two forms of the perfect indicative is seen under the combination of the past imperfect and the past perfect indicative (II, 282). The combination by means of *can, mentre, sitot, siben* is stated to be possible 'with the first *significatz* of the said past perfect and not with the second'. This 'first *significatz'* is exemplified in the following two sentences, which show the aorist type:

cant yeu anava a Tholosa [...] *yeu vi Bernad.*

sitot sibem era malautes. yeu aniey o *cavalguiey. x. legas.*

Both these sentences show the 'aorist' type.

The second *significatz,* which here 'ges be no seria dig' is, by contrast, the perfect (stative) form. It is quoted in what is said to be an incorrect sentence:

mentre anava a la gleyza. hay encontrat Bernat.

The same term is used in the section on the combinations of the past imperfect indicative and the future indicative (II, 286). A number of examples are listed, such as '*yeu estudiava et estudiaray'*. However, it states that all of these examples are better if the imperfects are replaced by perfects and specifically 'en lo segon significat del preterit perfag'. Thus '*yeu hay estudiat et estudiaray'*.

As noted, this analysis is not used in every case. Thus, immediately after the distinction of the *significatz* of the perfect under the <u>*claus*</u> *can, mentre, sitot, siben,* the text goes on to a number of other *claus,* which are quoted with only one of the two forms (e.g. with *que; 'de so qu·ieu fazia me soy penedutz').* Here the use of one form only is not even noted, much less explained, and no guidance is given as to whether the other form would be permissible.

4. 4. The moods.

4. 4. 1. The Latin analysis.

The moods recognised by the Latin grammarians were the indicative, imperative, optative, subjunctive[13], and infinitive. While the attribution of Occitan forms to the appropriate mood was complicated and prompted differing responses, the definitions of the moods are not greatly affected by the fact that the grammars are describing the vernacular.

Molinier's definition of mood (*Leys* II, 240) is Priscianic. '*Mos* es variabla enclinatios de coratge monstrans diversas voluntatz et affectios' (cf. Priscian's 'Modi sunt diversae inclinationes animi, varios eius affectus demonstrantes', Priscian I, 421). The etymology provides a verbal link to that of tense: '*Mos* es ditz de *moderansa* o de *moderar* so es atemprar quar totas las paraulas ques hom ditz del verb son moderadas o tempradas per la. i. o per lautre dels mozes'.

The moods are given semantic definitions (again not far from Priscian[14]). The indicative *demonstrates* something present, past or future. The imperative *commands* something present or future. The optative *desires* something present, past or future. The first two have no syntactic cue, but the definition of the optative is qualified thus: 'ab aquesta dictio *am mo vol* expressat o entendut'. The use of *am mo vol,* or the alternatives provided, (*volontiers, volontieramen, trop, mot),* like the use of Priscian's *adverbium optandi,* is seen as basic to the definition of the mood, though these words do not always appear in the examples.

The subjunctive is defined in purely syntactic terms: 'sajusta ab autre verb o li autre verb am luy. ab adverbis oz ab conjunctios'. The infinitive is defined as meaning 'cauza infinida' without number or person.

---

[13]The form is *subiunctivus* in Priscian. Donatus uses *coniunctivus,* which is adopted by the Occitan grammarians. No theoretical difference is implied by this variation. The term 'subjunctive' will be used in this thesis except in direct quotation.

[14] I, 421-425.

The text then attempts to justify the order of the moods, in this too following Priscian. Where there is divergence from Priscian, this usually reflects an attempt to give primacy to semantic issues, with syntactic issues and morphology being downgraded. The indicative is first 'because the other words are formed from it' (a notion from Priscian, but of course capable of being interpreted in several ways). The imperative precedes the optative because commanding is more noble than wishing; the idea here is again from Priscian, but Priscian is also exercised by the syntactic issue of the optative's need of an adverb (a reason for placing it after the imperative) and the morphological issue of the optative's greater number of person and tense forms (as being a reasonable, though evidently not conclusive, argument for the opposite ordering). The optative precedes the subjunctive because 'mays val dezirars que duptars'. Here Molinier or some mediate source innovates. Priscian's main reasoning for the relative ordering between these moods is syntactic; compared with the optative, the subjunctive needs not just another adverb, but another verb. At this point (Priscian I, 424) he explicitly states that while 'diversas habeat significationes, non ab una earum, sed a constructione nomen accepit'. *Dubitatio* is cited as one of these meanings, along with *confirmatio.* However, he does use the identification of the subjunctive with doubt as one of the reasons for the primacy of the indicative; Priscian I, 422: 'subiunctivus vero, quem quidam dubitativum appellaverunt, manifestam habet indicativi cognitionem. ipsa enim dubitatio ante se esse indicativum confitetur; nam si tollas dubitationem, non opus est subiunctivo in re certa, sed indicativo'. Finally, Molinier bases the primacy of the subjunctive over the infinitive on the latter's impersonality; the personal mood is ranked higher, as the possession of a quality is ranked higher than its negation: 'mays val habitz que privatios'. The lack of person in the infinitive is ultimately based on form, but given the context it is probably seen as a semantic category.

4. 4. 2. <u>The subjunctive/ optative distinction in Latin.</u>

The Occitan grammarians were faced in this area with a problem which the Latin grammarians had bequeathed to them. The distinction between the two moods

had been made first in Greek grammar, where (to simplify slightly), it had been a question of identifying two distinct sets of forms and giving them names which were appropriate at least to their most typical uses. In applying this distinction, the Roman grammarians had been forced to regard identical forms, drawn largely from what is now called the 'subjunctive', as belonging simultaneously to the two moods. Some variation existed (notably over the perfect optative)[15], but the standard version of Priscian and Donatus was as follows.[16]

	subjunctive	optative
present	*amem*	*amarem*
imperfect	*amarem*	*amarem*
perfect	*amaverim*	*amavissem*
pluperfect	*amavissem*	*amavissem*
future	*amavero*	*amem*

The division between the two moods is not that which the detailed use of the two Greek moods would have suggested. Roughly, the optative is in Latin confined to the expression of wishes; and it has a strong association to the word *utinam* and other adverbs of wishing. All the examples of its use in Priscian's Book XVIII (Priscian II, 239) are wishes of some kind.

To what extent the *adverbia optandi* are necessary is ambiguous in Priscian. Readers of the *maior* alone would come across the unambiguous statement (I, 424) 'optativus [...] eget adverbio optandi, ut plenum significet sensum'. In the *minor* (Priscian II, 239-40) this is less clear: 'optativa verba indicant per se cum re et votum, adverbium vero 'utinam' tantum votum significat. ad ampliorem igitur demonstrationem additur verbis optativis [...] 'o' etiam adverbium et 'si' coniunctio et 'ut' pro

---

[15]Priscian does refer (Priscian II, 241) to the fact that other grammarians had recognised a perfect optative similar to the perfect subjunctive. This would provide recognition of the use of the *-erim* inflection to express wishes (see Woodcock 1959: 88 for examples). But the observation has no influence on the traditions relevant to the Occitan grammarians.

[16]For Donatus see Holtz 1981, 593-95.

'utinam' invenitur.' And in a section omitted by a number of manuscripts he states that 'per se tamen verbum optativum saepe ponitur sine praedictis particulis ut Lucanus in I: *di visa secundent [...]'* etc.

The subjunctive was defined as follows by Priscian in his Syntax (Priscian II, 241): 'dicitur: 'subiunctivus', vel quod subiungitur coniunctioni vel quod alteri verbo omnimodo vel subiungitur vel subiungit sibi alterum [...] necesse est alteri modo eum sociari vel eiusdem modi alteri verbo'. In the earlier definition, a second verb was explicitly regarded as necessary; the subjunctive required 'non modo adverbio vel coniunctione, verum etiam altero verbo, ut perfectum significet sensum' (Priscian I, 424)[17] Under the second definition, the mood cannot provide the sole verb in a sentence; but it can freely occur in a main clause in sentences also possessing a subordinate clause. Under the first, it may occur in particular circumstances as the sole expressed verb.

Since many forms in Latin were ambiguous as between the optative and subjunctive, it was necessary to define which mood was regarded as appearing in particular constructions. The examples given by Priscian show a clear tendency to restrict the occurrence of the optative to the expression of (generally main clause) wishes, where it was accompanied in general by the *adverbia optandi.* The subjunctive occurs in most other situations, such as doubt (*'si videam, intellego');* confirmation, persuasion (*'prodest ut legas'),* commands (*'ne dicas')*; possibility (*'potuisse fieri'*, as *'facerem, si placuisset'*) (Priscian I, 424-5).

It is thus clear that, of the two moods, the optative is the one with a clear semantic limitation, while the subjunctive has a far wider range. In addition, while Priscian refers to an association between the optative and the *adverbia optandi,* with *utinam* as the standard such adverb, he is less specific about any one conjunction being particularly fitted to the rôle of accompanying the subjunctive. And, as we have seen from his examples, a subjunctive need not have a conjunction in the same clause,

---

[17] It is not clear whether the later examples always fulfil all these particulars. Thus the example showing doubt 'quid igitur faciam' (Priscian II, 248) shows the conjunction *igitur* but no second verb.

even if there is one in the sentence. However the paradigms of the Latin grammarians had for some time associated the subjunctive with the conjunction *cum,* just as firmly as they associated the subjunctive with *utinam.* Donatus, whose *Ars minor* paradigms became definitive, was representative in this respect. Their motive was no doubt practical; given the ambiguity of the forms, the quotation with this marker served to orientate the reader. The standard use of *cum* is reflected in Priscian in that on both occasions when he introduces the subjunctive mood, he quotes the following line from Virgil's Eclogues (3, 77; Priscian I, 424; II, 241): 'Cum faciam vitulam pro frugibus, ipse venito'. [18]

The use of *cum* in Latin to accompany the subjunctive did not force any explicit decision as to the precise meaning of the conjunction, except insofar as some potential meanings were limited syntactically to clauses with a particular mood. Logically, indeed, all uses of *cum* with the subjunctive should have been welcomed. It is probably true that the temporal use, 'when', predominated in the thoughts of the classical grammarians. It is the sense required by Priscian's first quotation, and it is the sole sense which is reasonable for the 'future subjunctive'. Since that tense is really an indicative, the causal and concessive uses of Latin *cum* are not applicable. It is also a particularly common use with the imperfect and pluperfect; though the perfect and present are more typically accompanied by other senses of the word. Typically, when Diomedes (Keil I, 392) distinguishes between indicative and subjunctive uses of *cum,* all the uses quoted are explicitly temporal.

However, none of the normal senses of the conjunction is excluded by the Roman grammarians, so that vernacular grammarians had to make their own decisions as to what the constructions meant before using them as a guide to their own grammar-writing.

---

[18] In fact, Priscian should probably have analysed the verb as a future indicative to be consistent (the form is ambiguous in the first person singular of this conjugation), but this is irrelevant to this issue.

4. 4. 3. The subjunctive/ optative distinction in Occitan grammars.

The complexity of the Latin grammarians' account of the subjunctive and optative provided an initial complication for Occitan grammarians. Futher difficulties arose from the problems of identifying Latin and Occitan forms. Some equations were easy; forms of the type *amavero* and *amaverim* were confined in the standard paradigm to the subjunctive and had only one translation each in Occitan: *(h)auray amat* and *(h)aia amat.* The present subjunctive/ future optative *amem* could be rendered *ame,* with the same ambiguity as in Latin; here, all that was necessary was to find some way of conveying the distinction of mood.

With the equivalents of *amarem* and *amavissem* there was a question of form to add to the modal distinction. Given the right context, three translations existed for each form: the types *ames, amera, amaria* and their perfect equivalents *agues/agra/ (auria) amat.*

Of these, *ames* was used in subordinate clauses with a variety of uses comparable to a sub-section of Latin subjunctive use, such as in final clauses, generics, and in conditional protases. *Amera* and *amaria* are both conditionals. *Amaria* was more open, usually combined with a protasis in the imperfect indicative; *ames* was more hypothetical, usually combined with a protasis in the imperfect subjunctive in *-s* (see Smith/Bergin 1984, 213-4, Jensen 1986, 276).

This caused difficulties. The Latin forms each filled three slots in the paradigm, and there would not have been any insuperable objection to some of these forms being restricted to fewer than three slots, thereby creating a better match between form and function. But innovation along these lines was restricted by the distinctions already made by the Latin paradigm, into which the Occitan forms did not fit very obviously. Thus, for instance, neither Molinier or Uc attempted to distinguish between forms for the present and imperfect optative, for there were no grounds on which to do so.

Molinier's solution was to quote all three examples in all three available slots (*Leys* II, 244-46). For the imperfect subjunctive this had advantages; his own exam-

ples show occurrences of all three forms in contexts where Latin would also require an imperfect subjunctive. But the logic is less overwhelming elsewhere. The optatives represented by the ambiguous Latin forms were hard to translate into Occitan. The same was not true of the 'future optative', which could be rendered by a simple verb of the *ame* type, as in Molinier's list of syntactic combinations (276). The presence of *am mo vol* in its paradigm is due to the influence of the other tenses. Molinier opts consistently for a system by which *utinam* is rendered *am mo vol* or *volontiers.* Whatever the merits of this analysis, the verb is then in a conditional, depending on an unspoken protasis. The quotation of the *-es* form in the optative tenses is therefore wholly superfluous.

The three translations of the *amarem* type are distinguished by Molinier, using his concept of *significatz,* under the combination of the past imperfect indicative with the past imperfect subjunctive in the *ajustamens* (*Leys* II, 294). The first and second *significat* are quoted under *si,* and the third under *pusque,* thus:

si yeu anava a la glieyza. faria mon pro.
yeu anava a la glieyza. si tu no mo tolguesses.
pusquieu gazanhava. tu degras gardar.

Uc is somewhat less consistent in his paradigms of the moods, but he works from a rather different set of assumptions, attempting to link the difference in mood to the available differences in form. For the common *amarem* type, he attempts to distinguish an imperfect subjunctive *cum eu ames* (*Donatz* 118) from an optative[19] *volonters amera, volunters amaria* (114). Here the problem is the reverse of that in the *Leys;* he has isolated the sole forms which can accompany *volunters* for his 'optative'. However, he does not mention the fact that *-ria, -ra* forms may also occur where the Latin analysis would regard the verb as subjunctive. He recognises that the protasis of *S'eu te donava mil marcs, serias tu mos hom* (120) has an unexpected form (some-

[19]Uc's three optative tenses are labelled simply 'optative' (equivalent to the Latin present and imperfect), 'pluperfect optative' (Latin perfect and pluperfect) and 'future optative' (as in Latin). This is unlikely to imply any conscious divergence from the Latin system.

thing resembling an indicative, instead of the expected regular subjunctive form). He is however silent on the apodosis, which is equally problematic; *serias* can only be optative in Uc's analysis, while Latin grammar requires a subjunctive

Uc's optative scheme is not consistent. In the active, he uses periphrases for the pluperfect and for the future. They are respectively *bon fora qu'eu agues amat* (116) and *Deus volha qu'eu ame* (120). From a Latin point of view these show two clauses, of which the second, containing the paradigm verb, would be in the subjunctive. The pluperfect type does at least show in its main clause what in Uc's own terms would be an optative *(fora)* though even here, the Latin equivalent would be a subjunctive, while regarding *volha* as an optative would also seem the most obvious understanding of Uc's usage here. And it is not clear that there is a great theoretical difference between translating simple Latin words by auxiliary constructions (which all the grammarians seem to do happily) and translating them by constructions involving a subordinate clause. As adequate translations of the optative, these two tenses are hard to fault, and Uc's exclusion of *per mo vol* and *volunters* from the future optative is true to the idioms of the language (Molinier cites the future with *am mo vol* in his paradigm but it is never exemplified in a sentence).

One might have expected substantially identical solutions in the passive, except for the presence of the auxiliary, and this is indeed largely the case. In the present/imperfect optative (*Donatz* 124), called simply *obtatiu* as in the active, the forms of the verb are again the modern conditionals (*seria, fora),* but the translation of *utinam* differs, becoming *per mo vol.* (Compare Molinier's *am mo vol.)* The future is identical to its active equivalent save in voice: *Deus volha qu'eu sia amatz* (*Donatz* 126). The pluperfect (126) is the most anomalous; it too uses the option of a verb combined with *per mo vol,* differing in this from its active equivalent. But while all other non-future optatives use conditional forms, this tense uses the *-es* forms of the subjunctive in the auxiliary, producing *per mo vol eu augues estat amatz,* which it is hard to insert into a grammatical sentence.

Yet another option is provided by the example cited when the moods themselves are introduced (106). Here the optative is given as *eu volria amar*. This fits neatly into the scheme of the majority of Uc's optatives, as it has an optative meaning and conditional endings on the auxiliary (there being no good reason why this verb should not be part of the paradigm when other auxiliaries are). [20] The same solution is found in one single example in the *Leys* (II, 274):

yeu volria esser/ am mo vol seria avesques sitot/sibem soy de bas linhatge.

Here the alternation with *am mo vol* guarantees that the construction with *volria* is still regarded as equivalent to *utinam essem,* and is the equivalent to a Latin simple optative.

The drawbacks of Uc's paradigm are thus the inability to cope with subjunctive-equivalents in *-ria, -ra* and the oddity of the pluperfect passive. His citation of different options in different tenses is a trifle inconsistent, since there can be nothing limiting *per mo vol* or *volunters* to particular voices. The use of subordinate constructions is less theoretically problematic; they are comparable with the use of auxiliaries and accompanying adverbs, neither of which could be dispensed with when rendering a Latin paradigm.

Uc appears to regard the most basic type of optative as involving a translation of *utinam,* in conformity with Latin practice. However he also shows a strong, though not overwhelming tendency, to associate forms in *-es* with the subjunctive and forms in *-ria, ra* with the optative, even where this leads to clashes with the Latin analyses. Such clashes are evidently regarded as more acceptable than those where there was confusion between moods that do not share forms in Latin, such as the imperfect indicative (*donava, dabam)* and subjunctive (*dones, darem).* The separation of the conditionals as grammatically distinct is of course desirable, but their ascription to the opta-

---

20 The Latin translation at this point renders this paradigm-example, corresponding logically to *utinam amarem,* by *ego vellem amare.* Evidently this represents a failure to understand the logic of the text.

Yet another option is provided by the example cited when the moods themselves are introduced (106). Here the optative is given as *eu volria amar*. This fits neatly into the scheme of the majority of Uc's optatives, as it has an optative meaning and conditional endings on the auxiliary (there being no good reason why this verb should not be part of the paradigm when other auxiliaries are). [20] The same solution is found in one single example in the *Leys* (II, 274):

yeu volria esser/ am mo vol seria avesques sitot/sibem soy de bas linhatge.

Here the alternation with *am mo vol* guarantees that the construction with *volria* is still regarded as equivalent to *utinam essem,* and is the equivalent to a Latin simple optative.

The drawbacks of Uc's paradigm are thus the inability to cope with subjunctive-equivalents in *-ria, -ra* and the oddity of the pluperfect passive. His citation of different options in different tenses is a trifle inconsistent, since there can be nothing limiting *per mo vol* or *volunters* to particular voices. The use of subordinate constructions is less theoretically problematic; they are comparable with the use of auxiliaries and accompanying adverbs, neither of which could be dispensed with when rendering a Latin paradigm.

Uc appears to regard the most basic type of optative as involving a translation of *utinam,* in conformity with Latin practice. However he also shows a strong, though not overwhelming tendency, to associate forms in *-es* with the subjunctive and forms in *-ria, ra* with the optative, even where this leads to clashes with the Latin analyses. Such clashes are evidently regarded as more acceptable than those where there was confusion between moods that do not share forms in Latin, such as the imperfect indicative (*donava, dabam)* and subjunctive (*dones, darem).* The separation of the conditionals as grammatically distinct is of course desirable, but their ascription to the opta-

---

[20] The Latin translation at this point renders this paradigm-example, corresponding logically to *utinam amarem,* by *ego vellem amare.* Evidently this represents a failure to understand the logic of the text.

tive is less immediately obvious. It might simply be a generalisation from the forms of the verb associated with *volunters.*

It is however possible that this practice is based on the analysis of remarks by Priscian. While the Latin grammarian regards the conditional apodosis (the usual role of the Romance conditional) as a subjunctive, he does however mention the fact that this usage occurred where, in Greek, one would expect an optative or an indicative: 'sic ergo quod illi solent et per indicativum et per optativum facere addentes ἄν coniunctionem Graecam, nos subiunctivis per se positis solemus demonstrare'[1] (Priscian II, 251). (The Greek subjunctive did not occur in this context, while the choice between the other two moods depended on various shades of meaning.) From this passage, a precedent could be established for regarding as optative these verbal uses, which Priscian distinguishes as showing *possibilitas.* The breach with Latin grammar might be regarded as minimal given the identity of the forms in that language; Priscian himself in the discussion cited ones refers loosely to the verbs in question as being 'optative or subjunctive'[22] before specifying the subjunctive in particular. As elsewhere in the discussion of the article, many were prepared to concede to Romance vernaculars features from Greek grammar; this would have reinforced the acceptability of this usage. Given the lack of consistency in the *Donatz,* such adaptation of Priscian's work is unlikely to have been the work of Uc himself. If, as is probable, similar views are shared by Jofre (see below), they may represent a distinction that already had some currency. [23]

---

[21]The sole example given is in fact one where the Greek equivalent used the indicative: ' "docuissem, si discere voluisses" "ἐδίδαξα ἄν, εἰ μαθεῖν ἠθέλησας" '.

[22] 'nostri... quando possibilitatem demonstrare volunt, optativis sive subiunctivis utuntur verbis' (Priscian II, 251).

[23] There is scant possibility that this analysis derives from an independent knowledge of Greek, quite apart from its improbability. A comparison of the Greek and Occitan verbal systems might have dissuaded grammarians from recognising subjunctive apodoses, but would have led to optative protases as well as apodoses, and to an unembarassed recognition of past indicative tenses in counterfactual conditionals. Neither of these occur in the Occitan writers.

4. 4. 4. The extension of the optative in the *Leys.*

Molinier's more wooden citation of equivalents creates several theoretically possible 'optatives' which do not in fact exist (those in *-es).* It allows the possibility of analysing as subjunctive all equivalents of Latin subjunctives, but his syntactic examples show a number of cases where the 'wrong' mood is cited from a Latin point of view.

The consequences of the various translations of *utinam* are seen in the examples in the syntactic section of the *Leys.* The Latin adverb could occur in the apodosis of a conditional clause according to Priscian, as in 'utinam discas, si doceam' (Priscian II, 241). Similarly, Molinier cites optatives, accompanied by *am mo vol,* in a number of sentences involving subordinate clauses, as in *'cum tu sias en ma correctio. ab mo vol serias pros homs'* (*Leys* II, 326). In this example there is no difficulty. The sentence *'am mo vol hagra cantat mas mos maestres sen fora irascutz'* (*Leys* II, 332) also expresses a wish, though the syntax is a little looser. Extended use of the optative is also seen in the combination of present indicative and present optative by means of *quar: 'yeu mesforsi quar am mo vol seria rix'.* (II, 274). The meaning is clear enough: 'I make an effort as I would gladly be rich', and it is consistent with the text's own rules for the optative; but it represents a further step away from Latin, where a sentence *quia utinam essem dives* would be dubious. The degree to which the paradigmatic optative adverbs are necessary may be proved by the fact that not all clear expressions of wishing, however semantically similar to those above, are classed as optative.

The examples with *volontiers* are a little further away. Thus *'volontiers iria a Sant Or. jaciayssoque no havia vodat o promes'* (II, 328) is harder to regard as truly optative; it is rather a hypothesis about an action undertaken willingly. In the conditional sentences, the apodosis is regarded as optative because of the presence of *volontiers,* as in *'volontiers fora anatz deportar si mos senhors no mo agues devedat. volontiers te hauria ajudat si tu o volguesses '* (II, 322). Objectively, they are hypotheses little different from the sentences *'si tu majudesses yeu tajudera'* (II, 340) and

'yeu fora bos clerx si agues be estudiat' (II, 342), where both clauses are described as subjunctive.

A few examples occur where an apodosis is ascribed to the optative, despite the absence of any *am mo vol,* or equivalent adverb, as in *mot me plaguera que mos filhs agues estudiat a Paris* and *yeu te pagaria quan o aguesses fach* (II, 328). Here the apodosis forms in *-ra* are all attributed to the present optative. The meaning of *plaguera* might be held to have an affinity to the optative, though grammatically it is a record of the speaker's desires rather than an expression of them. Even this possibility does not hold for *pagaria.*

Even more damagingly, while *am mo vol,* like *utinam,* refers to the will of the speaker, *volontiers* should refer to the will of the grammatical subject. Thus *volontiers amarias* would not translate *utinam amares.* The ultimate result of both *volontiers/volunters* and *am mo vol* being used as the stock translations of *utinam* is to extend the definition of the optative to any sentence where either *volontiers/ volunters* or *am mo vol* could qualify the verb. They could be used in conditional apodoses where the volition is stated to be a feature of the hypothetical act, rather than being a feature of the speaker at the moment of utterance. In such cases *utinam* would not have been appropriate. Conversely, some clauses where the meaning does involve a wish on the speaker's part may be analysed as subjunctive if one of the formulas *volontiers/ volunters* or *am mo vol* is missing. (Cf possibly *'yeu volria esser ben garnitz. que/quar seray agachatz'* (imperfect subjunctive combined with future indicative, *Leys* II, 320.) One might ask in what way this differs from *yeu volria esser avesques* (II, 274), regarded as optative, and from optative sentences where *am mo vol* links to *quar* such as *'am mo vol me pauzaria. pusque tant hay trabalhat'* and *'am mo vol hauria Bertranda per molher. quar trop lay dezirada''*(II, 304).

The use of the word *volunters* in connection with a 'conditional' form is apparently standard in Occitan grammarians insofar as can be checked. However, it is unlikely to be an independent insight by different grammarians, in that it is not quite accurate as a translation. The other shared form, *am mo vol/ per mo vol* is somewhat

more accurate but a little stilted. It too is probably a convenient grammarian's equivalent, and known independently to Uc and Molinier. The different solutions adopted by the grammarians faced with features of Occitan rule out any hypothetical Occitan vernacular grammatical tradition, oral or written, underlying our texts. However, what is very likely to have existed is an oral tradition of glossing Latin grammar into the vernacular for pedagogic purposes. Such a tradition would gloss paradigms and Latin words without any consideration of the consequences which its translations into the vernacular would have for the study of the latter. In addition, it would tend to translate as literally as possible; an idiomatic expansion would less readily serve the purposes of inculcating Latin grammar. In this context, a translation of *utinam* by *volunters* or the like, slightly inaccurate though it be, becomes credible. What the vernacular grammars would have done, under this scenario, is to take such standard equivalents and build upon them a vernacular grammar; it is not surprising that the consequences were to set up categories divergent from the Latin ones.

A third option for the translation of the optative occurs in all three of the texts discussed, namely the use of *eu volria.* In none of them, however, does the equation *eu volria amar* = *utinam amarem* become the basis of the system. Quite why this was so is not clear, since it is semantically as reasonable as the other translations and it is a normal construction in the language. Its use of an auxiliary marks a divergence from Latin, but in this it resembles the perfect tenses, all of which are admitted without difficulty, and their auxiliary nature only rarely attracts comment. It would appear that this construction represents yet another standard translation of the Latin optative, but one which was found less useful in the analysis of the vernacular.

4. 4. 5. <u>The subjunctive marker *cum:* Occitan or Latin?</u>

One of the facts which is clear about *utinam* is that the Occitan grammarians tried, albeit with varying solutions and success, to translate the Latin term. The status of *cum,* which accompanies the subjunctive in both Uc and Molinier, is somewhat less obvious. It is of course identical in form to the *cum* which had the same task in Latin, and Marshall in fact regards it as a Latin word, remarking on the perfect sub-

junctive of Uc's paradigm (1962, 93): 'Here, as elsewhere, Faidit prefixes the Latin *cum* to his paradigm; he could hardly have done otherwise, for if he had translated it, he would have made the presence of a subjunctive in the Provençal phrase completely inept.'

It is not however clear that *cum* really is a Latin word in the two grammarians. Admittedly, there are times when Latin *cum* must be translated by dissimilar Occitan forms; the temporal meaning 'when' is usually *can* in Occitan, as Molinier would have agreed: '*yeu soy devotz can soy a la gleyza.* quar per aquel *can* hom diria en lati *cum'* (*Leys* II, 258). And Molinier does not quote *cum* in a temporal meaning. In addition, this temporal meaning, whether rendered by *can* or by *cum,* [24] would require the indicative in Occitan, thus being truly 'inept' as a marker of the subjunctive.

This fact subverts the 'future subjunctive', since the Latin *cum amavero* can hardly be regarded as other than temporal; Occitan would use *can* with the equivalent tense as in *Leys,* II, 322, *yeu malegraray can* [...] *hauray manjat.'* Molinier makes no attempt to quote *cum* with this tense in the *ajustamens dels mozes e dels temps. (Cum,* strangely enough, is not an official *claus,* though it is quoted now and again in the *ajustamens.)* One could possibly find a use of *cum* in the meaning 'like, as' with this tense, thus saving the paradigm example *cum yeu hauray amat* from complete non-existence, but it would no longer correspond to a Latin use of *cum.* One must regard this tense as being an extension of a use of *cum* found satisfactory elsewhere.

The temporal significance of *cum* is of less significance elsewhere. In the primary tenses, present and perfect, constructions existed which were wholly equivalent

---

[24]Jensen remarks (1986, 347) that '*com, cum, co* [...] is also used with the meaning 'when'; it differs from *can* through its inbility to express future action'. The examples show temporal uses exclusively with the indicative, and the ones cited are in the present and the preterite (aorist) e.g. *co fo en la croz, fez orazo a Deu; con per las ciutatz anam visitar, fazem portar davant nos .iiii. vayssels.* Jensen comments that the material 'confirms Hoepffner's assertion [...] that the temporal *con* is archaic, but that it reappears in later texts after the troubadour period'. This meaning equates well with Latin temporal *cum* in meaning but, of course, not in syntax.

in the two languages. The example by which Uc introduces the mood shows this clearly: '*cum eu ame fortmen, torz es si no sui amatz*' (*Donatz* 106). The Latin gloss shows to what this is equivalent: '*cum ego diligam fortiter, iniustum est si non diligar*'. Here *cum* in both languages has a causal meaning, 'since', and can be combined with the subjunctive (though the indicative would also be possible in Occitan). The examples in the *Leys* provide support for this usage. [25]

The secondary tenses, imperfect and pluperfect, are not so easy to exemplify. Only one use of *cum* + pluperfect is given in the *Leys,*[26] compared with the many primary tense uses. While the causal sense is common in Latin in these tenses, Jensen does not exemplify causal uses of *cum* with them for Occitan. Those constructions which are normal, such as a final clause use, would not translate any sense of Latin *cum.*

It is undeniable that *cum* is used as a marker of the subjunctive partly because an identical form was so used in Latin. It is also true that some of the Latin meanings of the word, even some of those which appear to have been primary for Latin writers, could not be maintained. Marshall's implication, that none of the uses of *cum* could plausibly show a Occitan word with correct syntax and translating a Latin use of *cum,* is not however accurate. In fact the perfect subjunctive, of which Marshall directly makes this assertion, is one of those where the causal sense is basic and common in both languages (and where Latin temporal uses are not recorded by modern writers on the classical language). Uc's assumption that the primary sense of *cum* is causal may not correspond to the thought processes of the Latin grammarians but is hardly unreasonable. The grammarians may well have succumbed to the temptation of prefixing *cum* to every subjunctive form, once the principle had been established; this probably explains the future. But *cum* is likely to have been thought of as a translation rather than a Latin word; and readers of the grammar, especially if their Latin were shaky,

---

[25] E.g. *Leys* II, 278 *'cum yeu te ame. tu me deves amar'*. See also II, 326, II, 296, II, 330, II, 336, II, 336, II, 338, II, 340, II, 344.

[26] II, 348: *'cum yeu agues renhat e viscut en aquel temps amb los homes. parer men degra'.*

would have no reason to suspect that there was an unassimilated foreign word in the text.

Molinier's case is a little stranger than Uc's. His commitment to an exhaustive list of verb combinations should have led him to quote *cum* wherever it appears, and to justify its appearance in the paradigm by citing it in all subjunctive tenses. Instead it fails to make an appearance as a *claus;* this omission means that when it does appear, it may be an afterthought rather than part of an exhaustive list. And it does so — arguably always with a causal meaning — almost exclusively in primary tenses and never in the future. He must therefore have become aware of at least some of the limitations of his marker of mood. Indeed, it seems that Molinier is distinctly unconcerned that his markers should occur in all the tenses in actual usage. Neither *cum* or *am mo vol* are appropriate to the future but they still appear in the list of tenses of the two moods, and the imperfect subjunctive also shows an example of the over-extension of *cum.* As mentioned, Molinier rightly recognises all three *amarem* translations as equivalents of the subjunctive, but this causes him to produce a paradigm in which the *-ria* and *-ra* forms, as well as the *-es* forms, are prefixed by *cum,* producing syntagms which would not be valid translations of the Latin subjunctive.

For Molinier therefore definitely, and for Faidit possibly as well, we are forced to recognise that *cum* is attached to <u>all</u> subjunctive tenses largely because, once one has decided to recognise it as the equivalent of the Latin marker *cum,* that is its function. If the results are all grammatical that is a bonus, and even more so if they represent Latin *cum* plus subjunctive; but it is not perhaps a prerequisite. What is still hard to see is why a Latin word would be imported to act as the subjunctive marker, contradicting tendencies elsewhere in the grammar. It is much more plausible to regard the use of *cum* as having been derived from the present (reinforced by the perfect) where *cum* plus subjunctive means 'since' in both languages, and is a mainstream meaning in both cases. The opportunity to use a form identical in two languages would not be missed when it occurred; and the identity makes it hard to disentangle how the grammarians saw their form.

4. 4. 6. The treatment of 'ungrammatical' Occitan uses of the moods.

Generally speaking, Molinier and Uc show little awareness of contradictions between the Latin and Occitan systems, despite the formal discrepancies. However, any attribution of Occitan forms to Latin categories led to some anomalies, in that these forms might occur where their regular Latin equivalents did not.

Uc's awareness of these issues is limited. He does note (120) the use of the imperfect indicative in conditional protases replacing the Latin subjunctive, though he chooses to regard it as an aberrant subjunctive form:

lo preteritz non perfeiç del conjunctiu es semblans al preterit non perfeitz del indicatiu a la vengada, et es contra gramatica, si cum en aquest loc: *S'eu te donava mil marcs, serias tu mos hom?'*[27]

Molinier devotes attention to several issues of this kind in the *ajustamens.* II, 344 has two examples which to modern eyes are discussions of the same or a very similar issue, but which are different according to the *Leys'* analysis. Both involve the *claus tantostque* and *deceque* being used in a temporal clause of logically future reference with the perfect subjunctive. The main clause is either in the future indicative or in what the text calls the *futur del conjunctiu* (future perfect indicative in Varro's terms and those of many moderns). In both cases Latin would have shown the 'future subjunctive' in the temporal clause. Thus:

Decequieu haia manjat e dormit.yeu iray deportar.

Tantostquieu haia apreza tota logica. yeu hauray apreza gran sciensa.

In both cases, the text regards the substitution of the future subjunctive as 'better' ('miels'); thus '*deceque* [...] *hauray manjat* and *tantostqu'ieu hauray apreza logica'*. The perfect usages are acceptable, but only on the usual excuse that 'loncz uzatges o requier'. They cannot be regarded as theoretically immaculate, and the more Latinate forms have in the grammatical paradigm, if not in real or recommended usage, the prime position.

The interaction between Latin grammar and Occitan is well exemplified under the combination of the present indicative with itself (II, 262), which introduces a

---

[27]The Latin gloss is *'Si ego donarem tibi mille marchas, esses tu meus homo?'*

loose discussion of various issues, not all theoretically relevant at this point. Molinier states that *si* is impossible in this combination unless it can be interpreted as *quar* or *can:* *'yeu hay gaug si gazanhi* so es *quar gazanhi* o *can gazanhi'*. The implied ban on the indicative after a conditional use of *si* is reinforced by a reference to Latin, only for the rule to be rejected in favour of usage in Occitan.

Segon lati. *si.* vol tostemps conjunctiu. coma *si placeat deo vel si deus det mihi bonum* [...] si donx nos pauzava aquel *si* per *quar.* coma *si deus est animus* [...]. Enpero segon luzatge de parlar en romans. nos dizem lo contrari. quar aquel *si.* os pauza conditionalmen o acertivamen[28], tostemps saordena am lo prezen del indicatiu en aquel loc on hauria loc le prezens del conjunctiu en lati. oz am lo preterit perfag[29] del indicatiu. layon hauria loc preteritz imperfagz de conjunctiu segon lati.

Thus *si Dieu* (sic)*o vol* is preferred to *si Dieus o vuelha,* and *si a Dieu platz* to *si a Dieu plassa.* The situation in the imperfect (which is treated here out of sequence) is considered as an aspect of the same tendency. The text gives *'si Bernads era rix. el saubria be despendre',* using an imperfect indicative where Latin would as he says require a subjunctive. However in this case, corresponding probably to the possible counterfactual nature of the sentence, the subjunctive is also acceptable. Molinier quotes as alternative constructions to *'si Bernads era rix'* the two versions *'si Bernads fos rix',* using the subjunctive and *'si Bernads havia M. liuras de rendas'* which shows a return to the indicative with only lexical variation.

The forms which modern analysis would ascribe to the present subjunctive (Occitan *ame)* are triply ambiguous in the normative system, between the subjunctive, imperative and optative moods. Here the analysis varies. The sentence with an initial indicative, followed by just such an ambiguous form, *'qui mal me vol, mal li venga',* (*Leys* II, 276) is described as being either imperative, if taken as 'pregan', or optative, if taken as 'deziran'. Both analyses, and the exclusion of the subjunctive as a possibility, are within the normative Latin tradition. In the above case, the third per-

[28]Distinctions of syntax associated with different uses of *si* are treated by Priscian, notably Priscian II, 242-44, and Eberhardus (1887, 202-03). The latter quotes *'si deus est animus'.*

[29] *Sic.* Read 'imperfag'.

son form leaves the choice open as between three moods, of which the imperative is one. The second person of course shows distinct imperative forms, leaving the ambiguous type (*ames*, etc.) to be allocated to the subjunctive or optative, even when the meaning is not far away from that of a canonical imperative. Here the positive identification of the optative with *volontiers* or *am mo vol* appears to force the subjunctive into the default role when neither of these is present. Thus the following two sentences are analysed as subjunctive despite having a meaning which is close to being imperative and might be related to the optative, but is not typical of the subjunctive:[30]

Si yeu hay fayt be. vulhatz far atertal. (*Leys* II, 306)

Ni fazia [...]*aytal cauza. ni la fassas* (*Leys* II, 292).

In a number of cases the precise motivation for the decision for one mood or another is not clear. The sentence *'am mo vol agra estudiat. quar agra aprofichat'* (II, 330) is regarded as having optatives in both clauses. The first clause is clearly optative within both the Leys' system and that of Priscian. The second, an apodosis corresponding to the implied protasis *'si agues estudiat'*, is parallel to other apodoses which the text clearly regards as subjunctive.

One possible though less than flattering explanation is that here, as elsewhere, complete consistency of analysis falls victim to the desire to fill out gaps in the analysis. The number of optatives that can be combined with other optatives is distinctly small, but the exhaustive nature of the tense/mood combinations of the *ajustamens* might tempt an analyst to find examples of each combination however marginal.

4. 5. 1. <u>The moods and tenses in the *Regles de trobar.*</u>

Jofre's views on the moods and tenses (*Regles* 82-87) are a little difficult to determine. The information given is partial, varies on crucial points from one manuscript to another, and would have communicated relatively little to the prospective reader who is assumed elsewhere to be ignorant of Latin grammar. Nevertheless, a

---

[30]This is especially true in the positive. In the negative, *ni fassas* would parallel the subjunctive *ne facias.*

number of the statements that are made seem to indicate that Jofre was innovative in his basic analysis of the verb.

The divisions which he retains include those of mood (*manera),* tense, and person. The past tense is not divided except by implication; in the discussion of the indicative, which probably involved examples from the paradigm of *amar* only (as in MS R, *Regles* 83), the three forms *amey, amava,* and *avia amat* occur without explanation under the past. The two other moods to which a past tense is attributed, the *optatius* (or *desirans)* and the *coniunctius* (or *aiustans),* have no more than one form cited. It is however evident that Jofre is not even attempting to cite all the forms which he believes to exist, let alone those which may have escaped his attention, since he attributes a future tense to both the optative and the subjunctive, but does not cite their forms. Under the subjunctive, in fact, the only forms quoted are of the type *cavalque, aiudetz,* though when this mood in combined with the infinitive, the combination *eu mi volgues mover* appears (86-87). It seems reasonable to regard the former type as present and the latter as past, but the text asserts neither of these attributions. Arguments from silence are thus particularly misleading in this text.

Features of interest include the following.

The future indicative tense differs between the 2 MSS in Marshall 1972. In H (82) forms from three verbs are quoted, thus: *'amaray, yray, faray'.* This is unexpected in that the previous tenses in this paragraph used forms from *amar* only. Given this, it is possible that MS R (83), as emended by Marshall, indicates the correct text: *'a‹maray›* e *hauray amat'.* This would represent a significant innovation in contradicting the grammatical tradition, since the normative tradition agreed that the latter form, representing Latin *amavero,* was future subjunctive. Jofre's decision agrees with that of Varro. It might have been aided by recognition of the formal parallel between future and future perfect. The situation is much clearer in this regard in Occitan than in Latin, where the form is reminiscent of both moods. The treatment of articles and case markers is sufficient proof that Jofre preferred solutions which allowed an uncomplicated analysis of Romance forms, and that the consequent breach with Latin

equivalents was not an issue. Form may therefore have been the source of his decision. This attribution raises another issue, in that it removes the form in question from the future subjunctive. One might ask what form Jofre did attribute to that tense, or whether his lack of a citation is in part due to his having renamed the only possible candidate for this office.

Similar problems of form afflict the analysis of the optative (84-85). For the present, MS H gives *'eu volrria, eu maniaria si havia que'*, while MS R has only *'eu volria, eu maniaria'*. The combination of the mood with the infinitive (86-87) gives *'eu volrria foc encendre'* (H) or *'eu volria fort entendre'* (R). For the past, MS H has *'si eu hagues cavalcat, si eu hagues pro maniat eu fora sadoyls'*. while MS R has *'si eu agues volentat'*. The easiest interpretation of this, given that the *-es* ending is associated with the subjunctive elsewhere, is to assume that the optative ends in *-ria* for the present and *-ra* for the past. The forms *havia* and *hagues* are indicative (probably) and subjunctive (almost certainly), cited here only to provide the protases for the apodoses in which the optatives are found. (The past tense in R therefore represents an infelicitous abbreviation by a copyist.) The presence of *volrria* suggests a connection with the notion of wishing; but *vollria* is not simply a representation of *utinam,* since *volrria ... encendre/entendre* is analysed as being a combination of an optative with an infinitive, rather than being equivalent to a simple optative. The term 'optative' has been hijacked to convey the conditional, a mood which *voler* possesses like any other verb. A use of *volrria* to convey a Latin optative may well of course have suggested the association.

Where this solution differs from that of Uc is in the following. Uc only partially excludes *-es* forms from his paradigm; and even in the present/ imperfect optative (which he calls simply optative) he can find no way to distinguish *-ria* and *-ra.* To some extent this was inevitable, since both, despite their differences, translate the same Latin form. Jofre links each form to one tense, giving the more counterfactual *-ra* to the past. The comparison with Latin is not wholly clear; it is possible to interpret 'past' as meaning 'past imperfect', in which case Jofre's analysis maintains con-

formity to Latin, but shows more innovation than the other Occitan grammarians in exploiting fully the three possible grammatical analyses of the *amarem* type to distinguish between the main three Occitan equivalents.

A further concern for Occitan form may lie behind the statement that the imperative 'non ha mays present temps e segona persona' (examples of such forms are *vay, cavalca).* The remaining persons would most plausibly be assigned to the future optative, but that again is a tense which is claimed to exist but not exemplified. In formal terms, the restriction of the imperative to the second person is easily comprehensible. Once more, it is an assault on the inherited system, the more so as there is no difference in the issues between Latin and Occitan; the implication is that the traditional analysis of Priscian and Donatus is wrong for Latin as well.

A number of tenses are absent. They include all the perfect auxiliary tenses except the pluperfect indicative, which is used to translate *amaveram,* and the pluperfect subjunctive, though that appears only to complete a sentence exemplifying the optative. Along with the brevity of the statements, it means that many familiar forms are not covered or given only a very general description. If we assume that Jofre was writing a carefully thought-out text, we must regard this section as merely an attempt to convey a few basic concepts about the grammatical analysis of the verb, rather than a comprehensive analysis which would guide one in choosing between forms. In analysing his criteria, therefore, we are discerning his private opinions, rather than a clear public system.

formity to Latin, but shows more innovation than the other Occitan grammarians in exploiting fully the three possible grammatical analyses of the *amarem* type to distinguish between the main three Occitan equivalents.

A further concern for Occitan form may lie behind the statement that the imperative 'non ha mays present temps e segona persona' (examples of such forms are *vay, cavalca).* The remaining persons would most plausibly be assigned to the future optative, but that again is a tense which is claimed to exist but not exemplified. In formal terms, the restriction of the imperative to the second person is easily comprehensible. Once more, it is an assault on the inherited system, the more so as there is no difference in the issues between Latin and Occitan; the implication is that the traditional analysis of Priscian and Donatus is wrong for Latin as well.

A number of tenses are absent. They include all the perfect auxiliary tenses except the pluperfect indicative, which is used to translate *amaveram,* and the pluperfect subjunctive, though that appears only to complete a sentence exemplifying the optative. Along with the brevity of the statements, it means that many familiar forms are not covered or given only a very general description. If we assume that Jofre was writing a carefully thought-out text, we must regard this section as merely an attempt to convey a few basic concepts about the grammatical analysis of the verb, rather than a comprehensive analysis which would guide one in choosing between forms. In analysing his criteria, therefore, we are discerning his private opinions, rather than a clear public system.

5.

The inflection- classes of Occitan.

5. 1. 1. The Latin theoretical background.

The inflection classes were somewhat ambiguous in status in contemporary Latin grammar. The inflections were used to mark features, such as *casus, numerus, genus, tempus, modus,* and *genus verbi*, which were admitted to the *accidentia* of Priscian's parts of speech and associated with important *modi significandi* in the Modistae. These features, however well they corresponded to Latin inflections, were regarded as not dependent on any specific form or *vox.* Consequently they could be regarded as linguistic universals and attributed to Occitan despite differences in the *vox* between the two languages.

However, the inflections themselves were features only of the *vox,* and the inflection-classes, the declensions and conjugations, were entirely based on the relationships between the forms of Latin. The classical definitions are consistently based on the endings of specific parts of the paradigm, such as the genitive or ablative singular of nouns, or the first and second person singular present indicative active of verbs. The choice of these elements of the paradigm is made on essentially practical grounds and may vary, while the classes themselves are largely fixed. Priscian identifies the five Latin declensions by their genitive singular endings; *ae, i, is, us, ei.* [1]

The Modistae customarily ignore the inflection-classes, consistently with their downgrading of the *vox.* More elementary and practical grammars continue to identify declensions and conjugations by form, occasionally innovating slightly in the definitions.

---

[1]The Roman grammarians' analysis of inflection is essentially paradigmatic, particularly in the noun. They identify a class and its endings, deriving the ending of one category from that of another. No abstract roots appear, and little attempt is made to formulate the generalisations which would be valid across the inflection-classes.

5. 1. 2. Occitan noun morphology.

In Occitan, the morphology of the *noms* (noun/adjective) is significantly less extensive than Latin. At its maximum extent, it serves to distinguish between singular and plural numbers, and between masculine, feminine and neuter genders (the last of these being restricted to substantivised adjectives). It also distinguishes — though to a limited extent in the feminine — between two forms which are linked to case.

From the perspective of Medieval Latin grammar, the first of these translates the Latin nominative and generally also the vocative[2]. The second form translates the Latin accusative, and, more marginally, the genitive. The Latin dative, ablative and most genitives are conveyed in Occitan translation by combining the second form with elements that would in modern analysis be prepositions. Such combinations also convey all the Latin constructions involving the *praepositiones.* All the vernacular grammarians recognise these two forms as relevant to the grammar, though they vary in the way they refer to them; no grammar regards them as constituting two *cas,* though each may be regarded as representing several *cas* . Adapting the terminology of the *Leys,* itself based on Latin usage, we may distinguish them as 'nominative' and 'oblique'.[3]

The categories of case and number are expressed morphologically mainly by the alternation of the endings *-s* and *-Ø.* (In the nominative plural, gender is also relevant to these inflections.) This distinction is generally neutralised where the noun stem ends in a sibilant, as in *cors, tem(p)s, bratz/bras*, though there are examples of *-es* in the oblique plural, especially in late texts (the same ending is found, rarely, in nominative singulars: see Jensen 1976, 48).

---

[2] Both cases could occur as a direct address form, though the nominative is preferred (Jensen 1986, 17). The *Donatz* indicates that some (singular) vocatives were formed by the loss of an *-s* present in the nominative but the other texts ascribe the same form to their *nominatiu* and *vocatiu* cases at all times.

[3] This is also the terminology used by Smith/Bergin 1984. The solutions of Mok 1977 ('cas sujet' and 'cas régime', following Francophone tradition), and of Jensen 1986 ('nominative' and 'accusative') are also defensible.

The following general rules apply to these endings, if, unlike the medieval grammarians, one takes the singular oblique as the base form.

1. The oblique endings are -zero in the singular and *-s* in the plural.

2. The nominative plural is -zero for masculines and *-s* for feminines.

3. The substantivised neuter adjective (singular nominative and oblique) has a zero ending.

The choice of form in the nominative singular is based on more complex rules. These are largely as follows (gender being irrelevant):

1. A group consisting primarily of words whose basic form ends in a consonant, semivowel or accented vowel, as well as some others. These receive an ending in *-s* (examples: *murs, sermos, amicx, auzels, cobdes* ; *naus, honors, vertutz).* They are derived from all Latin declensions bar the first, but retain a flexion deriving primarily from the second and third declensions.

2. Words in unstressed *-a,* such as the feminines *filha, domna,* and the masculine *legista.* (Masculine nouns of this type are rare, and several nouns referring to males oscillate between masculine and feminine gender.) These receive no *-s* ending, with the exception of *dia* when used as a masculine.[4] This remains true throughout medieval Occitan. In general, these forms derive from the Latin first declension, with the addition of some members of the fifth and of Latin neuter plurals.

3. A number of types deriving from Latin forms without *-s* show variation between the two endings. This is common in nouns ending in unstressed vowels other than *-a,* and in those showing a change of stem between the nominative singular and the other inflected forms. A number of sub-categories have been distinguished in scholarship, and some are given here as they are to some extent treated separately by

---

[4]According to Smith/Bergin (1984, 69) and Jensen (1976). Mok (1977, 9) states that a number of nouns of variable gender (including *papa* and *propheta)* take *-s* when masculine. Jensen (1976, 77) notes that while these nouns adopt the masculine form in the plural (*li propheta, li papa)* 'it is simply not possible to come up with a single example of **lo prophetas* or **lo papas* as proof of the existence of a sigmatic nom[inative]. On the contrary, this form of the noun is consistently asigmatic' .

the Occitan grammarians. It should be noted that many of these groups show inconsistent behaviour, that some of the types are highly marginal in being exceptions to the *-s* flexion, and that some are insufficiently well attested for clear trends in their inflection to be noticeable (see Jensen 1976).

(i) Forms in *-re,* such as *paire, maire, fraire, maestre,* where the asigmatic form is common. These derive from second and third declension forms in *-er.*

(ii) Nouns in *-atge* (Latin *-aticum),* like *damnatge, usatge,* where the asigmatic use is the exception (Jensen 1976, 50).

(iii) Nouns in *-i,* mostly learned, such as *breviari,* where asigmatic use is normal (but the category itself is rare).

(iv) Nouns in *-ire* (*<-rium)* where both forms are found though examples are few (note that Uc favours *-s).*

(v) A number of nouns in *-e* from Latin proparoxytones where a regular *-s* is occasionally lost, as in *diable(s).*

(vi) A limited number of nouns in consonants which do not originally take *-s,* notably *cor* , 'heart', to which Molinier adds a number of others. While *cor* is found in an asigmatic form, the sigmatic *cors* (which is also the regular form of the indeclinable *cors,* 'body') is also attested.

(vii). Words where the nominative singular stem varies from that used elsewhere, called imparisyllabics[5]. Examples are *sor (seror), hom (home), trobaire (trobador).* This originally took no ending. Later developments show an increase in two (not necessarily linked) tendencies: to adopt the *-s* of type 1 and to use the same stem in all cases and numbers, frequently causing two separate words to be generated. This group can be subdivided in various ways; the group most clearly identified in the medieval tradition, under various analyses, is that consisting of the verbal nouns in *-ire/-dor.* Distinctions involving the number of syllables and the behaviour of the accent

[5]The term refers properly to the differing number of syllables between nominative and oblique cases in the Latin forms from which this type derives. Not all are imparisyllabic in Occitan, though most show shifts of accent and, frequently, considerable phonological changes.

are generally irrelevant to the medieval discussions. These nouns are derived from Latin imparisyllabics, generally from the third declension with the exception of *preire/ preveire* (*<presbyter).*

While it is possible to base paradigms on these rules, the result is highly unlike the only paradigmatic system known to the Occitan grammarians, that of Latin. The only point of contact is the existence of a distinctive class characterised by the ending *-a.* Other groups differ from Latin declensions not only in ending but also in membership. Notably, the Latin second and third declensions both give rise to examples of types 1, 3(i) and 3(vii) above.[6] It is thus unsurprising that the Occitan grammarians make extensive use of general rules, based on case, gender and number, to describe Occitan inflections. This is usually supplemented by some recognition of distinct formal classes typified by particular endings. Among these classes, that of the feminines in *-a* is recognised and successfully defined by most Occitan grammarians, no doubt on the basis of its similarity to the Latin first declension; treatment of the remaining types appears to have caused greater difficulty.

The sections treating inflection generally cite substantives and adjectives indiscriminately, which is a reasonable reflection of the morphology. Generally speaking, the feminine adjective is an *-a* stem formed by addition of *-a* to the oblique singular of the masculine (with deletion of *-e* where necessary), as in *bela<bel, glorioza<glorios;* there are a number of associated changes which may be neglected here. In some adjectives, however, the same stem is used in both genders, thus *gran, fort.*. The distinction between the two types, based on the Latin difference between 2nd/1st declension adjectives and 3rd declension adjectives, is not clearly linked to the Occitan form. The second type frequently assimilates to the first. The only feature of adjective morphology not found in nouns is provided by the neuter singular, which is identical in all cases with the masculine oblique singular.

---

[6] From the second declension: *amicx, fabre* and *prestre/preveire.* From 3rd declension masculines, *reys, payre* and *senher/senhor.* From 3rd declension feminines, *naus, mayre* and *sor/ seror.*

5. 2. 1. The practical need to discuss Occitan nominal inflection.

All the Occitan grammars under discussion considered it important to give an understanding of these distinctions of case and the variation between some of the main types. In fact, given the prominence it enjoys in early works like the *Razos,* this issue may well have been one of the immediate practical problems which the grammatical literature emerged to address. For the Catalans who were the primary audience for the *Razos* and the *Regles,* as for the Italians to whom the *Donatz* was directed, the reason for this is obvious. Neither Catalan nor Italian possessed any vestige of the Latin nominal case-system. This is seen clearly in the *Razos* (Marshall 1973, 11). The nominative and vocative singular and plural, are said to be

plus de leu per entendre a cels qe an la parladura qe als autres qe no l'an dreccha; car li catre cas singular, so es le genitius e·l datius et l'acusatius et l'ablatius, s'abreuien (i.e. have a zero ending) per totas las terras del mon, et li catre cas plural, so es a saber, le genitius e·l datius et l'acusatius et l'ablatius, s'alongon per totas las terras del mon.

The obliques therefore correspond to the Romance norm. By 'all the countries of the world' the text means Iberia and France, since while Italian distinguishes number, not case, thus having the same system as the Iberian tongues, it does so by vowel endings, having no final *-s.*

For speakers of vernaculars without case-endings, the endings of Occitan nouns must have appeared disturbingly random, due to the multiple use of the same morphological material. Even Latinists who understood cases in principle would have needed guidance in assimilating the Occitan inflectional endings.

The inflectional classes too could not easily be related to Latin forms, since, with the single exception of the feminines in *-a,* they had developed from groups unknown to Latin analysis and unlike any intuitive division of the nouns outside the Gallo-Romance area.[7] By contrast, elsewhere in the grammar, the forms might vary between languages, and the paradigms might be complex, but the system was famil-

[7]Contrast the Italian distinction of nouns in *-o* and *-e,* largely continuing the second and third declensions, with the Occitan reflexes of these declensions.

iar, so that one could understand a Occitan form as equivalent to a Catalan or Italian form. This is presumably the reason why so little information is generally given about verb inflection, though this was an order of magnitude more complex than nominal inflection; the Romance languages of the period were broadly similar in their tense systems, conjugations, and in the inflection of the verb for person and number.

The emphasis placed on the issue by the *Leys* reflects growing uncertainty even in the native Occitan region as the language diverged from the troubadour standard. The eventual fate of the case-distinctions was to be disappearance, with the original oblique forms generally becoming the sole forms, giving a simple contrast between singular (*-Ø)* and plural (*-s).*

5. 2. 2. The analysis of nominal inflection in the *Razos, Regles* and *Donatz.*

The Occitan grammarians retain the six cases of Latin though they recognise the reduction to two distinct endings, at least informally. Most do so by listing the names of several cases while making a single observation about a form, or by making one statement about the nominative and vocative and then another about all the 'other' cases. Molinier consistently uses the word *oblicz* to refer to the ending of the genitive, dative, accusative and ablative *cas*, referring to the other form under discussion as *nominatius* or as *nominatius e vocatius*. This is an unsurprising use of a traditional concept in Latin grammar, that of the difference between the nominative as *casus rectus* and the other cases as *obliqui.* [8] Its application to the Occitan context is therefore a happy one.

---

[8]Obliquus is found in Priscian: 'vel quod cadens a sua terminatione in alias facit obliquos casus' (Priscian I, 184), 'de nominativo et obliquis casibus compositi' (Priscian II, 449). Cf. also Balbus 1971, 66: 'genitivus secundum locum sibi defendit [...] generat autem omnes obliquos casus sequentes'. The vocative would in these sources count as oblique, but its near-universal identity with the nominative in Latin paradigms means that its removal from the oblique category made sense in a morphological context. As Law (1986, 49) points out, the oblique is also recognised in one version of the *Razos* as a description of four cases 'qi se resemblon' (Marshall 1972, 149), and both *retz* and *oblics* are found in

The grammarians do not attempt to replicate the Latin system entirely, with every noun clearly linked to a numbered declension and declined through its (reduced) number of cases. In fact, only Uc employs the term *declinaços* at all, and only his first *declinaços* (predictably consisting of nouns in *-a)* gives information not already presented by other rules. However, the absence of the term, while a significant theoretical issue itself in the *Leys d'amors,* does not prevent the grammarians from distinguishing various types based usually on gender and form. These coexist with general rules relating to case and ending and the presence and absence of *-s*, from which various types are then cited as exceptions.

The *Razos* (undoubtedly an influence on the *Regles* and the *Leys)* gives rules for the alternation *-s/-Ø* that depend fundamentally on gender. The basic masculine type in *-s, -, -, -s* is given for all masculines, except for those in *-s* 'qe s'alongon en toz los cas', (*Razos* 13). The terminology used distinguishes the concepts of 'alongar' (adding -s) and 'abreviar' (the zero ending), and lists the cases in which these are found, thus (*Razos* 10):

> toutas las paraulas del mon masculinas [...] s'alongan en ·vj· cas, so es a saber, el nominatiu [et el vocatiu] singular, el genitiu et el datiu et en l'acusatiu, et en l'ablatiu plural; et s'abrevion en ·vj· cas, el genitiu et el datiu et el acusatiu, et el ablatiu singlar et el nominatiu et vocatiu plural.[9]

No mention is made of the masculines in *-a* (admittedly not numerous). In addition, no link is drawn between imparisyllabicity and inflection.

The feminines are divided into three *manieras* (13) on the basis of their endings, and these categories are then given separate rules of inflection, using the same terminology. Those in *-a,* like *dompna, poma* 's'abreuian en ·vj· cas singulars et alon-

---

the grammar of Terramagnino da Pisa (Marshall 1972), a work which is otherwise largely a less than competent adaptation of Raimon.

[9]Law (1986, 48) suggests that *alongar* and *abreviar* derive from works drawing on Servius' *De finalibus (De ultimis syllabis),* in which case endings are identified as long or short (referring to their vowel quantity and/or metrical weight). While interesting, the very different distinction being made here makes it hard to prove that the two uses are linked.

gan si en los ·vj· cas plurals', while those in *-or* and *-on* 's'alongon en ·viij· cas (...) el nominatiu et el vocatiu singular et en toz los cas plurals'. This covers two types of inflection, in -, -, *-s*, *-s* and *-s*, -, *-s*,*-s* but no similarities are drawn between the classes (for instance on the nominative plural). In addition the attempt to define the classes formally is problematic; the first is given simply enough as 'las unas qe fenissen en *-a'* (13), but the pattern associated with the second and third *manieras*, which is that of most feminines not ending in unaccented-*a* (or *-e),* is represented merely by those in *-or* and *-on*, leaving a large number of nouns undescribed.

A slightly greater formal diversity is allowed for the common nouns adjective, (14) of which *fortz, vils, sotils, plazens, soffrens* are quoted. These are stated to be lengthened in the *nominatiu* and *vocatiu* (sc. singular); Raimon quotes *fortz es le cavals, fortz es li domna, fortz es li chansons,* thus citing the three admitted types of noun. For the other cases, he states that 'alongan si et s'abreuian aisi com li substantiu'.

This use of the endings is thus still paradigmatic, with no generalisations across the groups (except possibly in the mention that both masculine and feminine *nominatiu* singular end in *-s* in the common adjective), and with three effectively separate classes.

Both Faidit, who may have achieved his insights independently, and Jofre de Foixà, who had Vidal as a source, extend the system by making the dominant masculine type the basis for generalisations which cut across individual classes. There are sound theoretical reasons for making this type standard, quite apart from its frequency. Excluding imparisyllabics, it is the only type which expresses morphologically the nominative/ oblique distinction in both numbers. It thus helps to establish the integrity of the systemic distinction, leaving the breakdown of the differentiation in either or both numbers to be handled by exceptions. The use of other types, particularly feminines, which lack case-distinction in the plural, would have complicated the analysis. This is not to say that a perceived superiority of the masculine over the femi-

nine (not restricted to the grammatical context) may not have contributed to this decision.

Jofre starts by providing a general rule, using terminology derived from Raimon. 'Tots temps li nominatiu e li vocatiu singular s'alonguen, e li autre cas singular s'abreuion; e.l nominatiu e.l vocatiu plural s'abreuien, e li altre cas s'alonguen.' (*Regles* 66-67.) It is qualified by two major rules (68-9). One is that 'lo nominatiu singular s'abreuia quant no es masculi ne femeni', e.g. *bell m'es;* this covers the substantivised neuter adjective. The other is that 'le nominatius s'alonga tots temps com es femini'. Jofre's rules thus cover the oblique cases, the neuter, and the nominative plural accurately. The rules are however over-general in their predictions for the nominative singular, from which only the imparisyllabics are excepted (78-81). The feminines in *-a* are not explicitly mentioned. This is unexpected, since in defining the neuter he contrasts the nominative *bell* not only with masculine *bels* but also with feminine *bella.* In addition, the earlier mention of the *articles* had linked *li* both to 'nom femeni alongat' (*li citatz)* and to 'mot femeni que fenescha en *-a,* sols que aquels motz sia nominatius' (65). The category is thus clearly understood, but not expressed. The text as a whole therefore uses general rules to a greater extent than its predecessor, but is less helpful in defining formal classes.

The use of the rules in the *Donatz proensals* has similar difficulties of overgeneralisation. Uc's introduction of the issue comes in the context of the distinction of six *cas* (corresponding to the Latin cases). The *nominatius, genitius, datius* and *acussatius* are initially described on the basis of the *silabe*[10] which accompany them, using the formula 'se conois per'; the *silabe* cited are *lo, de, a, lo.* Since both the *nominatius* and the *acusatius* are accompanied by the same form (the article *lo,* which has no case-distinction in the masculine singular in Uc's Occitan) Uc has recourse to the endings (*Donatz* 93): 'E no se pot conosser ni triar l'acusatius del nominatiu sino per

---

[10]The term *silaba* is used in the Latin gloss (93); the Occitan text does not provide any name for this group.

zo que.l nominatius singulars, quan es masculi, vol *-s* en la fi e li autre cas no.l volen, e.l nominatiu plural no [lo] vol e tuit li altre cas volen lo enl plural'.[11]

The next step is to give the exception for the feminine plural.[12] Then the nominative singular exceptions begin. The first group (those in *-aire, -eire, -ire)* are quoted with a reference to their possession of an oblique singular in *-dor;* the next group of nouns, including *maestre, prestre, pastre, sener (= dominus) melher, peier, sordeier, maier, menre, sor, bar, gençer, leuger, greuger* (96), mainly consists of imparisyllabics, but no comment is made on the relevance of this fact to their ending. The neuter adjectives 'quan sun pausat senes sustantiu' as in *greu m'es, mal m'es* (96) and some pronouns are also quoted as exceptions. Of these, the adjectives are defined grammatically. The other groups present new classifications, which Uc can neither link to the fundamental features nor to a Latin class such as the declensions. Indeed, only the nouns in *-ire* are easy to define by their ending. The attempt to link these groups to Latin categories was not however given up. The nouns in *-a,* as in the *Re-*

[11] A difference in detail is given in that the vocative (the singular alone is meant) is considered to form one of the 'other cases' distinguished from the nominative, though it resembles the nominative 'al menhz en silabas et en letras [...] trait sol *-s* en la fi' (92). This distinction would seem to apply to nouns with stem change, though only relatively few of them have an *-s* in the nominative singular anyway by his analysis. A number of exceptions are also cited, such as the words ending in *-ors,* and a number of others which are quoted, (e.g. *deus, reis, francs, pros, bos, cavaliers, canços)* where the vocative must be like the nominative. According to Marshall (1969, 261) 'the presence or absence of *-s* [...] seems not to have been subject to any rule.' The remaining grammars are equally eager to give a general rule, but they treat the vocatives, both singular and plural, as identical in form to the nominative. This corresponded to the general Latin situation. In addition, the case- distinction which it established corresponded to the distinction between nominative/ vocative against oblique occurring in the nouns with stem change. Faidit has to make two different sorts of distinctions.

[12] 'De la regla [...] que.l nominatius cas no vol *-s* en la fi quan es pluralis numeri, voilh traire fors toiz los femenis' (94). Theoretically the rule has not been stated to apply to feminines, but he is proceeding as if it had, and no positive information on feminines has so far been supplied.

gles, are not handled by general rules. They are attributed to a 'prima declinaço', where, as in a Latin paradigm, all the endings are specified, including the obliques (which follow the general rules), and the nominative plural which obeys the previously-established gender-based rules. The use of the *declinaços* to present full paradigmatic information however extends no further. The second *declinaços* defines its members by citing the plural endings, which are simply those of the masculine. The nominative singulars include types both with *-s (deus)* and without it (*segner, maestre).* The third *declinaços* presents no explicit information on endings at all. The criteria for the establishment of the *declinaços* (see 5. 2. 7.) evidently prevented them being usable in general to cover those elements of inflection not susceptible to feature-based rules; and it is these rules which remain the main element of the system.

5. 2. 3. Noun-inflection in the *Leys.*

The *Leys* rejects *declinatios* explictly but is one of the more successful texts at handling Occitan inflections — partly by not having to use inappropriate declensions, partly by better formulation and partly because it describes a version of Occitan from which some of the older complexities have been removed. The rule-based nature of the system is reminiscent of Faidit and Jofre; the nominatives are separated from the obliques, and a generalisation is made for each case- number combination, again on the basis of the masculine type *-s, Ø , -Ø, -s.* The effectiveness of this system is seen in the section on the obliques (*Leys* II, 190), where the single page devoted to the issue has to record only two types of exception to the general rule; these are provided in the singular by the sibilant stems, and in the plural by various numerals.

The section on the nominatives (*Leys* II, 154-88) works ostensibly from the fundamental rule (154) that 'tug li nominatiu e li vocatiu singular e plural regularmen devo termenar en. *s.* e li plural ses. *s.*' but recognises among the exceptions a number of distinct classes, in which reference is also made to the oblique forms where they too are problematic. Some classes are described in general terms, while specific rules are given for small groups and the behaviour of some individual words is defined in detail.

The first class consists of those words which behave 'regularmen' (154), such as *reys, savis, valens*. The first group of exceptions comes from the feminines with *nominatiu singular -a,* like *dona,* 'que no teno la regla [...] ans fan tot lo contrari' (154), ending without *-s* in the singular and with *-s* in the plural, such as *dona, bela.*

The feminines 'que no termeno en *-a'* (156), like *naus,* 'teno la regla' in the singular but 'son exceptat. quar tug termeno en. *s.*' in the plural. There is an oddity, however, in the forms cited at this point. A number of adjectives are quoted which have no gender-distinction in the feminine singular, such as *avinens.* This would be reasonable, as they belong to this category when feminine; but then comes the qualification that 'cant aytal adjectiu o particip comu [...] sajusto am lo masculi. adonx seguo la regla del masculi. coma *li clerc son avinen e plazen'.* It would appear that these adjectives are regarded as linked to this group even when masculine, possibly as a result of their shared origin in the Latin third declension (compare the membership of Faidit's third *declinaços* (5. 2. 7)). It is notable however that this attraction does not apply to *valens,* quoted as regular above; this would be explicable if Molinier regarded it as exclusively masculine, with the feminine being *valenta.* (See Jensen 1976, 113 on analogical feminines of this type.)

The reference here to the 'regla del femini' and the 'regla del masculi', implies recognition of the general gender-based rule for the nominative plural. The link between gender and ending is not however made as clearly as in other texts, since the two main groups of feminines, differing in their singulars, each have their plural specified separately as though under a paradigm system.

The *Leys* is notable as making an attempt to provide guidance on all feminines. Both Raimon and Uc had distinguished the feminines in -a as a group: Molinier does so with greater accuracy[13]. Of the remaining feminines, a large number of endings are never covered in Raimon.

---

[13]The nominative singular is explicitly specified as excluding those feminines in *-a* in the oblique which have nominatives in *-s,* like *mas,* 'hand' (Latin *manus).* We are also informed that some restrict the type of the feminines in *-a* to those with a long penultimate (this would evidently exclude the mo-

Systemically, both Uc and Moliner provide much the same analysis of the feminines not in *-a,* but Uc's presentation is less obvious. In Uc, feminines in nominative singular *-s* followed the general rule and would not need to be cited, let alone subdivided; the only exception, apart from the *prima declinaços* in *a,* is represented by the inclusion of *sor* in a list of exceptions (96). The regular nominative is thus ascribed to all other *nom,* including by implication those in *-e.* Molinier makes the same view explicit, ascribing *-s* simply to those feminines which 'no termeno en *.a.*' (156). This simple analysis is undermined later by the quotation of *mayres* and *co-mayres* as being *indiferens*, thus potentially taking either ending (168), though the text claims that some regard these *nom* as entirely regular, as the account here would imply.

Those nouns which have 'votz feminina jaciaysso que realmen so es naturalmen sian del masculi' (158), such as *papa propheta legista,* are also handled under the general rule, as being of the 'meteyssha exceptio' as the feminines in-*a* in the singular though regular in the plural.

One larger category which is also set up is that of the 'neutris substantivatz' (176) which also do not take *-s,* as in *bo mes, mal mes.* It is also noted that this category cannot take an *habitutz,* or be combined with any other adjective, apparent exceptions like *le mals* being explained as taking 'loc de sustantiu', the place and therefore the role of a substantive.

The section also distinguishes three groups described by original terms: *nom parcial, nom integral* and *nom indiferen,* which will be discussed below (5. 2. 4., 5. 2. 5.).

---

nosyllabic *mas,* as well as others with final accent). This is considered to be too restrictive since it excludes *ma, ta, sa,* unless one takes them as syncopated from *mia, tua, sua,* (which is considered *opinios... veraya*); also, the text objects to describing words of two syllables like *porta* as having a penultimate, since the preceding syllable should be referred rather with the more worthy name of *primiera* than by a name deriving from the last syllable.

5. 2. 4. Nouns with sibilant stems.

Nouns possessing *-s* in the oblique singular were normally monoptote in earlier Occitan. This is reflected in the *Razos* and the *Donatz;* Raimon lists 'paraulas [...] qe s'alongon en toz los cas singlar[s] e plurals' (*Razos* 13), while Uc lists 'nom que no se declinon' (*Donatz* 100). In both cases lists of examples are given, largely tallying with what is known of usage elsewhere. Jofre omits the group entirely in its analysis, oddly since he mentions at least one ending (*-itz, Regles* 78) which belongs in this class.

The *Leys* represent a version of the language in which a large number of nouns ending in postvocalic *-s* (as opposed to *-tz)* show the *-es* ending in the oblique plural. The formal distinction is not entirely simple on the basis of the examples cited, though one notes that those ending in *-s* after a monophthong *(bras/ brasses, amoros/-amorozes)* usually have *-es,* while those cited in *-tz* usually do not. For 'noms verbals e quaysh verbals' in *-itz*, one is advised to observe whether or not *alongamen* is customary; this lack of a general rule implies variation. The lack of *-es* is also ascribed to *ros temps pros repaus ris laus* and 'trops autres'. The nouns are still recognised as one group, called *nom integral* because 'volon esser tostemps entier'. With the loss of final *s* they would change or lose their meaning: 'per ostamen de la derriera letra so es de. *s.* mudo o perdo lor significat et enayssi volon esser tostemps entier aytal nom' (*Leys* II, 158). The subdivision is handled by distinguishing those which can 'alongar las termenatios' in the oblique plural from those where such lengthening, which occurs in some *lengatges* (dialects) where *votz, notz* and *dotz* give *vozes, nozes* and *dozes,* and is not entirely forbidden, is to be avoided: 'hom lo deu pauzar al plus tart que pot' (II, 160). (Note the use of *alongar* for something more extensive than a simple addition of the regular *-s*, its meaning in Raimon Vidal.) 'Good usage' is referred to as being the basis for the choice of form, and no general rules are given. An unusual feature of this section is the fact that the *nom integral* are defined by their lack of endings without *-s* (including by implication the oblique singular, the sole such case for consonantal feminines) and are subdivided on the basis of the oblique plural, al-

though the regular oblique endings have not yet been mentioned, and the category is relevant to nominatives only in the masculine plural. Here the logic of the rules takes second place to the recognition of a clearly defined inflection-class.

Molinier implies a close relatioship between the *nom integral* and a category called the *nom parcial* (*Leys* II, 160), whose members are distinguished from the *integral* in that each 'fay pars de si meteyssha e ses perdre lo significat' (*Leys* II, 162); this means that they show the usual loss of *-s* in the oblique singular, etc., without prejudice to the meaning. By implication, however, thay retain some feature which distinguishes them as a group from most regular nouns. The most obvious candidate for this feature is the oblique plural *-es,* seen also in the *nom integral.* This ending is fully admitted for some, like *crus cruses,* 'ques podon alongar', and for the types with 'doas termenatios' like *homs/ home/ home/ homes.* For *nutz/ nuzes, vertutz/ vertuzes, pęs/ pezes,* this 'lengthening' is said not to be customary, though used by some. Its potential use remains however the only plausible reason for Molinier to regard these nouns as *parcial.*[14]

5. 2. 5. Imparisyllabics.

These nouns are associated with the ending *-Ø* in the nominative singular in early Occitan. The Occitan grammarians do not necessarily see any link between membership of this class and nominative inflection. Raimon attempts to give guidance on both issues, but does not link them. Discussing the 'paraulas [...] qe son dessemblan[z] al nominatiu et al vocatiu singular et a tot los autres' (*Razos* 14), he makes no particular observation about the endings of the nouns. In the three masculine groups (the first shows those in oblique *-on*, the second a mixed group, and the third the *nomenz verbals* in *-ires/-dor)* all the nominative singulars are quoted with *-s*, which is consistent with his general rules for masculine nouns. (Thus *compags, Pei-*

[14]The presence of *pes, crus, & nutz* in this category is probably because their Latin medial *-d-* is represented by the *-z-* of the oblique plural -zes (which thus appears *integral),* while the -d- is lost or devoiced in the oblique singular giving *pe, cru, nut.* See the complications caused by medial *-d-* in Ronjat, 1930-1941, II, 95-6.

res, [...] *laires* [...] *abas, pastres, senhers, homs* [...] *emperaires*, oblique singulars *compaignon, Peiro, lairon* [...] *abat, pastor, segnor, home* [...] *emperador).* The feminines cited are generally forms which would usually be regarded as independent lexemes, such as *ma domna/ midons/ dompnas, gasca/ gascona/ gasconas, garsa/ garsona/ garsonas,*[15] but include the common word *sor/ seror/ serors.* Those in *-a* obey his general rules in the nominative singular, but *sor* provides an exception to his rules on feminines in *-or* (14-15). Ostensibly, therefore, but for the single exception of *sor,* the lack of any cross-reference is because the two sets of rules are logically independent of one another. Marshall claims however (1962, 222) that the *-s* ending for the masculines is practically unknown in troubadours of the period, and is not a Catalanism either. To provide a full account of the work of the troubadours Raimon cites elsewhere, some mention of the zero ending and of the constraints on its occurrence might have been expected.

Uc cites a number of nouns as lacking nominative singular *-s* (*Donatz* 94-6). While some of these are imparisyllabic, Uc does not generally refer to this fact, except to distinguish nouns in *-ire/-dor:* 'tut aquelh que·us ai dit, don lo nominatius singulars fenis en *-aire* et *-eire* [et en *-ire],* fenissen totx lor cas singulars en *-dor,* trait lo vocatius' (94).

The link between the two categories is made only by Jofre, who cites both the *-ire /-dor* type (as *noms verbals)* and 'altre nom qui han atressi mudament' (*genser, meyler, hom, bar, layre, bayle, coms)* (*Regles* 78-79) with the observation that all, with the exception of *coms,* 's'alongon o s'abreuien, qual te placia'. The former solution follows the 'regla general', while the latter is admissible as 'si ha gran differencia

---

[15] The three forms represent *nominatiu/vocatiu* singular, other singular *cas,* and plural forms. The doublets *gasca/ gascona* and *garsa/ garsona* are not examples of stem change, though the element *-on-* is reminiscent of a widespread genuine masculine type; nor is the choice between *mi dons* and *ma domna* conditioned by case. (*Midons,* though derived from a Latin nominative, had usually no case distinction.) Having been led to define the class, Raimon seems to have been over-anxious to find feminine members of it.

en l'uns e els altres cases' (78). Thus Raimon's solution is followed as far as the regular pattern is concerned, but an ostensibly practical concession is made to accommodate the alternative form.

The situation in the *Leys* is somewhat different. Despite some familiarity at least with the *Razos de trobar*, Molinier does not recognise the reality of a change of stem within the paradigm of a noun except possibly for the oblique singular and nominative plurals *home, comte* from *homs, coms* (The oblique plural *-es,* found in both the *nom parcial* and the *nom integral,* is evidently regarded as a variant of *-s.)* In this it is evidently representative of the spoken language, which eventually generalised forms from one part of other of the paradigm, so that the modern forms may derive historically from either nominative or oblique. The forms which appear in the text, whether descending from the nominative or oblique historically, are thus all separate nouns with forms for both morphological cases and both numbers. On occasion both descendants are cited, as when both forms from earlier *sénher/ senhór* are cited as independent nouns[16]. Molinier however sees most such words as belonging to a special class, that of the *mot indiferen*, where the choice between *-s* and *-Ø* does not depend on the standard inflectional pattern in the nominative singular. Rather, it may depend on phonological factors and a formal, rather than grammatical, agreement with adjectives and pronouns. The rules for *hom,* extended at least in part to certain other types (II, 162-64), prescribe *homs* before a vowel. Elsewhere, in direct combination with an adjective it has *-s* (as, of course, does the adjective, though this is not stated). Next to a pronoun without *-s* it too lacks *-s,* except where a vowel follows.[17]

---

[16]Since they are both *indifferen,* four nominative forms thus appear, *senher, senhers, senhor,* and *senhors* (*Leys* II, 166).

[17]A similar influence between the endings of adjective and substantive, independent of the features held to be of grammatical significance elsewhere, is claimed for a number of 'noms particulars. li qual lunh temps no volon. *s.* en lo nominatiu singular' (*Leys* II, 176) which can cause the deletion of *-s* on qualifying adjectives. This group includes *mar, sor, ser, or, cor, gra, gạ,* producing sentences like *freol cor es le mieus.* (Neither the complete lack of *-s* on these substantives, nor such influence on the

This rule, which applies to a large number of words where both endings are historically attested, provides an example of Molinier providing a rule which is not based directly on the practice of earlier writers, but which admits both competing forms in a number of positions, thus being somewhat more liberal than Raimon. The preference for *-s* before a vowel may be linked to Molinier's dislike of hiatus involving vowels and *-m* (*Leys* I, 22). It is clear, however, that this rule would not serve as a description of earlier standard usage.

Apart from the citation together of both *senhers* and *senhors,* which argues an awareness of some relationship, the sole grammatical interpretation of the existence of the doublets occurs in the discussion of the two classes in *-ayre* (*Leys* II, 168). Others had apparently regarded those nouns in *-ayre* 'dels quals hom pot formar autres noms en *ors'* (i.e the nouns in *-áyre/adór <-átor/ atórem)* as indifferent, but those with no such alternation (like *payre)* as showing only *-s*. Of the examples cited, *payres, compayres, mayres, comayres, layres, ayres, cayres,* all originally had the zero ending; they were evidently assimilated earlier by many speakers, since only *layre* originally showed stem-change, and it did not belong to the verbal nouns, which is the class presenting the least difficulty to the grammarians. The text rejects this distinction, allowing all as *indiferens.* This may reflect either usage, or an unwillingness to be too dogmatic in an area where the zero ending was attested in earlier writing.

The category of the *indiferens* is also used to handle other groups where alternation is attested in earlier texts, such as the nouns in *-atge* (*Leys* II, 168) the palatal stem *gaug* (164), and infinitives 'en loc de nominatiu'[18] (172). The old neuter *mar*

---

adjectives, are representative of earlier practice.) Optionally, 'daquesta natura podon estre li nom masculi termenat en. *a.'* as in *aquest es bo legista.*

Unlike the *indiferens,* here the substantive has fixed endings and the adjective conforms to it. However, both categories show a replacement of historic rules of agreement by ones based more narrowly on similarity of form between adjacent words.

[18] These show either ending when unqualified, follow the *indiferens* rule in combination with adjectives, but are uninflected when a syntagm like *pregar Dieu* forms the nominative.

(164) is cited in this category, only to appear later (176) among those 'li qual lunh temps no volon. *s.* en lo nominatiu singular.'

Another category of nouns *indiferens* in the nominative and vocative is constituted by the proper names (except for those in-*a,* whether feminine or masculine), thus *Guilhem* or *Guilhems* (188). This applies to first names only, as 'sobrenom el nom daventura' are completely invariant. The claim is also made that 'propri nom quaysh grec' are like the proper nouns in being *indiferens*. Oddly, however, the examples include grammatical terms such as *synodoche(s), paragoge(s)* and *cacosintheton(s).* Even given the mediæval tendency to allegory and personification, a tendency to which the *Leys* are not immune, this analysis is hard to explain. The link of this group to the proper names evidently reflects a desire to find a plausible reason why these nouns should in general be *indiferens.* (They belong to classes which should, under the usual rules in this text, take an *-s* if there is no indication to the contrary[19]. A reluctance to use the vernacular ending is plausible among Latinists, especially as these words do not even accommodate their nominatives to the Latin flexional system.)

5. 2. 6. Molinier's rejection of declension.

As shown above, the grammarians agree in distinguishing some inflection-classes in the noun, however they choose to do so. The inflection classes of the verb are treated at length only by Faidit, but some of the rules given in the *Leys* at least imply that verbs can be divided on individual issues into a number of classes. The Latin terms of *declinatio* and *coniugatio,* whether in the meaning of 'inflection' or as the inflection-classs themselves, are only applied in the *Donatz* and the *Leys* , and display a fundamentally different understanding of what features are vital to the two concepts, and therefore to the potential for extending them to the vernacular.

---

[19]The ending *-e* is of course frequently though by no means universally associated with this flexion, but Molinier never makes this explicit.

Molinier uses the section on the noun to demolish the two allied concepts of inflection: *declinatios*, for parts of speech with case, and *conjugatios*, for verbs. (*Leys* II, 110).

He rejects *declinatios* by equivocating to some extent between the two possible understandings of the term, 'nominal inflection' and 'inflection class', producing an apparently conservative theoretical position. He starts with an argument based narrowly on form: 'declinar es lo comensamen tener. e la fi variar. e quar tug li cas no varian la fi. ni teno lo comensamen. ans lo varian tug que mays. per so no havem declinatio'. The concept of *declinatios* as affecting the end of the word is obviously derived from Latin practice. The denial that Occitan shows variation at the end, at least by comparison with Latin, is uncomplicated; the reference to the 'beginning', by contrast, shows that Molinier is comparing the declined forms of the nouns with the Occitan noun and its *habitutz*, since it is only by virtue of such forms that it varies. However, neither of these formal claims satisfy him completely. He goes on to argue that the lack of variation at the end is not invalidated by nominatives and vocatives that vary such as *le reys. li rey.* [20] This is because this happens only in some nominatives and vocatives, not in all. In some nouns — *dona* and *lutz* are cited — 'no y trobaras differensa. si no. en labitut'. (II, 110-2) Even in *reys,* etc, the majority of cases (genitive, dative, accusative and ablative) show no variation. One might ask, however, why this fact abolishes *declinatios;* he in fact cites in this short section *reys, dona* and

[20]This would imply, interestingly enough, that he is thinking of the oblique forms as basic at this point. This would be a very reasonable position, since they are those forms most amenable to general rules, but there seems to be no other evidence for this point of view in the work. The passage is also anomalous in taking the forms with distinct nominatives and vocatives as the divergence from the norm, and as a feature only shown by some (*alcus)* words. Contrast the discussion of the cases, in which the basic system is that of the typical masculines (*-s, -, -, -s),* from which all else is treated as a divergence. Evidently, neither solution is without support in the language; but the argument chosen here is no doubt intended to weaken further the concept of declension by treating as basic the examples most hostile to that concept.

lutz, all of which are revealed later as having different patterns of endings. *Reys* follows the basic pattern: *dona* is a 'feminine in -a', while *lutz* is one of the monoptote *noms integrals.* If one were to regard *declinatios* merely as variation of the end, the concept would seem established rather than demolished.

The key to Molinier's analysis is the observation that comes next. 'La diversitatz de las declinatios es conoguda segon lati en la final termenatio dels genitius e dels datius singulars.' Occitan words fail this test as they show no 'diversitat ni variamen' in the genitive and dative. How they fail the test remains ambiguous; but the next observation provides a clue. Throwing aside his previous objection to 'varying the beginning', Molinier points out that some might say that, at least, all the cases are varied by *habitutz,* and 'majormen aquest duy cas le genitius el datius. per losquals son conogudas las declinatios en lati'. And Molinier concedes at least the first assumption of this statement; that the variation of these two cases (which here can only mean variation between two cases of the same paradigm) would constitute one declension: 'tug li cas que mays per habitutz se varian en Romans. sos assaber la us de lautre per una maniera. o quays per una maniera. segon laqual. poyria assignar una declinatio'. The only reason why this is not acceptable is that as all nouns have the same variation by *habitutz,* this *declinatio* could not be called first, as there is no second. Marshall (1962, 398) comments on Molinier's whole treatment that 'it is not so much declension as declensions whose existence is denied'. This is an apt summary of Molinier's position on the possibility of using the *habitutz* to define *declinatios,* though it will not prove appropriate to the treatment of the endings of the noun.

The issue which the section on *habitutz* illuminates is how the variation between the genitive and dative singular forms is understood. The original meaning in Molinier's sources is not complicated. Priscian in the *Institutio de nomine pronomine et verbo* (Priscian II, 443) follows tradition in identifying the five Latin declensions

by their genitive singulars.[21] This was a simple matter of convenience; the nominative, regarded as more basic in most aspects, was too ambiguous to be used, while the genitive, the second case in the standard order, identified the declensions adequately. The mention of the dative is likely to derive from a major source of Molinier's, the *Catholicon.* (Balbus 1971, 65) 'Cognoscitur autem declinatio maxime per genitivum et eciam dativum. Prima declinatio est cuius genitivus singularis desinit in ae dyptongon. et dativus in ae.' Here the system is like Priscian's. The same case is compared across declensions to identify the different classes; but the author has added the dative, the third case, as an equally good diagnostic of the declensions.

What Balbus definitely cannot mean is that the declension is established by the variation *between the genitive and dative of the same paradigm.* The fact that the genitive and dative singular are identical to one another in the first and fifth declensions (while remaining distinct from the same cases of other paradigms) proves this clearly. But the assumption that the variation between the *habitutz* of these two cases would establish a valid declension seems to indicate that Molinier did take this view. In this case, the mention of the endings of the genitive and dative of the noun would have to be interpreted as follows: since there is no distinction in ending of any sort between the genitive and dative of the same Occitan noun, the noun fails the test of having declension, even the one type of declension allowed to the *habitutz.* Since it is itself not declined, there can be no distinction between its forms and those of another noun which merits the name of declension. To adapt Marshall's analysis above: the existence of *declension* itself is here denied, and the denial of *declensions* flows from it.

The rejection of *declinatios*, like the later one of *conjugatios*, is based on a very selective reading of its theoretical basis, incorporating what appears, if the *Catholicon* is the immediate source for declension, to be a genuine misunderstanding.

---

[21] 'Omnia nomina, quibus Latina utitur eloquentia, quinque declinationibus flectuntur, quae ordinem acceperunt ab ordine vocalium formantium genetivos, prima igitur declinatio est, cuius genetivus in ae diphthongon desinit [...].'

Nor is the text entirely consistent for the nouns, as it does recognise groups which are declensions in all but name. However, Molinier's scruples about using Latin names for features of Romance are not necessarily problems for his analysis; in fact they are probably one of its strengths. Since declension, by rights a general concept, meant in practice 'the declensional system of Latin', a consistent rejection of it would allow the groups usually naturally present in the language to emerge without the constraining structure of an analysis imposed from outside. It is part of the general pattern by which Molinier concedes the major principle that structures like the Latin ones are grammatically definitive, but then manages to claim that a particular notion like declension or the notion of 'grammatical correctness' in general is simply not relevant to what is good Occitan.

5. 2. 7. Uc on declension.

Uc's attitude is spelt out in less detail, especially for the *declinaços*. The definitions of the *declinaços* are heterogeneous and bear no clear resemblance to the standard Latin ones, but this attracts no grammatical comment in itself. The only mention of a theoretical difficulty in applying the Latin system is that relating to the number of *declinaços*: 'En vulgar non trop mas d'aquestas tres maineras [de] declinazos qu'eu ai dit dessus' (*Donatz* 98). The 'nom que no se declinon' are regarded as outside this system.

The first *declinaços* (96) is described as having *-a* in the singular and *-s* in the plural in all *cas.*, and is exemplified by adjectives in *-a* like *bona, bela, cointa, gaia,* and by substantives like *savieza, cortesia, dreitura, mesura.* All members of this *declinaços* are stated to be feminine except *propheta, gaita, esquiragaita, papa; propheta* and *papa* have no *-s* in the nominative plural. It is the sole *declinaços* for which all the case-endings are given in the way normal in Latin, and is clearly based on the final *-a* which is present in both languages. Unlike Molinier, Uc does not see the differences in inflection in the two languages as invalidating the identity of the category.

Greater complications arise with the remaining two *declinaços*.

The second (100) is defined as including *deus, segner, maestre,* and 'tut li nombreumen que no volun *-s* el nominatiu plural et en totz los autres cas lo volun'. This would therefore be a group identical to the masculines as defined earlier, as far as the plural goes; the singular is not specified. In practice it consists of the words with this inflectional pattern which do not end in *-a.* Since the first *declinaços*, which includes such nouns, has just been defined, this is evidently regarded as too obvious to need to be spelt out explicitly. Faidit makes no reference to any link of this category to gender.

The third *declinaços* consists of 'all the participles which end in *-ans* and-*ens,* and all the nouns whose nominative singulars and nominative plurals end in *-atz* and are feminine, like *bontatz, beutatz, amistatz'.* It also includes 'mout autre'; whether this refers to additional examples of the last category in *-atz,* or to other formally identifiable types, is not clear. Unless the second is true, there is no place in this system for the majority of the consonantal feminines.

In these classes the link between Latin declensions and Occitan inflection-types is extremely tenuous. The second *declinaços* as defined has the appearance of a reasonably logical group in Occitan, though one which does not need further definition in this grammar, since the plural endings *Ø -s* by which it is defined are also those of all masculine nouns. However some words satisfying this rule are known to be excluded, such as the masculines in *-a* (ascribed to the first *declinaços)* and the masculine participles in *-ans* and *-ens,* treated under the third. It is by no means certain that the category is extended even to one of the more obvious groups to satisfy it, the majority of consonantal masculines from the third declension, such as *reis.* Alongside the examples *deus* and *maestre,* which translate and continue the second declension *deus* and *magister,* the example *segner* appears. This is of course historically derived from third-declension *senior,* but it probably owes its place at least in part to the semantic equivalence with second-declension *dominus.* There is thus no example here that unequivocally points to any group except nouns equivalent to Latin second declension masculines.

Similarly the forms cited as constituting the third *declinaços*, the participles in *-ans* and *-ens,* and the nouns in *-atz,* are the translations and descendants of the Latin participles in *-ans* and *-ens,* and the nouns in *-as, -atis*.

Neither the second nor the third *declinaços* is declined throughout its paradigm, and no information at all is explicitly given for the endings of the third. This is evidently because, even among the limited types definitely associated with the *declinaços*, there are inflectional difficulties. In the second, the examples include nouns with nominative singular in *-s* and in *-Ø,* and one noun, *senher*, which is usually imparisyllabic. In the third, the presence of both masculine and feminine participles implies the gender-based distinction of ending in the nominative plural. These two *declinaços* are thus of limited paradigmatic value.

The basis of the distinction appears to be that groups of nouns are identified informally as equivalent to a particular Latin declension. The third *declinaços*, where two particularly obvious groups from the Latin third declension are cited, is a case in point. The rules for their recognition are however based on the resulting Romance forms, given the impossibility of using the Latin forms. This reading explains why some types of noun are treated together despite certain differences (such as in the second *declinaços)* and why others such as most consonantal feminines are apparently excluded entirely. The lack of a fourth or fifth *declinaços* is only a limited sign of autonomy; nouns whose Latin originals belonged to these declensions are relatively few in Occitan and had become members of classes dominated by the descendants of other declensions. Short of attributing to each noun its Latin declension, these could not be accomodated. Faidit's reading of the inflection-classes is thus only liberated from the Latin system to the extent that he is ready to concede that the definitions may vary between the languages. The declensions cannot handle truly independent classes, though other parts of the grammar can apparently accommodate such concepts.

5. 3. Verb inflection.

5. 3. 1. Linguistic background and practical issues.

Verb inflection receives markedly less attention than nominal, in comparison to its total systemic complexity, in all of the texts except the *Donatz*. This is no doubt due to a perception that there were few issues of particular difficulty involved. Western Romance languages at the time showed considerable similarity in the features relevant to the choice of form. The same persons and numbers existed, all but a few tenses were identical in meaning, and syntactic rules were usually similar. Few mistakes would therefore have been occasioned by foreign learners' application of the rules of usage obtaining in their own languages, once the forms of Occitan had been identified on a one-to-one basis with those of the language which was the learner's point of departure. The *Donatz* indeed instructs its readers specifically to refer to their own vernacular usage in the context of the verb.[22] Conjugations were also broadly similar. The forms of the endings were generally similar in Occitan and Catalan, though Italian showed a considerable divergence from the Western solutions, which is possibly a contributory factor in the decision to go into detail in the *Donatz*. [23] In general,

---

[22](*Donatz* 121). The note is made only in the Latin text, and is variously placed around the end of the conjunctive active paradigm and the beginning of the passive: 'Inspiciat lector in huius modi modis et temporibus et consideret qualia verba debet profere in vulgari suo et quod intellectum habent, quia in vulgare provincialis lingue eundem sensum habent ista verba quem sua in suo vulgari'. The basic issue is here clear, that one vernacular is the best guide to the other while Latin is less useful. The precise meaning is less clear. Marshall (1969, 270) claims that these lines contain 'a general comment on the passive mood (sic)', and considers that the issue is the formal discrepancy between e.g. *sui amatz* and *amatus sum.* However, the differences between the vernacular and Latin in the passive were purely formal issues of a type which usually were not a cause for concern to medieval grammarians. Uc's point seems rather more relevant to the mood distinctions, where, despite his Latinate analysis, the different categories in Latin and the vernacular are clearly seen. Here, the vernaculars were sufficiently similar that the usage of one could broadly be adopted for another.

[23]Contrast Occitan *yeu ami* and Italian *tu ami.*

however, the task of the foreign learner or the speaker of a late or non-standard form of Occitan was to attach the written forms of the standard language to the categories already familiar from one's own vernacular. In many cases this could certainly have been made easier by a well-organised grammatical analysis, but it posed fewer practical difficulties than understanding the nominal system. These practical considerations underlie the paucity of information in the Catalan texts and the only partial treatment of the *Leys*.

In a number of areas, a Latinate analysis would obscure features generally shared by the relevant Romance languages. All possessed a conditional, despite divergences in its formation; Latin had no obvious single equivalent form. The inflection classes had undergone extensive change, notably showing a new conjugational type with the infix *-isc-*. Some forms, such as the first person singular present indicative active ending, show a loss of distinctions directly resulting from Latin paradigms and the simultaneous development of fresh distinctions. It may therefore be questioned quite how useful such an analysis as that of the *Donatz,* ostensibly the most complete, actually would have been; the assumption of the *Leys* (admittedly writing for Occitans) that what was needed was information on highly specific issues, while the main system could be assumed to be known, may have been of more relevance to a contemporary Romance audience. In the Catalan grammarians, the lack of paradigms would not have been a great problem given the similarities of form between the two languages.

The main regular types of conjugation in Occitan include verbs in *-ar* and *-ir*; these groups roughly represent the Latin first and fourth conjugations, though a number of words have changed their allegiance with respect to Latin. The verbs in *-ir* however divide between those showing endings with and without the descendants of the infix *-isc-* in part of the paradigm. The descendants of the second and third conjugations show greater complications. They share a present indicative which is also that of the 'non-inchoative' *-ir* verbs, and show similar forms elsewhere. In the most regular outcome, verbs in *-ér* (all of which show irregular strong preterites) represent the

Latin second conjugation in *-ēre,* while the third conjugation *-ĕre* is represented by *-re, -́er.* However, certain verbs moved between between these two conjugations, such as *cazér< cádere,* and *moure* (besides *movér) < movére*. Others moved from the second and third to take an ending in *-ir: emplir, jauzir.*

5. 3. 2. Verb rules in the *Razos* and the *Regles.*

The *Razos de trobar* as the first text in the tradition starts a pattern found also in the *Leys;* to devote a considerable amount of attention to the restricted set of noun endings, while not attempting to give a full account of the verb forms. The rationale for the distinctions made is pragmatic (as was also that of the noun), but such distinctions are made for only a small part of the system. After citing the present indicative active of the verb to be, the author says 'ai parlat d'aqestas tres personas car mant trobador an messa l'una en luec de l'autra' (*Razos* 16). The selection is thus, as is that of the *Leys,* targeted towards potential errors. With little lack of self-confidence, Vidal then takes 'the majority of the troubadours' to task for confusing *trai* (present indicative third person singular) with *trac* (first person), *crei* (first person) with *cre* (third), and putting *traï/trasi*[24] (first person singular past perfect indicative) in place of *traïc/trasic.* Vidal may be right in identifying these as the major areas of error, but most of the paradigms and the differences between different 'conjugations' are ignored.

The *Regles de trobar* is not particularly interested in form. It does quote a considerable number of forms of the verb to be in order to identify it when discussing its syntax. However, the forms are not explained or related to a grammatical paradigm; indeed, the profusion of forms is probably found because Jofre assumes that his readers have so little grammatical knowledge that they cannot identify a lexeme from one citation-form.

The discussion of indicative tenses (*Regles* 83) does give the forms of the present tense, past (only the synthetic perfect form in *amey* etc. is cited), and future. Examples are however drawn only from one verb, *amar.* In addition, he discusses a few

---

[24] MS variation.

doubtful forms such as *cre/crey, ausi/ausic.* Otherwise evidence on verb conjugation is lacking.

5. 3. 3. The *conjugaços* of the *Donatz proensals.*

Faidit has no doubts about the applicability of the Latin conjugation system to his text. As with noun declensions, traditional principles for the recognition of the inflection classes have been adapted. Instead of using the usual second person singular present indicative active, which would have given results very different from Latin, he uses the infinitives, as in the Northern French texts cited below (see 5. 3. 5.). The formal distinction is however only partially in accord with Latin, since the distinction between infinitives in short and long *e* (*ĕre* and *ēre)* is impossible. He assigns the *-ar* infinitives to the first *conjugaço: amar, chantar, ensenar (= amare, cantare, docere).* (*Donatz* 108). These he seems to regard as like Latin; only of the other three *conjugaços* does he say that 'de las autras tres conjugaços sun tan confus l'infinitiu en vulgar que conven a laissar la gramatica e donar autra regla novella'. Marshall comments (1962, 266) that the conjugations may reflect the four of Priscian rather than the three of Donatus, but that here 'Faidit was already abandoning the pattern of Latin grammar.' In fact, while the two classical grammarians differ in the number of conjugations, Donatus subdivides his third conjugation into the two classes which are Priscian's third and fourth conjugations. There is thus no significant difference, and the numbering with four conjugations was normal (it is for instance that of the *Catholicon).* The degree to which Latin grammar is abandoned is also debatable. The text reads as though the existence of the conjugations were not in doubt; only the definition of them via the infinitive was problematic. Since Uc feels no need to 'laissar la gramatica' in the case of the first conjugation, it appears that the difference between endings in *-ar* and in *-are* was too slight to be an obstacle to complete identification. The other conjugations are problematic only in that their infinitives are *confus;* so the *regla novella* may mean no more than a different diagnostic feature is necessary to recognise them, with the integrity of the conjugations themselves being assumed. Of course the text shows the difficulties caused by working merely with four conjuga-

tions, and ascribes several verbs to different conjugations between the two languages. It is not however clear that Uc was aware of difficulties on this score, and his conjugations must be regarded as an attempt to remain within Latin grammar.

According to his rules, the second *conjugaços* ends in *-er: aver, tener, dever* (translated in the accompanying Latin gloss by their Latin originals *habēre, tenēre, debēre*[25]*).* The third ends in *-ire* and *-endre: dire, escrire, tendre, contendre, defendre (dicĕre, scribĕre, tendĕre, contendĕre, defendĕre).* The fourth ends in *-ir; sentir, dormir, auchir (sentire, dormire, audire.)* Later observations make clear that this excludes verbs where *-ir* is a permissible variant of *-ire* (*Donatz* 134).

Faidit's list of verbs by conjugation (152-179) conforms to this pattern in the first and fourth *conjugaços.* Some difficulty occurs in distinguishing the other two; a list (170-174) starting 'De la segonda declinaço' mixes both types and only retrospectively gives the rule (174) that 'Tut li verbe sobredit don l'i[n]finitius fenis in *-er* sum de la segonda conjugaco et tut li altre de la terça'. No distinction is admitted between stressed and unstressed *-er,* though they are cited in two different groups at different points in the list, and though those in the unstressed ending derive solely from the Latin third conjugation (e.g. *fenher<fingĕre).* The importance of the accent would however have been less obvious in that the group with accented *-er* includes descendants of both conjugations, such as *aver< habére, caber<cápere.* It would appear that Uc encountered some difficulty in making the distinction between these *conjugaços,* since neither Latin equivalents nor Occitan morphology were unambiguous. The infinitive offered the maximum possibility of distinction, but Uc unsurprisingly did not make use of distinctions of accent, which were unknown to Latin definitions of conjugations.

Further distinctions than those arising purely from the *conjugaços* are hinted at in the present indicative active of the second, third, and fourth *conjugaços,* which

---

[25] The glosses at this point (except for *doc ēre* rendering *ensenar*) quote the etymologically corresponding Latin verbs, all of which belong to the same conjugation as the Occitan equivalents. Some such comparison was evidently the basis of Uc's distinctions.

are taken more or less together. Examples of the second are omitted from the initial list but are listed immediately afterwards (*Donatz* 128-130). They are described as *mout divers,* and a number are cited in their singular persons, while the plural of all three is stated to be the same: *-em, -etz, -en/-on.* A number are cited with the two forms in the first person singular, something which is mentioned explicitly as relating to all verbs under the discussion of the first conjugation.The only fourth *conjugaços* verb actually cited is an *-isc-* type, although as the non-infixing inflection is shared by the third *conjugaços* (whose forms are cited in the same group without distinction) one might argue that the lack of a non-infixing *-ir* verb here is not important. The citation of the second conjugation is notable only in that the *-ér* verbs are represented, as was almost inevitable given the limited choice, by three different irregular verbs, of which *ai/as/a* is one.

The paradigms which follow do attempt to give the forms for all the conjugations in all persons in all recognised tenses, (as mentioned earlier, some of the Occitan tenses are entirely unrepresented). The first *conjugaços* is first conjugated in full, with mentions of the other conjugations if the paradigm can, at the point under discussion, be applied to them as well, as in the *futur [del indicatiu]* (110-2). The second, third and fourth are largely conjugated as one, dividing in those tenses in which their forms diverge. A distinction between the second and third conjugations is only made in the singular of the present indicative active; and the verbs given for the second are somewhat isolated types: *ai (habeo), tenh (teneo), sai (sapio!), fenh (fingo)* (130).

5. 3. 4. Verb inflection in the *Leys.*

Molinier's handling of verb inflection is similar in theory to his handling of nominal inflection, in that both conjugation and declension are rejected, leading to a concentration on the forms associated with the *accidens* such as tense, mood, person, number, and to the non-recognition of paradigms.

It is probable that a full analysis of the verbal system would become impractically complex without such a recognition of the Occitan inflection-classes, given that the verbal morphology is vastly more complex than the nominal. Molinier does not

however attempt to provide a complete description, but only a guide to certain issues where the *pronuntiatios* of a particular form may give rise to difficulties. He states that he intends to 'donar doctrina' because 'om se peca'; not, however, 'de totz los temps ni de totz los mozes ni de totas las personas daquels. mas solamen en los quals trobam qu·om se pecca soen e plustot' (Leys II, 352). Even the decision to start the section by discussing the first person singular present indicative, hardly a controversial idea in the European grammatical tradition, is justified in part because 'people make more mistakes [in it] than in any of the others.'

5. 3. 5. Molinier's rejection of *conjugatios.*

Molinier rejects *conjugatios* as a feature of Occitan, in the same way that he rejects *declinatios,* by basing his definition of the term on specific Latin forms (*Leys* II, 110): 'conjugatios es conoguda als infinitius loncz o breus. laqual cauza nos no podem trobar regularmen ni assignar. en romans.' The 'long or short infinitives' must refer to the infinitives in *-ēre* (second conjugation) and *-ĕre* (third conjugation). One might have thought that this did not invalidate the distinction between the other conjugations which in Latin have different vowels without length being distinctive: *-āre -īre.* In any case this is not the sole, or even the most common, method of distinguishing the conjugations. The usual definition, whether in Donatus (Holtz 1981, 591-92), Priscian (*Institutio de nomine pronomine et verbo,* Priscian II, 450) or the *Catholicon* (Balbus 1971, 80 ff.), cites the present indicative active, especially the first and second persons singular, with the second person defining the conjugation; *amas, doces, legĭs, audīs.* The distinction between the third and fourth conjugations, called in Donatus the two types of the third, is usually achieved by contrasting short and long *i.* Donatus mentions the difference between the short and long vowels, but also cites the passive endings (*-eris* versus *-iris),* and offers the following diagnostic: 'haec in imperativo et infinitivo statim discerni possunt, utrum i littera correpta sit an producta. nam correpta i littera in e convertitur; producta si fuerit, non mutatur' (Holtz 1981, 592). The same view as the *Leys* can however be seen in Städtler 1988, 93 (cf. 100):

Quantes conjugations de verbe sont? .iiij. Quelles? La premiere, la seconde, la tierche, la quarte. A quoi congnois tu la premiere? A ceu qu'elle ha *a* lonc devant *re* en present et preterit imparfet del infinitif muef, si come *amare.* La seconde ha *e* lonc devant *re,* si come *docere.* La tierche ha *e* brief devant *re,* si come *legere.* La quarte ha *i* lonc devant *re,* si come *audire.*

Molinier would therefore have been aware that the distinction was not always based on the infinitive. Nor would the Latin sources necessarily imply that only one method of recognition was correct, so long as the conjugations themselves were not threatened. None of the Latin definitions would have given useful results in Occitan without modification, and Molinier may have had good reason to abandon them; but the specific excuse is narrow and hardly defensible within his own framework.

5. 3. 6. Conjugational distinctions and the *Leys'* concept of *pronuntiatios.*

Of those issues covered in the section on *pronuntiatios*, very few have much relevance to conjugational distinctions. Where they do, the text either covers them by an adequate generalisation from one form to another or relies on previous knowledge. Even where a recognition of a conjugational pattern might allow some explanations to be more focussed, it is seldom the case that an adaptation of the Latin system would have been particularly useful, though a truly independent analysis might have been so.[26]

A number of sections predict one verb form on the basis of another. Thus Molinier gives a rule that past perfects in acute *-i* in the first person singular have the third person singular in *-ic,* as in *senti. sentic* (*Leys* II, 379). The group is distinguished explicitly from types where the first person singular ends in an *-i* which is not acute (*conogui.conoc.* etc), but also stands in implicit contrast to other perfects in different vowels and diphthongs (e.g. *amiey).* The ability to predict the first person form is assumed.

Another general rule (II, 396) explains whether a future optative/present conjunctive ends in *-a* (e.g. *cel diga)* or in *-e (cel cante).* This distinction goes back to the Latin distinction between the first conjugation *(-e-)* and the rest *(-a-).* In Occitan,

[26]See Marshall 1962, 517-545 for a fuller account of the forms and their general currency.

however, the distinction has been complicated in that a number of non-first conjugation verbs such as *facere (far)* had lost syllables and therefore assumed some first conjugation endings in *-a* in the present indicative, by placing the original *a* of the root next to the consonantal elements of the endings. Molinier starts from the third person plural present indicative, which exists in two forms, *-o* and *-an*. Those which can take either form are stated to have the future optative/present conjunctive singular in *-e* and plural in *-o;* those which can only end in one form, whether it be *-o* or *-an,* have conjunctive/ optatives in *-a* (plural in *-an).* This rule is like nothing in Latin and seems *a priori* somewhat arbitrary; but it gives exactly the right answer. *-o/-an* are possible variants for verbs deriving from the Latin first conjugation). *-o* is the sole regular endings for the verbs coming from the other conjugations. The ex- non first conjugation verbs with *-a-* in their radical syllables, such as *far <facere, estar<stare, haver <habere,* end always in *-an.* [27]

The verb *anar* is apparently cited as an exception, though its third person plural present indicative is not cited. The problem is evidently that the relevant form is *van,* with no alternative form in *-o.* Unlike the verbs of the *far* type, however, the optative/conjunctive is formed from the first conjugation, giving third singular in *-e*, and plural in *-o,* as in the example given: *yeu vuelh que sen ano*. The added issue of the suppletive elements of this verb are not addressed.

While the rule above assumes that the *-o/-an* distinction in the indicative is known and thus an adequate starting point, Molinier also legislates for the indicative distinction (II, 372). He recommends *-o* for most verbs, while distinguishing between those where an ending in *-an* is 'acostumat' while that in *-o* is preferred *(aman/o cri-*

[27]The examples are unproblematic except for the third group. This is represented correctly in the three-book version (Anglade 1919, III, 167) by *'cil fan: aquel fassa'*. The examples in the five-book version replace the indicatives in -an with the subjunctive/ optative plural in -an, making the point incomprehensible, thus: *cil fassan. aquel fassa.* Some of the verbs cited, such as *estar, far, haver* would be valid examples if the correct forms were cited; others, such as *ploure, mover* are wholly spurious, as Marshall points out (1962, 539).

dan/o cantan/o), and those where *-o* is the sole form *(crezo, bevo. podo,* etc). No criteria distinguish these except usage, though they could have been related to other endings of the present. Since the preferred form is in *-o,* however, the distinction is of less importance at this stage, becoming so only in its use to define the conjunctive/ optative. Verbs with *-an* only are cited as including those which some pronounce with ‹ou›: *hou, vou, estou, fou;* the fact that this *pronunciatios* is condemned does not apparently stop it being used to define the group.

These three groups cannot in fact be linked in any simplistic way to the vowel of the infinitive, the second person singular ending, the conjugation class of their Latin originals, or any other obvious basis for a conjugational distinction. The text's lack of any such class is therefore not altogether unreasonable given its avowedly limited scope. It is not surprising that Molinier concludes (372) 'delsquals [those in *-o* only] no pot hom saber nombre. ni dar certa regla. si no uzatge.'

In a number of other cases, generalisations on matters of form are made which apply either to all verbs sharing the same grammatical 'accidents', or to groups which are of relevance only to Romance. In these cases, it is clear that a conjugational analysis would be of limited use if it perpetuated the Latin categories.

The first person singular present indicative is a good example (II, 354–368). The various distinct endings of Latin have little direct impact on the Romance languages, though the second and fourth conjugation endings *-eo* and *-io* may give rise to a Romance yod affecting the development of a preceding consonant. In the language described by the *Leys* there were once more a variety of endings, but in ways that have little to do either with the Latin paradigms or with the paradigms that might be set up for the Occitan verb on its own terms. A zero ending, the regular descendant of the *-o,* alternated with a novel form in *-i* in most words, with *-i* being compulsory following certain consonant clusters. The consonantal endings had been preferred in earlier literature. Elsewhere, a series of consonantal differences had emerged in addition to the alternation between *-i* and zero.

In order to list these first person forms in some sort of order, the verbs are classified by the principle of counting the number of endings, and analysing the sorts of variation between the endings by using the figures of *apocopa* and *anthitesis* (sic). This represents a redeployment of classical resources to provide a novel analysis without inventing much in the way of new terminology, and is thus parallel to other aspects of the text.

The distinction between the endings *-i* and zero, as in *yeu vos remiri* and *yeu vos remir,* is handled by distinguishing the first as *propria* and the second as *non propria* (II, 354). The second 'se soste per esta figura apocopa'. As elsewhere, the apparently less grammatical alternative is equally acceptable, and Molinier invokes usage to support it: 'Laqual termenatio dicha non propria motas vetz reputam per aytambe dicha coma la propria. quar on plus breu son li mot plus bel es segon nostra art. mas que l·abreviamens es acostumatz.'[28]

---

[28]The *-i* is taken as the basic type no doubt because in some environments it was the only ending found. Molinier mentions (II, 358) that some had rejected a number of other forms without *-i* as being ambiguous, since there were identical forms with different meanings, such as *men,* 'I lie'/ '(s)he lies', *engan* , 'I deceive'/ 'deceit'. They recognised that the verb system did possess numerous ambiguities (thus *manjo,* third person present indicative, future optative, and present conjunctive) but argued that the distinctions should be made where possible, and that these abbreviated forms should therefore not be used. Molinier is prepared to agree that maintaining the distinction is 'bela cauza e bona', but argues against it on two grounds, one practical, that it would be 'greus cauza gardar tantas subtilitatz', and one on the basis of literary tradition: 'li excellen e aproat Trobador quen son passat han pauzat aytal abreviamen ses far la dicha differensa. e que man dictat poyrian esser destruch e repres si hom gardava la dicha differensa.' His own recommendations go in two directions; the abbreviated forms 'motas vetz... han plus bela cazensa' but the forms must be current in several provinces to be acceptable, except in the most obvious cases. Despite the attempt to avoid condemning the troubadours, literary usage is not mentioned as a guide on this point. Marshall suggests (1962, 517) that the fact the issue is raised suggests that it was relevant to the spoken language. Since he also considers that the spoken language generally used *-i*, which would avoid most of these confusions, it is perhaps more

Apocopa becomes the technical name for this variation, as is clear from Molinier's handling of the alternation *veni/ venc* (*Leys* II, 362). Here, the *-i* is removed by *apocopa,* while the *c* is put in its place by *anthitesis* (sic). In terms of the *figuras,* this variation could have been treated more simply and correctly as *anthitesis* alone; however, Molinier's use of *apocopa* emphasises that the loss of *-i* in both types corresponds to the same grammatical issue.

Faidit also recogises this particular rule as general; after citing the variation for the first conjugation he observes (*Donatz* 110) that the first person 'dobla se en totz verbes el tems presens del indicatiu'. This note does not fit easily into the analysis by conjugations, and no attempt is made to give detailed rules for the alternations.

One issue which seems to have preoccupied a number of grammarians is the confusion of forms like *cre* and *crey* between the first and third person singular present indicative. As we have seen, some verbs did not distinguish these forms; it is therefore a question of whether particular verbs fell into a category possessing such distinctions or not which is at issue, not the categories themselves; and this seems to have been an area in which there was variation. For Molinier, *crey (I believe)* is the first person and *cre* the third (*Leys* II, 370). This causes problems in analysing past writers, in his case Nath de Mons, who used *cre* as a first person (*'Et en ayssim cove/ Qu·ieu non enten ni cre').* Molinier is prepared to excuse this 'segon los anticz dictatz', but still needs to explain it in terms which will fit into his analysis. He therefore treats it as apocopated from *crezi.* the contemporary 'regular' form, while *crey,* a correct form in his own day is syncopated from *crezi.* This analysis is synchronic; *crezi* is the form evidently most regular for Molinier, but is a historically younger form. However he is also aware of the distinction between the various historical stages of the language; *cre* may be held to be acceptable as an apocope of *crezi* 'to excuse the ancient poems' but 'nowadays we would not consider it correct.'

---

likely that the issue had been raised by contemporaries with reference to literary usage. Those whose spoken language included only the longer forms might have attempted to follow earlier usage by using the shorter verb forms in general but have been unwilling to do so when this gave rise to ambiguity.

The lack of a concept of different paradigms is exposed by the section on the infinitive (*Leys* II, 402-06). Infinitives in *-ar, -er, -ir, -e* (effectively *-re),* and *ire* are recognised, but no attempt is made to relate these to any other features of the form of the verbs in question. Rather the questions are involved with the variations between *-ire* and *-ir* for particular verbs, and the existence of less systematic variants such as *fayre* for *far.* Again, the issue is practical; the possibility of variation between *dire* and *dir, rire* and *rir* was a potential problem, the relationship *amar: ami, amas* etc. being a far more abstract issue and not one which was felt directly to give rise to problems.

A major use of the *pronunciatios* section is to refer to variation of stem within one part of the paradigm. Thus in the present conjunctive/ future optative (II, 398) there is variation between *traya/traga, duelha/dolga, estrenha/ estrenga, conosca/ conoga.* Each of these is associated by juxtaposition with similar examples, but no structure is suggested by the text beyond the obvious one that such verbs have two *manieras* of the ending.

6.

The analysis of nominal gender in the Occitan grammarians.

6. 1. The linguistic and theoretical background.

A modern analysis of Latin and Occitan would reveal three genders in each, masculine, feminine and neuter. The major difference is that Occitan possesses no neuter substantives. The neuter gender and inflection are confined to substantivised adjectives and pronouns, which do not refer to any substantive, as in *bell m'es*, 'it is pleasant to me'.

Priscian and Donatus analysed Latin in somewhat different terms, partly inspired by the fact that they wished to assign *genera* to adjectival forms without reference to accompanying or implied substantives. As well as masculine, feminine and neuter, they recognise the *genus commune* and *genus omne*. The *commune* consists of those words which can be used both as masculines and feminines, like *sacerdos.* The *omne,*[1] not admitted to the primary list of *genera* by Donatus, covers words which can refer to all three genders, such as *felix, sapiens*.[2] Marginal *genera* include the epicene, which is based on the contrast between grammatical gender and sex (also *genus).* This covers those creatures who are referred to by a word of only one grammatical gender, such as *aquila.* There are also *dubia,* words where 'nulla ratione cogente' authorities had differed on the correct gender.

Since the Latin grammarians do not attach the same status to all these classes, the precise number of Latin *genera* is not a totally obvious issue. Donatus admittedly gives an unambiguous answer in the *Ars Minor:* 'Genera nominum quot sunt? Quattuor' (Holtz 1981, 586), including masculine (*hic magister)* feminine (*haec musa)* neuter (*hoc scamnum)* and common (*hic/haec sacerdos).* This excludes both the *omne*

---

[1] This term is usual in the later medieval period (cf. Donatus below). Priscian calls it the *commune trium generum.*

[2] Examples of the *omne,* as of other genders, are generally given in the nominative singular. No declinable Latin *nomen* used the same form for all three genders in all its cases.

and the epicene, which he goes on to list separately: 'est praeterea trium generum, quod omne dicitur, ut hic et haec et hoc felix; est epicoenon, id est promiscuum, ut passer aquila'.

Priscian at no point gives gives a total number of *genera*, commenting only that there are two *genera principalia,* masculine and feminine. Including the epicene and *dubia,* he mentions seven all told; only five of them however appear when he lists the *genera* associated with nominal endings. These are the masculine, feminine, neuter, common and *commune trium generum,* the only ones which are relevant to the grammatical gender as such.

A number of medieval accounts take up these five genders, rather than Donatus' four, as the basic list (e. g. Städtler 1988 DonatB, DonatG, DonatM^1, DonatM^2 (86, 92, 98, 110); Martinus de Dacia 1961, 36).

It is consequently unsurprising that the Occitan texts under discussion regard the normal analysis of Latin as involving five *genera.*

The adaptation of this system to Occitan required at least some amendment. The lack of neuter substantives was of secondary importance, since the gender was still in common use with adjectives. The *omne* gender was however threatened, not by the gender system of Occitan, but by its morphology. Descendants of the third declension adjectives of Latin were identical in the masculine and feminine in the nominative singular and throughout the oblique (though not in the nominative plural), and seem to have made acceptable examples of the *genus commune.* There was no such obvious example for the *omne,* however, since in the nominative singular the masculine *-s* contrasts with neuter zero in all adjectives, unless the *-s* is part of the stem. (All three genders may converge in the oblique, but this was evidently not sufficient.) The number of real *omne* endings was thus vanishingly small, and no Occitan grammarian quotes an acceptable form.

6. 2. Gender in the Occitan grammarians.

The *Leys'* list of Latin principal *gendre* is of five, including masculine, feminine, neuter, common and *omne*, a list reduced by one in Romance 'quar omne non

havem', while the distinction between masculine and neuter is confined to the case of the 'neutri sustantivat' as in *aysso es fayt* or *greu mes.* In addition the epicene *gendres* makes an appearance (*Leys* II, 72) outside the main list.

Molinier derives *gendres* from '*genos.* que vol dire natura' or 'engendrar cant ad aquels que podon engendrar. cum son le masculis el feminis. liqual son dig veray gendre' (*Leys* II, 64). The first derivation is probably from the *Catholicon*, where it appears both in the *ethimologia* section (Balbus 1971, 49) and in the dictionary (under *genus)*, while the second is Priscianic.

Of the other Occitan grammatical writings, the *Razos* and the *Donatz* share the concept of five Latin *gendre/ genera*, though for Romance Raimon Vidal only recognises masculine, feminine and common, with the exception of 'petitas [...] qe pot hom abreuiar per rason del neutri' (*Razos* 8-10).

Uc keeps the five genders for both languages. His solution to the problem of the missing neuter substantives is to assert that the neuters exist, even though 'aici no sec lo vulgars la gramatica els neutris substantius, an se diçen aici cum se fossen masculi' (*Donatz* 90). The neuter substantives cited include *gauç* and *bes,* equivalent to *gaudium* and *bonum,* and he does not cite any substantivised adjectives in this discussion.[3] The neuter adjectives are included only in the later section on case, where one of the exceptions to the nominative singular *-s* is provided by 'totz los ajectius neutris quan sun pausat senes sustantiu' (96). He does not however explicitly note that his neuter substantives and neuter adjectives have different endings. Since he regards masculine forms as being also neuter forms, it follows that any common adjective can be regarded as *omne;* in fact, it would be logical for all of them to be *omne,* subject only to semantic restriction. Uc provides examples of both *genera,* drawn from Latin third declension adjectives; *presans* and *avinens* for the *commune,* and *plasens* for the *omne.* The only difference is that the first two are cited qualifying masculine and feminine substantives *(aquest chavaliers es* [...] , *aquesta domna es* [...]), while the *omne* adds *aquest bes* to the list. (*Donatz* 88-91).

---

[3] *bes*, though translated as *bonum*, is a substantive rather than a substantivised adjective.

The *Regles* lacks any organised statement on the *gendre*, but refers to masculines and feminines and to the substantivised adjectives thus: 'lo nominatiu singular s'abreuia quant no es masculi ne femini'. The lack of the term 'neuter' may simply indicate a wish to avoid a technical term (*Regles* 68).

6. 3. The explanation of the basis of gender.

6. 3. 1. The theoretical background.

The task of giving some account of the basis of *gendres* is attempted only by Molinier (if one excludes references concerned primarily with nominal inflection). This issue was not one in which there was any evident difference between Occitan and Latin, except for the obvious fact that, with the demise of the neuter substantives and the change of some other *genera* (as well as the incorporation of new words) formally or semantically equivalent words in the two languages might belong to different categories.[4] However, the discussion is of interest in providing another example of the importance attributed by Molinier to the concept of the *votz* as the basis for important grammatical distinctions, a distinction which it is not unreasonable to link to the need to give an account of linguistic diversity with the fewest possible grammatical constraints.

Both Latin and Occitan had a gender system that had limited semantic basis. Humans, and the more familiar animals, usually have a gender corresponding to sex, but other words do not. Certain endings also tended to correspond to particular genders. For a very large number of nouns in both languages, however, there was no way of predicting or explaining the gender.

Attempts were made by some grammarians to explain these nouns by a number of criteria.

Priscian recognises *natura, qualitas, vox* and *significatio* as being relevant, in various degrees, to different *genera* and particular types of noun. In terms of the genders, he links masculine and feminine more to *natura*, common and neuter more to

---

[4] Molinier appears to regard at least some of these changes as strictly ungrammatical, though permissible by usage. See 2. 2. 7.

vox. The masculine and feminine are the 'genera [...] principalia [...] duo, quae sola novit ratio naturae', while 'commune et neutrum vocis magis qualitate quam natura dinoscuntur' (Priscian I, 141). For the epicene, the two possible genders according to *natura* are contrasted with the single one implied by the *vox* and the article: 'epicoena [...] vel masculina sunt vel feminina, quae una voce et uno articulo utriusque naturae animalia solent significare'.

The most explicit contrasts of the different bases of gender are made in the context of the *mobilia,* words showing masculine and feminine equivalents f various types (Priscian I, 141-2).

The categories used to describe the *mobilia* include the following;

Natura or **significatio** correlating with sex, possessed by animates like *filius/ filia, frater/ soror.* This distinction is limited to the masculine and feminine.

Vox, corresponding to a regular correspondence of endings with *genus*. Thus *natus/ nata* qualify, and *lucifer/lucifera,* despite the existence of nouns in *-a, -us, -er* with other *genera* than those seen here.

It is quite possible to possess one set of qualities without the other. *Pater/ mater* are distinguished only 'naturā et significatione'. This is no great problem since the semantic (sexual) basis of at least some gender-attributions is disputed by none. The reverse is provided by words which are *mobilis* 'voce, non etiam significatione' such as *lucifer -a, frugifer -a.* They are so described because 'sive enim de sole sive de luna sive de agro sive de terra loquar, nulla est discretio generis naturalis in rebus ipsis, sed in voce sola'. *Sol, luna, ager, terra* are thus regarded as having no genus by virtue of nature *(naturalis)* but only in the *vox.*

What remains unclear in Priscian is the basis of gender-attribution where neither category gives clear answers.

Many medieval texts, including those to which Molinier is close elsewhere, explained such nouns by expanding the semantic basis of *genus*, even to those nouns denoting entities without distinction of sex.

The *Catholicon,* one of Molinier's main sources, is typical in this respect (Balbus 1971, 49). In Balbus' view, *genera* are ascribed

ad ymitacionem sexus. ut hic ignis hic aer. hec aqua hec terra. Nam superiora elementa quasi mares et inferiora quasi femine. quoniam illa agunt in inferiora. et hec patiuntur ab illis.

He consequently attempts to establish natural reasons and justifications for all genders. The neuter *genus* of *animal*

dicitur non tantum de sexatis sed etiam de insexatis quare multe sunt species animalium que carent sexu. eo quod nascuntur de putrefaccione vel confricacione.

The converse situation is found in the explanation of the application of masculine and feminine *genera* to inanimates. A suitable example is provided by the synonyms for 'stone, rock', *lapis* (m), *petra* (f) and *saxum* (n), in which *lapis* is explained on the basis of the traditional etymology as *laedens pedem,* and therefore 'in hoc imitatur marem qui est fortior quam femina in laedendo'. *Petra* meanwhile 'quasi pedibus trita dicitur, et sic ostenditur pati, et ob hoc est feminini generis'. As for the neuter:

saxum dictum fuit a sauciendo id est firmando. quia propter magnitudinem suam est firmum ita quod non mouetur. et in hoc differt a masculino et feminino sexu. et sic est neutri generis proprie.

For Martinus de Dacia (1961, 35), such explanations are part of an elaborate structure in which the *potentia activa et passiva* is made the basic criterion for sex and therefore for *genus*, which is the 'discretio sexus vel similitudo cum dictionibus discernentibus sexum'. While Martinus recognises that there exist objects of no sex, their *genus,* when it is masculine or feminine, is attributed to their active or passive qualities, and is therefore made to conform to the same pattern. The application of this principle generally leads only to explanations after the fact based on etymology, as in the discussions of *lapis* and *petra,* similar to those above. Examples could be multiplied of contemporary views which accept the same basic principles.[5]

---

[5]This system may be influenced in part by the coincidence that *genus* is an accident of noun and verb. There is no evidence that this fact had any theoretical significance in the classical grammarians, but the medievals had raised the issue of whether the concepts were univocal. Boethius de Dacia (1969, 187) answers this question in the negative, but the fact that it is raised is significant. An equation of the two

6. 3. 2. The analysis of the *Leys.*

In the *Leys*, however, different solutions appear. A primary distinction is made between 'gendre *real* e *vocal'*.[6] The division is between nouns whose *gendres* is derived from the nature of the thing they represent and those where the thing does not include masculine or feminine nature.[7] The examples in *Leys* II, 68 employ the distinction in something like this sense. Proper names and names of species of animals are given as representing those known *a la cauza,* while inanimates and adjectives make up those known from the *votz.* A slight complication is caused in that the same terminology is employed to make a different distinction, that between sex and grammatical gender; for it is stated that the 'votz *homs'* is not of the 'masculi gendre real [...] mas solamen la cauza.' Here the point is that the *votz* of (all) nouns has a *gendres vocals* only, it being only the thing which has *gendres reals.* This thoroughgoing *cauza/ votz* distinction goes beyond Priscian and is reminiscent of Petrus Helias, who states that 'Genus ergo in gramatica duobus modis consideratur: secundum rem et secundum vocem.'[8] Ps-Kilwardby also carefully distinguishes the concepts of *res* and *vox* and therefore avoids having to justify the attribution of grammatical gender to inanimates by reference to reality:

---

concepts explains more readily why masculine and feminine should be associated with active and passive.

[6]Note the use of the same distinction in discussing number: 'Nombre pot hom cossirar realmen. o vocalmen' (*Leys* II, 80).

[7] *Leys* II, 64: '*Real.* so es *cauzal* de la cauza quom ve. quar a la cauza conoysh hom si es de masculi o de femini.' *Leys* II, 66: '*vocals.* de votz. quar en la cauza entenduda per la votz. no pot hom trobar natura de masculi ni de femini... perque ... on sen torna a la votz. ... si la votz es mays covenabla al masculi quez al femini'.

[8]Helias (1993, 323-4). In this text, *genus secundum rem* is 'sexus masculinus et femininus dictum a "generando" ' (324). *Genus secundum vocem* is recognised by articles (i.e *hic haec hoc),* 'diversas terminationes' (as in *albus ba bum)* or by 'alterius dictionis iungibilitas' (325).

dicendum genus in nomine dicitur duplex secundum rem et uocem [...] dicendum quod neutrum non est genus secundum rem et positionem sed solum secundum priuationem unde nomina quae significant res insexatas proprie sunt neutrius generis secundum rem licet secundum uocem sunt alii masculini et feminini generis (Ps- Kilwardby MS 50v).

Molinier cites adjectives as examples of *gendres vocals.* This is odd in that the *gendres* of adjectives could, in some of those cited (such as *bels/bela)* be derived from the *gendres reals* of substantives, making it *reals* although the adjective itself does not refer unequivocally to a thing of any *gendres.* The link of adjectives to the *vocals* category may derive from the Priscianic citation of adjectives like *lucifer -a, frugifer -a* as being *mobilia* 'voce, non etiam naturae significatione' (see above: Priscian I, 142). They are apparently cited in this category not because they are adjectives, but because they are tied by their meaning to being used of inanimates (such as *sol, luna, ager, terra* in his examples). Hence the distinction of *genus* cannot be linked to any sexual feature for these adjectives. The extension of this principle to other less restricted adjectives would not follow from this analysis, though it might do from some adaptation of it, particularly if grammatical agreement was not enough to link the *gendres reals* of a substantive to the accompanying adjective.

The twofold distinction of *gendres* by *cauza* and *votz* includes a recognition that *-a* endings are 'covenabla al femini' (*Leys* II, 66), though this and other cases of *gendre vocal* can be overruled by *gendres reals* as in *le propheta*, though 'leumen ditz hom *la garda* e *la gayta...* jaciaysso que sian noms d·ufficis li qual son mays atribuat et apropriat ad home quez a femna'. In the list of *gendre* following the claim that there is no 'gendres articulars' in Romance (*Leys* II, 68), proper names are recognised from 'la cauza' and inanimate appellatives 'a la votz'.[9]

6. 3. 3. The recognition of *gendres vocals* in the *Leys.*

Molinier implies that the *gendres vocals* can be recognised from the endings, though he does not give extensive rules on what these endings are: 'quals termenatios son mays aptes e covenablas al masculi quez al femini e pel contrari. Aysso pot hom

[9]Petrus Helias states that *albedo* shows 'genus secundum vocem' (1993, 325).

haver per uzatge bo de parlar' (*Leys* II, 66). In fact, while genders might be acquired by usage, only some endings are identified unambiguously with a particular gender.[10]

The only group explicitly identified as having a specific ending of the *votz* which was more applicable to one particular *gendres* than to the other is that consisting of the nouns in *-a.* Other nouns whose gender is recognised 'a la votz' are listed, but without any clear statement that the ending specifically indicates the gender concerned (*Leys* II, 68). Of the masculines, a number are adjectives corresponding to feminines in *-a;* this contrast of course means that they have an unambiguously masculine form in context. Of the rest, four are trees ending in *-iers,*[11] and thus represent a single minority formal and semantic type whose gender is predictable. They are joined in thematic continuity by *vergiers* 'garden', which shares the *-iers* ending, and by *ortz* and *boscz,* 'garden' and 'wood'. The *-iers* ending in Occitan derives in most instances from Latin *-arius* (m) or *-arium* (n), and most of the members are of masculine gender whether substantive or adjective, the feminine equivalent being *-(i)eira.* Its gender is thus given unambiguously by the *votz. Ọrtz* is a problem in that its rhyme-words are quite likely to be feminine substantives or common adjectives; e.g. *sọrtz, mọrtz; fọrtz.* An earlier list (*Leys* II, 66) includes *focz, libres, codis, fluvis* as masculines. Both the *-cz* and the *-i* ending would be typically masculine; *libres* is less obvious.

Of the feminines, the only two not ending in *-a* are *naus* and *claus.* Rhyme words to these include *paus* ('peacock') as well as a number of common adjectives (e.g. *suaus),* thus making the link of this ending to feminine *gendres* somewhat dubious.

Except for the *-iers* class therefore, it is not clear that the ending could reveal the Occitan *gendres* to anyone in doubt. *Gendres articulars* being banned and agreement ignored, the *gendres* cannot be derived from accompanying words. If one

---

[10]Other factors, such as grammatical agreement (not mentioned as relevant here) would be instrumental in learning the remainder.

[11]*perceguiers, amelliers, oliviers, milgraniers.*

wished to salvage the claim that *gendres* is based on *votz,* there would theoretically be one remaining way of doing it; namely, to base it on the *vocals* elements of the case endings, which taken over the whole paradigm do reveal gender (the nominative being the diagnostic case, except of course for the *noms integrals).* No mention of this is however made, and it is likely that Molinier did not have this in mind. It appears rather that Molinier's rejection of the tortuous attempts to attribute some variant of real gender to inanimates left only the form (*gendres vocals)* as a method of recognition. It thus became the default category even where neither *gendres reals* nor *gendres vocals* was really applicable.

Molinier claims (*Leys* II, 66) that most Latin neuters are *pronunciat* as masculines and quotes *cel, vergier, banc* to back this up. This claim is of course true for the majority. The only oddity is provided by one of the examples; while *cel* comes from *caelum* and *vergier* from *viridarium, banc* is of Germanic origin. While it exists as a borrowing into medieval Latin, it is then usually masculine or sometimes feminine in gender, rarely neuter.[12]

Genus/ gendres according to the *vox* is thus an ambiguous concept. In Priscian's usage it is most clearly correlated with morphological endings. It is possible for a noun not to possess it, though examples are only quoted (*pater mater* etc.) when there is another basis for the *genus.* In Molinier it becomes the term for all grammatical gender which is not simply linked to sex; as such it includes words whose endings regularly indicate their gender, but also words possessing no morphological clue. In a sense this is reasonable, in that *vocals* implies only that the *gendres* is associated with the word as opposed to its referent, not that the word's *gendres* is necessarily given by the form. (One might have preferred in this case a term referring to the *dictio* rather than the *vox,* but none was in use.) Of course, Molinier was writing for an audience for whom only a small proportion of genders caused any difficulties, and may have had a native speaker's difficulties in recognising whether grammatical gender

[12]Du Cange (1954, I, 543-6) cites forms such as *banc(h)us* and *banc(h)a* extensively, but *banchum* attracts only one citation: 'Ego sum Banchum rationis et veritatis ad ponendum animas in via honestatis'.

attribution was principally linked to form or some other issue. The distinction between gender and sex was in contrast clear.

7.

The word divisions of Occitan.

7. 1. 1. Words in Latin and Occitan: the linguistic and theoretical background.

One of the areas of difficulty in applying Latin grammatical models to Occitan was provided by the concept of the word (Latin *dictio).*

The classical Latin definitions of the *dictio* concentrate on its function as the smallest separately meaningful part of speech; according to Priscian, 'dictio est pars minima orationis constructae', and its *proprium* is 'per se [...] aliquid significare' (Priscian I, 53). The *dictio* is therefore largely equated with the individual *pars orationis.* The Latin grammarians do not provide explicit principles for the degree of autonomy that elements require to be recognised as *dictiones,* but their analysis of the parts of speech displays the results of their decisions in this area, and was available as a model to later grammarians.

The Latin grammarians however also use the concept of the *dictio* in a different context, that of accent. Donatus confines the accent (i.e. acute or circumflex) to one of the last three syllables in a word, and states that all words show one accent: 'in conpositis dictionis unus accentus est non minus quam in una parte orationis' (Holtz 1981, 609-10). Exceptions to this principle are provided by interjections and foreign words, whose accent is uncertain. In addition, prepositions placed before the noun change their final acute accent to a grave (in modern terms, losing their accent) (Holtz 1981, 651)[1]. Priscian refers also to circumstances when conjunctions 'gravantur omnibus syllabis' (Priscian II, 24).

---

[1]The class of *praepositiones,* as recognised by the classical grammarians, also included the inseparable *praepositiones* (prefixes in modern analysis); but this was challenged by medieval Modistae. Martinus de Dacia (1961, 81-83) states that they are not 'verae praepositiones' but merely 'sillabicae adiectiones', since 'omnis pars orationis est per se dictio'. Boethius de Dacia is less forthright but downgrades the status of the inseparable *praepositiones* in compounds, where they 'non serva[nt] construc-

There are thus two possible ways of distinguishing *dictiones* in the Latin grammatical tradition.

In a large number of examples, the obvious Occitan translation of a single Latin word would consist of a sequence of syllables which could not be divided into separately meaningful elements, and which included the same number of accented syllables (namely one or zero) as the Latin form. Instances also existed, however, where there were considerable divergences. Single Latin verb forms were frequently translated by sequences involving separable units, each of which bore an individual accent (auxiliary constructions in modern analysis). Thus *(yeu) hauray fayta* would correspond to Latin *fecero*[2]. Translations of nouns frequently began with elements which, though usually unaccented, were clearly separable (Molinier's *habitutz,* articles and prepositions in modern analysis). Occasions also existed when Occitan moved in the opposite direction: a large number of morphemes, many corresponding in meaning to separate Latin words, could be reduced in a suitable phonological context to single consonants. The single syllables of which these formed a part would thus correspond in meaning to two Latin *dictiones.* Thus the group *bet (be+te)* corresponds to two Latin *dictiones/ partes orationis,* the adverb *bene* and the pronoun *te.* While Latin verse might on occasion reduce two words to one syllable by synalepha, the complete suppression of a vowel was not a common feature of Latin spelling, so that grammatical analysis provided no model for such reductions in Occitan[3].

7. 1. 2. Word division in Jofre.

Most of the Occitan grammars have little explicit to say about word division, though their analyses occasionally have implications in this area. Jofre regularly uses

---

tiones ipsarum praepositionum'; for him 'tota dictio composita sit dictio una et habeat unum modum significandi'. (Boethius 1969, 253).

[2]The non-Latin gender agreement of *fayta,* with a feminine direct object, also represented an addition to the features of the theoretically genderless Latin verb.

[3] Other similarly reduced groups, such as *del (de+lo),* by contrast, did not translate separate elements in Latin and were less grammatically problematic.

motz to describe a single word, using *paraula* for a phrase or sentence (see *Regles* 70-1, where the group *tot be pert qui·s part de Deu* is regarded as a *paraula)*. No explicit attention is paid to word division. However it may be noted that, in keeping with his theoretical analysis, Jofre's views on the case-markers and articles cannot be reconciled with the Latin word-divisions. In saying 'en singular s'aiusta aquell *li* ab mot femeni allongatz, axi com *li ciutatz es bella'* (64) he gives the status of *motz* to the basic noun, and therefore excludes the *article* from being part of it; the *article* is thus presumably a separate word. The recognition of the case-markers as *preposicions* will also imply their separate identity as *motz*, as when Jofre's analysis of the *noms, article* and *preposicions* would make a complex such as *al rey* consist of three words probably representing different parts of speech (*preposicions, article*, and *noms)*, as against a Latin single genitive noun.

7. 2. The analysis of the *Leys.*

7. 2. 1. Terminology.

The *Leys* use freely a number of lexemes which can be translated roughly as 'word': *dictios, motz* and *paraula.* In most parts of the text, the terms are not held apart strictly, and one is used to explain another. Thus *Leys* (II, 180): 'aquesta dictios *mot* se pot penre [...] per *paraula'*[4]. Similarly (*Leys* I, 50): 'una dictios es us motz. don hom pren clar e cert significat dece quom ha pronunciat aytal mot o aytal dictio.'

Of the three, *motz* and *dictios* are significantly more frequent than *paraula.* Only *dictios* is formally defined and thus identified with its Latin near-homograph *dictio:*

> dictios es segon las artz.
>
> doratio la menors partz.
>
> significativa cum. *blanca.*
>
> *bels.* e *Johans. mayzos.* e *franca.* (*Leys* I, 50).

---

[4] The context is the distinction of *motz,* 'word', from *motz,* 'many, much'.

In addition, a *dictios* has but one principal accent: 'no deu haver una dictios. mas un accen principal' (I, 60). There is however no clear statement on whether a word can be envisaged without a principal accent.

In general Molinier tried to maintain conformity to the Latin analysis. He acknowledges the resulting syntactic and phonological difficulties by distinguishing, on occasion, several different types of 'word'. The terminology used is somewhat inconsistent, and the discussions usually arise from particular, problematic cases[5].

7. 2. 2. Word division in contractions and clitics.

The most explicit treatment of these issues is found in the three-book version of the work, where the discussion of various contractions leads on to the issue of whether various forms consist of two words *(mot)* or one (Anglade 1919, III, 75-76). This section is unusual in representing an occasion when the three-book version expands on grammatical information given in the earlier five-book version; elsewhere, grammatical sections are either left largely unchanged or drastically reduced. This suggests that some questions had been asked on precisely this difficult issue. However, much of the doctrine is implicit in the earlier text. Two classes are distinguished here. The first is when 'duy mot s'ajusto entre lor'; the second is whether the *habitutz* and its *cazuals* are two words or one.[6] In the first class, which Molinier does not analyse or

---

[5] There is no clear relationship between Molinier's theoretical views and the practice seen in contemporary Occitan, examples of which can be seen opposite *Leys* I, 2, where the opening page of the relevant manuscript (Académie des Jeux Floraux, no. 263) is cited, and in the manuscript of the *Chanson de la croisade Albigeoise,* copied around 1275 (see facsimile in Tudèle/ L'Anonyme 1984). These manuscripts generally separate independently accented forms. Unaccented elements are sometimes attached to adjacent accented words, but this is not universal. No element is written as a separate word if it does not constitute a syllable.

[6] For the details of the membership of the *habitutz* category, see the discussion in Chapter 3. The *cazuals* represents the Latin *casuale* covering all parts of speech distinguishing case, namely the noun, the participle and the pronoun. In this text it refers exclusively to the lexical element of the expression, that part which is not an *habitutz,* as *rey* in *al rey* . Strictly of course both the *habitutz* and the *cazuals*

sub-divide, some examples consist of forms combining two elements, both of which correspond to independent Latin words, as in *quem* and *bet* (*que'm* and *be't,* Latin *qui me, bene te).* Others consist of a preposition plus an *habitutz,* as in *pel, pels, sul, suls.* In this second type, the two elements still correspond to elements of separate Latin words, even though the *habitutz* is not autonomous in Latin.[7] Both types are analysed as being one *dictios,* governed by one accent, but consisting of two *motz,* and compared to a tree with many grafts but only one root.[8] Here the image seems to consider the different *motz* as being different grafts, and therefore in a state of equality with each other.

The discussion of the combination of the *habitutz* and its *cazuals* is somewhat different. The combination of the two is still described as one *dictios*, but no contrast with *motz* is made, evidently because there was no pressure from Latin grammar to give word status to the two elements. The imagery is different; instead of the tree image where the constituents are equal, the *habitutz* is described as being to the *cazuals* as the clothing to a man. Without the *habitutz,* when it is necessary (as a contemporary hand qualifies the statement) the *cazuals* is, like a man without clothes, 'nutz e

---

represent the Latin *casuale,* and indeed it is the *habitutz* which is, in this text, the principal marker of case.

[7]*pels* could of course be an ablative *habitutz,* but this is unlikely; even where Molinier recognises that an *habitutz* can be split into two elements, he regards it as a unity:

si donx hom no volia dire que aquesta habitutz *del* sia apocopada d'aquesta habitut [de lo], e *dels* d'esta habitut *delos.* Lasquals habitutz *de lo* ni *de los* no son en nostre uzatge de parlar, per que d'aquelas no uzam, sino amb entrepozitio, coma: *de tot lo be, de totz los bes.* (Anglade 1919, III, 66, Punctuation, italics and emendation mine.)

Here *de los,* even though it is only used with another element interposed, remains singular; 'esta habitut'.

[8]'Al primier dizem que *quem* et enayssi dels autres es una dictios enpentada (**margin:** enpeutada) de dos motz, regida e governada per .I. accen, coma l'aybres ques ha motz enpeutz e diverses, ques per so non es mas us aybres, governatz e sostengutz [...] per una razits o per .I. pe.'

despulhatz'.[9] The *cazuals* has the privileged status in this relationship; even though it is 'naked' without its *habitutz,* its fundamental identity is not challenged. When both elements are together, the clothing, or *habitutz,* is still secondary; as a clothed man with his clothing still represents no more than one man, the whole is still only one *dictios,* and the part played by the *habitutz* is thus by implication small. Molinier evidently considers that the *habitutz* cannot occur alone in regular use, and that their function is merely peripheral as markers of case. The *cazuals* is the basic element, and can of course occur without the *habitutz.*

The treatment of the *habitutz* and the *cazuals* as a different issue from the other types is wholly explicable by reference to Latin. Where Latin recognises two parts of speech, Molinier regards the forms in question as fundamentally separate units; this separate grammatical status, coded in the term *motz,* is not lost when they are combined, in a way that is here described in essentially prosodic terms; the single *dictios* is 'ruled and governed by one accent'. When the issue is that of the *habitutz* and the *cazuals,* there is no motivation to concede autonomous status to both elements, since both together correspond to single Latin nouns, and only the *cazuals* can regularly occur alone. The single *dictios* is thus again affirmed, but without any counterbalancing recognition of two *motz.* [10]

---

[9] 'Al segon dizem que la habitutz ses lo cazual es coma la vestimenta o l'abitz separatz de l'home, e·l cazuals ses l'abitut, *en cas que haia mestiers d'abitut* (**in margin**), es coma us homs nutz e despulhatz; et ayssi cum us homs vestitz el am sa vestidura tot essems representa ses plus .I. home, ayssi meteysh le cazuals am la sua habitut reprezenta solamen una dictio.'

[10] Terminologically, the distinction is more problematic. Elsewhere, as in the section on hiatus, the division between *habitutz* and *cazual s* has at least some of the features of a word division. The same is implied by *pel, sul,* where Moliner feels no need to cite the *cazuals* belonging to the *habitutz, ·l.* So while an analysis distinguishing two parts of speech is obviously excluded, some recognition that the link between the two elements is phonologically looser than those obtaining in the interior of a word might have been appropriate; the use of the same term, *dictio,* here implies that the constituents of *la dona* are as intimately linked as those of *be·m.* The use of the term *cazuals* also contrasts with the

The issue is also addressed by the discussion of the possible hiatus between the *habitutz* and its *cazuals* (*Leys* I, 28). Here the immediate context is that of a rule that one should not put one vowel before another at the boundary of 'diverses motz'; within one word, like *Johans, Cleofas,* such hiatus is not a vice. Following the discussion of these single words, Molinier states:

per aquela meteyssha maniera deu hom entendre. de labitut am son cazual en lo nominatiu plural. can la votz es del masculi gendre. si don per sinalimpha no eran agensat aytal mot.

Examples are *li honest, li huelh, lamic.* The implication is that the acceptability of these forms is explained by their status as something akin to single words, although the recognition of the division between *habitutz* and *cazuals* implies some separate status.

The discussion of the syllable (Leys I, 46) addresses a number of the same issues by citing *mot* of one or two syllables. The words of one syllable are: *'Dieus ve cels que be fan e mal/ E ses luy res no pot ni val'.* This testifies to the autonomy of the conjunctions and the preposition *ses,* despite their probable lack of accent. By contrast, the words of two syllables include two examples of an *habitutz* combined with a *cazuals: 'Verges humils dedins loscels/ Dona recep lostieus fizels'.* [11]

7. 2. 3. Word division in the verbal system.

For the verb, similar issues arise from the differences between Latin and Occitan. A minor issue is presented by the subject pronoun. Molinier frequently cites Occitan verbs with subject pronouns as corresponding to simple Latin verbs; thus *yeu ami* is the equivalent of *amo* (*Leys* II, 233; cf. the discussion of *yeu hay fayt* below). Elsewhere the pronouns are regarded as equivalent to the Latin ones, and hence do not raise any theoretical difficulties. The most explicit discussion of this issue leaves the exact theoretical equivalence unclear, but implies a greater use of subject pronouns in Occitan than in Latin. Molinier notes that in the first and second persons

---

claim in the discussion of case that it is the *habitutz* which preeminently distinguishes case in the noun. Logically therefore only the combination of the two should correspond to a Latin *casuale.*

[11] Despite the unequivocal analysis here, the edition writes *los*, *cels* and *tieus* as monosyllables.

'deu hom segon lati entendre' *yeu, tu, nos,* and *vos.* 'Enpero segon romans alcunas vetz es miels dig can li dig pronom son expressat en las dichas personas. Et aysso pot leumen conoyssher a la maniera de parlar acostumada' (*Leys* II, 376). In fact, of course, the pronouns were commonly used only for emphasis in both languages[12]: it is possible, however, that Molinier's use of subject pronouns in grammatical examples derives from a tradition of glossing Latin verbs in this manner (a practice which might be suggested or encouraged by the more frequently ambiguous morphology of Occitan).

More importantly, the existence of auxiliary forms in the equivalents of the passives, and of most of the perfect tenses, means that, for instance, the equivalent of *amavi* is *yeu hay amat.* The potential clash between the grammatical analysis of these vernacular forms and their Latin equivalents comes to the fore on a number of occasions.

In a major discussion, the question is raised whether *soy amatz* is one word or two, consisting in the latter case of verb and participle, and whether *havia estat amat* is one or three (*Leys* II, 350-52). Molinier argues in favour of the multiple-word analysis on two grounds, one syntactic and one phonological. Using the Latin forms to point an argument that works in both languages, he says that *habeo* requires an accusative to follow, while *sum* requires the same case before and after it. The words after *habeo* are 'pronunciat per maniera d·acuzatius singulars', as in *yeu havia amat, yeu havia estat amat.* Similarly, words after *sum* are 'pronunciat per maniera de nominatius singulars' when a nominative singular precedes, as in *yeu soy amatz.* The one exception he cites is the impersonal *lo es amat,* without *-s* as 'no ha nombre ni persona'.

The other argument is phonological. One word has one principal accent, so the forms must be separate words as they each have their accents. Molinier is however prepared to say that these words 'teno loc du mot'. By doing so he reaffirms the identity of Romance and Latin grammar in essentials. This recognition merely allows him

---

[12]See Jensen 1986, 86-87 and Ronjat 1930-41, III, 531-534.

to use the forms as parts of verb paradigms. It does not lead him to lose sight of the grammatical consequences of the multiple-word analysis, such as agreement.

Elsewhere the analysis of the number of words follows as a consequence of an issue of agreement which involves a decision about the syntax of the sentence and hence the status of its components. Examples are the issue as to whether one should say *yeu me soy ufert* or *uferts* (*Leys* II, 12) and whether *yeu hay fayt* or *fayta bon obra* is correct (*Leys* II, 382). In both cases, the issue is one of agreement, whether with the subject or the object. [13]

In both cases a view that the expression of the tense should be invariable is based on the comparison with the single word of Latin. This is less clear in the earlier passage, where it is simply stated that 'sembla quom deia dire.*ufert.* ses. *s*. e sia del preterit perfag. quar en lati hom diria. *ego me obtuli'*, thus comparing *(yeu me)soy ufert* and *(ego me) obtuli* without further comment. The latter section presents a view which pushes the equivalence further:

> *feci* es us motz de lati que vol dire en romans *yeu hay fayt*. et enayssi. *yeu hay fayt*. tot essems es verbs es us motz de la primiera persona singular del preterit perfag. et ha son cert significat loqual hom no deu mudar ni variar ni en adjectiu transportar.

This literal equivalence flows from the conception of the Latin-derived tenses as absolute units, whose form may differ from one language to another but whose basic analysis should not; since equivalent Latin verbs show no gender variation, to recognise such a variation would indeed mean making a verb into an adjective. Molinier does

---

[13] Marshall (1962, 548) sees this passage as evidence of fluctuation of form for the reflexive type, but quotes no other examples; Jensen's citations for accusative reflexives almost all show subject agreement, though the issue is not addressed apart from the rules on agreement with *estre* in general. As far as transitive perfect direct object agreement went, usage was genuinely fluid, going from complete agreement to complete non-agreement, but with agreement predominating in the literary language (Jensen 1986, 261). It would appear that one view recorded by Molinier, by which objects preceding the past participle caused agreement but ones following did not, might well have been true of some speakers.

not accept this view in either case. According to him, *soy* is present and not preterite, since the preterite would be *hay;* thus *obtuli* is represented in Occitan by *ufri* and *hay ufert,* but implicitly not by **soy ufert(s).* Once it is denied that the form is the equivalent of the Latin preterite perfect, the next phase of the argument is unproblematic; since *soy* requires the same case before and after it, and *yeu* is nominative, what is after the verb must be nominative. There remains a slight complication, since what is before the verb in fact consists of *yeu me.* At first sight, and on the basis of the Latin equivalent, one would regard these as the nominative and accusative cases of the first person singular pronoun. Having two different cases of the same word before the substantive verb is of course practically unknown in Latin[14] and makes the rule of having the same case before and after this verb somewhat useless; so Molinier reinterprets the two words as meaning *yeu meteys.* This is of course 'wrong' but has apparent plausibility in the first person singular. It is not clear whether Molinier would be prepared to claim, as logic would require, that all the other apparent object pronouns, such as *te, se, nos, vos,* similarly represent *meteys.*[15] The version on the reflexives therefore appears to deny that the Occitan verb reflects a Latin preterite, and that the object pronoun is a pronoun; presumably the result is some combination of *esser* with a participle used adjectivally. This is an acceptable grammatical construction in itself, but leaves unclear how it is to be related to the Latin semantic equivalent.

---

[14]It would of course be possible in reflexive use of a transitive deponent verb, but this plays no role in this argument.

[15] The section in the three-book revision (Anglade 1919, III, 12) states that *yeu me soy ufertz* is equivalent to *yeu meteysh soy ufert* which means *yeu hay ufert mi meteytsh.* Though this apparently involves two different constructions, the text merely comments that *soy* replaces *hay* and that 'en est cas mays s'atenda al vocable qu'om pronuncia, so es *soy,* ques ad aquel qu'es entendutz, so es *hay.*' No comment is made explicitly on the tenses involved; as in the section on object agreement below, this revision maintains the fundamental conclusions of the fuller work, but often suppresses the discussions that allow a better understanding of the justification of the theory.

In the section on the object agreement (II, 382), Molinier attempts to maintain the link between the vernacular and Latin. He disputes the argument that the perfect *yeu hay fayt* should be invariable because it corresponds to the invariable Latin *feci.* Departing from his practice in the discussion of reflexive subject agreement, he does not substitute an analysis which regards the two grammars as different.

One of the arguments which he rejects in this section does represent such a re-analysis. It is that while 'vertatz es qu·om se deu conformar am lo lati coma am lengatge plus veray e mays bel et apte que sia entre nos. et aquel segre aytan quan pot. Pero en tot cas no·l pot hom segre. ni en aquest del tot'. According to this analysis, *yeu hay fayt* is regarded as consisting of pronoun, verb and participle, and this is made clear by a back translation into Latin *'ego habeo factum/ factam'*. The agreement is then established by the normal rules of agreement, with *fayt* agreeing with *obra* in case, number and gender.

Another view cited is that the agreement only occurs when *obra* precedes the past participle *fayt.* No analogy based on Latin grammar is presented, no doubt because none could easily be formulated to be relevant. The sole reason for the existence of this view is therefore presumably the real usage of some speakers.

The analysis which Molinier regards as correct is an attempt to combine the phenomenon of agreement with the grammatical equivalence between Latin and the vernacular. Repeating the desirability of conforming to Latin, he quotes the Latin suppletion of two words for one as in *locutus fui.* As he points out, the fact that these two words represent one word, which is a verb of the first person singular preterite perfect indicative, does not prevent *locutus* from varying according to gender. Clearly, Molinier does not want to accept an analysis which breaks with Latin, but he cannot reject agreement; and the sole elegant way out is to prove that in Latin too, similar constructions exist. The deponent form cited here is of course a minority type in Latin active perfects, and it is not obvious that *yeu hay fayt*, unlike some other transitive verbs, could be translated by a deponent. But this does not invalidate the argument. Of course the fact that the Latin form shows subject agreement, and the Occitan

object agreement, depends on the issue which Molinier is attempting to avoid: the syntactic behaviour typical of *esse* and of *haver* as lexical verbs. To that extent the equivalence is not perfect.

As Molinier points out, 'cant acuzatius no se sec, no deu hom variar la locutio. o par le masculis o feminis' (384). The phrasing seems to imply that the ending involved, though formally identical with the masculine singular, is not to be construed as having gender, a reasonable view.

One may note that while the constructions of *hay* to form perfects is a feature of the vernacular only, the status of the Latin suppletive forms in *sum* had caused concern in contemporary Latin grammar. Thurot (1964, 338) quotes Gosvin de Marbais discussing whether a form like *amatus sum* (the masculine and the citation form) could be said by a woman, since 'declinatio est proprietas dictionis et non orationis, cum ergo hoc quod est *amatus sum* vel *fui,* ponatur in declinatione verbi, debet dictio et non oratio appellari.' As in the *Leys*, this argument is rejected, but it is evidently thought worth formulating.

The various discussions of the issue do not provide an entirely consistent account of the word-divisions of Occitan. The concept that words have separate accent allows Molinier to separate at least in part the different elements of auxiliary constructions, while conversely regarding contractions like *quem* as single words on one level at least. Other criteria, of meaning and syntax, are almost wholly suggested by the need to reduce to a minimum the distance between Romance and Latin, without sacrificing features of Occitan, like past participle agreement, which the most literal analyses would have declared ungrammatical. Even here, where the construction diverges theoretically from Latin it remains expressible in that language; no new part of speech or syntactic rule is postulated. For the proclitic *habitutz,* no accentual division can be recognised and the Latin analysis dominates totally, even to the extent as recognising as a unity a discontinuous series of forms cliticising to different words, such as *de* [...] *lo* in *de tot lo mon,* accented probably *de tót lo món*. The issue displays the complex consequences of maintaining a Latin-based analysis.

8.

Comparatives and superlatives.

8. 1. 1. Introduction.

Another area of interest in which there was a contrast between the forms of Latin and Occitan, and hence a potential problem of analysis, was provided by the comparatives and superlatives. These two concepts are discussed only in the *Leys,* where they occur as 'manieras dels noms appellatius derivatius' (*Leys* II, 54 cf. 36), consistently with Priscian's analysis (Priscian I, 60).

8. 1. 2. The Latin analysis.

The Latin grammarians' treatment of these two categories, if ultimately from the Greek example, corresponded closely with the formal patterns applicable to the regular Latin adjective. Thus for a positive *fortis, fortior* was recognised as the comparative and *fortissimus* as the superlative. This did not preclude the recognition of the same categories in adjectives which used periphrastic comparatives, such as *magis arduus.* Nor does it prevent the recognition of the fact that the superlative contained two sub-types, which one may label the relative and absolute superlatives. Priscian states (Keil II, 94):

Superlativum est, quod vel ad plures sui generis comparatum superponitur omnibus vel per se prolatum intellectum habet cum 'valde' adverbio positivi, ut 'fortissimus Graecorum Achilles' id est 'fortis super omnes Graecos'; sin autem dicam 'fortissimus Hercules fuit', non adiciens quorum, intellego 'valde fortis'.

8. 1. 3. The Occitan linguistic situation.

In Occitan the expressions of the relative comparative and superlative derive from the Latin comparative. The main change is that only a few synthetic forms remain, while the great majority of nouns uses analytic forms involving *mays* or *plus* and the positive. The differentiation between comparative and superlative uses of these forms is not obvious formally; in general, the superlative takes the definite article, but this is not always the case (Jensen 1986: 41) and this novel distinction would be unlikely to occur to a grammarian even if the grammatical terminology had permit-

ted it to be stated. (This would have been very difficult in Molinier's system, in which the article was only one of the members of a larger category, the *habitutz.*) The syntactic constructions associated with these forms are also ambiguous. While the superlative usually takes *de* (compare the Latin genitive), not all comparatives use *que* (compare Latin *quam).* Comparatives with *de* are seen in *'anc plus pros baros de lui no portet lansa'* (Jensen 1986, 37) and *'non hy ha plus apte de mi'* (*Leys* II, 56). Nor of course was the grammatical interpretation of the word *de* unambiguous. In the event it would be interpreted in accordance with an analysis adopted for other reasons.

The absolute superlative is expressed by a number of periphrases. The form *sobre,* used in the *Leys,* is a typical one of these but not the only possible choice.

8. 2. Molinier's analysis of comparatives and superlatives.

8. 2. 1. The comparative and the marker *mays / plus.*

Whether by accident or design, Molinier's analysis is adapted to conform more nearly with the forms of the language, though breaches of the Latin system are disguised. In the process of achieving this, the semantic definitions of the two categories are dropped.[1] The sole reference to the meaning of the forms is anodyne and ambiguous:

> le *superlatius* es le ters gra. e vol dir superlatius sobremontans. quar sobremonta per creysshemen o per mermamen lo positiu. el comparatiu. quar en ayssi quel comparatius sobremonta lo positius. le superlatiu sobremonta lo comparatiu. e per conseguen lo positiu' (*Leys* II, 58, sic).

The identification is therefore made by the adaptation of an expedient used by Priscian. For the comparative he says that 'comparativum est, quod cum positivi intellectu vel cum aliquo participe sensu positivi "magis" adverbium significat: ut fortior "magis fortis" ' (Priscian I, 82). This is therefore a semantic equivalence, valid for all

[1]The limitation of the category to the 'veray adjectiu que significo qualitat o quantitat' is maintained, and the substantive nouns excluded, as are the pronouns which signify 'mera e pura substantia laquals nos pot mermar creyssher ni remetre' (*Leys,* II, 54). Ths is traditional material, deriving ultimately from Priscian with some more modern vocabulary.

adjectives, but expressed using the construction found in that minority of adjectives whose form precludes a regular comparative ending.

In the *Leys* the definition reads: 'le comparatius es regularmens aquela meteyssa votz del positiu ab aquest adverbi *mays* o *plus.*'

In Occitan this becomes an identification which is purely formal, and a number of consequences follow.

a) The remaining synthetics are not covered by any definition. They are introduced by saying 'enpero autra maniera havem de comparatius en los quals no qual dire *mays* ni *plus'* (*Leys* II, 54-56). The implied equivalence to the construction with the adverb, along with the citation of several of these comparatives, does however mean that this lack of definition did not cause any practical difficulty.

b) The use of *mays* or *plus*, though regarded as happening *regularmens,* is itself regarded as improper (*Leys* II, 54), since expressions such as *mays blancz* have two words corresponding to one in Latin (*albior).*

c) All uses of *mays* and *plus* are regarded as comparative, even those whose literal Latin translations would be superlatives. The only subdivision recognised which has any relevance to this distinction is recast in terms appropriate to this new analysis while maintaining apparent similarity to Latin grammar. Thus one group of comparatives 's·aordeno leumen segon romans am nominatiu menjanssan aquest adverbi. que' (II, 56). This use of a 'comparative adverb' answers to Latin *quam,* and is in full semantic and syntactic accordance with Latin. A number of other constructions, not distinguished by the text in any way from the above group, are described as being ordered with the ablative 'am sen de *de'* (II, 56). Here the remaining Occitan construction is matched to the remaining Latin construction despite an only partial overlap of meaning. The Occitan uses are mostly relative superlatives, such as *yeu ami la plus bela de totas* and *de* would idiomatically translate (as often elsewhere) a Latin genitive plural. The Latin analysis to which this is assimilated is another true comparative construction involving a simple ablative of comparison. It is appropriate

to some of the examples cited, such as *non hy ha plus apte de mi,* but not to the majority.

The text is at a loss, unusually, for any real criteria to distinguish the constructions involving *de* from those involving *que*. After the constructions in *de* are cited, it says 'jaciaysso que en aquestz locz et en alqus autres car sia be quar es acostumat de dire per alqus. pero en totz no se sec. quar ges no seria bel dig,*yeu soy plus blanx de Bertran'* (56-58).

The analysis of *de* as an ablative is logical within the framework of the text, which regards the analysis of markers of the oblique cases as determined by their Latin equivalents. This particular use of *de* is not picked up in the discussion of the *habitutz* of case, though *de* is once cited as an ablative *habitutz* on other grounds.

8. 2. 2. <u>The treatment of the superlative.</u>

It is within the context of the augmented role of the comparative that the reduced role of the superlative should be seen. Here the only unambiguous description is again formal (*Leys* II, 58):'Aquest superlatius es pronunciatz ab aquesta dictio. *sobre*. coma *sobre bos. sobre bels. sobre savis* [...]'. Again it comes ultimately from the Priscianic use of a semantic marker, *valde*. But this *valde* is clearly used in the Latin text exclusively to indicate the absolute superlative. It is hard to believe that its generalisation, which leads to the absolute superlative being the sole superlative, could have been done in ignorance, so the resultant divergence from Latin must have been regarded as acceptable. Naturally this would come the more easily if the absolute superlative, understood on the basis of *valde* and its vernacular equivalents, was felt to be the basic component of the Latin category, so that it was the relative that was thought dispensable.

If, as probable elsewhere, the text is informed by a tradition of exposition of Latin grammar in Romance, such a preference would of course be explicable, since the absolute superlative was the only one possessing an unambiguous vernacular translation. Such a tradition may be indicated by the fourteenth- century French text in Städtler (1988, 109):

Quans degrez de comparaison sont? Trois. Quiex? le positif, le comparatif et le suppellatif: le positif, si comme *doctus,* 'sage'; le comparatif, si comme *doctior,* 'plus sage'; le suppellatif, si comme *doctissimus,* 'tres sage'. A quele case sert le positif? A tele case comme il li [eschiet]. Le comparatif? A ablatif plurier ou singulier sanz preposition. Le suppellatif a quele? A genitif plurier tant seulement, ou a genitif singulier, quant c'est non collectif.

Here the standard gloss of *doctissimus* is the absolute *très-sage.* The genitive constructions mentioned, by contrast, can apply only to the relative superlative. Such an illogical solution, giving the translation of one superlative and the syntax of another, might serve a basic grammar of Latin expressed in the vernacular; but it would have to be modified for Romance. Molinier evidently worked from the standard vernacular translation of the forms, and refrained from mentioning any (now impossible) genitive constructions of the superlative.

8. 2. 3. The contrast of form and meaning in comparatives and superlatives.

The mention of synthetic comparisons leads on to a claim that there are three types of comparison in Latin but only two in Romance (*Leys* II, 56). The two extant in Romance are those 'de*votz* e de significat' such as *bela/ belazors,* and of *significatz* alone like *bos/ milhors.* The third type, stated to apply to Latin alone, is not cited. Marshall (1962, 384-5) regards it as the Latin type involving *magis,* which would put into question why the Occitan periphrastic class, its close formal equivalent, is regarded as improper. This would indeed be problematic but is unlikely to be the correct analysis. The missing type must obviously show comparative *votz,* but not comparative meaning. The logic of the text would seem to demand that this *votz* refers to a Latin synthetic form. This is confirmed by the probable requirement that the comparative meaning be absent; this is plausible for some Latin comparatives and superlatives, where the meaning is not simply the relevant degree of the positive. By contrast, the Latin periphrastic forms like *magis arduus,* whatever view one may take of their form, have an unimpeachable comparative meaning. It seems likely therefore that the view of Latin here is equivalent to that in Städtler (1988, 109-110):

En quantes manieres est faite comparaison? En .iij. En queles? Par sens par soi, si comme *bonus, melior, optimus;* par vois par soi, si comme *novus, novior, novissimus;* par vois et par sens, si comme *dignus, dignior, dignissimus.*

The category of 'vois par soi' here refers to the fact that *novissimus* can mean 'last' as well as the expected superlative 'newest'. It is not altogether surprising if, among the limited category of synthetic comparatives in Occitan, Molinier failed to find one of regular form but irregular meaning, and therefore considered the category as relevant to Latin only. The category of periphrastic comparatives, present in both languages, is wholly irrelevant to this distinction.

The use of *no* in such sentences as *Peyres es plus savis que no es Guilhems* is recorded though it is 'mot contrari al lati', but banned altogether where 'Guilhems' is not associated with a verb. This calls for little comment except as yet another example of something contrary to Latin being accepted without difficulty.

9.

Conclusions.

The Occitan vernacular tradition is of great interest as an attempt to write the grammar of previously undescribed vernacular languages. While it is by no means the first such attempt in Europe, it operated in isolation from previous attempts, none of which had involved Romance languages. Similarly, although some thought had been given by Latin-medium grammarians to issues arising from the Romance vernaculars (notably over the article), none of the Latin writers had made more than a few superficial observations about such matters.

The theoretical interest of the grammars to the historian of linguistics lies particularly in their treatment of the issue of linguistic diversity. The Occitan writers had no access to any grammatical model other than that of Latin; this fact would in any case have limited their capacity to recognise the distinctive characteristics of the vernaculars. In addition, much contemporary linguistic theory, including that of the Modistae, insisted on the unity of all languages, making it impossible to recognise fundamental divisions between individual languages. The phonetic form or *vox* was excluded from the core grammar for which universality was claimed, but many aspects of the Latin grammatical system, such as the number of cases, were widely regarded as invariant. The status of other issues remained unclear, in part due to uncertainty about the part played by *vox* in their definition. In general, the Modistae attempted to reduce the importance of the *vox* in many areas where the classical writers had accepted it; this had the result of increasing the scope of the core grammar. Both the universality of grammar, and the precise analysis of traditional categories, had been issues of theory in speculative grammar; the Occitan grammatical writings put them to a practical test.

The motivations of the Occitan grammarians in each case included the practical goal of prescribing forms to less competent users of the language. Consequently, certain differences between Latin and vernacular practice had to be addressed explic-

itly. These were explained theoretically either by minimising the underlying differences between the languages, or by allowing the assumption of cross-linguistic unity of grammar to be wholly or partially abandoned. However, their theoretical opinions are rarely explicit, and are to be found largely in the details of their analyses of difficult issues.

In the adaptation of certain aspects of the Occitan tradition by Pedro de Alcalá in order to provide an account of Colloquial Arabic, the issues of linguistic diversity were broadly similar, though in some ways more acute. The theoretical complications were greater in that Pedro had access to two authoritative and mutually contradictory grammatical systems, that of Latin and that of Arabic. His solution was generally to impose the Latinate analysis in the core areas of the grammar, reserving the Arabic analysis to issues of form and as a source of technical terms redefined to conform to Latin usage, while affirming explicitly the grammatical unity of languages. His analysis does however accept some grammatical differences in practice, notably over the tenses of the verb.

Among the Occitan writers, Molinier accepts the main idea of the unity of grammar, though he occasionally avoids its consequences by subterfuges such as the recognition of certain constructions as acceptable by *uzatges* while being ungrammatical. He takes up fully the freedom offered by the fact that no unity is claimed on matters affecting the *vox,* and as a result analyses Latin concepts in terms of the *vox* whenever possible, since this offers a justification for linguistic diversity. Where no such possibility offers itself, however, he accepts the complications derived from the supposed universality of the Latin categories.

Jofre shows no sign of believing in the universality of one system of grammar; his understanding of some difficult issues is astute, but his system cannot be reconciled with that of Latin. The (no doubt deliberate) avoidance of much theory however makes it hard to analyse Jofre's thought with precision.

Raimon's work is not particularly sophisticated, and his divergence from expected analyses is more a matter of emphasis than of fundamental issues.

Uc Faidit's work is conservative without great theoretical awareness. The general attempt to maintain Latin categories does not have the same success as Molinier's, and some issues of importance go unexplained. The status of the *vox* is of limited value, since it is on issues such as inflection, where the link to the *vox* made it impossible to claim universality, that Faidit shows considerable conservatism (without producing particularly useful analyses in practical terms).

Examination of the main issues on which Latin and Occitan diverge in the core grammar illuminates the way in which these theoretical views influenced the description of the vernacular.

One of the main issues is that of case-marking. Here the six Latin cases were maintained by the Occitans (and by Alcalá), but the paucity of morphology forced the writers to attribute case-distinction in new or uncommon ways. Simultaneously, grammarians faced the logically separate issue of the existence of the definite article, unknown in Latin, and of greater prepositional usage than in the classical language. Among the more developed analyses, Jofre recognises both articles and prepositions in a strikingly original way, anticipating the modern analysis, and allows the latter to serve as case-markers. Molinier adapts the Modistic concept of the *habitudo casualis* of case — a relationship sometimes expressed formally, as in analysis of the Greek article — to describe articles and prepositions without recognising a new grammatical *accidens* or a new part of speech. Alcalá adapts Molinier's solution, with some blurring of the details which maintain conformity to Latin, to the analysis of Arabic.

The verbal system presents a number of difficulties. The lack of a synthetic passive in Romance causes it to be impossible to find the sorts of contrasts between form and meaning that are the basis of the Latin common and deponent voices (even in the Modistae, who usually rejected categories based on form). Molinier's analysis consequently rejects these while recognising the active, passive and *neutris.*

In the tense system, where Occitan possessed more forms than Latin (though the classical analysis had more tense/mood categories than forms), the grammarians disagree. Molinier displays a preparedness to quote more than one form per category;

he is only able to distinguish them by setting up vague sub-categories called *significatz* within the context of an innovative if clumsy set of syntactic combinations, while avoiding any analysis that would ascribe forms to a different category from the Latin translation. Uc distinguishes optative and conjunctive in an attempt to find a place for the Occitan conditional forms, in a way that, while novel, posed no challenge to tradition. He is however inconsistent and excludes several tenses entirely from his grammar. Jofre's partial observations may indicate a thoroughgoing reanalysis.

The treatment of inflection was affected by a distinction in the grammatical model between the features expressed by inflection and the inflections themselves. The former, however dependent on Latin they had been in origin, were now self-evidently universal classes; the latter were not regarded as important, since they were based on "accidental" issues of *vox.* While grammarians should logically have been free to dissociate the inflectional classes of the two languages entirely, as long as the features were preserved, they did not do so. Uc attempts to identify the classes of Latin and Romance on an informal basis, while varying the membership criteria. Molinier uses an almost perversely literal application of the Latin criteria to Romance to deny declension and conjugation altogether. This decision is potentially disastrous, but is salvaged as far as the noun is concerned by a feature-based analysis leavened with informal recognition of some paradigms. In the verb Molinier's analysis is only claimed to be partial; but its lack of conjugational paradigms would have made a full analysis impossible.

Nominal gender was affected by relatively few issues of conflict between the two languages, though some are caused by the lack of a neuter gender in substantives in Occitan, which meant that either the *omne* or conceivably the common gender was superfluous, though both are retained by Uc who also recognises neuter substantives (on the basis of words which had been neuter in Latin) while conceding their formal identity with masculines. Molinier accepts the loss of neuter substantives and the *omne,* and denies the existence in Occitan of the *gendres articulars* which he ascribes to Latin. In addressing grammatical gender, an issue similar in both languages,

Molinier shows the same attribution of important distinctions to form which flows elsewhere from his status as a grammarian of the vernacular.

The word divisions of Occitan become a grammatical issue for Molinier in that Occitan words did not correspond one-to-one with Latin ones and hence with the Latin part-of-speech analysis. Molinier adopts various, partly inconsistent, strategies to address this, including the recognition of a distinction between phonological and meaningful words, as well as partial recognition of different constructions in the two languages where such recognition became vital to explain accent and grammatical agreement.

The analysis of the comparatives and superlatives also shows the influence of distinct Occitan forms. Molinier recognises as superlative only the absolute superlative, the usual Romance translation of the Latin citation-form, and merges the relative superlative with the comparative on the basis of their shared form. In contrast, the discussion of the analytic and synthetic constructions is relevant to the issue of linguistic diversity only in the minor observation that Occitan has no comparison by *votz* alone, a category provided in Latin by synthetic forms with unsuspected meanings.

The Occitan tradition, and its derivatives, is thus seen to have a rich theoretical input, partially hidden by the manner of its exposition and its frequent concern with practical issues which were of less interest to the contemporary Latin theoretical tradition. It deserves greater recognition as an attempt to confront the problem of linguistic diversity within a constraining grammatical model, raising issues which have continued to be relevant to grammar-writing to the present day, and as a precursor to the numerous grammars of vernaculars in succeeding centuries.

Bibliography.

Admirantes, Orléans, Bibliothèque Municipale, Cod. 299, pp. 1-185.

Alibert, L., 1935. *Gramatica occitana segón los parlars lengadocians*, Toulouse: Societat d'Estudis Occitans.

Anglade, J., ed., 1919. *Las Leys d'amors,* 4 vols, Toulouse: E. Privat, Paris: A. Picard.

Anglade, J., 1921. *Grammaire de l'ancien provençal*, Paris: Klincksieck.

Anglade, J., 1926. *Las flors del gay saber,* Barcelona: Institut d'Estudis Catalans.

Alexander de Villa Dei, 1893. *Doctrinale*, ed. D. Reichling (*Monumenta Germaniae Pedagogicae,* 12), Berlin: Hofmann.

At de Mons, 1887 (N'Ath de Mons). *Die Werke des Trobadors N'At de Mons,* ed. W. Bernhard, Heilbronn: Gebr. Henninger.

Averçó, L., 1956. *Torcimany*, ed. J. M. Casas Homs, Barcelona: Consejo superior de investigaciones científicas.

Bacon, R., 1902. *The Greek Grammar of Roger Bacon and a fragment of his Hebrew grammar,* ed. E. Nolan, and S. A. Hirsch, Cambridge: CUP.

Balbus, J., 1971. *Catholicon*, Farnborough: Westmead (facsimile of Mainz 1460 edition).

Bec, P., 1970-7. *Manuel pratique de philologie romane* (*Connaissance des langues,* 5-6), Paris: A.& J.Picard.

Bergsträsser, G., 1983. *Guide to the Semitic languages,* trans. and notes P. T. Daniels, Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns.

Boethius de Dacia, 1969. *Modi significandi sive quaestiones super Priscianum maiorem,* ed. J. Pinborg and H. Roos (*Corpus Philosophorum Danicorum Medii Aevi,* IV, i-ii), Hauniae: F. Bagge/ G. E. C. Gad.

Corriente, F., 1977. *A Grammatical Sketch of the Spanish Arabic Dialect Bundle,* Madrid: Dirección general de relaciones culturales, Instituto hispano-árabe de cultura.

Cowan, W., 1983. 'Arabic grammatical terminology in Pedro de Alcalá', in *The History of Linguistics in the Near East,* ed. C. H. M. Versteegh, K. Koerner, H.-J. Niederehe (*Studies in the History of Linguistics,* 28), Amsterdam: Benjamins, 121-127.

Donatz see Marshall 1969.

Du Cange, F., 1954. *Glossarium mediae et infimae Latinitatis*, Graz: Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt (reproduction of edition of 1883-1887).

Eberhardus Bethunensis, 1887. *Graecismus,* ed. J. Wrobel (*Corpus grammaticorum medii aeui,* I), Breslau: Koebner.

Fredborg, K. M., 1980. 'Universal Grammar according to some 12th-century Grammarians', in *Studies in Medieval Thought dedicated to Geoffrey L. Bursill-Hall,* ed. K. Koerner, H-J. Niederehe, and R. H. Robins (*Studies in the History of Linguistics,* 26), Amsterdam: Benjamins, 69-84.

Gatien-Arnoult, M., ed., 1841-43. *Las flors del gay saber, estier dichas las leys d'amors*, 3 vols, Toulouse: Paya.

Gilliéron, J., and E. Edmont, 1902-9. *Atlas linguistique de la France,* Paris: Champion.

Gonfroy, G., 1980. 'Les grammairiens occitano-catalans et la dénomination de leur langue', *La Licorne* 4, 47-76.

Gonfroy, G., 1981. *La rédaction catalane en prose des* Leys d'amors. *Édition et étude critique des trois premières parties,* Unpublished thesis, Poitiers.

Grafström, Å., 1958. *Etude sur la graphie des plus anciennes chartes languedociennes,* Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells.

Helias, P., 1993. *Summa super Priscianum,* ed. L. Reilly, Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediæval Studies.

Holtz, L., 1981. *Donat et la tradition de l'enseignement grammatical: étude sur l'Ars Donati et sa diffusion (IVe-IXe siècle), et édition critique*, Paris: CNRS.

Isidore of Seville, 1911 (reprinted 1985). *Etymologiarum sive Originum Libri XX,* ed. W. M. Lindsay. Oxford: Clarendon Press. (Citations follow the traditional system by book and section, since the edition has no page numbers.)

Janzarik, D., 1989. 'Uc de Saint-Circ — auteur du Donatz Proensals', *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie,* 105, 264-275.

Jensen, F., 1976. *The Old Provençal Noun and Adjective Declension* (*Études romanes de l'Université d'Odense,* 9), Odense: Odense University Press .

Jensen, F., 1986. *The Syntax of Medieval Occitan,* Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Jensen, F., 1990. *Old French and Comparative Gallo-Romance Syntax,* Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Johannes Dacus, 1955. *Johannis Daci Opera,* ed. A. Otto, 2 vols (*Corpus Philosophorum Danicorum Medii Aevi,* I), Hauniae: F. Bagge/ G. E. C. Gad.

Keil, H., 1857, 1855, 1859. *Grammatici Latini*, vols 1, 2 and 3, Lipsiae: Teubner.

(Pseudo-)Kilwardby, R., Priscian maior commentary, Peterhouse MS 191, Cambridge.

(Pseudo-)Kilwardby, R., 1975. *The Commentary on Priscianus Maior ascribed to Robert Kilwardby* (extracts), ed. K. M. Fredborg, N.J. Green-Pedersen, L. Nielsen, and J. Pinborg, introduction by J. Pinborg, discussion of authorship by O. Lewry (*Cahiers de l'institut du moyen âge grec et latin,* 15), Copenhagen: Institute of Greek and Latin Medieval Studies.

Kühner, R., 1966. *Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache*, Hannover: Verlag Hahnsche Buchhandlung.

Lagarde, P., 1883. *Petri Hispani de lingua arabica libri duo,* Göttingen: Hoyer.

Law, V., 1986. 'Originality in the Medieval Normative Tradition', in *Studies in the History of Western Linguistics in Honour of R.H.Robins*, ed. T. Bynon, and F. Palmer, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 43-55.

Lafont, R., 1966. 'Les *Leys d'amors* et la mutation de la conscience occitane', *Revue des Langues romanes,* 77 , 13-59.

Lepschy, G. C., ed., 1990-. *Storia della linguistica,* vol. 2, Bologna: Il Mulino.

Leys see Gatien-Arnoult 1841.

Lienig, P., 1890. *Die Grammatik der provenzalischen Leys d'amors*, Breslau: Koebner.

Llabrés y Quintana, G., ed., 1909. *Poéticas catalanas d'En Berenguer de Noya y Francesch de Olesa,* Biblioteca catalana, Barcelona: Librería de Verdaguer Rambla, Palma de Mallorca: Amengual y Muntaner.

Lusignan, S., 1986. *Parler vulgairement: les intellectuels et la langue française au XIIIe et XIVe siècles,* Paris: Librairie philosophique J. Vrin.

Marshall, J.H., 1962. *Linguistic and Literary Theory in Old Provençal*, unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oxford.

Marshall, J.H., ed., 1969. *The* Donatz Proensals *of Uc Faidit*, London: Oxford University Press.

Marshall, J.H., ed., 1972. *The* Razos de Trobar *of Raimon Vidal and associated texts* (contains also the *Doctrina d'acort* and the *Regles de trobar),* London: Oxford University Press.

Martinus de Dacia, 1961. *De Modis significandi*, ed. Henricus Roos (*Corpus Philosophorum Danicorum Medii Aevi, II; Martini de Dacia Opera*) Hauniae: F. Bagge/ G. E. C. Gad.

Menéndez y Pelayo, M., 1927. *Antología de poetas líricos castellanos, Tomo V.* Madrid: Biblioteca clásica.

Mistral, F., 1879-86. *Lou tresor dóu Felibrige,* Aix en Provence: Veuve Remondet-Aubin.

Mok, Q. I. M., 1977. *Manuel pratique de morphologie d'ancien occitan,* Muiderberg: D. Coutinho.

Nebrija, A., 1909. *Gramatica castellana (reproduction phototypique de l'édition princeps (1492)),* ed. E. Walberg, Halle: Max Niemeyer (reproduces the Salamanca edition of 18 August 1492).

Papias, 1966. *Vocabulista (Elementarium),* ristampa anastatica, Turin: Bottega d'Erasmo (reproduces the edition of Boninus Mombritius, Venice: Philippus de Pincis Mantuanus 1496).

Pasero, N. 1965. 'Sulle fonti del libro primo delle «Leys d'amors»', *Studj romanzi,* 34, 125-185.

Pedro de Alcalá, 1929. *Arte para ligeramente saber la lengua arauiga*, and *Vocabulista arauigo* , New York: Hispanic Society of America[2] (reduced facsimile of the editions printed by Juan Varela, Granada. The *Vocabulista* is dated as 5 Feb 1505, the *Arte* is of similar age).

Priscian, *Institutiones grammaticae,* ed. M. Hertz, and *Opera Minora,* ed. H. Keil, 2 vols, Lipsiae: Teubner. See Keil, vols 2 and 3.

Quintilian (M. Fabius Quintilianus), 1920. *Institutio Oratoria,* 4 vols, with trans. by H. E. Butler (*Loeb Classical Library)*, London: William Heinemann/ Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Radulphus Brito, 1980. *Quaestiones super Priscianum minorem,* 2 vols, ed. H.W. Enders and J. Pinborg (*Grammatica Speculativa,* 3), Stuttgart-Bad Cannstadt: Frommann Holtzboog.

Ravier, X., 1978. *Atlas linguistique et ethnographique du Languedoc occidental,* 2 vols, Paris: Editions du CNRS.

Razos see Marshall 1972.

Regles see Marshall 1972.

Riquer, M., 1983. *Los trovadores: historia literaria y textos*, 3 vols, Barcelona: Ariel.

Riquer, M., and others, 1984-1988. *Història de la literatura catalana*, 11 vols, 4th ed., Barcelona: Ariel.

---

[2]The modern edition has no page numbers and each page corresponds to nine original ones. Consequently references in this thesis distinguish between the two texts and use the original page numeration. A page number such as 'a iij' is given as 'a3r'. (Verso pages are never numbered in the original editions.)

Ronjat, J., 1930-1941. *Grammaire istorique des parlers provençaux,* 4 vols, Montpellier: Société des langues romanes.

Santillana, Í. L. de M., 1988. *Obras completas,* ed. A. G. Moreno and M. P. A. M. Kerkhof, Barcelona: Planeta.

Schlieben-Lange, B., 1991. 'Okzitanisch: Grammatikographie und Lexikographie', in *Lexikon der romanistischen Linguistik,* V, 2. Tübingen, Niemeyer.

Shirbini, M., 1981. *Arab linguistics: an introductory classical text with translation and notes* (محمد الشربيني ، نور السجية في حل الفاظ الاجرومية), ed. M. G. Carter (*Studies in the History of Linguistics*, 24) Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Sigerus de Cortraco, 1977. *Summa Modorum Significandi, Sophismata,* ed. J. Pinborg (*Studies in the History of Linguistics,* 14), Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Smith, N. B., and Bergin, T. G., 1984. *An old Provençal Primer,* New York/ London: Garland.

Städtler, T., 1988. *Zu den Anfängen der französischen Grammatiksprache*, Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Swiggers, P., 1989. 'Les premières grammaires Occitanes: Les Razos de Trobar de Raimon Vidal et le Donatz proensals d'Uc (Faidit)', *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie,* 105, 138-147.

Thomas of Erfurt, 1972. *Grammatica speculativa,* ed. G. Bursill-Hall, London: Longman.

Thurot, C., 1964. *Extraits de divers manuscrits latins pour servir à l'histoire des doctrines grammaticales au moyen âge,* Frankfurt am Main: Minerva (reprint of Paris 1869).

Tudèle, Guillaume de, and L'Anonyme, 1984. *La Chanson de la croisade albigeoise,* introduction by Henri Gougaud, Paris: Berg International.

Woodcock, E., 1959. *A New Latin Syntax,* London: Methuen.

Wright, W., 1974. *A Grammar of the Arabic Language,* third edition revised by W. Robertson Smith and M. J. de Goeje, preface by P. Cachia, Beirut: Librairie du Liban.