

# CONTENTS

---

Editors' foreword	xiii
Author's preface	xv
1 A NATION OF GRAMMARIANS	1
2 MORPHOLOGICAL UNCERTAINTY	22
2.1 Aberrant verb forms	22
2.2 Sixteenth-century hesitation	22
2.3 <i>-oient</i> for <i>-oient</i>	24
2.4 <i>-arent</i> and <i>-erent</i>	24
2.5 Seventeenth- and eighteenth-century hesitation	25
2.6 <i>Je vas</i> and <i>je vais</i>	27
2.7 Nineteenth-century hesitation	29
2.8 <i>Poindre</i>	29
2.9 Twentieth-century hesitation	30
2.10 <i>Ayions, ayiez; soyions, soyiez</i>	31
2.11 History of <i>-iions, -iiez</i>	31
2.12 Modern inaccuracy: ignorance or analogy?	37
2.13 <i>Vêtir</i> and <i>revêtir</i> conjugated like <i>finir</i>	38
2.14 <i>Bruire</i>	42
2.15 <i>J'eus</i> for <i>j'eusse</i> in conditional perfect	49
2.16 General ignorance of conjugation today	51
2.17 <i>Dors-je</i> and <i>dormé-je</i> , and similar types	52
2.18 Aberrance in past definite and imperfect subjunctive	54
2.19 <i>Recouvrir</i> confused with <i>recouvrer</i>	55
2.20 Past definite of <i>cuire</i> and <i>luire</i>	59
2.21 Evidence from French schools	61
3 SYNTACTICAL UNCERTAINTY	63
3.1 Introductory	63
3.2 Incorrect agreement of the past participle	63
Often due to carelessness	63

	<i>Allé, venu</i> + infinitive	64
	Negligence where auxiliary is <i>avoir</i>	65
	Marot's law	66
	Neglect of agreement in inversion	67
	Oversights	75
	<i>Fait</i> + infinitive	75
	Past participle of reflexive verbs	76
	Pronouncements of modern grammarians	78
	The evidence of the spoken language	82
	Historical background: the sixteenth century	85
	Seventeenth-century rulings	92
	Seventeenth-century agreement of reflexive verbs	101
	Eighteenth-century rulings	102
	The situation today	109
3.3	Incorrect insertion or omission of <i>ne</i>	109
	General: modern examples	109
	<i>Ne</i> with <i>sans que</i>	111
	<i>Sans que</i> : grammarians' rulings	113
	Inconsistency or love of variety?	116
	Summary	117
3.4	<i>Qui</i> substituted for predicative <i>que</i>	117
	Examples and rulings	117
3.5	<i>Dont</i> incorrectly used	118
	Condemned by grammarians	118
	The seventeenth century: the first type	119
	The seventeenth century: the second type	119
	Survival today of the second type	119
	Reasons for survival	121
	Other misuses of <i>dont</i>	122
3.6	Ellipsis	123
	General	123
	Incompatible uses of object pronoun	123
	Noun used simultaneously in two functions	125
	Noun object of two verbs construed differently	125
	Condemned by grammarians	126
	Incompatible prepositions in double construction	128
	Ellipsis of preposition in double construction	129
	<i>trop et de trop</i> + adj./ <i>tant et de si</i> + adj.	129
	Noun governed by incompatible prepositions	131
	Ellipsis involving omission of verb	134
	Change from negative to positive or from positive to negative	135
3.7	Non-agreement of verb with subject	136
	Frequency in modern French	136
	Plural verb for singular	137
	Singular verb for plural	139
	Aberrant cases	140
	Faulty concord of predicative adjective	141

	Semantic aberrance	142
3.8	Loose infinitive constructions	142
	The basic rule today	142
	Historical examples	143
	Present-day examples	145
	Not always to be condemned	148
3.9	Aberrant uses of accusative and infinitive	149
	Modern examples: <i>attendre</i> and <i>vouloir</i>	149
3.10	Ambiguous use of <i>on</i>	150
	<i>On</i> referring to different persons or groups	150
	Seventeenth-century examples and rulings	151
	The modern rule	154
3.11	Aberrant uses of neuter <i>le</i>	154
	<i>Le</i> = unexpressed past participle	154
	Historical examples and rulings	154
	Not uncommon today	157
	<i>Le</i> used incompatibly as to number and gender	157
	Extreme cases of neuter <i>le</i>	158
	Further examples	159
3.12	The wrongly related participle and gerund	159
	A medieval example	159
	Sixteenth-century examples	160
	Seventeenth-century examples: the first objections	162
	Eighteenth-century rulings	166
	Eighteenth-century examples	169
	Girault-Duvivier's ruling	171
	Nineteenth-century examples	173
	Present-day examples	174
	Examples in which the subject <i>on</i> is understood	175
	Subject indicated by personal pronoun or possessive adjective in main clause	176
	A variant of the foregoing	179
	Subject is in noun clause dependent on main clause	179
	No participle is present at all	180
	Clarity is seldom affected	180
	Some examples reflect spoken usage	181
	Attitudes of modern grammarians	181
	R. GeorGIN's pronouncements	182
	Comments from standard grammars	183
	Not reprehensibly aberrant	184
	Historically respectable	185
	It makes for brevity	188
	It is inelegant rather than aberrant	188
3.13	Noun/adjective wrongly related to subject of main verb	189
	Inelegant but clear: modern examples	189
	Adjective or noun has same gender and number as subject of main verb	192

3.14	Unnecessary use of <i>sans que/pour que</i>	192
	A further inelegance: seventeenth-century objections	192
	Eighteenth-century pronouncements	195
	Girault-Duvivier and Bescherelle	195
	Modern departures from normal usage	196
	Not always condemned, and sometimes justified	198
3.15	Summary of the foregoing	198
3.16	The incomplete nature of grammatical description and prescription today	199
3.17	The persistence of uncertain usage	199
3.18	<i>Faire</i> with dependent infinitive	200
	<i>Faire faire</i> : the earliest example	200
	Two parallel constructions: historical	200
	The third construction, involving <i>par</i>	201
	The parallel constructions in seventeenth-century usage	202
	Pronouncements of seventeenth-century grammarians	203
	Eighteenth-century examples	205
	Eighteenth-century grammarians: Féraud	206
	Pronouncements of nineteenth-century grammarians	207
	Unsatisfactory nature of present-day pronouncements	208
	Conflicting views	209
	Evidence of modern usage	211
	Current hesitation	214
	The position of the pronoun objects: special cases	215
	The position of the pronoun objects: ordinary usage	216
	The position of the noun object	217
	Grammarians' rulings	220
	Indirect pronoun object with <i>faire</i> , where dependent infinitive has no direct object	221
	Grammarians' rulings on the foregoing	223
	Objections: examples to the contrary	224
	Kr. Sandfeld's explanation refuted	227
	<i>Faire faire</i> : general conclusion	228
4	A CASE STUDY: THE SYNTAX OF THE PARTITIVE ARTICLE	230
4.1	Modern uncertainty	230
	Not used in the earliest texts	230
	Hesitant use in Middle French	232
	Inconsistent use in sixteenth-century texts	234
	The seventeenth century: pronouncements by early grammarians	237
	The seventeenth century: pronouncements by later grammarians	239
	Cassagne	241
	Thomas Corneille	242
	Scipion Dupleix	243
	Patru	244
	The findings of the Academy	245

Uncertainties of grammatical doctrine	245
<i>De</i> giving partitive value to noun	246
<i>De</i> before noun in negative verbal locution	248
The evidence of Nicot's <i>Thresor</i>	249
Need for care in interpreting examples	250
Problem of defining a verbal locution	251
Some verbal locutions have alternative forms	251
<i>Ne ... point + de</i> and <i>ne ... pas + de</i>	253
A necessary distinction	254
Seventeenth-century verbal locutions with and without <i>de</i>	256
Exceptions	258
Verbal locution modified by adverb of quantity	260
4.2 Omission of partitive article in seventeenth-century French	264
Circumstances in which liable to be omitted: examples	264
Exceptions to the foregoing	267
4.3 Replacement of partitive article by <i>de</i> before adjective + noun in seventeenth-century French	268
Advocated by grammarians, but debated by authors	268
Examples of indiscriminate alternation	269
Evidence for the strengthening of Maupas' ruling	271
<i>Des</i> or <i>de</i> with adjective + plural noun: a corrective	271
Examples of <i>de</i> + adjective + plural noun	273
Extreme rarity of <i>des</i> + adjective + plural noun	275
Doubtful validity of apparent exceptions	276
<i>Les grosses larmes</i> or <i>des grosses larmes</i> ?	277
Adjective-noun combinations regarded as units	278
The problem of a plural noun represented by <i>en</i>	279
4.4 Replacement of partitive article by <i>de</i> after negative in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century French	281
Retrospect: earlier usage and seventeenth-century usage	281
<i>De</i> : the official norm	282
Deviations	282
Partitive article for <i>de</i> where noun not directly dependent on negative	283
Partitive article justified in litotes	285
<i>De</i> substituted for partitive article after <i>ni ... ni</i>	285
The partitive article or <i>de</i> after <i>sans</i>	286
The partitive article or <i>de</i> in <i>ne ... que</i> construction	288
A possible explanation through analogy	290
The partitive article or <i>de</i> in negative-interrogative sentences	291
The partitive article instead of <i>de</i> after negative: a special case	293
Eighteenth-century developments	295
<i>Ni ... ni</i> constructions	299
<i>Ne ... que</i> construction	301
Negative-interrogative sentences	302
Verbal locutions	304
Inadequacy of Féraud's comments	307

	Verbal locutions modified by adverbs of quantity	310
4.5	Replacement of partitive article by <i>de</i> before adjective + noun	
	in eighteenth-century French	313
	The rule reiterated, but not always observed	313
	Some adjective-noun combinations regarded as units	318
	The Academy's view	319
	Cases where <i>de</i> is considered justifiable	320
	Inconsistencies of omission	322
	The situation at the time of the Revolution	323
4.6	Nineteenth-century developments	324
	Girault-Duvivier	324
	Critique of Girault-Duvivier's findings	326
	Noël and Chapsal	328
	The Academy	329
	Littré and Laveaux	330
	Disregard of the grammarians' rulings	334
4.7	Twentieth-century developments	335
	Brunot's ruling	335
	Varied and contradictory rulings	336
	R. Georquin's rulings	344
	Miscellaneous rulings	346
	Sauvageot, M. Cohen, etc.	348
	Grevisse, Colin, <i>Bodico</i> , and <i>Le Grand Larousse de la langue française</i>	352
	Damourette and Pichon	355
	Nyrop	357
	Twentieth-century practice	359
	Inconsistency within the sentence	362
4.8	Recent trends	363
	Growing respectability of <i>des</i> before adjective + noun	363
	Written versus spoken French	365
	The evidence of <i>Le français élémentaire</i>	370
	Plural noun represented by <i>en</i> : conflicting rulings	371
	Careful written language prefers <i>de</i> when <i>en</i> is involved	375
	Partitive article replaced by <i>de</i> in negation	377
	Inadequate treatment of this by grammarians	377
	Inadequate treatment by lexicographers	380
	Inadequate treatment where negative is involved	381
	<i>Avec</i> and <i>sans</i> with partitive article	382
	G. Mauger's ruling	384
	Michaut and Schricke criticized	384
	J. Hanse and M. Grevisse	387
	<i>Des</i> or <i>de</i> with <i>ne ... que</i>	389
	<i>Des</i> or <i>de</i> when noun not directly dependent on negative	390
	<i>Des</i> preferred where a contrast is made	393
	Present-day examples of the foregoing	394
	A related type: grammarians' rulings	395

Examples	396
Usage hesitant in the absence of a precise ruling	396
Negative-interrogative sentences today	400
Litotes	402
Negatived verbal locutions	403
Omission of the partitive article	404
A theoretical possibility	410
Conclusion: usage still not adequately stabilized	410
5 THE RESPONSIBILITY OF GRAMMARIANS	411
5.1 Allegations of disorder in the present state of French	411
Comments on modern usage	411
Are grammarians blameless?	415
5.2 Disagreements of grammarians	416
Wide variations	416
Responsibilities	418
5.3 Grammarians do not practise what they preach	419
The disconcerted layman	419
Inconsistencies	419
The passive voice	424
Vaugelas	424
5.4 Failure to record usage accurately	425
A serious shortcoming	425
Initial noun clause introduced by <i>que</i>	425
Mood after <i>se plaindre que</i>	427
Current usage with <i>se plaindre</i> : examples	429
Contradictory rulings of grammarians	432
Mood after <i>se réjouir</i>	432
Further contradictions	434
5.5 Failure to describe the language as it is now	435
Grammarians critical of grammarians	435
5.6 Careless and inaccurate formulation	436
Wording of rules	436
Errors even at the highest levels	437
5.7 The stabilizing influence of grammarians	439
Positive value	439
Appendix: Lack of harmony	441
Bibliography	447
Index	465