Re(de)fining Address

An overlooked French phenomenon

Richard Ashdowne[*]

> 'He's Winnie-ther-Pooh. Don't you know what "*ther*" means?'
> 'Ah, yes, now I do,' I said quickly; and I hope you do too, because it is all the explanation you are going to get.
>
> Milne ([1926] 2000: 1)

Much attention has been focused in recent years on the historical development of the definite article in the Romance languages. That literary Latin of the classical period lacked articles is well known, and the much-quoted comment of Quintilian *noster sermo articulos non desiderat* is a familiar tag in this context.[1] The developments of the various Latin demonstratives and their reflexes are thus well documented in the scholarly literature, if not always straightforward in either their description or indeed explanation, and synchronic studies of the articles at various stages in the histories of these languages are numerous.

One area of the use of definite articles in some modern Romance varieties seems to have largely escaped such exhaustive scrutiny, however, and this is the possibility of forms of address which seem, superficially at least, to contain the definite article. Modern French is one such variety:

(1) *Bonjour, les amis!*
Hello, friends!

Likewise, modern Romanian has (admittedly optional) vocative morphology which in some instances (e.g. all plurals) is identical in form to exponents of/containing the definite article:[2]

(2a) *cărțile fetelor*
the girls' books, the books of the girls

---

[*] This is a very substantially revised version of a paper presented to the Comparative Philology Seminar at the University of Oxford in April 2003 and the XIIth International Conference on Historical Linguistics, held at the University of Copenhagen in August 2003: I am grateful to both audiences for many helpful comments. In addition, I should also like to express gratitude to Martin Maiden, John Charles Smith, John Penney, and Mary MacRobert for invaluable advice. Naturally, any errors are my sole responsibility. My work is supported by the Arts and Humanities Research Board.

[1] 'Our language has no desire for articles.' (*Institutio Oratoria* 1.4.19)

[2] The Romanian definite article is postposed and enclitic on the first element in a noun phrase. In the plural, the address forms in question are identical to the articulated gen./dat. case, although native speakers very often use the unarticulated form (which does not vary for case) instead; indeed this is the general rule when the phrase contains an adjective. In the singular, no address form is identical to the articulated form of either nom./acc. or gen./dat. case of that noun, but some masculines do have (again optional) address forms which appear to contain the articulated nom./acc (e.g. *omul* 'the man' with 'voc.' *omule*).

(2b) *Am dat cărțile fetelor.*
I gave the books to the girls, I gave the girls the books

(2c) *Bună dimineața, fetelor!*
Good morning, girls!

Since classical Latin had no definite article and so such patterns did not appear, it would seem obvious to claim that these constructions arise in some way as part of the general development of the definite article, albeit possibly within the history of the daughter Romance varieties after they had diverged from one another (the phenomena in question are not found in modern Spanish, for example, and the history of Italian has some potentially related patterns involving demonstratives but no clear address use of its definite article).[3] However, not only have the majority of scholars not made such a claim, but it seems that every such attempt has come across some serious problems. The purpose of this paper is to examine the history of this construction in French and to attempt to offer an explanation for its existence. Evidence from Romanian and Italian will be taken into consideration, since attempts have been made to connect the patterns in these varieties with the French pattern, but from the outset it must be stressed that this paper offers no evidence for these patterns being anything more than potentially parallel but independent innovations.

1. Modern French Data

In modern French the definite article is consistently available for use in certain kinds of address phrases. It is most often found in plural or collective contexts:

(3) *Salut, les enfants!*
Hello, children!

(4) *Bonjour, la classe!*
Good morning, class!

However, it can appear with a noun denoting an individual:

(5) *Salut, l'ami!*
Hello, friend!

It can be accompanied by a grammatically complete sentence or by just an interjection; the address phrase can be initial, medial or final:

[3] On Italian, see §7.1 below; on modern Spanish, see Butt & Benjamin (1994: 31-2). As for other Romance varieties, on Portuguese, see Hutchinson & Lloyd (1996: 108-10) and Perini (2002: 102-3, 333, 380): the sheer complexity of the geographical variation in address usages in Portuguese demands far more detailed study than would be possible in this paper with its focus on French, and I consciously exclude it from consideration both for this reason and because its apparent use of the definite article in address corresponds to the use also of similar forms in bound address (see below) with 3sg and 3pl verb-forms referring to the addressee(s).

(6) *Debout, les morts!*
Get up, dead men!

(7) *L'ami, crois-moi, il faut rentrer chez toi.*
Friend, believe me, you must go home.

(8) *Dois-je entendre, l'abbé, que vous allez me soupçonner aussi?*
Should I understand, vicar, that you are going to suspect me too?

(9) *Passez votre chemin, la fille.*
Go on your way, girl.

The underlined phrases are unexceptional address phrases as far as pragmatic function and sentence position are concerned; in this respect they behave exactly as other clear examples of 'free' address phrases do, for instance proper names.[4]

(10) *Bonjour, Charles!*
Good morning, Charles!

(11) *Dois-je entendre, Marie, que vous allez me soupçonner aussi?*
Should I understand, Marie, that you are going to suspect me too?

(12) *Passez votre chemin, mesdames et messieurs.*
Go on your way, ladies and gentlemen.

We should also note that the patterns of address availability for phrases introduced by the article in French show no particular distinction between use as so-called 'calls' and 'addresses' (on which distinction see Zwicky 1974).[5]

Standard grammars of the modern language describe this usage as part of *l'usage familier* (e.g. Grevisse & Goosse 1993: 877; Wartburg & Zumthor 1989: 294), a view shared by earlier accounts of the phenomenon in French (e.g. Brunot 1899: 381; Haas 1909: 103; Guillaume 1919: 300).[6]

---

[4] I intend not to consider in detail in this paper so-called 'bound' forms of address, i.e. those syntactically integrated into a sentence (e.g. as subject, object, complement etc.), and confine my observations mainly to what I consider to be free forms (on this distinction, see Dickey 2002: 5-7). The interaction between the two (pragmatically-related) phenomena is in my view crucial for understanding some historical developments in address use, notably the evolution of the grammaticalised T/V distinction in languages such as Italian, Spanish and Romanian.

[5] In terms of sentence 'position', free address forms show up in two superficially distinctive patterns, which I term 'independent' and 'dependent', i.e. whether the address phrase appears alone in the sentence/ utterance or is accompanied by some kind of other material. The patterns typically correspond to the pragmatic functions of attracting attention ('call') and maintaining contact ('address') respectively, although in fact either pattern may on occasion fulfil the other function. Independent and dependent address phrases appear to share a number of phonological features, morphological patterns and semantic restrictions on the items that can be used (Ashdowne 2002: 17-23); the two patterns can be claimed to be conditioned surface alternations of a single underlying phenomenon.

[6] Diez (1874-6: iii.20) remarks somewhat cryptically of a range of data from various Romance varieties both old and modern that '*l'article semble avoir pour mission d'ajouter à l'exclamation ou à l'interpellation*

2. The General Development of the Definite Article

This is not the place to rehearse at great length the details of the development of the Romance definite articles, but it is important to sketch a general outline from Latin to modern French for what happened outside the address context.[7]

The origins of the French definite article lie in the Latin demonstrative *ille* ('that, yon'). Continuous semantic weakening characterised its gradual shift from a real-world (exophoric) demonstrative via a period as an endophoric marker to its present-day status. The first stage of weakening led to the increased frequency of use of *ille* observable in late Latin texts (along with a number of other items including *ipse*).[8] By the old French period we find the definite article being used primarily with noun phrases that are semantically/pragmatically definite: the definite article had an identifying role, marking a phrase as referring to the same thing as something previously mentioned. It was not needed with generic or abstract nouns, nor was it normally used with nouns denoting unique referents (e.g. *Dieu* 'God'); it was also not necessarily employed with phrases following prepositions or qualified by adjectives, if the latter could be felt in the context to indicate the identification sufficiently. In subsequent centuries the continued weakening of the semantics of the article (a consequence of increased frequency of use resulting from a shift from strict endophoric use to identification with any 'given' information whether overt in the discourse or inferred from its context) led to its eventual use with generic and abstract nouns, while it also came to be used with almost all unique items — *Dieu* remains in modern French without the article as one of the few exceptions to this expansion, when it refers to the Judaeo-Christian god.

In the light of Greenberg's (1978) work looking cross-linguistically for universal features of the development of definite articles, one might say that the modern French definite article has many of the characteristics associated with its having the status of a default determiner, and it is therefore employed whenever no other determiner (e.g. indefinite article, demonstrative etc.) is appropriate; this corresponds to a restriction on the grammaticality of bare NPs. Analysed thus, the definite article is little more than a 'noun marker', i.e. a morphological unit that is marked for or varies according to the number or gender of the phrase (categories which in French, as a result of regular phonological change, happen to be no longer necessarily overtly marked in the inherited position,

---

de la vivacité et de l'énergie' ('the mission of the article seems to be to add some vivacity or energy to an exclamation or address'). I shall attempt to be more precise.

[7] On the general development see, for example, Nyrop (1899-1930: v.173-80), Guillaume (1919), Harris (1980a, b), Epstein (1993, 1994, 1995), Vincent (1997), Zink (1997: 66-72) and Price (1998: 115-18).

[8] Vincent (1997: 150-63) discusses this in detail, with reference to a substantial extract from the *Peregrinatio Aetheriae*; we should note that even in classical Latin, *ille* had a very wide range of uses, many of which could be classed as endophoric (e.g. *hic ... ille* 'the latter … the former'), and it is not clear that *ille* was or ever had been *only* an exophoric demonstrative. The eventual apparent opposition between *ille* and *ipse*, for example as witnessed in the *Peregrinatio*, is worth bearing in mind if it is something in the meaning or use of *ille* that explains the modern address usage: those Romance varieties that derive their article from the reflex of *ipse* might be expected then to behave differently from those deriving it from *ille*.

namely on the end of words). If accepted, such an analysis would indicate that the French definite article is at or approaching Greenberg's final stage (III) of development.[9]

3. The Historical Evidence

In the following sections I summarise the historical evidence for the use of the definite article in address contexts.

3.1. Latin

3.1.1. The Evidence

Not many scholars have looked at the patterns of address usage found in Latin, and of those who have, few have attempted a comprehensive study: the most detailed and recent investigation of address in Latin is that of Dickey (2002), who adopts a sociolinguistic rather than grammatical approach. What is clear from existing work, though, is that there is no straighforward evidence that *ille* was available for use in address in the classical period.[10] Nonetheless, there are some debatable examples which may perhaps be forebears of the French pattern and thus which merit our attention.

Svennung (1958: 286-8) quotes some apparent evidence for the use of *ille* in address; his survey is not intended to be exhaustive so I cite in this section his examples and also others which he does not consider. In fact I quote all the potential instances I have found: they have not previously been collected (so far as I know) and should be highlighted as a set of evidence for the use of *ille*.

I have found only two examples from Latin prose:

(13) *o <u>nox illa</u> quae paene aeternas huic urbi tenebras attulisti, cum Galli ad bellum, Catilina ad urbem ... vocabantur, cum ego te, Flacce, ... obtestabar ...! o <u>Nonae illae Decembres</u>, quae me consule fuistis! … o <u>nox illa</u> quam iste est dies consecutus, fausta huic urbi, miserum me, metuo ne funesta nobis!*

(Cicero, *Pro Flacco* 102-3)

O that night which nearly brought eternal darkness to this city, when the Gauls were being called to war, Catiline to the city, … when I called on you, Flaccus, as witness …! O that 5th of December, which happened while I was consul! … O that night which that day followed, propitious for this city, — woe is me! — I fear it may be the death knell for us!

---

[9] This kind of analysis seems to lie behind Harris (1978: 74-6; 1980a, b).

[10] Interestingly in Classical Greek the demonstrative **οὗτος** ('this [near me]', masc. 'nom.' sg.) and its corresponding fem. sg. **αὕτη** *could* be used in the address function, although almost exclusively pronominally (i.e. on their own and not accompanying a noun). This use is securely if not frequently attested: its origins remain obscure (Dickey 1996: 154-8). Though Greek had many influences on the Latin language as a result of its prestige (and the development of the definite article is often cited in this connection), I think it is absolutely clear that Greek influence is *not* what lies behind the phenomena I am concerned with here.

(14) *o nox illa aeternis saeculis monumentisque mandanda!* (*Panegyricus* 4.26.1)
O that night to be committed to the eternal ages and monuments!

Here the underlined 'apostrophes' refer to periods of time (or perhaps the corresponding state of affairs), which seem to be personified and have depending on them relative clauses with second-person verbs (*attulisti*, *fuistis*). Akin to these but in verse (and with 2sg imperatives) we find:

(15) *nullus erat custos, nulla exclusura dolentes*
ianua: si fas est, mos precor ille redi. (Tibullus 2.3.72-5)
There was no guard, to shut out those in grief
no door: if it is right, that custom, I pray, come back.

(16) *sic mihi servitium video dominamque paratam:*
iam mihi, libertas illa paterna, vale. (Tibullus 2.4.1-2)
Thus I see slavery and a mistress arranged for me:
now, farewell, for me, that ancestral freedom.

Again in these two examples the apparent addresses refer in a way to states of affairs. To these examples we might add the following:

(17) *'salve, vera Iovis, vera o Iovis' undique 'proles'*
ingeminant, 'o magnanimis memoranda palaestris
Taygeta et primi felix labor ille magistri.' (Valerius Flaccus, *Argonautica* 4.327-9)
'Hail true scion of Jove, Jove's true scion,' on all sides
they re-echo, 'Hail Taygetus, famed for greathearted wrestling schools,
and [hail] the happy work of your first teacher!'

Yet again we find *ille* in a phrase referring to a state of affairs or period of time, namely a period of teaching (or perhaps the state of affairs resulting from it).[11] Finally, note also:

(18) *o noctem meminisse mihi iucunda uoluptas,*
o quotiens uotis illa uocanda meis,
cum te complexa morientem, Galle, puella
uidimus et longa ducere uerba mora! (Propertius 1.10.3-6)
O delightful pleasure for me in remembering the night,
o that night how often to be called upon in my prayers,
when I saw you, Gallus, dying as your girl embraced you
and drawing out your words with long delay!

Svennung quotes only a single example of a phrase referring to a person which might be in the vocative case headed by a form of *ille*:

[11] There are two further potential examples of address use of *ille* from the *Argonautica*, namely 8.10 and 2.486. In the former it is my view that Heinsius' emendation *mille* should be adopted. The latter I quote as (21).

(19) *quid numeras factos ad nova membra pedes?*
illa Iovis magni paelex metuenda sorori
fronde levas nimiam caespitibusque famem;
fonte bibis spectasque tuam stupefacta figuram
et, te ne feriant quae geris arma, times. (Ovid, *Heroides* 14.94-8)
Why do you count the feet formed as your new limbs?
That mistress of mighty Jupiter, feared by (his) sister,
you ease your great hunger with leaves and grass:
you drink from springs, and, stunned, see your shape,
and fear lest the weapons you bear might kill you.

To this I might add the following possible examples also with a less abstract referent:

(20) *en concede meos miseris genitoribus artus,*
quos pater infelix multo mercabitur auro.
dona feres victor. Priami nunc filius orat
te primus, dux ille ducum, quem Graecia solum
pertimuit: (Italicus, *Ilias Latina* 980-4)
Look, grant my parents my limbs,
which my wretched father will ransom with much gold.
As victor you shall bear the things given. Now Priam's son is the first to implore
you, the commander-in-chief, whom alone Greece feared.

(21) *verum o iam redeunt Phrygibus si numina tuque*
ille ades auguriis promisse et sorte deorum,
iam cui candentes votivo in gramine pascit
cornipedes genitor … adnue me. (Valerius Flaccus, *Argonautica* 2.485-9)
But oh if heaven is returning to the Phrygians and you
are present as the one promised by augury and the omens of the gods
for whom my father now feeds in the pastures of his vow
white horses, … nod your assent to me.

In fact (21) is the sole example I have found where an apparently distinctive vocative form (*promisse*) appears in a phrase containing *ille*.

Svennung also cites some later Latin examples:

(22) *daemones autem videntes fiduciam ejus invisi sunt, et volentes terrere eum, vocabant quasi quamdam mulierem dicentes: nonna illa, veni nobiscum ad balneum!*
(*Vitae patrum* 5.7.10 [894c])
But the spirits, seeing his faith, hated his faith, and wishing to terrify him, called to him as if he were some woman, saying: 'Sister so-and-so, come with us to the bath!'

(23) *coepit singulorum discipulorum suorum cellas pulsare, dicens: frater ille, veni, quia opus te habeo!* (*Vitae patrum* 5.14.5 [948d])
He began to knock on the doors of each of his disciples, saying: 'Brother so-and-so, come, for I have need of you!'

3.1.2. Could *ille* be Used in Address in Latin?

There is, unsurprisingly, no straightforward answer to this question. There are some interesting things to be observed from examples (12) to (23). The first is that, other than (21), none contains a distinctively vocative form in the phrase containing *ille*.[12] It is important to note that, while apparently distinctively nominative forms could be used in free direct address in classical Latin, the vocative was the regular exponent of this function;[13] moreover, the vocative had few other functions than direct address (i.e. free forms, both dependent and independent), of which appeal to the gods ('oaths') was the most common.[14]

Given that *ille* in our examples is always part of a phrase and never on its own, we might well wonder whether this lack of distinctively vocative forms is in fact the result of avoidance rather than an accidental gap. Perhaps speakers felt that both *ille* and *illa* even when actually vocative (triggered by being used, for whatever reason, in address phrases) appear to be nominative (because they do not have any distinctively vocative forms): thus both have to have nouns with them that also are nominative in form in order to avoid perceived superficial case disagreement. For the feminine this is unproblematic as indeed it is for those masculine nouns which do not have nom. sg. in *-us*: all such nouns exhibit the same case-form ambiguity as *ille* and *illa* and so can appear to be simultaneously nominative (for superficial case agreement) and vocative (for the syntax). However, for masculines with nom. sg. *-us*, perhaps neither *ille* + *~e* seemed acceptable (with its apparent case disagreement) nor *ille* + *~us* because such a phrase would appear to be distinctively nominative (since the noun *has* a distinctive vocative in *-e* which is not being used). For a speaker faced with such a dilemma, avoidance was an obvious strategy to adopt.

---

[12] Briefly, the vocative of Latin nouns and adjectives was generally identical to the nominative, except (a) in the singular of second declension nouns with nom. in *-ius* and *-us* whose vocatives were in *-i* and *-e* respectively, and (b) in the singular of second/first declension adjectives whose masculine nominative singular was in *-ius* and *-us* (vocatives respectively in *-ie* and *-e*). Some other nouns had vocatives distinct from the corresponding nominative (e.g. Greek nouns and, in some authors, *puer* 'boy'), and some nouns and adjectives in *-us* seem to have had a vocative also in *-us* (particularly those in *-eus* e.g. *deus* 'god'). The possessive *meus* 'my' had masculine singular vocative *mi*.

ille itself had no distinctive vocative forms. Modern grammars make no reference to *ille* having a vocative at all (implying that it had none — either as cause or consequence it could not appear in address); ancient grammarians gave forms identical to the nominative for its vocative, although these should be taken *cum grano salis*, for we know that they commonly attempted to fill out morphological paradigms even where gaps existed (cf. Law 1995: 109-11, on the vocative of *ego* 'I').

[13] The few instances of forms in *-us* being used as addresses reflect phrases containing elements for which the inherited vocative form was in *-us*.

[14] This could certainly have been conventionalised, and arguably these items (e.g. *mehercle* 'by Hercules', *pol* 'by Pollux') became lexicalised interjections.

Such a hypothesis is not idle speculation: there is evidence of parallel avoidance for other morphologically problematic items in address, in particular *meus* and *deus*. The regular (i.e. inherited) vocative of *deus* 'god' was *deus*, but this is very rarely found indeed; it seems that its apparently nominative form led to its avoidance (cf. Dickey 2003). Likewise inherited masc. voc. sg. *meus* 'my' became rare and died out to be replaced by a suppletive form *mi* (believed to be etymologically a dative of the personal pronoun *ego* 'I'): however, on the rare occasions when we find *meus* we find it only with second declension masculine nouns of the *-us* type, which are always attracted into their *-us* ending (Svennung 1958: 252).

A problem for this view, of course, is example (21), where we have a pattern (*ille ... promisse*) which my hypothesis should rule out: having *ille* in the phrase should either block altogether the use of an item that has a distinctive vocative form available, or at the very least insist that the 'nominative' *-us* appear here. In my view, however, (21) is not an example of *ille* used in direct address: the morphology of *promisse* appears to be vocative, but in poetry a predicative phrase in a phrase with a verb in the second person (here *ades*) often appears in the 'vocative' case (i.e. adopts its morphological form) where a nominative is expected and also possible.[15] I would claim, then, that it is precisely because this is a predicative construction that the expected avoidance does not occur: *ille ... ~us*, the expected phrase, is not syntactically vocative but nominative (and there is no case disagreement so it is not blocked). It is then through a superficial poetic or stylistic rule that *-us* is realised as *-e*, which is in effect as much an 'honorary' nominative here as it is in other similar predicative vocative examples which do not contain *ille*.

The second point to note about the remaining examples is how many of them refer to periods of time or states of affairs. Presumably a literary and rhetorical trope, the use of *ille* in (13) to (18) has not been properly considered before. In each it is used to indicate a situation that is, at the speech time, treated as remote, but presumably the situation is expected to be familiar to the audience; this is an expected use of a distal demonstrative, particularly when we note its change from real-world deixis to relying on audience knowledge (the mechanism being the same as discourse-internal anaphora which relies on and connects with audience knowledge deriving from previously mentioned information).

We might wonder, however, whether these uses really are addresses. Admittedly in (13) we have relative clauses with second-person verbs that depend on these supposed 'vocatives', but we also find a vocative *Flacce* referring to a person present in the discourse situation. It seems to me that all these examples are very literary apostrophes in which a state of affairs is personified and this personification is achieved through treating these phrases as forms of address — forms of address most typically refer to people. It is

[15] The most often quoted example is:

> *quo moriture ruis ...?* (Virgil, *Aeneid* 10.811)
> Where are you, about to die, rushing to …?

Here, *moriture* is taken to be not a free form of direct address ('O one about to die') but a bound form attached to the (understood) second person pronoun subject of the verb as a (predicative) adjective: it thus stands for *moriturus*. (Cf. Kühner & Stegmann 1914: i.255-6; Hofmann & Szantyr 1965: 25-6.)

then important that these phrases could be taken to be nominatives, and in fact to be nominatives in exclamation (albeit in place of the expected accusative).[16] In my view the underlined phrases in (13) are indeed nominatives in exclamation which, because they are indistinguishable in form from vocatives, present a literary option of personification: it is then because of this that they then can and do have second-person verbs in dependent relative clauses. I would further argue that the nominative rather than the accusative is chosen for the exclamation precisely because this option is thereby made available. Indeed (14) may just be an exclamation and not an address at all.[17]

Personification is equally apparent in (15) and (16) where the *ille* phrase accompanies sentences with imperative verbs. If the explanation for (13) is right and can be validly extended to these, we might assume that the basis for these constructions again is a nominative, this time not in exclamation but as the subject of a third-person (jussive subjunctive) verb. Because their morphology is likewise ambiguous, these subject phrases can be personified, and this personification is effected through the use of the second-person verb.[18]

In all of these instances, then, the use of *ille* originates (notionally) outside the address (→ vocative) context but when the phrase is personified by being made a form of address the *ille* is retained. The most striking examples, of course, are those with personal reference already, namely (19) and (20). Svennung argues that *illa ... sorori* in (19) is an apposition to the (covert) subject of the verb *levas*. In syntactic terms this example is then parallel to (15) and (16) where the phrase starts as a nominative subject for the main verb. It is surely no coincidence that the meaning of *ille* here alludes again to a past/remote state of affairs when Io *was* Jupiter's mistress, whom Juno feared as a rival, although at this stage she no longer is (following her metamorphosis into a cow). (20) is deeply problematic and I include it only because it is cited by the *TLL* (s.v. *ille*) as being vocative: the context is Hector addressing Achilles and talking about himself in the third person. If we accept Baehrens' emendation *primus* agreeing, as a secondary predicate, with *filius* —

---

[16] See Kühner & Stegmann (1914: i.272-4), Hofmann & Szantyr (1965: 48). Note also Vairel-Carron (1975: 68-76), who believes there to be a subtle difference in force between the use of the nom. and the acc. (and indeed the voc.), but despite considerable discussion finds it difficult to be certain precisely what it is (74): '*que nous ayons du mal à percevoir — et à rendre dans la traduction ... — cette différence de valeur ne nous autorise pas à nier son existence*' ('that we have difficulty in perceiving this difference — and rendering it in translation — does not allow us to deny its existence').

[17] I mention it because it has been quoted elsewhere. Interestingly, Rodgers (Nixon et al. 1994: 335) alludes to a tradition that Nazarius, the author of this text, originally came from the area around Bordeaux, though I would stress that it is of little linguistic significance even if it is reliable.

[18] This is a slight simplification. The imperative, which is prototypically second person, can sometimes take a nominative subject: in the plural this could, in Latin at least, sometimes be distinguished on semantic (but not morphological) grounds from a form of address (since the 2pl denotes a set including the addressee(s) but may, unlike address, include others too). The phrases in (15) and (16), which, for my argument have necessarily to be ambiguous in form, could thus still be nominatives even 'after' personification, and for the speaker perhaps they were intended as such. This possibility does not undermine my position but strengthens it: address is in fact a likely reanalysis of such ambiguous types by the audience given that, in general, addresses are more common with imperatives than nominative subjects are. The stages thus are: nom. + 3sg subjunctive → nom. + 2sg imperative > voc. & 2sg imperative; all I have needed to show is that ambiguous instances allowing this final reanalysis existed.

Hector is attempting to anticipate his father's pleas for his body —, we are left with two further constituents *dux ille ducum* and *quem Graecia solum pertimuit*. It seems to me likely that both should be taken to refer to the same individual, but I am not at all sure that the referent is the addressee, Achilles: from the meaning, it makes more sense to take both as referring to Hector himself and thus *dux ille ducum* is a nominative apposition to a normal third-person sentence subject and not an address accompanying *te*. We can thus exclude this example from any further consideration.

The final observation I wish to make of the classical examples is that in all of them except (21) (for which I offered a separate analysis) the form of *ille* does not appear at the start of the phrase. The significance of this is not clear, but perhaps it may be connected with the force of *ille*: it seems unlikely to be purely the result of chance.

Before I move on to the evidence from the history of French (and I will return later to some further aspects of the meaning of *ille* in these examples in the light of the subsequent usages), I should comment on Svennung's two later Latin examples, (22) and (23). Superficially they might well look much more like a forebear for the French pattern than any of the examples we have considered so far; the underlined phrases are simply *ille* with a noun (and indeed one with human reference). While these could be subjects for the imperatives *veni*, Svennung's view seems more likely, namely that this is address but involving a different use of *ille*, possible outside address contexts, where *ille* means 'so-and-so' and functions as a pro-proper-noun: it is thus standing in for the name of each person called in turn. What was actually called out was, for example, 'Brother Francis, come! Brother William, come!'; a 'condensed' report of these would be '… each …: "Brother *so-and-so*!"' and indeed in (23) we have evidence for this in the distributive *singulorum* ('each individually'). (23) is not, therefore, evidence of *ille* in direct address at all, only of *ille* in a non-verbatim report of direct address.[19] In respect of (22), the use of *quamdam* corresponds to the meaning 'a (certain) woman': she could be named but is not, and *illa* stands for that name in the quoted direct speech, the actual name called out being of no importance.

Overall, I conclude that there is, at best, marginal evidence of *ille* in address in Latin but cannot deny that there is good evidence of patterns which might form the basis for a reanalysis and thus establish the reflex of *ille* as available in address.

3.2. Old French

Among the earliest examples of the use of the definite address in the context of direct address are the following from the *Chanson de Roland* (early 12th century):

[19] This pro-proper-noun usage was certainly available in non-address contexts in classical Latin (cf. *OLD* s.v. *ille* sense 15).

(24) *Paien escrient: 'Aïe nos, Mahum!*
Li nostre Deu, vengez nos de Carlun! (1906-7)
The pagans cry: 'Help us, Mohammed!
Our gods, avenge us on Charles![20]

(25) *Dient Franceis: 'Sempres murrez, glutun!*
De vos seit hoi male confusiun!
Li nostre Deu, guarantisez Carlun!
Ceste bataille seit ... en sun num!' (3275-8)
The French say: 'You will die soon, scoundrels!
May there be terrible confusion among you this day!
God of ours, protect Charles!
May this battle be … in his name!'[21]

(26) *Dist Baligant: 'La meie gent averse,*
Car chevalchez pur la bataille quere!' (3295-6)
Baligant said, 'My heathen people,
ride now and seek the battle!'

(27) *Tut premereins s'escriet Baligant:*
'Li mien baron, nurrit vos ai lung tens.
Veez mun filz, Carlun vait querant,
A ses armes tanz barons calunjant.
Meillor vassal de lui ja ne demant.
Succurez le a voz espiez trenchant!' (3373-8)
Baligant straight away cries:
'My barons, I've supported you for a long time.
You see my son, seeking out Charles,
Challenging so many barons with his arms.
I do not seek a better subject than him.
Help him with your piercing lances!'

What is most striking about these examples is that they all contain some kind of possessive element. The phenomenon is not limited just to the *Roland* but can be found in other texts of the old French period:

(28) *Li chevalier Mahom, aïe!* (Jean Bodel, *Jeu de S. Nicolas* 452)
Knights of the Prophet, help!

(29) *Que pensez vos, dist il, le filz Charlon?*[22] (*Aliscans* 3425)
What do you think, he said, son of Charles?

---

[20] The Saracens are held to have three gods: Bédier translates: '*Vous, nos dieux, vengez-nous de Charles!*'

[21] The plural form here is problematic and should be explained as influenced by (24); Bédier translates: '*Vous, notre Dieu, défendez Charles!*'

[22] This line is problematic: I quote Régnier's text here, but note that both Wienbeck (l. 3044) and Holtus (l. 3256) adopt readings with the definite article in address.

3.3. From the 13th Century to the Present

A pattern not found in earlier French, we begin to find the address use of the definite article in combination with adjectives but without nouns starting from the 13th century. Meyer-Lübke (1890-1906: iii.§176) traces this pattern back to examples such as the following from the end of the 15th century:

(30) *ne plorés plus, la belle,*
car il est trespassé (*Chansons du XVe siècle* 126.13)
cry no longer, pretty one,
for he has died

There appears, however, to be some earlier evidence, from the 13th century:

(31) *la bele, des nonpers la flors,*
ne faites vostre pris mentir (*Chansons du tresorier de Lille* 2.22)
fair maid, the flower of those without equal,
don't make your price deceive

From the mid-15th century we find examples of nouns with the definite article but no possessive used in address, a pattern which appears frequently in literature thereafter:[23]

(32) *Dieu gard, les marchans …* (*Mistère de viel testament* iii.17689)
God preserve, merchants

(33) *Or sa, que dictes vous la belle?*
La chambre est-elle despechée? (*Mistère de viel testament* ii.13892)
Now, what are you saying, fair one?
Is the room cleared?

The 16th century sees the earliest examples of the pattern *monsieur le X* in referential (i.e. non-address) use: the *TLF* (s.v. *monsieur*) cites the following, dated to around 1515:

(34) *monsieur le Prevost* (*Vie Monseigneur St Louis* ii.205)
Mr. Provost

It seems reasonable to suppose that the address usage should be dated to around this time also.

---

[23] It is well attested in, for example, Molière:

Enfin, le beau mignon, vos bons déportements
troubleront les vieux jours d'un père à tous moments. (*Dépit amoureux* III.VI, 907-8)
In the end, young man, your excesses
will disrupt a father's days all the time.

Holà, ho, l'homme! ho, mon compère! ho, l'ami! un petit mot, s'il vous plaît. (*Don Juan* III.I)
What ho! Good chap! Hey, my fellow! Hey, friend! A brief word, please!

Et vous avez, la belle, une chaise roulante, … (*Amphitryon* Prol., 20)
And, fair one, you have a chariot on wheels …

The origins of *monsieur* as a form are, in my view, significant: Foulet (1950a, b, 1951a, b, c) provides a comprehensive study of the development and use of the forms *sire* and *messire* (→ *monsieur*) both in referential and address use; the address use of *messire* with a following proper name or (later) absolutely, without any following nominal element, can be traced back into the old French period, but (34) is the earliest instance I have found of the pattern involving the definite article (though not in address).[24] Similar points might be made concerning *madame* (and *mademoiselle*), although for these the evidence is rather less substantial.[25]

I turn finally to the present day, since I have not found evidence of further significant developments in the patterns after the early modern period. We have already looked at some present day evidence (§1), but at this point I think it useful to classify the uses into the following main patterns:[26]

- forms which could (though they are not) be preceded with *monsieur* or *madame* (e.g. *l'abbé*),
- 'substantivised' adjectives (e.g. *la belle*),
- forms which could be preceded by a first-person possessive instead of the definite article (e.g. *l'ami*), and
- collective and plural forms (e.g. *la classe*, *les gars*).

Further examples, which can all be straightforwardly fitted into these groups, are cited by Grevisse & Goosse (1993: 877).

4. A Problematic Analysis

Svennung (1958: 301-6) summarises the various attempts to explain the address use of the French definite article, and there have, to my knowledge, been no significant studies since his work.[27] None of the recent general literature on the origins of the Romance definite articles makes any reference to this modern use or considers it to need explanation. In some instances this may be because scholars have concentrated on the early stages of the article and believed the address use(s) to arise relatively late (i.e. after the individual

---

[24] *Sire*, without the (later fused) 1sg possessive, is found earlier than *messire*, and earlier still we find *dan(s)* (< *dominus*) which *sire* seems to have supplanted: see Foulet *op.cit.* for detailed textual evidence; Stowell (1908: 191-223) also documents the development of the forms *sire* and *messire* in address.

[25] An example of the type *Madame la X*, parallel to (34) in not being in address, is found in the *Pèlerinage de Charlemagne* (mid-12th century):

> *Ma dame la reine dist folie et tort.* (813)
> My lady queen spoke foolishly and mistakenly.

See Stowell (1908: 123-5, 133); note also Lagorgette (2004).

[26] These are, in my view, intersecting categories and not mutually exclusive.

[27] The major previous accounts are the following: Tobler (1899), Spitzer (1927), Meyer-Lübke (1890-1906: iii.§176), Haas (1909: §178), Lerch (1925-34: iii.70-8), Diez (1874-6: iii.19-20).

Romance varieties diverged, given that they appear most obviously in French and Romanian and have rather different characteristics in each), but even in works concerned with the later development of the article within individual varieties there is little if any comment.

One possible reason for this is that it is tacitly assumed that the French usage exemplified in §1 above simply fits into the observed general tendency for expansion in the use of the definite article in the language: the modern use is thus explicable in terms of the modern (wide) distribution of the definite article outside address contexts. In old French the article corresponded primarily to semantic/pragmatic definiteness (i.e. it was used only anaphorically and thus never with abstract or generic nouns) whereas by the 17th century, through a process of semantic weakening, the definite article came to be used even with abstract and generic nouns; the apparent status in the 20th century of the definite article as a default (used when no other determiner is appropriate) might lead one to argue that it has become a noun marker (cf. §2 above). Accordingly, the definite article in address in modern French could simply be a further example of this default status, being used precisely when no other determiner is appropriate.

In favour of this view one might reasonably claim that the use of the French definite article has developed 'further' than its correlates in other Romance varieties and that this is why this address phenomenon is limited to French: the definite article does not have the right meaning/status in the other varieties. (A separate alternative explanation for Romanian is then, of course, required, but since the Romanian definite article is in morphosyntactically rather different from the French, perhaps independent explanation is not undesirable.)

There are, however, two serious difficulties. The first is the age of the construction in French: we have seen examples which demonstrate that the definite article was being used in address long before a time for which it is justifiable to speak of the 'default' status of the French definite article;[28] this is especially problematic given that even the present-day status of the French definite article as a default is hotly debated. While there is no doubt that its use is no longer confined to NPs that are semantically definite, and its use for generics, as in, e.g., *j'aime le poisson* ('I like fish'), is evidence enough that the term '*definite* article' is now a misnomer, many would take issue with the noun-marker view.

The second problem is that even if we accept for the sake of argument the default status of the modern French definite article, it is still not clear this would necessarily explain the data: many instances of address usage would still remain to be explained,

[28] Nyrop (1899-1930: v.173) remarks that '*l'ancien usage n'était pas constant; il règnait une très grande liberté dans l'emploi de l'article défini*' ('usage was not constant in old French; there existed a very great freedom in the use of the definite article'). Some might try to claim that the earlier address use (before the article became a default) is an example of such *liberté*: however, since I intend to show that the usage was conditioned and thus not merely free variation, I see no reason to adopt such a line of argument, which neither describes nor explains the situation at the time nor how it arose in the first place.

although it would instead be (the frequent) addresses without the article (or any other determiner) which would be at issue.[29]

Perhaps we could salvage this view were we to accept that the present situation was one of transition to default status for the definite article (a more reasonable standpoint): a state of variation might be expected during such transition, in which address may or may not involve the article; address would then be the last bastion of bare NPs still attempting to hold out against the inexorable spread of the definite article (or, better, a prohibition on bare NPs), i.e. the final part of a diffuse change.[30] However, appealing though this proposal may be, the historical evidence in its support is far too weak: the possibility of the article in address can be traced back to examples at a time when the definite article (in all other contexts) was apparently confined to semantically definite NPs. There is, so far as one can tell, no evidence that its use in address has undergone a diffuse transition in precisely the same way that abstract and generic NPs can be shown to have changed from having no article through variation (with and without it) to having an obligatory article; however, I will outline below (§6) my view of the transitions for which there is evidence and which may have prompted some to adopt the default value as an explanation for the definite article in address.

5. Restrictive vs. Non-restrictive Modification

How then are we to explain the modern French pattern? It seems to me to be fundamental to explain the examples in old French outlined above (§2.1). To do this I draw on a number of different threads of analysis: there is, despite their now dated terminology, much of value in the earlier accounts, and I gladly acknowledge that I have retained a good deal of their insights. Still, I think it is fair to say that my view nonetheless differs in various ways (both in terminology and analytical detail) from each of them, though I believe they all were trying in their way to describe the distinction that I draw.

The distinction in question is in fact a familiar one, namely that between restrictive and non-restrictive modification. We are most familiar with this in terms of types of relative clauses:

(35a) The children, <u>who are ten years old</u>, are enjoying the party.

(35b) The children <u>who are ten years old</u> are enjoying the party..

[29] Grevisse & Goosse (1993: 877): '*L'article est absent d'ordinaire devant le nom en apostrophe.*' ('The [definite] article is normally absent in front of a noun in address.')

[30] Greenberg (1978: 58) speaks of languages which 'have the unarticulated form for the vocative of common nouns' being 'strictly speaking, … still in the stage of the non-generic article [i.e. stage II], albeit at an advanced stage.' This formulation seems to allow for a period of variation during the transition from one stage to the next and also to imply, perhaps, that address forms might be resistant to such a development; the explanation for such apparent resistance lies beyond the scope of this paper, since I believe French not yet to be at a stage where it is having a significant or observable effect. In connection with this latter point, I note that Lyons (1999: 153) is, given his view that that definiteness is to be identified with the grammatical category of person, surprisingly non-committal on the interaction between the semantics of definiteness and address (stating that 'in general, vocatives are not consistently definite or indefinite'): despite the scale of his work, much research on this general issue remains to be done.

In (35a) the underlined phrase is non-restrictive and merely describes the 'children'; it tells us more about them, something which of course we may or may not already know, but it is said of all the children salient in the discourse context. By contrast, in (35b) the underlined phrase is restrictive and picks out from a set of salient children those aged ten years; this construction tells us nothing more about the children in question than we are supposed to know already, for it relies on (logically) prior knowledge in limiting the ultimate set of referents to a subset of the set referred to by the antecedent, *the children*, on its own.

The same distinction can be applied to the use of many different types of modifier including adjectives and indeed genitives expressing possessors (cf. Truswell 2004). For example, parallel to (35) we could consider the following to be ambiguous between the two readings:

(36) The ten-year-old children are enjoying the party.

Albeit depending (for some speakers) on the placement of stress, we can get both restrictive (e.g. with stress on the underlined phrase) and non-restrictive readings (no contrastive stress).[31]

Reviewing our examples in old French, I believe that the fact (highlighted by Svennung 1958: 297, Diez 1874-76: iii.19-20) that the phrases include a possessive is significant, not because there is a possessive but because there is *something*, i.e. the possessive is a modifier. Moreover, in my view, the modifiers in these phrases are crucially not non-restrictive but restrictive: it is the restrictive modifier within the phrase that seems to trigger the presence of the article.[32]

Let us consider the examples in detail. In (24) and (25) *nostre* is used to indicate that the pagans and French are respectively crying to their (own) god(s) rather than to god in general.[33] In (27) the restrictive meaning of *mien* is evident from the overall speech which

[31] Martin Maiden points out to me that the non-restrictive usage is less common and perhaps limited to or more typical of certain registers (e.g. the compressed style of newspaper journalism) rather than everyday language. This need not undermine the general principle that modifiers can alternate (with stress) or be ambiguous (in writing) in this way.

[32] While there is undoubtedly a phonological link between the so-called stressed ('strong') personal possessive adjectives and accompanying determiners, such that the presence of one generally correlates with the presence of the other, I do not share the view that choosing a stressed form necessarily triggers the presence of the article simply because they *have* to appear together (*pace* Svennung 1958: 297). Rather it is in my view the choice of the stressed form since it can and does have the correct (i.e. restrictive) 'meaning' which triggers the use of the article. Its restrictive meaning may perhaps relate to the connection between stress and contrastive elements: restrictive elements are generally taken to be notionally if not actually contrastive and contrastive elements are likely to be phonologically prominent.

Note that for the sake of clarity I illustrate the argument in this and subsequent sections with reference to the 1sg possessive. Thus by *mon X* and *le mien X* I refer to these structural patterns or types and they encompass feminine examples as well as masculine: they also encompass the 1pl possessives, although for the latter there are two major problems (the lack of evidence that stems from their infrequent use and the lack of distinction in form between strong and weak forms that arises from not meeting the conditions for diphthongisation), since in my view they develop in parallel.

[33] There is perhaps an issue here given that each side would presumably consider recognising the existence of other (or others') gods as heresy — but grammar need not take a theological risk here: 'our' here also implies 'genuine' of its referent and thus contrasts implicitly with the others' 'so-called god(s)'.

might be paraphrased '(you are barons, but of all the people whose barons you might be, in particular you are) *my* barons (and) *I* have supported *you* for a long time — (now I want something in return)'. In (28) the designation *Mahom* picks out the knights who are to help inasmuch as it indicates why they should help; it's not because they are knights (which is taken for granted) but because they are knights *of the prophet*. The restrictive force of (29) is more difficult to interpret from the context: I do not wish to argue that possessive phrases are necessarily restrictive, but those where the possessor is expressed by a proper noun seem to me to be likely to require restrictive interpretation.[34] The fact that the referent is *someone's* son is obvious, but the modifier restricts (i.e. identifies) the reference: in support of this I would claim that the force is indeed (weakly, at the very least) contrastive ('of Charles' ~ all the other people of whom he might have been the son): 'You're *Charles'* son! That's why we're asking you.'[35] One might make a similar kind of claim for (26) where Baligant is urging on people to do something for him, because they are 'his people'.

In order for this analysis to be convincing and to prove that what we have here is a robust generalisation, we should contrast some examples of address which contain modifiers and see whether those modifiers are non-restrictive:

(37) *e! Deus, dist il, bels reis qui tut guvernes,*
se tei ploüst, ici ne volisse estra. (*Vie de S. Alexis* 201-2)
Ah! God, he said, good king who rule all,
if it had pleased you, I would not have wanted to be here.

(38) *e! reis celeste, tu nus i fai venir!* (*Vie de S. Alexis* 335)
Ah! King in heaven, you make us come there!

(39) *mercit, mercit, mercit, saintismes hom!* (*Vie de S. Alexis* 359)
Thanks, thanks, thanks, most holy man!

(40) *tere de France, mult estes dulz païs* (*Chanson de Roland* 1861)
Land of France, you are a very sweet land.

(41) *E! France dulce, cun hoi remendras guaste*
de bons vassals, cunfundue e chaiete! (*Chanson de Roland* 1985-6)
Ah! Sweet France, how shall you remain today emptied
of good vassals, humiliated and fallen!

[34] Personal possessives ('my, your, his' etc.) are quite clearly able to be used non-restrictively, as we shall see, both within and outside address contexts, although in old French this tended to correspond to the distinction between so-called 'strong' and 'weak' forms in those persons where such a distinction was morphophonlogically marked; we would expect full phrase possessives (such as those in (28) & (29)) to allow the same semantic distinction even if the default interpretation might be different. It occurs to me that an example of non-restrictive interpretation for proper name possessives would be the formulae 'son of Adam' and 'daughter of Eve' found in C.S. Lewis' *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe* and his other Narnia books; interestingly, these phrases are used both referentially and as forms of address.

[35] Given that parenthood is a typical example of inalienable 'possession', there is also an implicit contrast here with the very likely default interpretation for such items (i.e. the speaker's own son).

(42) *e! malvais deus, por quei nus fais tel hunte?* (*Chanson de Roland* 2582)
Ah! Ill god, why do you do us such shame?

(43) *reis orguillos, nen est fins que t'en alges!* (*Chanson de Roland* 2978)
Proud king, you will not get away with leaving!

(44) *barons franceis, as chevals e as armes!* (*Chanson de Roland* 2986)
French barons, to your horses and your arms!

(45) *Mahom te saut et beneïe,*
riches amiraus d'Orkenie,
par le roy, qui secours te mande! (*Jeu de S. Nicolas* 321-4)
Mahommed save and bless you,
rich Emir of Orkenie
by the king, who seeks your aid!

In almost all of these examples it seems to me that the modifiers are very clearly non-restrictive: in (42), (43) and (44) the adjectives *malvais*, *orguillos* and *franceis* are descriptive and do not serve to pick out referents from among all the gods, kings or barons of the world — this is, of course, not to say that these words could never do this, merely that they are not doing so in these examples. (38) is similar in that 'heavenly king' is simply intended to mean 'king in heaven' as opposed to 'king in heaven rather than king on earth', and indeed in (37) there is a longer descriptive apposition to *Deus* (including a relative clause with a 2sg verb) which could in no way be taken to be intended to pick out one divine referent from among many. (39) contains a superlative *saintismes*; superlatives could be argued to be necessarily restrictive (i.e. 'most X' implies a contrast with referents that are 'a little X' or 'rather X'). but this is not an instance of a so-called 'relative' superlative but is an absolute superlative ('very X') intended by the speaker to describe its referent as having a lot of holiness, a compliment that corresponds to the degree of emotion shown in the repeated *mercit*. The least obviously non-restrictive examples (given the observations about modifiers containing proper nouns) are (40) and (45). For (40) it is sufficient, I believe, to note that the context is Roland's lament for the fallen and France is already highly salient: *de France* does not serve to pick out France as opposed to other lands, and the sense is more 'French soil'. For (45) there appears to be a serious challenge to my view because this speech occurs as one of a series in which a number of emirs are addressed by phrases including their territorial designation, and so modifiers like *d'Orkenie* in this speech look very much as though they are restricting the reference (since they implicitly contrast with the designations of the other emirs). However, the view normally taken of the scene in question is that Auberons is addressing each emir at his own court and thus acting a journey between each short dialogue;[36] if this is so, then the non-restrictive interpretation is very much available since Auberons is in/at *Orkenie* and *Orkenie* presumably has only the one *amiraus*.

[36] Warne (1951: 74, note on l. 320).

I am not the first to observe a connection between the definite article and restrictive modification with respect to personal possessives (cf. Lyons 1986, Posner 1988) but I believe I am the first to identify its significance in this context: Posner (1988: 392) notes that the definite article is preferred in apostrophe in old French when there is a possessive in the phrase but she makes no further remark and indeed some of her putative examples are doubtfully addresses. My observation is, however, not limited to possessives and is a general claim about the distribution of the definite article in address in old French.

We should of course now reconsider the Latin examples looked at earlier: much of what I have claimed for old French could be said to be true of the Latin examples too. It is noticeable that they all also have some modifier in the phrase (with the exception of (22) and (23) with their own explanation). The presence and status of this modifier seem to me to be the justification for the presence of *ille* in these phrases, and in my view it is through reanalysis of examples of this kind of pattern that *ille* and its reflexes came to be possible in address.[37]

6. Later Developments

I now need to return to the points made earlier (§2 & §4) about the development in the use of the definite article outside address contexts. The later developments of the article within address usage in my view *do* correspond to the general spread of the definite article through its semantic weakening but not perhaps in the way we might have expected: the reason it is used in address in modern French is not that the article is now effectively obligatory in the absence of any alternative. Rather, the correspondence is that, through the same weakening, the article comes to be (available to be) used in address with phrases not necessarily (or, in anachronistic terms, no longer) containing a restrictive modifier.

My analysis is in three parts, concerned with three aspects of what I take to be a single development. First, I consider the status of *adjectives* when used without nouns in this construction. Second, I claim that, for *nouns*, the definite-article-in-address construction supplanted an earlier construction which contained not only the article but also a possessive adjective with restrictive interpretation; I explain how the restrictive force and the possessive form both came to be lost, leaving this source for the modern

[37] Why these can be reanalysed in this way, if there is a general and inherent semantic clash of some kind between address and demonstratives/articles (or perhaps determiners in general), remains a serious issue but it may perhaps be put down to weakening in the meanings of the latter towards evaluative descriptive meanings, e.g. for *ille* ‘known, famous’ (cf. fnn. 41 and 49 below). Nonetheless, for the explanation of the subsequent developments after these are analysed as address forms, it seems to me that we do require at least some of the determiner force of the article: that may require us to assume a degree of ‘contamination’ from its non-address uses. However, while Lyons' (1999: 153) observation that ‘in general, vocatives are not consistently definite or indefinite’ may be descriptively accurate in general (depending on the definition of ‘definite’), it should not be taken to imply the existence of an unconditioned free-for-all, whether diachronic or synchronic, within individual varieties that obviates the need for its own explanation and can be taken to explain any possible pattern in the data: both the possibility or existence of a semantic clash and any contamination require much further research and I present them here as hypotheses to illustrate the kind of approach I think needs to be taken in attempting to explain the intra- and cross-linguistic data on definiteness and the address context (cf. also fn. 30 above).

construction with the form and meaning it has today. Third, I consider the semantic status of *phrases* headed by the article in construction with some specific items containing possessives, namely *monsieur* and *madame*, and argue that some modern examples are the result of abbreviation of such phrases.

6.1. Substantivisation

The first stage of this development is the use of the article with phrases containing only the restricting 'modifier' and no head that is modified, i.e. 'substantivised' adjectives. Examples such as (30) & (31) are evidence for this: adjectives, which could with a noun have been either restrictive or non-restrictive (because the noun could provide the reference), on their own have to be taken to be semantically restrictive and indeed (still) require the definite article to do so.[38]

6.2. First-person Possessives

Alongside this development, we need to observe the general replacement of possessives of the form *le mien X* (i.e. involving the strong personal possessives) with *mon X* outside address contexts even when the possessive is restrictive: although the strong (restrictive) possessive persists in such attributive use for some centuries, it becomes increasingly rare and obsolete. In passing, we might note that its use in predicative contexts (*c'est le mien* 'it's mine, my one') is retained perhaps as we might expect on semantic as well as phonological grounds, for in that situation the usage is contrastive ('not yours') and thus restrictive. A thorough and adequate *explanation* for the general loss of *le mien X* in favour of *mon X* has in my view not yet been found: it appears to come from the general weakening of the article's force in phrases not including a possessive and thus the possibility of interpreting it as weakened in *le mien X*; this weakening (corresponding to increased frequency of use) was such that the article no longer necessarily signalled that a modifier within a phrase was to be interpreted restrictively. Thus the meaning of *le mien X* drifted or weakened towards non-restrictive 'my'. This meaning, however, had a realisation already in existence (*mon X*) which was already common and indeed perhaps always had been more common than contrastive *le mien X* because it expressed a relation more often needed in discourse: *mon X* then superseded the latter altogether.[39]

---

[38] Posner (1988) seems to argue that *le* in configurations of this type in modern French remains (or is) pronominal and is qualified (restrictively) by the accompanying adjective, at least in non-address contexts. Her view may or may not be right, but in any case does not affect my argument since we both view the adjective as a defining or restricting element in a phrase of this type.

[39] Descriptively, at least, this whole change has been compared (Posner 1997: 335-42) with structural realignment elsewhere in the French determiner system between old and modern French, whereby forms which had once expressed different semantic values (e.g. degrees of proximity, *cist* 'this' vs. *cil* 'that') came to represent different categories (determiner vs. pronoun). For personal possessives, to regard *mien* and the like as pronominal (vs. *mon* as the determiner) represents something of a change of view from Posner (1988), but one should not lay too much stress on the theoretical significance of these superficially parallel developments, which may but need not share an explanation.

In address contexts we may suppose a similar development to have occurred. However, we must take account of the fact that in address contexts the non-restrictive (weak) possessive was in old French rare to the point of virtual non-existence. Such a distribution is very surprising given the cross-linguistic availability and frequency of such examples (e.g. in English *my friends*, German *meine Freunde*, Italian *amici miei*) and indeed the fact that it had been common in Latin (*mi amici*, *mi Attice*) and is common in modern French (*mes amis*).[40] There is clearly no reason to assume that the function did not exist and was not wanted by speakers: in fact, it seems to have been realised with other lexical items, in particular *bel*, *ch(i)er* and *doux* (cf. Stowell 1908, Love 1985):

(46) *E! kiers amis, de ta tendre char bele …* (*Vie de S. Alexis* 476)
O dear friend, of your delicate fair flesh …

(47) *tenez, bel sire, dist Rollant a sun uncle,*
de trestuz reis vos present les curunes. (*Chanson de Roland* 387-8)
Take it, good sire, said Roland to his uncle,
of all the kings I present you the crowns.

This synchronic and diachronic gap in usage has, like so many aspects of address, not been previously discussed at length nor indeed noticed at all; even Foulet (1950-1) tracing the development in which *messire* (→ *monsieur*) replaced *sire* hesitates to say anything of the reasons for the near total absence of weak possessives as part of such address phrases earlier. All the more remarkable is the fact that the function clearly did exist and had, in a way chronologically ordered, realisations in the forms *bel*, *ch(i)er* and *doux*. Although none of these items etymologically expresses possession, we should remember that the speaker meaning of non-restrictive possessives in address is cross-linguistically rarely that of possession (since they do not, by definition, contrast one possessor with another) even though that may be their (etymologically) literal meaning; rather, such non-restrictive possessives are used very often to express affection, and they certainly indicate a speaker's attitude towards the addressee.[41] *Bel*, *ch(i)er* and *doux* have meanings that can do precisely this, namely indicate a speaker's (complimentary and thereby affectionate) attitude, and

[40] The Latin situation is typologically complex: the loss of inherited voc. *meus* in favour of *mi* (supposed to be a dat. of the corresponding pronoun *ego*) may perhaps be viewed as some kind of parallel, for we cannot be certain there was no gap between its loss and the arrival of the new form. If so, this may be a cyclic development prompted by some inherent instability in the status of these items which are possessive in form but in address are often only very weakly possesive in meaning. On the etymology and history of these items, see Dickey (2002: 214-24; 2003).

[41] It is for this reason that such possessives can accompany proper names in address, which would, of course, not generally admit of restrictive modification in their prototypical 'meaning': thus, for example, in Latin we find *mi Attice*, while in English we have the type 'my dear Atticus' where 'dear' is present perhaps to ensure that 'my' is interpreted non-restrictively and thus avoid any potential perceived semantic clash between its restrictive meaning and the following proper name that might otherwise occur. There are, however, certainly varieties of English where the 1pl possessive adjective can be used with precisely the force I suggest without needing any intervening adjective, for example 'our Charlie': such usage is possible also in non-address contexts and may in some way have been carried over from them, but the possessive must nonetheless be explicable on *semantic* grounds, for not all phrases used in non-address contexts (e.g. English nominal phrases introduced by definite articles) can be carried over and used unmodified in address.

they seem to have done so in turn, the one replacing the or being added to the other(s) as bleaching led to a need for reinforcement (Stowell 1908, Love 1985). It may well be the case that such bleaching was what had led to the near total demise of the non-restrictive use of the first-person possessive in address between Latin and old French, but I have not discovered any illuminating evidence to substantiate such a claim.

The (re-)entry of the weak possessive into address usage is a crucial stage for our investigation of the definite article in address: it seems to correspond chronologically to the point at which, outside address use, the construction involving the strong possessive could sometimes be replaced with the weak possessive construction, possibly because the former had gradually become less and less restrictive and a grey area of near overlap came to exist with some of the functions for which the non-restrictive weak possessive construction had been used. At this point and as a result of this overlap the latter, which was the pattern that occurred more frequently anyway, began to be considered as acceptable *anywhere* in place of the strong possessive construction.

Importantly, because the weak form was now in general increasingly being used to carry out the functions which had previously employed the strong form and the latter had previously had greater semantic force, the weak form enters into address then not as the attitudinal marker we might have expected but as a successor to or replacement for the *le mien X* construction we have already documented in address. Once, however, it starts to be used in address, the fact that it *can* also have a non-restrictive meaning (unlike its predecessor *le mien X*, which despite attenuation elsewhere, seems to have retained its strong restrictive meaning in address) means that it becomes available for that use also. The existence of *bel* etc. may perhaps have had a limited blocking effect to begin with, but it seems clear that relatively quickly the possessive supplants these uses (which we have seen already to have undergone bleaching and reinforcement cycles).[42]

In support of this analysis, we should note that the fact that it could also be used for the restrictive use explains the well-documented fact that *messire* and *madame* containing the weak possessive are initially used only of and to those of whom it was literally true (Stowell 1908: 123-5). To begin with, such expression is of possession and *thereby* (because one is mentioning it at all) attitude, but before long, such use came to be reanalysed as attitude and *thus* possession: the attitude of deference expressed could then be extended to others of whom the possession relation would not exist but can be metaphorically employed. It is this which ultimately ensures the non-restrictive interpretation of the possessives in *messire* and *madame* etc. so that they fit alongside the *mon ami* type.

[42] Examples such as (30), (31) and (33), however, may point to limited survival of *bel(le)* with this force in address: near impossible to render directly into English (e.g. 'don't weep, ?*mine*, for …'), they seem to be examples where the speaker wishes to use a non-restrictive quasi-possessive (as we might describe this item) on its own, i.e. with no head for it modify. Without the head to provide the reference, the quasi-possessive necessarily becomes restrictive and requires the article, but this solution is preferred to using the true possessive which I imagine would have been felt to be too strongly possessive in the same construction (the one requiring the article).

So much for possessives, but how does the modern definite article usage relate to these historically?[43] The answer to this lies in the existence of the new *mon ami* type of address when used in lieu of the earlier *le mien ami*; it is reasonable to think that, for at least some non-restrictive uses, the new type seemed too closely associated with its alternative emphatic/restrictive meaning, and that thus a hypercorrect non-restrictive form could develop. The options for such a form are, it seems, two: one is to use a bare phrase (i.e. *ami*) if the attitudinal modification is evaluated as not really sufficiently important to need to be retained — this bare phrase option remains to this day —, or alternatively one could use what appears to be a derivative of the old *le mien ami* form including the article *le* but without the possessive *mien*, i.e. the definite article in address without a modifier.

In support of this view, we should recall that, as a general development outside address contexts, the pattern definite article + strong possessive + noun gradually became unacceptable: if one wanted to express possession, the former weak possessive form was the developing successor; where the possession relationship was less significant (especially so in the case of inalienable possession where its expression might be felt to be tautologous), the pre-existing pattern of definite article + noun (which originally had nothing to do with possession) could appear to be a suitable alternative and appear to be derived from (the increasingly unavailable) *le mien X* type.[44] This would, in my view, also be likely in the case of the (by now occasional) use of *le mien X* for non-restrictive possession in address resulting from the overlap between *le mien X* and *mon X* already considered above, since we have seen that there it is the attitude and not the possession which is the intended force, something which the new construction could convey simply by virtue of being employed.

6.3. Apposition Revisited

We saw, in considering the Latin evidence, that the very earliest origins of the definite article construction lie in the possible reanalysis of structurally ambiguous phrases from exclamation or apposition to address. Address has very often been mistaken for apposition and *vice versa* in linguists' attempts to explain the general characteristics of address grammar. However, the origin of one of the types of address involving the definite article in modern French can be convincingly traced to a pattern involving restrictive apposition, namely the development from *monsieur l'abbé* to *l'abbé*:[45] this is, as we have seen,

---

[43] It is perhaps worth stressing that for present purposes it is only the fact that there *was* replacement of *le mien X* with *mon X* that is crucial to my explanation of how the definite article came to be used in address: the processes leading to and during the replacement, however, do merit further attention in their own right, and I believe their apparent effect on the (re-)introduction of the *mon X* formula into address should be taken seriously.

[44] Cf. Brunot (1899: 169): '*La langue moderne a une tendance de plus en plus marquée à remplacer par l'article les pronoms possessifs, lorsque le rapport de possession se trouve déjà suffisamment marqué par le sens général de la phrase.*' ('The modern language has an increasingly marked tendency to replace possessive pronouns with the article, when the relation of possession is already felt to be sufficiently marked by the general meaning of the phrase.')

[45] Since apposition is often taken to be exclusively non-restrictive, I should point out that it may in fact be either restrictive or non-restrictive: 'Jones the butcher' vs. 'Jones, the butcher' respectively.

relatively late (compared with the other developments considered) and indeed represents exactly what we might expect to be *usage familier* (cf. §1 above).

Monsieur le X did not arise itself until many people could be addressed by a single speaker as his/her lord (i.e. there had been significant pragmatic weakening), and thus the speaker needed to restrict the meaning of *monsieur*: the use of the article again indicates that part of the succeeding phrase is to be interpreted as restrictive. This is the situation for non-address use, and later this whole *monsieur le X* becomes fixed as an appellation.[46] It then becomes used as a form of address even to the person (where the restriction seems unnecessary as he would not usually need to pick out the referent). Naturally, once this is fixed as a locution, familiarity and consequent frequency of use can lead to its abbreviation. The same analysis is equally applicable to feminine forms, in which *madame* is, of course, the parallel to *monsieur*.

6.4. Summary

In §3.3 above, I identified four types of example of definite article use in address in modern French. The origins of each have now been examined. Those which could be preceded by *monsieur* or *madame* are examples of abbreviation of the full form resulting from the restrictive apposition of a phrase headed by the article (§6.3). Substantivised modifiers can be treated as restrictive and thus as requiring the article (§6.1). Those where a first-person possessive could be appropriate instead of the article can be treated as instances where the article construction replaced the lexical possessive (§6.2).

The final class I suggested was that of collective and plural forms: in my view the explanation for these combines aspects of all three of the other groups and confirms the non-mutually-exclusive nature of the groups. This type is arguably the most frequently occurring in everyday use, and the historical basis for it is the type involving replacement of the lexical possessive (§6.2), this being more expected for collectives and plurals: addressing a group of people is more likely to be less personal and thus any 'possession' expressed is less likely to be restrictive, emphatic or indeed literally applicable. However, since speakers are of course unaware of the history of the locution, once established as a construction with the relevant meaning (i.e. a way of addressing a group), the analogical extension to plurals or collectives in general even where a first-person possessive might never have been employed is perfectly understandable. The reinforcing influence of the existence of the abbreviated and substantivised types can be seen as facilitating the necessary reanalysis because their existence obscured the existence of an alternation or connection between this type and those involving first-person possessives.

---

[46] Cf. Diez (1874-6: iii.20) '*Lorsqu'en français l'article se trouve placé entre deux titres, comme dans Monsieur le comte, on a là une espèce de composé et l'article ne disparaît pas au vocatif.*' ('When in French the article is found between two titles, as in *Monsieur le comte*, we are dealing with a compound type and the article is not lost in the vocative.') It is interesting to observe the way that the address form is here assumed to be logically posterior to the referential form: *if* the relation is generally so, we might wonder whether the relationship with the base form is purely inflectional (especially in languages, like Latin, that have a morphologically distinct form) or is morphosemantically derivational.

7. The Definite Article in Address in Other Languages

The investigation so far has concentrated on tracing the development of a phenomenon through from the Latin evidence to the present day, but modern French is just one Romance variety among many; to set our findings in context we need briefly to look elsewhere both within and outside the Romance-speaking world. In particular, we need to consider why it should be that French differs in this respect from its sister languages if, as I have claimed, the roots of the pattern are old enough for it to have been possible for it to be inherited by other varieties.

7.1. Italian

In modern standard Italian the article is not admitted in address use. However, there are some examples of the demonstrative *quello* in address (Renzi et al. 2001: ii.386-7):

(48) *Buongiorno, (*i) ragazzi!*
Hello, (*the) children!

(49) *Ditemi, quel giovine, …* (Goldoni, *Le femmine puntigliose* 1750)
Tell me, young man, …

This is notable because, of course, *quello* shares part of its etymological source with the French (and Italian) definite article.[47] It seems to be in the light of this fact that some have taken the use of the French definite article in address to lie among its demonstrative uses (as also, less controversially, in phrases such as *de la sorte* etc.).[48] In this paper, however, we have seen the evidence for the degree to which the French usage can be considered demonstrative through its history: in my view, it is only in the earliest (i.e. Latin) examples that we see a true demonstrative value and even in those examples one might observe the extent to which *ille* means 'that famous, that one with which you are familiar' rather than 'that over there, yon'.[49]

To make such a connection is, then, not without its problems. Furthermore, the meaning of the modern French definite article is rather different from that of this Italian demonstrative in other contexts. One might perhaps allow for this by hypothesising that it corresponds to a difference between so-called 'address' and 'referential' meanings of nominal phrases;[50] if so, however, it would hardly be necessary to claim that either the French or the Italian addres usage is 'demonstrative' (i.e. deictically 'pointing/picking out' in the real world) at all. The reason for doing so seems to be only the genetic relationship

[47] For example, Diez (1874-6: iii.19-20), Meyer-Lübke (1890-1906: iii.§176), Tobler (1899: 128), Spitzer (1927) and Svennung (1958: 293-5).

[48] For instance, Nyrop (1899-1930: v.175), Tobler (1899: 127) and Grevisse (1980: 362).

[49] Cf. Svennung (1958: 287-8). In fact, it is from the 'famous, familiar' meaning that the use to indicate a phrase as containing a restrictive modifier (which relies on prior knowledge) arguably derives.

[50] It is widely accepted that items used in address may have different 'meanings' from their normal lexical meaning when used referentially (i.e. within a sentence).

between the two items going back to their common demonstrative origin in Latin *ille*, and that is by no means sufficient.

The parallel that I prefer to hypothesise instead is slightly different: it is between the development of Latin *ille* into the French definite article (which can be used in address) and that of Italian *quello* into a form that can be used in address; in other words, these are at most independent but similar innovations shown by two original demonstratives that happen to be genetically related and which acquire an address use perhaps in a similar way, though not at the same time nor as a direct result of their genetic link. Evidence (albeit negative) in support of separating these phenomena comes from the relatively late date at which the Italian pattern seems to have appeared.[51]

Renzi et al. (2001: ii.386) also point out affective phrases used in address in Italian (specifically, in spoken Florentine and its literary derivatives) of the type *il mio* + noun (optionally reinforced with an adjective such as *caro* or *povero*) as an exception to the general exclusion of the article from address:

(50) *che dite mai, <u>la mia povera giovine</u>?* (Manzoni, *I promessi sposi*)
Whatever are you saying, my poor young woman?

The history of this pattern in Italian remains to be investigated thoroughly, but it may indeed be a relic of the reflex of the Latin pattern observed and thus the result of a development somewhat akin to that which I have claimed happened in French. If so, the fact that it survives so much later than French *le mien X* presumably would reflect the fact that *il mio X* is the normal way to express 'my' outside address contexts (and thus *il mio* + noun does not seem in any way ungrammatical), while the 'reinforcement' with an affective adjective may correspond to the fact that, in general, addresses containing possessives now do not take the definite article, *caro* or *povero* therefore indicating that the possessive *is* only quasi-possessive.[52]

[51] The earliest dictionary citations I have found for the address use of *quello* are in Battaglia (1961-2002: s.v. *quello*) and come from the sixteenth century authors Firenzuola and d'Ambra. The history of this phenomenon within Italian deserves much greater treatment than is possible here, but our conclusion for French regarding the semantic developments in the article should prove a valuable comparison, particularly for establishing why this Italian usage is also described as 'familiar' (e.g. by Tommaseo) though usually addressed to those one is reluctant or unable to name, and why it ultimately became obsolete.

[52] I am still not arguing that a possessive has to be accompanied by the article but that here, at least, it has inherited the *option* of doing so: the meaning need not be restrictive possession, and indeed where it is not and the article pattern is selected nonetheless, the optional adjective serves to obviate any ambiguity.

Incidentally, it seems that Italian also at some point had a formula of the *monsieur le X* type: Renzi et al. (*ibid.*) cite '*Messer lo frate*' (Boccaccio) which is fairly clearly a borrowing (of structure and, for the word *messer*, form) from French.

7.2. Romanian

The Romanian situation is extremely complicated and I do not intend here to deal with it in any detail. I outlined in my introduction the kind of patterns (of morphology) which may be relevant to our present investigation.[53]

In fact, it seems to me that, as in the case of Italian, we have no good evidence to connect the Romanian phenomena in direct historical terms with those in French. Although the Romanian article shares an etymology with that of French, it is not even entirely clear that these so-called 'vocative' desinences indeed contain the definite article etymologically: at best we may have evidence that these forms have at some point been (and for some speakers perhaps still are) considered as containing the article. If the morphology, however, has a different source from the article, the parallel with French is again no more than a parallel and *not* a shared development: given that the plural forms in *-ilor* continue the Latin genitive plural of *ille* namely *illorum*, this seems to me to be by far the most likely solution.[54] Nonetheless, we should note that speakers appear to feel (or have felt) little or no incompatibility between the meaning of the article in other contexts and its apparent use in address, and this is worth bearing in mind.[55] For this reason, the kind of approach to considering semantic developments in French determiners and modifiers that I have adopted in this paper may well be able to be usefully extended to Romanian.

7.3. English

Finally, before turning to my conclusions, I wish first briefly to consider a parallel/contrast from outside the Romance languages, namely from English.

---

[53] On Romanian address in general, see Braun (1984).

[54] The Romanian morphology has had little investigation: the most thorough examination is that of Meyer-Lübke (1895: 478-9) who suggests that the origin of the voc. masculine forms that purport to contain the definite article in Romanian may be parallel to the borrowing from a Slav source of a voc. sg. in *-o* for some feminine nouns. He cites various forms which appear to contain an *-l-* and which he alleges to be expressive, emotive or in some way hypocoristic (but note Leskien 1914: §371, §443, §581). The theory seems to involve borrowing this morphology only in the vocative, where perhaps such forms might be more common, and then combining them with the inherited masc. voc. sg. inflection *-e*. The plural forms then derive in some way by analogy from these, and thus contain the article because the singular is analysed as containing the article; the gen./dat. pl. form is the articulated form chosen because it too contains the *-l-*. On Slav borrowing in general in Romanian and some detail on its effects on vocatives in particular, see also Petrucci (1999).

[55] There remains a great deal of research to do on explaining the precise semantic details of the developments, i.e. what in the 'meaning' of the article overlapped with or approached close to the address meaning associated with the 'vocative' morphology, assuming it is not historically the definite article or its demonstrative etymon.

As for modern speakers, while they identify the 'vocative' morphology, when it is used, with the article, their widespread use of the nominative in more complex address use (cf. fn. 2) suggests that (a) the semantic contribution of this 'article' is now somewhat limited and (b) if the contribution is felt to be present, it is also felt to be slightly incompatible with what address requires.

Address forms in English have received about as much semantic and syntactic investigation as those of the other languages discussed in this paper so far, with the emphasis placed squarely on sociolinguistic analysis. However, there has been some limited attention (e.g. Thorne 1966, Zwicky 1974) to some grammatical aspects of address usage. The consensus (which on this matter recently has been tacit but is expressed clearly by, e.g., Jespersen 1928-49: vii.529-31) is that the definite article may not introduce address phrases in modern English (nor, for that matter, may demonstratives or other determiners except personal possessives):

(51a) Hello, (*the) children!

(51b) Hello, (*the) friend!

(51c) Am I to understand, (*the) vicar, that you're going to suspect me too?

The chief further generally-agreed exception to this principle is the use of the second-person pronoun *you* introducing phrases such as the following:

(52) Am I to understand, you idiot(s), that you're going to suspect me too?

Postal (1966) analyses *you* and *we* in phrases of the kind *you X* or *we X* as articles, and Thorne (1966) treats *you* as the second-person form of *the*, citing examples of the kind (51) as evidence of a complementary distribution of *the* and *you*. Whatever the correct analysis of *you* as an element in noun phrases, whether in address contexts or elsewhere, examples such as the following have rarely been considered:

(53) Stand up, <u>that man</u>/<u>the boy in the corner</u>!

(53') ?What time is it, <u>that man</u>/<u>the boy in the corner</u>?

(53") *The door's open, <u>that man</u>/<u>the boy in the corner</u>.

The underlined phrases in (53) and (53') superficially look like free dependent address phrases, but we can see from the ungrammaticality of (53") that all may not be as it seems: in fact they should perhaps be treated as some kind of subject for the (implied) commands.[56] Of course, we saw that in old French many examples of the definite article

[56] Questions which require an answer from the interlocutor arguably share the feature of interactivity with commands, which similarly require something (i.e. an action) from the interlocutor. Quirk et al. (1972: 403) remark that vocatives and imperative subjects may easily be confused. On imperative subjects, see also Jensen (2003), Potsdam (1998), de Rycker (1984), Downing (1969) and Thorne (1966).

There is a further issue brought to the surface here by the examples in (53). If (53") is taken as having directive illocutionary force (i.e. 'close the door' albeit in statement form), its ungrammaticality is considerably diminished. This may point towards illocutionary force (which very often correlates with grammatical form) as the *synchronically* significant factor in determining whether an address headed by a determiner is grammatical. However, it remains to be seen whether in *historical* terms there has been a spread in English from sentences with the grammatical form of a command to other grammatical forms which, when employed, share the most common illocutionary force of a command, i.e. being directive. The importance of this for my account of French is that it would provide a suitable parallel for the kinds of development associated with a reanalysis from imperative subject to address between Latin and early old French (cf. §3.1.2) and that this may be in a period for which better evidence for English exists than for my investigation of Latin and old French. If such a spread happened, it seems to be complete by the time of old French, while it may still be ongoing in modern English.

pattern were accompanying sentences containing directive expressions, and the parallel with the modern English pattern is obvious. However, since there is a robust alternation between the grammatical (53) and ungrammatical (53"), while in old French both, e.g., (27) and (24) are grammatical, it is probably wise not to treat the English pattern as a straightforward parallel to that in old French.

A satisfactory analysis of the English pattern remains to be found, but Zwicky's (1974: 790-1) concern at the availability in English of bare *you* only as a call and not as an address (or, in my terms, in independent rather than dependent address) may possibly also be dealt with alongside this phenomenon, for *you* in address seems to me in fact to have a remarkably similar distribution to that seen in examples (53) and not be as limited as he suggests.[57] Zwicky also observes a difference in grammaticality between the use of *you* in combination with 'evaluative' and 'non-evaluative' nouns (e.g. *idiot* and *man* respectively) which may be significant in this context:[58] if the (non)-evaluative distinction actually corresponds to a difference between non-restrictive and restrictive use, aspects of my solution for French could possibly be applied to resolve a number of these phenomena in English, with the very real possibility of capturing an important cross-linguistic generalisation.

In cross-linguistic terms, there are also some related questions surrounding the use of the definite article within phrases where the first element is not *you* but a noun: examples include English *William the Conqueror*, *Henry the Eighth*, and the French *Monsieur le Président* type which we have already dealt with.[59] The questions here arise out of the contrast with, e.g., *Louis quatorze* or *Mr. President*, and they concern the semantic (and categorial) status of the two elements separated (or not) by the article. Further work is needed to establish the proper synchronic analysis of the internal structure of these phrases, although the diachronic claim I made for French (§6.1 on defining apposition) seems justified by the evidence, along with the subsequent fossilization as part of a fixed formula or name. Whether, of course, one might apply the same analysis to *Winnie-the-Pooh* is perhaps unknowable, but it seems to me to be parallel in form at least.

At any rate, the whole problem of nominal phrases containing two elements, somehow combined, is for most of these types a wider one than simply in the context of address, since the same form (whether with or without the interposed article) is found consistently for the same item in both address and referential usage (cf. Zwicky 1974, Lyons 1977: 223, Braun 1988: 264); the issues raised thus need not prevent us drawing our

---

[57] Independent address in my view can be regarded synchronically as *derived* from dependent address and it very often has the illocutionary force of a directive or interrogative (cf. Ashdowne 2002).

[58] Even in the absence of determiners, the apparently limited interpretation of a term like English 'driver' when used as an address (i.e. meaning only 'professional driver' rather than 'person who happens to be driving', though both interpretations are possible in non-address use, cf. Zwicky 1974: 790) is a further type of semantic pattern which might be captured by the restrictive ~ non-restrictive analytical approach, although that lies well beyond the scope of this paper: treating all these phenomena together may prove to be a way of finally laying to rest the general puzzle that linguists have had concerning the existence and nature of any *systematic* relationship(s) between referential and address meaning.

[59] The Latin type *Socrates ille sapientissimus* should perhaps be included in this list (cf. Löfstedt 1981).

conclusions regarding the history of the types of address that begin with the definite article in modern French.

Conclusions

In this paper I have attempted to describe and explain the origins of the modern French use of the definite article in address, a usage which contrasts very strongly with its near total ungrammaticality in English and some other Romance varieties. I have shown that the key to understanding the development is a period during which the article was apparently triggered by the presence of a restrictive modifier within the phrase, and have suggested that this in turn was the result of a reanalysis of an earlier state of affairs in which the etymon of the French definite article, Latin *ille*, was present for this kind of reason but in which the phrases in question were not addresses. The date of this reanalysis is still unclear although we know it to be between Latin and old French and we may suppose it took place relatively late given that it seems to be limited to this one major branch of Romance, and not present in the others which derive their definite article from *ille*. The allegedly parallel patterns of Romanian and Italian are not straightforwardly parallel developments from the same original source in Latin, but the possibility of tracing this development in French should encourage renewed investigation along similar lines for these varieties.

References

I. Primary Sources

(a) Latin: texts are cited from the most recent *Oxford Classical Text* edition, except where listed below.

Italicus: Baehrens, Emil (ed.). (1879-86). *Poetici Latini Minores*. 5 voll. Leipzig: Teubner, iii.

Panegyrici: Mynors, R.A.B. (ed.). (1964). *XII Panegyrici Latini.* Oxford: OUP.

Tibullus: Murgatroyd, Paul (ed.). (1994). *Tibullus:* Elegies II. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Valerius Flaccus: Ehlers, Widu-Wolfgang (ed.). (1980). Valeri Flacci *Argonautica*. Leipzig: Teubner.

Vitae Patrum: Migne (ed.). *Patrologia Latina.* vol. 73. [brackets give page/col. ref. in *PL* 73]

(b) French

Aliscans. Claude Régnier (ed.). (1990). 2 voll. Paris: Honoré Champion.

——. Günter Holtus (ed.). (1985). *La versione franco-italiana della 'Bataille d'Aliscans': Codex Marcianus fr. VIII [=252]* Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.

——. Erich Wienbeck et al. (edd.). (1903). Halle: Max Niemeyer.

Chanson de Roland. F. Whitehead (ed.). (1946). Oxford: Blackwell.

——. Joseph Bédier (ed.). (1922). Paris: D'Art.

Chansons du XVe siècle. Gaston Paris (ed.). (1875). Paris: Firmin-Didot.

Chansons du tresorier de Lille: Aug. Scheler (ed.). (1879). *Trouvères Belges* (nouvelle série). Louvain: Lefever, 137-42.

Jeu de S. Nicolas. F.J. Warne (ed.). (1951). Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Mistère du viel testament. James de Rothschild (ed.). (1878-91). 6 voll. Société des anciens textes français.

Molière: *Œuvres complètes*. 2 voll. Paris: Gallimard. (1983).

Le Pèlerinage de Charlemagne. Glyn S. Burges (ed.). (1998). Edinburgh: Société Rencesvals British Branch.

La Vie de Saint Alexis. Maurizio Perugi (ed.). (2000). Droz: Paris.

II. Secondary Literature

Ashdowne, Richard. (2002). *The syntax of the vocative case in Latin.* MPhil Thesis, University of Oxford.

Battaglia, Salvatore (ed.). (1961-2002). *Grande dizionario della lingua Italiana.* Turin: UTET.

Braun, Friederike. (1984). 'Rumänische Anredeformen' in Werner Winter (ed.), *Anredeverhalten*. Tübingen: Narr, 151-88.

———. (1988). *Terms of Address: problems of patterns and usage in various languages and cultures.* Berlin, New York & Amsterdam: Mouton de Gruyter.

Brunot, Ferdinand. (1899). *Précis de grammaire historique de la langue française avec une introduction sur les origines et le développement de cette langue.* 4th ed. Paris: G. Masson.

Butt, John & Carmen Benjamin. (1994). *A New Reference Grammar of Modern Spanish.* 2nd ed. London: Edward Arnold.

Dickey, Eleanor. (1996). *Greek Forms of Address: from Herodotus to Lucian.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

———. (2002). *Latin Forms of Address: from Plautus to Apuleius.* Oxford: OUP.

———. (2003). '*o dee ree pie*: the vocative problems of Latin words ending in *-eus*', *Glotta* 76: 32-49.

Diez, Frédéric. (1874-6). *Grammaire des langues romanes.* (tr. Auguste Brachet & Gaston Paris) 3rd ed. 3 voll. Paris: Franck.

Downing, Bruce T. (1969). 'Vocatives and third-person imperatives in English', *Papers in Linguistics* 1: 570-92.

Epstein, Richard. (1993). 'The definite article: early stages of development' in Jaap van Marle (ed.), *Historical Linguistics 1991.* Amsterdam: Benjamins, 111-34.

———. (1994). ‘The development of the definite article in French’ in William Pagliuca (ed.), *Perspectives on Grammaticalization.* Amsterdam: Benjamins, 63-80.

———. (1995). ‘L'article defini en ancien français: l'expression de la subjectivité’, *Langue française* 107: 58-71.

Foulet, Lucien. (1950a, b). ‘Sire, Messire’, *Romania* 71: 1-48, 180-221.

———. (1951a, b, c). ‘Sire, Messire’, *Romania* 72: 31-77, 324-67, 479-528.

Greenberg, Joseph H. (1978). ‘How does a language acquire gender markers?’ in *id.* (ed.), *Universals of Human Language.* Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 3 Word Structure, 47-82.

Grevisse, Maurice. (1980). *Le bon usage: grammaire française, avec des remarques sur la langue française d'aujourd'hui.* 11th ed. Paris & Gembloux: Duculot.

——— & André Goosse. (1993). *Le bon usage: grammaire française.* 13th ed. Paris & Louvain-la-Neuve: Duculot.

Guillaume, Gustave. (1919). *Le problème de l'article et sa solution dans la langue française.* Paris: Hachette.

Haas, Joseph. (1909). *Neufranzösische Syntax.* Halle: Max Niemeyer.

Harris, Martin B. (1978). *Evolution of French Syntax: a comparative approach.* London: Longman.

———. (1980a). ‘The marking of definiteness: a diachronic perspective’ in Elizabeth C. Traugott, Rebecca LaBrum & Susan Shepherd (edd.), *Papers from the 4th International Conference on Historical Linguistics.* Amsterdam: Benjamins, 75-86.

———. (1980b). ‘The marking of definiteness in Romance’ in Jacek Fisiak (ed.), *Historical Morphology.* The Hague, Paris & New York: Mouton, 141-56.

Hofmann, Johann Baptist & Anton Szantyr. (1965). *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik.* Lateinische Grammatik. vol. 2. Munich: Beck.

Hutchinson, Amélia P. & Janet Lloyd. (1996). *Portuguese: an essential grammar.* London & New York: Routledge.

Jensen, Britta. (2003). *Imperatives in English and Scandinavian.* DPhil Thesis, University of Oxford.

Jespersen, Otto. (1928-49). *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles.* (ed. Niels Haisland). 7 voll. London/Copenhagen: Allen & Unwin/Munksgaard.

Kühner, Raphael & Carl Stegmann. (1914). *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache.* Zweiter Teil: Satzlehre. 2 voll. Hanover: Hahn.

Lagorgette, Dominique. (2004). ‘De *ma dame* à *les madames*: évolution du possessif dans les titres en diachronie — un cas de grammaticalisation?’, Paper given at the 32nd Romance Linguistics Seminar, Trinity Hall, Cambridge, January 2004.

Law, Vivien. (1995). *Wisdom, Authority and Grammar in the Seventh Century: decoding Virgilius Maro Grammaticus.* Cambridge: CUP.

Lerch, Eugen. (1925-34). *Historische französische Syntax.* 3 voll. Leipzig: Reisland.

Leskien, A. (1914). *Grammatik der serbo-kroatischen Sprache.* vol. 1. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

Löfstedt, Leena. (1981). 'A propos des articles et des articloïdes' in Christian Rohrer (ed.), Logos semantikos*: studia linguistica in honorem Eugenio Coseriu.* (ed. Horst Geckeler et al.). Berlin & New York/Madrid: Walter de Gruyter/Editorial Gredos, IV.269-79.

Love, Nathan. (1985). 'The vocative adjectives *biaus*, *dous* and *chiers* in old French', *Lingvisticae Investigationes* 9: 307-19.

Lyons, Christopher. (1986). 'On the origins of the Old French strong-weak possessive distinction', *Transactions of the Philological Society*: 1-41.

———. (1999). *Definiteness.* Cambridge: CUP.

Lyons, John. (1977). *Semantics.* Cambridge: CUP.

Meyer-Lübke, Wilhelm. (1890-1906). *Grammaire des langues romanes.* (tr. Eugène Rabiet, Auguste Doutrepont & Georges Doutrepont) 4 voll. Paris: H.Welter.

———. (1895). 'Zur Syntax des Substantivums', *Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie* 19: 477-512.

Milne, A. A. ([1926] 2000). *Winnie-the-Pooh.* London: Egmont.

Nixon, C.E.V. & Barbara S. Rodgers (edd.). (1994). *In Praise of Later Roman Emperors: the* Panegyrici Latini. Berkeley, Los Angeles & Oxford: University of California Press.

Nyrop, Kristoffer. (1899-1930). *Grammaire historique de la langue française.* 6 voll. Copenhagen: Gyldendal.

OLD = Oxford Latin Dictionary (ed. P.G.W. Glare) Oxford: OUP.

Petrucci, Peter R. (1999). *Slavic Features in the History of Rumanian.* Munich: LINCOM Europa.

Perini, Mária A. (2002). *Modern Portuguese: a reference grammar.* New Haven & London: Yale University Press.

Posner, Rebecca. (1988). 'Definiteness and the history of French possessives', *French Studies* 42: 385-97.

———. (1997). *Linguistic Change in French.* Oxford: OUP.

Postal, Paul. (1966). 'On so-called pronouns in English' in D. Reibel & S. Schane (edd.), *Modern Studies in English*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 201-24.

Potsdam, Eric. (1998). *Syntactic Issues in the English Imperative.* New York & London: Garland.

Price, Glanville. (1998). *The French Language: present and past.* rev. ed. London: Grant & Cutler.

Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech & Jan Startvik. (1972). *A Grammar of Contemporary English.* London: Longman.

Renzi, Lorenzo, Giampaolo Salvi & Anna Cardinaletti. (2001). *Grande grammatica italiana di consultazione.* 2nd ed. 3 voll. Bologna: Il Mulino.

de Rycker, Teun. (1984). *Imperative Structures: form and function in conversational English.* Antwerp Papers in Linguistics, 38. Wilrijk: University of Antwerp.

Spitzer, Leo. (1927). '"Bestimmter Artikel im Anruf und Ausruf" und Verwandtes', *Revista filologică* 1: 41-50.

Stowell, William A. (1908). *Old-French Titles of Respect in Direct Address.* Baltimore: JH Furst.

Svennung, Josef G. A. (1958). *Anredeformen: vergleichende Forschungen zur indirekten Anrede in der dritten Person und zum Nominativ für den Vokativ.* Uppsala: Almqvist and Winksells.

Thorne, James P. (1966). 'English imperative sentences', *Journal of Linguistics* 2: 69-78.

Tobler, Adolf. (1899). 'Bestimmter Artikel im Anruf und Ausruf' in *Vermischte Beiträge zur französischen Grammatik.* Leipzig: Hirzel, 3.126-32.

TLF = Trésor de la langue française: dictionnaire de la langue du XIXe et du XXe siècle, 1789-1960. (1971-1994). Paris: CNRS.

TLL = Thesaurus Linguae Latinae. Leipzig: Teubner.

Truswell, Rob. (2004). 'Non-restrictive adjective interpretation and association with focus'. This volume.

Vairel-Carron, Hélène. (1975). *Exclamation, ordre et défense: analyse de deux systèmes syntaxiques en Latin.* Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Vincent, Nigel. (1997). 'The emergence of the D-system in Romance' in Nigel Vincent & A. van Kemenade (edd.), *Parameters of Morphosyntactic Change.* Cambridge: CUP, 149-69.

Warne, F. J. (ed.). (1951). *Jean Bodel:* Le Jeu de Saint Nicolas. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Wartburg, Walther von & Paul Zumthor. (1989). *Précis de syntaxe du français contemporain.* 4th ed. Bern: Francke.

Zink, Gaston. (1997). *Morphologie du français médiéval.* 4th ed. Paris: PUF.

Zwicky, Arnold M. (1974). 'Hey, Whatsyourname!' in Michael La Galy, Robert Fox & Anthony Bruck (edd.), *Papers from the 10th Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistics Society.* Chicago: Chicago Linguistics Society.