

THE SEMANTICS OF SUSPICION IN THE WRITINGS OF DESMOULINS

by

Ivy Gilbert

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of

Dorothy F. Schmidt College of Arts & Letters

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

Bachelor of Arts in Linguistics

with a Concentration in French

Dorothy F. Schmidt College of Arts & Letters of

Florida Atlantic University

Boca Raton, Florida

May 2017

THE SEMANTICS OF SUSPICION IN THE WRITINGS OF DESMOULINS

by

Ivy Gilbert

This thesis was prepared under the direction of the candidate's thesis advisor, Dr. Romain Rivaux, and has been approved by the members of her supervisory committee. It was submitted to the faculty of Dorothy F. Schmidt College of Arts & Letters and was accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Bachelor of Arts in Linguistics.

SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE:

Dr. Romain Rivaux

Dr. Geraldine Blattner

Dr. Marcella Munson, Department Chair

Date

Acknowledgements

I would like to extend a most sincere thank you to Dr. Romain Rivaux for advising this project and for spending many hours on its development. A more intuitive advisor could scarcely be found elsewhere.

ABSTRACT

Author: Ivy Gilbert

Title: The Semantics of Suspicion in the Writings of Desmoulins

Department: Department of Languages, Linguistics and Comparative Literature

Institution: Florida Atlantic University

Thesis Advisor: Dr. Romain Rivaux

Degree: Bachelor of Arts in Linguistics

Concentration: French

Year: 2017

An exacting command of language in his employ, journalist Camille Desmoulins was arguably one of the most dangerous and cunning players in the political arena of revolutionary France. His work is a clear synthesis of linguistic and political theory but what, precisely, made it so effective? When his work is regarded collectively, a theme emerges wherein Desmoulins uses language designed to categorically perpetuate suspicion. Using the principles of lexical semantics, rhetoric, and connotation, this project seeks to examine the semantic undercurrents of Desmoulins's works as they relate specifically to the public perception of suspicion, and to define the linguistic parameters within which he operated. An analysis of selected examples will demonstrate how the evocative language speaks to the author's acute cognizance of his audience and his talent for inflaming the collective unrest through the use of tropes; specifically dehumanization, personification, and the neologism *brissoter*. Additionally, a feature analysis of

nouns and verbs drawn from a sample of Desmoulins's work further identifies tropes and atypical semantic forms and argues that, through his linguistic manipulation, he was able to sow suspicion among the mercurial Third Estate; both against the monarchy and the ultra-radical Republic.

Table of Contents

I. Background	2
a. Historical Context	2
b. Theoretical Considerations	5
II. Method	
a. Procedure	10
b. Materials	13
III. Results	
a. Example-Based Analysis	
1. Dehumanization & Personification.....	15
2. Neologism in Brissotter	24
3. Suspect	27
4. Conclusion	30
b. Qualitative Corpus Analysis	30
1. Corpus Results	30
2. Analysis of Nouns	32
3. Analysis of Verbs	35
IV. Discussion	39
a. Limitations	40
b. Future Analysis.....	41
c. Conclusions	43
Appendices	
Appendix A – <i>Discours de Camille Desmoulins</i>	45
Appendix B – Feature Analysis of Nouns.....	49
Appendix C – Feature Analysis of Verbs	53
References	
Primary Sources	57
Secondary Sources	58

The Semantics of Suspicion in the Writings of Desmoulins

by Ivy Gilbert

On the eve of the French Revolution, attorney Camille Desmoulins was a relative newcomer to Paris. Dreaming endlessly of affecting political change but lacking social connections or title, he seemed doomed to die destitute and unknown. However, as the years passed and the political conflict progressed, Desmoulins turned to seditious pamphleteering and journalism and, an exacting command of language in his employ, sought deliberately to use these mediums to incite rebellion against what he felt was a bloated and ineffective monarchy. Over the course of the following years, he would undergo a startling transformation, becoming arguably one of the most dangerous and cunning players in the political arena of revolutionary France. His work is a clear synthesis of linguistic, literary and political theory but what, precisely, made it so effective? When his work is regarded collectively, a theme emerges wherein Desmoulins uses language designed to categorically perpetuate suspicion.

Using principles of linguistic theory, this project seeks to examine the semantic undercurrents of Desmoulins's works as they relate specifically to the public perception of suspicion, and to define the linguistic parameters within which he operated. First, an analysis of selected examples will demonstrate how the evocative language speaks to the author's acute cognizance of his audience and his talent for inflaming the collective unrest through the use of tropes: specifically dehumanization, personification, and neologism. Second, a feature analysis of nouns and verbs drawn from a sample of Desmoulins's work will help further identify tropes and atypical semantic forms and show that through his linguistic manipulation he was able to sow suspicion among the mercurial Third Estate; both against the monarchy and the ultra-radical Republic. Given the interdisciplinary nature of this paper, each theoretical and contextual

consideration must be appraised. Therefore, Section 1 will first examine the political climate of Revolutionary France and attempt to give a measure of the man, Desmoulins, and then delve into relevant linguistic theory through a discussion of structural semantics and Lakoff's theory of cognitive metaphor (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980 and Lakoff, 1993). As to not be impeded by the dense research on cognitive semantics and metaphor, this paper will limit its scope to only the most salient principles of the relevant theoretical framework.

I. Background

a. Historical Context

To fully understand the impact Desmoulins's work might have had on the public, a working knowledge of pro-revolutionary opinion is critical. On the threshold of revolution, Paris hummed with discord and a seething, omnipresent undercurrent of resentment toward the nobility, called the Second Estate. Eighteenth-century journalist Mercier (1781) offers a tidy summary of the conflict: « *Ainsi la distance qui sépare le riche du reste des citoyens s'accroît chaque jour [...] La haine s'envenime, et l'état est divisé en deux classes; en gens avides et insensibles, et en mécontents qui murmurent* » (p. 31). Having lived for centuries under a system of royal absolutism, wherein the sovereign possesses unconditional power over the state and its people, the often impoverished Third Estate, comprising all manner of commoners, desired the establishment of a republic. Eager for an outlet for their collective frustration, they were vulnerable to the psychologies of language; the discerning orator needed only to flesh out the exact formula of linguistic manipulation and timing to incite the public to move against the monarchy. Camille Desmoulins, who had long harbored aspirations of aiding in the establishment of a republic, found his voice in this chaos.

From childhood, Desmoulins demonstrated great scholastic ability. He attended the prestigious College Louis-le-Grand, where he was surrounded by intellectuals equaling his own, such as those of Stanislas Fréron and Maximilien Robespierre (Methley, 1915). Desmoulins proved himself a scholar worthy of note, though he was relatively unpopular. His social ineptitudes were furthered by a pervasive stammer, although this eventually worked to his benefit; according to Methley, it enabled him to cultivate his skills in a written medium, where his impediment could pass unnoticed. Methley's biography on Desmoulins further details how the scholar went on to become a barrister and moved to Paris to practice law, though he lacked any true professional talent and lived in near poverty. Eventually falling in with such characters as Georges-Jacques Danton and Philippe Fabre d'Églantine, and having maintained his childhood bond with Robespierre, Desmoulins soon found himself among men whose ambition aligned with his own: men who would eventually compose the Dantonists, a powerful faction of the radical Club des Jacobins (Methley, 1915).

Seventeen eighty-nine brought the actualization of Desmoulins's years of revolutionary fervor; standing on a table at the Café de Foy – a place “known to the police as ‘*le rendez-vous de gens vifs et séditieux qui troublaient la tranquillité publique*’” (Rudé, 1959, p. 70) – surrounded by hordes of Parisian malcontents, Desmoulins delivered an impromptu speech so rousing that it saw the crowd become a mob. In a showing of bald aggression, they set off to relieve Les Invalides of its weaponry and storm the Bastille (Weber, 2003).

The storming of the Bastille is accepted as one of the most salient precursors to the chaotic period one calls the French Revolution, if not the flashpoint itself. Indeed, if the storming of the Bastille was the catalyst that spawned the Revolution, Desmoulins himself gave rise to it all on the day he mounted the café table and called to arms the citizens, who responded with alacrity – his

words, delivered even in so impromptu a fashion, lanced the sore of public acrimony that had been swelling steadily over the years.

The attack on the Bastille marked the true dawn of Desmoulins's journalistic and political career, thrusting him into the public eye and validating him amongst his contemporaries. With his newfound popularity and influence, Desmoulins devoted himself to the swift establishment of a republic. He enjoyed a healthy popularity, collecting influential contacts and carefully tending his close friendships with Maximilien Robespierre and the irascible George-Jacques Danton. His *œuvre* is prodigious; read chronologically, one can witness the evolution of the reckless and radical journalist desperate to provoke social change, to the older, much disillusioned but no less ardent writer who takes a hard line against the now hyper-radical revolutionary government; the same government he had helped construct. As Robespierre tightened his grip on the Revolutionary Tribunal and conducted his Reign of Terror, the government's paranoia of royalist sentiments or any perceived threat to the fledgling Republic drove the Revolution to, as du Pan famously wrote, « *dévore[r] ses enfants* » (1793, p. 80).

Desmoulins could no longer countenance the Republic, as it were, under which Parisians lived in a feral state of anxiety. Desmoulins's newspaper *Le Vieux Cordelier* addressed this harsh regime, speaking against the new absolutism of the Committee of Public Safety and the Revolutionary Tribunal, using much of the same language he had previously reserved for the absolutism of the crown. While these publications ultimately occasioned the execution of Desmoulins and the entire Dantonist faction on *16 Germinal an II* (April 5, 1794), they also laid the foundation for the looming downfall of Robespierre, and with him the Terror.

Yet before the Terror, before they guillotined the king, before they found their voices as revolutionary spearheads, even before the bright promise of a Republic, Desmoulins and

Maximilien Robespierre were friends. When discussing Desmoulins and his work, one must also discuss Robespierre, because the two childhood friends shared in many things; their political ideals and their revolutionary fervor are most evident, but in many instances their influence on one another is suggested in the stylistic aspects of their writings. Desmoulins himself never achieved the notoriety of Robespierre, nor of Danton; but that his work remains largely unknown to all those who do not specifically seek it cannot negate the fact that at one time, two hundred and twenty-five years ago in the cradle of Revolution, Desmoulins's work possessed an indisputable gravity.

With his work fully contextualized, one can turn an eye to the semantic implications of Camille Desmoulins's writing. This paper lies within the purview of literature, politics, history, psychology, cognition, and most critically, linguistics. One must understand the alien climate within which Desmoulins lived and wrote: the events surrounding his writing, the literary and political influences which saw themselves reimagined in his work, and the utter humanity of the writer himself. One must categorically document each of these aspects to extricate the essence of what is happening linguistically, to distinguish between language as a science and language as sorcery; or, perhaps, to acknowledge the blurred dimension that exists between the two, and firmly place Desmoulins within that secret space. All that he built and all that he ruined is a testament to his mastery of rhetoric and linguistic manipulation.

b. Theoretical Considerations

Although this paper gives significant attention to the historical backdrop of Desmoulins's work, it is primarily a contextualized linguistic analysis. Analysis of the selected excerpts from Desmoulins is done through the lens of cognitive semantics and figurative language, while corpus analysis is performed using structural semantics.

This paper is largely concerned with the structural semantics–cognitive semantics interface, where structural meaning is addressed through lexical, sentence and discourse constructs and then interpreted with an eye to the psychology of language cognition and processing. Through an examination of semantic properties and their use in various contexts, this paper aims to establish the semantic values of Desmoulins’s work at both micro- and macro-levels.

Semantic content is determined in part by the connotative meaning drawn from an utterance, connotation being a primarily emotive function which conjures meaning and associates language with mental images. Traditional semantics holds that connotations associated with an utterance are first derived from the mental representation conjured by that utterance, then solidified by physical representations drawn from real-world incarnations; these two representations, mental and physical, are known as *sense* and *reference*, respectively (Brinton & Brinton, 2010). While this sense-reference conduit through which linguistic values are transmitted is a necessary component of semantics, it is a somewhat limiting model as it largely ignores the subjective subtleties of language. With his cognitive metaphor theory (CMT), Lakoff (1980) challenges the “myth of objectivism” in traditional Chomskyan linguistics, writing that its great flaw is the view that “linguistic objects that exist – their building-block structure, their properties, and their relations – are independent of the way people understand them” (p. 205). Lakoff further argues that metaphor processing is a cognitive function which transcends the limit of traditional linguistics but is often expressed and processed through linguistic mediums. Later expanding on these ideas with the development of his contemporary theory of metaphor, Lakoff (1993) posits that metaphor is both connected to and distinct from traditional linguistics; that it is a systematized conception of meaning largely eschewed by formal semanticists for being outside the domain of “semantics proper.” The present paper relies on Lakoff’s theory of metaphor cognition as a more

comprehensive approach to the role metaphor plays in linguistics than that held by formal semantics, and as such any following discussion of metaphor processing will presuppose an acceptance of Lakoff's model. A grasp of these concepts is necessary to determine how specific words might have been employed by Desmoulins to influence the public through carefully extorted meaning.

One potential drawback of using CMT as the basis for this paper's discussion of metaphor is that Lakoff's (1980) research primarily utilizes English idiomatic expressions and common metaphorical formulas, e.g. IDEAS ARE RESOURCES, TIME IS MONEY, LOVE IS A JOURNEY, as examples for his arguments (1980, p.46-48). This paper, however, is not concerned with Desmoulins's use of metaphor in idioms, but rather in French figurative language arising from semantic anomaly; therefore, there is a potential handicap in the applicability of Lakoff's examples to the examples in this paper. To counteract any such shortcomings, this paper turns to Fludernik (2012), who writes that classical CMT attempts to categorize the "metaphoric nature of our thinking" with little consideration given to the interpretation of local semantic values within an individual text (p. 6). She attempts to bridge the lacuna of literary metaphor within CMT through a reduced focus on the set of examples Lakoff provides. Instead, Fludernik (2012) supplements CMT with the work of Fauconnier & Turner (2002) in Blending Theory, and Turner's (2006) Conceptual Integration Theory, wherein context is kept ever at the forefront; its dominion is constant, always shifting, zooming out to claim its jurisdiction in broad terms and then zooming in to take the pulse of its basic elements. Fludernik's (2012) discussion of these three theories synthesizes their properties, which offers an applicable approach for understanding literary metaphor.

Lakoff's (1993) later work defines metaphor as belonging to this same strange mezzoterrain as Fauconnier & Turner's (2002) 'blending' – equidistant between linguistics, literature, and cognitive science – as “a cross-domain mapping in the conceptual system” in which the lines between literal and metaphorical meanings become blurred (Lakoff, 1993). Fludernik (2012) argues for the necessity of acknowledging this unavoidable blending of literary metaphor and linguistics, which lends support to a discussion of metaphor within a linguistic study.

A dissection of semantic value differs from other linguistic studies, a study in phonology for example, because of the incredibly complex accord between semantic theory and cognitive processes related to metaphor and semantic anomaly. Critical to this is the particular kinship between certain lexical items known as *selectional restrictions*, or the required co-occurrence of certain words with others, depending on the semantic features of those items; a verb may “select features in its noun arguments” while often adjectives “select” their nouns (Brinton & Brinton, p. 175). Further, when selectional restrictions are violated, or when the semantic features of paired lexical items are incompatible, it results in semantic anomaly; yet semantic anomaly often elicits an essential ambiguity in the elusive condition of figurative language, which “routinely violates selectional restrictions” (Brinton & Brinton, p. 175).

Conclusively, semantics is an inexorable, omnipresent force in language that concerns itself with meaning; it is arguably one of the most slippery sub-linguistic concepts, open to a great deal of interpretation. This element of fluidity is precisely what makes it an effective instrument in political discourse, as it allows for intentional connotative applications in such mediums as speeches or, often in the case of Desmoulins, politically-charged pamphlets. Having now established the relationship between linguistics, cognition, and metaphor, one can target the marrow of this paper: how do these concepts interact with emotive values, and specifically the

emotion of *suspicion*, within the writing of Desmoulins? As Desmoulins's intention was to generate doubt and suspicion amongst the Third Estate, his rhetoric was often inflammatory in nature; he relied upon it to conjure a sense and reference that would win the audience to his cause. Naturally, he would require dynamic semantic techniques to serve the intended evocation of suspicion; these techniques can be examined as tools of rhetoric.

Aristotle (trans. 1954) writes that rhetoric is an art firmly rooted in emotion, persuasion and reason, both a tool of great utility and a device of ghastly devastation. Within the field of semantics, this paper views rhetoric and pragmatics as a two-step process, where rhetoric can be defined as the content of a message directed at an audience, specifically designed to be evocative and influential, while pragmatic value determines the receiving party's conceptualization of that message.

Weber (2003) details this concept beautifully, focusing directly on the importance of rhetoric and semantics in the political arena of the French Revolution while analyzing the oratory prowess of two of the Revolution's more prominent enforcers: "Robespierre and Saint-Just were painfully aware of the capacity of language to mean something other than what it appeared to say, to signify differently to different people, to mutate over time and space, to undo rather than to secure a fusion between word and referent" (p.2). In Revolution-era writing and in the writing of Desmoulins, this mutation, this fusion between word and referent, was often a forcible degradation of the word's sense and, as a result, its referent(s).

II. Method

a. Procedure

This paper is divided into two separate but related portions, the first of which is an analysis of three key tropes. These tropes were chosen to represent critical techniques employed by Desmoulins, namely dehumanization and personification, both of which speak to Desmoulins's aim of promoting suspicion. This analysis of examples draws support primarily from theories in cognitive and structural semantics, and addresses the following essential tropes:

- Animal metaphor: dehumanization and personification
- Political neologism and dehumanization in *brissoter*
- Repetition and converseness in *Le Vieux Cordelier*

As such, it will be appropriate to examine all aspects of these examples: the context in which they appear, their historical significance, and their effect on the audience, with consideration given to theories in semantics and cognitive linguistics. Given the extent of Desmoulins's work, this paper is selective in what is chosen for analysis; the selection is carefully curated to represent a comprehensive range of techniques and best illustrate the ways in which Desmoulins used his linguistic ability to further his political agenda.

The second portion of this paper will provide a qualitative feature analysis of nouns and verbs, presented as a corpus, culled from Desmoulins's *Discours de Camille Desmoulins*. Both analyses will highlight and identify Desmoulins's use of tropes and other atypical language forms as they pertain specifically to semantic degradation and perception.

In keeping with the methodology used by Morzinski (1994), this corpus is comprised of the first 100 nouns and 100 verbs used in Desmoulins's *Discours de Camille Desmoulins*. This text was chosen because it was written in 1792, before the execution of Louis XVI; Robespierre's

Reign of Terror had not yet begun, and Desmoulins still belonged to the radical Jacobin Club. Thus, this text was written solely to attack the Second Estate and promote the Republic. Desmoulins's later work from 1793-94 is complex; as the Jacobin factions became too radical for Desmoulins, he began to work against them. His writing becomes difficult to analyze qualitatively because it is directed simultaneously against two different and opposite forces: the remaining royalists and the radical Republicans. Desmoulins's complex relationship with the Jacobins complicates the stylistic aspects of his work, and must often be interpreted on multiple levels. Thus *Discours*, written with only one enemy in mind, Louis XVI, is more stylistically 'pure' and can be analyzed directly.

The noun corpus (Appendix B) is organized sequentially, with words arranged in the same order as they appear in the original text. This allows for any clusters of atypical forms to be immediately identified. Atypical usages appear in boldface type. Only the features [ANIMATE], [HUMAN] and [MALE] are qualified in this analysis, as atypical usages with relation to personification, dehumanization, and feminization are of primary interest; the bearing of any features beyond those listed above on the final interpretation of data is negligible at this time.

In an effort to control for any misleading data, the noun corpus makes some exclusions. It excludes proper nouns on the basis that Desmoulins often uses proper nouns so deeply steeped in literary and historical reference that they warrant a separate explanation, one that does not have immediate relevance in this paper. It also excludes any repeated items; if one noun appears three times in the first 100 nouns, it only appears once on the corpus; however, all subsequent repetitions of nouns are analyzed within the 100-noun sample and any atypical occurrences will be discussed.

The primary function of this feature analysis is to identify atypical usages. *Atypical* in this context is defined as beyond the realm of denotative meaning. Desmoulins's heavy use of literary

tropes fall outside the boundary of literal sense, or denotative meaning. Any use of trope or metaphor appearing in this sample corpus will be treated as atypical. This analysis does not consider the literal definition of each word to determine its features, but rather the context in which the word appears. Thus, although the identification of individual words may appear to signal an analysis of lexical semantics, these words are being analyzed in the context of the sentence and discourse meanings, not in isolation. The question is not ‘what are the features of this noun’ but rather ‘what are the features of this noun in the context of this piece?’ With this question in mind, the features of the noun are not determined in isolation from the text, but rather alongside it. For instance, where typically [-ANIMATE] nouns are chosen by selectional restrictions of adjectives that require animacy, the noun will be treated as [+ANIMATE].

The corpus of verbs makes only the exclusion of auxiliary verbs and auxiliary modals in compound constructions (*pouvoir, vouloir, savoir, devoir*) as they do not directly contribute to meaning in this context. As modal meaning is treated and qualified differently than verb meaning, modals require a separate feature analysis; such an analysis falls outside the scope of the present paper. The above verbs will, however, be included outside of those two excluded conditions. All verbs are presented in their infinitive form and, as in the noun corpus, each item is listed sequentially, and is listed only once; however, each individual appearance within the parameters of the sample text will be analyzed to determine atypical usage. The use of infinitive forms and the omission of repeated verbs are purely organizational regulations imposed by this paper to present data clearly. Despite being presented in the infinitive form, atypical verb usages will be discussed with reference given to the verb tense used by Desmoulins, which is often relevant.

Verbs will be classified only as [TELIC], where telicity is determined by a necessary endpoint for the action, and [VOLUNTARY], where volition is an intentional action on the part

of the agent (Brinton & Brinton, 2010); other possible features, such as those established in the typology of Vendler (1967), [STATIVE] and [DURATIVE], have negligible relevance in this context. Brinton & Brinton (2010) draw a clear distinction between verbs and *situation types*, where verbs are the lexical items and situation types comprise all the elements and features therein. While the corpus is composed of individual verbs, data analysis will consider situation type to determine the features of those verbs. Therefore, atypical forms are identified by the situation type rather than the verb itself.

Atypical forms are identified by violations of denotative meaning. Where a [+VOLUNTARY] or [+TELIC] verb is paired with an inanimate noun, that verb will be classified as atypical; the use of active verbs with inanimate nouns signals a potential occurrence of trope, namely personification and dehumanization. Verb features will be identified as atypical only as they occur in the context of the sample text, and only when the feature analysis of nouns has been consulted in tandem. Verb features in this project can only be considered atypical when considered alongside their noun arguments.

b. Materials

This paper examines tropes found in four separate works by Desmoulins, on which some background information will prove useful in interpreting the analyses that follow in later sections:

- *Discours de Camille Desmoulins député de Paris à la convention dans le procès de Louis XVI sur la question de l'appel au peuple* (1792) : This text is referred to from this point on as either *Discours de Camille Desmoulins* or simply *Discours* when appropriate. Printed by order of the National Convention, of which Desmoulins was an elected deputy, *Discours* is the equivalent of a modern opinion piece; it acts as Desmoulins's judgment on the trial of Louis XVI and

argues steadfastly for the king's execution. The corpus for feature analyses in this paper is drawn from *Discours* through which several compelling examples of dehumanization and personification are identified.

- *Discours de la lanterne aux Parisiens* (1789): Embedded in this text are several barbed metaphors which liken the nobility to all manner of non-human beings, reiterating animal metaphor and introducing parasite metaphor.
- *Jean-Pierre Brissot démasqué* (1792) : This tract is a biting rebuke of the former political ally to Desmoulins, Jacques-Pierre Brissot,¹ for whom it was designed to humiliate and discredit. Brissot was a member of *la Gironde*, the dominant faction of the Club des Jacobins during the period in question, before becoming quite undone in 1793. Although the Girondins belonged under the same umbrella term *Jacobins* as did the hyper-radical Montagnards – the group to which Desmoulins and Robespierre belonged – various disparities of power and purpose forced a rift between factions.
- *Le Vieux Cordelier* (1793): These journals are perhaps Desmoulins most celebrated works, and house some of his most stirring prose. They are striking in their contrast to his earlier writings, in tone and purpose. While his work from the early 1790s targeted royal absolutism and its proponents, *Le Vieux Cordelier* is a lamentation; a eulogy to mourn the death of the Revolution's initially pure Republican ideals, which had mutated into those of a dictatorship. By 1793, Desmoulins had grown disillusioned by the paranoid brutality of the Revolutionary Tribunal, where suspicion acted as an impetus for the blood-lust of ultra-radical factions. Desmoulins penned *Le Vieux Cordelier* to speak against the political violence and climate of

¹ See footnote 117 in Linton. Desmoulins is mistaken in his title; Brissot's first name was in fact Jacques-Pierre (2013, p. 130).

fear which characterized the new Republic, enforced by the Committee of Public Safety and the Tribunal. He initially focused his energies on the Hébertist faction led by Jacques René Hébert,² but by the final issues of the journal, Desmoulins was appealing directly to Robespierre himself. In the present paper, *Le Vieux Cordelier* is not consulted in its entirety as it warrants its own separate study; each of the seven issues are of considerable length. Only an excerpt from the third issue of the journal is discussed in this project, in which Desmoulins, masquerading as the Roman politician Tacitus, paints an embittered landscape of the new Republic and its unrelenting severity. An analysis of this passage will consider the incisive quality of Desmoulins's use of repetition and antonymic pairs.

III. Results

a. Example-Based Analysis

1. Dehumanization & Personification

The first two tropes examined in the example analysis are those of dehumanization and personification. This paper identifies several salient examples of these tropes within the selected materials, but the findings ultimately suggest that dehumanization is the trope most frequently employed by Desmoulins. It is used in myriad contexts and against an array of victims, but in a manner which suggests a high level of cohesion; in each instance, Desmoulins uses dehumanizing animal metaphors to force a semantic pejoration of terms associated with his opponents. Personification, while not used as frequently within the selected materials as dehumanization, introduces a truly compelling depth to the dimension of dehumanization in Desmoulins's work.

² See Desmoulins, *Le Vieux Cordelier* I & II.

During the hypothesis stage of this paper, personification was expected to represent a manifestation of metaphor on a similar scale to that of dehumanization in terms of frequency. However, the results suggest that personification is more an aggrandizing technique in this context, employed to augment the impact of dehumanization. There appears to be a degree of co-occurrence between examples of these two tropes; instances of personification require the presence of dehumanization for the personifying metaphor to be fully realized. The findings suggest that when personification occurs, Desmoulins is exploiting the duality of these two tropes – dehumanization and personification – rather than using them as separate techniques.

Desmoulins often draws comparisons between the aristocracy and non-human beings; he liberally peppers his work with insulting animal metaphors, crafting comical and often vulgar images of those unfortunate enough to fall prey to his pen. Desmoulins was famously sardonic, even abrasive; Claretie (1874) writes of him, « *Au seul rôle littéraire de cet écrivain d'un talent si rare, d'un esprit si éclatant et si fin, digne fils, en ligne directe, des grands rieurs gaulois, ceux qui inventaient Gargantua ou la Satire Ménippée* » (p. 3).

Desmoulins appears to derive a distinct pleasure from insulting his opponents, which may allow the reader to grin indulgently at the trenchant echoes of a writer long-dead but also demands they question, relentlessly, the veracity of each comparison he draws; care must ever be taken to distinguish petty insults from carefully curated, fanged invectives against Desmoulins's many political opponents. It is in the latter type that the linguistic skill of the journalist Desmoulins reveals itself. Thus, it is necessary to discuss Desmoulins's use of animal metaphors and terminology in tandem with a discussion of the construction and maintenance of the body politic of France, and of the deconstruction and dismemberment of the royal body through the medico-political discourse which haunts much of the rhetoric of Revolutionary France.

The royal absolutist structure of the eighteenth century relied entirely on the classical body of the sovereign, where the form is human and proportionate – naturally, the deconstruction of this perfect body was a favorite tactic amongst those who sought to dethrone a monarch. Desmoulins time and again draws a clear parallel between the monarch and a beast, and in doing so performs a linguistic dissection of the classical body of Louis XVI.

Sternberg, Tourangeau, & Nigro (1978) expound upon this process in their discussion of the animal metaphor MAN IS A WOLF, using the Lakoffian (1980) representation of metaphor not as a series of words but as a concept identified by all capital letters. Before exposure to the metaphor, *man* occupies what Sternberg et al. (1978) calls a “higher-order space” wherein the sense of the word represents a specific set of attributes and concepts, while the referents might contain, for example, prominent world leaders (p. 294). Sternberg et al. (1978) argues that upon being exposed to the metaphor, the processor constructs two prototypical conceptual domains: one for *wolf* and one for *man*, where the qualities of each coalesce to create a blend of the two prototypes; this represents a new sense for the composite concept of *man* and *wolf*.

One can apply the MAN IS A WOLF metaphor to *Discours de Camille Desmoulins* (1792), in which Desmoulins delivers many a scathing perspective on the function of the king. Particularly cutting is this excerpt, in which he calls the king a beast and a cannibal: « *Vous savez bien qu'il n'y a qu'un seul homme que le véritable républicain ne saurait regarder comme un homme, en qui il ne peut voir comme Homère, comme Caton, qu'un bipède anthropophage, & que cette bête ennemie, c'est un roi* » (p. 95).

The semantic relationship between words pertaining to the nobility and their meanings can be examined, as in Sternberg et. al's (1978) model, in terms of sense and reference. This paper will call the metaphor in the excerpt from Desmoulins – « *cette bête ennemie, c'est un roi* » – THE

KING IS A BEAST, which can be conceptualized in precisely the same manner as MAN IS A WOLF. *Roi* occupies a higher-order space than does *bête*. Before exposure to the metaphor, the sense of *roi* contains a set of abstractions and attributes typical to the notion of royalty. The referents of course include Louis XVI, but likely his predecessors and perhaps kings from other countries. *Bête* exists in a lower space, where the sense is of brutality, gluttony, and inhumanity, and the referents include feral incarnations, real-world beasts: perhaps a rabid dog seen on the street or the neighbor's filthy livestock.

In creating THE KING IS A BEAST, Desmoulin forces a collision of these two separate prototypes which then develop a composite sense, introducing themes of savagery into the sense of *roi*. One could conjecture that an irrevocable connection has been forged in the mind of the reader between the word *roi* and the new composite sense. The referents associated with *roi* expand to include the lower-order referents of *bête*. Sternberg et al. (1978) further posits that in such metaphors, the more negative "dimension of aggression" – introduced by the animal half of the metaphor – will likely "receive a higher weight than that of prestige" (p. 294). With this supplemented reference for *roi*, Louis XVI is dehumanized, given animal qualities and proclivities.

This triggers an irrepressible response in the reader to the connotations of Desmoulin's language, as they are made to subconsciously question the veracity of their earlier sense against the newly introduced sense and referents. Lakoff (1993) contends that, "Our system of conventional metaphor is *alive* in the same sense that our system of grammatical and phonological rules is alive; namely, it is constantly in use, automatically and below the level of consciousness" (n.p.). The proposed vitality of this system, operating at the level of the sub-conscious, permits metaphors such as THE KING IS A BEAST to manipulate the processor's understanding of these words at the very point of cognition.

This paper elects not to delve much into the sociocultural facets of dehumanizing rhetoric, as the historical and sociopolitical context of Desmoulins's work has been firmly established. At this stage, the reader has sufficient background to which they may apply the linguistic theories detailed in the following discussion. Although dehumanization is typically considered a psychological process, its linguistic merits within the realm of rhetoric and connotation are undeniable, particularly with regards to semantic pejoration.

Bandura (1996) defines dehumanization as a "moral disengagement" which "divests people of human qualities or attributes bestial qualities to them" (p. 366). Desmoulins's preferred technique can be categorized using the three-dimensional model of what Haslam (2014) terms *humanness denial*, wherein these denials of human attributes are polarized either as animal or object, relative or absolute, explicit or subtle. Desmoulins's own dehumanizing rhetoric typically registers as animal, absolute and explicit dehumanization, characterized by his use of animal metaphors, "ratings of others as subhuman animals" and "rating [...] as wild creatures" (p. 40).³

Notably, Desmoulins does not overtly deny the king his humanity; in fact, he argues explicitly against a total humanness denial. Immediately after calling the king a cannibal and a beast in *Discours*, Desmoulins writes, « *Nous ne demandons pas que, comme Caton, vous ravaliez Louis Capet au-dessous de l'espèce humaine et vous le mettiez au rang des animaux féroces, mais du moins n'en faites pas un être privilégié et d'une nature supérieure* » (p. 95). This appears inherently contradictory, but Haslam (2014) argues that it is "overly restrictive" to define dehumanization as a total denial of humanity, based solely on the presence of the privative prefix *de-*, contending that, "perceiving others as substantially less human than one's own kind... intuitively represents a dehumanizing view of those others" (p. 44).

³ See *Figure 3.1* in Haslam (2014).

Desmoulins seeks to force a mutation of the Second Estate from men to beasts through semantic pejoration of terms related to the Crown, thus creating a sense of mistrust amongst the Third Estate. In an examination of dehumanization and public attitudes, Vasiljevic & Viki (2014) discuss the potential effects of dehumanizing rhetoric on the public perception of criminal offenders, explaining that once the offender is isolated by their crimes from the larger community, punishment is considered justifiable due to the moral disengagement of the public. Kury & Ferdinand (1999) suggest that, “If...criminals are regarded as nonreforming savages, then public attitudes are likely to be negative and result in highly punitive approaches to criminal justice” (cited in Vasiljevic & Viki, 2014, p. 130).

This phenomenon draws from relatively recent research, and is used to characterize the dehumanization of modern criminals; but those same principles can be applied in the context of 18th century France, where Louis XVI was, from the perspective of Desmoulins and his fellows, an offender. The king was formally charged and convicted of his alleged crimes, and his public image degraded by the calculated rhetoric of Desmoulins, to promote the *most* highly punitive approach to criminal justice: execution. Thus, clear parallels exist between the offender paradigm offered by Vasiljevic & Viki (2014) and the unfortunate condition of the animal king.

Desmoulins did not reserve this punishment for the king alone; he extended his viperous expositions to all those he considered oppressors of the rights of man. When the August Decrees were ratified in 1789, which abolished several royal privileges, Desmoulins penned his celebratory *Discours de la lanterne aux Parisien* which Van Laun (1880) describes as “a cry of joy so fervid, so ecstatic [...] perhaps the most exalted passage of rhetoric of the Revolution” (p.149). Most relevant in the said passage is Desmoulins’s references to Decrees II & III, which abolished

exclusive rights of access to dovecotes and exclusive game laws, including that of the royal forest (Van Laun, 1880).

Desmoulin addresses the abolition of these laws through several polemic animal metaphors, comparing the nobles and aristocrats (who had previously retained exclusive rights under feudal law to the game population of the lands) to the game themselves. He writes, « *C'est cette nuit qui a exterminé les sangliers, les lapins, & tout le gibier qui dévorait nos récoltes* » (p. 145) and at once reduces all those fine aristocrats to pests. Of great interest is the coherence of this metaphor, in which Desmoulin chooses the verb *exterminer* to discuss the Second Estate 'pests.' This verb unveils the entire metaphor, making it quite conspicuous within the text.

Using Lakoff's (1980) model for determining the purpose of a metaphor, the basic sense of this is ARISTOCRATS ARE ANIMALS. One must then consider the deeper metaphor, layered underneath the basic A PERSON IS AN ANIMAL metaphor model. Desmoulin's reader is intended to receive the embedded code that these animals are pests who devour the resources of the French people, and that the relationship between the people and the aristocrats is that of adversaries. Thus, the intended metaphor is proposed here to be ARISTOCRATS ARE ADVERSARIES.

Later in *Discours de la lanterne aux Parisien*, Desmoulin lauds the abolition of tithing laws and feudal rights with a gleeful, « *O nuit désastreuse pour [...] gens du roi, pour tous les gens de rapines! [...] pour toutes les sangsues de l'État [...]* » (p. 148). « *Les gens de rapines* » he calls them, and again invokes the offender paradigm of Vasiljevic & Viki (2014) in comparing the gentry to criminals who sap the country's vitality. Desmoulin dehumanizes them in this way, makes them thieves and pillagers with the inherent violence of rapine, makes them savage and parasitic as blood-suckers.

The latter example, « *les sangsues de l'État* », marks an even greater degradation than that of animal metaphor; the beasts are no longer simply beasts, but parasites draining the lifeblood of the nation. Brennan (1995) expounds upon the metaphor of the parasite and the way it represents a threat to the survival of a host: “The blood-draining propensity of parasitic creatures transforms them into the most revolting and threatening entities imaginable... [it] conveys the ultimate in repugnant and malevolent characterizations” (p. 110). The basic sense of this metaphor is THE SECOND ESTATE IS A PARASITIC ANIMAL. Given the supremely negative connotations associated with parasitism, the reader is meant to understand the parasitic animal to be universally reviled, a threat to the health of their own affairs, and to be exterminated; the intended metaphor is THE SECOND ESTATE IS A THREAT.

Desmoulins uses these bestial terms alongside terms normally associated with the aristocracy to force a small-scale semantic pejoration; this sort of degradation occurs when a word begins to take on connotative associations which are more negative than those it initially carried (Brennan, 1995), the natural consequence of which is dehumanization of the subject.

In contrast, *Discours de Camille Desmoulins* (1792) introduces a feature that operates as a compelling foil to Desmoulins's dehumanization of the monarch and aristocracy: it personifies the State. The opening paragraph reads:

La France sera-t-elle une république, ou cherchera-t-elle dans la monarchie, le repos de sa lassitude des trahisons éternelles de ses représentans ? Ferons-nous partie de la monarchie prussienne ou autrichienne, ou la France ne sera-t-elle démembrée qu'en républiques fédératives ? Paris, pour prix de son civisme et de ses sacrifices, nagera-t-il dans le sang ? (p. 91)

Roughly, “France: will she be a republic or will she seek, in the monarchy, repose from the eternal betrayal of her representatives? Shall we be part of the Prussian or Austrian monarchy, or will France only be dismembered as federal republics? Will Paris, for the price of civism and sacrifice, swim in blood?”⁴

This passage is so emotionally arresting because Desmoulins employs critically non-traditional language, pairing the action verbs *chercher* and *nager* with inanimate nouns, and using them specifically in the future tense, *cherchera* and *nagera*. The primary utility of the future tense is to express the will and capacity to perform an action. In giving France and Paris metaphorical will and activity, Desmoulins gives them agency. This depicts them as free-thinking entities and furnishes them with cognitive and emotive capacities; France and Paris are personified.

Lakoff (1980) discusses personifying metaphors as vehicles through which humans make sense of nonhuman beings, objects, and abstractions; in relating these things to human experiences, they are more palatable to the reader or listener. In the above passage, the metaphor suggests in its most basic sense that FRANCE/PARIS IS A PERSON. Under the layer of its basic sense, France/Paris is framed as an entity that shares the interests and the trials of the people, and is framed as an equal. The reader is meant to identify with the entities of France and of Paris; thus, the metaphor is FRANCE/PARIS IS AN EXTENSION OF THE SELF.

Further, in this passage Desmoulins questions the potential dismemberment of the state. This French verb, *démembrer*, comes from the Latin *dis* (apart) and *membrum* (limb); it refers specifically to limbs. Rhetorically, Desmoulins gives France a body, for if a thing can be dismembered it must possess a body. When one considers the 18th century culture of royal absolutism and its reliance upon the humanity and proportionality of the royal body, it is necessary

⁴ Translation mine.

to wonder how crucially this classical body would factor into the public perception of the king. If the body is deconstructed, so is its powerful symbolism.

Desmoulins's use of animal metaphor for the monarch and aristocracy takes on fresh significance when contrasted with his personification of the State, revealing a dynamic sense-reversal: Desmoulins at once rhetorically gives France a body while obliterating the notion of the ruler's body. This serves as a critical precursor to the following discussion of Desmoulins's use of the neologism *brissoter*, in which he metaphorically robs the man Brissot of his personhood, and again draws upon the inherent symbolism of the body.

2. Neologism in *Brissoter*

« *Factus sum in proverbium, je suis devenu proverbe* » (p. 255).

The second trope this paper examines is that of the political neologism *brissoter*. As this neologism cannot be analyzed with regards to frequency, its analysis is primarily concerned with how deeply it is rooted in semantics, and how it might have served Desmoulins's rhetoric. The results of this analysis suggest a strong likelihood that *brissoter* significantly contributed to the rhetoric of suspicion that Desmoulins propagated. Further, the analysis indicates that this neologism represents a clear occurrence of semantic pejoration.

Desmoulins commences *Brissot démasqué* with the above quote from the Psalms, which was, according to Hamel (1866), an « *allusion sanglante au nom de Brissot, dont, comme on vient de le voir, on avait fait 'brissoter' pour dire intriguer...cette riposte est mordante, incisive, accablante* » (p. 99). There is, in fact, much to be said on Brissot and the matter of the Girondins, but none of it is relevant here. It is sufficient to say that Desmoulins and Brissot fundamentally disagreed with one another, culminating in the following episode:

In 1792, Brissot wrote an article for his own newspaper, *Le Patriote français*, aggressively questioning the patriotic authenticity of Desmoulins, who consequently flew into a rage. Claretie (1874) writes of this incident, « *Camille se sentit pris de rage. Il répondit vertement, d'un ton endiablé [...] l'auteur de 'Brissot démasqué' le traita de fripon, forgea le verbe, et fit passer le néologisme en proverbe : brissoter signifiait 'filouter' » (p. 253). Linton (2013) speaks further on the neologism *brissoter*, suggesting that its closest English approximation is 'to steal' or 'to cheat' (p. 130). Although coined by Parisian journalist Morande, the word was popularized when Desmoulins integrated it so devastatingly in his pamphlet, in which he explicitly targets Brissot (Linton, 2013); but how could Desmoulins expect a single word to carry import?*

An excerpt from this pamphlet, *Jean-Pierre Brissot démasqué*, makes clear the linguistic gravity of his insult: « *Je vous avertis qu'on ne réussira pas à brissoter ma réputation: c'est moi qui vais vous arracher le masque » (p. 259); "I warn you that you shall not succeed in your attempt to *brissoter* my reputation: it is I who will tear the mask from your face" (Linton, 2013, p. 130). This pamphlet was extraordinary in its effect on its readership within the Revolutionary Tribunal, particularly Robespierre. Jordan (1999) writes that the work of Robespierre, himself a highly capable orator, is characterized by, "the language of unmasking, unveiling, revealing, discovering, exposing the enemy within, the enemy hidden behind patriotic posturings, the language of suspicion" (cited in Doyle & Haydon, 1999, p. 27). A man so willing to see a traitor in every man warms easily to Desmoulins's image of a patriot unmasked; of Brissot the cheater, Brissot the thief. This can be nothing short of diabolical calculation on the part of Desmoulins, who was perhaps as close to Robespierre as one could be. The Incorruptible, despite his self-imposed patriotic alienation, allowed himself the human indulgence of Desmoulins's friendship (Linton, 2013); it is naïve to suggest that Desmoulins's construction of a metaphorical "unmasking" is*

accidental. Therefore Desmoulins, being both famously clever and direly offended by Brissot, took up his pen and resurrected Morande's neologism.

(Newmark, 1988) defines neologisms as “newly coined lexical units or existing lexical units that acquire a new sense” (p. 140). *Brissoter* is an embodiment of political neologism, specifically used in a political context to serve rhetoric; political neologisms are often coined by the speaker, and uniquely relevant to the native language (Mustafa & Yasin, 2009). As such, they are steeped in situational context and connotation, and serve as useful linguistic tools.

Brissoter is an eponymous neologism, with its etymology tracing back to a proper noun, derived from the qualities associated with its referent, Brissot. Eponyms enjoyed a relative popularity in France; Newmark (1988) argues that the primary function of an eponym is “denoting either allegiance to or influence of the person, or a conspicuous quality or idea associated with them. This has always been common for French statesmen and writers...” (p. 198). Desmoulins's use of *brissoter* supports Newmark's theory in that the function of the neologism is to draw a parallel between the name Brissot and the concept of theft: the conspicuous quality perceived by Desmoulins.

In the precise way that he used animal terminology to achieve a semantic pejoration of monarch-associated terms, Desmoulins produces a degradation of Brissot's own name. The sense of the word is modified to include the concepts of theft and cheating, while the referents may expand to include not only Jacques-Pierre Brissot, but perhaps known local criminals and identifiably corrupt acquaintances.

Further, in using this neologism, Desmoulins goes beyond a simple degradation of Brissot's name; once more, dehumanization is a vital concept. Danesi (2008) claims that, “names are perceived typically to belong to the realm of the sacred” (p. 41); the name is an integral part of

identity, tied inextricably to the very notion of personhood. By employing this eponymous root creation, Desmoulins dehumanizes Brissot in much the same way he dehumanized the monarch and the Second Estate.

There is one striking difference between Desmoulins's treatment of the Second Estate and that of Brissot: he dehumanizes Louis XVI using animal metaphors, and thus preserves his sentience. He robs the king of his personhood, but allows him to remain conscious and animate. By creating a verb from a proper noun and a name - Brissot - Desmoulins simultaneously degrades the sense of Brissot's name and deprives him of his personhood entirely, reducing him to nothing more than a verb. There is a deep incivility to being made a verb; a verb may be conjugated, forced into various forms to suit the necessary operation, made to submit to an agent. With this neologism, Desmoulins takes away both Brissot's humanity and his agency.

Regardless of whether Desmoulins's attack on Brissot was unjust, and indeed Desmoulins himself expressed regret for having written it,⁵ the negative connotation attached to *brissoter* pervades the sense related to the name itself. Linton (2013) suggests that Desmoulins's use of *brissoter* dealt a terrible blow; in a brutally concise summary of the consequences *Brissot démasqué* had on its titular figure, she writes, "these words were used to kill him" (p.131). In fact, they indisputably marked Brissot's descent into public ruin and, in little more than a year, his execution by way of the guillotine (Claretie, 1874).

3. Suspect

The third edition of Desmoulins's newspaper *Le Vieux Cordelier* was released on *quintidi Frimaire, an II* (December 15, 1793). Working insidiously to bolster suspicion, Desmoulins introduces clever antonymic pairs, punctuated with a single condemnation: « *Suspect* ». While

⁵ At the sentencing of the Girondins, Desmoulins exclaimed "O my God! my God! it is I who kill them! my 'Brissot unveiled.' O my God! this has destroyed them!" before collapsing (Claretie, 1876, p. 248).

one could argue that this simply signifies Desmoulins's predilection for dramatic effect, the political nature of the speech in addition to the context revealed when examining his work as a unit suggests that he is deliberately employing semantic techniques: namely, repetition and converse antonymy. Antonymy is expressed in pairs of propositions with meanings that are semantic opposites; while there are several distinct types of antonyms, Desmoulins concerns himself mostly with converseness, wherein two contrasting propositions oppose one another only in terms of point of view (Brinton & Brinton, 2010).

Desmoulins begins his argument in *Le Vieux Cordelier* with, « *Tout donnait de l'ombrage au tyran* »; that any action or reaction by a citizen offends a tyrannical government (p. 166). Desmoulins elaborates, suggesting that « *Étiez-vous riche; il y avait un péril imminent que le peuple ne fût corrompu par vos largesses. Auri vim atque opes Plauti principi infensas. Suspect* ». He then offers the converse: « *Étiez-vous pauvre; comment donc! Invincible empereur, il faut surveiller de plus près cet homme. Il n'y a personne d'entreprenant comme celui qui n'a rien. Syllam inopem, undè præcipuam audaciam. Suspect* » (p. 166).

The speech continues in this vein, offering examples that function as converse antonyms. Desmoulins masquerades here as the Roman philosopher Tacitus; Gilchrist (1971) suggests that Desmoulins presents the aforesaid pairs of converse antonyms, followed by the original Latin text, “under the guise of a translation of Tacitus” which acted as a feasible façade from behind which he could critique the Revolutionary Tribunal, particularly the Law of Suspects, without committing outright treason (p. 289). He writes that in the time of Tacitus, there was the death penalty for those who had committed treason, and that corrupt rulers, both monarchical and not, used their influence to enact terrors against the people.

Tacitus seems to adopt the tone of narrator in this passage, thus it is perhaps not a coincidence that Desmoulins chooses him as the voice through which he argues that terror is not the means to justice; anything but a royalist, yet no longer willing to count himself among the radicals, Desmoulins used *Le Vieux Cordelier* to campaign for moderation and clemency (Scurr, 2006). Desmoulins perhaps views himself as a later incarnation of Tacitus, striving for balance between the broken system of royal absolutism and the new tyranny of the Terror.

Writing from behind the mask of Tacitus, Desmoulins punctuates each half of his converse pairs with the repetition of the word *suspect*. Repetition is a common trope and tool of rhetoric, the purpose of which is to emphasize a key idea; it is perhaps unremarkable in isolation, but used in conjunction with converse pairs, its effect is considerable. Desmoulins uses *suspect* multi-functionally; it encompasses all manner of people and all manner of circumstances, highlighting his argument that suspicion is the lens through which all citizens are watched. As the passage progresses and the scope of who and what is considered suspect widens inexorably, the word *suspect* begins to swallow Parisian society whole; citizens must hold themselves cautiously inert under the scrutiny of the Terror.

In this way, Desmoulins paints the Republic as a dangerously suspicious entity, trusting that the reader will feel suspicious in return; this repetition is a deliberate rhetorical and therefore semantic device designed to fortify the climate of suspicion by using situational and emotional context to establish a value for the word *suspect*. These semantic features, repetition and antonymy, facilitate Desmoulins's argument through their shared rhetorical capabilities. Desmoulins's language is clear and aggressive: calculated to seize the attention of his audience.

4. Conclusion

In conclusion, this contextualized analysis of selected examples yields a wealth of textual evidence which supports the argument that Desmoulins categorically perpetuated suspicion through trope. In the following feature analyses, several of these tropes re-emerge to add a degree of quantitative support and fortify the examples provided above.

b. Qualitative Corpus Analysis

This paper uses structural semantics to interpret corpus data. It must be stressed that this data is herein interpreted *qualitatively*, as it pertains to the semantic features of each word. Any atypical forms that are identified within the corpus will be discussed with the same attention given to historical and situational context as was given to the example analysis portion.

1. Corpus Results

The feature analysis of nouns yielded 9 atypical out of 100 total nouns. These atypical noun usages appear in two distinct clusters: Cluster N1⁶ includes seven (Items 24, 26, 27, 30, 31, 32 & 33), and Cluster N2 includes two (Items 59 & 60).

The feature analysis of verbs yielded 7 atypical out of 100 total verbs. These atypical verbs also appeared in clusters, with the exception of two (Items 56 & 97). Cluster V1⁷ includes two atypical verbs (Items 2 & 4), and Cluster V2 includes three (Items 18, 19 & 20).

Notably, when the atypical forms (Appendices B & C) are viewed alongside the text sample (Appendix A) Cluster N1 and Cluster V2 demonstrate high correspondence, creating a composite cluster of atypical forms.⁸

⁶ N = Noun

⁷ V = Verb

⁸ See Appendix A, Paragraph 1-2.

Unlike the example-based analysis, the corpus analysis shows personification rather than dehumanization as the dominant trope. The entire composite cluster of Cluster N1 and Cluster V2 represents semantic anomalies of personification, and both Cluster V1 and one of the isolated items in the verb corpus (Item 56) signal two pertinent instances of personification. Conversely, the only instance of dehumanization occurs in Cluster N2, although the semantic gravity of the examples therein is particularly strong.

These examples of semantic anomaly and trope are interpreted using the work of Altmann & Kamide (1999), who argue that, in responding to both auditory and visual stimuli, “the processor can project, at the verb, the upcoming referring expression... it evaluates that projected expression with respect to the context and the entities within that context which fulfill the selectional restrictions of the verb” (p. 249).⁹ This notion of predictive processing relies entirely on the processor’s expectation that the language they are reading or hearing will conform to selectional restrictions. When that expectation is not met, such as when a violation of selectional restriction occurs, the utterance can then be called atypical. The word or words which violate selectional restrictions can be conceptualized as a tripwire; when the expected input structure is in some way breached, the wire is tripped, which triggers a response in the processor who is then required to process the sentence differently: through metaphor.

This harkens back to Lakoff’s (1993) claim that the cognitive system of metaphor processing is alive, that the processor must constantly amend their expectations to sort through the many manipulations linguistic input may undergo before finally being processed either as semantically ambiguous or, in the case of Desmoulin’s readership, as semantic anomaly; all

⁹ The data supporting this assertion comes from studies in predictive eye-tracking experiments, which demonstrated varying speeds of saccadic eye movement depending on the situation type proposed by the verb (Altmann & Kamide, 1999).

atypical forms identified within these corpora represent instances of semantic anomaly by way of figurative language use, and thus rely heavily upon the Lakoffian theory of metaphor cognition and Altmann & Kamide's assertions about predictive processing.

2. Analysis of Nouns

Before moving into an analysis of atypical forms, a brief digression must be taken to make a distinction between atypical forms and items that require some justification for their qualification. Several items were identified within the corpus that are not atypical, but the features of which – within the scope of the sample text – necessitate a degree of contextualization to justify the reasons for their qualification.¹⁰

Items 13 (*départemens*), 70 (*assemblée*) and 84 (*multitude*) are qualified as [+ANIMATE] and [+HUMAN]. As semantic analysis relies on conception, these items are qualified using the notion of “the collective body of people” that constitutes them (Brinton & Brinton, 2010, p. 159). For example, in the case of Item 84, the *multitude* is comprised of *mauvais citoyens*, thus it is human and animate.

Although missing from modern dictionaries, Item 6 (*représentans*) was the 18th century French spelling of the modern French *représentant(e)s*.¹¹ *Représentans* was the sole form of the noun, with no optional grapheme ⟨ e ⟩ to denote a female representative, especially considering the absence of women within the realm of 18th century politics. Therefore, this item is [+MALE] despite any explicit qualification as such.

Cluster N1 is introduced by Item 24 (*nation*), which sets the stage for the atypical forms appearing in the following paragraph. This item is recognized as atypical when examined within

¹⁰ All items that require justification are tagged on Appendices B-C with an asterisk [*].

¹¹ See the French spelling reform of the 19th century.

the scope of its appearance in the text, where the direct quote reads, « ... *qu'on vous propose de donner à la nation fatiguée* ». Desmoulins's usage of this noun renders it arguably animate. A nation is a collection of animate beings, which is itself support for animacy, as discussed above in the cases of Items 13, 70 & 84. Yet many entities and concepts beyond people are inherent in the word *nation*; it comprises resources, cities, landmarks, statistics. The argument that a collective body of people constitutes animacy is not enough to render Item 24 [+ANIMATE]. Therefore, the value of *nation* in isolation from the surrounding meaning properties at the sentence level would register [-ANIMATE]. However, *nation* is followed by the adjective *fatiguée*, which marks an atypical adjective-noun pairing; *fatiguée* would choose animate nouns through its selectional restrictions. Thus, Item 24 is [+ANIMATE] which is both semantically atypical and consistent with Desmoulins's pattern of utilizing specific rhetoric to personify France, speaking to the metaphor FRANCE IS A PERSON.

In the following paragraph, Desmoulins continues in this vein, where Item 26 (*regards*) is flagged as atypical despite being typical in each of its features. « *J'entends parler sans cesse des regards de l'Europe et de la postérité* », writes Desmoulins, attributing human capabilities and qualities (*regards*), to the continent of Europe. Thus, while Item 26 remains typical in its features, it is paired with an inanimate proper noun (*Europe*) and with the atypical Item 27 (*postérité*); the latter is atypical because the presence of Item 26 makes it [+ANIMATE] where typically it would be negative for the feature of animacy, signaling semantic anomaly.

Items 30 (*état*), 31 (*avilissement*), 32 (*droit*) and 33 (*mépris*) all belong within Cluster N1, justified by the same selectional restriction and semantic anomaly as Items 26 & 27. Items 30-32 appear in conjunction with the inanimate proper noun, *Europe*, and are spoken of as human

attributes and capacities; the “debased state” of Europe gives it no “right” to despise anyone.¹² Item 33 is treated identically to Item 26, as the noun it pairs with is a later repetition of Item 27. These atypical forms represent a set of coherent personifying metaphors, connected by an overarching theme wherein the metaphor is that EUROPE IS A PERSON and, more specifically, EUROPE IS A JUDGE (Lakoff, 1980).

Belonging to Cluster N2, Items 59 (*criailleries*) and 60 (*grenouilles*) are the most strikingly atypical items identified within the corpus. Although relatively unassuming in the greater context of *Discours*, this sentence possesses a great deal of layered meaning which, once explored, proves a cutthroat tactic. The excerpt in its entirety reads: « ..ne pouvant même imaginer comment des républicains demandent la mort de Louis, parce qu’il fut roi, appelle élégamment cette opinion de ses ancêtres Brutus, les criailleries des grenouilles de marais ». Here, Desmoulin expresses contempt for those who question the Republic’s desire to execute Louis XVI. It is necessary to note that *les grenouilles* is situated within a certain historical context, having been used by Mercier (1781) several years earlier to describe Parisians.¹³ Mercier’s use of this expression likely derives from La Fontaine’s (1668) apologue *Les Grenouilles qui demandent un roi*, in which « la gent marécageuse, gent fort sott et fort peureuse » (7-8) desires a monarchy and soon comes to regret it, for its monarch is a tyrant. Written during the reign of Louis XIV, it certainly appears to have inspired Mercier, although it is in fact Desmoulin who resurrects La Fontaine’s initial metaphor of the foolish frogs which propagate royalism and therefore tyranny.

Desmoulin chooses to recycle La Fontaine’s use of the feminine plural noun *grenouilles* rather than opting for the masculine *crapauds*. Desmoulin’s employment of the female gendered

¹² The use of the pronoun *personne* is also significant, as it equates Europe to other humans.

¹³ See Mercier, « *Que disent les grenouilles ?* » (1781, p. 44).

noun is a conscious choice, dense with nuanced implication: to assign men the female option. Further, not only is *grenouille* a feminine noun, but one which includes the diminutive suffix *-ille*. French gender agreement then permits the use of another feminine noun, *criailleries*. Had Desmoulins written « *les cris des crapauds de marais* », there would be nothing to discuss, and the metaphor would contain significantly less layered meaning. But the noun *criailleries* also possesses a feminine nominalizer as its suffix, *-ies*, which allows the noun to connote diminutive properties. The result of this is that Desmoulins not only dehumanizes his enemies, calling them frogs, but feminizes them as well with the use of feminine pejoratives. Therefore, *les grenouilles* is arguably positive for the human feature because it is used as an unveiled metaphor for Desmoulins's very human political opponents, particularly those who were opposed to the execution of Louis XVI.¹⁴

3. Analysis of Verbs

Only one item from the corpus of verbs must be justified prior to beginning the analysis of atypical forms: Item 54 (*voyager*) is classified as [+VOLUNTARY] but [-TELIC], whereas typically this verb would imply telicity. In this context, Desmoulins writes of a man who travels « *toute sa vie* » and not one who travels to a specific destination with any specific intention. The situation is an ongoing activity, lacking a necessary endpoint.

Discours de Camille Desmoulins begins with an atypical item, setting the tone for the remainder of the piece, although this item, Item 2 (*chercher*), is not atypical in isolation. In conformance to typical language, the [+VOLUNTARY] verb *chercher* would select [+ANIMATE] noun arguments; however, in Desmoulins's text, Item 2 violates selectional restriction by selecting *la France* as the agent, the performer of a [+VOLUNTARY] and [+TELIC]

¹⁴ See La Fontaine's apologue, *Les grenouilles qui demandent un roi*.

situation type, searching for *repos*, which is something uniquely enjoyed by animate beings. The noun *repos* is not treated as atypical in this context because it is not part of the semantic violation; that is to say, if the agent of Item 2 were human, this sentence would be typical.

Item 4 (*nager*) is atypical in several ways, the first being that it violates selectional restriction much in the same manner as Item 2 in choosing an [-ANIMATE] argument, *Paris*, for a situation type that would typically select animate arguments.

Further, Item 4 is [-VOLUNTARY] where the typical value of *nager* implies volition. Appearing in the context of « *Paris [...] nagera-t-il dans le sang?* », it possesses a connotative meaning more akin to drowning than swimming, and is therefore decidedly [-VOLUNTARY]. Although the verb used is *nager*, the situation type is more accurately represented by the reflexive *se noyer*; this also signals an atypical usage in that it is an active verb used figuratively to elicit passive meaning.

The meaning itself can be examined on multiple levels: in literal terms, Desmoulins questions whether the city of Paris will suffer desolation from monarchical bloodlust, while figuratively, he questions whether Paris will drown in blood. The metaphor here is quite curious; Desmoulins at once personifies Paris – which, as was discussed above regarding *nation*, is not inherently [+ANIMATE] despite being a collective body of animate beings – and takes away its agency. Paris does not choose to swim, and in fact does not swim at all; under the extrinsic pressure of its circumstances, it drowns.

This complexity can be further explicated using the Lakoffian (1980) formula for metaphors. The circuitous process by which one arrives at the intended meaning of this metaphor begins with PARIS WILL SWIM IN BLOOD. Once contextualized through the passivity of the situation type, however, the meaning becomes PARIS WILL DROWN IN BLOOD which, in turn, has the literal

meaning PARIS WILL BE DESTROYED BY THE MONARCHY. Furthermore, there is deeper meaning embedded in the metaphor, which is that if PARIS WILL BE DESTROYED BY THE MONARCHY, then PARIS REQUIRES A REPUBLIC TO SURVIVE.

This paper holds that the interrogative structure of the original sentence, « *Paris [...] nagera-t-il dans le sang?* », can be largely ignored on the basis that this is not truly a question, but rather an imperative statement with all the trappings of a question. Desmoulin frames the proposition PARIS REQUIRES A REPUBLIC TO SURVIVE using an interrogative structure, but when the meaning is broken down using Lakoff's formula, one can see that the meaning becomes rhetorically imperative. Thus, Desmoulin's multilayered metaphor personifies the city of Paris and demands that the people align themselves with Revolutionary aims. In questioning the fate of the city, Desmoulin questions the fate of the reader, who is expected to recognize the microcosmic synecdoche PARIS = THE FRENCH PEOPLE.

Cluster V2 appears at this juncture, pertaining to this excerpt: « *S'il est vrai que l'Europe & la postérité contemplent beaucoup d'entre nous; comment ne sera-ce pas, je ne dirai point de la part de l'Europe, (dans son état d'avilissement, elle n'a le droit de mépriser personne), mais de la part de la postérité, comment ne sera-ce pas avec le plus grand mépris* ». The atypical nouns in this excerpt have been discussed at length in the noun analysis; herein are discussed the atypical verbs, Items 18, 19 & 20.

Item 18 (*contempler*) can be interpreted using Altmann & Kamide's (1999) postulation on predictive sentence processing. It registers as atypical because the action of contemplation in this instance is anomalous, as only animate and specifically human beings are capable of contemplation. Yet it is paired with the proper noun *l'Europe* and the noun *la postérité*. As the linguistic input is processed, the processor expects Item 18 to select [+ANIMATE] noun

arguments; when it fails to do so, it violates its selectional restrictions, as neither of the chosen noun arguments are [+ANIMATE], yet the verb *contempler* implies, and in fact necessitates, cognition.

The semantic features of Item 19 (*avoir*) are not atypical, yet this is a fine example of selectional restriction violations by way of metaphor, where the components of the word itself are logical and typical, but its usage within the sentence is not. Brinton & Brinton (2010) write that when there is “no apparent violation of selectional restriction in the immediate context...the larger context will undoubtedly reveal a violation” (p. 178); such is the case in Item 19.

Although Item 20 (*mépriser*) has typical features in isolation, it is atypical for the same reasons discussed in Item 18; this emotive verb is paired with a traditionally inanimate noun. Where Item 18 (*contempler*) denotes cognition, Item 20 denotes emotive function.

Although it is separate from Cluster V2, Item 56 (*vouloir*) is treated in the same fashion as Items 18 & 20, with regards to predictive processing. Item 56 selects the [-ANIMATE] noun *nation*. As something inanimate certainly does not have the capacity to *want*, this is semantically anomalous.

Item 97 (*coucher*) contrasts intriguingly with the verb that immediately precedes it, *lever*. Both verbs are performed by the agent *aristocrates*, « *qui, s'étant levés royalistes, se sont couchés républicains le 21 septembre* ». This paper argues that the features of these two verbs differ in volition and that their connotative meaning is quite separate from their denotative meaning, when considered alongside the historical context. September 21, 1792, is the day the National Convention voted to abolish the monarchy; the very next day, September 22, was the first day of *an I* on the French Republican calendar. The aristocrats of whom Desmoulins writes had arguably never chosen to be royalists but were indoctrinated by birth and culture; thus, that they had risen

that day as royalists is a state of being, and is [-VOLUNTARY]. After the abolition of the monarchy that same day, they chose (albeit perhaps under strong duress) to become Republicans; this transforms the situation type from a state of being to a voluntary action. Denotatively, *lever* is “to get up” and *coucher* is “to go to bed”; however, in this context, *lever* implies the action of existing in an ongoing state of being and is therefore involuntary and atelic, while *coucher* implies the voluntary and telic transition from the former state of being into a new one. Critically, *coucher* does not connote the new state of being itself, but rather the choice to transition.

IV. Discussion

Desmoulin demonstrates a masterful application of semantic theory in each of the examples analyzed in this paper; each serves to demonstrate the range and depth of his linguistic acuity and his proficiency in employing both rhetorical guile and subtle connotation. With regards to the corpus results, the frequency of atypical forms is encouraging, despite the small sample size.

Furthermore, this paper highlights potential shortcomings in traditional semantics with regards to the interpretation of metaphor and figurative language. Traditional semantic theory neglects to account for the subtle cognitive processes inherent in the interpretation of such language; for example, while traditional semantics discusses the sense-reference relationship, it fails to account for how that relationship is processed cognitively. Additionally, the present paper encountered shortcomings in Lakoff’s (1980) model, and was compelled to supplement with theoretical frameworks from Fauconnier & Turner (2002), Turner (2006) and Fludernik (2012). This identifies a potential lack of cohesion in the available theoretical frameworks, and suggests the need for more comprehensive institutional instruction in the cognitive facets of semantics.

a. Limitations

Several limitations to the breadth and accuracy of this paper are evident, the first of which is the small sample size used in the corpus analysis. Further, only the writing of Desmoulins was analyzed, which does not allow for comparative analysis. Constructing a test-bed of other writers' work with which to compare Desmoulins's would eliminate the problematic element of analyzing a sole author. Furthermore, although the example-based approach used in the methodology offers strong support for its argument, it creates a potential degree of bias as the analysis utilizes hand-selected texts and excerpts that best support the hypothesis. This certainly does not negate the impact of the examples discussed nor the significance of the findings thereof, but devoting part of the paper to an analysis of randomly sampled texts analyzed alongside other randomly sampled texts from the test-bed would furnish the study with an unbiased dimension. In a repeat study, random sampling of examples would perhaps be a good next step to augment the findings of the current example analysis.

Beyond potential bias in the methodology, this paper is limited by several practical constraints. One major constraint to the corpus analysis is that atypical forms, specifically as they relate to semantic anomaly and metaphor, must be searched manually which "drastically limits the potential size of the corpus" (Stefanowitsch, 2006, p. 2). Indeed, the small sample size used in the present paper was labor-intensive. However, given the relatively high frequency of atypical forms identified, the ability to statistically support this paper's hypothesis is promising enough to override concerns of labor. Stefanowitsch (2006) further expresses that although a corpus-based approach to metaphor is a fledgling field, there is a great deal of promise to such a non-traditional conceptualization of metaphor.

b. Future Analysis

In future, a quantitative corpus analysis measured against corpora taken from the test-bed will be necessary in establishing a statistical basis for the frequency with which Desmoulins uses certain tropes and atypical forms. A feature analysis with a larger sample size compared with feature analyses from a test-bed composed of two of Desmoulins's contemporaries offers a promising next step for this project. Utilizing the first 1,000 nouns and verbs in a work from Desmoulins, alongside the first 1,000 nouns and verbs in works culled from the test-bed is closer to the methodology of Morzinski (1994) which was used to construct the methodology in the present paper.

Selecting writers for the test-bed may prove somewhat difficult; for the most unbiased comparison, Desmoulins must be compared alongside writers as circumstantially similar to him as possible. They must be writers from the Montagnard faction rather than the Girondin faction, as the political aims and purposes differ substantially between the two. Of the Montagnards, Robespierre and Danton immediately come to mind; however, despite being a popular and influential writer in his day, the celebrity of Desmoulins never quite matched that of Robespierre nor Danton. There is a further difficulty in determining who is best suited for comparison, as the Montagnard faction eventually split into several sub-groups, of which Desmoulins belonged to the Dantonists. Therefore, Dantonist writers of similar esteem who wrote political materials between 1789-1793 would comprise an ideal test-bed.

Alternatively, a comparative analysis of one writer from each faction within the Montagnards would offer a great deal of breadth for contrastive study; perhaps Saint-Just of the Robespierrists, Chaumette of the Hébertists, and Desmoulins of the Dantonists – the three sub-factions of the Montagnards – would allow for a striking study in stylistic differences between the

factions. As none of these men were the titular figures of their factions, their prestige is in approximate alignment; a comparative study of their works would aid in further contextualizing Desmoulins's writing itself. There were many popular, persuasive writers, Saint-Just and Chaumette included, who published opinion pieces on Louis XVI's trial and execution. Comparing these texts with *Discours de Camille Desmoulins* would allow for a cohesion of subject matter across all three writers, helping to control for content and context.

Lastly, drawing content from the same test-bed to construct comparative corpora will make a statistical analysis possible, which is expected to demonstrate a measurable difference in frequency of atypical forms related to tropes of dehumanization and personification in Desmoulins's writing as compared to his fellows.

Another potential next step for this study is the addition of a corpus-based keyword search in keeping with the approach laid out in Toolan (2009). By compiling work from the test-bed discussed above, a keyword search of terms related to animal metaphor and personification could identify each occurrence of such terms across the test-bed, allowing for a comparative and quantitative analysis of tropes, specifically dehumanization and personification. The context and surrounding words could be then examined qualitatively to determine whether there is a violation of selectional restrictions.

Yet these future considerations are not without limitations themselves. One potential constraint in a keyword search is the availability of searchable source material. Although much of the work of Desmoulins and his contemporaries has been digitized, the digitization was performed through optical character recognition (OCR), which converts a scanned image of text to a machine-readable format (Bowker, 2002). Texts converted using OCR software are highly searchable, but lack absolute accuracy due to mistakes in pattern matching; a number of factors can influence OCR

reliability, including source texts in which there is faded or blurred text. This proved an issue in the present paper; in several of Desmoulins's works the original text is somewhat marred by distorted characters, which impeded pattern matching. It was therefore necessary to manually transcribe the sample text of *Discours de Camille Desmoulins* in order to enter data into the corpus. For a keyword search, this would be particularly difficult, as searching a keyword would not necessarily identify each occurrence of that word. Therefore, to control for any such errors, a manual transcription of all sample texts – from Desmoulins and from the test-bed writers – would prove necessary for a reliable keyword search.

Another major consideration in performing a keyword search is the variance of language and the age of the text; it would be necessary to control for potential synonyms, alternative spellings,¹⁵ misspellings and instances of metonymy and synecdoche. A great deal of manual quality control by a transcriptionist would be necessary to ensure the integrity of the source text with regards to misspellings and alternative spellings.

c. Conclusion

The day the Bastille fell, Camille Desmoulins was thrust irrevocably into revolutionary glory, but that would not be his only legacy. Through words alone, the strange young man with a speech impediment destroyed reputations, undermined the dominion of the steely Robespierre, aided in the execution of a monarch, and was the impetus that drove the downfall of an entire opposing faction; whether he was a patriot or a terrorist is subject to interpretation, but his masterful manipulation of rhetoric and connotation is undeniable.

¹⁵ As the work in question is pre-language reform, alternative spellings are common.

Understanding the linguistic applications in Desmoulins's work requires one to delve into both the political and social climate of eighteenth century France, as well as into abstract linguistic theory. Although the argument could be made that all French Revolutionaries employed these same techniques, the sheer breadth and impact of Desmoulins's work places him firmly at the forefront of the Revolution's journalistic movement; thus, understanding the mechanics which made his writing relevant is critical to understanding the Revolution itself and appreciating the depth of Desmoulins's linguistic cunning.

Appendix A

*Discours de Camille Desmoulins*¹⁶

La France sera-t-elle une république, ou cherchera-t-elle dans la monarchie, le repos de sa lassitude des trahisons éternelles de ses représentans ? Ferons-nous partie de la monarchie prussienne ou autrichienne, ou la France ne sera-t-elle démembrée qu'en républiques fédératives ? Paris, pour prix de son civisme et de ses sacrifices, nagera-t-il dans le sang ? Allez-vous décréter son entière destruction, la dépopulation des 84 départemens, et peut-être 50 ans de guerres civiles ? Sera-ce une question si les fondateurs de la république ne sont pas dignes de mort ? Que dis-je, sera-ce vous-mêmes qui prononcerez que vous avez mérité l'échafaud ? Telle est l'étrange discussion que je soutiens, qu'on est parvenu à mettre à l'ordre du jour ; tels sont les jours de paix, d'ordre et de bonheur, qu'on vous propose de donner à la nation fatiguée ; tel est l'arrêt qu'on vous demande contre vous-mêmes.

J'entends parler sans cesse des regards de l'Europe et de la postérité : de bonne foi, connaissons-nous donc nous-mêmes. S'il est vrai que l'Europe et la postérité contemplent beaucoup d'entre nous ; comment ne sera-ce pas, je ne dirai point de la part de l'Europe, (dans son état d'avilissement, elle n'a le droit de mépriser personne), mais de la part de la postérité, comment ne sera-ce pas avec le plus grand mépris ? Quoi ! nous, nous disons la convention nationale de France, c'est-à-dire la représentation, révolutionnaire, et jusqu'au veto du souverain, toute-puissante de 24 millions d'hommes !

Au milieu de nous préside l'image du premier des Brutus, nous recueillons religieusement dans les ruines de l'antiquité, les vestiges les plus incertains de leurs paroles, et il a suffi de leur nom pour faire adopter, d'enthousiasme, les plus injustes motions. Diférans entre nous d'opinions,

¹⁶ From Desmoulins's *Discours de Camille Desmoulins* (1793, p. 91-96).

nous nous accordons tous à nous disputer à l'envi le surnom de Brutus, et voilà quatre mois que Brutus délibèrent gravement si un tyran n'est pas inviolable ! Le Brutus de Nancy, Salle, délibère : écoutez, citoyens, ce sont ses expressions : si ce n'est pas souiller sa mémoire d'un régicide abominable ; et le Brutus de Perpignan, Birotteau, ne pouvant même imaginer comment des républicains demandent la mort de Louis, parce qu'il fut roi, appelle élégamment cette opinion de ses ancêtres Brutus, les criailleries des grenouilles de marais. Ces débats interminables de nos Brutus et de nos Cassies, à qui le cri de leur conscience ne permet pas de faire périr un roi parjure, qui fut à la fois César et Catilina tout ensemble, aura eu du moins ce bon effet de permettre à ceux qu'on appelait les tyrans de la parole, d'obtenir une fois la parole. Étrange part de tyrannie, de triumvirat, de dictatorial que la mienne dans une assemblée, où pour qu'il me fut possible, depuis quatre mois, de dire une fois mon opinion, il n'a pas fallu moins qu'un appel nominal de tous les orateurs. Il m'est donc permis de monter une fois à la tribune et de m'élever à la hauteur de Lanjuinais et de Buzot à qui Edme Petit ne reproche que d'être trop savant. Je viens à mon tour, et je n'ai gardé de laisser échapper cette occasion unique de vous exposer ce que je pense de notre situation politique, si étroitement liée à cette discussion, que je n'aurai pas besoin de sortir de la question et de l'ordre du jour.

Je suis loin de me livrer au découragement. Ouvrez les annales de tous les peuples, et voyez quel petit nombre d'hommes de bien a suffi pour balancer les intrigues, la puissance et la multitude des mauvais citoyens ! voyez sur le penchant de sa ruine, la république soutenue si longtemps par un Barneveldt, et les deux Corneille, et Jean de With en Hollande : par Pym, Hamden, et Jean Hollis en Angleterre ; par Caton et Cicéron, à Rome. Voyez Caton lui seul, luttant contre le génie et les victoires de César, uniquement avec les forces de la probité et du patriotisme. Rappelez-vous dans tous les temps cette disette affreuse de patriotes prononcés & à grand caractère. Voyez les conjurés

contre César, le lendemain du plus glorieux des tyrannicides, obligés de se soustraire par la fuite, à la fureur du peuple. Jetez surtout un regard sur le dernier âge de l'Europe ; rappelez-vous qu'il n'y a pas longtemps qu'un homme qui n'avait fait que voyager toute sa vie, répondait qu'il aurait bien voulu se fixer dans quelque ville, mais qu'il n'en avait trouvé aucune où la puissance et le crédit pussent entre les mains des gens de bien. Observez encore le parlement d'Angleterre, et non pas seulement cette foule de pensionnaires de Georges, mais ce parti même de l'opposition qui n'est qu'une comédie & un simulacre de Publicola, pour ôter au peuple anglais, la pensée de se nommer des défenseurs, en lui faisant croire qu'il en a dans les communes; et dites quelles espérances ne doit pas concevoir la patrie et la génération en comptant dans cette assemblée nationale, non pas seulement un ou deux, non pas seulement six, mais bien plus de cent membres déterminés, comme l'a dit Robespierre, à défendre la cause de la liberté à la manière des Hamden et des Sydney, & à porter leur tête sur l'échafaud plutôt que de la trahir.

Cependant je dois l'avouer ; je n'ai jamais moins espéré la république, que depuis que nous avons la république. Qu'est-ce en effet qui constitue l'état de la république ? Montesquieu vous l'a dit ; c'est l'égalité des droits ; et l'assemblée constituante qui avait proclamé cette égalité, qui avait dit : La loi, soit qu'elle protège, soit qu'elle punisse, est égale pour tous, avait fait de la France une république, quelque nom qu'elle eût donné à la constitution ; car ce n'est point le nom que le notaire donne à l'acte, mais la substance même de l'acte qui en fait la nature. Il était donc vrai de dire que nous devînmes une république en 1789, comme il semble vrai de dire que nous voilà redevenus une monarchie en 1793, puisque reconnaissant tous que Louis fût un traître et le condamnant à mort, vous lui réservez l'appel au peuple, comme si les autres malfaiteurs, les autres conspirateurs, ses égaux en droits, pouvaient appeler au peuple. Ne venez plus me dire que vous êtes des républicains, que vous portez dans le cœur la haine de la royauté. Vous, des républicains

! vous ne le croyez pas vous-mêmes. Vous savez bien que, devant le républicain, tous les hommes sont égaux. Je me trompe : vous savez bien qu'il n'y a qu'un seul homme que le véritable républicain ne saurait regarder comme un homme, en qui il ne peut voir comme Homère, comme Caton, qu'un bipède anthropophage, et que cette bête ennemie, c'est un roi. Nous ne demandons pas, que, comme Caton, vous ravaliez Louis Capet au-dessous de l'espèce humaine et vous le mettiez au rang des animaux féroces, mais du moins n'en faites pas un être privilégié et d'une nature supérieure. Et ne me parlez point de raison d'état : car dès que vous avez fait de la France une république, et après que vous avez condamné à mort Louis Capet pour ses crimes, c'est attenter à l'égalité, c'est renverser la république et votre ouvrage, que d'introduire pour Louis le privilège d'un appel qui n'est point ouvert aux autres malfaiteurs. Et certes la première raison d'état, c'est pour nous de maintenir la république. Si au lieu de sentir au fond de vos cœurs cette haine dont tout républicain poursuit le tyran, vous inventez pour lui un privilège, si vous ne regardez pas un trône comme un échafaud enchanté, autour duquel le brigand voit les malheureux qu'il pille et qu'il assassine, au lieu de le frapper de la hâche, se prosterner et trembler à ses pieds, c'est le vil sang des esclaves, et non celui de Brutus, qui coule dans vos veines, et je vous rejette parmi ces aristocrates, ces feuilans honteux, qui, s'étant levés royalistes, se sont couchés républicains le 21 septembre. Vous vous efforcez en vain de pallier ce royalisme par un dilemme qu'on a fait sonner bien haut : ou la nation veut que Louis meure, ou elle ne le veut pas : au premier cas, le jugement sera confirmé ; au second, le souverain a droit de le casser.

Appendix B

Feature Analysis of Nouns

#	NOUN	ANIMATE	HUMAN	MALE
1	république	-	-	-
2	monarchie	-	-	-
3	repos	-	-	+
4	lassitude	-	-	-
5	trahisons	-	-	-
6	représentans*	+	+	+
7	prix	-	-	+
8	civisme	+	-	+
9	sacrifices	-	-	+
10	sang	-	-	+
11	destruction	-	-	-
12	dépopulation	-	-	-
13	départemens*	+	-	+
14	guerres	-	-	-
15	question	-	-	-
16	fondateurs	+	+	+
17	mort	-	-	+
18	échafaud	-	-	+
19	discussion	-	-	-
20	ordre	-	-	+
21	jour	-	-	+
22	paix	-	-	-
23	bonheur	-	-	+
24	nation	+	-	-

25	arrêt	-	-	-
26	regards	-	-	+
27	postérité	+	-	-
28	foi	-	-	-
29	part	-	-	-
30	état	-	-	+
31	avilissement	-	-	+
32	droit	-	-	+
33	mépris	-	-	+
34	convention	-	-	-
35	révolutionnaire	+	+	-
36	veto	-	-	+
37	souverain	+	+	+
38	hommes	+	+	+
39	image	-	-	-
40	ruines	-	-	-
41	antiquité	-	-	-
42	vestiges	-	-	+
43	paroles	-	-	-
44	nom	-	-	+
45	enthousiasme	-	-	+
46	motions	-	-	-
47	opinions	-	-	-
48	surnom	-	-	+
49	mois	-	-	+
50	tyran	+	+	+
51	citoyens	+	+	+

52	expressions	-	-	-
53	mémoire	-	-	-
54	régicide	-	-	+
55	républicains	+	+	+
56	mort	-	-	-
57	roi	+	+	+
58	ancêtres	+	+	+
59	criailleries	-	-	-
60	grenouilles	+	+	-
61	marais	-	-	+
62	débats	-	-	+
63	cri	-	-	+
64	conscience	+	-	-
65	fois	-	-	-
66	effet	-	-	+
67	tyrannie	-	-	-
68	triumvirat	+	+	+
69	dictatoriat	+	+	+
70	assemblée*	+	+	-
71	appel	-	-	+
72	orateurs	+	+	+
73	tribune	-	-	-
74	hauteur	-	-	-
75	tour	-	-	+
76	occasion	-	-	-
77	situation	-	-	-
78	découragement	-	-	+

79	annales	-	-	-
80	peuples	+	+	+
81	nombre	-	-	+
82	intrigues	-	-	-
83	puissance	-	-	-
84	multitude*	+	-	-
85	penchant	-	-	+
86	génie	+	-	-
87	victoires	-	-	-
88	forces	-	-	-
89	probité	-	-	-
90	patriotisme	+	-	+
91	disette	-	-	-
92	caractère	-	-	+
93	conjurés	+	+	+
94	lendemain	-	-	+
95	tyrannicides	-	-	+
96	fuite	-	-	-
97	fureur	+	-	-
98	regard	-	-	+
99	vie	-	-	-
100	ville	-	-	-

Appendix C

Feature Analysis of Verbs

#	VERB	TELIC	VOLUNTARY
1	être	+	+
2	chercher	+	+
3	faire	-	+
4	nager	-	-
5	décréter	+	+
6	dire	+	+
7	prononcer	+	+
8	mériter	-	-
9	soutenir	-	+
10	parvenir	+	+
11	mettre	+	+
12	proposer	+	+
13	donner	-	+
14	demander	+	+
15	entendre	-	-
16	parler	+	+
17	connaître	-	-
18	contempler	-	+
19	avoir	-	-
20	mépriser	-	-
21	présider	-	+
22	recueillir	-	+
23	suffire	-	-
24	adopter	+	+

25	accorder	+	+
26	disputer	-	+
27	délibérer	-	+
28	écouter	+	+
29	souiller	-	+
30	imaginer	-	+
31	appeler	+	+
32	permettre	+	+
33	périr*	+	+
34	obtenir	+	+
35	falloir	+	-
36	monter	+	+
37	élever	-	-
38	reprocher	-	+
39	venir	+	+
40	garder	+	+
41	laisser	+	+
42	échapper	+	+
43	exposer	+	+
44	penser	-	-
45	sortir	+	+
46	livrer	+	+
47	ouvrir	+	+
48	voir	+	+
49	balancer	-	+
50	lutter	+	+
51	rappeler	+	+

52	soustraire	+	+
53	jeter	+	+
54	voyager*	-	+
55	répondre	+	+
56	vouloir	+	-
57	fixer	-	+
58	trouver	-	-
59	observer	-	+
60	ôter	+	+
61	nommer	+	+
62	croire	-	-
63	concevoir	-	+
64	défendre	+	+
65	porter	+	+
66	avouer	+	+
67	espérer	-	+
68	constituer	-	-
69	proclamer	+	+
70	protéger	+	+
71	punir	+	+
72	devenir	+	+
73	sembler	-	-
74	redevenir	-	-
75	reconnaître	-	-
76	réserver	+	+
77	savoir	-	-
78	tromper	-	-

79	regarder	-	+
80	ravaler	-	+
81	condamner	+	+
82	attenter	+	+
83	renverser	+	+
84	introduire	+	+
85	maintenir	-	+
86	sentir	-	-
87	poursuivre	+	+
88	inventer	+	+
89	piller	+	+
90	assassiner	+	+
91	frapper	+	+
92	prosterner	+	+
93	trembler	-	-
94	couler	-	-
95	rejeter	+	+
96	lever	-	-
97	coucher	+	+
98	efforcer	+	+
99	pallier	+	+
100	sonner	-	+

References

Primary Sources

Desmoulins, C. (1874). *Discours de la lanterne aux Parisiens*. In Claretie, J. *Œuvres de Camille Desmoulins, 1*, 137-195. Paris, France: Charpentier et Cie.

Original work published in 1789.

Desmoulins, C. (1874). *Jean-Pierre Brissot démasqué*. In Claretie, J. (1874). *Œuvres de Camille Desmoulins, 1*, 255-290. Paris, France: Charpentier et Cie.

Original work published in 1792.

Desmoulins, C. (1874). *Discours de Camille Desmoulins député de Paris à la convention dans le procès de Louis XVI sur la question de l'appel au peuple*. In Claretie, J. (1874). *Œuvres de Camille Desmoulins, 2*, 89-115. Paris, France: Charpentier et Cie.

Original work published in 1792.

Desmoulins, C. (1874). *Le Vieux Cordelier*. In Claretie, J. (1874). *Œuvres de Camille Desmoulins, 2*, 161-179. Paris, France: Charpentier et Cie.

Original work published in 1793.

de la Fontaine, J. (1668). Les grenouilles qui demandent un roi. Poésie française. Retrieved on March 4 2017 from <http://www.poesie-francaise.fr/fables-jean-de-la-fontaine-fables-livre-III/>

Mercier, L. S. (1781). *Tableau de Paris, 1*. Paris, France: Virchaux & Compagnie.

Mallet du Pan, J. (1793). *Considerations sur la nature de la revolution de France*. Paris, France: Chez Emm. Flon.

Secondary Sources

- Altmann, G.T.M. & Kamide, Y. (1999). Incremental interpretation at verbs: Restricting the domain of subsequent reference. *Cognition*, 72, 247-264.
- Roberts, W. R. (1924). *Rhetorica: The works of Aristotle, 11*. Oxford, England: Clarendon Press.
- Bandura, A., Barbaranelli, C., Caprara, G. V., & Pastorelli, C. (1996). Mechanisms of moral disengagement in the exercise of moral agency. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71, 364–374.
- Brennan, W. (1995). *Dehumanizing the vulnerable: when word games take lives*. Chicago: Loyola University Press.
- Brinton, D. M. & Brinton, L. J. (2010). *The linguistic structure of modern English* (2nd ed.). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Claretie, J. (1874). *Œuvres de Camille Desmoulins, 1-2*. Paris, France: Charpentier et Cie.
- Claretie, J. (1876). *Camille Desmoulins and His Wife: Passages from the History of the Dantonists Founded Upon New and Hitherto Unpublished Documents*. (F. Cashel Hoey, Trans.) London, England: Smith, Elder, & Co.
- Danesi, M. (2008). *Of cigarettes, high heels, and other interesting things* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Fludernik, M. (2012). *Beyond cognitive metaphor theory: Perspectives on literary metaphor*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Gilchrist, J. T. (1971). *The press in the French Revolution: A selection of documents taken from the press of the Revolution for the years 1789-1794*. Gilchrist, J. T. & Murray, W. J. (Eds.) Melbourne, Australia: Cheshire.
- Hamel, E. (1866). *Histoire de Robespierre d'après des papiers de famille : Les sources*

- originales et des documents entièrement inédits*, 2. Paris, France: A. Lacroix, Verboeckhoven & Co.
- Haslam, N. (2014). What *is* dehumanization? In P. G. Bain, J. Vaes, and J. P. Leyens (Eds.), *Humanness and dehumanization* (pp. 32-48). New York, NY: Routledge Psychology Press.
- Jordan, D. P. (1999). The Robespierre problem. In Doyle, W. & Haydon, C. (Eds.), *Robespierre* (pp. 17-34). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, G. (1993). The contemporary theory of metaphor. In Ortony, A. (Ed.) *Metaphor and Thought* (2nd ed.). 202-251. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Linton, M. (2013). Friends, enemies and the role of the individual. In P. McPhee (Ed.), *A companion to the French Revolution* (pp. 263-277). Sussex: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Linton, M. (2013). *Choosing terror: Virtue, friendship and authenticity in the French Revolution*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Methley, V. (1915). *Camille Desmoulins: A biography*. New York, NY: Dutton.
- Morzinski, M. (1994). *Linguistic influence of Polish on Joseph Conrad's style*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Mustafa, M. & Yasin, A. (2009). Neologism as a linguistic phenomenon in mass media. Tikrit, Iraq: Tikrit University Press.
- Newmark, P. (1988). *A textbook of translation*. Hertfordshire, England: Prentice Hall International.

- Rudé, G. (1959). *The crowd in the French Revolution*. London, England: Oxford University Press.
- Scurr, R. (2006). *Fatal purity: Robespierre and the French Revolution*. New York, NY: Owl Books.
- Stefanowitsch, A. & Gries, S. (2006). *Corpus-based approaches to metaphor and metonymy. Trends in linguistics: Studies and monographs, 171*. New York, NY: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Sternberg, R., Tourangeau, R. & Nigro, G. (1978). Metaphor, induction, and social policy: The convergence of macroscopic and microscopic views. In Ortony, A. (Ed.) *Metaphor and Thought* (2nd ed.). (pp. 277-303). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Toolan, M. (2009). *Narrative progression in the short story: A corpus stylistic approach*. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Turner, M. (2006). *The artful mind: Cognitive science and the riddle of human creativity*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Van Laun, H. (1880). *History of French literature: From the end of the reign of Louis XIV till the end of the reign of Louis Philippe, 3*. New York, NY: G.P. Putnam.
- Vasiljevic, M. & Viki, G.T. (2014). Dehumanization, moral disengagement, and public attitudes to crime and punishment. In P. G. Bain, J. Vaes, and J. P. Leyens (Eds.), *Humanness and dehumanization* (pp. 129-147). New York, NY: Routledge Psychology Press.
- Vendler, Z. (1967). *Linguistics in philosophy*. New York, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Weber, C. (2003). *Terror and its discontents: Suspect words in revolutionary France*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.