KOINEISATION IN THE BURGUNDIAN NETHERLANDS: A SCRIPTOLOGICAL INSIGHT FROM THE CENT NOUVELLES NOUVELLES?

WHAT SORT OF FRENCH DID THE COURTIERS OF PHILIPPE LE BON SPEAK?

At the time when the Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles were presumably recounted at the court of Philippe le Bon (Philip the Good)¹, the Burgundian dominions consisted of the Duchy of Burgundy itself plus, as a result of a dramatic territorial expansion initiated in 1384 by the Duke’s grandfather Philippe Le Hardi (Philip the Bold), the Counties of Burgundy and Nevers and what we now refer to as the ‘Burgundian Netherlands’, namely Rethel, Luxemburg, Artois, Picardy, Hainaut, Brabant, Flanders, Holland, Zeeland, Namur, Limburg. These lands, which together constituted the richest state in Europe at the time, formed a multilingual territory across which several Romance and Germanic dialects were spoken: northern and eastern Langues d’oil, Jurassien, West Central and Low German. The process of territorial expansion saw unprecedented migration from the Pays de par-delà (Burgundy) to the Pays de par-deçà (Low Countries), especially of military troops and administrative personnel². The Burgundian court now brought together a number of dignitaries from Burgundy and from the Low Countries – many of whom were native Flemish speakers – and met in various cities across the Low Countries (primarily Brussels, Lille and Bruges)³. At a time when spoken French was hardly standardised at all⁴, the linguistic melting-pot that the Burgundian administration had become is reminiscent of what Anthony Lodge – writing about Paris – describes

¹ Edgar De Blieck has observed that ‘the presence of almost all the raconteurs at court is attested by a variety of independent records over the winter and spring 1458 /1459’. E. De Blieck, ‘The Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles, Text and Context: Literature and History at the Court of Burgundy in the Fifteenth Century’, PhD thesis, University of Glasgow, 2004, p. 87. Surprisingly he does not comment on Robert McGillivray’s remark that: ‘Jean de Montespédon, dit Houaste, became lord of Beauvoir after 1461, but he held the title in 1462, so that, whenever his tales were told, they cannot have been written until 1461 at the earliest’ R. McGillivray, ‘The Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles: A Monograph’, PhD thesis, Yale University, 1959, p. 53.
² ‘Quant aux gens de guerre, les deux Bourgognes les fournissaient libéralement, concurremment au comté d'Artois et aux territoires 'picards'; les ducs ont préféré demander à leurs sujets hollandais, zélandais et flamands des aides en argent, affectant parfois la forme d'un rachat du service militaire, qui leur permettaient de solder des contingents de mercenaires. […] Si les commensaux du duc, qui narrent des histoires, souvent lestes, dans la chambre du prince, au témoignage des Cent nouvelles nouvelles, sont en grande partie des Bourguignons, c'est d'abord parce que l'évolution historique a amené ceux-ci à s'assurer dès le départ, et à se transmettre, les postes de l'hôtel; c'est aussi parce qu'ils forment le noyau de l'armée ducale.’ (J. Richard, ‘Les pays bourguignons méridionaux dans l'ensemble des Etats des ducs Valois’, BMGN - Low Countries Historical Review, 95/2, 1980, p. 335-348, especially p. 346-347.
⁴ While evidence suggesting that Parisian or Île-de-France spoken French was perceived as aesthetically superior can be found as early as the twelfth century (cf. Adenet le Roi, Conon de Béthune, anonyme de Meung, Manières de Langage, etc.), it was not until the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries that pronunciation standards were actually codified.
as a ‘text-book environment for rapid linguistic change and new-dialect formation’\(^5\), especially if the comment made two centuries before by Roger Bacon still held true: ‘Quod proprie et intelligibiliter dicitur in idiomate Picardorum horrescit apud Burgundos, immo apud Gallicos vicinores’ [What is correctly and intelligibly expressed in the Picard dialect is unpleasant to Burgundians and indeed to their closer neighbours in the Île-de-France.]\(^6\):

> Quando locutores provenant de secteurs non-adjacents d’un continuum dialectal se trouvent en contact, ils créent des variétés mixtes plus ou moins temporaires, accommodant leur parler personnel à celui de leurs interlocuteurs, nivelant les traits les plus encombrants. Ceci nous met dans le domaine de la koinéisation. D’innombrables actes individuels d’accommodation ne font pas, évidemment, une nouvelle koiné. Une koiné stable se produit seulement après une période relativement longue d’interactions régulières et intensives, au cours de laquelle les actes individuels d’accommodation en viennent à converger plus ou moins\(^7\).

> [When speakers coming from non-adjacent sections of a dialectal continuum come into contact with each other, they create mixed varieties which are more or less temporary, accommodating their personal parlance with that of their interlocutors, levelling the most cumbersome traits. This brings us into the domain of koineisation. Innumerable individual acts of course do not make a new koine. A stable koine appears only after a relatively long period of regular and intense interactions, during which individual acts of accommodation start to more or less converge.]

While it is difficult to decide whether a period of about eighty years was sufficient for a fully fledged spoken koine\(^8\) to establish itself within the Burgundian administration, one cannot conceive that this prolonged situation of language- and dialect-contact could have had no impact on the variety of French spoken by the Burgundian courtiers.

As far as written language is concerned, Serge Lusignan has shown that in their northern chanceries, the Dukes of Burgundy favoured the so-called central *scripta* at the expense of the established scribal conventions of Picardy: ‘le français central devint la langue administrative de la Flandre avec la prise de pouvoir par Philippe le Hardi, duc de Bourgogne, en 1384. La chancellerie de Flandre se fixa alors à Lille et sa langue usuelle fut le français central, pour toute la période bourguignonne.’ [Central French became the administrative languages of Flanders when Philip the Bold took power in 1384. The chancery of Flanders thus settled in Lille and its everyday language became central French for the entire Burgundian period.]\(^9\) However, when it comes to literature commissioned by Philippe le Hardi’s grandson, Philippe le Bon (1396-1467), a significant amount of scriptological features indigenous to dialectal zones under Burgundian rule can be found in works by such writers as Georges Chastelain, Jean Wauquelin, Jean Molinet, Pierre Crapillet and David Aubert\(^10\). Could this suggest that Philippe le Bon was far from hostile to provincial variants – which in any case he would have routinely heard from his birth in Dijon?

---


\(^8\) Cf. Peter Trudgill’s definition: ‘a historically mixed but synchronically stable dialect which contains elements from the different dialects that went into the mixture, as well as interdialect forms that were present in none.’ P. Trudgill, *Dialects in Contact*, Oxford, 1986, p. 107-108.

\(^9\) S. Lusignan, *Le français picard au Moyen Âge*, p. 161-162

through to his youth in Ghent (where he also learned Flemish), and later at his cosmopolitan court in Brussels, Lille or Bruges?

The koineisation process presumably at work within the Burgundian administration would have involved various phonological, morphological, lexical and syntactic features from a number of Langues d’oil (Bourguignon, Franc-Comtois, Walloon and Picard), as well as from neighbouring Jurassien and West Central/Low Germanic adstrata. Some of the Langues d’oil in question – Franc-Comtois, Walloon and Picard – are known to be connected as part of a sub-group of oil dialects (including also Lorrain, Champenois and Norman), which René Lepelley refers to as the « couloir romanique ». Indeed evidence of old lexical and phonological ties (e.g. yêpe vs. guêpe, warder vs. garder)\(^\text{11}\) seem to confirm that ‘il a bien existé dans les premiers siècles de notre ère une “bande” qui représente le mouvement de progression des Romains, et donc de la langue latine, à partir de Lyon et de l’est du couloir rhodanien vers le nord, puis vers l’ouest’ [there certainly existed in the first centuries of our era a ‘belt’ which reflects the progressive advance of the Romans, and thus of the Latin language, from Lyon and the east of the Rhône corridor to the north, then to the west]\(^\text{12}\). Nonetheless, mutual intelligibility between the dialects of this Romanic corridor was impaired by an isogloss with marked consonantal oppositions, the ‘Joret line’, setting apart Normanno-Picard from the other Langues d’oil (e.g. quién vs. chien, gardin vs. jardin, chiel vs. ciel, etc.)\(^\text{13}\). In other words, the two main players at work in this process of dialect-mixing, Bourguignon and Picard, sat at the two opposite ends of the continuum, and were the least mutually-intelligible. This of course does not mean that comprehension between Burgundians and Picards would have been impossible at all, especially since the two dialects actually have a few isoglosses in common: the absence of epenthetic –d\(^\text{14}\), instability of –e- in the group –ner\(^\text{15}\), instability of –d- in the group –ndr\(^\text{16}\), –ATICUM > –aige\(^\text{17}\), -AL > –aul\(^\text{18}\), and the first person plural ending –iens\(^\text{19}\).

**LES CENT NOUVELLES NOUVELLES:**

The Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles are notably famous for their mise-en-scène, that is, the fact that the tales are ostensibly presented as having been recounted by Philippe le Bon and members of his

---


\(^\text{13}\) Lepelley, ‘Particularités phonétiques’.


court, and compiled at his request as if they were transcribed from viva voce performance (the anonymous author refers to himself as a mere ‘secretaire’ of the narrators’ own words). As such, the collection may provide a unique insight into the variety of French spoken at the Duke’s Court.

The only extant manuscript of the collection, MS Glasgow Hunter 252, is thought to have been produced between 1480 and 1490 and to be related, albeit indirectly, to the copy offered to Philippe le Bon. Cross-comparison with Antoine Vérard’s printed edition (1486) confirms Pierre Champion’s observation that ‘Vérard n’a fait qu’un rajeunissement des Nouvelles dans le dialecte parisien’ [Vérard merely overhauled the tales to set them into the Parisian dialect], or in other words, that ‘Vérard a fait revoir le texte pour en supprimer les archaïsmes, les provincialismes et les apparentes obscurités’ [Vérard revised the text in order to eradicate archaic and provincial expressions, or apparent obscurities.] This strongly advocates MS Glasgow Hunter 252 as the copy closest to the lost original, and makes an even stronger case for its scriptological study since, as Mildred Pope puts it: ‘the literary centres of the fifteenth century are again provincial, and neither in the courts of the Valois nor in those of the Dukes of Burgundy nor at Orléans were provincialisms meticulously avoided’.

---

20 The names featured in MS Glasgow Hunter 252 are: Monseigneur de la Roche, Monseigneur (le Duc), Messire Chrestian de Dygoyne, Jehan Martin, Monseigneur le Prevost de Wastenes, Monseigneur de Santilly, Montbluer, Philippe Vignier, Michault de Changy, Monseigneur de la Salle, Monseigneur de Beauvoir, Monseigneur de la Barde, Monseigneur de Vavrin, Monseigneur de Foquessoles, Monseigneur de Crequy, Monseigneur de Saint-Pol, Monseigneur de Thalemas, Caron, Philippe de Saint Yon, Philippe de Saint Yon, Monsieur Le Voyer, Maistre Jehan Lauvin, Monsieur de Beaumont, Monsieur de Launoy/Lannoy, Monseigneur de Fennes, Monseigneur de Castregat, Monseigneur de Quievraing, Philippe de Loan, Meriadech, Monseigneur de Villiers, Marquis de Rothelin, Poncetel, Alardin, Pierre David, l’acteur, Mahiot D’Auquasnes, Messire Timoleon de Vignier. The exact number of storytellers varies depending on whether one considers l’acteur to be one of the named narrators, Monseigneur de Beauvoir to refer to two different persons, the two anonymous tales to be told by one or two additional raconteurs, the titles ‘Messire Chrestian de Dygoyne’ and ‘Monseigneur de Thienges’ to refer to the same person, and on whether the same applies to ‘Monseigneur de Castregat’ and ‘Monseigneur l’amant de Bruxelles’, etc. Cf. E. De Blieck, p. 29, 46-59, 529; and Les Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles, ed. P. Champion, Paris, 1928, p. XXVIII, LIV-LIVII.

21 Les Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles, ed. F. Sweetser, Paris, 1966, p. 90. Unless otherwise stated, all page references are to Franklin Sweetser’s edition. For a discussion on how the tales may have been recorded, see G. Roger, ‘La mise-en-scène des Cent nouvelles nouvelles: point de vue dialectologique’, in Comptes rendus du colloque international ‘Autour des Cent nouvelles nouvelles, sources et rayonnements, contextes et interprétations’, Université du Littoral – Côte d’Opale, 2011, ed. J. Devaux and A. Velissariou, Paris, 2014 (forthcoming). Edgar de Blieck notes that ‘In his chapter on the exécutants de la chancellerie, [P. Cockshaw] described the business of the greffiers – minute-takers, and secretaries – of the great council. An ordinance of 1433 specified that: wherever [the duke’s] court held an ordinary council meeting, which should take place twice a day; in this council, two secretaries should be present by standing mandate, to hear the deliberation of matters arising, to record the outcomes and decisions made, and make letters and papers relating to these. (...) The principle is entirely discernible: the duke and his court were to have their deliberations taken down for posterity’. (De Blieck, p. 156-157).


23 ‘The scribal copy from which Hunter 252 was made was not written in two columns but one, […] the ducal library copy was in two columns, and this is reason to suppose that the Hunterian manuscript was not a copy of it, but of another manuscript – possibly an earlier one, such as the first one completed, or a later copy.’ (De Blieck, p. 503).

24 Champion, p. LIV.


27 M. K. Pope, From Latin to Modern French with Special Consideration of Anglo-Norman: Phonology and Morphology, Manchester, 1934, p. 36.
The authenticity of the mise en scène of the *Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles* has often been questioned, and indeed was vehemently dismissed by Jens Rasmussen:

Everything leads me to believe that the *Cent nouvelles nouvelles* have been composed by only one writer. Their attribution to the named narrators is without doubt pure fantasy. It is even probable that the nouvelles have never been recounted before the audience indicated.

Rasmussen’s view was later countered with convincing arguments, which may be briefly summarised as follows:

1. The 1469 inventory of the ducal library describes a ‘livre tout neuf […] contenant cent nouvelles, tant de Monseigneur que Dieu pardonne, que de plusieurs autres de son hotel’ [a brand new book containing one hundred tales, some by my Lord (may God forgive him), some by others of his entourage].

   This entry indicates that the scribe responsible for the inventory, at least, believed that the stories were told by the Duke and by his entourage, whether or not they actually were. Since the book had been compiled only a short time before (it is referred to as tout neuf), we are entitled to believe the scribe was not misinformed.

2. The collection is of uneven quality. Courtly etiquette, that is, reverence to the storyteller as a dignitary, may explain why a few unsuccessful stories were retained:

   It is difficult to believe that, had there been a single author, there would have been such an extreme range between the best stories, such as 99, and the worst, such as 74, the futile anecdote of the priest who performed part of the mass twice.

   Some of the tales have such insignificant plots (e.g. 5, 6 and 53), it is highly improbable even a court gossip would have bothered to remember or record them.

3. The notion that a single author could have invented so many varied and detailed autobiographical tales is implausible:

   So many stories are autobiographical that no single author could ever have known so many detailed anecdotes and adventures concerning such a variety of persons in such diverse places. […] Other stories could have been known only to their tellers from first-hand observation.

4. The order of storytellers suggests courtly protocol:

   The three principal storytellers, the Duke, Philippe Pot, and Philippe de Loan, tell almost half of their stories in the first fifth of the collection, in fact, they contribute seventeen out of the first twenty-one. […] It is quite feasible that out of deference to the Duke and his two favourites, others were unwilling to come forward at first, but became more prominent once the tone had been set and the flow from the three leaders had dried up a little.

---


Cf. also Champion, p. LIII: « Le rédacteur du livre est unique […] l’unité du style le prouve surabondamment »; and *Les Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles*, trans. by R. Dubuis, Paris, 2005, p. 18: « Il n’est pas nécessaire de se livrer à une longue étude stylistique de l’ouvrage, il suffit de le lire d’une traite, pour y relever une unité d’inspiration, de structure et d’écriture qui permet d’affirmer que les cent nouvelles nouvelles sont bien l’œuvre d’un seul homme, qui était un authentique écrivain ».


5. The grouping of tales suggests practical convenience: ‘Some conteurs’ tales are clustered in groups, which may indicate that they told them on separate occasions when they were at court and involved in the enterprise.’

6. After scrutinising the respective narrative techniques of the five most prolific raconteurs, Robert McGillivray concludes that: ‘the narrators display very real differences of manner and technique, […] dissimilarities that incline us to believe that the tales were not composed by the acteur and arbitrarily assigned to one or another of the courtiers.’ Likewise, Madeleine Jeay observes that: ‘Le narrateur s’efface jusqu’à l’inexistence. Il abandonne le champ de la parole à ses illustres conteurs de la cour de Bourgogne, ne profitant même pas des occasions de se manifester que pourrait lui offrir l’histoire-cadre du modèle boccacien.’ [The narrator effaces himself unto inexistence. He abandons the field of play of his illustrious storytellers of the Burgundian court, not even seizing the opportunities to manifest himself that are presented in the storytelling framework of the Boccaccian model.]

7. Alongside substantial evidence of oral delivery, the text contains what appears to be an insider’s innuendo comparing the heroine of the twelfth nouvelle to ‘la femme qui nagueres au bailly d’Amiens se complaignit de son mary pour le tres-grand travell qu’il luy donnor de semblable cas’ [the woman who recently complained to the bailiff of Amiens about her husband for giving her too much work in that department]:

   Who was this woman who complained of her husband to the bailiff of Amiens? We do not know, but the public to whom the story is addressed must have known, or the reference would not make sense.
   And who could this public reasonably have been, acquainted as it was with the woman’s case, other than the group of courtiers at the Burgundian court in Flanders?

THE NARRATORS:

Of the hundred tales, ninety-eight are attributed to ostensibly authentic narrators, most of whom have been identified as documented courtiers of Philippe le Bon. The majority are part of the Duke’s own circle, which interestingly appears to include a few commoners. We also know a

---

34 De Blieck, The Cent nouvelles nouvelles: Text and Context’, p. 102. De Blieck’s observation may be confirmed by internal evidence, whereby some storytellers are shown to ignore the contents of previous tales, suggesting absence from the court (p. 95-101). Correspondingly, ‘thirty-nine stories have some element of their subject matter in common either with the previous one or with a very recent one, producing an impression of spontaneous generation of new material. The nature of these links is varied, and they are themselves sometimes the source of humour’ (Baxter, ‘Author’s Point of View’, p. 11-12).


37 Monseigneur de Villiers, for instance, is heard to open Nouvelle 57 by saying: ‘Tantdiz que l’on me preste audience et que ame ne s’avance quand a present de parfournir ceste glorieuse et edifiant euvre de Cent Nouvelles, je vous compteray ung cas qui puis n’a gueres est advenu ou Dauphine, pour estre mis ou reng et nombre des dictes nouvelles’.

38 p. 87.


40 ‘The class and income differentials in the raconteurs’ circle are also intriguing: noblemen to whom other nobles owed allegiance, such as the count of Saint Pol, the marquis de Rothelin, and the duke of Burgundy, undertook to exchange tales with relatively obscure quartermaster sergeants, valets de chambre and (possibly) chapel clerks, such as Mahieu d’Auquasnes, Pierre David and Caron.’ (De Blieck, The Cent nouvelles nouvelles: Text and Context’ p. 213).
few of the raconteurs to have been sitting at the court as guests of Philippe le Bon; these were members of the suite of the dauphin of France who was in exile in the Burgundian dominions from 1456 to 1461, the period within which the storytelling would presumably have occurred. Although research by the pioneering editors Antoine Le Roux de Lincy, Thomas Wright, and Pierre Champion, as well as by other scholars like Edgar Peers, Charles Knudson, John Watkins, and Edgar De Blieck has shed light on the identities of most of the raconteurs, uncertainty persists regarding a few of them (e.g. Caron, Alardin, Messire Thimoleon de Vignier, etc.). Nonetheless available prosopographical information indicates that Monseigneur de la Roche, Messire Chrestian de Dygoyne and Jehan Martin were Burgundians, that Monseigneur de Vavrin, Monseigneur de Foquessoles, Monseigneur de Crequy and Monseigneur de Saint-Pol were from the Low Countries, that Monseigneur de la Barde and Michault de Chany were French, that Meriadech was Breton, and that the Marquis de Rothelin was from Neuchâtel. Our storytellers therefore came from different linguistic or dialectal zones: Picard, Bourguignon and other unspecified Langues d’oïl, Romand, and Breton. Nevertheless, as I have shown elsewhere, the scriptological evidence within MS Glasgow Hunter 252 is homogenous and does not reflect any dialectal variation from one narrator to another. There follows a list of scriptological features which I have identified across the tales (I have excluded examples found in direct speech passages, as they might result from linguistic stereotyping):

**THE NARRATORS’ FRENCH**

**Vowels:**

-aiche vs. -ache

Alongside forms in –ache, MS Glasgow Hunter 252 presents alternatives such as caiche (Nouvelle 44, Monseigneur de la Roche, p. 299), caichast (Nouvelle 1, Monseigneur, p. 25), caicha

---

41 De Blieck questions the identities of two of the four guests designated by the earlier editors Le Roux de Lincy and Champion. According to Champion (p. XLVIII), de Villiers is the member of the dauphin’s suite to whom Chastellain refers as being ‘Breton, beau fils et net’ (Chronique des ducs de Bourgogne, III, chap. 214). De Blieck observes that ‘it would be difficult not to admit the raconteur identified as Monseigneur de Villiers as the dauphin’s servant, but it ought to be acknowledged that there were other candidates at the court in the 1450s and 1460s, who bore the title. […] One possible alternative candidate was a Messire Philibert de Villiers knight […] Another possibility is Jacques, also lord of Villers la Faye […] There are also notes in the account books of one Jehan de Villiers, from Montdidier’. (E. De Blieck, p. 533).

42 Les Cent Nouvelles nouvelles, ed. A. Le Roux de Lincy, Paris, 1841


48 Hervé de Meriadech came from the Breton-speaking area around Montroulez/Morlaix in the Duchy of Brittany. Both his first and second names derive from Old Breton, respectively haer/hoiarn - biu (strong/iron - quick) and mor-iatoc (sea/edge). Cf. A. Stéphan, Tous les prénoms bretons, Plouéden, 1996, p. 51, 78.

49 Judging by his origins, the Markgraf Rudolf IV von Baden-Hochberg, lord of Neuchâtel and Rothelin (1427-1487), may also have been a German-speaker.

P. Fouché observe: ‘Au Nord et à l'Est, on note en ancien français un subj. saiche, saiches, etc. Palgrave donne encore saiche’ [In the north and the east, in Old French, the subjunctive saiche, saiches, etc. can be found. Palgrave also gives saiche]51. A. Dees’s map52 shows that this palatalised phono-grapheme is most frequently found in Old French literary texts from Franche-Comté.

The manuscript presents evidence of the evolution of [ã] to [o] for derivatives of *bilancia: balochouere (Nouvelle 82, Monseigneur de Launoy, p. 483), balochoère (ibid.), balochoit (ibid.). Louis-Ferdinand Flutre notes that ‘en Flandre, en Artois et en Ternois à a tendance à s’articuler vers le fond de la bouche et à se fermer en o. […] Dans la Somme, â est passé à o dans balôC’ [in Flanders, Artois and Ternois à has a tendency to be voiced at the bottom of the mouth and to close on o. … In the Somme region, â evolved into o in balôC ‘balance’, and its derivatives balôÇé ‘balancer’ and balôÇwèr ‘balanoire’]53.

CUNEARE shows outcomes in both coign- and cuign-, the latter form being Picard according to the Französisches etymologisches Wörterbuch: eine Darstellung des galloromanischen Sprachschatzes (hereafter FEW)54: ‘a paine estoit elle contente qu’on la cuignast en plaines rues avant qu'elle ne le lust’ [she wouldn’t be happy until she was screwed right on the street] (Nouvelle 91, l’Acteur, p. 518). The Dictionnaire du moyen français (hereafter DMF)55 has one attestation from the Relation du voyage de frère Bieul by Jehan le Long, a Flemish monk from Ypres. C. T. Gossen notes:

Ce qui distingue le picard du francien, c’est le traitement de o protonique + yod qui aboutit en picard à ui (franc. oi), p. ex. PÔTIONE > puisson Gav., PŬGNATA: pugnie Bodel, empuigna Chev., CŬNEATA > cugnie Amiens, CUNEU + diminutif > cuigniet Amiens (pic. mod. puignie, cuignet, Corblet 356, 525)56.

What distinguishes Picard from Francien is the treatment of the protonic o + yod which results in Picard in ui (French oi), e.g. PÔTIONE > puisson Gav., PŬGNATA: pugnie Bodel, empuigna Chev., CŬNEATA > cugnie Amiens, CUNEU + diminutif > cuigniet Amiens (pic. mod. puignie, cuignet,]

Consonants
[k] vs. [ʃ]
The manuscript contains evidence of conservation of the velar occlusive [k] before [a], a phonological trait specific to Norman and Picard57: recaner / racaner (Fr. rechaner – Nouvelle

52 Dees, Atlas des formes linguistiques, p. 379.
Another phonological trait specific to Picard and Norman is the development of [ʃ] where the other Languages d’oïl have [s]:

Placée à l’initiale ou à l’intérieur d’un mot derrière une autre consonne, cette vélaire sourde a évolué en [ʃ] dans la zone nord, alors qu’elle est devenue [s] dans la zone sud comme dans le français de référence. Les groupes secondaires [kj] et [tj] ont suivi la même évolution. [placed at the head or interior of a word behind another consonant, this mute velar evolved as [ʃ] in the north, but became [s] in the south as in standard French. The secondary group [kj] and [tj] followed the same evolution.]

Examples found in the manuscript include: pèche (Fr. pièce – Nouvelle 1, Monseigneur, p. 24; Nouvelle 2, Monseigneur, p. 35; Nouvelle 3, Monseigneur de la Roche, p. 43), sancié (Fr. sancié – Nouvelle 38, Philippe de Loan, p. 165), parchon (Nouvelle 73, Maistre Jehan Lauvin, p. 445), balocher (Fr. balancer – Nouvelle 82, Monseigneur de Launoy, p. 483-484), percher (Fr. percer – Nouvelle 98, l’Acteur, p. 551; Nouvelle 95, Philippe de Loan, p. 537), soichons (Fr. soissons – Nouvelle 99, l’Acteur, p. 557), challer (Fr. celer – Nouvelle 99, l’Acteur, p. 559).

cras vs. gras
crasse (Fr. grasse – Nouvelle 99, l’Acteur, p. 568): Louis-Fernand Flutre mentions similar forms in Middle Picard: cra, cras, cresse, enccession, ‘où le c initial du groupe cr n’est pas passé à la sonore g comme il l’a fait dans le français gras, par influence probablement de gros < gróssu’ [where the initial c of the cr group does not change to g as in the French gras, probably due to the influence
of \textit{gros} \textless \textit{gróssu}]\textsuperscript{66}. The \textit{FEW} notes that \textit{cras} is especially common in Walloon, Picard and Anglo-
Norman\textsuperscript{67}.

\textbf{Initial \texttt{w}-}

The manuscript has nine derivatives of Vulgar Latin *\textit{vocitus} for \textit{VOCUUS}, \textit{VACUUS}, all spelt with an initial \texttt{w}: \textit{wide} (Nouvelle 27, Monseigneur de Beauvoir, p. 185; Nouvelle 83, Monseigneur de Vavrin, p. 487), \textit{wided(e)} (Nouvelle 85, Monseigneur de Santilly, p. 493; Nouvelle 96, Monseigneur Philipe Vignier, p. 497), \textit{wida} (Nouvelle 73, Maistre Jehan Lauvin, p. 442; Nouvelle 99, l’Acteur, 557), \textit{wider} (Nouvelle 92, l’Acteur, p. 522; Nouvelle 99, l’Acteur, p. 567). This pronunciation is Picard, Walloon and Ardennais according to the \textit{FEW}.

Il semble y avoir eu une tendance à écrire le \texttt{v} comme \texttt{w}, sans que l’on sache affirmer l’existence d’une prononciation correspondante (\textit{wan} = \textit{van}, \textit{wiede} [ou \textit{vuiede} ?] = \textit{vide}), voir GoeblNorm par.134/1). Cette variation graphique se rencontre aussi en picard (\textit{wespre}, SilenceR 6352 = \textit{vespre} ‘soir’), en anglo-normand (\textit{westemenz} = \textit{vestements}, Stone 865a) et ailleurs\textsuperscript{68}.

En ce qui concerne l’évolution ultérieure, il semble que ce soit au XIIe siècle que le \texttt{w}, quelle que soit son origine lointaine, s’est affaibli en \texttt{v}. On a déjà signalé qu’en français quelques noms communs issus du latin on vu leur \texttt{v} initial évoluer comme s’il venait du germanique. Dans ces cas et dans quelques toponymes, le nord de la ligne Joret a conservé le \texttt{v} issu du \texttt{w} latin, comme ont pu le faire l’italien, l’espagnol, l’occitan et le francoprovençal, c’est-à-dire les régions de la Romania fortement romanisées\textsuperscript{69}.

Concerning subsequent evolution, it seems that it was in the twelfth century that the \texttt{w}, whatever its distant origin, weakened to \texttt{v}. We have already noted that, in French, a few nouns stemming from Latin saw their initial \texttt{v} develop as if it came from Germanic. In these cases, and in a few toponyms, north of the Joret line the \texttt{v} was conserved from the Latin \texttt{w}, as in Italian, Spanish, Occitan and Franco-Provençal, in other words those regions of the Roman Empire which were heavily Romanised.

\textbf{Morphology}

\textit{noz} \textit{vs. nostro} as possessive adjective

Ordonna néantmains à sa gouge qu’elle entretenist le prestre, voire sans faire la courtoisie, et si fist elle si bien que noz sire en avoit tout au long du braz. (This and the following examples are from Nouvelle 76, Philipe de Loan, p. 455)

He then instructed his servant to entertain the priest, to the exception of having sex with him, and she did this so well that our lord had it all down his arm. \textit{Translator’s note: ‘our lord’ in this and the following translations refers to the priest.}

La gouge en fut contente, et fist son rapport à noz sire, qui jour de sa vie ne fut plus joieux. (p. 456)

[The servant was happy with that, and made her report to our lord, who had never been happier.]

Or est tout prest, et noz sire appelle, et au plus doulcement qu’il peut entre dedans le lit. (Vérard’s edition has « nostre domine »)

[Now it was all ready, and our lord was called, and as quietly as he could he got into the bed.]

Et sa femme d’approcher, qui à genoux se mist devant ses piez, cuidant pour vray estre son curé, et sans tarder commença sa confession et dist Benedicite. Et noz sire son mary respondit Dominus. (p. 464)

\textsuperscript{67} Vol. 2-2, 1277b. See also \textit{cras} and \textit{cra} in R. Debrie, \textit{Glossaire du moyen picard}, Amiens, 1984, p. 132-133.
\textsuperscript{68} Möhren, ‘ “Guai victis!” ’, p. 38.
\textsuperscript{69} Lepelley, ‘Particularités phonétiques’, p. 136.
[And his wife came forward, kneeling at his feet, believing him to really be her priest, and without hesitation began her confession by saying ‘Benedicite’. And our lord her husband replied ‘Dominus’.

Dees’s map shows that the weakened possessive adjectives no / vo are most frequently found in Picard. C. Buridant notes that:

Le Picard présente, à côté des formes communes de large extension, des formes atones spécifiques témoignant d’un affaiblissement du vocalisme. [...] La tendance a donc été de créer deux séries de paradigmes:

a. les uns déterminants, avec des formes courtes comme no-, vo-;

b. les autres en fonction d’adjectifs/pronoms.

[The Picard dialect presents, alongside widespread shared features, specific atonic forms, which show a weakening of the vowel. [...] The tendency was thus to create two series of paradigms:

a. one for determinants, with the short forms no-, vo-;

b. the others functioning as adjectives/pronouns.]

**Verbs**

Future/conditional AVOIR stem ar- (Fr. aur-): Dees’s maps show that this spelling was most common in Old Picard. Likewise Christiane Marchello-Nizia notes that ‘leur fréquence est particulièrement élevée dans les textes du Nord de la France’ [they occur particularly frequently in texts from northern France].

Future/conditional SAVOIR stem sar-: Pierre Fouché observes that ‘à cause de la ressemblance qui existait entre avoir et savoir on a eu de plus, sur le modèle de aura et de ara, des futurs saura et sara’ [because of the resemblance between avoir and savoir there was also, on the same model as aura and ara, the future forms saura and sara].

Future/conditional LAISSER stem lair(r)-: The TLFi notes that L’a fr. possède à côté du paradigme répondant à laisser, un paradigme répondant à laier (ind. prés. 3 laie; imp. 6 layevent (lorr.); parfait 3 laie, 6 laierent; impér. 5 laiés; inf. laier; part. prés. laiant, passé laié) dont H. Stimm ds Mél. Lommatzsch, 1975, p. 371-383 a montré qu’il était uniquement pic. et lorr. (cf. encore dans les patois mod. de Picardie, Lorraine et Franche-Comté ds FEW vol. 5, 225a).

[Old French, in addition of the paradigm for laisser, had one for laier (3rd person singular present indicative laie; 3rd person plural imperfect layevent (lorr.); 3rd person singular perfect laia, 3rd person plural lairent, 2nd person plural imperative laiés, infinitive laier; present participle laiant,

---

72 Nouvelle 28, Messire Michault de Chaugy, p. 195; Nouvelle 51, l’Acteur, p. 329; Nouvelle 52, Monseigneur de la Roche, p. 335; Nouvelle 55, Monseigneur de Villiers, p. 350, Nouvelle 59, Poncellet, p. 369; Nouvelle 60, Poncellet, p. 373, 375; Nouvelle 62, Monseigneur de Quiévrain, p. 388.
74 p. 223; see also Buridant, Grammaire nouvelle de l’ancien français, p. 266.
75 Nouvelle 27, Monseigneur de Beauvoir, p. 185; Nouvelle 93, Messire Timoléon Vignier, p. 528.
76 atilf.atilf.fr/dendien/scripts/tlfi/v5/visusel.exe?11;s=3041560950;r=1;nat=;sol=0; , accessed 24 June 2014.
past participle *laiié*). H. Stimm in *Mél. Lommatzsch*, 1975, p. 371-383 showed that it was only in Picardy and Lorraine. (Cf also in the modern *patois* of Picardy, Lorraine and Franche-Comté in *FEW* vol. 5, 225a]


Dental stems in verbs ending in –*aindre/-eindre/-oindre*: *craindent* (Nouvelle 63, Montblenu, p. 398 – Vérard’s edition has ‘craingnent’), *craindoit* (Nouvelle 66, Philippe de Loan, p. 412; Nouvelle 73, Maistre Jehan Lauvin, p. 443 – Antoine Vérard’s edition has « craignoit »); *plaindit* (Nouvelle 37, Monseigneur de la Roche, p. 259 – Antoine Vérard’s edition has ‘plaignit’); *feindant* (Nouvelle 88, Alardin, p. 510 – Antoine Vérard’s edition has ‘feignant’), *faindit* (Nouvelle 33, Monseigneur, p. 231); *joindoient* (Nouvelle 87, Monsieur le Voyer, p. 505 – Antoine Vérard’s edition has ‘joignoient’). Pierre Fouc’hé quotes instances of dental stems in documents by Jehan Froissart, Arnoul Gréban, Jean de Stavelot, etc., and concludes that ‘dans les verbes du groupe *plangërè* on constate, surtout au N.-E., une généralisation du radical dentalisé de l’infinitif’ [in the verbs of the *plangërè* group it can be seen, especially in the north est, a general trend to dentalise the infinitive stem]\(^80\).

**PHILIPPE LE BON’S FRENCH:**

If the *Cent nouvelles nouvelles* can indeed offer any insight into the variety of French spoken at the Court of Burgundy at the time, then the Duke’s own tales should provide the best illustration of what was perceived as linguistically befitted to the ‘treschier et tresredoubte Monseigne ur le duc de Bourgoigne’ [the most dear and most redoubtable my lord the Duke of Burgundy]. Although we cannot expect the text to faithfully reproduce Philippe le Bon’s own words, pronunciation and syntax, in all probability the finalised text must have been considered fit enough to portray his performance as a speaker. There follows a brief review of the scriptological features found in the tales attributed to the Duke:

**Phonology**

*caichast* (Nouvelle 1, p. 25), *caicha* (Nouvelle 4, p. 50), *saichant* (Nouvelle 9, p. 75); *peche* (Nouvelle 1, p. 24)\(^81\).

**Morphology**

*aroit* (Nouvelle 17, p. 117), *saroit* (Nouvelle 1, p. 27; Nouvelle 17, p. 117; Nouvelle 29, p. 199), *faindit* (Nouvelle 33, p. 231)\(^82\).

**Vocabulary**

Last but not least, the Duke can be heard to use a handful of seemingly regional lexemes:

- *hodez*\(^83\): the *FEW* notes that: ‘Die verbreitung des wortes, das in den nord-östlich gebieten (wallon. pik. champ. lothr. nördlich FrComté) am stärksten belegt ist, und das *h*- lassen keinen zweifel darüber, dass hier ein germ., element vorliegt’ [This word is most densely distributed in the north-east (Walloon, Picard, Champagne, Lorraine, north Franche-Comté), and its

---

\(^81\) Cf. above.
\(^82\) Cf. above.
\(^83\) ‘Ses gens hodez et traveillez, et leurs chevaux aussi ne contredirent pas a monseigneur, qui picque son courtaut et fait tant en peu d’heure qu’il est en la basse court de son hostel descendu’ (Nouvelle 16, p. 111).

- **hoignard$^{86}$**: according to Pierre Champion$^{87}$, ‘le mot “hongnart” a encore été recueilli par le chanoine Haigneré, *Patois Boulonnais*, 1903, p. 330. Il se rencontre très fréquement dans Jean Molinet (cf. *Godefroy*, *ad. v.* HOGNART)’ [The word ‘hongnart’ (grumpy) was recorded by Canon Haigneré, *Patois Boulonnais*, 1903, p. 330. It is also very frequently found in Jean Moninet (cf. *Godefroy*, *ad. v.* HOGNART)]. Although the verb ho(i)gner appears to be widely attested, this substantive form is Picard according to the *FEW*.$^{88}$

- **ramon$^{89}$**: *Gdf* and the *FEW* show that this derivative of Old French *ram* < RAMUS was also in use in Champagne, Lorraine and Wallonia.$^{92}$

- **escollee$^{93}$**: the *FEW* flags this form in Wallonia, Picardy and Ardennes.$^{94}$

- **graux$^{95}$**: The *FEW* flags this outcome of *krawa* in the Ardennes, Picardy and Wallonia.$^{96}$ The *DMF*, which identifies it as Picard, presents attestations from MOLINET, *Faictz Dictz* D.; MOLINET, *Chron.* D.J., t.1; MOLINET, *Myst. st Quentin* C. and *Percef.* II, R., t.2.$^{97}$

**CONCLUDING REMARKS**

If the *Cent nouvelles nouvelles* may be considered as reflecting to some degree the variety of French spoken at the court of Philippe le Bon, after about eighty years of a koineisation process involving the northern and eastern oïl dialects spoken across the Burgundian dominions, it would appear that:

1. This koineised variety contained a substantial proportion of non-central features in use across several dialects: Picard, (Anglo-)Norman, Walloon, Ardennais, Lorrain, Franc-Comtois, and to a lesser extent Bourguignon.

2. These features overwhelmingly converge towards the Picard area, which provides the highest proportion of regionalisms, including a few narrowly localised phono-graphemes (e.g. *baloch-* pointing to the Somme, cf. above).

3. From a sociolinguistic point of view, the fact that such regionalisms are widespread in the various literary works commissioned by Philippe le Bon, and all the more in the present collection

---

$^{84}$ XVI, p. 216-217 *hoddôn.*
$^{85}$ Cf. also Debrie, *Glossaire du moyen picard* p. 237.
$^{86}$ ‘Sa femme, qui misérablement son temps passoit avecques son tres maudit mary, le plus suspessonueux hoignard que jamais femme accoinstast’ (Nouvelle 11, p. 85).
$^{88}$ vol. 16, p. 184a *haunjan.*
$^{89}$ ‘Sa bonne femme, qui mesnageoit par leans, en sa main tenant ung ramon, demande ce qu'elle bien scet’ (Nouvelle 1, Monseigneur, p. 27).
$^{90}$ Vol. 6, p. 582.
$^{91}$ Vol. 10, p. 41b.
$^{93}$ ‘La demoiselle de sa maistresse est escollee et advoée que mieulx on ne pourroit, baille au bon seigneur à demain l'heure de besoigner, dont il est tant content que son cueur tressault tout de joy’ (Nouvelle 9, p. 74).
$^{94}$ Vol. 11, p. 301b: schola.
$^{95}$ ‘Quelque refus que de la bouche elle m'ayt fait, si en cheviray je bien si je la puis à graux tenir’ (Nouvelle 17, p. 117).
$^{96}$ Vol. 16, p. 378: *krawa.*
where he features as a prolific narrator and prime dedicatee, suggests a level of linguistic security at odds with contemporary and earlier accounts about the superiority of Parisian French (cf. n. 4). At the death of Philippe le Bon in 1467, his son Charles le Téméraire (the Bold) – who had also grown up in the Burgundian Netherlands – inherited the Duchy for ten turbulent years leading to his own death at the Battle of Nancy. Charles’s ill-fated attempt at annexing the Duchy of Lorraine, in order to secure a territorial continuum uniting the *Pays de par-delà* and the *Pays de par-deçà*, probably had little linguistic impact, if any at all. After Charles’s succession, King Louis XI of France took possession of the Duchy and County of Burgundy, as well as of the County of Artois, whilst the remnant of the formerly Burgundian Netherlands passed to the Holy Empire. This would mark the end of the century-long process of koinèisation which we have discussed here.