Toward a Scriptology of Middle French:
The Case of MS Glasgow Hunter 252[[1]](#footnote-1)\*

Abstract:

MS Glasgow Hunter 252 presents a significant amount of Picard isographs, most probably copied from its model. These variants are consistent with the regional vocabulary one can also find in the text, meaning that the anonymous *acteur* is likely to have grown up and/or been trained in Picardy. This evidence makes identification of the *acteur* with Antoine de la Sale, Olivier de la Marche, Michault de Chaugy or Philippe Pot, as was argued for in the past, rather unlikely.

\*\*\*

In spite of teleological misconceptions and/or ideological bias reproduced *ad nauseam* through much of the historiography of French,[[2]](#footnote-2) regional spelling conventions were still very much at work in the late Middle Ages and beyond, as has been reported for a long time,[[3]](#footnote-3) and quantitatively explored more recently.[[4]](#footnote-4)

The diasystem of medieval written French was supra-regional from the outset; regional graphemes were non-systematic and comparatively few (typically between 3 and 30 percent according to Charles-Théodore Gossen),[[5]](#footnote-5) and some of them became adopted far beyond their original habitat due to wide dissemination and/or sociolinguistic prestige (Insular, Champenois, Picard and Parisian variants sequentially). Yet these isographs appear to have been perceived as highly distinctive by contemporary readers, as evidenced by records describing given documents as either ‘françois’ or ‘picart’ on the basis of their minimal presence,[[6]](#footnote-6) or the fact that scriptoria routinely chose between a variety of them when writing to different recipients.[[7]](#footnote-7)

Diatopic variation in medieval written French therefore is a major sociolinguistic phenomenon, and as such it is the primary focus of what has come to be designated, in Romance historical linguistics, as *scriptology*. This subfield of historical dialectology and sociolinguistics examines *scriptae*, i. e. pre-standardisation regional varieties of written language. Scriptological methodology consists in identifying and quantifying regional variants, primarily phono- and morpho-graphemes, with a view to localising given documents. Because regional variation in written French has never, in any time period, matched regional variation in spoken language, localisation can only be achieved *typologically* (i.e. *diasystematically*)as opposed to geolinguistically. Indeed, diatopic substrata are just one of several factors likely to have influenced a given *scripta*, and unequivocal correspondences between graphemes and phonemes are often impossible to ascertain – although regional toponymy, post-medieval patois literature and modern Oïl dialects may provide convincing corroborating evidence.[[8]](#footnote-8)

It follows that localising a medieval French text is a troublesome and occasionally treacherous task, especially when it comes to the Middle French period, for which diatopic variation is unfortunately under-researched and largely undocumented.[[9]](#footnote-9) Because scribal practices evolved considerably over the 14th- and 15th-centuries, the scriptological criteria currently available for localising 13th-century texts must be used with great caution,[[10]](#footnote-10) as given spellings may have gone from strictly localised to widespread before ultimately disappearing.[[11]](#footnote-11) In the absence of a comprehensive survey of regional variants, localising a Middle French manuscript inevitably consists in conflating and cross-comparing scattered evidence from various resources. In the case of MS Glasgow Hunter 252, what little information is available on its localisation turns out to be contradictory. It is Picard according to Pierre Champion,[[12]](#footnote-12) Robert McGillivray[[13]](#footnote-13) and the *Dictionnaire étymologique de l’ancien français* (hereafter *DÉAF*),[[14]](#footnote-14) whereas Christiane Marchello-Nizia localises it in the Ile-de-France.[[15]](#footnote-15) As per the *Französisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch* (hereafter *FEW*), its languagepoints towards both Burgundy and Romance Flanders.[[16]](#footnote-16) Finally, Luciano Rossi claims that Antoine Vérard’s indirectly connected,[[17]](#footnote-17) printed edition of the *Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles* (Paris, 1486) contains ‘features typical of Burgundian dialects’.[[18]](#footnote-18)Only Pierre Champion justified his localisation with linguistic evidence, mainly lexical (and convincing overall), which gives further incentive to explore the graphematic dimension and elucidate the manuscript’s position. This has been done here through direct examination (in relation with Franklin Sweetser’s 1966 edition), as well as cross-comparison with Vérard’s print. It shows that both our extant sources contain regional variants, although significantly fewer in Vérard’s Parisian edition, which nonetheless replicates some of the evidence found in the manuscript, alongside other forms absent from it (as illustrated below). It is likely therefore that the lost original contained more regional features than can be gathered altogether from its two extant copies.

On the sociolinguistic context of the *Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles* and MS Glasgow Hunter 252, the following should be noted. The tales are ostensibly presented as having been recounted by Philip the Good and members of his court, then compiled at his request as if they had been transcribed from *viva voce* performance (the anonymous *acteur* refers to himself as a mere ‘secretary’ of the narrators’ own words – see Nouvelle 12, p. 90).[[19]](#footnote-19) The storytelling is likely to have taken place ‘between the early autumn of 1458 and the summer of 1459’, at which time the court was initially based ‘in the principle towns of the county of Hainaut’ before relocating to Brussels.[[20]](#footnote-20) In that period the Burgundian dominions consisted of the Duchy of Burgundy itself plus, as a result of a spectacular territorial expansion initiated in 1384, the Counties of Burgundy and Nevers and what we now refer to as the ‘Burgundian Low Countries’, namely Rethel, Luxembourg, Artois, Hainaut, Brabant, Flanders, Holland, Zeeland, Namur and Limburg. These lands formed a multilingual territory across which several Gallo-Romance and Germanic dialects were spoken (northern and eastern *Langue d’oïl*, Jurassien, West Central and Low German), and characterised by extensive migration from the *pays de par-delà* (Burgundy) to the *pays de par-deçà* (Low Countries).[[21]](#footnote-21) The Burgundian court brought together different dignitaries from Burgundy and the Low Countries – many of whom were native Dutch speakers.[[22]](#footnote-22)

It is in this text-book environment for koineisation and creolisation, through dialect- and language-contact, that Philip the Good is reported to have recruited his fellow storytellers. It is important at this point to restate a number of points addressed more fully in other contributions to the present volume. Those *conteurs* on whom biographical information is available hail mostly from the Low Countries and Burgundy, but also from Brittany, Saintonge, Bourbonnais and Markgräflerland.[[23]](#footnote-23) This cosmopolitan group comprises humble commoners alongside hugely powerful nobles, including a few knights of the Golden Fleece. It appears to be an entirely masculine crowd, in their thirties through to their seventies,[[24]](#footnote-24) whose mission, as outlined in the collection’s epistle, was to produce a Northern counterpart to the Italian *Decameron*, i.e. Boccaccio’s ‘livre de Cent Nouvelles’,composed of tales taking place primarily ‘in parts of France, Germany, England, Hainaut, Brabant and other places’ (Epistle, p. 20). The Burgundian court therefore was both the collective author and the main audience of this performance, with Philip the Good as prime contributor and dedicatee of the compiled collection. Beyond the court itself, it is difficult to evaluate how wide a readership the text was aimed at; the *Decameron* model would suggest a very broad one indeed, however we have evidence of just two manuscript copies of the text, and convincing indicators of an additional lost one[[25]](#footnote-25) – a shortfall which may well have been caused by Philip’s death and succession, as explained by Graeme Small below.[[26]](#footnote-26) While the lost ducal manuscript is described as a luxury artefact, ‘covered with white chamois leather’,[[27]](#footnote-27) MS Glasgow Hunter 252 is a later, less sophisticated piece, and probably not a direct copy of the former.[[28]](#footnote-28) It contains altered rubrics and interventions by an early 16th-century hand[[29]](#footnote-29) apparently unfamiliar with Philip’s court, introducing misinformed data such as the date (‘M IVC XXX II’) or the positions of certain storytellers, casting doubt on whether or not the text was actually produced in Dijon as indicated.[[30]](#footnote-30)

With these points in mind, here is the phono- and morpho-graphematic evidence I have identified towards the localisation of our manuscript:

**Phono-graphematics**

##

## Vowels

### -A- > *-ai-*

The MS has examples of variation between *-a-* and *-ai-*: eight *rasiere* compared with one *raisiere*[[31]](#footnote-31). This phenomenon appears to have spread from Lorraine to Franche-Comté and Burgundy[[32]](#footnote-32), and later on to Picardy.[[33]](#footnote-33)

Alongside forms in *–ache*, MS Glasgow Hunter 252 presents alternatives such as *caiché* (table, p. 2; Nouvelle 28, p. 196 – *cachié* in Vérard’s edition; Nouvelle 44, p. 299), *caichast* (Nouvelle 1, p. 25), *caicha* (Nouvelle 4, p. 50; Nouvelle 38, p. 264), *caichez* (Nouvelle 13, p. 94 – *cachiés* in Vérard’s edition), *saichant* (Nouvelle 9, p. 75; Nouvelle 26, p. 169). This digraph also appears frequently in Vérard’s edition, and is a northern and eastern *Langue d’oïl* phenomenon according to Pierre Fouché.[[34]](#footnote-34)

### -an- > *-o-*

Derivatives of *\*bilancia* consistently show denasalisation: *balocho*(*u*)*ere*, *balochoit*, *balocher* (Nouvelle 82, p. 483). Vérard’s edition only partially mirrors the first instance (‘baloichere’); all three subsequent mentions are absent. Louis-Ferdinand Flutre notes that /ɑ̃/ has tended to evolve into /o/ in Romance Flanders, Artois and Ternois. In the Somme district, this phenomenon has specifically affected *balance*, *balancer* and *balançoire*, the stem of which is pronounced /baloʃ/.[[35]](#footnote-35)

**Checked -AE- > *-ie-***

Nouvelle 83 has a conjugated form of *ahierdre* < ADHAERERE: *ahiert* (p. 486 – *print* in Vérard’s edition). This *-ie-* digraph reflects the diphthongisation of checked /ɛ/ in Walloon and neighbouring Picard dialects. It is widely attested in corresponding medieval *scriptae*[[36]](#footnote-36).

### Unstressed initial /[ɛ](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Open-mid_front_unrounded_vowel)/ > /i/

Vérard’s edition has examples of *milleur* < MELIOR (Nouvelle 61, 207a; Nouvelle 62, 211b – the MS having *meilleur* in both instances). According to Charles-Théodore Gossen, this is one of the distinguishing vocalic features of Picard in regard to so-called *Francien*.[[37]](#footnote-37) Indeed the *DMF* only has matching attestations by Jean Froissart. Gossen notes that within Picardy, this grapheme is more frequently found in Artois, Romance Flanders and Hainaut, plus Saint Quentin and Laon.

### -O- > *-u-* vs. *–*(*i*)*eu-*

### Nouvelle 75 presents an undocumented *ulyer*, presumably cognate with *œiller* < OCULARE:[[38]](#footnote-38) ‘Et luy la venu fut bien esbahy, Dieu le scet, et regarde et ulye tousjours vers ce bois, mais c'estoit pour neant’[[39]](#footnote-39) (this was mistranscribed by Franklin Sweetser as *veye*. Vérard’s edition has ‘…regardoit devant et derriere et le plus vers…’). While non-palatalisation of final /l/ + yod is a classic feature of Normanno-Picard, as discussed below, the reduction of /oku/ into /y/ is specifically Picard, pointing in particular towards the Pas-de-Calais and the Somme as per Charles-Théodore Gossen’s survey.[[40]](#footnote-40)

### Protonic –U- + yod > *-ui-* vs. *–o*(*i*)*-*

CUNEARE (Fr. *cogner*) presents outcomes in both *coign-* and *cuign-* (table, p. 2; Nouvelle 91, p. 518), the latter form being Picard according to the *FEW*.[[41]](#footnote-41) Charles-Théodore Gossen confirms that this is one of the key vocalic distinctions between Picard and French, as evidenced by PŬGNATA > *pugnie* andCŬNEATA > *cugnie*.[[42]](#footnote-42) Vérard’s edition has -*coingn-* in both instances.

## Consonants

###

### Conservation of velar occlusive /k/:

A defining phonological characteristic of Norman and Picard, and Insular French to a lesser extent, is the conservation of the velar occlusive /k/ which underwent palatalisation south of the so-called Joret line, distinguishing Normanno-Picard from other *oïl* dialects, e.g. VACCA > *vaque* vs. *vache*.[[43]](#footnote-43)This phenomenon is occasionally reflected in regional *scriptae*, and evidenced within our manuscript in the following forms: *recaner* (Nouvelle 61, p. 383 – ‘hyngner’ in Vérard’s edition) and *racaner* (Nouvelle79, p. 469 – ‘reclamer’ in Vérard’s edition), corresponding to French *rechaner*. The *FEW* confirms that derivatives of Old Frankish \**kinni* (cheek) were affected by palatalization south of the Joret line.[[44]](#footnote-44)

*Calonge* (< CALUMNIA/CALUMNIARE, Fr. *challenge*) in Nouvelles 76 (p. 455) and 96 (p. 541 – Vérard’s edition has *calenge* in both instances).

Nouvelle 82 has *mercque* < \**merki* (p. 483 – Vérard’s edition has *merche*). Pierre Champion observes that this is how the word is pronounced in Hainaut.[[45]](#footnote-45) According to the *FEW*, this form is attested in Norman, Anglo-Norman and Picardy, the rest of the *Pays d’oïl* presenting a palatalised ‘merche’.[[46]](#footnote-46)

Nouvelle 95 presents a past participle of the verb *marescaucier* (p. 495 – absent from Vérard’s edition).The velar occlusive in this outcome of Germanic *\*marhskalk* normally evolved to /ʃ/ south of the Joret line, i. e. *maréchausser*.

The MS also suggests conservation of /k/ before –ARE/-ARIU(M) in *bucquer* (Fr. *buschier* – Vérard’s edition has *hucher*),[[47]](#footnote-47) *crocquer* (Fr. *crochier*),[[48]](#footnote-48) *sacquer* (Fr. *sachier* – Vérard’s edition has *sacha*),[[49]](#footnote-49)and *bancquiers* (Fr. *banchiers*).[[50]](#footnote-50)

### /tj/, /sj/, /kj/ > /ʃ/ vs. /s/

Another phonological trait specific to Picard, Norman and Insular French is the evolution of /tj/, /sj/ and /kj/ into /ʃ/where other *Langue d’oïl* dialects have /s/.[[51]](#footnote-51) In MS Glasgow Hunter 252, graphematic evidence of this phenomenon includes the following:

* *peche* < \**pettia* (Nouvelle 1, p. 24; Nouvelle 2, p. 35; Nouvelle 3, p. 43 – Vérard’s edition has *piece* in the first two instances, *pechié* in the third). This form appears in the expression *a chef de peche* (‘in the end’),alongside thirty-one instances of *a chef de piece*. The forms *pièche* and *piècha* survive into Middle and Modern Picard.[[52]](#footnote-52)
* *sanchié* < SANITIATUS (Nouvelle 38, p. 165 – Vérard’s edition has *changié*). The word itself is Picard according to the *DMF*, referring to Gilles Roques.[[53]](#footnote-53)
* *parchon* < PARTITIO (Nouvelle 73, p. 445 – Vérard’s edition has *porcion*).
* *perchant* (Nouvelle 95, p. 537) and *percha* (Nouvelle 98, p. 551 – Vérard’s edition has *perça*) from *percher* < \**pertusiare*.
* *chula* < \**eccillūi* *illāc* (Nouvelle 75, p. 453 – Vérard’s edition has *cestui ça*). Demonstrative articles and pronounsdeveloped a voiceless palato-alveolar fricative in Normanno-Picard. See the examples provided in Charles-Théodore Gossen’s ‘Petite anthologie picarde’: *chiauls, chils, chest, chele, che, icheste*.[[54]](#footnote-54) Louis-Ferdinand Flutre mentions *chela,* *chelo, choulo*, *cheul(l)e, chu* in Middle Picard documents.[[55]](#footnote-55)
* As observed above, the same phenomenon is at work in derivatives of \**bilancia*: *balochouere*, *balochoere, balochoit*, *balocher* (Nouvelle 82, pp. 483-84 – the final three being absent from Vérard’s edition).[[56]](#footnote-56)
* *soichons* < SOCIUS (Nouvelle 99, p. 557 – Vérard’s edition has *compaignons mariniers*). This word is Picard according to the *DMF* and the *FEW*;[[57]](#footnote-57) it also appears in Nouvelle 93, spelled *soisson* (p. 528 – Vérard’s edition has *sortes*).
* *challer* < CELARE: *toutesfoiz le challoit il a sa femme* (‘nevertheless he hid it from his wife’ – Nouvelle 99, p. 559. Vérard’s edition has *celoit*; interference from *chaloir* < CALERE is both semantically and syntactically unlikely.
* Worth adding to this list is *cuyracher*, in Nouvelle 90 of Vérard’s edition (273b), where MS Glasgow Hunter 252 has *cuirasses* < CORIACEAE (p. 516).

One graphematic consequence of this phonological correspondence between /ʃ/ and /s/ is the usage, originating north of the Joret line, of *–c-* to symbolise /ʃ/, e.g. *sace* in the present subjunctive of *savoir* (Fr. *sache*).[[58]](#footnote-58) Evidence of this can be found here in *cicaneur* (Nouvelle 96, p. 540 – Vérard’s edition has *chicaneur*). Nouvelle 3 has both *cruches* and *cruces* < \**krûkka* (p. 38, 41 – Vérard’s edition has *cruches*).Besides 31 instances of *–chev-* < CAPUT ((*par*)*achever*, *eschever*), the manuscript contains two *–cev-*: *acevez* (Nouvelle 75, p. 473 – Vérard’s edition has *achevez*) and *acever* (Nouvelle 81, p. 449 – Vérard’s edition has *achever*). While the phonological interpretation of *–c-* seems rather straightforward here, since *cruces* occurs alongside *cruches*, and likewise *acev-* alongside *achev-*, it should be noted that both morphemes would normally have kept their velar occlusive north of the Joret line, cf. attestations of *crucque* and *akiever* in the *DMF*. There is therefore a chance that –*c*- might have symbolised /k/ rather than /ʃ/, as suggested by attestations of *chief*, *kief*, *quief* and *cief* in the *DMF*’sdatabase. In other words, *–c-* may symbolise either a Normanno-Picard /k/ or a French /ʃ/, but as a graphematic convention it originates in Picardy.

### CRASSUS> *cras*

Nouvelle 99 has two instances of the feminine adjective *crasse* (pp. 568, 575) where Vérard’s edition has *grasse*. Louis-Ferdinand Flutre mentions similar forms in Middle Picard: *cra, cras, cresse, encresson,* and observes that /kr/ did not develop into /gr/ as it did in French (probably under the influence of GROSSUS.[[59]](#footnote-59) The *FEW* notes that *cras* is especially common in Walloon, Picard and Anglo-Norman.[[60]](#footnote-60) See also the *cras* and *cra* entries by René Debrie.[[61]](#footnote-61)

### *-ng-* vs. *-gn-*

Charles-Théodore Gossen observes that, in the Picard *scripta*, /ɲ/ could be rendered by *(i)ng, (i)gn(i), (i)ngn(i)*.[[62]](#footnote-62) The MS contains evidence of such variation in derivatives of LONGE, with eleven occurrences of *e(s)loign-* alongside two of *(d)eslonger* (Nouvelle 26, p. 170 – Vérard’s edition has *eslongier*; Nouvelle 76, p. 456 – Vérard’s edition has *d’eslongner*).

### *-gh- / -h-* vs. *-g-*

The *Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles* appear to contain the earliest attestation of *goguette*, created from Old French *gogue*, ‘joke, jape’(also attested in Nouvelle 29, p. 199):[[63]](#footnote-63) *gogettes* (Nouvelle 16, p. 110 – Vérard’s edition has *bonne chiere*) ; *gohettes* (Nouvelle 48, p. 317 – Vérard’s edition has *goguettes*) ; *goghettes* (Nouvelle 93, p. 528 – Vérard’s edition has *goguettes*). The digraph *–gh-*, which one can also observe in *Stevelinghes* (p. 60, 64) and *Gravelinghes* (p. 385 – substitute folio) was especially common in the ‘northern region’ according to Mildred Pope.[[64]](#footnote-64) Indeed Charles-Théodore Gossen lists numerous examples,[[65]](#footnote-65) although he does not comment on the geographical extent of its use. Godefroy has one example of *goghe* from the *Chron. de l’Abb. de Floreffe* (County of Namur, dated 1488.[[66]](#footnote-66) Our second attestation, *gohettes*, is potentially interesting towards the localisation of the manuscript, since Louis-Ferdinand Flutre notes that in Vermandois /g/ tends to develop into /h/ before vowels, cf. *éheudir*  < \**ex-gaudire, halibié* vs. *galibier*.[[67]](#footnote-67) If this particular spelling is indeed not attested outside the Vermandois, and is not a scribal mistake, it then provides us with a highly precise geographical pointer – to an area of about 1000km2 in southern Picardy. One should bear in mind however, that *gohettes* is the only example of this phono-graphematic phenomenon across the whole document.

### Non palatalization of final /l/ + yod

### As indicated above, Nouvelle 75 presents an undocumented *ulyer*, presumably cognate with *œiller* < OCULARE.[[68]](#footnote-68) The non-palatalisation of /l/ + yod is a classic feature of Normanno-Picard, and is abundantly attested in corresponding *scriptae*, in such examples as *ortel*, *solel*, *consel*, *traval*, etc.[[69]](#footnote-69) Assuming *grouller* (Nouvelle 31, p. 212 – *glappir* in Vérard’s edition) is not a mere scribal mistake for *grouiller* (Nouvelle 31, p. 211 ; Nouvelle 79, p. 469), it may further illustrate this phenomenon, as does *deul* < DOLIUM in Vérard’s edition of Nouvelle 37 (142a) where the MS has *dueil*

### Conservation of –*lr*-

Speakers of Picard, Walloon, Lorrain and Franc-Comtois appear to have had no difficulty pronouncing /lr/ or /nr/ where other oïl dialects developed a non-etymological, epenthetic consonant [d] to compensate for the loss of an unstressed vowel, e.g. PŨLVĔRE(M) > \**polre* > *poudre*.[[70]](#footnote-70) MS Glasgow Hunter 252 has two forms echoing this phenomenon, both in the third person plural of *vouloir* in the preterite tense, i.e. *voulrent* (Nouvelle 52, p. 334 – Vérard’s edition has *voulsissent*; Nouvelle 65, p. 410 – Vérard’s edition has *voulurent*). See Anthonij Dees’ maps for analogous conjugation patterns in the future tense, and confirmation of their geographical intensity in northern and eastern Langue d’oïl.[[71]](#footnote-71)

### Conservation of initial *w-*

Besides examples of the conservation of Germanic initial *w-* in proper names (*Walerant, Warengeville* and *Wastenes*), MS Glasgow Hunter 252 has one attestation of *wart* < \**warda* (Nouvelle 26, p. 166 – Vérard’s edition has *grans languages*). Conservation of Germanic initial /w/ is attested in Normandy, Picardy, Wallonia and Lorraine, cf. Anthonij Dees’ map for verbs *gager, gagner* and *garder*.[[72]](#footnote-72) The fact that this doubly[[73]](#footnote-73) Picard *wart* co-occurs alongside numerous examples of *garde* raises a few questions: is its use stylistically motivated? If not, how different is its semantic value from that of *garde*?

The MS has nine derivatives of Vulgar Latin \**vocitus* for VOCUUS, VACUUS, all spelled with an initial *w-* where Vérard’s edition has *vu-*: *wide(e) (*p.185, 493, 497), *wida* (p. 442, 557), *wide* (p. 487), *wider (*p.522, 567), *widera* (p. 565). The /w/ pronunciation is Picard, Walloon and Ardennais according to the *FEW*.[[74]](#footnote-74)

### Final *-te* vs. *-de*

Besides conserving its initial *w-*, *wart* (Nouvelle 26, p. 166 – Vérard’s edition has *grans languages*) suggests an unvoiced pronunciation of *–de*, a classic phonological tendency in Picard.[[75]](#footnote-75) Christiane Marchello-Nizia observes that Northern authors of verse often make voiced and unvoiced consonants rhyme, because their pronunciations are similar.[[76]](#footnote-76)

One potential other illustration of this phenomenon is *coute* < CUBITUS (Nouvelle 80, p. 472), the final consonant of which underwent voicing in most oïl dialects between the fourteenth and sixteenth centuries, for reasons unclear to the *FEW*, whilst remaining unvoiced in Wallonia, the Pas-de-Calais and Lorraine.[[77]](#footnote-77)

## Morpho-graphematics

Suffix -­ELLA > *-ille*

Christiane Marchello-Nizia, citing *–il-* forms used by Eustache Deschamps and Jean Froissart, argues that pretonic internal /ɛ/ has tended to evolve into /i/ when followed by palatalised /l/.[[78]](#footnote-78) Nouvelle 6 has evidence of this phenomenon in *coustille* < CULTELLA (p. 61), defined by the *DMF* as a cutlass or short, double-edged sabre.

### Verbal stems

AVOIR: *ar*- vs. *aur*-

The manuscript shows variation in the spelling of the future/conditional stem of the verb *avoir*, presenting twenty-seven instances of *aur-* besides seventy-five of *ar-*, all corresponding to *aur-* in Vérard’s edition. Anthonij Dees’ maps show that this spelling was most common in Old Picard.[[79]](#footnote-79) Christiane Marchello-Nizia confirms that their frequency is particularly high in texts originating in Northern France.[[80]](#footnote-80)

SAVOIR: *s*(*ç*)*ar*- vs. *scer*- vs. *saur*-

Similar variation can be observed in the future/conditional stem of *savoir*: three instances of *s(ç)aur-* besides forty-four of *s(ç)ar-*, again all corresponding to *s*(*ç*)*aur-* in Vérard’s edition.According to Christiane Marchello-Nizia, *ar-* and *sar-* fell from use from the mid-fifteenth century.[[81]](#footnote-81) The MS further has eleven instances of a raised stem *scer-*, all corresponding to *sçaur-* in Vérard’s edition. The *DMF* has no attestations of this raised stem other than those of the *Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles*. In Middle Picard, Louis-Ferdinand Flutre notes similar forms for both AVOIR(*ara* vs. *era*) and savoir(*sara* vs. *séra*). This phenomenon may be linked with the transformation of dental /r/ into velar /R/ in various oïl dialects from the fifteenth century on, particularly in Picard, where /ar/ tended to converge with /ɛr/.[[82]](#footnote-82)

LAISSER: *lair*(*r*)- vs. *laisser*-

The MS has four instances of the future/conditional stem *laisser-* besides fourteen of *lair(r)-*, eight of which correspond to *laisser-* in Vérard’s edition. This stem is Picard and Lorrain according to Helmut Stimm.[[83]](#footnote-83) It may also be found in Franche-Comté and Wallonia according to the *FEW* and Claude Buridant.[[84]](#footnote-84)

-MENER: *-merr-* vs. -*mainr-*/-*menr-*

Alongside seven instances of -*mainr-*/-*menr-*, MS Glasgow Hunter 252 has two attestations of a denasalised stem *–merr-*: *enmerrons* (Nouvelle98, p. 548 – *enmenerons* in Vérard’s edition) and *amerrons* (p. 549 – *amenerons* in Vérard’s edition). These words are spoken by the worst evildoers of the collection, i.e. the murderers of a young knight, who further cause his virgin mistress to kill herself as they attempt to rape her. This future tense stem –*merr‑*, which does not appear anywhere else in the manuscript, contrasts with the young knight’s use of –*mainr*- (p. 547). Is it a stylistic device as part of the characters’ portrayal? Pierre Fouché indicates that this case of assimilation of –*n*- by -*r*- first appeared in Anglo-Norman texts, and is later attested in central *Langue d’oïl* where it riled sixteenth- and seventeenth-century grammarians. He also mentions that such assimilation was very rare in the east, and unknown in Picard and Walloon.[[85]](#footnote-85) However, Louis-Ferdinand Flutre presents a wide variety of manifestations of this phenomenon in Middle Picard: *tairre*/*ter* (tendre), *dorrai* (donnerai), *dorroi* (donnerait), *merrai* (menerai), *merra* (meneras), *verrai* (viendrai), *verron* (viendrons), *verroient* (viendraient), *souvaira*/*souvera* (souviendra), *entretara* (entretiendra).[[86]](#footnote-86)

SUIVRE: *syeu*- vs. *suy*-

The MS has one attestation of the Picard/Walloon stem for suivre *syeuz* (Nouvelle 72, p. 459 – Vérard’s edition has *suyvray*).[[87]](#footnote-87) This form derived from Old French \**sieure* (< \**sewwere* < sĕquĕre) is largely outnumbered by twenty-seven attestations of the more common stem *suy-*.

-*d-* vs. -*gn*- / *-nn-*

Besides three attestations of *prenne* and one of *prengne* in the present subjunctive of PRENDRE, the manuscript has a dental *prende* in Nouvelle 99 (p. 560 – Vérard’s edition has *prengne*). Pierre Fouché observes that *–d-* stems are more frequently found in north-eastern dialects.[[88]](#footnote-88) According to André Lanly, this etymological form of the stem (< PRENDAT) was still frequent in the sixteenth century, alongside the analogically remodelled *preigne* and *prenne* and the western *prienge*.[[89]](#footnote-89)

Likewise the manuscript has variant stems for verbs in *–aindre, -eindre* and *-oindre*. Besides five occurrences of palatal *craign-*, three examples of dental *craind-* (based on the infinitive) can be found in finite forms: *craindent* (Nouvelle 63, p. 398 – Vérard’s edition has *craingnent*), *craindoit* (Nouvelle 66, p. 412; Nouvelle 73, p. 443 – Vérard’s edition has *craignoit* in both instances).

The same applies to -*plaindre*, i.e. five occurrences of -*plaign-* besides one of *plaindit* (Nouvelle 37, p. 259 – Vérard’s edition has *plaignit*).

*Feindre* has six palatal and two dental stems: *feindant* (Nouvelle 88, p. 510 – Vérard’s edition has *feingnant*), *faindit* (Nouvelle 33, p. 231).

*Joindre* and its compounds show eight examples of the palatal stem besides two dental *joindoient* (Nouvelle 87, p. 505 – Vérard’s edition has *joignoient*) and *enjoindit* (Nouvelle 67, p. 417 – Vérard’s edition has *enjoingnit*).

Pierre Fouché quotes exemples of dental stems in texts by Jean Froissart, Arnoul Gréban, Jean de Stavelot, etc., and confirms that, in the plangĕre group, those prevailed in north-eastern dialects.[[90]](#footnote-90)

**Verbal endings**

Present subjunctive–*ge*

The manuscript has a single attestation of the present subjunctive ending *–ge*, here added to *cheoir*: *chiege* (Nouvelle 3, p. 39 – Vérard’s edition has *chee*). According to Pierre Fouché,[[91]](#footnote-91) this present subjunctive ending was commonly found in a zone reaching from the south-west to the north-east. He cites Anjou, Maine, Brittany, Perche, Normandy, Hainaut, along with parts of Picardy and Wallonia. Claude Buridant confirms that this subjunctive ending was active in Picard, Anglo-Norman and western dialects.[[92]](#footnote-92)

Feminine past participle to palatal-final 1st group roots

Presuming it is not an agreement error, Nouvelle 34 shows evidence of -*iee* being shortened to *-ie* after a palatal consonant, which is an ending characteristic of the Picard *scripta*:[[93]](#footnote-93) *Il eut tantot sa longue robe despoillie* (‘His long robe was soon taken off’, p. 242 – *il eut* *tantost despouillié* *sa robe longue* in Vérard’s edition).

**Morpho-syntax**

### *il* vs. *elle*

On two occasions, our scribe wrote *il* where prevalent practice would have *elle*:

Vindrent en leur chambre Conrard et Gerard, parlans de beaucop de choses, mais il n'y venoit nulz propos en termes que pleussent a Con­rard. Quand il vit qu'il ne dira rien si on ne luy mect en bouche, elle luy demanda de quelz gens il estoit de Brabant. (Nouvelle 26, p. 174 – identical in Vérard’s edition)

Combien que sa volunte fust plainement deliberee et resolue de soy retraire et revenir à son dit premier mestier, toutesfoiz le challoit il a sa femme, doubtant qu'il ne le print a desplaisance. (Nouvelle 99, p. 559 – Vérard’s edition has *el*)

The first example is somewhat debatable since the character in question is a transvestite – Katherine pretending to be Conrard. Nevertheless, the fact that *elle* supplants *il* in the very same sentence sounds rather unnatural. Although the possibility of a scribal error cannot be ruled out, these two cases may well reflect regional usage. Indeed Christiane Marchello-Nizia notes that eastern and northern oïl dialects may express the feminine singular through *il*.[[94]](#footnote-94) A. Dees’ map shows that this form is most frequently found in thirteenth-century charters from Moselle, Aisne, Vosges and Hainaut.[[95]](#footnote-95) In some modern Picard sub-dialects such as Rouchi, *i* is frequently used as a feminine third person singular subject personal pronoun.[[96]](#footnote-96)

*noz* vs. *nostre* as possessive determiner for singular nouns

Besides 255 occurrences of the singular form of the first person plural possessive adjective *nostre*, I have found seven examples of the form *noz* in the MS, concentrated in just two tales. Nouvelle 76 has five instances of *noz sire* whereas Vérard’s edition has *nostre* *sire*/*domine* (p. 455-56). Nouvelle 78 has *noz mesnage* (p. 463) and *noz sire* (p. 464), both corresponding to *nostre* X in Vérard’s edition.

Anthonij Dees’ map shows that the weakened possessive determiners *no / vo* are most frequently found in Picard.[[97]](#footnote-97) Charles-Théodore Gossen observes that they are more common in literary texts than notarial documents. 22 percent of the Picard charters he analysed used them exclusively, while 24 percent used both *no* and  *nostre*, and 54% used exclusively *nostre*.[[98]](#footnote-98) Claude Buridant further observes that Picard tended to use *no* / *vo* as articles, and *nostre* / *vostre* as pronouns or adjectives.[[99]](#footnote-99)

**Concluding remarks**

MS Glasgow Hunter 252 presents a significant range of regional graphematic variants, most of which can also be found in other *DMF* sources. This provides confirmation if any were needed that late Middle French is, graphematically speaking, far from deregionalised, let alone ‘standard’, as evidenced by Vérard’s print differing in over 90 percent of the data presented here. This also further confirms that a large-scale graphematic survey of 14th- and 15th-century French is much needed, as has been insisted upon for a few decades now.[[100]](#footnote-100)

The variants identified here belong to northern and eastern Langue d’oïl, namely to the Picard, Walloon, (Anglo-)Norman, Lorrain, Champenois, Burgundian and Franc-Comtois regions. These isographs intersect consistently in Picardy, which corroborates lexical evidence presented elsewhere,[[101]](#footnote-101) indicating that the anonymous *acteur* was substantially exposed to Picard dialects. Furthermore, some of the phono-graphemes point to narrower sectors within the Picard area: the Somme (*baloch-*), Hainaut and Romance Flanders (*ahierdre*), *milleur* (Artois, Romance Flanders, Hainaut, Saint Quentin and Laon), the Somme and Pas-de-Calais (*ulyer*), northern and eastern Picardy (*acev-, cruce, cicaneur*), the Vermandois (*gohettes*). They can be seen to intersect on the edges of the counties of Vermandois, Artois, Flanders, Hainaut and Cambrésis, and may well be attributed to the single *acteur* whom Philip the Good asked to record the tales in a volume, on the principle that scribes tend to deregionalise their models rather than the other way around. This evidence makes identification of the *acteur* with Antoine de la Sale,[[102]](#footnote-102) Olivier de la Marche,[[103]](#footnote-103) Michault de Chaugy[[104]](#footnote-104) or Philippe Pot,[[105]](#footnote-105) as was argued for in the past, rather unlikely. It follows that northern authors like Jean de Wavrin,[[106]](#footnote-106) George Chastelain[[107]](#footnote-107) or David Aubert[[108]](#footnote-108) – as others have proposed – make far better candidates, as does fellow ducal writer Jean Miélot. The biographical information available for several of them fails to match exactly the perimeter described above. Jean de Wavrin was from Romance Flanders, notably around Douai and Lille – more within the northern and eastern sectors of the region identified.[[109]](#footnote-109) Chastelain was a native Flemish speaker who resided during his writing years in Hainaut, further to the east.[[110]](#footnote-110) David Aubert is closer, given what is known of his career: reportedly born in Hesdin, he was first known in any professional capacity as receiver in the nearby County of Ponthieu, and later in life conducted his affairs in different parts of the ducal dominions.[[111]](#footnote-111) Jean Miélot, Aubert’s occasional collaborator, is equally close: born in Gueschart, introduced to ducal service by the Picard lord Jean de Créquy, Miélot became a ducal secretary and canon of Lille, later entering the service of Louis of Luxembourg, Count of Saint Pol, another conteur of the *Cent Nouvelles nouvelles* (alongside, the duke and Créquy).[[112]](#footnote-112) These points made, biographical evidence is nevertheless too slight to advance either Aubert or Miélot as the *acteur* with any certainty – which now makes a case for stylometric cross-analyses of ms. Hunter 252 with texts authored by these two writers.

As I have shown elsewhere,[[113]](#footnote-113) the distribution of regional variants is rather homogenous across the manuscript, regardless of individual narrators or discursive modes, although two potential cases of dialectal stereotyping have been detected in direct speech sections (see *chula* and *–merr-* above).

In any event, the diatopic evidence collected contradicts Christiane Marchello-Nizia’s contention that the *Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles* were written in the ‘Île-de-France *scripta*’;[[114]](#footnote-114) indeed as explained above it is likely that the lost original contained significantly more Picard variants. Their use in stories told by courtiers, including the ‘tres chier et tres redoubté monseigneur le duc de Bourgoigne’,[[115]](#footnote-115) shows that they were recognised as sociolinguistically appropriate, which goes against contemporary comments on the perceived superiority of Parisian French.

These traits are consistent with the sociolinguistic background of the *Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles* project, i.e. tales recounted in the Low Countries, by narrators based in the Low Countries for most of them, and essentially taking place in Picardy’s sphere of influence. Although the text can be said to originate in the Burgundian Dominions *at large*, it has been shown to contain very few Burgundian variants *per se*, contrary to unsubstantiated claims by Luciano Rossi, the *FEW* and others. It follows that the *Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles* have a rightful place in the prolific Picard literary tradition, and as such should be given due consideration in dedicated anthologies[[116]](#footnote-116).
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