

GEOFFREY ROGER  
**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)<sup>1</sup>, 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'oïl*, 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 personnel<sup>2</sup>. 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)<sup>3</sup>. At a time when spoken French was hardly standardised at all<sup>4</sup>, the linguistic melting-pot that the Burgundian administration had become is reminiscent of what Anthony Lodge – writing about Paris – describes

---

<sup>1</sup> Edgar De Blicke 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 Blicke, '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 Montespedon, 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.

<sup>2</sup> '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.

<sup>3</sup> Graeme Small notes that 'after the leading regions of Burgundy, Flanders and Picardy, Brabant provided the next largest group of servants at the ducal court under Philip the Good (about 20%), whereas no more than 3.7% of court personnel hailed from Hainaut, and nobles from Holland and Zeeland amounted to just 1.7%'. (G. Small, 'Local Elites and "National" Mythologies', in *Building the Past – Konstruktion der eigenen Vergangenheit*, ed. R. Suntrup and J. R. Veenstra, Frankfurt am Main, p. 229-45, especially p. 235-241). Cf also S. Lusignan, *Essai d'histoire sociolinguistique. Le français picard au Moyen Âge*, Paris, 2012, p. 187-233; C. A. J. Armstrong, 'The Language Question in the Low Countries: The Use of French and Dutch by the Dukes of Burgundy and their Administration', in *Europe in the Late Middle Ages*, ed. J. R. Hale, J. R. L. Highfield, and B. Smalley, London, 1965 [1970], p. 386-409, esp. p. 396, 402.

<sup>4</sup> 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’<sup>5</sup>, 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 viciniores’ [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.]<sup>6</sup>:

Quand les locuteurs 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 koinè. Une koinè 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<sup>7</sup>.

[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<sup>8</sup> 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.]<sup>9</sup> 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<sup>10</sup>. 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

---

<sup>5</sup> R. A. Lodge, ‘The Medieval Sources of Standardisation in French – Written or Spoken?’, in *The Anglo-Norman Language and its Contexts*, ed. R. Ingham, Rochester/New York, 2010, p. 26-43, especially p. 29.

<sup>6</sup> R. Bacon, *The ‘Opus Majus’*, vol. 2, p. 80-81, quoted and trans. by R. A. Lodge, *French: From Dialect to Standard*, London, 1993, p. 98).

<sup>7</sup> R. A. Lodge, ‘Standardisation, koinéisation et l’historiographie du français’, *Revue de Linguistique romane*, 75, 2011, p. 5-25, especially p. 15.

<sup>8</sup> 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.

<sup>9</sup> S. Lusignan, *Le français picard au Moyen Âge*, p. 161-162

<sup>10</sup> Cf. S. Lusignan, *Le français picard au Moyen Âge*, p. 70-71, 249; and R. Bultot and G. Hasenohr, *Le ‘Cur Deus homo’ d’Anselme de Canterbury et le ‘De arrha animae’ d’Hugues de Saint-Victor, traduits pour Philippe le Bon*, Louvain-la-Neuve, 1984, p. 132.

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'oïl* (Bourguignon, Franc-Comtois, Walloon and Picard), as well as from neighbouring Jurassien and West Central/Low Germanic adstrata. Some of the *Langues d'oïl* in question – Franc-Comtois, Walloon and Picard – are known to be connected as part of a sub-group of *oïl* 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. *vêpe* vs. *guêpe*, *warder* vs. *garder*)<sup>11</sup> 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]<sup>12</sup>. 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'oïl* (e.g. *quien* vs. *chien*, *gardin* vs. *jardin*, *chiel* vs. *ciel*, etc.)<sup>13</sup>. 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*<sup>14</sup>, instability of *-e-* in the group *-ner*<sup>15</sup>, instability of *-d-* in the group *-ndr*<sup>16</sup>, *-ATICUM* > *-aige*<sup>17</sup>, *-AL* > *-aul*<sup>18</sup>, and the first person plural ending *-iens*<sup>19</sup>.

#### 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

---

<sup>11</sup> Cf. F. Möhren, ‘“Guai victis!”: Le problème du *GU* initial roman’, *Medioevo romanzo*, 24, 2000, p. 5-81.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. R. Lepelley, ‘Particularités phonétiques et romanisation du domaine gallo-roman ‘nord occidental’ ’, *Revue de linguistique Romane*, 65, 2001, p. 113-143.

<sup>13</sup> Lepelley, ‘Particularités phonétiques’.

<sup>14</sup> C. T. Gossen, *Grammaire de l’ancien picard*, Paris, 1970, p. 116-119, E. Philipon, ‘Les Parlers du duché de Bourgogne aux xiii<sup>e</sup> et xiv<sup>e</sup> siècles’, *Romania*, 39, 1910, p. 476-531, especially p. 530; A. Dees, *Atlas des formes linguistiques des textes littéraires de l’ancien français*, Tübingen, 1987, p. 292.

<sup>15</sup> Gossen, *Grammaire de l’ancien picard*, p. 117-118; Philipon, ‘Les Parlers du duché de Bourgogne aux xiii<sup>e</sup> et xiv<sup>e</sup> siècles’, p. 530.

<sup>16</sup> Gossen, *Grammaire de l’ancien picard*, p. 118; Philipon, ‘Les Parlers du duché de Bourgogne aux xiii<sup>e</sup> et xiv<sup>e</sup> siècles’, p. 530; Dees, *Atlas des formes et constructions*, p. 266, and *Atlas des formes linguistiques*, p. 372-73.

<sup>17</sup> Dees, *Atlas des formes linguistiques*, p. 135 and 218; *Atlas des formes et constructions*, p. 218. See also Gossen, *Grammaire de l’ancien picard*, p. 53-55, Philipon, ‘Les Parlers du duché de Bourgogne aux xiii<sup>e</sup> et xiv<sup>e</sup> siècles’, p. 508), G. Taverdet, ‘Les *Scriptae* françaises 7. Bourgogne, Bourbonnais, Champagne, Lorraine’, in *Lexikon der Romanistischen Linguistik*, ed. Günther Holtus et al., Tübingen, vol. 2, p. 374-389, especially p. 373; and C. Marchello-Nizia, *Histoire de la langue française aux XIV<sup>e</sup> et XV<sup>e</sup> siècles*, Paris, 1979, p. 75.

<sup>18</sup> Gossen, *Grammaire de l’ancien picard*, p. 115; Philipon, ‘Les Parlers du duché de Bourgogne aux xiii<sup>e</sup> et xiv<sup>e</sup> siècles’, p. 507, 525, 530; and Dees, *Atlas des formes linguistiques*, p. 137.

<sup>19</sup> Gossen, *Grammaire de l’ancien picard*, p. 137-139; E. Philipon, ‘Les Parlers du duché de Bourgogne aux XIV<sup>e</sup> et XV<sup>e</sup> siècles, II: La Bourgogne Occidentale’, *Romania*, 41, 1912, p. 541-600, esp. p. 591. Cf. also A. Dees, *Atlas des formes et des constructions des chartes françaises du 13<sup>e</sup> siècle*, Tübingen, 1980, p. 243.

court<sup>20</sup>, and compiled at his request as if they were transcribed from *viva voce* performance (the anonymous author refers to himself as a mere ‘secrétaire’ of the narrators’ own words)<sup>21</sup>. 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<sup>22</sup> and to be related, albeit indirectly, to the copy offered to Philippe le Bon<sup>23</sup>. 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]<sup>24</sup>, 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.]<sup>25</sup>. This strongly advocates MS Glasgow Hunter 252 as the copy closest to the lost original<sup>26</sup>, 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’<sup>27</sup>.

---

<sup>20</sup> 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, Montbleru, 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, Philipe de Saint Yon, Philipe de Saint Yon, Monsieur Le Voyer, Maistre Jehan Lauvin, Monsieur de Beaumont, Monsieur de Launoy/Lannoy, Monseigneur de Fiennes, Monseigneur de Castregat, Monseigneur de Quievrain, Philipe de Loan, Meriadech, Monseigneur de Villiers, Marquis de Rothelin, Poncelet, 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 Blicq, p. 29, 46-59, 529; and *Les Cent Nouvelles nouvelles*, ed. P. Champion, Paris, 1928, p. XXVIII, LIV-LIVII.

<sup>21</sup> *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 Blicq 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 Blicq, p. 156-157).

<sup>22</sup> H. Wijsman, ‘The *Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles* and Hunter 252: Fashionability of the Text and Fashion in the Images’, *Les Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles. International Workshop*, University of Glasgow, 17 September 2011.

<sup>23</sup> ‘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 Blicq, p. 503).

<sup>24</sup> Champion, p. LIV.

<sup>25</sup> M. Roques, ‘*Les Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles*, publiées par Pierre Champion’, *Romania*, 54, 1928, p. 562-566, especially p. 563.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. M.-D. Glessgen: ‘Les copies ont une tendance naturelle à neutraliser les marques diatopiques de leurs modèles, notamment dans les graphies’, *Linguistique romane. Domaines et méthodes en linguistique française et romane*, Paris, 2007.

<sup>27</sup> M. K. Pope, *From Latin to Modern French with Especial 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<sup>28</sup>.

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<sup>29</sup>.

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<sup>30</sup>.

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<sup>31</sup>.

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<sup>32</sup>.

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<sup>33</sup>.

---

<sup>28</sup> J. Rasmussen, *La prose narrative française du XV<sup>e</sup> siècle: étude esthétique et stylistique*, Copenhagen, 1958, p. 146. 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 ».

<sup>29</sup> McGillivray, 'The *Cent nouvelles nouvelles*: A Monograph', p. 17.

<sup>30</sup> H. Baxter, 'Author's Point of View in the *Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles*, *Le Petit Jehan de Saintré* and *Les Quinze Joyes de Mariage*', doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1970, p. 10.

<sup>31</sup> *The Hundred Tales*, trans. R. H. Robbins, New York, 1960, p. XIV.

<sup>32</sup> See for instance Nouvelles 63, 74, 84, 87. Cf. Robbins, *The Hundred Tales*, p. XIII-XIV; C. Carton 'Un Tableau et son donateur: Guillaume de Montbléru', *Annales de Bourgogne*, 38, p. 171-184, especially p. 180-81; De Blicq, 'The *Cent nouvelles nouvelles*: Text and Context', p. 85-86, 370-389.

<sup>33</sup> Baxter, 'Author's Point of View', p. 10-11.

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.’<sup>34</sup>

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.’<sup>35</sup> 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 Boccacian model.]<sup>36</sup>

7. Alongside substantial evidence of oral delivery<sup>37</sup>, the text contains what appears to be an insider’s innuendo comparing the heroine of the twelfth nouvelle to ‘la femme qui naguères au bailli d’Amiens se complaignit de son mary pour le tres-grand travail qu’il luy donnoit 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]<sup>38</sup>:

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<sup>39</sup>?

#### 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<sup>40</sup>. We also know a

---

<sup>34</sup> De Blicq, *The Cent nouvelles nouvelles: Text and Context*, p. 102. De Blicq’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).

<sup>35</sup> McGillivray, ‘The *Cent nouvelles nouvelles: A Monograph*’, p. 44, 48.

<sup>36</sup> M. Jeay, ‘L’enchâssement narratif: un jeu de masques. L’exemple des *Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles*’, *Masques et déguisements dans la littérature médiévale*, ed. Marie-Louise Ollier, Montréal, 1988, p. 193-201, especially p. 193-194.

<sup>37</sup> 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 comperay ung cas qui puis n’a gueres est advenu ou Daulphine, pour estre mis ou reng et nombre des dictes nouvelles’. See F. Desonay, ‘A propos d’une nouvelle édition des *Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles*’, *Revue belge de philologie et d’histoire / Belgisch tijdschrift voor Filologie en Geschiedenis*, 8, 1929, p. 993-1027, especially p. 995.

<sup>38</sup> p. 87.

<sup>39</sup> McGillivray, ‘The *Cent nouvelles nouvelles: A Monograph*’, p. 21-22.

<sup>40</sup> ‘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 quatermaster sergeants, *valets de chambre* and (possibly) chapel clerks, such as Mahieu d’Auquasnes, Pierre David and Caron.’ (De Blicq, *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<sup>41</sup>; 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<sup>42</sup>, Thomas Wright<sup>43</sup>, and Pierre Champion, as well as by other scholars like Edgar Peers<sup>44</sup>, Charles Knudson<sup>45</sup>, John Watkins, and Edgar De Blicke<sup>46</sup> 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 Changy were French<sup>47</sup>, that Meriadec was Breton<sup>48</sup>, and that the Marquis de Rothelin was from Neuchâtel<sup>49</sup>. 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<sup>50</sup>, 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*

<sup>41</sup> De Blicke questions the identities of two of the four guests designated by the earlier editors Le Roux de Lincy and Champion, viz. Monseigneur de Beauvoir and Monseigneur de Villiers. 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 Blicke 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 Villiers la Faye [...] There are also notes in the account books of one *Jehan de Villiers, from Montdidier*'. (E. De Blicke, p. 533).

<sup>42</sup> *Les Cent Nouvelles nouvelles*, ed. A. Le Roux de Lincy, Paris, 1841

<sup>43</sup> *Les Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles publiées d'après le seul manuscrit connu avec introduction et notes*, ed. T. Wright, Paris, 1858.

<sup>44</sup> E. A. Peers, 'The Authorship of Certain Prose Works Ascribed to Antoine de la Sale', *Modern Philology*, 14, 1916, p. 406-412.

<sup>45</sup> C. R. Knudson, 'Antoine de la Sale, le duc de Bourgogne et les *Cent nouvelles nouvelles*', *Romania*, 53, 1927, p. 365-373.

<sup>46</sup> J. N. Watkins, 'A Note on the *Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles*', *Modern Language Review*, 36, 1941, p. 396-397.

<sup>47</sup> Monseigneur de la Barde, a.k.a. Jean d'Estuer (c.1420 – after 1472), Seneschal of Saintonge, Baron of Nieul and Lord of l'Isleau, La Barde, Saint-Maignin, and Roussillon, apparently came from the Saintongeais area, i.e. South-West *langue d'oïl* territory. Cf. [sites.google.com/site/siresdepons/Home/0-archives/0-00-genealogies-dunet/seigneurs-et-gentes-dames-d-aunis-et-de-saintonge-par-www-chevaliers-pourpres](https://sites.google.com/site/siresdepons/Home/0-archives/0-00-genealogies-dunet/seigneurs-et-gentes-dames-d-aunis-et-de-saintonge-par-www-chevaliers-pourpres), accessed 21 May 2014.

<sup>48</sup> Hervé de Meriadec 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*, Plouédern, 1996, p. 51, 78.

<sup>49</sup> 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.

<sup>50</sup> G. Roger, 'La mise-en-scène des *Cent nouvelles nouvelles*'. Cf. also G. Roger, 'The *Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles*: A Linguistic Study of MS Glasgow Hunter 252', PhD thesis, University of Glasgow, 2011, p. 154-177.

(Nouvelle 4, Monseigneur, p. 50; Nouvelle 38, Monseigneur de Loan, p. 264), *caichez* (Nouvelle 13, Monseigneur de Castregat, p. 94), *saichant* (Nouvelle 9, Monseigneur, p. 75; Nouvelle 26, Monseigneur de Foquesolles, p. 169). P. Fouché observes: ‘Au Nord et à l’Est, on note en ancien français un subj. *saiche*, *saiches*, etc. Palsgrave donne encore *saiche*’ [In the north and the east, in Old French, the subjunctive *saiche*, *saiches*, etc. can be found. Palsgrave also gives *saiche*]<sup>51</sup>. A. Dees’s map<sup>52</sup> shows that this palatalised phono-grapheme is most frequently found in Old French literary texts from Franche-Comté.

*-an- / -o-*

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

*-uign-* vs. *-oign-*, *-ongn-*

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)<sup>54</sup>: ‘a paine estoit elle contente qu’on la cuignast en plaines rues avant qu’elle ne le fust’ [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)<sup>55</sup> 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. PŌTIONE > *puisson* Gav., PŪGNATA: *pugnie* Bodel, *empuigna* Chev., CŪNEATA > *cugnie* Amiens, CUNEU + diminutif > *cuigniet* Amiens (pic. mod. *puignie*, *cuignet*, Corblet 356, 525)<sup>56</sup>.

[What distinguishes Picard from Francien is the treatment of the protonic *o* + *yod* which results in Picard in *ui* (French *oi*), e.g. PŌTIONE > *puisson* Gav., PŪGNATA: *pugnie* Bodel, *empuigna* Chev., CŪNEATA > *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 Picard<sup>57</sup>: *recaner* / *racaner* (Fr. *rechaner* – Nouvelle

<sup>51</sup> P. Fouché, *Le Verbe français, étude morphologique*, Paris, 1931, p. 151.

<sup>52</sup> Dees, *Atlas des formes linguistiques*, p. 379.

<sup>53</sup> L.-F. Flutre, *Du moyen picard au picard moderne*. Amiens, 1977, p. 25.

<sup>54</sup> *Französisches etymologisches Wörterbuch: eine Darstellung des galloromanischen Sprachschatzes*, ed. W. von Wartburg and J.-P. Chambon, Bonn, 1928-, vol. 2, p. 1531b: *cüneüs*.

<sup>55</sup> *Dictionnaire du moyen français (1330-1500), version 2012*, ed. R. Martin, G. Souvay et al., www.atilf.fr/dmf, accessed 21 May 2014.

<sup>56</sup> C.-T., *Petite Grammaire de l’ancien picard*, Paris, 1951, p. 59; cf. also C.-T. Gossen, *Grammaire de l’ancien picard*, p. 82.

<sup>57</sup> See Pope, *From Latin to Modern French*, p. 487; Gossen, *Grammaire de l’ancien picard*, p. 95-100; L.-F. Flutre, *Le moyen picard d’après les textes littéraires du temps (1560-1660): textes, lexique, grammaire*, Amiens, 1970, p. 462-465. Cf. also J. Wüest, *La dialectalisation de la Gallo-Romania*, Basel, 1979, p. 220-224; and R. Lepelley, p. 113-143.

61, Poncelet, p. 383; Nouvelle 79, Messire Michault de Changy, p. 469)<sup>58</sup>, *calonge* (Fr. *challenge* - Nouvelle 96, anonymous, p. 541), *marescaucier* (Fr. *maréchauser* – Nouvelle 95, Monseigneur de Santilly, p. 495)<sup>59</sup>, *bucquer* (Fr. *buschier* – Nouvelle 88, Alardin, p. 508)<sup>60</sup>, *sacquer* (Fr. *sachier* – Nouvelle 98, l'Acteur, p. 553)<sup>61</sup>.

[ʃ] vs. [s]

Another phonological trait specific to Picard and Norman is the development of [ʃ] where the other *Langues 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<sup>62</sup>.

[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)<sup>63</sup>, *sanchié* (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)<sup>64</sup>, *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)<sup>65</sup>, *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*, *encresson*, 'où le *c* initial du groupe *cr* n'est pas passé à la sonore *g* comme il l'a fait dans le franç. *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

---

<sup>58</sup> The *FEW* notes: « Dem got. *kinnus* "wange", asächs. *kinni* "kinnbacken" musste ein anfrk. \**kinni* entsprechen. Dieses muss, wie *kīnan*, etwas später ins gallorom. übergegangen sein, da es pik. norm. mit *c*- anlautet, im fr. mit *ch*- » (XVI, p. 325-326: \**kinni*).

<sup>59</sup> The *DMF* has attestations of *marescal* from FROISS., *Chron. D. and M.*, and Arch. Nord.

<sup>60</sup> For the Old French period, Yan Greub notes that *bucquer* was specific to Picardy and Hainaut, but 'à l'époque du moyen français il est emprunté dans la langue générale' Y. Greub, *Les Mots régionaux dans les farces françaises*, Strasbourg, 2003, p. 89-90. Frédéric Godefroy (*Dictionnaire de l'ancienne langue française et de tous ses dialectes du IXe au XVe siècle* [hereafter *Gdf*], Paris, 1881-1902, vol. 1, p. 760c-761a) signals comparable forms in the modern dialects of Champagne (*buquer*), Lorraine (*beuquai*, *s'boquaëi*), Vosges (*b(e)qué*), and in print in the *Prise de Salins* (Salins-les-Bains, Jura, 1688), and the *Discours sur les moyens de bien gouverner* (Geneva, 1576). He also signals *buskant* in the collection entitled *Serventois et sotes chansons* (Paris, BnF, fr. 24432, 1345-1349).

<sup>61</sup> 'La pucelle sacqa ung petit cousteau qu'elle avoit pendu a sa cincture' (Nouvelle 98, l'Acteur, p. 553). 'Aujourd'hui, dans le nord de la France on dit "sacquer un coup", donner un coup' (Champion, ed., *Les cent nouvelles nouvelles*, p. 304). The *DMF* has attestations from *Drap. Valenc.* E.; FROISS., *Chron. M.*, XIV; HENRI LANC., *Seyntz medicines*. See also J. Picoche, *Dictionnaire étymologique du français*, Paris, 1979, p. 597; and A. Rey, *Dictionnaire historique de la langue française* (hereafter *Rob hist*), Paris, 1992, vol. 2, p. 1855-1856).

<sup>62</sup> Lepelley, 'Particularités phonétiques' p. 114; Gossen, *Grammaire de l'ancien picard*, p. 91-95.

<sup>63</sup> Cf. Flutre, *Le moyen picard*, p. 101 (line 202), 149-185 (lines 77, 223, 344, 418, 448, 523, 559, 575), 316; *Du moyen picard au picard moderne*, 1977, p. 44 §38, p. 134 §159.

<sup>64</sup> See Gossen, *Grammaire de l'ancien picard*, p. 91-94; and Flutre, *Le moyen picard*, p. 465-467. Godefroy also notes it in the thirteenth-century anonymous poem 'De Martin Hapart', and observes that '*balocher* est resté dans le langage populaire; dans le Bessin on dit *baloquer*' (vol 1, p. 165a). For the etymologies of *balance* and *balancer*, see *Trésor de la langue française informatisé* (hereafter *TLFi*), dir. P. Imbs, 1971-, atilf.atilf.fr/ , accessed 21 May 2014), 'balance' and 'balocher'.

<sup>65</sup> Cf. *FEW*, XII, p. 21b: *socius*.

of *gros* < gróssu]<sup>66</sup>. The *FEW* notes that *cras* is especially common in Walloon, Picard and Anglo-Norman<sup>67</sup>.

Initial *w*-

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

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

[It seems to have been common to write *v*- as *w*-, although it is not known whether there was a corresponding pronunciation (*wan* = *van*, *wiede* [or *vuiede* ?] = *vide*), see GoeblNorm par.134/1). This spelling variation is also found in Picard (*wespre*, SilenceR 6352 = *wespre* 'evening'), in Anglo-Norman (*westemenz* = *vestements*, Stone 865a) and elsewhere.]

En ce qui concerne l'évolution ultérieure, il semble que ce soit au XII<sup>e</sup> siècle que le [w], quelle que soit son origine lointaine, s'est affaibli en [v]. On a déjà signalé qu'en français quelques noms communs issus du latin ont vu leur *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 [v] issu du [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<sup>69</sup>.

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

### Morphology

*noz* vs. *nostre* as possessive adjective

Ordonna néantmoins 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, Philippe 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. *Translator's note: 'our lord' in this and the following translations refers to the priest (or pretend 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 doucement 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)

<sup>66</sup> C.-T. Gossen, *Grammaire de l'ancien picard*, p. 230, 463.

<sup>67</sup> Vol. 2-2, 1277b. See also *cras* and *cra* in R. Debrie, *Glossaire du moyen picard*, Amiens, 1984, p. 132-133.

<sup>68</sup> Möhren, ' "Guai victis!" ', p. 38.

<sup>69</sup> 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<sup>70</sup>. 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<sup>71</sup>.

[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-*)<sup>72</sup>: Dees’s maps show that this spelling was most common in Old Picard<sup>73</sup>. 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]<sup>74</sup>.

Future/conditional SAVOIR stem *sar-*<sup>75</sup> (Fr. *saur-*): 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*]<sup>76</sup>.

Future/conditional LAISSER stem *lair(r)-* (Fr. *laisser-*)<sup>77</sup>: The *TLFi* notes that

L’a fr. possède à côté du paradigme répondant à *laissier*, un paradigme répondant à *laiier* (ind. prés. 3 *laie*; imp. 6 *layevent* (lorr.); parfait 3 *laia*, 6 *laierent*; impér. 5 *laiés*; inf. *laiier*; part. prés. *laiant*, passé *laiié*) 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)<sup>78</sup>.

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

<sup>70</sup> Dees, *Atlas des formes linguistiques*, p. 36; cf. also C.-T. Gossen, *Le moyen picard*, p. 127.

<sup>71</sup> C. Buridant, *Grammaire nouvelle de l’ancien français*, Paris, 2000, p. 149.

<sup>72</sup> 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.

<sup>73</sup> Dees, *Atlas des formes et des constructions des chartes françaises du 13<sup>e</sup> siècle*, p. 249; *Atlas des formes linguistiques des textes littéraires de l’ancien français*, p. 255.

<sup>74</sup> p. 223; see also Buridant, *Grammaire nouvelle de l’ancien français*, p. 266.

<sup>75</sup> Nouvelle 1, Monseigneur, p. 27; Nouvelle 14, Monseigneur de Crequy, p. 104; Nouvelle 17, Monseigneur, p. 117; Nouvelle 28, Messire Michault de Chaugy, p. 191; Nouvelle 31, Monseigneur de la Barde, p. 213, Nouvelle 32, Monseigneur de Villiers, p. 215; Nouvelle 37, Monseigneur de la Roche, p. 255, Nouvelle 38, Monseigneur de Loan, p. 266, Nouvelle 39, Monseigneur de Saint Pol, p. 269; Nouvelle 42, Meriadech, p. 285, Nouvelle 59, Poncellet, p. 368, Nouvelle 60, Poncellet, p. 375; Nouvelle 64, Messire Michault de Chaugy, p. 406; Nouvelle 72, Monseigneur de Quiévrain, p. 437; Nouvelle 73, Maistre Jehan Lauvin, p. 440; Nouvelle 80, Monseigneur le Marcquis de Rothelin, p. 490

<sup>76</sup> p. 387. Cf. also Buridant, *Grammaire nouvelle de l’ancien français*, p. 266.

<sup>77</sup> Nouvelle 27, Monseigneur de Beauvoir, p. 185; Nouvelle 93, Messire Timoléon Vignier, p. 528.

<sup>78</sup> [atilf.atilf.fr/dendien/scripts/tlfiv5/visusel.exe?11;s=3041560950;r=1;nat=;sol=0](http://atilf.atilf.fr/dendien/scripts/tlfiv5/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]

According to Claude Buridant<sup>79</sup>, *la(i)ier* corresponds to an ‘ensemble de formes plus particulièrement circonscrites dans l’aire picarde, wallonne et orientale’ [collection of forms particularly limited to Picardy, Wallonia and the east]. The *DMF* records attestations of *lair(r)*-throughout the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries from GRÉBAN, *Pass. J.*; MACH., *R. Fort.*; MOLINET, *Chron. D.J.*, t.1; CHASTELL., *Temple Boc. B.*; *Myst. Pass. Troyes B.*; *Livre bêtes L.*; *Colin loue dép. Dieu T.* and *Comte Artois S.*

Dental stems in verbs ending in *-aindre/-eindre/-oindre*: *craindent* (Nouvelle 63, Montbleru, p. 398 – Vérard’s edition has ‘craignent’), *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 ‘plaingnit’); *feindant* (Nouvelle 88, Alardin, p. 510 – Antoine Vérard’s edition has ‘feingnant’), *faïndit* (Nouvelle 33, Monseigneur, p. 231); *joïndoient* (Nouvelle 87, Monsieur le Voyer, p. 505 – Antoine Vérard’s edition has ‘joignoient’). Pierre Fouché quotes instances of dental stems in documents by Jehan Froissart, Arnoul Gréban, Jean de Stavelot, etc., and concludes that ‘dans les verbes du groupe *plangëre* on constate, surtout au N.-E., une généralisation du radical dentalisé de l’infinitif’ [in the verbs of the *plangëre* group it can be seen, especially in the north est, a general trend to dentalise the infinitive stem]<sup>80</sup>.

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 Monseigneur 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), *caïcha* (Nouvelle 4, p. 50), *saïchant* (Nouvelle 9, p. 75); *peche* (Nouvelle 1, p. 24)<sup>81</sup>.

#### *Morphology*

*aroit* (Nouvelle 17, p. 117), *saroit* (Nouvelle 1, p. 27; Nouvelle 17, p. 117; Nouvelle 29, p. 199), *faïndit* (Nouvelle 33, p. 231)<sup>82</sup>.

#### *Vocabulary*

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

- *hodez*<sup>83</sup>: 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

<sup>79</sup> Buridant, *Grammaire nouvelle de l’ancien français*, p. 285.

<sup>80</sup> Fouché, *Le Verbe français*, p. 132-133.

<sup>81</sup> Cf. above.

<sup>82</sup> Cf. above.

<sup>83</sup> ‘Ses gens *hodez* et traveillez, et leurs chevaulx 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).

conservative *h-* leaves no doubt that it is of Germanic origin]<sup>84</sup>. *Gdf* signals *hodaige* ‘fatigue, lassitude’ [tiredness, weariness] in Champagne (*Archives législatives de la ville de Reims: collection de pièces inédites, 2<sup>e</sup> partie, Statuts, 1<sup>er</sup> volume, Paris: Crapelet, 1844, p. 562*)<sup>85</sup>.

- *hoignard*<sup>86</sup>: according to Pierre Champion<sup>87</sup>, ‘le mot “hongnart” a encore été recueilli par le chanoine Haigneré, *Patois Boulonnais*, 1903, p. 330. Il se rencontre très fréquemment 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*<sup>88</sup>.
- *ramon*<sup>89</sup>: *Gdf*<sup>90</sup> and the *FEW*<sup>91</sup> show that this derivative of Old French *ram* < RAMUS was also in use in Champagne, Lorraine and Wallonia<sup>92</sup>.
- *escollée*<sup>93</sup>: the *FEW* flags this form in Wallonia, Picardy and Ardennes<sup>94</sup>.
- *graux*<sup>95</sup>: The *FEW* flags this outcome of \**krawa* in the Ardennes, Picardy and Wallonia<sup>96</sup>. 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<sup>97</sup>.

#### 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 oil dialects spoken across the Burgundian dominions, it would appear that:

1. This koinèised 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

---

<sup>84</sup> XVI, p. 216-217 \**hoddôn*.

<sup>85</sup> Cf. also Debrie, *Glossaire du moyen picard* p. 237.

<sup>86</sup> ‘Sa femme, qui misérablement son temps passoit avecques son tresmaudit mary, le plus suspessonieux hoignard que jamais femme accoinstast’ (Nouvelle 11, p. 85).

<sup>87</sup> Champion, *Les cent nouvelles nouvelles*, p. 295.

<sup>88</sup> vol. 16, p. 184a \**haunjan*.

<sup>89</sup> ‘Sa bonne femme, qui mesnageoit par leans, en sa main tenant ung ramon, demande ce qu'elle bien scet’ (Nouvelle 1, Monseigneur, p. 27).

<sup>90</sup> Vol. 6, p. 582.

<sup>91</sup> Vol. 10, p. 41b.

<sup>92</sup> Cf. also *Rob hist*, vol. 2, p. 1712; Debrie, *Glossaire du moyen picard*, p. 342.

<sup>93</sup> ‘La demoiselle de sa maistresse est escollée et advoée que mieulx on ne pourroit, baille au bon seigneur à demain l'heure de besoigner, dont il est tant content que son cuer tressault tout de joy’ (Nouvelle 9, p. 74).

<sup>94</sup> Vol. 11, p. 301b: *schola*.

<sup>95</sup> ‘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).

<sup>96</sup> Vol. 16, p. 378: \**krawa*.

<sup>97</sup> Cf. also *Gdf*, vol. 4, p. 340; T. Matsumura, ‘Sur le vocabulaire d’ “Ami et Amile” en alexandrins’, *Revue de linguistique Romane*, 56, 1992, p. 475-493, especially p. 479; Debrie, *Glossaire du moyen picard*, p. 222; Vasseur, *Dictionnaire des parlers picards du Vimeu (Somme)*, p. 358; L. Vermesse, *Dictionnaire du patois de la Flandre française ou wallonne*, Douai, 1867, p. 273.

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.