David, Trotter, 2003, 'Not as Eccentric as it Looks: Anglo-French and French French', *Forum for Modern Language Studies*, vol. 39, no. 4, pp. 427-438. 10.1093/fmls/39.4.427

NOT AS ECCENTRIC AS IT LOOKS: ANGLO-FRENCH AND FRENCH FRENCH[1]

ANGLO-NORMAN, if it has recovered from the stigmatisation arising from its treatment at the hands of early twentieth-century scholarship, remains for most historians of French something of an oddity. It is, according to Bruneau, “une langue à part”.[2] The black sheep of the family has been readmitted to the dynastic estate, but is still treated with some circumspection: no longer a terminally-deranged relative who has to be stashed away in a distant wing of the mansion, but still an eccentric cousin, to be tolerated rather than taken too seriously. Anglo-Norman is, of course, literally eccentric, the product of an area remote from Paris and politically and geographically independent of it; but this detachment should not be overstated. Islands are only as isolated and as insular as their inhabitants want them to be, and Anglo-Norman England did not want to be cut off from the Continent.[3] Apart from geographical distance (less real when sea travel, although dangerous, was easier than overland movement), there are other reasons for regarding the variety of French used in the British Isles as eccentric: the divergence between its grammatical structures and that of the alleged French norm; and the extent to which Anglo-Norman was affected by contact with Middle English.

To take, then, the issue of the supposed **isolation of Anglo-Norman**, as one of the principal factors certainly facilitating, and possibly directly provoking, its aberrant evolution. Clearly, of course, isolation of languages can and routinely does lead to separate development, especially measurable in the case of emigrant languages deposited and left either to fossilise or to go their own way in colonies overseas. There is no shortage of evidence, from the Middle Ages and from other periods, of this happening.[4] The question is whether Anglo-Norman was so isolated; and whether (if it was) this translates into and is discernible in linguistic evidence of separate evolution. The historical evidence suggests otherwise. From before the Conquest, there were links between England and France; indeed, William’s claim to the throne clearly rested on family connections. Edward III married Philippa of Hainaut; Chaucer the diplomat travelled extensively in France, long after the *date fatidique* of 1204 and the alleged isolation of English by a sudden and all-enveloping bank of early thirteenth-century Channel fog. The links between England and northern France, or England and the Low Countries, at the level of individual towns are as evident as the dynastic, personal and political connections demonstrated by the wide range of addressees and authors of the documents in Legge’s edition of Anglo-Norman Letters and Petitions in All Souls MS 182.

All Souls MS 182 is a complicated, composite volume in which the 451 Anglo-Norman letters and petitions edited by Dominica Legge[5] are only one

© *Court of the University of St Andrews 2003; all rights reserved.*

element. The editor observes, of the volume, that "The fact that the MS. is written in more than one hand need cause no difficulty in accepting that the collection is the work of one man. It is not necessary to assume that the compiler wrote it or the whole of it, with his own hand" (p. xi). Of greater importance from our point of view is the fact that one of the petitions (out of 41) and 25 of the 410 letters cannot be regarded, by any definition, as Anglo-Norman. They include a petition from the hermits of Cordoba to the archbishop of Canterbury (XXXIV); a number of letters from Charles VI of France to Richard II (10, 172, 174, 175, 178, 180); letters from Philippa of Portugal to Richard II (28), to the archbishop of Canterbury (287), and to the bishop of Norwich (307); letters from the Mayor and Jurats of Bordeaux (150, 332), and from the Mayor and Commoners of Bayonne (276). Further evidence of the role of French as an international diplomatic language[6] is found in correspondence between Christine de Pisan and Isabelle of Bavaria (98) and between Isabelle and Richard II (177). Now these international letters are no doubt copied in the All Souls MS because they were in the compiler's (unidentified) source collection. But what is noticeable is that they are (in the All Souls collection) quite unremarkable: they do not stand out in any way. It is probable that the (Anglo-Norman) scribes will have added a certain amount of local colour in the form (say) of Anglo-Norman spellings – it is a little unlikely that a scribe employed by Charles VI of France would have written *compassioun* (178, 25) or that a clerk employed by Philippa of Portugal in Lisbon would have written *tresgraundement* (287, 11) – but the main point is that letters were clearly going to and fro between England and France, Portugal, Bavaria, and Gascony, with neither senders nor recipients concerning themselves overly about the finer dialectological distinctions which their orthography apparently betrays. Of course we are here dealing with the period of Anglo-Norman (1390–1410) when the influence of central French (i.e., Parisian chancery) forms was considerable and this may in part explain why there is no discernible disparity between documents of different "national" provenance.[7] Moreover, it might also be objected that the letters in this manuscript are overwhelmingly from and to socially very elevated people and thus most likely to be couched in relatively standardised, elevated language.

As much could not, however, be said of the Correspondence of the City of London published by G. F. Chapple.[8] Chapple prints 262 letters (a fraction of what is available) of which no fewer than 46 are sent overseas. Most of the destinations are in France and in Flanders: four letters to the municipal officials of Amiens (127, 128, 130, 247), five to Calais (61, 220, 229, 239, 250), two to Bordeaux (118, 176) and one to La Rochelle (43), with Flanders dominant: there are twelve letters to Bruges (45, 160, 166, 174, 184, 185, 192, 215, 217, 218, 261), five to Sluys (46, 167, 188, 200, 245), one to Ghent (161), one to Brussels (181) and one to Dordrecht (232) and to Termonde (153) and to Louvain (47). The most exotic destination is Bethlehem, whose bishop was written to in 1367 concerning the Hospital of Bethlehem outside Bishopsgate (246). A remarkable feature of the London correspondence is that much of the overseas material was

evidently sent (in Anglo-Norman) to Flemish-speaking towns, but *sans commentaire*: it was apparently assumed that patently non-Francophone towns such as Bruges, Brussels, Ghent and Sluys would be able and willing to cope with business and legal correspondence in French. It would be fascinating to see what the replies would have been like and in what sort of French they were written.

The documents in these two representative collections undermine any argument that Anglo-Norman was isolated: it functioned internationally, as a perfectly acceptable variety of the Middle Ages' second international language, after Latin. Scribes and administrators accustomed to generating diplomatic, legal and commercial documentation in insular French would have found themselves constantly exposed to the continental variety, a process which can only have contributed to the effectiveness of the influence of the emergent central French "standard" on its offshore counterpart. Trade (as the London documents demonstrate) was international: hence, too, evidence of the wine trade between Carmarthen and Portugal and Gascony,[9] and the survival, in Anglo-Norman, of the name of a wine from Portugal, *osey*, hitherto thought to hail from Alsace,[10] or the copious and multilingual international documentation assembled in a series of studies by Laura Wright,[11] or the less than pristine material of the Southampton Port Books.[12] None of this documentation is monolingual and none of its users can have expected it to be; none, indeed, can have been monolinguals.

The relationship between Anglo-Norman and Middle English is of huge importance, both in terms of the appearance of Middle English (and earlier on, Anglo-Saxon) words in Anglo-Norman texts, and because of the enormous impact of Anglo-Norman itself on the development of the lexis of modern English. Less attention has, however, been paid to the relationship between Anglo-Norman and French. On the one hand, it is becoming increasingly apparent (for example in the revised "A" fascicles of FEW 24 and 25) that the lexis of Anglo-Norman needs to be satisfactorily incorporated into historical treatments of French.[13] At the level of individual lexical items, it is striking (and well known) that the French words for the main points of the compass are Anglo-Saxon, and the recently-completed "H" of the DEAF shows again that linguistic trade between Anglo-Norman and French was not the one-way process which it is often assumed to be.[14] "Hansac", an Anglo-Saxon word imported into Anglo-Norman (first attested in Gaimar *c.*1140), then moved, by some unspecified route, into continental French, with a change of ending to *-art*, which of course obscures the Anglo-Saxon axe now in the hands of the French (DEAF H139). But in many cases words which appear to be "Anglo-Normanisms" are not, and Frankwalt Möhren rightly calls them "pseudo-anglo-normandismes":[15] it is merely that they are attested, or (more commonly) have thus far only been found, in Anglo-Norman, partly, in some areas of lexis, because of what has been called "le panorama qui penche outrageusement en faveur de l'anglo-normand".[16] Quite simply, Anglo-Norman scholarship has devoted more time

and energy to (for example) the lexis of medicine, botany, and law (and indeed to non-literary registers in general) than has been the case so far for Continental French. This does not mean that the vocabulary unearthed is exclusively or indeed particularly Anglo-Norman, and indeed most of it (notably the scientific lexis) patently is not.

Despite evidence of this sort (little if any of which is new), isolation (if only geographical) is held to have led to the **linguistic divergences** which ostensibly characterise later Anglo-Norman and which so dismayed the early explorers. The grammatical structures, and notably the seemingly chaotic morphosyntax, of later Anglo-Norman are the main arguments adduced (in traditional accounts of the variety) for regarding it as little more than (to quote Mildred Pope) a "half-understood" language, a "jargon". The features of Anglo-Norman which give rise to such an assessment are, for example, the propensity of writers to reconjugate all verbs in the first conjunction (*metter* < *mettre*; *saver* < *savoir*; *vener* < *venir*); a marked indifference to noun gender and adjectival agreement; carelessness regarding the distinctions between past participles and infinitives (over-use of -*er*); the influence of English (*entrer* v.t.); and so forth. These factors, it is suggested, diverge from Continental norms and thus mark Anglo-Norman out as grammatically defective in the same way that the stereotypical pronunciation features highlighted in texts purporting to represent "stage Anglo-Norman" are held to indicate the shortcomings of this "bad French as spoken in England". A number of things need to be said about these features.

Firstly, they are almost exclusively encountered in later Anglo-Norman, i.e. from the period (post-1250 or so) when the language had largely ceased to be a vernacular. Secondly, some could be analysed as "transcription errors" arising from grammatically inaccurate written representations of homophonous forms (–*er* for –*é*), of a type familiar nowadays in informal or careless written French and which may offend grammarians but do not in reality seriously impede communication. Thirdly, these features surface, in the main, in documentary texts operating at the sociolinguistically (and probably socially) lower levels. Fourthly, and for our purposes most importantly, these infringements of the grammatical rules are (with the obvious exception of those tendencies attributable to L1 English interference) by no means restricted to later Anglo-Norman: they, and other similar solecisms, may be readily found in comparable Continental texts too.

The key word here is of course "comparable". A comparison between a municipal account written as a purely local record in fifteenth-century Leicester and an elaborate prose text from a famous French writer is not valid: it is rather like the practice of comparing very formal written French with highly colloquial conversation, where the predictable differences are predominantly a matter of register. But if we look (for example) at Continental building accounts and other routine, everyday documents, then the same "errors" are equally widespread. So, for example, in a contract for the construction of a forge at Champigneulles (Moselle) at the end of the 14th century, we read

"Et doient estre les muirs dez menoirs de la dite forge de chaul et de savelon sus boins fondemens et lou teil [*l.* teit? the editor glosses "toit"] bien *maireneir* de groz mairien et de menus et bien couver de theule ensy comme il affert [...]".[17] This document exhibits a high percentage of Lorraine orthographies; the form *maireneir* with its characteristic Lorraine diphthong ("charpenté" according to the editor) could conceivably be an infinitive but the syntax suggests that it is indeed a past participle.

A series of documents from the Archives des Vosges in Épinal are less ambiguous. In one (Archives des Vosges G 696,3, from 1357) there is a whole series of participles in *–er*: "ont recogneu et *confesser* de lour plenne volentet"; "ont *renoncier* li dis rendour et debtour"; "notaire *jurer* de nostre court". In another in the same series (G 711,11, from 1291) the pattern is repeated: "ont recognu et *confesseir*". The Censier de Toul[18] of 1297 shows exactly the same hesitation: "il puet *wagié* selonc la forme de nostre statut" §6; "feme [...] de boinne *renummer*" §14; "c-il [= s'il] pooit *monstrei* par lettres" §14. Other features of such documents include unusual (and "irregular") uses of the "wrong" auxiliary: "les queiles parolles injuriouses *sunt esteies provees* per boins temoignages dignes de croire" (Archives des Vosges G 696,3) and "ensi com li dis sieges et li cours de l'iawe est abonneis par prodommes que a consaul laxier *sont estei seant* entre lai mason (= "maison") que li dis Colignons tient de Saint Dyei et lou wey desous lou grant prei Sain Dyei" (G 677,4, January 1310). "Irregularities" of this type are not unique to Lorraine: the same uncertainties are evident in documents from Flanders: lack of participial agreement, confusion of relative pronoun forms, etc.[19] Although a long way away, they are evident, too (although perhaps for different reasons), in documents in French from Gascony of the same type and of similar vintage.[20] The point here is to compare like with like before we conclude (in part because non-literary texts in Anglo-Norman are relatively well known) that Anglo-Norman is uniquely aberrant and uniquely incapable of following grammatical rules which were in reality much less slavishly followed on the Continent than the literary evidence might suggest.

What this of course raises is the underlying issue of the **French norms** with which Anglo-Norman is to be compared, and what these norms are themselves based on. The sad reality, of course, is that there is very little evidence of them except in the minds of modern philologists. A few endlessly recycled anecdotes regarding the desirability of the Parisian (or possibly the Pontoise) norm in the 12th and 13th centuries have misled generations of scholars to conclude that a Paris-based norm was recognised and aspired to long before any other evidence is to hand to support the existence of such a proto-standard French, let alone one documented and located in Paris this early. Even the publication of quite substantial amounts of evidence to the contrary by such scholars as Dees, Roques, and Pfister has done little to alter the manuals' misrepresentation of events: so we can still read the same statements, with minimal adjustments, over a thirty-year period or more.

It has to be said that French manuals are better than English-language ones in noticing that "francien" (note the inverted commas) has to be approached with care. There is a much more subtle discussion in Jacqueline Picoche and Christiane Marchello-Nizia's student textbook on *Histoire de la langue française* (Paris, 1994), pp. 19–26, than in anything written in English. The excellent *Nouvelle histoire de la langue française* edited by Jacques Chaurand (Paris, 1999) has a predictably impressive chapter by a real expert, Serge Lusignan (pp. 93–143) on "Langue française et société du XIIIe au XVe siècle", and a review of "Le français et ses patois" (pp. 547–80) by a distinguished modern dialectologist, Marie-Rose Simoni-Aurembou, which has a page on "Le 'francien': invention et usages" (pp. 562–3). *Ouvrages de vulgarisation* for the French seem to be a good way ahead of the same for English-speaking students. What is particularly odd is the idea that *francien* was a *spoken* norm which extended as such during the Middle Ages into other dialect areas of northern France. This problem was addressed in a seminal article by Max Pfister,[21] as long ago as 1973, which discusses the spread of *francien* from Paris outwards but explicitly states that the process is one which involves the development of a "Norm in der Dichtersprache" (p. 218), "eine literarische Norm" (p. 250): nothing to do with speech. A later article (originally a 1988 conference paper) by the same author goes further, incorporates the important findings of Dees[22] and states that:

1) Vers 1200, on ne peut pas encore parler d'une koinè formée à partir d'un noyau linguistique parisien [...].
2) Vers 1200, le dialecte de l'Ile-de-France commence à s'imposer dans la cour royale, mais sans irradiation linguistique sensible dans les régions linguistiques avoisinantes. (Pfister 1993: 39–40)

This (based on close analysis of linguistic features of a selection of charters) is quite some way from the textbooks' version of events. Dees himself would take the dates even further forward, and perhaps as late as 1300: "La notion de koinè écrite, ainsi que la notion corrolaire [*sic*] de scripta régionale, n'ont aucune adéquation observationnelle pour la période antérieure à 1300."[23]

But even without scholars like Dees and Pfister,[24] common sense surely causes writers on the subject to pause before putting forward inherently unlikely scenarios regarding the dissemination of a *spoken* norm in the Middle Ages. It is extremely difficult to envisage how, in a pre-literate age where transport and travel were at best difficult, and where for most speakers the local *pays* or indeed their village was the known world, the *speech* of Paris could possibly have impinged on the inhabitants of (say) Burgundy or Anjou. In the construction of a norm at this period, we are not dealing with speech at all, but with writing: with a "Norm in der Dichtersprache".

Now this language is not, unfortunately, much discussed in contemporary theoretical treatises.[25] What is presented as the "Continental norm" from which Anglo-Norman allegedly diverges is a reconstruction, often involving the superimposition on medieval French of a grammatical regularity which it patently

lacked and was little exercised by. Once the (relative) purity of literary texts is abandoned for the significantly less pristine non-literary documents, which historians of French often remain so reluctant to examine, the artificiality of the "norm" becomes evident. Those who remain content to verify the manuals' observations against literary texts on which the manuals are based will (not surprisingly) find that the manuals are reassuringly accurate. But these are not grammars or histories of medieval French: they are treatments of medieval literary French, a sub-variety (no doubt a very rich and important sub-variety) of the language as a whole.

The availability for some time of Dees's corpus (used by Anthony Lodge in his recent work on Parisian French) and of the growing collection of *Documents linguistiques de la France* under the general editorship of Jacques Monfrin[26] has had little impact so far on conventional histories of medieval French, whether these are written from a sociolinguistic or a more traditional, morpho-phonological viewpoint. Even a relatively comprehensive modern grammar like that by Claude Buridant[27] remains strongly literary in its focus. The change to our understanding of medieval French (both Old and especially Middle French) would be dramatic, if the analysis of grammatical forms were to encompass (for example) some of the fourteenth- and fifteenth-century non-literary materials available. Overwhelmingly these have been edited by and for historians but it is frankly astonishing that linguists should have passed up the chance to work on some of what is (for example) listed in the DEAF bibliography or in the pre-publication volume of the DMF.[28]

The third aspect which requires attention is **language contact**. In the Anglo-Norman context this normally means English, although other languages must have played a role outside England itself. As the language of an invading elite, Anglo-Norman fairly quickly ceased to function as a true vernacular, becoming instead an acquired second language, proficiency in which must have varied hugely according to linguistic ability, experience and degree of exposure to the language. Even if there were no further considerations of (for example) register of documents, intended addressee, or importance of the document itself, the variability of linguistic competence alone would guarantee considerable variation in the grammaticality of different examples of Anglo-Norman. Varying degrees of L1 interference are to be expected. It is difficult to assess the impact and reality of the phenomenon, but what is more important is the recognition that (despite the impression often given) Anglo-Norman is in this respect by no means unique. Conventional histories have always presented French as the product of an essentially monolingual society with a continuum between one dialect and the nascent standard. The reality is different: many areas of Francophone Europe were, in the Middle Ages, multilingual, and there is documentary evidence of the effect such multilingualism had in areas far more "central" than the relatively remote British Isles. The Continental material is not, or not all, new; but here again, historians of the French language have so far managed almost entirely to overlook it. It is hard not to see in this omission a deliberate or at best an unconscious policy, to

eliminate from consideration (lest it interrupt the rectilinear development of "standard French" from "Latin in Paris") those peripheral areas which exhibit a less satisfactorily tidy evolution, and which display incontrovertible evidence of wholesale language contact and its influence on the development of French in those regions so infected.

Conspicuous amongst these areas are the parts of eastern and north-eastern modern France and Belgium where Germanic and Romance were and indeed still are in contact. Leaving aside the issue of the particular importance of these regions in the Germanicisation of early Romance, what is relevant here is the coexistence of two vernaculars, immediately comparable to those found in England, plus Latin. It comes as no great surprise, then, to find that in documents from Flanders,[29] Flemish lexical items are used in exactly the same way as they are in Anglo-Norman texts: "Item, nus ne fache ciervoise de *goudale* plus chier ke un denier" (p. 394); "Pour voiture de cars entre le vivier de Zelebke a Ypre et del *overdraghes* a Ypre" (p. 375), etc. A set of documents concerning mill-construction[30] contains important metalinguistic observations about the necessity to use Flemish in order that the carpenters can understand the work to be carried out: "Les charpentiers cy aprés denommez ont ouvré et charpenté au dit moulin les dictes manieres d'ouvraiges que on ne scet proprement nommer en françois car le dit Ector ne autres charpentiers d'ilec ne scevent nommer en françois communaulment ne les engins qui compettent et sortissent au dit moulin" (Opwijk 1428; CoutantMoulin 8). Documents then incorporate, presumably for this reason, Flemish technical terms: "ung loyen de fer appellé 'kenneve', en quoy gist le marbersteen" (1453 document, CoutantMoulin 200), where the first word (*kenneve*) is marked as a loan, the second (*marbersteen*) is not. The pattern is widespread in Flanders and the Germanophone areas of eastern France: loanwords (marked or unmarked) are routinely introduced because they are either more precise or perhaps better known. The municipal documents of medieval Saint-Omer have been published *in extenso*[31] and contain numerous Flemish terms and the only attestation of the loanword *makelare* from Low Dutch *makelâre*, *makelaar* (GiryStOmer 526,338; FEW 16,502b "apik." [no source given] = Gdf 5,103). Without this one St-Omer text, definite evidence for the source of the OF word would be lacking, and we would be reduced to speculation about how and via what route the word made its way into French.

Scattered around Lorraine are documents which incorporate Germanic words, seemingly without any difficulty or self-consciousness: not solely in Metz and the Germanophone areas but also, for example, in documents from Toul and the Château-Salins area. An example is the nickname "vrouwellinne" in a charter from the Abbey of Salival near Vic-sur-Seille (Archives Départementales de Meurthe-et-Moselle H 1241, from May 1299). *Vrou* is only attested in French from 1500 (FEW 17,437b) and the diminutive is not recorded at all. The document opens with the name of the person transferring property to Salival: "Je Anne, ditte 'Vrouwellinne', feme Ferri de Saulmes, escuier [. . .]".

Many of the Salival documents in the Archives Départementales de Meurthe-et-Moselle (especially those pertaining to the bourgeoisie of Vic-sur-Seille) are striking for the presence of such nicknames, but what is noticeable here is the presence of a patently German element.[32] A slightly different type is the relatively common use of *fenal* (Gdf 3,747a) in (especially) Lorraine documents to mean "July" (e.g. "lou premier juedi de fenal", ADMM B 718 (1), 1236). The etymon is Latin (FENUM), but the presence of the word exclusively in eastern France in areas bordering on German-speaking regions suggests that it is a direct translation of the German *heumonat* (literally, "hay-month").[33] Nor is this practice of code-switching and borrowing limited to documents whose matrix language is French. A 1234 Latin charter from Sigolsheim in Alsace (concerning the rebuilding of the choir of the church of Ingersheim) refers to "quod dicti parrochiani memorate curie omne debitum tam in vino quam prandiis in quo tenebatur bannalibus custodibus qui vulgo *banwart* appellantur" (Archives Départmentales des Vosges G 818,5). The document (agreed in the presence of the bishop of Basel) has already spelt out who the *banwart* ("guards, wardens of the *ban*") are (*bannalibus custodibus*, itself ultimately from the Latinised Germanic etymon *ban*) and the vernacular term (also imported into French throughout Lorraine, and attested with particular frequency in Metz[34]) is in some ways redundant.

North-eastern and eastern France are an obvious area where there is a parallel with the situation in Anglo-Norman England, both in terms of the availability of competing or at least coexisting vernaculars, and because these vernaculars are (like English and Anglo-Norman) of Germanic and Romance origin. At the far corner of France, Gascony constitutes another area where (with rather different vernaculars) similar results are found. Here, of course, all the languages concerned are Romance. In Bagnères-de-Bigorre in the Hautes-Pyrénées, we see a similar pattern to that in Flanders: a contract for the reconstruction of a wall is in Latin, the instructions to the builders are in Gascon. Language-mixing across the Pyrenees is evident in documents recording the *passeries* across the border, as well as in all sorts of administrative texts from right across south-western France.[35]

Anglo-Norman is notorious for the amount of material of this type which it preserves. The multilingualism of the available linguistic evidence demonstrates beyond reasonable doubt the polyglot nature of medieval English (indeed British) society;[36] but it has led to an unfounded view that medieval Britain was somehow anomalous. Thus, Anglo-Norman itself was traditionally perceived as little more than an eccentric and aberrant dialect, "une langue avortée et déformée".[37] Informed scholarly opinion no longer dismisses Anglo-Norman in this way. But it is also important to recognise that Anglo-Norman is not unusual: multilingualism in medieval France was the norm, not the exception. The history of French remains the history of convergence and centripetal forces, and centrifugal tendencies and divergence have been treated (if at all) solely as regional phenomena, rarely allowed to impinge on mainstream language history.

The incorporation of Anglo-Norman into that history would, amongst other things, place centre-stage a series of problems of language contact and its effects which in reality impinge not just on Insular French, but on its Continental neighbour too.

DAVID TROTTER

University of Wales
Aberystwyth SY23 3DY
United Kingdom

NOTES

[1] This article owes a good deal to the perspicacious comments made on a previous version by Professor W. Rothwell, who more than anyone has helped to demolish the traditional, censorious view of later Anglo-Norman.

[2] C. Bruneau, *Petite histoire de la langue française* (Paris, 1955), p. 39, quoted by F. Möhren, "Unité et diversité du champ sémiasologique – l'exemple de l'*Anglo-Norman Dictionary*", in: *"De mot en mot": Aspects of medieval linguistics. Essay in honour of William Rothwell*, ed. S. Gregory & D. A. Trotter (Cardiff, 1997), pp. 127–46 (p. 127).

[3] F. Möhren, "Onefold lexicography for a manifold problem?", in: *Multilingualism in Later Medieval Britain*, ed. D. A. Trotter (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 157–68.

[4] See, e.g., *The Origins and Development of Emigrant Languages*, ed. H.-F. Nielsen & L. Schøsler (Odense, 1996).

[5] *Anglo-Norman Letters and Petitions from All Souls MS. 182*, ANTS III, ed. M. D. Legge (Oxford, 1941).

[6] See Rymer, FoederaR, RotParl[1]M, TreatyRolls (as per DEAF sigla); also P. Chaplais, *English Medieval Diplomatic Practice: Part I, Documents and Interpretation*, 2 vols (London, 1982).

[7] T. de Jong, "L'anglo-normand du 13e siècle", in: *Distributions spatiales et temporelles, constellations des manuscrits. Études de variation linguistique offertes à Anthonij Dees à l'occasion de son 60ème anniversaire*, ed. P. van Reenen & K. van Reenen-Stein (Amsterdam, 1998), pp. 103–12, and "L'anglo-normand des 13e et 14e siècles: un dialecte continental ou insulaire?", in Nielsen & Schøsler, *Origins and Development of Emigrant Languages*, pp. 55–70.

[8] G. F. Chapple, "The Correspondence of the City of London 1298–1370" (University of London PhD, 1938).

[9] E. A. Lewis, "A Contribution to the Commercial History of Mediaeval Wales", *Y Cymmrodor*, 24 (1913), 86–188; K. L. Gruffydd, "Wales's Maritime Trade in Wine during the Later Middle Ages", *Cymru a'r Môr (Maritime Wales)* 15 (1992), 7–42.

[10] M. Freeman, "'Pots of osey': Portuguese wine in late medieval England and its place of origin", in: *"De mot en mot"*, pp. 17–36.

[11] For example: *Sources of London English: Medieval Thames Vocabulary* (Oxford, 1996); "The records of Hanseatic merchants: Ignorant, sleepy or degenerate?", *Multilingua* 16 (1997), 339–50; "Code-intermediate phenomena in medieval mixed-language business texts", *Language Sciences* 24 (2002), 471–89, with a list of Dr Wright's articles.

[12] *Port Books of Southampton*, ed. P. Studer, Publications of the Southampton Record Society 15 (Southampton, 1913). I was reminded of this parallel and that with Laura Wright's work by Professor W. Rothwell.

[13] See also D. A. Trotter, "Les néologismes de l'anglo-français et le *FEW*", *Le Moyen Français* 39–41 (1998), 577–636.

[14] It is thus wrong to state that "it has not yet been proved that continental dialects also underwent Anglo-French influences" (de Jong, "L'anglo-normand des 13e et 14e siècles", p. 57).

[15] "Unité et diversité", p. 127.

[16] G. Roques, "Des interférences picardes dans l'*Anglo-Norman Dictionary*", *"De mot en mot"*, 191–8 (p. 191). The reference is to medicine and botany. Cf. also Trotter, "Les néologismes", pp. 581–2.

[17] A. Girardot, "A propos d'un bail de forge en 1391: Fonte et forges hydrauliques en Lorraine au XIVe siècle", *Annales de l'Est* 28 (1976), 275–85 (p. 283). Original document, Archives Départementales de la Moselle H 124, s.d. (before 1391).

[18] H. Olland, "Le polyptyque de l'évêché de Toul (fin du XIIIe siècle)", *Bulletin philologique et historique (jusqu'à 1610) du comité des travaux historiques et scientifiques* 1979 [1981], 153–233.

[19] R. Mantou, *Actes originaux rédigés en français dans la partie flamingante du comté de Flandre (1250–1350). Étude linguistique* (Liège, 1972), pp. 288–95, 306–8.

[20] D. A. Trotter, "*Mossenhor, fet metre aquesta letra en bon francés*: Anglo-French in Gascony", in *"De mot en mot"*, pp. 199–222; "Some Lexical Gleanings from Anglo-French Gascony", *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie* 114 (1998), 53–72; "Langues en contact en Gascogne médiévale", in *Actas del XXIII Congreso Internacional de Lingüística y Filología Románica, Salamanca, 2001* (Tübingen, 2003); "*Si le français n'y peut aller*: Villers-Cotterêts and mixed-language documents from the Pyrenees", in: *Conceptions of Europe in Renaissance France: A Festschrift for Keith Cameron*, ed. D. J Cowling (Exeter, forthcoming).

[21] "Die sprachliche Bedeutung von Paris und der Ile-de-France vor dem 13. Jh.", *Vox Romanica* 32 (1973), 217–53.

[22] Especially A. Dees, "Dialectes et scriptae à l'époque de l'ancien français", *Revue de linguistique romane* 49 (1985), 87–117.

[23] Dees, "Dialectes et scriptae", p. 113.

[24] See also M. Pfister, "Scripta et koinè en ancien français aux XIIe et XIIIe siècles", in: *Écritures, langues communes et normes: formation spontanée de koinès et standardisation dans la Galloromania et son voisinage*, ed. P. Knecht & Z. Marzys (Neuchâtel & Geneva, 1993), pp. 17–41; "Nordöstliche Skripten im Grenzbereich Germania-Romania vor 1300", in: *Skripta, Schreiblandschaft und Standardisierungstendenzen. Urkundensprachen im Grenzbereich von Germania und Romania im 13. und 14. Jahrhundert*, ed. K. Gärtner et al., Trierer Historische Forschungen Bd. 47 (Trier, 2001), pp. 223–44.

[25] See T. Städtler, *Zu den Anfängen der französischen Grammatiksprache: Textausgaben und Wortschatzstudien*, Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie Bd. 223 (Tübingen, 1988).

[26] The series is to be continued by Martin-Dietrich Gleßgen (Zurich) and Françoise Vielliard (Paris) and will comprise printed and electronic editions.

[27] C. Buridant, *Grammaire nouvelle de l'ancien français* (Paris, 2000).

[28] To take one example: the general assumptions made about the chronology of *ne*-deletion in French negatives needs to be reviewed in the light of data from Flanders: cf. Mantou, *Actes originaux*, pp. 396–9; most cases are attributable to Flemish influence (*nieman* and *nien* as simple negatives), but one attestation points to authentic *ne*-deletion (Ypres text from late 13th/early 14th century, p. 397). There are sporadic attestations of unambiguous *ne*-deletion in simple statements in Anglo-Norman (e.g. YBB Ed II vi 155, main text *pas* without *ne*, variant *ne ... pas*; YBB Ed II xxvi 309; YBB 20 i Ed III 315). It seems likely (given the geographical spread) that the issue is one of register and that both the Flanders and Anglo-Norman documents record levels of language not adequately represented in the literary sources of conventional language histories. J. P. Collas notes only *point* without *ne* ("influenced no doubt by *nient*, which contained negation within itself") in his discussion of negation in *Year Books of Edward II: 12 Edward II* (London, Selden Society vol. 81, 1964; Year Books Series XXV), p. ci n.3. Articles published twenty and more years later have overlooked these data. See, for example, W. Ayres-Bennett, "Negative Evidence: Or Another Look at the Non-Use of Negative *ne* in Seventeenth-Century French", *French Studies* 48 (1994), 63–85 (p. 66); N. Armstrong & A. Smith, "The influence of linguistic and social factors on the recent decline of French *ne*", *Journal of French Language Studies* 12 (2002), 23–40. The problems of using written evidence for this type of investigation are considerable. Modern novels often continue to use *ne* in dialogue, even where the register of the exchange and the background of the speakers make it highly unlikely that this increasingly redundant element would be present.

[29] Mantou, *Actes originaux*.

[30] Y. Coutant, *Middeleeuwse Molentermen in het graafschap Vlaanderen. Terminologie du moulin médiéval dans le comté de Flandre* (Tongeren & Liège, 1994); = CoutantMoulin.

[31] A. Giry, *Histoire de la ville de Saint-Omer et de ses institutions jusqu'au XIVe siècle* (Paris, 1877); = GiryStOmer.

[32] Cf.: Huart dit "lou Vogien" ADMM H 1237; Symonins dit "lou Roukant" H 1233; Jennaus dis "Bruleis" H 1232; Thierias dis "Melleis" H 1240; Jaques dis "Lombars" H 1256. These documents are published as an appendix to D. A. Trotter, "Diastratische und Diaphasische Variation: Normierungstendenz und Unabhängigkeit in lothringischen Dokumenten des Mittelalters", in: *Überlieferungs- und Aneignungsprozesse im 13. und 14. Jahrhundert auf dem Gebiet der westmitteldeutschen und ostfranzösischen Urkunden- und Literatursprachen*, ed. K. Gärtner & G. Holtus (Trier, forthcoming).

[33] "Die benennung des juli nach der heuernte findet sich nur in den unmittelbar ans deutsche sprachgebiet anstossenden und mit diesem lange zeit in rechtsgemeinschaft verbundenen gegenden [. . .]. Es darf daher mit sicherheit angenommen werden, dass diese rom. ausdrücke an d. *heumonat* übersetzt sind" (FEW 3,461a n.4). Another example: *treisse* (<low Frankish **threosk* "uncultivated land"), attested for the first time in a 1234 Salival charter (Arch. Dép. Meurthe-et-Moselle H 1244) and restricted to Wallonia, Flanders, Champagne and Lorraine; see M.-D. Gleßgen, "Étude lexicologique des *Plus anciens documents linguistiques de la France* à l'aide de l'informatique", *Actes du X*^{e} *Colloque sur le moyen français* (Metz, June 2002).

[34] See K. Wichmann, *Die Metzer Bannrollen des dreizehnten Jahrhunderts* (4 vols, Metz, 1908–1916). Cf. also M. Pitz, "Volkssprachige Originalurkunden aus Metzer Archiven bis zum Jahr 1270", in: *Skripta, Schreiblandschaft und Standardisierungstendenzen. Urkundensprachen im Grenzbereich von Germania und Romania im 13. und 14. Jahrhundert*, ed. K. Gärtner et al., Trierer Historische Forschungen Bd. 47 (Trier, 2001), pp. 295–392, in particular the discussion of Frankish words in Metz (p. 302), including *ban* itself.

[35] Trotter, "*Si le français n'y peut aller*".

[36] See the articles in Trotter (ed.), *Multilingualism in Later Medieval Britain*.

[37] G. Roques, review of *Multilingualism in Later Medieval Britain*, *Revue de linguistique romane* 64 (2000), 464–5 (p. 464).