

David Trotter, 2013, 'Deinz Certain Boundes: Where Does Anglo-Norman Begin and End?', *Romance Philology*, vol. 67, no. 1, pp. 139-175. [10.1484/J.RPH.1.103932](https://doi.org/10.1484/J.RPH.1.103932)



*DEINZ CERTEINS BOUNDES:*  
WHERE DOES ANGLO-NORMAN BEGIN AND END?\*



DAVID TROTTER  
*Aberystwyth University*

**1. Introduction.** This article is in part prompted by a practical problem which has existed since the inception of the *Anglo-Norman Dictionary* (*AND*) in 1947 and which the present editorial team has certainly not resolved.<sup>1</sup> It is quite simply: what should go in the *AND*? The underlying question—what exactly *is* Anglo-Norman?—also surfaces in much early writing about Anglo-Norman and it lurks in the depths of a good deal of more recent scholarship. Frequently, indeed, it does so as part of an ideologically laden and disconcertingly polemical discussion about the nature and history of French. A second reason for the present contribution is that it seeks to take further ideas which I have been developing for twenty years or so on the relationship between Anglo-Norman and other languages. The question of the definition of Anglo-Norman is inseparable from this discussion. Much of the debate on both has (until relatively recently)<sup>2</sup> been couched overwhelmingly in terms of the *difference* between Anglo-Norman and other languages, whether this means continental French, English, or Latin. In contrast, Ardis Butterfield, in a fine recent study, regrets that “Anglo-

1. The *AND* should always now be consulted on line: see <http://www.anglo-norman.net>. The internet version (access free and unlimited) is being revised (thus far the revision covers A-N) and the rest of the alphabet is from time to time being corrected (O-Z from the first edition is also on line as part of the same project). The print versions of the first edition (1977–1992) and of the beginning of the second (A-E only, 2005) are now increasingly out of date.
2. See most recently Ingham 2012, which makes a compelling linguistic case for the development of later Anglo-Norman in parallel with (rather than diverging from) continental French. I do not agree with Ingham in the assertion that the continuing grammatical accuracy of Anglo-Norman *necessarily* indicates native-speaker-type inter-generational transmission (it is perfectly possible to *write* a second language without a trace of non-native grammar, even without being really able to *speak* the language, as Classicists and earlier generations of modern language professors in the United Kingdom could confirm), but that does not detract from the importance of his work in demonstrating the similarities between later Anglo-Norman and continental French.

*Romance Philology*, vol. 67 (Spring 2013), pp. 139–177. DOI 10.1484/J.RPH.1.103932

\* This work was supported by the Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC) [grant number AH/J012351/1]; [grant name Revision of the Anglo-Norman Dictionary N-Q]. © TROTTER DAVID, 2014. This is an open access article, distributed under the terms of the CC-BY-NC License.

Norman is . . . insistently described as separate, distinctive, and as possessing its own linguistic integrity” (2009:12). Picking up a theme I made some rudimentary comments on a decade ago (Trotter 2003a, 2003b), I would like to concentrate less on this distinctiveness, and more on the parallels and similarities with other contiguous linguistic varieties, in England and France, and on whether these varieties are really as *lexically* separate as they appear, a discussion also touched on in an earlier publication (Trotter 2011d). This may appear paradoxical in light of the title (and its deliberately Anglo-Norman term *boundes*),<sup>3</sup> but boundaries (however porous) nevertheless existed and are essential to an examination of both difference and similarity.

The problem can be and has been approached from a variety of perspectives; typically, though, much of what has been said on the subject omits a strictly *internal* linguistic analysis. By that, I do not mean that the salient features of Anglo-Norman are disregarded, or unknown, but rather, that the starting-point of much of the discussion is either a predominantly literary one, concerned both to establish a purported canon of Anglo-Norman texts, and to buttress a conception of the history of French which sees it as deriving from a quite narrowly circumscribed literary language in the Île-de-France, or a strictly philological one which can overlook cultural and indeed historical aspects. It is not difficult to see how all these conceptions can assist in the production of a decidedly teleological history of the French language itself.

Moreover, much of the earlier scholarly writing concerning Anglo-Norman emerged in an era largely ignorant of language variation. Thus, the way in which Anglo-Norman is presented is as though it was a fixed and unchanging block, measured against the background of progressive evolution within continental medieval French, typically designated by the nineteenth-century label of *francien*. We are dealing, in the field of medieval French dialectology, not with a static image, but with an ever-changing series of overlapping synchronic sub-systems. Anglo-Norman itself is part of this diachronically evolving pattern. Thus, the relationship between early Anglo-Norman and (for example) twelfth-century western French will be one element in such an account. The admixture of later dialectal forms (south-western *oïl*, Picard) will change the picture, and to a greater or lesser extent render the earlier model obsolete.

This is all within a strictly linguistic (internal) analysis, but whatever

3. The Treaty of London of 1359 contains an interesting case where the Anglo-Norman *boundes* (absent from continental French) is preserved (albeit in the continentalized form *bondes*) in the two versions, Anglo-Norman, i.e., “English,” and French, that survive of the treaty. As Lusignan observes, “les Anglais ont imposé leur propre mot pour désigner la frontière, une notion de clé, s’il en est une, dans tout traité” (Lusignan 2004:241–242). On the conception of the English Channel as a frontier zone or “marche,” see Trotter 2011a:122.

the Neo-Grammarians thought (and the generativists sometimes suggest) such an analysis cannot be usefully effected without reference to the sociolinguistic and indeed strictly historical background. Because much of the evidence, particularly in the earlier period, is literary, it will be impossible to avoid addressing questions of authorship, and of the relationship between author and scribe, both often crucial in terms of the attribution of works to “Anglo-Norman.” This has been a recurrent if tacit problem throughout the history of the *AND*, and the question of whether a given text is to be incorporated in the dictionary’s materials is entirely dependent on the answer to this sort of conundrum. That the *AND* has declined to come up with clear-cut answers to these problems is perhaps unacceptable; that no such clear-cut answer can, in my view, exist is maybe more surprising. It is not altogether unreasonable to expect the compilers of a dictionary to be able to define the language which they seek to record, but in the case of the *AND*, it would be dishonest to make such a claim. This is part of a broader difficulty in perceptions of the dictionary as a repository of knowledge: dictionaries are often and erroneously thought of as uniquely “authoritative,” but their compilers know otherwise and there is (*pace* the *OED*) no such thing as “the definitive record” of any language.<sup>4</sup>

One aspect of the discussion which it seems pointless to pursue is that of nomenclature. The traditional philologists’ label “Anglo-Norman” has always had its rivals. The Victorians tended to talk of “Norman French,” and later contenders include “Anglo-French,” “Insular French,” and latterly, “the French of England.” None, it seems to me, improves sufficiently on the traditional designation to the point where it carries conviction. If “Anglo-Norman” can be criticized for over-stating the link with Normandy, “Anglo-French” is equally suspect because of the implication of a close and ongoing relationship with French. “Insular French” is seemingly safe from this criticism but it overemphasizes insularity (Trotter 2003a, 2003b). “The French of England” is the most problematic term. It implies that England had (as in, owned) its own form of French, and it suggests that England is where (and only where) it was found. This is for several reasons misleading. Clearly, in so far as French existed in England, it did so in relation to the French of France; equally clearly, it was not only used in England, but throughout the rest of the British Isles and, moreover, in English Gascony. Following Ian Short (2007:11, n. 2), I shall stick with the tradition of simply using the term “Anglo-Norman.” In doing so, I do not intend to imply that there is necessarily any very specific relationship with Normandy, beyond the beginning of the period with which I will be concerned; nor, obviously, is there any implication (as has sometimes misguidedly been sug-

4. Cf. Max Pfister’s comment: “Ein etymologisches Wörterbuch kann nie vollkommen sein. Die etymologische Diskussion geht ständig weiter und baut auf neuen Belegen und deren Interpretationen auf” (2012:198).

gested) that Anglo-Norman is in any sense a hybrid or creole language (Trotter 2012a), as the two-part structure of the name might imply. That it was a variety which caused English itself to become to a significant extent a hybrid, is another matter altogether, and one which I shall discuss below (section 2.2.).

The title of this article carefully avoids any seductive promise that it will offer a *definition* of Anglo-Norman. I am concerned to investigate the *boundaries* of the variety, in the hope that this will contribute to some clarification of its status, function, and relationship to adjacent languages. The underlying hypothesis is in fact that the boundaries are anything but clearly demarcated. Essentially, there are three main dimensions to the problem. In the first place, and most pressingly, there is the question of the relationship of Anglo-Norman to other languages in medieval Britain (section 2). In practice, and notwithstanding what has been stated above about the existence of Anglo-Norman outside England itself, I shall concentrate predominantly on that part of the British Isles. This is partly in order to reduce the complexities of an already intractable problem, and partly because the documentary evidence which would be needed for a thorough investigation of the situation in other parts of these islands is not as readily to hand as it is for England, the most densely colonized part of the British Isles and the best documented. For the same reason, this part of the study will mainly restrict itself to the two most important languages concerned, namely, medieval Latin and Middle English. I am aware that this leaves out of the equation some other languages (Cornish, possibly Cumbric), as well as the largely neglected question of Anglo-Norman and Hebrew (which I intend to address elsewhere), but by grappling with the two main contact languages to start with, the ground will be cleared for a wider-ranging investigation in due course. A second question (see section 2.3) is the complex and evolving relationship between Anglo-Norman, as a variety forming part of the medieval French dialect continuum, and forms of French (and I emphasize the plural) on the continent. This is where the history of Anglo-Norman itself intersects with that of French, and indeed with longstanding arguments, which often contrive simultaneously to be uninformed and politically charged, about the emergence of a “standard language” in France itself. Here, too, I am conscious that to restrict the discussion to France is probably to overlook important connections to various forms of Low German, in the Netherlands and in what are now the *Platt*-speaking areas of northern Germany. Again, the exclusion of these problems is both a practical matter (the need to keep the discussion within manageable limits) and one which has some linguistic basis: in practice, it seems likely that the interactions between those varieties and England will have concerned English rather than Anglo-Norman. The third element of the discussion (section 3), inevitably, concerns the

criteria according to which a given text may legitimately be considered “Anglo-Norman,” and how the complex interplay of author, scribe, and the accidents of manuscript transmission and survival, impinges on this. “Inevitably,” because this is a decidedly tricky area, and one in which, as we shall see, it is once more remarkably difficult to arrive at a satisfactory, all-purpose set of rules. Yet, fairly obviously, the question of what constitutes an Anglo-Norman text is a precursor to any discussion concerning the linguistic characteristics of Anglo-Norman itself. No texts, no language. In other words, this is not purely a problem for the compilers of the *AND* (although it certainly is that), but for any discussion from a broadly dialectological perspective of Anglo-Norman. In that, Anglo-Norman is no different from any of the other regional varieties of medieval French, and one result of the exploration of Anglo-Norman (the only medieval French variety to have its own dictionary) may well be to conclude that greater caution is needed when assigning regional status to medieval French texts and words. It is more than likely that problems in assigning individual words to “Anglo-Norman” will be replicated elsewhere—where competing varieties are typologically and genetically closer—and thus that the Anglo-Norman situation may serve as a case-study for a much wider problem.

Over the course of the past twenty or thirty years, a great deal has been written about multilingualism and medieval languages. England, for obvious reasons, has had pride of place in much of this scholarship: it offers a well-documented situation with three (indeed more) languages which are typologically nicely distinct. It is relatively straightforward to spot the differences between Anglo-Saxon, Anglo-Norman, and medieval Latin, even if (as we shall see) it becomes less so as time goes on. Informed by research into code-switching in modern bilingual societies, studies have shown how the patterns of language-mixing in England in the Middle Ages are not only perfectly normal, but constitute, in certain text-types, the predominant discourse mode (notably, in business texts; Wright 1996). Patterns of language use, which an earlier era would have regarded (and did regard) as conclusive evidence of terminal decay or lexical inadequacy, are now generally recognized as part of a language system produced perfectly naturally by a society which simultaneously deployed a number of languages in everyday life. The analysis, in other words, has moved on to talk not in terms of a scrambled and “semilingual” *Mischsprache*, but of a complex interplay of languages, the understanding of which requires an often sophisticated analysis of inter- and intrasentential code-switching and language-mixing. Any number of studies have shown beyond any reasonable doubt that what previous generations regarded as a dysfunctional mess was on the contrary a fully functioning linguistic sub-system. Tony Hunt has gone so far as to call Anglo-Norman, in this context, an “interlect” (Hunt 2003:385).

But—and there is always a but—many of these studies tacitly assume that the component parts of the system (that is, the individual lexemes from individual languages) were conceptually separate and that they were drawn from languages which the writers of the documents upon which we rely perceived, and conceived of (the two are not quite the same), as discrete varieties. As we shall see, this is a contention which the evidence, at times, does not unequivocally support.

## 2. Lexis

**2.1. Anglo-Norman and medieval Latin.** The relationship between British medieval Latin and Anglo-Norman is a long, complex, and above all reciprocal one. No doubt facilitated by the underlying and surely recognizable structural and etymological relationship between the two languages,<sup>5</sup> this relationship finds expression in the vast number of ostensibly Latin words which are patently Anglo-Norman terms with Latin inflections appended, in the adoption within Anglo-Norman of substantial numbers of Latinisms, and in the enormous quantity of mixed-language documents of an administrative nature, whereas Middle English becomes to an unhelpful extent invisible after the Conquest. The Leicester project on English in manuscripts after the Conquest confirmed that relatively little written English survives in the twelfth century (Da Rold 2006). For English, we are left with a sort of fossil record a little like that drawn on by biologists, whereas the medieval Latin documentary trace is unbroken throughout the Middle Ages and beyond. Moreover, even when Anglo-Norman begins to occupy some of the domains previously the preserve of Latin alone, sufficient documentation in that language survives to enable comparisons to be drawn, and to allow us to observe the process of cross-fertilization between the two languages. Finally, the information available in the exemplary and now complete *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources (DMLBS)* makes possible an efficient exploration of the underlying question which lies behind this article: to what extent can medieval Latin and Anglo-Norman genuinely be regarded as separate languages *at the level of individual lexemes?*

**2.1.1.** There are, clearly, various stages, or (better) types, of interaction between the languages. At the most explicit level—and here there can be no doubt of a metalinguistic awareness of which language is which—are words glossed from Latin to Anglo-Norman, and introduced by a formula such as *quod vulgo dicitur* or *vulgariter*:

concedium eidem [. . .] tribulagium nostrum sive consuetudinem vocatam  
*le tribulage* [. . .] infra stannariam nostram [. . .] *DMLBS*, sub **tribulagium**

5. “[Anglo-Norman’s] use as a language of administration and of learning may well have had practical advantages, Medieval French being close enough to Latin for them to be recognised, presumably, as being situated within the same linguistic spectrum, and to be regarded functionally as different registers of the same language” (Short 2007:13).

videres [. . .] tubarum intonationibus, quas *trumpas* vulgo dicunt *DMLBS*, sub **trumpa**

continens j gemmam in medio subrubeam et oblongam, viz. dictam vulgariter *rubibalois* *DMLBS*, sub **subrubbeus**

illud vas quod dicitur '*tyralira*': poteris intus denarium projicere, sed nihil extrahere nisi confringatur *DMLBS*, sub **tiralira**

de quadam consuetudine m'dccxxj bracinarum servis' vocata *castelcouuel* *DMLBS* sub **tina**

hernasia pro turnimanet' et guerr' quondam ordinata, scilicet capiter' equorum fert' vocata *chaufreyus* *DMLBS*, sub **subtrappura**

Instances of this sort are the bread and butter of those who wish to investigate code-switching, since they explicitly demonstrate the type of linguistic and metalinguistic awareness generally regarded as central to that practice. Of these words, *AND* records the equivalents of *trumpas* (sub **trumpe**), *rubibalois* (not as a compound but cf. **balais**, **rubi**), *couuel* (simplex only), sub **cuel**<sup>1</sup>, and the *AND* entry **chanfrein** "chamfrain, frontlet (of a barded horse)" authorizes a re-reading of minims and the legitur *chanfreyus* for the erroneous *chaufreyus*, an emendation which I should have suggested when correcting the *DMLBS* proofs. *Tribulage* is absent from the *AND* and needs to be added.

**2.1.2.** A second type involves the incorporation with no such introductory flag of words from Anglo-Norman in Latin texts, but where the definite article (usually *le*) is used, seemingly to indicate a shift to the vernacular (although not invariably—indeed, usually *not*—leading to an Anglo-Norman word since it may also be followed by a Middle English one, as in the last example below):<sup>6</sup>

in j ymagine B. Marie empta cum factura tabernaculi sui et pictura ejusdem stantis super *le parclos* ante altare S. Stephani *DMLBS*, sub **tabernaculum**

pro truta et stureo et *le (l. lé?) mombles* unius porpess *DMLBS*, sub **sturio**  
ordinatum est quod *lé [ed.: le] coynes* in cingulis campanilis ad extra subducantur *DMLBS* sub *subducere*

pro j barra ferri empta ad ponendum in traverso in hostio domus vocate *le Rundehus* *DMLBS* sub **2 transversus** ("vocate" here is an indication of the house name rather than a marker of a gloss)

Of these, the second is at once problematic and intriguing. If it indeed refers to "the breast(s) of a porpoise" (is *porpess* also Anglo-Norman, or Middle English?), it is not only a hapax attestation of *mombles* (assumed to be < Lat. MAMILLAS?; but Ø *FEW* 6<sup>1</sup>, 133a) but a possible piece of evidence for one of the etymologies sometimes proposed for Mumbles, near Swansea (Owen and Morgan 2007, s.v.).

**2.1.3.** Finally, the most common category is that where an Anglo-Norman (or a Middle English) word is inserted, with no warning:

6. See below, 2.1.6., and Trotter 2010a; Wright 2010. Ingham 2011 convincingly rebuts my initial hypothesis.



emerunt *superium* suum et de die *supaverunt* *DMLBS* sub **superium** [ME *soper, souper(e), supper(e)*, AN *super, supir, so(u)per, supper*] *supavit* et bibit coram lecto suo *DMLBS* sub **suppare** [ME *soupen, sope, suppen*, AN *super, supir, souper, supper*]

de uno parvo *payele* stante super j triper' *DMLBS* sub **triparium**

pro j *traversino* de ferro *DMLS* sub **traversina** [OF *traversaine, traversin* ME *traversein*]

usque ad *sursam* alterius rivi qui est in latere montis *DMLBS* sub **2 sursa, ~um** [AN *surse*]

in sintcatio unius putei apud Heworth, cum *piks, bukets* . . . *DMLBS* sub **sincatio**

reddat Willelmo M. *areragium* et *surplusagium* sua *DMLBS* sub **surplusagium** [*surplus* + *-agium*, cf. ME, AN *surplusage*]

fuit filius Radulfi de *suignetagio* [v.l. *signetagio*] et ideo bastardus *DMLBS* sub **soignantagium** [OF *soignantage*, cf. LL *sonium*], **suignantagium** [AN *suignantage*]

ijj *gupillerettos* bonos et *baldos* et j terrarium *DMLBS* sub **terrarius**

In some of these cases, as the *DMLBS* etymology indicates, there is uncertainty as to whether the etymon of the borrowing is Anglo-Norman or Middle English or (probably) both, an inevitable consequence of the historical developments of the two vernaculars concerned. Some of the words listed under these *DMLBS* entries are otherwise unknown to French lexicography: *gupillerettos*, for example (absent from *DEAF G* 1072 and all other medieval French dictionaries), but also found in a *DMLBS* substantive entry **gupillerettus**, clearly reflects a spoken (?—in any case, unattested) *\*gupilleret* ‘fox-hound’. The word is eminently plausible but the point is that medieval Latin preserves a trace of it, and medieval French does not. As Tony Hunt has put it (2003:384), “Historical attestations of individual lexical items rarely begin with the presumed donor language.” *Traversin* is attested in the *AND* sub **celure** (a quotation from the Black Prince’s last will and testament of 1376) but there is no main article **traversin**: there should be. When, sub *DMLBS* **suignantagium**, we learn that the (illegitimate) son of Ralph was born as a result of extramarital activity, this provides an indirect attestation of Anglo-Norman *suignantage* (the *DMLBS* citation is from the Curia Regis Rolls of 5-6 Henry III, that is, 1221–1222) which corroborates the occurrence in the *AND* from Jordan Fantosme’s chronicle of 1174/1175, and shows again (cf. Rothwell 2000; Brand 2010) how medieval Latin legal terminology draws on—indeed, is largely based on—Anglo-Norman.

Sometimes words from both Anglo-Norman and English can be incorporated in one and the same sentence:

principale meremium, videlicet quinque *couples* [AN] cum *syderesenis* [ME], *walplates* [ME] et *furstes* [ME] *DMLBS* sub **siderasenus**

in xxiiij *chiveronibus* [AN] ad *staeriam* [ME] habendam et ad suppositoria dicte *staerie* *DMLBS* sub **suppositorius**

de vj d. de R. de W. pro *sursisa* [AN] quia non venit ad *fftedai* [ME] cum secta hundredi *DMLBS* sub **sursisa** [AN *sursise*, cf. *supersisa*]

in *surzenglis* [AN] et *girtis* [ME] . . . xviii d. DMLBS sub **sursinglum** [AN *sursengle, surcengle*; cf. *supercingulum*]

Note also that in most cases, the words are accommodated to the morphological (inflectional) requirements of Latin: *in xxiii chiveronibus, ad staeriam, ad suppositoria dicte staerie, pro sursisa, in surzenglis, ad sursam alterius rivi, emerunt superium, pro j traversina, de suignetagio, iii gupillerettos, reddat [ . . . ] areragium et surplusagium*. Inconsistently, or maybe just sporadically, this does not happen: *de uno parvo payele* (not *\*payela*), *walplates et furstes* (not *\*walplatis et \*furstis*), *piks, bukets* (not *\*pikis, \*bukettis*). Whether this can be elevated into a “rule” which allows us to determine whether the words have thereby “become” Latin, is another matter. Finally, contiguous instances of a clearly Latin and an equally clearly Anglo-Norman word, point again to the apparent interchangeability of forms:<sup>7</sup>

tantum debent . . . Rob. H. iij s. iiii d., ejus plegii Galfridus *teintor* de Eitona, Radulfus *tinctor* francus . . . DMLBS sub **2 tintor** [CL TINGERE + -TOR; cf. AN **teintur**]

**2.1.4.** Even in this last case, it is usually argued that these are simply what code-switching experts call “single-lexeme switches,” and thus that (implicitly) the authors of the texts concerned were well aware that they were importing a word from another language. This, however, is merely conjecture. It is equally possible (and equally unprovable) that in fact these lexical items simply formed part of the repertoire of the author, without his necessarily perceiving them, or indeed maintaining them in his vocabulary, as elements from another language. This raises the vexed question of how, if at all, we can plausibly hope to recapture linguistic consciousness through purely written documents, compiled some eight hundred years ago. But at the very least, I would argue, the possibility has to be considered that this is evidence not of code-switching at all, but of the fusion of two lexical sets, facilitated by the morphological similarity of certain Anglo-Norman words, and complicated (as Laura Wright has brilliantly shown: Wright 1997) by a perhaps deliberately ambivalent manuscript suspension-and-contraction system which allows for the possibility of interpreting words with a final suspension mark as belonging not exclusively to one language, but (by allowing for a different final morpheme) to several languages. This is not to suggest that the authors of these documents were unaware of the fundamental distinction between Latin and Anglo-Norman *as languages*. It does however raise the possibility (which I have aired elsewhere) that when we are dealing only with single lexemes, it is by no means certain that just because we now recognize these as belong-

7. To the extent that just before this entry in this text (Bateson 1899–1901:1,12–13), the editor inadvertently prints “tinctor” in an item where the manuscript quite clearly reads “teintor” (there is a facsimile in the edition); cf. Trotter 2009b:158–159. The subconscious equation of the Latin and Anglo-Norman forms by an expert modern editor is revealing: something similar may well have occurred in the twelfth century.

ing to a different language, the authors of these documents did so. Similar observations have been made about the “latin farci” of southern Europe, where a comparable “symbiosis” between Occitan and Latin, in some cases involving short phrases in Occitan in Latin documents, is evident from the early eleventh century (Belmont and Vielliard 1997:177; Trotter 2009b:154).<sup>8</sup>

The phenomenon is clearly not one restricted to the Middle Ages. A modern builder who (quite correctly) refers to the cornerstone or external angle of a building as a “quoin,” presumably does so little realizing that this is a word of Anglo-Norman origin.<sup>9</sup> Nor, or so it seems, is it the case that in the type of text which I am dealing with here, recourse was had to Anglo-Norman because of any lexical deficiency in medieval Latin. In other words, the “borrowing from necessity” hypothesis is itself unnecessary. The essential point is that our assumptions about the boundaries between languages are difficult to perceive at this distance, but that it is not obviously the case that matters then were as we would interpret them now. It can be argued that there is any amount of material, in the form of theoretical treatises about, in particular, the learning of French, which militates against such an interpretation, and suggests that authors at the time were every bit as cognizant of the distinctions between languages as we now are. But the authors of the functional and utilitarian documents of the type cited here cannot automatically be assumed to have had the same level of sophisticated metalinguistic awareness as the authors of such works as the *Orthographia Gallica*; and an awareness of the difference between *languages* is not the same as a consciousness of the “nationality” of an individual word.

**2.1.5.** In the case of personal names, the boundaries are more muddled still (Trotter 2012c). In part, this is because first attestations of proper names, notably in the form of surnames (or bynames), are often in documents such as witness-lists, where there is no discernible referent, and often nothing beyond the name itself with its two component parts (i.e., forename plus surname; cf. McClure 2010; Postles 1995). This, obviously, makes it almost impossible to determine which language we are dealing with unless the (unabbreviated) suffix clarifies this. So, for example, in the following case, it is reasonably certain that Roland, whose unsavory personal practices appear to have secured for him not only a serjeanty but also a degree of notoriety in Norfolk and beyond, is being designated

8. H  l  ne Carles’s work on toponyms in the Auvergne shows that the process began (at least with place-names or elements thereof) much earlier (Carles 2011).

9. The first *OED* attestation (1350) is in the compound *coynston* (“600 de coynston”), based on the variant spelling *coin*; the source is a London Bridge inventory in Anglo-Norman. The *OED* quotes from Riley’s 1868 edition which only provides an English translation on the page cited. *MED* has this also under **coin** n.(1), as “[600 of] coynston.” Obviously, working from a translation is not ideal. *Quoin/coin* does not appear to be attested in Anglo-Norman itself with this exact sense although the *DMF* has examples sub **coin** which are essentially the same (albeit not in technical contexts).

by an Anglo-Norman name, since the spellings all end in *-ur* or *-our* (new *AND* entry):

**[petour], pettour, pettur**

s. *one who (frequently?) breaks wind, (habitual?) farter (used as a surname)*: serjantia que quondam fuit Rollandi le Pettour . . . pro qua debuit facere die Natali Domini singulis annis coram domino rege saltum et siffletum et unum bumbulum *DMLBS* sub **bombulus**; dicunt quod Rollandus le Pettus (*l. Pettur*) tenuit . . . serjantiam faciendi saltum, siffletum, pettum *DMLBS* sub **siffletum**.

Another interpretation is that Roland is a professional flatulist: a *pétomane avant la lettre*. He provides at any rate what is thus far the only evidence for the clearly Anglo-Norman substantive *petour*, and indeed the only instances in French lexicography outside—and earlier than—Latin-French glosses of the fourteenth century (cf. *Gdf* 10:328c; Tobler, Lommatzsch, and Christmann 1925-2002:7,867; *DMF* sub **péteur**; *FEW* 8:132a: “14.-15. jh.”).<sup>10</sup> The case for inclusion in the *AND* is more straightforward than that of the still hypothetical *\*gupilleret* (section 2.1.3).

A slightly different case is the *MED*’s **hauberger**, which furnishes a series of attestations of what appears to be an Anglo-Norman form but (at least in the earliest cases) in Latin contexts:

- (1201) in *PipeR.Soc. n.s.14* 183: Willelmus le *Haubergier*.
- (1209) *Lib.R.King John* (PRO 62) 116: Emericus le *Hauberger*.
- (1251) in Fransson *Surn.* 150: Pet. the *Hauberger*.
- (1311) in G. Otto *Handwerkernamen* 31: *Haubergier*.
- (1326) in Fransson *Surn.* 150: Steph. le *Hauberger*.

Again, the first example here apparently antedates (and certainly dates more precisely) what other medieval French dictionaries have to offer, since the first instance of the word in French is from the first quarter of the thirteenth century (FlorenceW 1080, *DEAF* H 285; cf. *Gdf* 4:436c; Tobler, Lommatzsch, and Christmann 1925-2002:4,994; *DMF* sub **haubergier**; *FEW* 16:134b: “13. jh.”). *AND*’s **hauberger**<sup>2</sup> has nothing older. *DMLBS* **haubergerius** (first attestation: 1212)<sup>11</sup> gives as the etymology “[OF *haubergier*]” but it looks as if this should probably read “AN.”

**2.1.6.** In place-names, the use of the Anglo-Norman definite article *le* in compound names (e.g., *Chester-le-Street*), seemingly invariably followed by an element which is English (Anglo-Saxon), has been discussed elsewhere (Trotter 2010a:59-60); the subject has received more thorough investigation by Wright (2010) and Ingham (2011).<sup>12</sup> The status of *le* as an

10. I am grateful to Laura Wright for this reference which has made possible an addition to the *AND*.
11. *DMLBS* sub **testera**, **testaria** has the following from 1210: “Eimerico le Hauberger, pro testaria ad equum para[nda].”
12. Cf. also: “The French definite article *le*, *la* could be prefixed to any place-name containing words in appellative use, as is *La Fairok*, ‘the beautiful oak’ = Farock (So.), *La Blakebrok* = Blackbrook (Db), *La Doune* = Down (K), *Lappal* (Wo) from earlier *Lappole*, i.e., ‘the pool’. *Le* or *la* in this function merely translates the English article,

introducer of a non-Latin element is evident in (certainly) place-names and (possibly) personal names. Many of these last offer remarkably early attestations of occupational bynames (McClure 2010) and it is not inconceivable that the use of *le* in this context facilitated its generalization as a switch-indicator.<sup>13</sup> A Boolean query on the *MED*'s database on *ad + le*, *cum + le*, *pro + le* yields 369 quotations, of which only eight offer instances of *le* followed by a (possibly) Anglo-Norman word:

Vestimentum meum rubium cum leonibus ad aurum *cum le contrefrontel* de eadem secta.: *Will York* in *Sur.Soc.* 30 139 sub *c untre-* (pref.)

In 2 robis emp. vz. *pro le catour* de H'tilpull et le catour de Hawthorn: *Acc. R. Dur.* in *Sur. Soc.* 99 44: sub **cātōur** (n.)

Pro 3 kirsettes ferri empt. *pro le Raunge*, 6 s.: *Acc.R.Dur.* in *Sur.Soc.* 99 93: sub **raunġe** (n.(1))

*Pro le napperie* in ospicio, 2 s.: *Sacrist R. Ely* 2 144: sub **nāperī(e)** (n.)

Et pro iij tabulis de elme *pro le punyon* ibidem.: (1459-1460) *Acc.St.Michael Bath* in *SANHS* 25 56: sub **pinōun** (n.)

Pro..iij crampons *pro le tablement* eiusdem Turris inde firmando.: *Acc. Exch.K.R.473/11.m.2* [OD col.]: sub **tāblement** (n.)

Ricardo Smyth pro . . . 2 barellez *pro le vergieux*, 16 d.: *Acc.R.Dur.* in *Sur. Soc.* 99 275: sub **verjōus** (n.)

*Pro le parlour*, j candelabrum pendule de auricalco cum vj soketts.: *Invent. Norwich* in *Nrf.Archaeol.* 12 222: sub **soket** (n.1)

Once more, these are words which in at least some cases are absent from the *AND*, either because they have not been picked up by the editors even though they are attested in Anglo-Norman, or because they have not been found—or not yet—in Anglo-Norman sources. Thus *contrefrontel* is lacking in the documentary record, though *contrefro(u)nt* is found in our sources (it is attested in *AND* sub **ciel**<sup>1</sup>, **[desteint]**<sup>1</sup>, **corporal**, but without its own entry in the dictionary). *Parlour*, *vergieux*, *tablement*, *napperie* are all found in the *AND* under the same or similar spellings, and with the same meanings. *Catour* is listed as an aphetic variant under **achatur**, 'buyer, purchaser'.<sup>14</sup> *MED*'s **pinōun**, derived from Anglo-Norman *pinnon* and here in a quotation from 1459-1460 (among the older quotations, the first two (from 1278) are also in Latin matrix texts), has no corresponding *AND* entry despite the fact that it is attested from 1174 in Guernes de Pont-Sainte-Maxence's

---

which still lingers on in many p.n. consisting of words in common use [. . .]. Somewhat more restricted was the the use of *le* in descriptive additions to p.n., such as Chester-le-Street (Du), 'the chester on the Roman Road', Mareham-le-Fen (L), Hamble-le-Rice (Ha), i.e., 'in the brushwood'. [. . .] This AFR. formula has survived to the present day in three or four score of names. By some popular notion *le*, later on, came to be looked upon as a preposition with the sense of 'on, 'with', or 'by' [. . .]' (Zachrisson 1929:95).

13. Ingham (2011) argues against this, I think correctly, on the basis of government theory where the determiner (here *le*) is the head of the Determiner Phrase.

14. The quotation here from *MED* **catōur** is from 1364; there are interestingly early surname attestations of the same form in the *MED* (1190s), confirming the frequent trend where surname attestations of substantives are among the oldest; cf. Trotter 2012c.

*Vie de saint Thomas* v. 686 (DEAF: SThomGuernW<sup>2</sup>), referring not, as here, to a gable-end of a roof but to a mountain-top: “L’eschelguaite est la sus el *pignon* de cel munt; / Veit les larrons el val ki embuschié se sunt / Pur prendre les errantz ki par le chemin vont.” This is the first known attestation of *pignon* in French (Imbs *et al.* 1971–1994 sub **pignon**<sup>2</sup>). *AND*’s **reng** only has the sense of ‘row’, rather than the “fireplace, stove” (mod. Eng. *range*) meant in the *MED*’s example, one of several fifteenth-century attestations in Latin texts (cf. *OED* sub **range** n.<sup>1</sup>, II,5). The first of these, from a Durham will of 1423) has rather than *pro le Raunge* the more overtly Anglo-Norman “pour le range”: “Pro j longo brandyryn pour le range, pro ollis superponendis,” that is, a different switch-site—at the preposition, not the article. *Ra(u)nge* itself—the velarized form is the normal prerequisite for the English [einʒ]—although cited in the *AND* variants, is attested only once in the citations in the *AND* (as pl. *raunges*, sub **free**), not at all in either the text-base accompanying the dictionary, and only once in our other resources, in an unusable citation which contains the word *raungez* in a (translated) sentence (Salzman 1952:98).<sup>15</sup>

The normal pattern is however clear: *le* in a Latin text introduces English, not Anglo-Norman, just as in the place-names (Wright 2010). To put it another way, we seem to have *le* used simply to introduce the *vernacular* (Anglo-Norman, rarely, or English, usually), which prompted my probably somewhat rash (and certainly inchoate) suggestion (Trotter 2010a:59-60; Wright 2010) that in at least some medieval documents, the system is essentially a binary, rather than a ternary, one, with the opposition being simply between Latin and the vernacular, and (implicitly therefore) with no distinction between Anglo-Norman and English.<sup>16</sup> This radical and quite possibly mistaken suggestion (cf. Ingham 2011:100) is not incompatible with the argument that at some stage during the process of incorporation of Anglo-Norman words into English, these must have begun to be perceived as simply English, rather than Anglo-Norman. It is clear that

15. Salzman refers to a National Archives (Public Record Office) document concerning Eltham in 1403: “a great fireplace of two *raungez* in the new kitchen” E502.24, but without even saying what language the document is written in. This citation is picked up by J. P. Collas in the approximately 1,000,000 slips that he bequeathed to William Rothwell.

16. Medieval grammarians dealing with Anglo-Norman and for that matter, medieval French in general, interpreted the definite article as a morpheme which marked case and number: “Tout montre que l’article *le* était perçu implicitement, ou explicitement, comme un indicateur morphologique des propriétés morpho-syntaxiques du nom en français (le genre, le nombre) . . .” (Andrieux-Reix and Monsonégo 1997:324). Cf. “Quantez cases est il? Six. Quelx? Nominatif, genitif, datif, accusatif, vocatif, ablatif, et ils sont cognuz par leurs signez. Qui sont ils? Ces trois: *le, du, au*. *Le* est signe du nominatif ou du accusatif, *du* est signe de le genitif ou le ablatif et *au* est signe du datif” (Städtler 1988:131). The word *article* itself in medieval grammatical writing is ambiguous as it can mean both “demonstrative adjective” (cf. DonatS 13, Städtler 1988:126) and “article” (DonatOxf 44, Städtler 1988:134). Cf. discussion (and bibliography) in Städtler 1988:169–171.

they did eventually become so viewed: the difficult question is when, and how we can know when.

**2.1.7.** The history of the emergence of the Romance languages, or rather of their consignment to writing, offers some support for the general hypothesis of non-distinguishing of languages adumbrated above. It is clearly the case that at some stage during this process (and the Carolingian Renaissance seems the most likely candidate) authors and scribes became aware of the fundamental distinction between the language they were speaking, and beginning to think about writing, and the Latin which they had learned. Nevertheless, at various moments during the slow move towards the development of autonomous Romance writing systems, there must inevitably have been uncertainty. The recent ground-breaking study by H el ene Carles (2011) of the emergence of “pre-textual” Occitan provides extensive evidence of how such uncertainty accompanied the formation of a written version of a spoken language. While this pattern within the history of Romance is obviously diachronic, that is, played out over a period of time, it is not fundamentally different from the synchronic (parallel) data which medieval Latin documents with inserted Anglo-Norman words provide. What we have in this case is a largely, if not exclusively, written language (Latin), alongside which lies a language both spoken and written (Anglo-Norman), and what the sources are able to show us is the process whereby they may, under certain circumstances and especially within certain text-types, be fused at the level of the individual lexeme.

## **2.2. Anglo-Norman and Middle English.**

**2.2.1.** The situation with regard to Middle English is in some ways comparable, in others radically different. Ardis Butterfield writes thus of the complexities of the (socio)linguistic situation:

The Anglo-French culture that existed in England for several centuries prevented either English or French from being a single condition. To speak French was no less an English act than to speak English. Conversely, to speak English was to speak only one of the English vernaculars. It was a divided and unequal but shared linguistic culture [ . . . ] This is not merely because French influenced English as a matter of lexis or etymology, though this is important, but that its presence as Anglo-French within an English culture gave English a sibling language with which it was in uneasy competition. French was both internal and external to English . . . (Butterfield 2009:353)

These observations echo, from a more linguistic and literary perspective, those by Richard Sharpe and Ian Short on identity and the terms used by the Anglo-Norman nobility to define themselves in the later part of the twelfth century (Short 1996; Sharpe 2012; cf. Georgi 2008). These points are worth remembering as we scrutinize the textual evidence. It could be argued that what is encountered is very much like that which

is found in Latin: what are (to us) visibly Anglo-Norman words, incorporated in a Middle English matrix text. If we knew nothing more about the history either of such words, or of the evolution of English itself, we would conclude that the situation was indeed directly analogous to that obtaining between Anglo-Norman and Latin. But of course that is not the case, and it is therefore inevitable that the evidence (though similar) lends itself to a fundamentally different interpretation. What we know, in this case, is that these are words which subsequently found their way into English, and became naturalized there (Trotter 1998b, 2009c, 2011c, 2011e). The insertion of individual words into otherwise pristine Middle English documents, then, is part of a dynamic process which was to relexify the English language itself.<sup>17</sup> In a number of respects, this creates (and has certainly created) some confusion among lexicographers and lexicologists alike. Thus the *Middle English Dictionary* and the *Oxford English Dictionary* both routinely produce, in the citations that support their articles, quotations in Latin or in Anglo-Norman, containing the relevant and ostensibly English word. Thus, none of the first four quotations sub **pōuntāge** in the *MED* is in English, which the *MED* points out by the use of square brackets around the quotation:

[(1251) *Cart. Ramsey* in *RS 79.1* 296: Tenentes sui dant cum villata ad auxilium vicecomitis, wardepeny, *pontagium*, wodehac. ]

[(1302) *RParl.* 1.155a: Prient les gentz . . . qe nostre Seigneur le Roi les voille granter *pountage* par cink anns.]

[(1403) *Pet. Hen. IV* in *BGAS 18* 58: Leur heirs . . . soient ffraunkes et quites . . de tolne, *pontage*, passage, pannage.]

[(1391) *Acc. Exped. Der.* in *Camd. n.s.* 52 7/17: Johanni Waterman et sociis suis pro *pountage* apud Douere, vj s. viij d.]

Not until 1447 is the word attested in a genuinely (unambiguously) English context:

(1447) \**Ordin. Exch. (PRO)* [OD col.] 35.c.62(b).A.v: For euerye viewe of customers of Tonnage and *pontage* and pety custome of London and Bystowe.

This quotation is also the *OED*'s second (sub **pontage**, n.), but there preceded by another which antedates the *MED*'s English first attestation by well over a century:

a1325 *Statutes of Realm* in *MS Rawl. B.520* f. 20<sup>v</sup>, De lord king grauntez þat . . . of . . . tollage, tronage, passage, *pontage* . . . lith fram nou forth ward assise of nouele disseisine.

The same is true of *MED*'s **grōcer**, where the first English quotation comes fifty years after the dictionary's first "attestation," in Anglo-Norman:

17. The use of the term "relexify" does not of course imply adherence to the now discredited creolization hypothesis, on which see Trotter 2012a.



[(1363) *Statutes Realm* 1.379: Les Marchauntz nomez *grossers* engrossent totes maneres des marchandises vendables, & le pris de tiele marchandise lev-ent sodeinement.]

(1418) *Grocer Lond.* in *Bk.Lond.E.* 200/190: William Grome, Freman of london, vsyd to sel dyuerz Warez to the Fraternalite of *Grocerz*, And aftyr retay-lyd to diuerz men.

It is possibly significant that this first quotation appears to offer a quasi-binomial explanation of “les marchauntz nomez grossers.” The *OED* (sub **grocer**, n.) offers one earlier Anglo-Norman quotation (from 1321) but nothing which antedates the strictly English use (its first English context is from 1427). The earliest *DEAF* attestation for the sense “marchand en gros” is from a continental source from 1303 (PéageChalonA 82; *DEAF* G 1490) with an Anglo-Norman example from 1311. The *AND* entry sub **groser** does not have any earlier attestations.

**2.2.2.** Clearly, once the chronologically arrayed quotations themselves start to be in English, the naturalization process has taken place or is at the very least under way; equally, however, there is no reason why we should not continue to interpret an Anglo-Norman word within an English sentence as a borrowing, conscious or not. As was the case with the Anglo-Norman and Latin material discussed in section 2.1, it is simply not possible to determine at what point a word taken from Anglo-Norman is sufficiently assimilated that it is no longer perceived as an element extraneous to the lexicon of Middle English. It is frequently the case that words of this type, even if they manifest themselves in Middle English, do not survive beyond the medieval period, thus confirming the assumption that there was a sizeable number of words which appear to have enjoyed loanword status, but (as is common with loanwords in general) have never been fully incorporated into the target language. Two examples of this are the near-synonymous *benefetour* and *benfesour*, neither of which has survived into modern English, whereas the Latinism *benefactor* has. This raises an interesting question of the status of these particular words in Middle English, because we now know something which no speaker or writer at the time could possibly have known, namely, whether they were really going to be absorbed into English. This is a type of knowledge to which we cannot be party in respect of Latin.

A second example of the difficulties which the taking-over of Anglo-Norman words into Middle English creates, is furnished by Sandahl in his remarkable study of *Middle English Sea Terms* (Sandahl 1951–1982). Here, Sandahl has a tendency to describe as “M.E.” words which in their first attestations within his collection, at least, are in fact incorporated in Anglo-Norman texts, and which are themselves words of impeccable Anglo-Norman pedigree (Trotter 2006:76-80).<sup>18</sup> Clearly, since these are

18. On the interpenetration of Anglo-Norman and English in shipping and shipbuilding terminology, see also Trotter 2003e, 2005b.

words which have survived into English, at some point they must have passed the citizenship test and become, henceforth, simply part of the technical lexis of the English language, but determining exactly when that took place is well-nigh impossible. We have, that is, a substantial period during which these are at best words of ambivalent status, and in respect of which hard-and-fast conclusions as to how they were perceived by contemporaries are impossible to draw. Yet this is precisely the period which the *AND* and *MED* seek to document.

**2.2.3.** The main chronological period during which this process appears to have occurred (and across which such uncertainties are extensively found) is precisely that point at which, as far as other sources can tell us, the use of French (Anglo-Norman) among formerly monoglot Anglophones was on the increase, as it became the language of the governing class. The historians Richard Sharpe and Serge Lusignan concur on the importance of its use in law and public affairs, albeit proposing somewhat different dates for the process and its concomitant linguistic impact: Sharpe writes that

For several decades after the Conquest there were interpreters who held land of the king by this serjeanty. As time passed, they were not needed, because more and more English-speakers learnt to get by in French. By the late twelfth century the meetings of shires had become smaller and more frequent, and most of their business was conducted in French. Ignorance of French was not a bar to participation but it marked someone as outside the governing class. French had widened from being the language of the invader to become the language of public activity, keeping English for the most part below the documentary horizon for more than two hundred years. (Sharpe 2012:110–111)

with Lusignan observing that

Les développements de l'administration et de la justice eurent pour conséquence qu'à compter du tournant du XIII<sup>e</sup> au XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle, la maîtrise du français devint un facteur déterminant de la carrière d'hommes appartenant à des catégories sociales autres que la noblesse [. . .] à partir du moment où l'anglo-français devint l'une des langues d'écriture de l'administration royale et que son usage se répandit dans les tribunaux, on constate son extension à toutes les régions sur lesquelles le roi exerçait son autorité. (Lusignan 2012:37, 38–39)<sup>19</sup>

It is unlikely to have been coincidental that the rise in the number of users of French (among sections of the population which had not previously known the language) should occur at the same time as the wholesale transfer of Anglo-Norman terminology into Middle English. We might suppose that those who had learnt Anglo-Norman in this way, and doubtless

19. This last phrase seems to contradict the view that Anglo-Norman “was largely confined to the South-east of England and the Home Counties” (Hunt 2003:385), also suggested by Rothwell (1983). For a counter-argument see Trotter (2012d), which draws in part on unpublished medieval documents in Anglo-Norman from rural Westmorland.

imperfectly,<sup>20</sup> would have been aware of the origin of those words which they were then going to incorporate into their English documents, but we have no proof of this either way. There is certainly nothing, in the main, in the way in which Anglo-Norman words are used within Middle English to suggest that the majority of writers saw any need to give any indication that these lexemes were other than straightforward words to be used in an English sentence. We do not get indications of the type found in Latin texts (*vulgariter, quod vulgo vocatur, etc.*) to the effect that these are foreign words that need to be flagged as such.

**2.2.4.** Moreover, there is some circumstantial evidence in glosses and in place-names to suggest that metalinguistic awareness of the distinction between the two languages was at best sporadic. So, in significant numbers of glosses in Tony Hunt's *Teaching and Learning Latin* (2003), glossators into the vernacular mislabel the language of the gloss, typically over-using the indication *anglice* for words which, to us, are patently Anglo-Norman. William Rothwell comments on one such ("*firmitor, -ris*: rameur, barquier anglice," Hunt 1991:II,109) and goes on to point out: "The erroneous attribution *anglice* occurs not infrequently in these glosses, an indication not that the glossators were fools, but of the extent to which the two vernaculars, English and French, were entwined in the consciousness of many educated Englishmen in the later Middle Ages. Compare *ansa*: gallice handle (Hunt 1991:1,138) and *gingiva*: gallice gummus (II, 155)" (Rothwell 1993:592, n. 25). Hunt puts it slightly differently but makes the same point: "scribes used *anglice* and *gallice* indiscriminately to indicate *vernacular* as distinct, in a diglossic situation, from Latin" (Hunt 2003:382). It is not always easy to determine whether *anglice* is in fact "erroneous," precisely because the boundary between the lexis of Anglo-Norman and that of English is not clear.<sup>21</sup> So, for example, out of 1681 vernacular words beginning with A- (which category also includes all glosses preceded by "anglice") in Tony Hunt's *magnum opus* (Hunt 1991), 598 or over a third are explicitly desig-

20. This thesis is at variance with that argued by Richard Ingham, where it is argued that the continuing regularity of Anglo-Norman grammatical features, and in particular the close parallels between the evolution of Anglo-Norman and continental French (the former not displaying the English influence which might reasonably be anticipated), point to continued "natural" transmission of Anglo-Norman, rather than its having been relegated to the status of a second language learnt by its users (the conventional view). I return to these questions in section 2.3.

21. Margaret Laing makes a similar observation, but from an Anglicist's perspective: "With glosses [i.e., such as those published by Tony Hunt] you have no context other than a single word. It's sometimes very difficult to say any more than that they are 'vernacular'. For instance, unless they are labelled *Gallice* or *Anglice*, at what point do you decide whether the word is English or whether it's still thought of as French? [. . .] Probably, in many cases, it cannot be decided. They were words that were known to both English and French speakers in England and 'vernacular' is the best word to describe them" (Laing and Williamson 1994:61).

nated “anglice.” Of these, the following may be regarded (from a modern perspective) as problematic:

calathus: anglice panier II 26; calofurcium: anglice gybet I 322; catena: anglice cheynne I 41; cicuta: gallice humbeloc, anglice herbe beneyt II 160; edilis: anglice meire II 16; farricapa: anglice hotte II 145; fel: anglice galle II 33; fercula: anglice faudestole II 148; herodius: anglice gerfaukyn I 322; lathomus: anglice massun II 27; lucinias: anglice chardunrol I 68; multorium anglice hudur de la vache II 156; onocrotalus: anglice bytor I 393; parasitus: gallice glotun (C), anglice glutun (D) II 27; renones: anglice tabars II 60; scala: anglice escole II 57; toga: anglice gunel II 19; tuba: gallice appellantur busyne . . . anglice appellatur trompe II 154; vafer: anglice vesie (*l. vesié*) II 170; ydria: anglice cuvel II 57.

While some of these words are indisputably and only Anglo-Norman, and were never to generate an equivalent English term—*panier*, *hotte*, *galle*, *faudestole*, *chardunrol*, *bytor*, *escole* (i.e., *eschele*, ‘ladder’), *gunel*, *vesiê*—, the others have been taken over into English and may well therefore have been en route into English at the time when these glosses were compiled. The dates at which these terms are unambiguously attested in English are as follows:

- gybet*: in Hunt 1991, from fifteenth-century manuscript of *Exoticon* of Alexander of Hales, itself first third of the thirteenth century: attested in English 1225 (*OED* sub **gibbet**, n.<sup>1</sup>);
- herbe beneyt*: in Hunt 1991, from John of Garland, *Unius Omnium*, mid thirteenth century: attested in English a1445 (*OED* sub **bennet**, n.<sup>1</sup>);
- meire*: in Hunt 1991, from gloss to Alexander of Villa Dei, *Doctrinale*, first half of thirteenth century: attested in English 1448 (*OED* **mayor**, n.), c1300 (*MED* sub **mair(e)**);
- gerfaukyn*: in Hunt 1991, from fifteenth-century manuscript of *Exoticon* of Alexander of Hales, itself first third of the thirteenth century; another (thirteenth-century) manuscript glosses the same word (*herodius*) with “gerfauc gallice”: attested in English c. 1330 (*OED* sub **gyrfalcon**, n.);
- massun*: in Hunt 1991, from gloss to Eberhard of Béthune, *Graecismus*, c. 1212, from a thirteenth-century manuscript; attested in English [?]a1200 = *machun*, [?]c1300 = *maçoun* (*OED* sub **mason**, n.<sup>1</sup>);
- glutun*: in Hunt 1991, from gloss to Eberhard of Béthune, *Graecismus*, c. 1212, thirteenth-century manuscript<sup>2/2</sup>, cf. another thirteenth-century manuscript, which glosses “gallice glotun”; attested in English [?]a1200 (*OED* sub **glutton**, n. and adj.);
- tabars*: in Hunt 1991, from Adam de Petit Pont, *De Utensilibus*, twelfth-century text<sup>1/2</sup>, fourteenth-century manuscript: c. 1300 (*OED* sub **tabard**, n.);
- trompe*: in Hunt 1991, from John of Garland, *Dictionarius*, c. 1220; thirteenth-century manuscript: attested in English 1297 (*OED* sub **trump** n.<sup>1</sup>);
- cuvel*: in Hunt 1991, from Adam de Petit Pont, *De Utensilibus*, twelfth-century text<sup>1/2</sup>, thirteenth-century<sup>ex</sup> manuscript: attested in English c. 1325 (*MED* sub **c\_vel**)

From this information, we can plausibly draw one of two conclusions. Either some of these words should be interpreted as Anglo-Norman (and

the glossator is wrong), or the glossators are right, and this evidence allows an antedating of current dictionary attestations. It is not certain that the label “anglice” is necessarily either erroneous or indiscriminate, despite first appearances. The overwhelming majority of the attributions are, after all, correct. Just because the glossators’ identification as *anglice* of the words *herbe beneyt*, *meire*, *gerfaukyn*, is certainly at variance with what modern dictionaries would have us believe, does not mean that we should assume that the authors of the glosses are wrong. *Gerfaukyn* and *glutun* are interesting in that different manuscripts label them English or Anglo-Norman. A particularly instructive case is the gloss to *multorium*: “hudur de la vache”, i.e., an English *udder* attached to an Anglo-Norman cow.

Philip Durkin has shown how within the *OED*, significant numbers of unattested Anglo-Norman words lurk beneath the surface of Middle English ones which are undoubtedly derivatives from Anglo-Norman (Durkin 2012).<sup>22</sup> William Rothwell has written extensively and illuminatingly on these processes (see in particular Rothwell 1980, 1985, 1991, 1992, 1994, 1998, 2001, 2004). I have touched on the general question of the usefulness of evidence in one language but which provides information about another (much less systematically than Durkin) in a number of previous studies regarding both English (Trotter 1996, 2003c, 2009b, 2012b) and Latin (Trotter 2010b). Dialectal English evidence also appears to conceal lost Anglo-Norman terms (Trotter 2012b; 2012d); yet received wisdom has it that Anglo-Norman was primarily “a largely urban and court phenomenon” (Short 2009:249), even though there is clear evidence of language contact among the landowning classes (Rothwell 2008). Postles (1995) has shown that by the fourteenth century, Anglo-Norman bynames and nicknames were being acquired even by the rural peasantry, at least in some areas. Modern English also shows in its more vulgar register that there was transmission of some decidedly uncultivated lexical items (Rothwell 1996a, 1996b). I return to the implications for lexicographers of all these phenomena in the conclusion to this article.

**2.3. Anglo-Norman and continental French.** The relationship between Anglo-Norman and continental French obviously predates the Conquest. What I am interested in here is not so much the *origin* of Anglo-Norman (and the dialectal peculiarities which early texts display), or even how it subsequently evolved away from emergent continental norms (if there were any such, they came into being later than is often alleged), but the

22. “The approximately 33% of *OED3* so far published contains approximately 100 etymologies that suggest the possible (and in some cases very probable) existence of an Anglo-French word that is not recorded by *AND*, and for which the *OED* editors are unaware of any evidence in documents written in Anglo-French” (Durkin 2012:102). Romanists are obviously familiar with the phenomenon, where either Romance words are hidden in Latin form, or Romance continues Latin forms which are otherwise lost. Cf. Vårvaro 2013.

question of Anglo-Norman's continued contact with the French of France. It has been rightly stated that the relationship of early Anglo-Norman to continental Norman is "difficult to assess because of the dearth of comparable dated material from the Continent" (Short 2007:24). That is obviously a problem: Anglo-Norman texts antedate continental texts, to such an extent that David Howlett has provocatively suggested that the origins of Old French literature are to be found in England (Howlett 1996). Some of the earliest "Norman" texts (which are the logical comparator) survive only in later, and unhelpfully Anglo-Norman, manuscripts. So, for example, although the Hildesheim manuscript of the *Vie de saint Alexis* supposedly contains a Norman text from the last decade or so of the eleventh century, the manuscript itself is Anglo-Norman from c. 1120, and all the other early manuscripts are also Insular. The sermon *Grant mal fist Adam* (DEAF: GrantMals<sup>1</sup>), similarly, is a Norman text from the second quarter of the twelfth century, surviving in a late-thirteenth-century Anglo-Norman manuscript. The "formule de Fécamp" (DEAF: EpreuveJudicG; Gersbach 1965) from the early twelfth century is a possible point of comparison. This is a 64-line mixed-language text of which barely a third is in French (some of it heavily Latinized) and the remainder (the majority) in Latin. It is a rather limited basis on which to compare Anglo-Norman and Norman. There is nothing else in localizable Norman *scripta* before 1160 (Möhren 2007:778). Pope's list of illustrative texts (1934, §1326) for the western region of France has nothing Norman (except GrantMals<sup>1</sup>—which, as we have seen, survives in an Anglo-Norman manuscript) before Wace in the 1160s. Comparing early Anglo-Norman texts, such as Gaimar's chronicles or the writings of Philippe de Thaon (who has a suspiciously Norman name), with continental material is thus decidedly problematic. So when editors of the *Brendan* refer to divergences between Benedeit's language and that of "the hypothetical Continental standard" (Short and Merrilees 1979:12, quoted by Hemming 1989:2), it is difficult to know quite what is meant; and of course Normandy (to judge by its modern dialectal diversity: Horiot 1990:618-624) is unlikely itself to have been all of one piece. Waters' introduction to his older but still irreplaceable edition is predominantly concerned with Benedeit's language (Waters 1928:cxxv-cc1), rather than with a comparison with continental dialects, but he does comment towards the end of his detailed account of the features of the *Brendan*:

How far were these peculiarities of Benedeit's language the result of purely insular development? Which of them had been brought over from the Continent by the followers of William the Conqueror? To these questions it is probably impossible to give a complete answer. Of French dialects in the eleventh century and the first quarter of the twelfth century we know very little save what can be inferred from their later characteristics. Continental parallels can be found for almost every one of the peculiarities in question . . . The fact that Anglo-Norman had not become strongly differentiated from continental

dialects within two generations of the Conquest need cause no surprise. (Waters 1928:CXCIX-CC)

Nevertheless, accounts of the dialectological specificity of Anglo-Norman are not lacking and have not fundamentally changed since the earliest contributions (Menger 1904; Vising 1923; Pope 1934; Burgess 1995; Short 2007). Early Anglo-Norman does indeed look like the earlier Norman texts we have, but the oldest texts also appear to show signs of influence from other areas, or maybe it is that the distinctions between regions are not as clear-cut as we assume them to have been. The accounts of its particularities also emphasize, perhaps inadvertently, the extent to which even the older stages of Anglo-Norman display features associated also with other—indeed, with virtually *all* other—regions of the *oïl* region. The still authoritative treatment by Mildred Pope (1934) exemplifies this (the emphases are mine):

Throughout the period, but more especially in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, the growing importance of *Paris and its speech* increased the influence exercised by *francien* on Anglo-Norman (§ 1186)

The influence of *francien* was strong enough, especially when supported by the *northern pronunciation*, to influence spelling considerably and to introduce some forms and pronunciations that displaced, partially or wholly, those current in Anglo-Norman which were of *western* origin (§ 1187)

Isolated forms in the works of some of the writers of the later twelfth and early thirteenth centuries indicate contact with the *speech of the south-western region*: Anjou, Maine, Touraine [. . .] (§ 1195)

The closer political and commercial relations entertained with Ponthieu and Flanders in the later thirteenth and fourteenth centuries encouraged the use of *northern forms in insular speech and spelling* [. . .] (§ 1200)

Clearly we need to disregard the confusion (endemic through Pope's work) between speech and spelling, but on the face of it, her treatment paints a picture not of dialectal isolation, but of a variety firmly connected to France, or at the very least, whose written manifestations display clear linkages to the language of French documents (cf. De Jong 1988, 1996).<sup>23</sup> This, as we shall see, is entirely consistent with the pattern of cultural, diplomatic, and trading connections across the Channel during the Middle Ages (cf. Trotter 2011a), and it also fits with a trend among dialectologists

23. Cf. Tony Hunt's comments: "Early Continental influence was Norman (esp. Manche and Maine-et-Loire, later Eure and Seine-Maritime) and the influence of Western French, the old empire of the Plantagenets, lasted until the fourteenth century; the influence of Paris was always small (though increasing in the fourteenth century, that of Picardy even smaller. The non-insular character of Anglo-French is a marked development of the fourteenth century" (Hunt 2003:385). I am slightly suspicious of the geographical precision implicit in the use when discussing medieval dialects of the relatively small post-Revolutionary *départements*. Cf. Trotter 2005a:21, n. 18: "Rares sont les textes français (à part les chartes) qu'on se permettrait de localiser même au niveau du département."

to think less in terms of dialect areas than of dialect continua, and of geographical points on a map rather than isoglosses.<sup>24</sup>

**2.3.1.** Ian Short (2007:25) has sensibly observed that “Just as there is a danger of presupposing a greater linguistic uniformity among Anglo-Norman speakers and writers than might actually have existed, so there is a risk in forgetting that Continental French must have exerted continual pressure and influence on its Insular counterpart.” This comment might, in fact, reasonably be extended to the whole question not only of medieval French dialectology, but of dialectology itself. The study of dialectal form is by definition, and of necessity, an inherently differential one. What one is looking for is that which demarcates, identifies, and classifies; hence, in part, what has been called (and not with approval) “the isolating comparison of Insular French with so-called Francien” (Hunt 2003:381; cf. Trotter 2003a, 2003b). A disturbingly high proportion of the ostensibly salient features of medieval French dialects are, however, shared across quite wide regions, a classic example being the absence of palatalization north of the Ligne Joret. A sizeable region is included in the zone so affected. Eastern and north-eastern French varieties, such as Picard, Walloon, and Lorrain, exhibit a large number of common characteristics which are surprising given the geographical spread which the varieties themselves cover (cf. Trotter 2005a:20-45). Even by taking what in modern terms would be treated as an isogloss bundle, it is difficult to draw hard-and-fast lines on a map of the north-eastern *oïl* area. Anglo-Norman, in other words, is by no means anomalous in the extent to which it shares linguistic features with other dialects, in the case of Anglo-Norman necessarily dialects found across the Channel. Moreover, as Gilles Roques has more than once demonstrated (Roques 1997, 2004), Picard influence, in particular, appears to continue during the history of Anglo-Norman itself. There are a number of possible explanations for this, linked to the patterns of usage of Anglo-Norman as both a trading and a diplomatic language. Alternatively, some or all of this influence may perfectly well have come through literary connections, or through the presence in Paris (in particular) of English scholars, or, in England, of visiting French natives (Butterfield 2009:16, n. 45).

There must indeed have been “continual pressure and influence” from the continent on its insular neighbor. With regard to the spoken lan-

24. In a study of English patronyms and matronyms, Postles observes (2001:27–28) that “One recent reaction to this tradition [*sc.* that of sub-dividing the whole of M.E. into five major regions] has contested the notion that bundles of isoglosses forming dialect boundaries are normal and emphasizes more a dialect continuum rather than clear regional differentiation.” The reference is to work on and deriving from the *Linguistic Atlas of Late Mediaeval English*, and specifically to the provocative arguments aired in Benskin 1994. During the discussion after the paper, Anthonij Dees announced that in dialectological work on medieval French, he had “abandoned the notion of dialect [. . .] we in Amsterdam express ourselves in terms of a matrix of features and geographical points” (Laing and Williamson 1994:192); cf. Dees 1985.



guage, which is both the ostensible basis of any dialectological discussion, we know virtually nothing. A Wittgensteinian approach would thus be to follow the no doubt sensible injunction at the end of the *Tractatus* and to remain resolutely silent on the subject. However, the spoken language necessarily intrudes on any discussion of Anglo-Norman as either a diplomatic or as a trade language.

The argument in favor of the existence of a dialect continuum between the continent and England does not, fortunately, depend crucially on speculation about the spoken language. We know, from the study of political and diplomatic documents, not only that these were mutually comprehensible between north-eastern France and Flanders, and England, but more intriguingly, that scribes appear to have been perfectly capable when necessary of modifying their spellings to accommodate them to the system in use by the recipient of a given document (Lusignan 2004:225-252; Trotter 2009a). There is evidence from Lorraine charters which exist in multiple copies of the same phenomenon: a 1291 charter from Moselle (Schwan and Behrens 1931, no. XXVI) exists in a more regionally colored copy for Henri de Blâmont (the local lord) and in a less "lorrain" copy made for the bishop of Metz (Trotter 2005c:246, with additional examples). This, incidentally, raises some quite serious problems about the use of written evidence for any dialectological purpose: if the regional coloring of a document may depend not on the underlying dialect of the sender, but the perceived orthographic conventions obtaining where the addressee was resident, then a thorough revision of certain of the core tenets of historical dialectology is indicated. What is also revealing about this practice is that it suggests a hitherto unsuspected linguistic virtuosity among copyists of relatively mundane documents. That they were able to identify the apparently salient variable(s), and accommodate their own orthography to them, points to a familiarity with different linguistic sub-systems and an awareness of different forms which patently demolishes any naive supposition about written documents being (or being simply) the representation of a scribe's own linguistic variety. Moreover, documents of this type (and by that I mean all international diplomatic documents, whether or not they embark on adjustment to conform to another system) very clearly also confirm the mutual comprehensibility of ostensibly different written forms. This is not surprising at a period when even the most highly "dialectalized" documents do not usually display more than a minority (sometimes estimated at no more than twenty-five per cent) of regional forms, alongside an overwhelming majority of orthographic forms which are broadly common to the whole of the French-speaking area. Whether we can extrapolate from this to draw similar conclusions about the ability of the *speakers* of these varieties to make themselves understood to others not from the same dialect area, is a moot point, although the appar-

ently successful prosecution of trade and diplomacy between England and France would tend to suggest that at some level, communication was apparently not irreversibly impeded by dialect difference. I labor this point not merely because it forms part of the discussion about the boundaries of Anglo-Norman in relation to continental French, but because that relationship is central to the function, status, and indeed importance of Anglo-Norman even in England. It is hard not to think that one of the reasons for the longevity of this Romance language in a Germanic-speaking country was the access that it gave not only to the culture and influence of France and French, but to international exchanges for which French was in all probability the most frequently chosen means of communication, from the English Channel to the Holy Land. Thus, in addition to being a “maritime *lingua franca*” around the coasts of England (Kowaleski 2007, 2009), Anglo-Norman was in use in Gascony (Trotter 1997a, 1998a, 2003d), and by Italian merchants in London (Trotter 2011f; Tiddeman 2012). Because it was the language in which petitions to the Crown were written, Anglo-Norman was used to represent the requests for intervention by Spanish, Genoese, Catalan, and German sailors and merchants whose cases came under English jurisdiction (Trotter 2011b). The fact that these documents are written in impeccable Anglo-Norman confirms that they were composed in London, no doubt by local specialists (Dodd 2007:294; Ormrod 2009:8).<sup>25</sup> Some Gascon material may have been an exception (Pépin 2009:127-129), but we know in any case that documents composed in English Gascony were influenced by Gascon itself (Trotter 1997a, 1998a). It seems in fact that *most* of the petitions sent by Gascons were not Gasconized in this way (Dodd 2007:308). Nevertheless, at some stage in this process all these people must have communicated to the clerks who drafted the petitions what the substance of their grievance was, and how they would like the king to intercede; this discussion, it seems to me, can only have taken place in some form (or forms) of French.

### 3. Philological and textual considerations

**3.1. Anglo-Norman texts and continental French texts.** Scholars concur in respect of the question of how to define an “Anglo-Norman” (as opposed to continental) literary text, as described in Ruth Dean’s *Anglo-Norman Literature*:

The term Anglo-Norman has long designated the French language used in the British Isles between the Norman Conquest and the fifteenth century. For historians it has covered the more restricted period of Angevin domination: from William the Norman to John Lackland. Defining the period

25. I misunderstood this crucial point when I tackled the issue of Welsh petitions (Trotter 1994; corrected by Sharpe 2012:114, n. 306). In fact, the point had already been made long ago by Fraser 1966:xi.

for literature raises some problems. Clearly, works that have dialectal traits that distinguish them from Continental writing are Anglo-Norman. But the poems of Marie de France, written at the Angevin court in England, do not show such traits and are distinctly part of Anglo-Norman culture. Even without royal ambience we may accept also the work of Guernes de Pont-Sainte-Maxence: he was born and raised in the Île-de-France, he wrote about the recently canonized Thomas Becket, he went to England to revise his account with first-hand-material, he guided pilgrims at the shrine, and his French did not remain as free of Anglo-Normanisms as that of Marie, who described herself specifically as “de France.” Again, though Jofroi de Waterford was probably born in Ireland, he apparently wrote for an Anglo-Norman public. Consider further the *Chanson de Roland*, an epic composed on the Continent and for that society: the best manuscript of the many extant is by the hand of an Insular scribe who betrays some of his native linguistic habits. (Dean 1999:ix-x)

Similar observations are made by Ardis Butterfield.<sup>26</sup> Ian Short raises “the methodological problem of how valid Anglo-Norman literature is as a discrete category, more specifically whether dialectal difference alone is a sufficient criterion for admittance to the canon” (Short 2007:31). There is then a sense that although pertinent, a purely linguistic attribution may be overruled by Dean’s “cultural evidence” but that this is not invariably sufficient on its own. The coexistence of two potential criteria makes the matter more complicated than were we to agree on one.

Of the hundred-odd entries in the first section (“historiographical”) of Ruth Dean’s bibliographical manual (1999), a significant number corroborate her own statement of intent and at the same time exemplify the difficulty of classification:

2: *Roman de Brut by Wace*: Composed by a Norman, this poem of 14866 lines belongs to Anglo-Norman literature by its content, its influence, and the number of its Anglo-Norman manuscripts.

2.2: *Historie des Ducs de Normandie, by Benoît*: Like Wace’s Rou (No. 2.1), Benoît’s vast but still unfinished chronicle [. . .] is in essence Anglo-Norman despite falling outside the linguistic canon (it is in the dialect of Touraine).

57: *William the Marshal*: Though written by a Continental rather than an Insular author, this poetic biography in 19,214 lines is of epic dimension and spirit with a considerable flavour of romance.

60: *The Song of Caerlaverock*: A contemporary account of the lords and knights present at the siege of Caerlaverock Castle in 1300, with blazons of their arms (106 coats) and some account of the siege; 956 lines in octosyllabic couplets. It lacks Anglo-Norman traits, and was probably composed by a French herald on Edward I’s staff.

72: *Life of the Black Prince, by Chandos Herald*: An account in verse of the Black Prince by the Herald of Sir John Chandos [. . .], composed ca. 1385. The sur-

26. “Anglo-Norman’ is not a straightforward category, linguistically, socially, or culturally. Its relations to both ‘Frenchness’ and ‘Englishness’ are fraught with interpretive questions and burdened by a history of partisan scholarly assumptions . . . Conversely, it is often hard to isolate texts as being Anglo-Norman” (Butterfield 2009:12–13).

living manuscripts are Anglo-Norman, although the language is of Hainault, as Chandos Herald probably was.

77: *Chanson d'Aspremont*: A *chanson de geste* of the Charlemagne Cycle from the late twelfth century, this Norman composition survives in seven Anglo-Norman and many Continental manuscripts.

80: *Le Pelerinage de Charlemagne*: Although this poem may have been of Continental origin, the only known copy, lost since 1879, was considered Anglo-Norman by Francisque Michel who edited it in 1838. Aebischer [. . .] distinguishes two layers of Anglo-Norman, the poet's and the scribe's.

81: *Gormont et Isembart*: This Anglo-Norman fragment is the sole extant copy of a twelfth-century Continental *chanson de geste*.

82: *La Chançon de Guillaume*: A Norman or Francien composition of which the only surviving manuscript is Anglo-Norman.

82.1: *La Destruction de Rome*: An epic of the Charlemagne cycle, this is a mid-thirteenth-century Anglo-Norman redaction of Continental material.

82.2: *Fierabras*: An Anglo-Norman redaction of Continental material.

In practice, then, it appears that *either* the presence of linguistic traits recognized as Anglo-Norman *or* some sort of "cultural" connection with Anglo-Norman England is a sufficient condition for inclusion in the category of "Anglo-Norman literature," but that one or the other condition can be absent. This conforms to Short's pragmatic suggestion that "an inclusive approach would seem the most convenient and practical answer to such intractable questions" (Short 2007:32). What it also implicitly accepts is that just as there are no hard-and-fast linguistic (dialectal) boundaries between Anglo-Norman and continental French, so the exact attribution of literary works within a shared literary culture (the authors of which were sometimes themselves itinerant) is similarly artificial.

In the case of non-literary material (administrative and archive texts of various types), the situation is different again. Here of course we normally have localizations and dates. These cannot always be trusted, for, as Jacques Monfrin observed many years ago,

La précision des résultats obtenus par une étude sur la provenance des actes est en quelque mesure illusoire. En effet, le personnage important, en toute cette affaire, est celui qui a tenu la plume. Et celui-là, quels que soient nos renseignements sur l'élaboration de l'acte, nous ne le connaissons pour ainsi dire jamais. (Monfrin 1968:33)

A case in point is that of the petitions from foreign merchants mentioned above (section 2.3.1). That they represent claims by Genoese or Germans is, in linguistic terms, of entirely secondary importance to the fact of their production by Anglo-Norman clerks in London. It is these clerks who determine the language of the texts. Anglo-Norman diplomatic documents, on the whole, are different from continental ones in other ways: the diplomatic and the calligraphy are different, so there are valuable external (non-linguistic) indicators as to provenance. These features have allowed scholars to determine that a given instrument is (for

example) composed by an English scribe but using Flemish diplomatic, or sealed in England but written by a Flemish copyist (hence heavily Picardized). These examples are from a series of copies of documents pertaining to an Anglo-Flemish agreement of 1296/1297 (Chaplais 1975-1982, I.ii, document 250; cf. Trotter 2009a:362-363), where the difference between regionally marked forms of language is of political importance (see above, section 2.3.1). English claims to Flemish territory were more plausible, or more acceptable, if the document asserting them was cloaked in the appropriate regional garb.<sup>27</sup>

**3.2. Anglo-Norman authors and Anglo-Norman scribes.** For literary texts, on which most studies of Anglo-Norman language have been resolutely (and detrimentally; cf. Hunt 2003:380-381) based, the question of whether or not texts are deemed “Anglo-Norman” is complicated further by the distinction between author and scribe. More rarely, problems can arise should there be more than one author. We have already seen some of the difficulties arising from this crucial distinction (see section 2.3), applicable only to literary texts where a scribal intervention can disrupt authorial language; the situation of non-literary texts is, in this regard, rather more straightforward,<sup>28</sup> though not invariably, since a collection like Rymer’s *Foedera* contains a significant number of documents which are Picard both linguistically and politically (i.e., where they came from). They have been preserved in—or copied into—notionally English collections because they were sent to England. That does not make them “Anglo-Norman.” Material from Gascony poses similar problems. There is clear evidence that some of what was sent back from Gascony to England was the work of local scribes, whose language is often heavily Gasconized (Trotter 1997a) yet there is no sign of their having considered that they were somehow writing a variety which would not be understood in London. This, too, points to a greater flexibility than we sometimes expect.

The most extreme (and certainly most problematic) cases of a contradiction between author and scribe concern not the best-known instances, such as the *Chanson de Roland* or the *Chanson de Guillaume*, where the only manuscript (*Guillaume*) or the best and oldest (*Roland*) is Anglo-Norman, but we know (or can surmise) that the original was continental. In a sense the decision on whether these are Anglo-Norman or not is a matter of deciding what is meant by “the language of a text,” and whether (or how

27. Influences of this type may well play a role in diachronic change. An interesting case is furnished by the corpus of Luxembourg charters studied by Harald Völker, in which the appearance of an abnormal number of instances of the negative particle *pas* (as opposed to the expected “eastern” *mie*) in one sub-group of documents is probably explicable because of the influence of the Paris chancery on those charters (Völker 2003:157; Holtus, Overbeck, and Völker 2003:229–232).

28. For a comprehensive discussion of the means whereby regional scriptae can be studied (and sub-regions identified), see Glessgen 2008.

far) it is legitimate to aspire to recovering authorial language underneath scribal practice. It is, in other words, a variant on an age-old editorial problem which also, in historical lexicography, has implications for datings, the classic *cas de figure* being the fourteenth-century manuscript of a text thought to have been composed in the twelfth century. An example is the *Pèlerinage de Charlemagne* (for these purposes, Aebischer 1965). Aebischer identifies as the later element (notably) graphies like *kaunt*, *aunz*, *trenchaunz*, which are indeed typical of later Anglo-Norman (and may indeed be the only exclusively Anglo-Norman graphy that exists),<sup>29</sup> but lists also phenomena which he claims also belong to the scribe: for example, future verb forms with unstable svarabhaktic *-e-* (*-erai* instead of *-rai*, or *frez* instead of *ferai*). These however are attested in texts from the twelfth and the fourteenth century and prove nothing. Likewise, hesitations over the case system or syllable-count are hardly ascribable to Anglo-Norman of only one period. The evidence, in a word, is inconclusive.

More complex are those texts where more than one *author* is involved and where there is (or where there may be assumed to have been) a dialectal difference between them. Two examples come to mind: the French translation of Odo of Cheriton's fables (*DEAF*: YsEudeR), and the Jofroi de Waterford-Servais Copale *Secretum secretorum* (*DEAF*: SecrSecrPr<sup>2</sup>S, SecrSecrPr<sup>2</sup>H). Each poses a slightly different challenge. Eude de Cheriton's translation survives in a manuscript whose language is tentatively identified by the editor, at the end of a lengthy study (Ruelle 1999:LXXXVI-C) as most plausibly coming from the south-western area of the *oïl* zone (Ruelle 1999:C). However, the text appears to contain lexical items which are firmly Anglo-Norman:

Si la datation est plausible, le texte me semble être à localiser plutôt en Normandie, voire même en Angleterre, car il contient plusieurs mots qui nous ramènent dans ces domaines tandis qu'on n'y trouve aucun mot du Sud-Ouest. (Matsumura 2004:285)

Another reviewer is a little more circumspect:

Que la version ici éditée ait été écrite dans un dialecte du "Sud-Ouest du domaine d'oïl," M. Ruelle l'a bien démontré. Toutefois, si des mots anglo-normands s'y sont glissés, cela change la perspective: ou bien le traducteur a des origines anglo-normandes mais il rédige dans un dialecte continental légèrement teinté, ou bien le texte a au départ été rédigé en anglo-normand et, lors de son importation sur le continent, il s'est vu transposé dans un dialecte local. Dans les deux cas, il est certain que le texte est originalement anglo-normand, ce qu'attestent les quelques mots qu'on n'aura su transposer en français continental. (Brun 2004:191)

29. See Trotter forthcoming b: *-aun* is to my knowledge only found (outside Anglo-Norman) in a small number of fourteenth-century and later documents from the Channel Islands (Goebel 1970:263).

It is difficult to argue with this. I incline to Brun's second hypothesis, which also makes of this manuscript a relatively unusual example of an Anglo-Norman text subsequently copied on the continent: the process is normally the other way round. Jofroi de Waterford's *Segré des Segrez* is another example of this rare species and it raises similar but slightly different problems. The author was an Irish Dominican who wrote in Anglo-Norman or (if one wants to be pedantic) Hiberno-Norman: he is also the author of a *Roman de Troie* (DEAF: TroieJofr), an *Estoire des Romains*, and possibly a sermon collection, all preserved in MS. BnF fr. 1822. The prologue names Jofroi as the author but the colophon mentions also Servais Copale, who appears to have been his Walloon scribe. As a result, the *Segré des segrez* is, to an even greater extent than Odo of Cheriton's *Fables*, a hybrid: Picardo-Walloon graphies cloak Anglo-Norman lexis (Schauwecker 2007:30; Henry 1986:8) and other types of Anglo-Normanism. These include (Henry 1986:7-8; Schauwecker 2007:26-30) syntactic features (*se* + subj.pr.), graphies (e.g., *-ee* for tonic final [e]; *-aun*), morphological traits (*-om* for first-person plural indicative present; *-ir* verbs converted to verbs in *-er*). In the case of both these texts, it is hard to avoid the conclusion that they belong in the Anglo-Norman canon and indeed, in the *Anglo-Norman Dictionary*, not least because among the more compelling evidence of their Anglo-Norman status is, precisely, the lexis.

**4. Implications for the *Anglo-Norman Dictionary*.** This last statement brings us back unerringly to where we came in: what does all this mean for the *Anglo-Norman Dictionary*, and how should its editors handle the textual legacy of the situation which obtained in medieval England? As far as texts themselves are concerned, it seems inevitable that a degree of compromise will continue. It would plainly be nonsensical to jettison the *Chanson de Guillaume* after it has been cited 365 times in the *AND* since 1977 and had been part of the List of Texts for thirty years before that. The logic of drawing on this epic, which survives in only one manuscript (Anglo-Norman scribe) but which came from the continent, is that the equally continental *Chanson de Roland* (multiple manuscripts, the oldest and best of which is Anglo-Norman) should be brought into the fold—which it now has been (furnishing already 386 citations). That in turn raises the awkward question of why *Gormont et Isebart* (again, a one-manuscript text whose only surviving witness is Anglo-Norman) is not included. If Jofroi de Waterford's *Segré dé Segrez* gains *droit d'asile* in the *AND* (and supplies 372 citations) despite its Walloon scribal coloring, then so too should Jofroi's other writings, a suggestion complicated somewhat, in practical terms, by the fact that one (*Le Regne des Romains*) is unpublished, another (*L'Estoire des Troiens*) only accessible in a 1952 London Ph.D. thesis, with a collection of sermons (of uncertain attribution) edited only in a 1936 Birkbeck College dissertation. Neither the DEAF (Möhren 2007) nor Dean (1999) mention the theses by F. W. A. George (1952) and Charles Pinchbeck (1936) (both listed in the

fuller bibliography provided at <http://www.arlima.net/no/62>). The *AND* includes and has always included Guernes de Pont-Sainte-Maxence's *Vie de Saint Thomas* and quotes it 650 times; yet Ruth Dean's account of him (see section 3.1) makes it clear that he was not Anglo-Norman by birth, even if his language (perhaps helped by scribes?) shows traces of Anglo-Norman. Marie "de France" is included (the surname may of course be an indicator of where she came from originally, like the "de Thaon" in the name of Philippe de Thaon); the Channel Islander Wace is not. Little of this is really very defensible in terms of strict logic. What we can say in mitigation is that however incoherent the policy, the 309 texts of the first fascicle of *AND*<sub>1</sub> in 1977 had become 458 by the end of *AND*<sub>1</sub> in 1992, and 914 in the editors' in-house List of Texts by 2012 (Trotter forthcoming b). Not all the newest additions have so far been gleaned and many of the additions are very short, odd one-page documents published in historical periodicals or record collections, so the volume of text which they add is not as great as the number of items might misleadingly imply; but they have expanded not only the overall coverage, but the type of sources used, considerably. One such is the one-line inscription on a font of the village church in Keysoe near Bedford,<sup>30</sup> which is the only known Anglo-Norman inscription on a font; another will in due course be the thousand Anglo-Norman glosses to a recently-published thirteenth-century Hebrew Bible from Ramsey Abbey in Kent (Olszowy-Schlanger *et alii* 2008). What we are trying to do is to demonstrate the full range of Anglo-Norman written evidence, and it is unavoidable, given the rather blurred definition of "Anglo-Norman" which all specialists appear now to accept as the reality, that the classification of texts as Anglo-Norman or not is itself more of an art than a science.

In discussing the linguistic as opposed to textual evidence, the situation is a little clearer. In common with the *MED* and *OED*, and increasingly as time went on successive fascicles of the *DMLBS*, the *AND* does not reject words merely because they are attested in the "wrong" language. At the simplest level, a word only attested in a Latin text (for example, *mombles*) is no less Anglo-Norman for that, however the author would himself have classified it. More problematic are Anglo-Norman words only surviving in another language: Gascon (*yssac*, for example, a Gascon wine-tax; cf. Trotter 1998a:67), *countrefrontel* in the *MED* which implies an Anglo-Norman ancestor, and possibly *le Raunge* which, attested in a Latin document cited in the *MED* (2.1.6., above; cf. also Trotter 2003c) may preserve an Anglo-Norman meaning, unless the development of that sense ('fireplace, stove, range') was only initiated in English. We could go further: there is probably place-name evidence which could usefully be quarried. *Cangle* in toponyms from especially Essex (*le Cangel* as a field-name there in 1392,

30. See the discussion in Trotter, forthcoming c. The exact wording of the inscription varies according to the book consulted.



*Cangle* from 1235, and also as a field-name in Oxfordshire c. 1300) appears to be a derivative of Anglo-Norman *cancel*, its meaning “enclosure” corroborating the sense of “grating, lattice” which the *AND* derives from one literary text (the *Proverbes de Salemon*) and one gloss, the latter explaining Latin *cancellus* (Parsons and Styles 2000:138).

Place-names are difficult to handle precisely because it is hard to know when an Anglo-Norman word has become an English one, but that of course is the central and unavoidable problem in the whole interplay of the languages of medieval England. It is a problem which will perhaps never be solved, but which certainly stands more chance of being at least partly solved if all the available evidence is consulted, and included in all dictionaries, irrespective of the matrix language in which it is found. Even more audacious—but sorely tempting—would be to cite *DMLBS*'s *gupilleret* in the *AND* as evidence for the now lost Anglo-Norman \**gupilleret* which must surely lie behind it (see section 2.1.3). Maybe we should let this sleeping dog lie, but it seems a shame to do so merely because the evidence for its existence is recorded in the “wrong” language. More daring, and more ambitious still, would be to bring all the dictionaries of the languages of medieval England together, and to present all the vocabulary in one place.<sup>31</sup>

#### Abbreviations

<i>AND</i>	<i>Anglo-Norman Dictionary</i> (Rothwell 1977—)
<i>DEAF</i>	<i>Dictionnaire étymologique de l'ancien français</i> (Baldinger <i>et alii</i> 1971—)
<i>DMF</i>	<i>Dictionnaire du Moyen Français</i> (Martin 2012)
<i>DMLBS</i>	<i>Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources</i> (Latham <i>et alii</i> 1975–2013)
<i>FEW</i>	<i>Französisches etymologisches Wörterbuch</i> (Wartburg 1922–2002)
<i>Gdf</i>	<i>Dictionnaire de l'ancienne langue française</i> (Godefroy 1880–1902)
<i>MED</i>	<i>Middle English Dictionary</i> (Kurath and Kuhn 1956–2001)
<i>OED</i>	<i>Oxford English Dictionary online</i>

#### Works cited

- ADAMS, JAMES NOEL. 2013. *Social Variation and the Latin Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- AEBISCHER, PAUL. 1965. *Le Voyage de Charlemagne à Jérusalem et à Constantinople*. Genève: Droz; Paris: Minard.
- ANDRIEUX-REIX, NELLY, and SIMONE MONSONÉGO. 1997. “Écrire des phrases au Moyen Âge: Matériaux et premières réflexions pour une étude des segments graphiques observés dans des manuscrits français médiévaux.” *Romania* 115:289–336.

31. I provide a test entry (for the word *bonnet*) in Trotter 2006:83–87.

- BALDINGER, KURT, FRANKWALT MÖHREN, and THOMAS STÄDTLER. 1971—. *Dictionnaire étymologique de l'ancien français*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer; Laval: Presses de l'Université Laval.
- BATESON, MARY. 1899-1901. *Records of the Borough of Leicester*. London: C. J. Clay.
- BELMONT, JÉRÔME, and FRANÇOISE VIELLIARD. 1997. "Latin farci et occitan dans les actes du XI<sup>e</sup> siècle." *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes* 155:149-183.
- BENSKIN, MICHAEL. 1994. "Description of Dialect and Areal Distributions." In *Speaking in Our Tongues: Medieval Dialectology and Related Disciplines*, ed. Margaret Laing and Keith Williamson, 169-187, and discussion, 189-194. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer.
- BRAND, PAUL. 2010. "The Language of the English Legal Profession: The Emergence of a Distinctive Legal Lexicon in Insular French." In *The Anglo-Norman Language and Its Contents*, ed. Richard Ingham, 94-101. York: York Medieval Press/Boydell & Brewer.
- BRUN, LAURENT. 2004. Review of Ruelle 1999. *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie* 120:190-194.
- BURGESS, GLYN S. 1995. "Französische Skriptaformen IV. England. / Les scriptae françaises IV. Angleterre." In *Lexikon der Romanistischen Linguistik*, edd. Günter Holtus, Michael Metzeltin, and Christian Schmitt, Band II, 2:337-346. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- BUTTERFIELD, ARDIS. 2009. *The Familiar Enemy: Chaucer, Language and Nation in the Hundred Years War*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- CARLES, HÉLÈNE. 2011. *L'émergence de l'occitan pré-textuel. Analyse linguistique d'un corpus auvergnat (IX<sup>e</sup>-XI<sup>e</sup> siècles)*. Strasbourg: Éditions de Linguistique et de Philologie.
- CHAPLAIS, PIERRE. 1975-1982. *English Medieval Diplomatic Practice*. London: H.M.S.O.
- DA ROLD, ORIETTA. 2006. "English Manuscripts 1060 to 1220 and the Making of a Resource." In *Literature Compass* 3:750-766. <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi:10.1111/j.1741-4113.2006.00344.x> [consulted 14 May 2013].
- DEAN, RUTH J. 1999. *Anglo-Norman Literature: Guide to Texts and Manuscripts, with the Collaboration of Maureen B. M. Boulton*. Anglo-Norman Text Society Occasional Publications, 3. London: Anglo-Norman Text Society.
- DEES, ANTHONIJ. 1985. "Dialectes et scriptae à l'époque de l'ancien français." *Revue de Linguistique Romane* 49:87-117.
- DE JONG, THERA. 1988. "L'anglo normand du 13<sup>e</sup> siècle." In *Distributions spatiales et temporelles, constellations des manuscrits. Études de variation linguistique offertes à Anthonij Dees à l'occasion de son 60<sup>ème</sup> anniversaire*, edd. Piet van Reenen and Karen van Reenen Stein, 103-112. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- . 1996. "Anglo-French in the 13th and 14th Centuries: Continental or Insular Dialect." In *The Origins and Development of Emigrant Languages*, edd. Hans-Frede Nielsen and Lene Schøsler, 55-70. Odense: Odense University Press.
- DODD, GWILYM. 2007. *Justice and Grace: Private Petitioning and the English Parliament in the Late Middle Ages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- DURKIN, PHILIP. 2012. "Etymological Research on English Words as a Source of Information about Anglo-French." In *Present and Future Research in Anglo-Norman: Proceedings of the Aberystwyth Colloquium, 21-22 July 2011*, ed. David Trotter, 101-107. Aberystwyth: Anglo-Norman Online Hub.
- FRASER, CONSTANCE M. 1966. *Ancient Petitions Relating to Northumberland*. Norwich: Surtees Society.
- GEORGI, DAVID. 2008. *Language Made Visible: The Invention of French in England after the Norman Conquest*. Diss., New York University. UMI No. 3307998.

- GERSBACH, MARKUS. 1965. "Eine altfranzösische Formel zu einem Gottesurteil." *Vox Romanica* 24:64–75.
- GLESSGEN, MARTIN-DIETRICH. 2008. "Les lieux d'écriture dans les chartes lorraines du XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle." *Revue de Linguistique Romane* 72:413–540.
- GODEFROY, FRÉDÉRIC. 1880–1902. *Dictionnaire de l'ancienne langue française et de tous ses dialectes du IX<sup>e</sup> au XV<sup>e</sup> siècle*. Paris: Vieweg.
- GOEBL, HANS. 1970. *Die normandische Urkundensprache. Ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis der nordfranzösischen Urkundensprachen des Mittelalters*. Vienna: Hermann Böhlau Nachf.
- HEMMING, TIMOTHY D. 1989. "Language and Style in the *Voyage of Saint Brendan*." In *Littera et Sensus: Essays on Form and Meaning in Medieval French Literature Presented to John Fox*, ed. David Trotter, 1–16. Exeter: Exeter University Press.
- HENRY, ALBERT. 1986. "Un texte œnologique de Joffroi de Waterford et Servais Copale." *Romania* 107:1–37. Repr. in *Contribution à l'étude du langage œnologique en langue d'oïl*, ed. Albert Henry, I:45–53 and II:37–49. Brussels: Académie Royale de Belgique, 1996.
- HOLTUS, GÜNTER, ANJA OVERBECK, and HARALD VÖLKER. 2003. *Luxemburgische Skriptastudien. Edition und Untersuchung der altfranzösischen Urkunden Gräfin Ermesindes (1226-1257) und Graf Heinrichs V. (1247-1281) von Luxemburg*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- HORIOT, BRIGITTE. 1990. "Areallinguistik II. Westliche Dialekte. / Les aires linguistiques II. Dialectes de l'Ouest." In *Lexikon der Romanistischen Linguistik*, edd. Günter Holtus, Michael Metzeltin, and Christian Schmitt, V: *Französisch*, 1:615–637. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- HOWLETT, DAVID. 1996. *The English Origins of Old French Literature*. Dublin: Four Courts Press.
- HUNT, TONY. 1991. *Teaching and Learning Latin in Thirteenth-Century England*, 3 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2003. "Anglo-Norman: Past and Future." In *The Dawn of the Written Vernacular in Western Europe*, edd. Michèle Goyens and Werner Verbeke, 379–389. Leuven: Leuven University Press.
- IMBS, PAUL *et alii*. 1971–1994. *Trésor de la langue française*. Paris: CNRS. <http://www.atilf.fr/tlfi>. [consulted 4 January 2014].
- INGHAM, RICHARD. 2011. "Code-Switching in the Later Medieval English Lay Subsidy Rolls." In *Code-Switching in Early English*, edd. Herbert Schendl and Laura Wright, 95–114. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- . 2012. *The Transmission of Anglo-Norman: Language History and Language Acquisition*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- KOWALESKI, MARYANNE. 2007. "'Alien' Encounters in the Maritime World of Medieval England." *Medieval Encounters* 13:96–121.
- . 2009. "The French of England: A Maritime *lingua franca*?" In *Language and Culture in Medieval Britain: The French of England c. 1100-c. 1500*, edd. Jocelyn Wogan-Browne *et alii*, 103–117. York: York Medieval Press/Boydell & Brewer.
- KURATH, HANS, and HANS KUHN. 1956–2001. *Middle English Dictionary*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Online. [http:// http://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/med](http://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/med) [consulted 4 January 2014].
- LAING, MARGARET, and KEITH WILLIAMSON, eds. 1994. *Speaking in Our Tongues: Medieval Dialectology and Related Disciplines*. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer.
- LATHAM, RONALD E., DAVID HOWLETT, and RICHARD ASHDOWNE. 1975—. *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources*. Oxford: British Academy.
- LUSIGNAN, SERGE. 2004. *La langue des rois au Moyen Âge. Le français en France et en Angleterre*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France.

- . 2012. “Le français médiéval: perspectives historiques sur une langue plurielle.” In *L'introuvable unité du français. Contacts et variations linguistiques en Europe et en Amérique (XIF-XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle)*, edd. Serge Lusignan, France Martineau, Yves Charles Morin, and Paul Cohen, 5–107. Québec: Presses de l'Université Laval.
- MARTIN, ROBERT. 2012. *Dictionnaire du Moyen Français*. www.atilf.fr/dmf. [consulted 4 January 2014].
- MATSUMURA, TAKESHI. 2004. Review of Ruelle 1999. *Revue de Linguistique Romane* 68:284–285.
- MCCLURE, PETER. 2010. “Middle English Occupational Bynames as Lexical Evidence: A Study of Names in the Nottingham Borough Court Rolls 1303-1455.” *Transactions of the Philological Society* 108:164–177 and 213–231.
- MENGER, LOUIS EMIL. 1904. *The Anglo-Norman Dialect*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- MÖHREN, FRANKWALT. 2007. *Dictionnaire Étymologique de l'Ancien Français. Complément bibliographique 2007*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- MONFRIN, JACQUES. 1968. “La mode de tradition des actes écrits et les études de dialectologie.” *Revue de Linguistique Romane* 32:17–47.
- OLSZOWY-SCHLANGER, JUDITH *et alii*. 2008. *Dictionnaire hébreu-latin-français de la Bible hébraïque de l'abbaye de Ramsey (XIII<sup>e</sup> s.)*. Turnhout: Brepols.
- ORMROD, W. MARK. 2009a. “Introduction: Medieval Petitions in Context.” In *Medieval Petitions. Grace and Grievance*, edd. W. Mark Ormrod, Gwilym Dodd, and Anthony Musson, 1–11. York Medieval Press/Boydell Press.
- OWEN, HYWEL WYN, and RICHARD MORGAN. 2007. *Dictionary of the Place-Names of Wales*. Llandysul: Gomer.
- Oxford English Dictionary online*. www.oed.com.
- PARSONS, DAVID, and TANIA STYLES. 2000. *The Vocabulary of English Place-Names (BRACE-CÆSTER)*. Nottingham: Centre for English Name-Studies.
- PÉPIN, GUILHEM. 2009. “Petitions from Gascony: Testimonies of a Special Relationship.” In *Medieval Petitions: Grace and Grievance*, edd. W. Mark Ormrod, Gwilym Dodd, and Anthony Musson, 120–134. York: York Medieval Press/Boydell Press.
- PFISTER, MAX. 2012. “Die etymologische Problematik von it. *andare*, fr. *aller*, cat. *anar*, it. *andito* und *adito*.” In *Ki bien voldreit raisun entendre: Mélanges en l'honneur du 70<sup>e</sup> anniversaire de Frankwalt Möhren*, edd. Stephen Dörr and Thomas Städtler, 191–198. Strasbourg: Éditions de Linguistique et de Philologie.
- POPE, MILDRED K. 1934. *From Latin to Modern French, with Especial Consideration of Anglo-Norman*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- POSTLES, DAVID. 1995. “Noms de personnes en langue française dans l'Angleterre du moyen âge.” *Le Moyen Âge* 101:7–21.
- . 2001. “Defining the ‘North’: Some Linguistic Evidence.” *Northern History* 38:27–46.
- ROQUES, GILLES. 1997. “Des Interférences picardes dans l'*Anglo-Norman Dictionary*.” In *De mot en mot: Essays in Honour of William Rothwell*, edd. Stewart Gregory and David A. Trotter, 191–198. Cardiff: MHRA/University of Wales Press.
- . 2007. “Les régionalismes dans quelques textes anglo-normands.” In *Actes du XXIV<sup>e</sup> Congrès International de Linguistique et de Philologie Romanes*, ed. David Trotter, 4:279–292. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- ROTHWELL, WILLIAM *et alii*. 1977–1992. *Anglo-Norman Dictionary*. London: Modern Humanities Research Association. [now online at www.anglo-norman.net]
- . 1980. “Lexical Borrowing in a Medieval Context.” *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 63:118–143.

- . 1983. "Language and Government in Medieval England." *Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Literatur* 93:258–270.
- . 1985. "Stratford atte Bowe and Paris." *Modern Language Review* 80:39–54.
- . 1991. "The Missing Link in English Etymology: Anglo-French." *Medium Aevum* 60:173–196.
- . 1992. "Chaucer and Stratford atte Bowe." *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 74:3–28.
- . 1993. "From Latin to Anglo-French and Middle English: The Role of the Multilingual Gloss." *Modern Language Review* 88:581–599.
- . 1994. "The Trilingual England of Geoffrey Chaucer." *Studies in the Age of Chaucer* 16:45–67.
- . 1996a. "Adding Insult to Injury: the English Who Curse in Borrowed French." In *The Origins and Development of Emigrant Languages*, edd. Hans-Frede Nielsen and Lene Schøsler, 41–54. Odense: Odense University Press.
- . 1996b. "The Anglo-French Element in the Vulgar Register of Late Middle English." *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 97:423–436.
- . 1998. "Arrivals and Departures: the Adoption of French Terminology into Middle English." *English Studies* 79:144–165.
- . 2000. "The Trial Scene in *Lanval* and the Development of the Legal Register in Anglo-Norman." *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 101:17–36.
- . 2001. "Stratford atte Bowe Revisited." *Chaucer Review* 36:184–207.
- . 2004. "Henry of Lancaster and Geoffrey Chaucer: Anglo-French and Middle English in Fourteenth-Century England." *Modern Language Review* 99:313–327.
- . 2008. "Anglo-French in Rural England in the Later Thirteenth Century: Walter of Bibbesworth's *Tretiz* and the Agricultural Treatises." *Vox Romanica* 67:100–132.
- RUELLE, PIERRE. 1999. *Recueil général des isopets. Tome quatrième: Les "Fables" d'Eude de Cheriton*. Paris: Société des Anciens Textes Français.
- SALZMAN, LOUIS FRANCIS. 1952. *A Documentary History of Building in England down to 1540*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- SANDAHL, BERTIL. 1951-1982. *Middle English Sea Terms*. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- SCHAUWECKER, YELA. 2007. *Die Diätetik nach dem 'Secretum secretorum' in der Version von Jofroi de Waterford. Teiledition und lexikalische Analyse*. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann.
- SCHWAN, EDUARD, and DIETRICH BEHRENS. 1931. *Grammatik des Altfranzösischen, III: Teil: Materialien zur Einführung in das Studium der altfranzösischen Mundarten*. Leipzig: Reisland.
- SHARPE, RICHARD. 2012. "Peoples and Languages in Eleventh- and Twelfth-century Britain and Ireland: Reading the Charter Evidence." In *The Reality behind Charter Diplomatic in Anglo-Norman Britain*, ed. Dauvit Broun. <http://paradox.poms.ac.uk/redist/pdf/chapter1.pdf> [consulted 4 January 2014].
- SHORT, IAN. 1996. "*Tam Angli quam Franci*: Self-definition in Anglo-Norman England." *Anglo-Norman Studies* 18:153–175.
- . 2007. *Manual of Anglo-Norman*. London: Anglo-Norman Text Society.
- . 2009. "*Anglici loqui nesciunt*: monoglots in Anglo-Norman England." *Cultura Neolatina* 69:245–262.
- SHORT, IAN, and BRIAN MERRILEES. 1979. *Benedeit: The Anglo-Norman Voyage of St Brendan*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- STÄDTLER, THOMAS. 1988. *Zu den Anfängen der französischen Grammatiksprache. Textausgaben und Wortschatzstudien*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

- TIDDEMAN, MEGAN. 2012. "Mercantile Multilingualism: Two Examples of Anglo-Norman and Italian Contact in the Fourteenth Century." In *Present and Future Research in Anglo-Norman: Proceedings of the Aberystwyth Colloquium, 21-22 July 2011*, ed. David Trotter, 91-99. Aberystwyth: Anglo-Norman Online Hub.
- TOBLER, ALFRED, ERHARD LOMMATZSCH, and HANS HELMUT CHRISTMANN. 1925-2002. *Altfranzösisches Wörterbuch*. Berlin & Wiesbaden: Steiner.
- TROTTER, DAVID. 1994. "L'anglo-français au Pays de Galles: une enquête préliminaire." *Revue de Linguistique Romane* 58:461-488.
- . 1996. "Language Contact and Lexicography: The Case of Anglo-Norman." In *The Origins and Development of Emigrant Languages*, edd. Hans-Frede Nielsen and Lene Schøsler, 21-39. Odense: Odense University Press.
- . 1997a. "Mossenhor, fet metre aquesta letra en bon francés: Anglo-French in Gascony." *De mot en mot: Essays in Honour of William Rothwell*, edd. Stewart Gregory and David A. Trotter, 199-222. Cardiff: MHRA/University of Wales Press.
- . 1997b. "Une traduction anglo-normande du Pseudo-Anselme: le manuscrit Lichfield 16." In *Traduction et adaptation en France. Actes du Colloque organisé à l'Université de Nancy II 23-25 mars 1995*, ed. Charles Brucker, 225-236. Paris: Champion.
- . 1998a. "Some Lexical Gleanings from Anglo-French Gascony." *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie* 114:53-72.
- . 1998b. "Translations and Loanwords: Some Anglo-Norman Evidence." In *The Medieval Translator, vol. 6: Proceedings of the International Conference of Göttingen (22-25 July 1996)*, edd. Roger Ellis, René Tixier, and Berndt Weitemeier, 20-39. Turnhout: Brepols.
- . 2003a. "Not as Eccentric as It Looks: Anglo-French and French French." *Forum for Modern Language Studies* 39:427-438.
- . 2003b. "L'anglo-normand: variété insulaire, ou variété isolée?" *Médiévales* 45:43-54.
- . 2003c. "The Anglo-French Lexis of the *Ancrene Wisse*: A Re-evaluation." In *A Companion to "Ancrene Wisse"*, ed. Yoko Wada, 83-101. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer.
- . 2003d. "Langues en contact en Gascogne médiévale." In *Actas del XXIII Congreso Internacional de Lingüística y Filología Románica, Salamanca, septiembre 2001*, ed. Fernando Sánchez Miret, 3:479-486. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- . 2003e. "Oceano vox: You Never Know Where a Ship Comes From. On Multilingualism and Language-mixing in Medieval Britain." In *Aspects of Multilingualism in European Language History*, edd. Kurt Braunmüller and Gisella Ferraresi, 15-33. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- . 2005a. *Albucasis, Traité de Chirurgie: Edition de la traduction en ancien français de la Chirurgie d'Abū'l Qāsim Halaf Ibn 'Abbās al-Zahrāwī du manuscrit BNF, français 1318*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- . 2005b. "Langue et transmission du savoir artisanal: la construction navale en Angleterre au Moyen Âge." In *La Transmission des Savoirs au Moyen Âge et à la Renaissance*, ed. Pierre Nobel, 319-329. Besançon: Presses Universitaires de la Franche-Comté.
- . 2005c. "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. Beiträge zum Dritten internationalen Urkundensprachen-Kolloquium vom 20.-22 Juni 2001 in Trier*, edd. Kurt Gärtner and Günter Holtus, 245-322. Trier: Kliomedial.
- . 2006. "Language Contact, Multilingualism, and the Evidence Problem."

- In *The Beginnings of Standardization: Language and Culture in Fourteenth-Century England*, ed. Ursula Schaefer, 73–90. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- . 2009a. “Auxi bien dela come decea: l’anglo-normand en France.” In *Studia Linguistica in honorem Mariæ Manoliu*, ed. Sanda Reinheimer Rîpeanu, 360–369. Bucharest: Editura Universităţii din Bucureşti. Also published with minimal changes as: “L’anglo-normand en France: les traces documentaires.” *Académie des Inscriptions & Belles-Lettres: Comptes rendus des séances de l’année 2008 (avril-juin)*, fascicule II (2008):893–905.
- . 2009b. “Stuffed Latin: Vernacular Evidence in Latin Documents.” In *Language and Culture in Medieval Britain: The French of England c. 1100-c. 1500*, ed. Jocelyn Wogan-Browne *et alii*, 153–163. York: York Medieval Press/Boydell & Brewer.
- . 2009c. “L’apport de l’anglo-normand à la lexicographie du français, ou: les «gallicismes» en anglais.” In *Gallicismes et théorie de l’emprunt linguistique*, ed. André Thibault, 147–168. Paris: L’Harmattan.
- . 2010a. “Bridging the Gap: The (Socio-)linguistic Evidence of Some Medieval English Bridge Accounts.” In *The Anglo-Norman Language and Its Contents*, ed. Richard Ingham, 52–62. York: York Medieval Press/Boydell & Brewer.
- . 2010b. “Language Labels, Language Change, and Lexis.” In *Medieval Multilingualism: The Francophone World and Its Neighbors*, ed. Christopher Kleinhenz and Keith Busby, 43–61. Medieval Texts and Cultures of Northern Europe. Turnhout: Brepols.
- . 2011a. “(Socio)linguistic Realities of Language Contact Across the Channel in the Thirteenth Century.” In *Thirteenth-Century England XIII: Proceedings of the Paris Conference, 2009*, ed. Janet Burton *et alii*, 117–131. Cambridge: Boydell & Brewer.
- . 2011b. “*Il sont aliens*: marchands étrangers et contact linguistique en Angleterre au Moyen Âge.” In *Lexikon, Varietät, Philologie: Romanistische Studien Günter Holtus zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Wolfgang Schweickard, Anja Overbeck and Harald Völker, 307–315. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- . 2011c. “L’anglo-normand et le français, et les emprunts en anglais.” In *Actes du colloque international ‘Les emprunts lexicaux au français dans les langues européennes’, Craiova, 10-12 novembre 2011*, 299–309. Craiova: Editura Universitaria.
- . 2011d. “Death, Taxes and Property: Some Code-switching Evidence from Dover, Southampton, and York.” In *Code-Switching in Early English*, ed. Herbert Schendl and Laura Wright, 155–189. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- . 2011e. “Intra-textual Multilingualism and Diaphasic/Diastratic Variation in Anglo-Norman.” In *Conceptualizing Multilingualism in England, 800-1250, University of York, July 2006*, ed. Elizabeth Tyler, 367–368. Turnhout: Brepols.
- . 2011f. “Italian Merchants in London and Paris: Evidence of Language Contact in the Gallerani Accounts, 1305-08.” In *On Linguistic Change in French: Socio-historical Approaches. Le Changement Linguistique en Français: Aspects Socio-historiques. Studies in Honour of R. Anthony Lodge. Études en hommage au Professeur R. Anthony Lodge*, ed. Dominique Lagorgette and Tim Pooley, 209–226. Chambéry: Presses Universitaires de Savoie.
- . 2012a. “English in Contact: Middle English Creolization.” In *Historical Linguistics of English*, ed. Alexander Bergs and Laurel Brinton, 2:1781–1793. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- . 2012b. “*Saunz desbriser de hay ou de clos: clos(e)* in Anglo-French and in English.” In *Communicative Spaces: Variation, Contact, and Change: Papers in Honour of Ursula Schaefer*, ed. Claudia Lange, Beatrix Weber, and Göran Wolf, 197–214. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.

- . 2012c. “L’anglo-normand dans le *Middle English Dictionary*.” In *Ki bien voldreit raisun entendre: Mélanges en l’honneur du 70<sup>e</sup> anniversaire de Frankwalt Möhren*, edd. Stephen Dörr and Thomas Städtler, 323–337. Strasbourg: Éditions de Linguistique et de Philologie.
- . 2012d. “L’anglo-normand à la campagne.” *Académie des Inscriptions & Belles-Lettres. Comptes rendus des séances de l’année 2012 (avril-juin)*, 1113–1131.
- . Forthcoming a. “Peut-on parler de variation interne dans l’anglo-normand?” In *Repenser l’histoire du français? Actes du Colloque de Chambéry 2012*, edd. Dominique Lagorgette, Maria Iliescu, and David Trotter. Chambéry: Presses Universitaires de Savoie.
- . Forthcoming b. “*Trové l’avum mis en tiste*: comment réduire notre ignorance du lexique de l’anglo-normand.” In *Anglo-Français: linguistique et philologie/Anglo-francese: filologia e linguistica*, edd. Oreste Floquet and Gabriele Giannini. Paris: Garnier.
- VÀRVARO, ALBERTO. 2013. “Il «latino sommerso» e la formazione delle lingue romanze”. *Revue de Linguistique Romane* 77:601–606 [commentary on Adams 2013].
- VISING, JOHAN. 1923. *Anglo-Norman Language and Literature*. London: Oxford University Press.
- VÖLKER, HARALD. 2003. *Skripta und Variation. Untersuchungen zur Negation und zur Substantivflexion in altfranzösischen Urkunden der Grafschaft Luxemburg (1237-1281)*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- WARTBURG, WALTHER VON. 1922–2002. *Französisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bonn, Leipzig & Basel: Zbinden.
- WATERS, EDWIN GEORGE ROSS. 1928. *The Anglo-Norman Voyage of St. Brendan by Benedeit: A Poem of the Early Twelfth Century*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- WRIGHT, LAURA. 1996. *Sources of London English. Medieval Thames Vocabulary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- . 1997. “Medieval Latin, Anglo-Norman and Middle English in a Civic London Text: An Inquisition of the River Thames, 1421.” In *De mot en mot: Essays in Honour of William Rothwell*, edd. Stewart Gregory and David A. Trotter, 223–260. Cardiff: MHRA/University of Wales Press.
- . 2010. “A Pilot Study on the Singular Definite Articles *le* and *la* in Fifteenth-Century London Mixed-Language Business Writing.” In *The Anglo-Norman Language and Its Contents*, ed. Richard Ingham, 130–142. York: York Medieval Press/Boydell & Brewer.
- ZACHRISSON, ROBERT EUGEN 1929. “The French Element.” In *Introduction to the Survey of English Place-Names, Part I*, edd. Allen Mawer and Frank Merry Stenton, 93–114. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.



