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LIST OF SYMBOLS

The symbols used in the presentation of the linguistic data are conventional, except in those instances when the limitations imposed by the typewriter do not permit. I am indebted to Dr. Gérard Taverdet for some of the symbols used in this study.

1. Vowels.
   a. Closed quality: ' 
   b. Open quality: 
   c. û = a palatal vowel between /è/ and /a/ as in English cat.
   d. û = French eu as in feu.
   e. oe = French eu as in peur.
   f. û = French u as in bu.
   g. u = French ou as in fou.
   h. The symbol * placed above a vowel indicates nasality. Since all vowels in a nasal environment are nasalized to some extent, the degree of weak vs. strong nasality is not indicated.

2. Semi-consonants.
   a. y = French i as in lion.
   b. ù = French u as in huit.
   c. w = French ou as in nouer.
List of Symbols (Cont.)

3. Consonants.
   a. \( t' \) = palatalized voiceless stop.
   b. \( d' \) = palatalized voiced stop.
   c. \( c \) = French \( ch \) as in \( chou \).
   d. \( j \) = French \( j \) as in \( joue \).
   e. \( n' \) = French \( gn \) as in \( bagne \).

4. Other symbols.
   a. Phonemic transcriptions are enclosed in slash marks: /mò/.
   b. A hyphen indicates a contrast between two or more phonemic sets: /mò/ - /pò/.
   c. Glosses in French are enclosed in single quotation marks: /mò/ 'moi'.
   d. The symbol + before a word indicates that it is archaic.
   e. The symbol = stands for "becomes": CLAVE = clé.
INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study is to examine the Burgundian dialect from the diachronic point of view, using as a basis of inquiry three periods which are accessible to linguists, either through written documents or through field studies made with the cooperation of informants. The three periods to be studied are: 1) the medieval, 2) the late 17th and early 18th centuries, 3) the modern. Less emphasis will be placed on the medieval language than on the other two periods, in part because the early history of written Burgundian is available in such standard works as, E. Goerlich, "Der burgundische Dialekt im 13. und 14. Jahrhundert," Franz. Studien 7, 1., Heilbronn (1889); and, E. Philipon, "Les perlers du duché de Bourgogne aux XIIIe et XIVe siècles," Romania, 39 (1910), 41 (1912), 43 (1914); and, in part because the main concern of this study is to establish the correlation between the written language around the turn of the 18th century, and the state of the spoken language as represented in graphic form. It should be noted, however, that the method used in examining the
corpus from the 18th century was inspired by the work of Carl Theodor Gossen who, in his research into the medieval dialects, has given the present-day linguist a new insight into the development of Gallo-Romance.

The first chapter will consist of a brief history of the development of dialect studies, pointing out the changes which have lead to the inception of the modern approach to dialectology. At the conclusion of the chapter, a detailed study of a document dating from the middle of the 14th century will be made as an example of the theory of Gossen applied to a text hitherto unanalyzed linguistically; and as an illustration of the kinds of solutions arrived at in the study of texts dating from a later period.

In the second chapter, I will present material gathered at the Bibliothèque Municipale of Dijon, France. The corpus to be examined is made up of poetry written in the late 17th century to the middle of the 18th century. This corpus will be studied from the point of view of the relationship of the written form of the language to the underlying phonemic and morphemic system of the spoken language.

The final chapter will consist of a composite study of the modern phase of the spoken dialect, as gleaned from the field work of the early dialectologists, as well
as a very recent field study, as yet unpublished, made by Gérard Taverdet of the University of Dijon. The presentation of the material relating to the modern period is essential, as will be seen from a closer examination of the technique of Gossen, to the understanding of the dialect as written in earlier periods.

At the end of the third chapter, it will be possible to draw certain conclusions about the linguistic state of the language as it appears at three synchronic stages, and to make tentative observations on the development of the Burgundian dialect as viewed diachronically.

It is an understatement to say that because of the moribund state of the various dialects in France, linguists must make an effort to study them from as many points of view as possible before their complete demise. The living dialects have been greatly threatened with extinction by the effects of centralization and the spread of a single national language through mass communication. The attempts of linguists to gather scientific information concerning the various stages of dialect development have in part been hampered by the unevenness of linguistic investigations in the past. Some of the problems facing the modern linguist in this field can be elucidated by a brief history of dialectology.
Our interest is not so much in exposing the shortcomings of the past, as it is in showing the transition of dialectology from the realm of casual observation to that of scientific endeavor.
CHAPTER I

THE DEVELOPMENT OF DIALECTOLOGY

1.1. The early period. The Renaissance in France marks the beginning of interest in the study of dialects. Rabelais, in the ebullience of his literary expression, did not eschew the use of dialect words in his writings, and the famous remark of Montaigne, "Le gascon y arrive, si le françois n'y peut aller," are two examples taken from literature which show an awareness of dialects. The authors of the Pléiade, besides infusing Greek and Latin elements into the literary language, made use of dialect words. These are modest beginnings which throw little light of a scientific nature on the status of the dialects of the period, but at least they are a seed which could have grown into a flourishing plant had it not been for the attitude of those, who in the following two centuries, for reasons of literary fashion or nationalistic pride, did everything possible to curtail the use of the dialects. For example, Wartburg, when speaking of the influence of Malherbe in the 17th century, states:
Le programme de Malherbe est assez simple: il faut abandonner toutes les expressions qui ne peuvent être comprises de tout le monde. Il proscrit les archaïsmes comme les néologismes et les emprunts. Les dialectalismes avant tout il les raye du vocabulaire.²

It is clear that under such a strenuous interdiction even the sporadic appearance of dialect elements in literature, as sanctioned by the previous century, was no longer to be thought of. There was, however, in the 17th and 18th centuries, a reaction to the rigidity of the classical period in which:

...on sentit le besoin de rendre accessible au public certains textes dialectaux ou écrits en un français hérissé de termes régionaux... Dans ce but, on composa des glossaires explicafits.³

In addition to glossaries, there also grew an interest on the part of the educated urban class in the composition of poetry in the local dialect. The desire to preserve the regional dialects manifests itself in Burgundy in the form of didactic poetry aimed at teaching the rustic population about the glories of recent French history; cf. Chapter II for a complete discussion of
this question as relating to Piron, La Monnoye, etc. For the most part, the 18th century, with its rationalistic and materialistic orientation, paid scant official attention to the dialects until the time of the French Revolution.

The impetus given to dialect study during the French Revolution had, unfortunately, an entirely negative purpose. The decree of 8 Pluviose an II (January 17, 1794) sought to eradicate the dialects in favor of the language of Paris so that the teachings of the Revolution could be carried to all parts of the country. The Abbé Grégoire, who had conducted a dialect census of France during the years 1790 and 1791, presented his findings in his Rapport sur la nécessité de détruire les patois. Abbé Grégoire's census showed that six million persons did not know the national language, a situation which he hoped to rectify by the publication of scientific works in French for the use of those whose native language was not French. These, and more elaborate plans to replace the dialects with the national language were not carried through because of the rapid changes of the following years.

Between 1806 and 1812, Charles-Etienne Coquebert de Montbret made a sampling of the dialects in which he obtained translations in the various local dialects of
the Parable of the Prodigal Son. With the aid of local officials, he was able to obtain a fairly accurate picture of the state of the dialects, at least as they were written. After assembling the data, Coquebert de Montbret was able to establish tentative linguistic boundaries between the dialects, as well as between the Romance and Germanic speaking areas. Coquebert de Montbret's discoveries were not published until 1824 and 1831, and then only a very small portion of them. It can be fairly said that the situation of the dialects on the eve of the scientific innovations in linguistics during the latter half of the 19th century was one of stagnation. The local dialects were neither losing nor gaining ground, and as far as literature is concerned, the early Romantics did little more than stir up a somewhat maudlin preoccupation with the plight of the peasant and his rustic speech.

1.2. The later period. Despite the great strides in linguistics in the latter part of the 19th century, dialectology itself shared but little in the general advancement of linguistic knowledge. This apparently anomalous statement can be justified if one realizes that the main interest of the Neogrammarians was to fix the immutable laws which govern change in language, much as natural laws were thought to govern the variety and change of natural species. Even with this mistaken notion
of the permanence of sound laws, much valuable data was collected; however, the data was confined to the sphere of the various national, literary languages without regard for those forms of popular speech which had not attained the status of a literary language. Nevertheless, a rigorous system for the study of language was established, and the general observations about the nature and function of language still form the basis for much contemporary work, despite the objections of American structuralists.

The 1880's marked a decade of extreme importance for the field of dialectology in France. In 1883, Jules Gilliéron, whose early work in dialectology had received favorable notice in scholarly circles, succeeded to the chair of Arsène Darmesteter at the École Pratique des Hautes Études. It was Gaston Paris, however, who most eloquently called attention in 1888 to the necessity of beginning a thorough study of the dialects of France. His lecture, "Les Parlers de France;" delivered at a meeting of Les Sociétés Savantes, and later published in Revue des Patois Gallo-Romans, 2 (1888), 161-175, is an impassioned plea to devote sufficient time and effort to the study of each region, with the purpose of establishing the linguistic state of each of the dialects. Given the method supplied by the Neogrammarians, and the need for sufficient knowledge of the dialects as
shown by Gaston Paris, the modern period of dialectology can be said to begin.

The first step toward the realization of Gaston Paris' dream was taken between the years 1903 to 1910 with the publication of the *Atlas Linguistique de la France* (ALF) by J. Gilliéron and E. Edmont. It is fortunate that the work of gathering examples from all parts of Romance speaking France was undertaken before the catastrophe of World War I which, in the final analysis, proved to be the event most responsible for the decay of local dialects. In addition to its detailed record of local speech habits, the ALF served to reorient Romance linguistics in a direction away from the rigidity of the Neogrammarians, and toward the realization that language is an extremely complex system which cannot be understood merely through the study of sound laws and the effects of analogy. The publication of the ALF and Gilliéron's monographs based on his and Edmont's research drew attention to the diversity of speech current in France, and gave tangible proof for Karl Jaberg's statement: "In Wirklichkeit hat jedes Wort seine besondere Geschichte." Although the method used to gather information for the ALF was noticeably improved upon by the *Sprach- und Sachatlas Italiens und der Südschweiz*, K. Jaberg and
J. Jud, 1928-1940, the way was then clear for linguists to begin making preliminary observations of a scientific nature on the status of French dialects.

In 1922, Albert Dauzat reaffirmed the ideas of Gaston Paris in *La Géographie linguistique*, in which he states:

> Il faut donc compléter l'Atlas par des monographies locales plus fouillées, offrant des garanties suffisantes, et, quand on est dialectologue, par ses notes personnelles;... §

He goes on to further state that each region must be examined in detail:

> ...en serrant jusqu'à l'extrême limite les mailles un peu trop lâches qui laissent passer forcément bien des phénomènes intéressants à travers le filet. ²

It was in 1939 that Dauzat proposed the *Nouvel atlas linguistique de la France*, a project which was not seriously undertaken until 1956. The method used in the *ALF* to gather information has been greatly improved by using, instead of one researcher as in the case of the *ALF*, only persons with either native knowledge of, or
long-standing familiarity with, the region to be investig­
tigated. The project has been underwritten by the
Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, and al­
though some atlases have already been published, the
majority have been delayed because of insufficient money,
including the Nouvel atlas linguistique bourguignon-
comtois whose publication would have been a great help
in the present work.

Since it began appearing in 1922, the Französisches
Etymologisches Wörterbuch (FEW) of Walther von Wartburg
has proven to be an indispensable tool for dialect re­
search. As the subtitle, Eine Darstellung des Gallo-
romanischcn Sprachschatzes, suggests, the FEW not only
lists all known occurrences of a given reflex in the
Gallo-Romance area, it gives in addition examples with
copious discussion of the semantic changes undergone in
the various forms, both literary and dialectal. It
should be noted that the methodology employed in the
FEW has changed radically since the appearance of the
first two volumes. Originally, the main sources of
lexical information were rather limited in number, but
since the first indication of the desire on the part of
Wartburg to broaden the scope of the FEW as first in­
dicated in Behrens-Festschrift (Supplement to Zeit­
schrift für französische Sprache und Litteratur, 1929)
and later expanded in the Introduction to Volume III (1934), Beiheft (1950), and finally in a lecture before the Colloques Internationaux du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, and later printed as "L'expérience du FEW," Lexicologie et Lexicographie françaises et romanes, (1961), 209-219, there is evident an increase in the space given to the dialects, not only by the inclusion of many more dictionaries, but also through the use of informants working on the spoken dialects. The reason for the broadening of Wartburg's thinking is the need to show the influence of the dialects on the standard language and vice versa, certainly the primary concern of this dissertation.

After having given a brief summary of the history of dialect study, it now becomes necessary to draw certain conclusions, and to consider the extent of the present work within the framework of the modern approach to dialectology. Several factors are immediately apparent if one weighs the major contributions to dialect study: 1) the Neogrammarians treat only the written, literary language, reducing the scope of their research to the discovery of laws governing the logical, orderly change which is observed in all languages in which at least two synchronic stages are preserved. That which does not conform to the laws as stated is attributed to analogy or
dialect borrowing, 2) the various atlases deal with spoken language on a purely synchronic level, a fact which, if taken alone, would vitiate the unique position held by Romance linguistics in the field of historical and comparative linguistics, 3) the innumerable dialect studies based on medieval texts and documents accept almost without exception the fact that the written form of the language represents the local speech of the area in which the document was written. The problem for this kind of research becomes one of localization and dating of texts. In view of the diverse interests and emphasis of Romance linguists since the mid-19th century, one essential problem remains which is of vital concern to the diachronic study of the different French dialects. Since our knowledge of earlier phases of French dialects comes solely from written texts, how, then, is it possible to interpret a given text in such a manner that it yields information about the spoken dialect on a synchronic level? In other words, did the scribe write more or less the way he spoke, or the way the inhabitants of the region spoke? Or, more importantly, did he merely employ a conventional system of writing, a kind of graphic koine? Much light has been thrown on this problem in recent years with the development of a new approach to the problem of interpreting the written word as a
representation of speech. The following will give a short summary of the genesis of this new technique of investigation.

1.3. The scripta technique. The first linguists who conceived the idea of examining the relationship of written documents to the spoken reality which lay hidden in the text were concerned primarily with the Walloon dialect. This is so primarily because historical and political events preserved the dialects of present-day Belgium in a state of vigor not enjoyed by the French dialects; consequently, there exists a large corpus in modern Walloon, a fact whose importance will become clear in the elaboration of the method to be used in this dissertation. The issue in question was first broached by Jules Feller in 1931 with the publication of his article, "Français et dialectes chez les auteurs belges du moyen âge", Bulletin de Toponymie, 5 (1931), 33-92. Feller observed that, although medieval Belgian scribes wished to write French, i.e., "francien," they wrote instead a composite language made up of analogical formations, local intrusions, and arbitrary inventions. He concludes that documents which had until then been considered as written in a particular dialect were nothing more than a regional form of French. For the traditional dialectologists who believed that scribes
recorded with accuracy the regional dialect, the ques-
tion did not arise concerning the origin of the written 
language. Again in 1939, Feller reaffirmed his belief 
in the primacy of "francien" as the basis for the written 
language in the following terms:

Je persiste...à croire que le français, 
soit parlé, soit écrit, a pour substrat un 
 dialecte, un seul. Lequel?...L'histoire et 
la raison désignent un dialecte central.8

The year 1948 marks the publication of Feller's 
student, Louis Remacle, of Le proglème de l'ancien Wallon, 
Liège, 1948, one of the most important works to appear 
on the subject. In his introduction, Remacle draws at-
tention to the basic ideas of Feller, but goes on to 
further state, concerning his own method of approach:

Il me paraissait urgent d'éclairer à 
 nouveau des réalités ou des vérités obscur-
cies; et à cette fin, il me semblait indis-
pensable de conduire la recherche sur un 
terrain que Feller n'avait pas abordé assez 
franchement, celui des faits.9

Remacle examines in detail the first charter 
written in Walloon (1236), comparing the written lan-
language with the modern spoken dialect. He uses the term "scripta" by which he means a hybrid system of writing used in a certain scriptorium. Remacle proposes to examine the medieval language from the point of view of the modern dialect, in an attempt to discover if the features of the modern dialect can be discerned in the medieval scripta; in other words, he proposes to answer the question of the dating of dialect features which are observed in the modern dialect, rather than, "...donner pour un trait du dialecte réel ce qui est seulement un caractère graphique du scripta."¹⁰

Remacle assumes that the various local scriptae had become fixed by the 13th century. All texts, including literary texts, are, therefore, written in a conventional scripta, showing little or no internal change, a fact which belies the evidence that behind this scripta, the spoken language was evolving rapidly. On the other hand, the inconsistencies in the texts, a fact heretofore attributed to the attempt of the scribe to record the local sound changes in his personal patois, are, according to Remacle, on the contrary, a result of the competition and intrusion of rival scriptae, especially that of Ile-de-France after the 13th century. (Note: both Feller and Remacle use the term "dialecte central," cf., p. 16, n.8, a term which was unfortunately used by
Gossen in the form "Zentralfranzösisch." We are to understand this not as a geographic designation as employed by linguists, but rather as a political designation equivalent to "francien" as used in Ile-de-France.) On the vexing question of "formes doubles," Remacle offers the suggestion that confusions of this nature result from interference of other writing traditions in the mind of the scribe (for a Walloon scribe, the scripta of Picardy, for instance); rather than from the attempt to record phonetically the sound changes operative in the dialect. In his concluding remarks, Remacle states:

...la scripta médiévale, qu'il s'agisse de la langue des chartes, même des chartes originales, ou qu'il s'agisse de la langue des oeuvres littéraires, même autographes, est naturellement composite; elle offre naturellement des formes doubles ou multiples, même sans l'intervention des copistes.  

It was not until about 1400, according to Remacle, that the influence of "francien" began to displace the various scriptae. Little by little, the local scriptae disappear in favor of the literary scripta of Ile-de-France, no matter how different the local speech was from the dialect of Paris. Later, in the case of Walloon, literature written in the local dialect began appearing
around the turn of the 17th century. If one were to accept the conventional theory of medieval scribal tradition which holds that all written documents are basically francien, with an occasional lapse betraying the origin of the scribe, then, according to Remacle, the diagram showing the transition of French to Walloon would be as follows:

The break in the first line indicates the absence of any "dialect" records, during which period the language of Paris appears to dominate, or in other words, fewer dialect peculiarities appear in the texts after 1400. However, after observing that it is highly unlikely French could have replaced Walloon as a written language, Remacle offers the revised diagram:

It is evident from the revised diagram that the
year 1400 loses its importance, since one scripta (Walloon) is gradually being replaced by another (French), neither of which represents the synchronic stage of the spoken language at the time it is written.

In the final analysis, Le-Problème de l'ancien wallon marks a new point of departure for the whole of dialect study. It gives a new perspective to the problem of spoken as opposed to written language by the author's insistence that it is a fallacious notion to consider competing written forms as indicative of sound changes in the language which can be ascribed either to the author or the scribe. That which can be studied scientifically in a medieval text is: 1) the nature of the scripta, 2) the forms common to all scriptae, given the fact that they all date from an early period when the spoken dialects were relatively homogeneous, 3) the later stages of borrowing from the scripta of Ile-de-France. The information gained is validated only if there is sufficient knowledge of the present-day oral dialect.

The next linguist to take up the problem of scriptae is Carl Theodor Gossen who, in his book Petite Grammaire de l'ancien Picard, Paris, 1951, alludes to Remacle's work on scripta. In the second edition of 1969, he expands on his theory of scripta in the Picard
dialect as a result of his study of the writing systems of the whole area comprising the dialects of langue d'oil. Gossen's change of emphasis as seen in the edition of 1969 is largely the result of his research leading to *Französische Skriptastudien. Untersuchungen zu den nordfranzösischen Urkundensprachen des Mittelalters*, Wien, 1967, a work which stands out as the most important contribution to the theory of scripta, and its practical application in the study of medieval documents.

Gossen, in his introduction, begins by paying tribute to Remacle's definition of the term "scripta," to which he adds:

Er (sc. der Neologismus "Skripta") bedeutet zunächst "mittelalterliche Schriftsprache" und umgeht im Französischen die Vieldeutigkeit der Bezeichnungen "langue écrite" und "langue littéraire."  

Gossen adds that his purpose in undertaking the study of medieval French scriptae is purely linguistic, and that he will not take up the question of the source and development of the various scriptae. His principal objective, therefore, is the determination of the relationship of grapheme to morpheme. He states:
The importance of this statement lies in the fact that too much ink has already been spilled in the needless pursuit to justify the supposed phonetic grounds of the inconsistencies of medieval spelling, not to recognize that those linguists who wish to ascribe phonetic value to the medieval scribal system fail to realize one important point—the scribe writes a particular word in a spelling sanctified by the tradition of the scriptorium he is affiliated with, and he may well be aware of innumerable variant spellings of other scriptoria, although for him, the word has only one pronunciation. Gossen cites as an example a document dated June 19, 1334, from a region which is now the Department of Loire-Atlantique. Here, the result of

VL *HERE 'héritier' are written hers, heyr, hayr, hair, and hoeyr. It is plain from internal evidence that the scribe meant to record the phoneme /ɛ/, which resulted from the monophthongization of an earlier /ɛy/. He does this in the case of hers, although he is conscious of the earlier spelling heyr which preserves a former
phonetic reality. It is also apparent that at this time /ay/ had monophthongized to /è/, cf., hayr, and the influence of francien, in which /êy/ had already become /çè/, is evident in hoeyr. The author concludes by saying:

Aus diesen verschiedenen Graphemen unmittelbar auf verschiedene Phoneme zu schliessen, ist ebenso kühn wie methodisch verkehrt, umsonder als zahlreiche Phoneme ihre heutige Gestalt erst im Laufe der dem Mitteralter folgenden Jahrhunderte gefunden haben. 16

As is evident, Gossen places a great emphasis on the present-day dialect to elucidate the relationship of grapheme to phoneme in a given medieval dialect. It is to be hoped that enough information can be gathered on the remaining spoken dialects to confirm and expand upon the knowledge hidden in the medieval scriptae.

The body of Gossen's book consists of a detailed analysis of regional scriptae based on documents preserved either in the original or in copies. It must be noted here that the technique applied in the passage at the end of Chapter I of this study, as well as in the examination of the 18th century corpus (Chapter II), is based on Gossen.
Unfortunately, despite the excellency of Gossen's work, there remains a problem which cannot be passed over without further comment. The problem, which is not new to anyone dealing with contemporary linguistics, consists of an annoying confusion of terminology. As Peter Wunderli points out in his review of Französische Skriptastudien in Vox Romanica, 28 (1969), 167-176, Gossen is not precise in his use of the terms "Phonie" - "Phonem" on the one hand, and "Graphie" - "Graphem" on the other. Wunderli notes that the phoneme is defined as a "technisch messbare Feststellung einer lautlichen Realität," and further that Gossen intends this definition in the sense that structuralists do, cf., p. 21, note 15. It is immediately apparent that Gossen has failed to make the necessary distinction between langue and parole, a distinction which gained currency in the first decade of the 20th century with the lectures of Ferdinand de Saussure. In effect, Gossen has not defined the "phoneme," but rather the "phone." By his own admission, Gossen realizes that it is impossible to recreate the level of parole, i.e., an objective, physical event of momentary duration; and, historical linguists can deal only with the level of langue, i.e., the phoneme as representative of the minimal unit capable of changing meaning. Wunderli adds that the
same confusion exists in Gossen's definition of the elements "Graphie" and "Graphem." These latter terms should, according to Wunderli, be taken as the equivalent on the written level of the two terms previously defined. However, let it be noted that, despite the symmetry of the oppositions as suggested by Wunderli, the need for this duality on the written level seems unnecessary. It has long been recognized that besides l'arbitraire du signe, there is an even more compelling reason to suggest that all writing systems are all the more arbitrary because they are an imperfect representation of speech. To admit a duality of the kind proposed by Wunderli is as futile as trying to assign a fictitious reality to either the models or the shadows in Plato's Allegory of the Cave.

Turning once more to Gossen, we find an excellent summary of his work of 1967 in a lecture "L'Interprétation des graphèmes et la phonétique historique de la langue française," delivered before the Centre de Philologie et de Littératures romanes de Strasbourg on April 1, 1968, and later printed in Travaux de Linguistique et de Littérature, 6/1 (1968), 149-168. In this article, Gossen gives the most succinct explanation of, as well as numerous examples for, the basic precepts of scripta research. After an opening remark on the relationship
of grapheme to phoneme in modern French, he states:

Nous acceptons sans discuter le fait que des graphèmes peuvent n'équivaloir dans leur configuration en rien à la réalité phonique qu'ils représentent; ce sont des signes arbitraires.

Thus, in the case of a modern language (the above quotation refers to present-day French), we are aware primarily of the phonetic reality, and the irregularities of spelling are secondary. It is also theoretically important to note Gossen's use of the word "arbitraire," especially in the light of the previous discussion of Wunderli's criticism. Gossen observes later that the relative lack of ambiguity in the Classical Latin texts which have come down to us is not disturbed until the Merovingian and Carolingian periods, during which time the spoken language was developing rapidly. The addition of new sounds to the phonemic stock results in a period of experimentation in which the scribes attempted to find a graphic means of recording the new sounds. The importance of this period of experimentation is that at an early stage the new grapheme, but certainly not all, may have had a phonetic reality. He uses as an example the Old French
grapheme ei, which in effect did represent the phoneme /ei/, resulting from Latin E tonic free. Later, the scribes continued to write ei despite the fact that the phonetic value of the grapheme was no longer than that of a diphthong.

As each region developed its own scripta based on Merovingian and Carolingian orthography, writing habits became fixed. The integrity and permanence of a scripta depend largely on external influences such as the political prestige of the region or the dissemination of the literature written in the particular regional scripta. According to Gossen, it is possible to distinguish three kinds of graphic elements in a regional scripta: 1) conventional graphemes, common to all scriptae of langue d’oil, 2) forms peculiar to a certain regional scripta, or individual scribal innovations stemming from an attempt to "modernize" the inherited graphemes from a phonetic point of view, 3) graphemes borrowed from other scriptae. Gossen then proceeds to a statistical analysis of various texts in which he shows that the relationship of the three scribal elements determines the "dialect" content of the text. As an illustration of how the tradition of two scriptoria can vary, even within the same geographical area, he cites the following distribution for the Lorraine region in charters from 1275-1325:
Comparable figures from the same period in the city of Metz, where for internal reasons, there is a strong local influence, are as follows:

| 71.89% | 21.59% | 6.52% |

Although category "a" remains relatively stable, the variation of "b" and "c" determines the degree of fidelity to a local tradition as opposed to one heavily influenced from without.

Traditional historical grammars tend to view the evolution of sounds chronologically from the Latin source, thereby isolating them one from another in their subsequent treatment. Gossen suggests that it would be more sound to examine a grapheme according to its various Latin sources, and to determine the points of convergence on the synchronic level. He says in this regard:

Pour juger de la valeur d'un graphème, il est nécessaire d'examiner toutes les fonctions

*Note: a) conventional, b) regional, c) borrowed; cf., above.*
He chooses to call this new system "graphématologie" which, in effect, is historical linguistics, but which reverses the normal chronological process. To clarify his point, he uses as a starting point the grapheme *ei in the various scriptae of western France. He finds that it represents eight different Gallo-Roman sources. As has already been stated, the grapheme *ei probably corresponded in an early period to a phoneme /ei/. The later diversity of graphic representation (e.g., texts from Poitou have: *ei; oi; e; ai; oe; ae; ee; aie in tonic position, and: ei; oi; ai; e; ae in pretonic position), is in part the result of phonetic change coupled with the scribe's attempt to make the grapheme conform to the current pronunciation; but to a greater extent, this diversity is the result of the mutual influence of competing scriptae. Certain words, however, retain their traditional spelling because of their inherent nature. An example of such a word is *HERE which keeps its original form heir, her in the vast majority of cases, despite evidence in the text that the grapheme *oi was becoming generalized in other words (trois from TRES, etc.).
After giving exhaustive examples of the regional graphemes of original Gallo-Romance /ei/, Gossen concludes that the greatest task still lies ahead since the bulk of the material has not as yet been sufficiently studied in light of the scripta method. What is needed is a detailed study of medieval spelling, based on a knowledge of all the regional variants. From this initial study, it would then be possible to write a history of the phonetic evolution of French, taking into account more than the evolution of the literary language. The problem of medieval scriptae, in turn, cannot be attacked until sufficient synchronic information has been collected from all regions to permit the elaboration of diachronic material.

Another author who addresses himself to the problem of the phonetic interpretation of written texts is Gören Hammarström who, in his article "Graphème, son et phonème dans la description des vieux textes," Studia Neophilologica, 31 (1959), 5-18, takes the position of a modern structuralist in that he denies the validity of what he calls after H. Lüdtke "la descendance linéaire" of the traditional historical method. The older school, which he identifies as "philologues," does not make an adequate distinction between sound and letter, and confuses data of various synchronic periods.
Hammarström's remedy is the minute study of the graphemes in an attempt to determine the sounds and the phonemes. His criticism of the older method is scarcely new, as we have already seen in the study of Remacle and Gossen. What is new is the rigorous division the author makes between sound and phoneme. Only the modern linguist working on a spoken language can make accurate observations about sounds, but these same linguists can at least be relatively sure of the phonemic structures of an early test. Hammarström distinguishes four kinds of data represented in the letters of a given text. He states:

On trouve donc non seulement des lettres qui correspondent à des phonèmes du parler de celui qui a écrit le texte, mais aussi des lettres qui représentent les étapes antérieures de la langue, d'autres qui restent par tradition sans représenter la structure de la langue actuelle, d'autres, enfin, qui sont empruntés à des langues ou à des dialectes distincts.\textsuperscript{25}

Once the linguist has thoroughly analyzed a corpus, he then has a synchronic study which has validity within the framework of historical linguistics only if there are similar synchronic studies of other periods of the same language. By comparing the various synchronic
studies, the linguist will be able to make observations about the nature of the sound changes within the language. The nature, or as Hammarström calls them, "les différentes possibilités de changement" are divided into ten categories treating either single phonemes or combinations of phonemes. One example will be sufficient to illustrate Hammarström's method of procedure. In his first category, the author identifies a state on the historical level which he calls, "L'époque postérieur à un phonème de moins," in which he cites the loss of Latin /h/ in the Romance language. In French, he notes the fusion in present-day speech of /œ/ and /è/ in certain positions; therefore, dè and dais are both pronounced /dé/. The remaining categories are concerned with the loss or gain of phonemes and their structural differences when in combination.

For Hammarström, the problem of the relationship of grapheme to phoneme is one of a statistical analysis of the phoneme inventory of various synchronic stages. What the written text can yield is information on the change in the number of phonemes, the change in the frequency of a phoneme, and the change in its possibilities of combination. In effect, he says very little about change, except to note that an earlier period has phonemes which vary in degree of occurrence in succeeding periods. His
whole argument is tantamount is saying that Italian and French are historically different languages because throughout their development, they have shown a disparity in the statistical occurrence of their individual phonemes. The same thing might be said in comparing Russian and French! He does, however, admit the validity of using "la descendance linéaire" in the field of etymology. He ends his article by exhorting modern linguists to interest themselves in the question of historical development of language, and adds that they could render a useful service only if "...ils (sc. les linguistes) pourraient s'efforcer de ne pas être plus ésotériques qu'il n'est strictement nécessaire." In the final analysis, Hammarström is pessimistic about the enthusiasm modern linguists will show for the analysis of old texts because the information they yield is not as interesting as that found in a living language. What he really seems to be saying is that the linguist should not venture into a domain where uncertainty exists, as it does in the study of medieval texts.

In a second article appearing in Studia Neophilologica, 33/2 (1964), 332-340, Hammarström continues the same theme by establishing a duality in written language comparable to "phoneme" and "phone" in the spoken language. He proposes to, "...analyser l'écriture comme
un système indépendant de la langue parlée," which, as he notes, is subject to its own particular rules. He suggests the term "typème" as equivalent to the "phoneme" and "type" as equivalent to "phone." There are two definitions at the core of Hammarström's approach to written language. In the first place, concerning the word "graph," he states:

Nous proposons d'appeler graphe un typème ou une combinaison de typèmes qui désignent un phonème. Ainsi le o de port, le ou de bouche ou le eau de beau sont des graphes.  

And, concerning the grapheme, he states:

Nous proposons d'appeler graphème la classe des graphes désignant le même phonème. Ainsi o, ò, au, eau, etc. désignant le phonème /o/ appartiendront au même graphème.

Bearing in mind the criticism Wunderli made of Gossen’s terminology (pp. 23–25) it becomes clear that once more we are dealing with a refinement of the sort which cannot adequately be justified when considering the question of written texts. The addition of an idea embodied in the term "graph" assumes that modern linguists,
although centuries removed from the source of their investigation, are capable of deducing the phonetic structure of a written text. The best one can hope for is that the corpus will yield enough information to guide the linguist in his attempt to ascertain the underlying phonemic structure of the language; in which case, the term "grapheme" must be accepted as representative of the minimal distinctive unit discernible in a written corpus.

Romance linguists are not the only ones to interest themselves of late in the relation of grapheme to phoneme. In the fields of Germanic linguistics, this question is receiving even more attention. Sherman M. Kuhn, in his article, "On the Syllabic Phonemes of Old English," Language, 37 (1961), 522-538, reconstructs the vowel system of Old English around the year 700. He then outlines the system as it was in the historical period of the major dialects. It is immediately apparent that, when dealing with an entirely reconstructed system as Germanic linguists are forced to do, the proto-language can be altered to fit the prevailing fashion of linguistic analysis. While calling attention to the lack of new information offered by traditional linguists, Kuhn states that the modern structuralist point of view must be adopted, at least in the matter of terminology,
so that modern linguists may have a better understanding of the weaknesses of the traditionalist outlook. The presentation of the material is, in its general format, that of the pre-structuralists. The explanations of the sound changes, however, are rigidly controlled in that there is no confusion of the concepts of letter and sound, as there was in earlier linguistic writings. The author recognizes the primacy of the phoneme, and its imperfect realization in the grapheme. Kuhn states, in conclusion, that the purpose of his study is, "...to present the OE syllabics structurally in a form easily grasped and understood."

Another Germanist to pursue the same problem is Herbert Penzl who, in his article, "Zu den Methoden der historischen Lautbestimmung: Die althochdeutschen Sibilanten," Folia Linguistica, 4, 1/2 (1970), 104-109, tries to define the phonetic nature of Old High German "s" and "z" ("zz"). Penzl's reason for examining the problem of the phonetic distribution of these graphemes is to determine how each of the critical methods used by linguists in historical research can be applied to a specific problem. As he says:

Es ist lehrreich, an einem konkreten Fall wie diesem die verfügbaren und verwendeten Methoden kritisch zu betrachten, weil so deren
Wirksamkeit und Problematik deutlich hervortritt.\textsuperscript{32}

The methods he uses are: 1) synchronic (study of oppositions within a given text), 2) diachronic (pre-history and later development), 3) comparative (Germanic dialects including English and Romance borrowings), 4) typological-structural (analysis of phonemic oppositions). The conclusion Penzl draws from these various means of investigation is that there is no possible way to ascertain the phonetic value of a grapheme, but it is possible to state accurately the phonemic oppositions and the distinctive features latent in the oppositions found in graphemes.\textsuperscript{33} This idea is the basis for much contemporary linguistics, as for example in the writings of Roman Jakobson.\textsuperscript{34} The next step would appear to be the application of the theory of language as a cohesive system to the field of historical linguistics.

In summary, the scripta technique is a means of gaining valid linguistic information from a written text, provided the following conditions are met: 1) those writing the text must be aware of a basic system subsumed in the principle that one phoneme may have one or several graphemes (in the case of medieval scriptae, the graphemes may be either indigenous or borrowed from outside), 2) the text must be an original which can be
dated and located precisely, thereby assuring that one is dealing with an exactly definable synchronic corpus. This places a heavy burden, as far as the medieval period is concerned, on charters, deeds, rolls, etc., rather than on literature with its numerous "remaniement" and mixed "dialect" traits. The region whose scripta is under investigation must be one in which there is a spoken continuation of the earlier written language. Once the conditions of scripta study have been defined, the question which remains to be answered is that of distinguishing what kinds of information the linguist may hope to extract from a text meeting the above conditions. To insist, whether directly or obliquely by the intrusion of needless distinctions in the form of terminological refinements, that our present state of knowledge permits us to penetrate beyond the phonological level into the phonetic level of a written text, stands outside the purpose of scripta study, and certainly beyond the scope of the present dissertation. A further limitation is that the scripta method cannot be called upon to reconstruct a linguistic state before the appearance of written records, as suggested by Kuhn; nor can it yield information useful to linguists when the modern languages used as comparison are too disparate geographically, as in the case of Penzl's article.
On the positive side, the corpus examined is a synchronic whole, brought into focus by the addition of earlier stages of the same language, and, what is more important, recreated in its essential phonemic and morphemic shape by the inclusion of the modern continuation. By research on several synchronic levels, the linguist may then form an accurate statement about the diachronic development of the language in a particular region.

The reason for choosing certain dialect poets of the 17th and 18th centuries as the focal point of this dissertation is that they fulfill the criteria of scripta study, with the added dimension that the medieval language in written form has been documented, cf., Goerlich and Philipon, thereby serving as a basis for comparison. In the first place, the dialect poets are aware of two writing traditions—that formerly used in the region, and to a greater extent, that of the standard literary language as disseminated from Paris. The poets, therefore, find themselves in the awkward position of trying to combine two traditions, and we see in the corpus that the influence of standard French is too strong to overcome. For example, the tendency to use borrowed words to fit the rime and meter distorts the lexical content of the spoken dialect, or the poet may, on the other hand, attempt to transform the borrowed word into a form
which he thinks it should have in the dialect, a fact nearly always revealed in the scripta. In the second place, the works under scrutiny were all published between 1685 and 1730, although the bulk were later re-edited between 1850 and 1890. It is important to note for the purposes of this study that there is little or no difference in the editions of the two periods. We are, in effect, dealing with a strictly defined locality (Dijon) and a well-defined synchronic period (two decades before and after the turn of the 18th century). Finally, we have an adequate record from several sources indicating the state of the modern dialect.

The study of the scripta of the 18th century offers the linguist a unique vantage point, in that he can look backward to the Middle Ages, tracing the development of the scripta of the period as it reveals the underlying spoken language, and at the same time, he can view the modern dialect as the end result of the type of changes latent in the earlier scriptae. It is hoped that some additional knowledge concerning the probable structure of the spoken language of the 18th century will be gained; and at the very least, the effect of the encroachment of standard French in the domain of dialect literature will be amply documented.

1.4. Application of scripta technique. Now that the
reader has gained some insight into the theory and purpose of scripta study, the next most logical step is to see its application to a medieval text heretofore not analyzed in the light of scripta research. This portion is intended to illustrate Gossen’s technique, and to give insight into the method of procedure as it will be applied in Chapter II.

The text chosen for this purpose was originally published by Paul Lebel in *Extrait du registre de l'écchevinage de Dijon pour l’année 1341-1342*, *‘Analecta Burgundica,*" 109 (1962), p. 26-27. A text of this nature is especially well suited to a scripta analysis because it is precisely dated, and the place of composition is known. The text, in effect, is an excellent point of departure for the examination of the scripta of the 14th century; although, besides comparing forms occurring within the text itself, reference will be made to other documents appearing in Lebel’s work (identified by Arabic numerals appearing after the primary citation). Whenever examples are identified as modern dialect forms, they are to be understood as coming from Rabiet and Taverdet, unless the more familiar notation ALF or FEW is appended. The main goals of scripta research when applied to a text of this sort are: 1) to compare the similarity of graphemes representing various Vulgar Latin origins, so as to determine, if possible, a difference
in underlying phonemes, 2) to isolate dissimilar graphemes representing the same Vulgar Latin origin, thereby determining whether the grapheme is borrowed, i.e., contrary to the suspected native development, or regional, 3) to contrast written forms of the medieval language with their reflexes in the modern dialect so as to determine the influence of the prevailing regional scripta on the accuracy of recording the underlying phonemes of the spoken language. The text is as follows:

Le sambadi(l) voille(2) de la Trinitey(3), fuit(4) criéz par trois criz par(5) Guillaume le Courdelier, nostre sergent, ensinc(6) com jai(7) ha estei criéz, se enquii estoit Perrenote qui fuit fille Humbert des Moline, qui estoit ajournée au dit sambadi, seconde foiz, pour suspeçon de la mort d'un enfant(8) qui fuit trouvée mors sus la rive d'Oiche(9), li quelle(10) ne vint. Mas(11) pour li(12) s'apparuit es(13) diz criz Perrins, ses filz, qui diest(14) qu'elle estoit fuers(15) de ville et qu'elle ne savoit le dit ajournement, mas quant elle seroit en la ville, elle se comparitroit et esterroit a droit por devant. Fuit encor dit, de par le dit Perrin, que il offroit à prover la bone fame(16) de sa dite mere et contredisoit toutes(17) enquestes faites et affaire contre ly et, se aucuns estoit qui sur ce la voussit poursuigre(18) par quelque voie que ce soit, il
estoi apparoilliëz de li deffendre par voie de raison. Sur ce, fuit rajournee par la court(19) et par le dit Guillaume, en la persone dou dit Perrin, au sambadi après l'octave de la Feste Dieu.

(Samedi 25 mai 1342)

Commentary:

1. **sambadi**: the usual development throughout the region (**FEW XI/1, 2a**). Piron has the form *sambaidi* in the 17th century, and the present-day dialect of Tournus shows /sâbadi/. Otherwise, Vulgar Latin MB and ND were reduced to *mm* and *nn*: CUMBA = *come* as in *La Come d'Espoisse* (near Dijon), attested in 1360, Archives de la Côte-d'Or, B 11255, f. 4241; VENDEMIA = *venoine* (32, 201, 210), modern /vmœj/; *PRENDERE = *prenre = panre* (69, etc.), modern /prœr/, either a continuation of the undissimilated form, or by analogy with the rest of the conjugation.

2. **voille**: as a reflex of *VL é* in tonic free position or when followed by a palatal element, the graph *oi* appears to have had an underlying /ɔ/ at its phonemic level. Further examples from our text are: TRES = *trois*; VICES = *foiz*, both of which occur in the modern dialect as /trɔ/ and /fɔ/; and the third person singular of the imperfect and conditional: *estoi*;
seroit. There are ample grounds for the belief that oi, when it was borrowed from the scripts of Ile-de-France, was used in the Burgundian scripta to represent a monophthongized /ɔ/. In the first place, oi was written to indicate that a palatal consonant followed: boiche 'bouche' (100, 108, 117); Oiche, now Ouche; soignour 'seigneur' (9, 63): or, that the syllable was closed by a nasal: poinne 'peine' (2, 74), modern /pɔn/; beloinchex 'boulanger' (2, 48, 70). The latter example, when compared to blainches 'blanche' (120), seems to indicate hesitation on the part of the scribe in his attempt to write a nasal sound which in the modern dialect has evolved to /ɛ/: /byɛc/ 'blanche'; /brɛc/ 'branche'. The spelling grange (7, 55) is imitated from standard French. In the second place, the alternate spellings: loier - louhier 'loyer'; noyé - nohié 'noyé', with h interposed to indicate hiatus, point to a syllabic division supporting the notion that graphic oi is, in effect, a monophthong. The use of h to mark hiatus is very common in the scripta: pehu 'pu' (8); abu 'eu' (53), modern /pɔvu/ and /ɛvu/, both of which have been reformed by analogy with the infinitive. Gossen discusses the frequency of h as a "Hiatusstilger," and cites the Burgundian scripta "im weitesten Sinne des Wortes" as the source from which it spread to Lorraine, where it
sometimes displaced the more usual -w-, Bourbonnais, Franche-Comté, and the Bernese Jura.

The spelling voie should be viewed as a scripta borrowing from Ile-de-France, since VL VIA = vie in the normal Burgundian scripta (FEW, XIV, 37a). The word /vi/ has survived into the modern period, although the meaning is that of 'un chemin non entretenu', Taverdet\(^43\), and in the place name Le Bois des Grandes Vies\(^44\).

3. Trinitey: Vulgar Latin tonic free a shows a twofold development in the modern dialect. When preceded by a palatal, the result of /é/: NECARE = /nôyê/; LIGARE = /lôyê/, and /è/ elsewhere: PRATU = /pré/; CLAVE = /t'è/. The fact that this alternation was already in effect by the time our document was written is evinced by the regularity in recording -ey (-ei) in final position when not preceded by a palatal: grey; volontey; estei, as opposed to é and ié: criez; trouvez; esclairié; rehusié. Here, we are probably dealing with an opposition /è/ - /é/ which was sufficiently differentiated at the time to assure its accurate recording in the scripta. In the example Trinitey, -ey, therefore, corresponds to an underlying /è/.

4. fuit: as a further extension of the problem of the "parasitic i", we find the grapheme ui used to record an underlying monophthong, as in: fuit 'fut',
also 'feu', i.e., 'décédé'; apparuit 'apparut'; nuy 'nu'. Spellings such as: fruz 'fruits' (210); produz 'produits' (85, 117); cuseney 'cuisinier' (147); cussin 'coussin' (99, 121), cf., OF coissin, in which the "yod" is justified by the etymon, but not written, point to an early loss of the "yod" element. This theory is further supported by evidence from the modern dialect: /lœ/ 'lui'; /puzɛ/ 'puiser'; /kuzɛn/ 'cuisine'.

In examples 2, 3, and 4, we see the effects of the scripta as related to the underlying phonemic structure of the spoken language. In the case of oi, we can clearly trace the phonemic development in the region of Ile-de-France through the stages: /ɔy/ = /œ/ = /wɛ/ = /wa/. In Burgundian, however, the shift of accent did not take place, resulting in the loss of the "yod". There is a high degree of correlation between modern French forms with /wa/ written oi, and modern dialect forms with /ɔ/: /frwa/ = /frɔ/ 'froid'; /vwatûr/ = /vɔtûr/ 'voiture'; /krwar/ = /krɔr/ 'croire'. The same is true of the standard French diphthong /wi/, which appears in Burgundian as /u/ (see p. 45, example 4). We can assume, therefore, that the graphemes oi and ui were borrowed from the scripta of Ile-de-France, and were used to record what had become, in the spoken language, a monophthong in both cases. The grapheme -ey, used to record
the result of VL tonic free a under the conditions described in example 3 above, is a particular feature of the eastern scriptae. It is impossible to tell from internal evidence if -ey represents a diphthong or a monophthong. All that can be stated is that the modern dialect has /-è/ in final position as opposed to /-é/ in a palatal environment. From this information, we know that the eventual palatalization of VL CL- and GL- took place much later in the language as shown by the modern examples: CLAVE = /t'è/; SINGULARE = /sèd'è/, not */t'é/ and */sèd'é/.

5. par: textual evidence points to a certain confusion in the distribution of par and pour. Our text shows: "...fuit criéz par troiz criz par Guillaume le Courdelier,..."; "Mas pour li...," as opposed to: "...por devant." = par devant. Elsewhere, one reads: "..., pour ce qu'il havoit dit...," in the sense of 'parce que'. This type of confusion is not uncommon throughout all medieval scriptae (PEW, VIII, 211 and IX, 399), and might pass unnoticed if it were not for the evidence of the modern dialect which has only /p6/ for both words.

6. ensinc: the modern dialect has only /âsè/, with nasalization of the final syllable. In our text, we find the early stage of the present-day form, also
written enxinc (36). The final -q is to be viewed as influenced by the similarity in syntactic function of Latin sic, and not as a pronounced sound (FEW, XI, 575b for the spread of the nasalized form.)

7. jai: Vulgar Latin tonic free a + palatal does not diphthongize, as evidenced by the modern dialect forms: MAGIS = /ma/; BASIU = /ba/; FACTU = /fa/. The dialect also shows the same development in the case of JAM = /ja/. On the other hand, there was an early tendency in the dialect to raise primitive /a/ to /e/; cf., Goerlich: maisle; gairanz; estait; baitaille. The scribe is apparently aware that a grapheme a in francien has an alternate spelling ai in his regional scripta. He therefore "corrects" the grapheme to jai, and in so doing, indicates that he is conscious of the scripta of Ile-de-France. If one compares the alternation jai with mas; cf., 11 below, one is immediately reminded of the alternation trovey - trovés discussed on p. 45.

8. anfant: nasal EN and AN both fell together early in the development of the Burgundian dialect as indicated by alternate spellings such as: an - en; antandit - entendit; entrer - entrer; etc.


10. li quelle: this example offers an interesting
mixture of scriptae. On the one hand, the Burgundian form for the feminine definite article *li* (Goerlich\(^4^5\): *li* femme; *li* dette; *li* tierce partie). On the other hand, the spelling *quelle* is borrowed from the scripta of Ile-de-France, as was generally done throughout eastern France in all cases of VL -ALE (Gossen\(^4^6\)). In francien, QUALE developed through the stage /kêl/ to /kêl/, written *quelle*. The latter change was not effected in the Burgundian dialect as witnessed by modern forms: /lekê/ 'laquelle'; /pêr/ 'père'; etc. The normal scripta spelling is *liqueille*, as cited by Goerlich\(^4^7\).

11. Mas: see page 47 for a discussion of the development of MAGIS.

12. pour *li*: VL *ILLAELI* was greatly extended in usage, probably by analogy with *lour* from ILLORU: entre lour (12, 129); riere lour (129). In addition, one finds *li* as an atonic object pronoun: de *li* defendre; *li* demandest (112, 114); de *li* rendre (112). For a complete discussion, see FEW, IV, 550b. It is impossible to ascertain the underlying phonetic structure of *li* because the regional spelling *li* seems to have been influenced by the article *li* as discussed on p. 48 above. One notes, however, the survival of a form /lay/ as a feminine disjunctive pronoun in the dialect of Bourberain: /sâ lay/ 'sans elle'; /pê lay/ 'pour elle'; cf., p. 154.
13. *es*: the Burgundian scripta does not show the formation *aus*. The form *es* serves as the plural of *au*, and is found in the modern dialect: /é cå/ 'aux champs'; /éz ôm/ 'aux hommes'.

14. *diest*: the scripta of Burgundy shows a marked tendency to use the grapheme *ie* in places where one would expect to find only *i* (Goerlich: *tenier*; *ocierre*; *herietaiies*). It is doubtful if we are dealing with a diphthong, since there is strong evidence that the grapheme *ie* for *i* may have been intruded into the scripta of Burgundy from the north. Bruneau cites numerous examples of this sort, and concludes by saying: "Les fausses graphies *ie* pour *i* sont continuelles: il semble que l'*e* ait servi à marquer la longueur ou le timbre de la voyelle:.."49.

15. *fuers*: the form with initial *f* is the only one retained in the modern dialect as /df8/ — another form /dôr/ is plainly a borrowing from standard French. Although the phenomenon occurs only in this word, the medieval Burgundian scripta does not betray the influence of Ile-de-France in the writing of initial *h* for *f*. The grapheme *h* in the Burgundian scripta is used almost exclusively to mark hiatus (see p. 44 above), and initially in forms of the verb *avoir*: *ha* (3, 6, 7, 10); *hait* (4, 37, 57); *havoit* (5, 7, 9, 11). In the case of *h* with
forms of avoir, we are probably dealing with the learned influence of HABERE.

16. fame: the usual writing for the result of VL A + nasal in the Burgundian scripta is either ai or ei. There are sufficient examples in which the scripta has simply a to warrant the assumption that there is present an influence from a competing scripta (Goerlich: reclam, manz (MANUS); chatelan50). It is possible that the influence is that of the France-provençal scripta of Lyons, or more probably in the isolated case of fame, the scribal tradition of the royal chancellery. See also "...l'octave de la Feste Dieu," p. 43.

17. toutes: the spelling is that of the standard French scripta. In the modern dialect, the reflexes of VL TOTTU survive as a tonic form as in /pörttu/ 'partout', or as an atonic form as in /töjtö/ 'toujours'.

18. poursuigre: the result of VL *SEQUERE also occurs in the Burgundian scripta as: segre; seigre; siegre; sigre: however, the present-day continuation /sögr/ is best seen in light of the series: sieug(u)e; siug(u)e; suig(u)e from *SEQUAT51 (FEW, XI, 488a) and *LEGUA = leue; lieue; liue; luy in the scripta (modern /y8/). The grapheme ui is borrowed from Ile-de-France.

19. court: despite what Gossen says about the loss of final -t52, and the numerous examples cited by
Goerlich\textsuperscript{53}, our text shows its full retention. On the one hand, the consistent recording of -\(t\), as well as of flexional -\(z\), cannot be solely the result of writing habits retained over several centuries. On the other hand, the evidence of the modern dialect in its reflexes of the combination \(r\) + consonant; cf., /awl/ 'aile', but /pal/ 'parle', points to a late loss of \(r\) + consonant. If we compare adjectives of the type: /m\(ö\)/ - /m\(öt\)/ 'mort(e)'; /k\(ö\)/ - /k\(öt\)/ 'court(e)', it would appear that final -\(t\) was retained long enough to have had an effect on the preceding \(r\). The present-day dialect has -\(t\) only when supported by -\(A\), but the effect of -\(t\) in analogical formations; cf., /g\(ë\)/ - /g\(ët\)/ 'gai(e)'; /j\(â\)ti/ - /j\(â\)tit/ 'gentil(le)' is too strong to make credible the theory of the early loss of -\(t\) in Burgundian.
FOOTNOTES

1 Notice the change of title to: "Les Parlers de la Comté de Bourgogne aux XIIIᵉ et XIVᵉ siècles", Romania, 43 (1914), 495-559.


4 Sever Pop, La Dialectologie. Aperçu historique et méthodes d'enquêtes linguistiques, 1ʳᵉ partie: Dialectologie Romane, Louvain, s.d. [1950], p. 11.


6 Quoted from second ed., 1948, p. 27.

7 Dauzat, p. 28.

Footnotes (Cont.)


10. Remacle, p. 27.

11. Remacle, p. 150.


13. Remacle, p. 171.


17. Wunderli, p. 175.

18. Wunderli, p. 176. Wunderli is correct if we assume that "technisch" refers to the various mechanical devices for registering speech sounds; yet, the phoneme may just as well be described as "technisch" since it is the "Realität" on the level of "langue."


20. Gos68, p. 149.
Footnotes (Cont.)

21 Gos68, p. 151.

22 Gos68, p. 152.

23 Gos68, p. 152.

24 Gos68, p. 152.

25 Hammarström (Ham59), p. 8. Unfortunately, Hammarström has chosen to stress the oral aspects of scripta by listing first, "des phonèmes du parler de celui qui a écrit le texte,..." The later the period, the less chance there is that the scribe will be able to identify his phonemes with the graphemes he uses.

26 Ham59, p. 11.

27 Ham59, p. 18. A point well taken in view of Hammarström's predilection for creating new terminology by suffixing "-eme" to make rather unexpected combinations.

28 Ham64, p. 338.

29 Ham64, p. 338.

30 Ham64, p. 338.
Footnotes (Cont.)

31 Kuhn, p. 538, para. 7.

32 Penzl, p. 104.

33 Penzl, p. 109.

Although not primarily concerned with written language, Jakobson's principle of binarism, as applied to "parole," is comparable to Penzl's approach to "langue" in historical evolution.

Although not primarily concerned with written language, Jakobson's principle of binarism, as applied to "parole," is comparable to Penzl's approach to "langue" in historical evolution.

35 The use of a regionally defined dialect as opposed to a national language, subject to many forms of outside pressures, is essential to the understanding of the scripta method.

36 Op. cit. A very traditionalist approach since it gives equal importance to literary texts, a fact which denies the basis for scripta study.


38 Rabiet (Abbé), "Le Patois de Bourberain", Revue des Patois Gallo-Romans, 1887-1891.

Footnotes (Cont.)


41 Lebel, p. viii.


43 Taverdet, p. 17.

44 Taverdet, p. 6.


52 Gos67, p. 326 ff. Gossen admits that -t was
Footnotes (Cont.)

retained longest in the north, a fact which indicates his long-standing familiarity with northern scriptae. He appears to have accepted too readily the information supplied by Philipon who, in turn, was in error.

2.1. Introduction. There is an extensive corpus of material which reflects the scripta of the Burgundian dialect in the late 17th and early 18th centuries. The literary activity of the "patoisants" was centered in the city of Dijon, and manifested itself in the form of poems celebrating a wide range of events, most of which deal with important historical events, or the glorification of the life of the simple peasant in Burgundy. The period which might be called the apogee of dialect poetry in this region can be roughly dated from 1685 to 1730, in other words, it coincides with the creative period of Aimé Piron (b. 1640, d. 1727). Aimé Piron is best remembered as the father of Alexis Piron, the 18th century playwright and poet whose work was considered of sufficient quality to make him a candidate, albeit unsuccessful, for the Académie Française. The remaining works were composed, although not necessarily published, during the early part of the 18th century. The majority of the
poetical works, especially in the case of Piron, were published in the 19th century under the influence of the impetus given to linguistic research by the Romantics.

The brief span of forty-five years during which time the dialect emerges in written form can be viewed as a final effort on the part of the intellectuals to revive a tradition that was rapidly falling away. Everywhere, the dialects were losing ground, and it was only a matter of time before standard French would displace the various local patois. The poets in question felt the encroachment of literary French on the local speech, and this was especially true in Dijon, where the dialect had ceased to be a vehicle of communication among members of the educated class. As will be shown in the portion devoted to the linguistic interpretation of the scripta, our "dialect" poets have only an imperfect knowledge of the dialect, and in opposition to Montaigne's well-known saying, use literary French wherever the dialect is incapable of going. Their poems are largely didactic, and are intended to instruct those members of the lower classes who know only the local dialect.

2.2. Works consulted. The basis for the examination of the scripta is divided into three principal sources as follows:
1. Aimé Piron. The bulk of Piron's work was published in his lifetime; however, only a few exist in their original editions. M. L. Crouslé, in the introduction to Poèmes Bourguignons d'Aimé Piron, p.p. J. Durandeau, Dijon, 1886, states:

Les poésies d'Aimé Piron n'eurent qu'une existence éphémère par la faute de leur auteur même qui négligeait de les faire imprimer ou ne les éditait qu'à un petit nombre d'exemplaires. Dès 1738, Alexis Piron les considérait "presque toutes comme perdues;" et en 1750, il écrivait à son frère Jean de faire son possible pour lui en envoyer quelques-unes à Paris, soit manuscrites, soit imprimées.¹

Nevertheless, it is possible to consult a few early editions of Piron's work, but for the most part, the completeness of the corpus is the result of the labors of Joachim Durandeau, who published the extant poems of Piron during the 1880's. If one compares the earlier edition of a poem with that of Durandeau, one finds that there is no difference of a linguistically significant nature between the two editions. In fact, Durandeau introduces certain limited features which give the 19th century poems a slightly more archaic flavor than the original. This apparent discrepancy presents no great
difficulty because of the existence of the second source.

2. Bernard de La Monnoye. La Monnoye's dialect works are collected under the title, *Noei Borguignon de Gui Barôsai*. Of especial interest is the fourth edition, Dijon, 1720, since it contains an extensive glossary which is of true linguistic merit as it gives invaluable information about the pronunciation of the times as well as observations about the native vocabulary; cf. BDP\(^2\), 2.2.16.4.1. The *Noei* were composed in 1700 and 1701.

3. *Virgille virai an borguignon*, p.p. Claude-Nicolas Amanton, Dijon, 1831. This burlesque translation of Virgil's *Aeneid* is the work of four friends whose original collaboration appeared between 1718 and 1720; cf. BDP\(^2\), 2.2.16.4.2.

2.3. **Method of treatment.** Since the aim of Chapter II is to give a composite view of the state of the Burgundian dialect in the region of Dijon as reflected by the scripta, it was not felt necessary to give a complete reference for every form cited in the linguistic portion. There were nearly thirty books consulted during the investigation in Dijon, and, bearing in mind that one of the precepts of modern linguistics is economy of presentation, a footnote referring to every citation would indeed be excessively cumbersome. A complete listing of the works consulted will be given in the bibliography at the end of...
this work, but as far as the presentation in the text is concerned, the various sources will be identified as: 
(P) = Piron; (B) = Barozai (La Monnoye); (V) = Virgile.

In the section on the morphology, forms left unmarked are common to all sources.

The presentation of the linguistic material is as follows: 1) phonology, with the vowels, both oral and nasal, arranged according to the standard IPA vowel triangle, as they have phonemic relevance deducible from their graphic representation. Consonants are arranged in the order: stops, fricatives, nasals, and liquids, 2) morphology, treating four main word classes: substantives, pronominals, verbs, and indeclinables, 3) syntax. It may be objected that the method of procedure as outlined above is too rigid, and does not allow enough flexibility of treatment; however, in view of the purpose of this dissertation, it was thought best to preserve an order of treatment in dealing with the various features, an order which is adhered to in Chapter III on the modern dialect. When needed, certain portions may be amplified to cover the material adequately; others may be shortened for the sake of economy of expression. The use of cross-references should, in the end, justify the subordination of different kinds of material to a system which is
carried out in all synchronic phases of the dialect under discussion.

2.4. **Phonology.** Oral vowels:

1. The letter i is the grapheme for the underlying phoneme /I/: maicredi (P) 'mercredi'; plaisi (P) 'plaisir'; podri (P) 'perdrix'; vicu (P) 'vécu'; risan (P) 'riant'; pitö (P) 'putois', whereas PUTIDA = peûte (P), modern /pöt/ (FEW, IX, 632a). The form pitö survives in the modern dialect as /pit′ëW/.

The reduction of palatal + -ATA to /i/ is amply attested by the following pairs of rimes: Aisie: dépecie (V) 'Asie' - 'dépiécée'; pognie: garnie (P) 'poignée' - 'garnie', the modern form /pön′ë/ 'poignée' is a later development (Rabiet); ecouchie: mélodie (P) 'accouchée' - 'mélodie'. Although the medieval scripta of Burgundy shows the influence of francien by using the graphemes -iee and -ee (Gossen⁴), forms in -ie were predominant (Lebel⁵, adrecie, baillie, chargies, hostaigie). Burgundy appears to have been the eastern point at which the competition of the francien scripta ceased, because the areas to the south (Franco-provençal) and east show almost exclusively -ie.

The result of VL MEDIU appears in the medieval scripta as mé, and more often meY, although Gossen⁶ notes such forms as: an mi; dimie; whereas Philipon
notes only medi. The form medi (P) is the continuation of the earlier Burgundian tradition, and, even though the modern dialect has no form derived from MEDIU, the existence of an early */mé/ can be posited on the basis of modern /pay/ (tonic) - /pê/ (atonic) from PEJUS. The forms ammi (V) and mi-jor (P) are influenced by standard French. Also of apparent literary French influence is the rime quitte:conduite (P); cf. p. 46 for the reduction of the diphthong /wi/ to /u/.

When compared to the modern forms /viy/ 'ville', /viyäj/ 'village', and /lèviynôv/ 'La Ville Neuve', Piron's rimes ville:file and ville:ille 'file' indicate an underlying /vil/. One also finds in Piron the rime velle:Farjoneille. Rabiet cites a form /vel/ which he asserts is used only in the expression /tû cmé mên è lè vel/ 'tout chemin mène à la ville'. Although the medieval scripta has only ville; the form velle may well be the original reflex of VILLA as preserved in a proverb, whereas the standard French ville has replaced it elsewhere.

The question of nasal vowels will be studied more fully in 2.5; however, it should be noted here that there is a certain hesitation in the case of oral vs. nasal /i/. In the medieval scripta, Lebel records the following examples: puxî; pousis - pucins 'poussin'; escheviz - eschevins 'échevin'. The modern dialect also
shows the same inconsistency. Both /cmé/ and /cmai/ 'chemin' are attested (ALF. 262). One can assume that the phenomenon of nasalization is recent if one compares the rime soti:reveni (P) with modern /sôti/ 'sortir' vs. /vné/ 'venir', and pri (P), although we find prin in Virgille agreeing with modern /pré/. The rime fremi: ni (V) 'fourmi' - 'nid' is confirmed in the modern dialect as /frômé/ and /né/. There is apparently no clear isogloss separating nasalization from non-nasalization, and the question is further clouded by the tendency to borrow non-nasalized forms from standard French (Rabiet notes that the archaic forms /nëné/ 'non', /drômé/ 'dormir', /emé/ 'ami' have since been replaced by French nenni, dormi, and ami. Taverdet finds only /drömi/).

A rime of particular interest in Piron is rubi: croi 'rubis' - 'croix'. Rabiet also cites the same form from Piron which he records as croui and crodi. Rabiet, while drawing attention to the place name /À lè krû/, theorizes that both /krû/ and /lüt/ 'lutte', which he compares, represent an early borrowing from standard French. Gossen notes that the medieval scripta has both oi and qui for VL O + "yod", although, under the influence of francien, the grapheme oi predominates. Lebel cites the form crusilles 'petite croix' and the place name Crusilles, and adds: "o passe à u par action
dilatrice de i:...," offering as examples: "...*coissin 
(ou *cossin) = cussin, *croisille (ou *crosille) = 
crusille,...," by which he means the metaphonic effect 
of stressed i. Given the fact that the dialect shows 
an early tendency to reduce /Wi/ to /U/, Piron may well 
have invented a "dialect" word for the sake of his rime 
on the basis of the comparison: standard French /pWi/ 
- Burgundian /pwi/ from PUTEU, ultimately influenced 
by the spelling croi. La Monnoye, in his Glossaire, 
gives only croi, the forerunner of the modern /krɔ/.

The passage of i + stressed vowel to "yod" is 
indicated graphically in: question: cofession (V) 
'confession' since the poet needs an extra syllable to 
make the line scan properly: "Lo fai baillai lai 
question/Et faire lo cofession."

The modern dialect has /i/ + consonant alternating 
with /y/ + vowel from EGO. The 18th century scripta 
has borrowed je and i' from the standard language, al-
though La Monnoye states in his Glossaire: "I. Pronom 
synonyme de je. En Bourguignon i mainge, je mainge sont 
équivalans pour signifier en François je mange." One 
must assume that because of the pseudo-Latin confusion 
of I and J (e.g., the alphabetical listing under I in La 
Monnoye's Glossaire), the spelling je is a mere concession 
to the standard scripta.
2. Perhaps the most difficult problem of all in the 18th century scripta is that of sorting out the underlying distribution of the phoneme /e/ based on the spelling. The problem goes back to the medieval scripta in which one notes a fairly consistent distribution between both -ey and -ê + flexional -s, to take only the case of participial -ATU not preceded by a palatal as a convenient point of departure (Lebel: trouvev - trovéz, etc.). When -ATU is preceded by a palatal, the Burgundian scripta usually has -ié for both, brisié - brisiéz. On the basis of the distribution one observes in the modern dialect; cf. /trövè/ 'trouvé' - /fracé/ 'brisé', it is evident that Piron is aware of the situation reflected in the modern dialect when he, with a high degree of regularity, makes the following graphemic distributions: caiché 'caché'; poïé 'payé' - palai 'parlé'; élemai 'allumé'. La Monnoye in his Glossaire also makes the same distribution: caiché, glossed as "Cacher, cachez, caché." - palai, glossed as "Parler, parlé." At first glance, it would appear that graphemic ê = /ê/ and ai = /æ/; however, the forms epróchai; gaignai - elmé on in Virgille, since they are the exact opposite of those examined above, tend to disrupt our former theory. Further examination merely serves to convince the researcher that the only plausible point of departure is not the
grapheme, but rather the phonetic realization in the modern dialect; consequently, we will use the modern dialect as the basis, and compare the various graphemes used to represent known sounds.

1. Where the modern dialect has /é/, the scripta has é, ei, ai, -êe, -ey: bé 'bien'; ché 'chez'; tête; feite (V) 'tête' - 'faîte': lai quei 'laquelle'; quei 'quoi'; Dei 'Dieu': fraire 'frère': née 'nez'; chemenée 'cheminée': vorey, also voré 'voudra'; faurey 'faudra'.

2. Where the modern dialect has /è/, the scripta has ai, e: vai 'vais'; mait 'met'; blai 'blé'; fairéne 'farine': garvelle 'cervelle'; hairidelle 'mauvais cheval'.

3. Where the modern dialect has /â/, the scripta has ai. Evidence from the medieval scriptae points to an extensive area in which -ATICU appears as -âige, suggesting the raising influence of the palatal. In the 18th century scripta, one sees the same forms, for example in Piron: saige 'sage'; formaige 'fromage'; viaige 'voyage'. The importance of the grapheme ai to represent a modern /â/ is not immediately clear until one compares the 18th century scripta for the reflexes of -ARIU/-A (cf. Fouché for a complete discussion13) with the modern dialect. Piron consistently writes -ei vs. -eire:
antei 'entier' - anteire 'entière', modern /ətɛ/ - /ətɛʁ/. The feminine is therefore formed analogically on the masculine. The scripta reserves the grapheme ei for an underlying /e/ (2.4.2.1.), or for what has become /ɛ/ in the modern dialect: brei 'berceau'; fenei 'fumier'; grenei 'grenier'; lei:entei (P) 'à elle' - 'entier'; etc. The relationship of modern /ɛ/ to /ɛ/, graphemically represented in the 18th century scripta by ei, is further indicated by the comparison of the modern forms: /pɛ/ - /pɛ/ 'pis'; /lɛ/ - /lɛ/ 'un lit'; /pnɛ/ - /pnɛ/ 'panier', in which the first form is tonic and the second is atonic, both of which are determined by sentence phonetics. We may assume, therefore, that the modern situation did not come into being until after the time our corpus was written, since there is no indication of the alternation as described above; or, what is more probable, these sandhi-variants did exist, but were ignored by the poets because the pressure of the culturally dominant scripta, i.e., that of literary French, dictated the uniformity of forms as opposed to their natural alternation. The esthetics of literary French made the poets opt for the tonic form, since no counterpart for the atonic form was available as a model in the prestige language.
We have, in consequence, an extreme uncertainty in the scripta for the entire palatal series, exclusive of /i/ as discussed in 2.4.1. This uncertainty is probably the result of the inability of the poets to record, or even to distinguish, the new phoneme /œ/. Rimes using what may be posited as a phoneme /œ/ are extremely rare, and may be classified as follows: 1) eye-rimes: leire: meire (P) 'lire' - 'mère', modern: /lœr/ - /mœr/, or, 2) rimes showing the influence of literary French: pousseire: lemeire (P) 'poussière' - 'lumière', elsewhere, poussô (P), with change of suffix, modern /pusœW/.

4. Sounds other than those of the palatal series for which the scripta has ai, ei, â, etc. For the sake of completeness, the following is a list of modern sounds which are rendered in the 18th century scripta by graphemes as discussed above:

1. The scripta shows ei and -aille, also -oille, for modern /œy/: voei and vouei (P) 'oui', modern /vœy/, also /vway/; nouei (P) 'noix', modern /nœy/, a word which La Monnoye notes in his Glossaire as pronounced in one syllable with the meaning "... une nois ou des nois,...," and in two syllables it has the meaning 'Nœîl'. In the case of the palatal environment, the scripta shows the strong influence of literary French: oraille: paille (P); morvaille: bôtaillé (P), and only once
does Piron rime in a fashion which reflects the modern development: \textit{pairoille: airoille} 'pareille' - 'oreille', modern /pêròย/ - /uròย/.

2. The scripta shows \textit{ai}, \textit{ei}, \textit{ê}, and \textit{oi} for modern /a/: \textit{deijai} (P) 'déjà', modern /dja/, \textit{jei} (P), medieval \textit{jai}; \textit{vé} 'vers' and \textit{anvé} (P) 'envers', but modern /trava/ 'travers'; \textit{jaimoi} (P) 'jamaïs', modern /jema/. All these forms indicate a strong reliance on the standard French scripta.

3. The letter \textit{a} is the grapheme for the underlying phoneme /a/. The question of /a/ must be considered in conjunction with the phoneme /r/, since the scripta shows great hesitation in writing \textit{a} + \textit{r} + consonant. Examples illustrative of the grapheme \textit{a} are: \textit{ovate} (P) 'ouverte'; \textit{ma} (P) 'mais'; \textit{abre} (P) 'arbre'; \textit{atô} (P) 'orteil'; \textit{rasin} (P) 'raisin'; \textit{calô} (P) 'noix'.

There is an important point in which the scripta shows a lack of consistency. The scripta records what appears to be an oral \textit{a} where one would expect, on the basis of the modern dialect, to find a nasal /â/: \textit{varredi} (P) 'vendredi', modern /vârdi/; \textit{tarre} (V) 'tendre'; \textit{carre} (P) 'cendre', modern /sår/; \textit{devaron} (P) 'deviendront', also \textit{veiron} and \textit{véron} in Virgille, modern /vârê/. The only rime which reveals the situation is found in Piron: \textit{pare:tapesare} 'prendre' - 'coup mortel'. 
In his *Glossaire*, La Monnoye discusses the word *tapesare*, which he writes *tape-carre*. He derives it from *tape* 'coup' and *carre* 'cendre'; cf. above. He states:
"...c'est à dire cendre, mot qui donne une idée de mort."
La Monnoye quotes by way of illustration: "Dan le pu gran feû de lai garre/Dei vo gade du tape-carre.", which rimes *carre* 'guerre' with *carre* 'cendre'. He ends the discussion by saying: "Quelques-uns cependant croient qu'il vaudroit mieux écrire *tape-sarre*, parce que ce mot naturellement signifie une tape bien serrée." In effect, Piron appears to have made an eye-rime, if, indeed, *carre* represents an underlying /sâr/.

The medieval scripta shows several attestations of *clers* from CLAVES (Goerlich\(^{14}\)), the continuation of which is found in Piron as: *clar* and *clair*. Especially revealing is the rime *clar*:soudar 'clé' - 'soldat' in *Virgille*. It is clear from rimes of this sort that final -r was no longer pronounced. La Monnoye glosses the word as 'clair' (adj.), 'cléf', and 'clerc'. The modern reflex /t'è/ 'clé' and 'clair' is perhaps a borrowing from standard French, although the development of /t'è/ is perfectly normal within the dialect. It is interesting to note that the standard French form does not occur in the 18th century scripta.
The spelling fla (P) 'fléau' may well represent a calque on the literary French, since the modern, disyllabic pronunciation did not occur until much later (Gougenheim notes the monosyllabic pronunciation of fléau in poetry of the 16th century). The modern form /fya/ found in Taverdet, as well as /fyè/ in FEW, III, 596a, seem to continue the earlier form, although the question is further complicated by the fate of the nexus FL-, and its ultimate reduction to /fy-/ . Also of evident French influence is the spelling age (P), modern /äj/. Both fla and age reflect a problem of standard French, i.e., that of "shwa" + stressed vowel; cf. Gougenheim for the 16th century. The rime in Virgille: ase:boase 'aise' - 'baise' is invented, and is not explained either by the medieval scripta, or by French influence.

4. As in the case of the phoneme /e/ as discussed in 2.4.2., the examination of the phoneme /o/ will be studied on the basis of the modern dialect as compared to the 18th century scripta.

1. Where the modern dialect has /ô/, the scripta has o, oo, ô, and ò: sote (P) 'sorte'; code (P) 'corde'; po (P) 'pour'; bêto (P) 'bientôt'; osetan and ostan (P) 'autant'; faisoo (P) 'faisait'; venoo (P) 'venait'; vorroo (P) 'voudrait' (used almost exclusively as the
morpheme for the imperfect and conditional singular):
\[ \text{d6:b0} (V) 'dos' - 'bois' (rare): j6, also written jo and
jor (P) 'jour'; pote, also written pote (V) 'porte' (rare).

2. Where the modern dialect has /ɔ/, the scripta
has o, ɔ, ə, and oo: loche (P) 'lèche'; noge (P) 'neige'
(verb and noun); dépochon (P) 'dépêchons': frôche (P)
'fraîche'; proté (V) 'prête' (adj.), also written proo
and pro 'prêt' in Piron. There is an interesting example
of the apparent retention of a medieval scribal grapheme
in Piron, where one finds: loigeman 'logement'; loigi
'logis', a direct reflexion of the grapheme oi + palatal,
e.g., Goerlich, cloiche, Oiche (see p. 44), and
parroiche. Because of the official nature of loigeman,
Piron may well have been aware of the older spelling;
cf., Gossen for a discussion of the influence of of-
official spellings in the case of hoirs. Piron also has
the alternation moillou - meillou 'meilleur', the first
of which is confirmed by the modern forms /mɔyu/ -
/mɔyuz/, the second of which shows the influence of
literary French.

3. One of the most common features of the 18th
century scripta is the grapheme oi which corresponds to
modern /ɔ/: doi 'doit'; noi 'noir'; etoi 'toit'; voi
'voix'; etc. We must assume, on the basis of the modern
dialect, that the underlying phoneme is /ɔ/ because of
the general tendency to retain the stress on the first
element of the diphthong; cf., /uy/ = /u/, p. 56. One
finds only oi rimating with itself: quoï:roi (P), modern
/kê/ - /rô/; foi:moi (V); etc.; therefore, we have to
view oi as a grapheme borrowed from literary French.
Also revealing is the case of voreïre (P) from VITRU +
-ARIA; cf., standard French /vèr/ from an earlier voirre;
and that of pouësson (P), a form created on the analogy
of French oi = /wè/ for the sake of the meter (pouësson
in three syllables), modern /pòsè/.

4. One finds many rimes in Virgille in 6:au:
pairôle:faule 'parole' - 'fable'; drôle:gaule 'drôle' -
galle'; hau:pôvô 'haut' - 'pouvait'; patenôtre:autre;
etc. Rimes of this type reflect the influence of stan-
dard French since the present-day dialect retains /aw/
in at least one of the above pairs: -ABULA = /-awl/;
/tawl/ 'table'; /fawl/ 'fable': A + 1 = /aw(1)/; /aw/
'haut'; /awtr/ 'autre'. The French borrowing ossi for
native aitô 'aussi', modern /etâu/, has clearly influenced
osseto (P) 'aussitôt', and forms osetan and ostan (see
2.4.4.1.).

It might be easy to dismiss the above-mentioned
rimes as mere imitations of French if it were not for a
similar alternation observable in the modern dialect, an
alternation which may have been current, although un-
recorded, as early as our 18th century corpus. In
Bourberain we find: /i yè fa maw/ 'je lui ai fait mal'
- /è mó d dâ/ 'un mal de dent', with the alternation
/aw/ - /ô/ determined by sentence phonetics. It is pos-
sible that the currency of this type of contrast may have
aided the rimes in /aw/ - /ô/ in Virgille.

 Literary French influence is evident in the hesita-
tion between pretonic ou and o: gorman (P) 'gourmand';
pourtrai (V) 'portrait'. Equally standard French is the
rime in Piron pairoisse:largesse '(qu'il) paraisse' -
'largesse'. The current spelling moitrosse in Piron is
confirmed by the rimes in Virgille: moitrosse:sausse
'maîtresse' - 'sauce'; moitrosse:serô-ce 'serait ce'.
The medieval scripta shows -oi- from -ITIA, as in
forteroisce, fortroisse, etc., and the suffix -ISSA
appears to have become confused with -ITIA, at least in
this one instance.

  5. The phoneme /u/ is represented in the scripta
by ou, ô, and -ouê: heurouse (P) 'heureuse'; générou
(P) 'généreux'; chaissoure (V) 'fouet'; écrivou (P)
'écrivain'; touba (V) 'tabac' (see Bruneau20 for the
modern forms /tubak/ and /tûbak/); joyouê (P) 'joyeux':
quouê (P) 'queue'. The medieval scripta has ou and o
(Gossen21), and all the evidence points to the retention
of the grapheme *ou* as a scripta feature corresponding to a phonetic reality, relatively uninfluenced by the grapheme *eu* of literary French. In the 18th century, one does find examples of the encroachment of *eu*: *neu* 'noeud', modern /nu/; *maulheureu* (P); *mangeu* (P) 'mangeur'; *bafreu* (P) 'bâfreur', and the rime in Piron *seur:choeur* 'seul' - 'choeur' must be taken as a borrowing from literary French, whereas *malheurou:prou* (P) 'malheureux' - 'preux' reflects the actual state of the dialect.

It is difficult to determine what is intended by Piron when he writes *roo* 'roue'. Despite the diversity of explanations for the reflex of ROTA (Pope and Fouché), the scripta points to an underlying */rʊ/ (see 2.4.4.1.). In his *Glossaire*, La Monnoye states: "Reuë. Rouë, & tout au contraire pour queue on dit en Bourguignon quouë." Nevertheless, in the *Noei*, he rimes *bleuë:reue:queue*, which in the modern dialect are /byʊ/ - /ru/ (FEW, X, 490a) - /ku/. In Lorraine, one finds modern /rʊ/ (ALF 1170 and /rʊ in Bruneau24). Apparently, La Monnoye's forms in /ʊ/ are eye-rimes showing the influence of standard French on the dialect in the case of /kʊ/, and Piron may well have intended *roo* to reflect the standard French /ru/ from older /rʊ/.
6. The phoneme /ʊ/ is represented in the scripta by u, û, eu, ou, and oi: su (P) 'sur'; pu (P) 'plus'; cetu (P) 'celui'; pussante (P) 'puissante'; ûsse (V), also written eussint (P) 'eussent': epreuchô (P) 'approchait'; ceu (P) 'cul'; c(u)eudô (P) 'pensait' from COGITARE; veudon (P) 'vidons': groûllai (V), also written grul- (P), modern /grûýe/ 'trembler': éloide (P) 'éclair', modern /elûd/.

1. The reduction of /ʌy/ to /ʊ/, as amply attested in the medieval scripta (Gossen and Goerlich), is present in the 18th century scripta, and corresponds to a phonetic reality: potu 'trou'; bru 'bruit'; faisu: bru 'fait' - 'bruit', all from Piron. Piron has the form busson which, however, is found in the modern dialect as /busô/, not */bûsô/. The rime in Virgille: dessu:su 'dessus' - 'suis' is inspired by the analogy: standard French /Wi/ = dialectal /ʊ/, and appears invented when compared to modern /sé/ 'suis'. The spelling éloide, modern /elûd/ is the result of two competing forms; cf., OF esloidier alternating with esluidier and the commentary in FEW, V, 264b and 265b/266a.

2. The most difficult grapheme to interpret is eu, for which one suspects an underlying /ʊ/. In the case of COGITARE and VOCITARE, OF cuidier and vuidier as they appear in the scripta of Ile-de-France, coupled with the
attested form /vud'ê/ in the dialect of Bourberain, seem to indicate an underlying /û/ phoneme. Unlike the case of modern French, in which the adjective vide from VOCITU played a part in the reduction of the original /wi/, the modern dialect forms /vaW/ - /vâd/, since reduced to /vâd/ for both genders (Rabiet^2^7), further complicate the question. The spelling cœu 'cul' and scœud- COGIT-, with initial c-, further indicate an underlying /û/ phoneme.

7. As already mentioned in 2.4.6.2., the grapheme eu is especially difficult to interpret. In effect, the difficulty is compounded by the interchangeability of eu with the grapheme ë, both of which, according to contemporary sources, represent different sounds. Concerning ë, La Monnoye states in his Glossaire under the word Aïvô 'avec':

Aïvô. Avec. Le circonflexe sur l'o final d'aïvô, marque une certaine prononciation Bourguignonne, qu'il n'y a que les naturels qui puissent attraper. C'est une espèce de diphthongue, dont le son grossier approche de celui que formeroit ohu prononcé très vite, comme si c'étoit un monosyllabe des plus brefs.

Concerning eû, the same author states under the word Seû 'suis':
Seû. Suis. I seû, ou je seû, je suis.
L'accent grave mis à seû donne à entendre que
la prononciation de cet eû est particulière.
Pour la concevoir, il faut se souvenir de celle
de l'â Bourguignon, dont j'ai dit, sur le mot
aivô, que le son ressemble à celui que formeroit
où prononcé aussi vite que si c'étoit un mono-
syllabe des plus brefs, d'où il résulte que le
son de cet eû ressemble à celui d'eû prononcé
avec la même vitesse. J'en dis autant de leû,
meû, feû, neû, jeû, treû, & autres semblables
terminaisons.

We have, first of all, to determine whether we
are dealing with a diphthong in the case of these two
graphemes, as stated by La Monnoye; or whether we are
dealing with an inaccurate description of a monophthong
of the front rounded series, i.e., /œ/ . On the one
hand, the evidence from the medieval scripta is of
little help, since the reflexes of open and closed O
are recorded by graphemes which either reflect the in-
fluence of standard French (Gossen28), or fail to yield
the desired evidence because the situation as described
in the 18th century did not then exist. On the other
hand, evidence from the modern dialect points to the
assumption that both graphemes did, indeed, represent
diphthongs. Unfortunately, the dialect of Bourberain
is not reliable, for reasons which will be discussed
below, in determining the situation in Dijon in the 18th century, and the information gathered by Taverdet, although it does coincide more fully with the earlier state, is far too scanty for the establishment of patterned occurrences. Once again, our point of departure must be the modern phonemes, with which we will compare the various graphemes.

1. Where the modern dialect has /ð/, the 18th century scripta has eu, eʊ, -euə, ə, and e: breule (V) 'brûle' (FEW, XIV, 76a); beu (P) 'boeuf' (ALF 141); cueu, also queure (P) 'cuir' (ALF 368); bleuve (V) 'bleue' (ALF 188); seugu (P) 'suivi'; beuvo (P) 'buivait'; meusoo (P), modern /ˈmʊsə/ 'se cacher pour épier'; cheulai (V) glossed as 'boire' in La Monnoye and as 'sucer le pouce' in Rabiet (FEW, XI, 566b): peûte (P) 'laide' (FEW, IX, 632a); treu⁸ (P) 'truie' (FEW, XIII/2, 315a); nörri (P) 'nourrir', (FEW, VII, 250a); clèlan (P) 'clouant', modern /təlɛ/ and FEW, II/I, 770a; tëjor (P) 'toujours' (ALF 1318 and FEW, III, 164a); òblie (P) 'oublie' (FEW, VII, 271b): brelï ai (P) 'brûler'; cf., breule above; devoo (P) 'devait'; tret⁸ (P) glossed as 'tous sans exception' in La Monnoye, modern dialect as 'tout à fait' (FEW, XIII/2, 127a). The examples cited would seem to indicate a graphemic distribution as follows: eu in tonic syllables;
6 in pretonic syllables; and ę in pretonic syllables containing r, cf., the modern free variants /brōlē/ - /būrē/ 'bruler', a question which will be treated more fully in the section on consonants. However, if we consider for a moment just the graphemes ę and ę, we find that it is at this point that the evidence of the modern dialect fails to clarify the earlier state, for both graphemes, as used in the 18th century, correspond to a tripartite division observable in the alternation of syntactic doublets in the modern dialect. For example, the rime in Piron neł: feł 'nuit' (NOCTE) - 'feu' (FOCU) points to the phoneme /6/, although one finds in the modern dialect the alternation /nay/ (tonic) - /n6/ (atonic) and /fay/ (tonic) - /f6/ (atonic), Rabiet29. The same is true of the rimes: leł:feł (P) 'lieu' - 'feu' and mel:feł (V) 'mieux' - 'feu' (FEW, VI/I, 668b for the modern form /mæ/ in Minot, near Dijon. The grapheme ę also occurs in a second type of alternation; mel:maseł (P) 'désormais', and the words depeł and peł (modern /pūsk/ for earlier peł que could well be a standard French borrowing) all show the alternation /-6/ (tonic) - /-6/ (atonic).

The grapheme ę also occurs in words which in the modern dialect have an alternation /św/ (tonic) - /ś/ (atonic), cf., 3.12: trę (P) 'trop'; desę, also dezę (P)
'dessous', modern /dʒə/ - /dʒ/, aivō (P) 'avec'; pechō (P) 'un peu'; sō (P) 'coup'. Bearing in mind what was said in 2.5.3 concerning the evidence that the tonic form was the one generalized in the alternation /-ay/ - /-ē/, we see by the examples above that the scripta shows evidence for only the atonic form. Examples of other words in which the scripta has either 6 or eu for which the modern dialect of Bourberain has /æ/, with no alternation, are: chōse (P) 'chose'; clō (P) 'clou'; calō (P) 'noix'; bonō (P) 'bonnet' (Gossen notes the frequency of the o graphemes from -ITTU/A30, and Fouché discusses the development of -ITTU with special reference to Bourberain.31); mō (P) 'mot'; pitō (P) 'putois'; pō (P) 'peur'; atō (P) 'orteil'; crō (P) 'creux': pleujo (P) 'pluie'.

The solution to the question of the uniformity of the 18th century graphemes as opposed to the diversity of the modern dialect forms lies in the realization that types of syntactic doublets cited above existed at the time our corpus was written; and the poets chose to generalize the form which most closely corresponded to that of standard French, thereby avoiding the problem of reproducing alternating forms for which standard French had no equivalents. In the spoken dialect, however, La Monnoye was aware of the alternations, therefore he is
inclined to identify both $\ddot{a}$ and $\mathfrak{e}u$ as diphthongs, i.e., the tonic forms as discussed above; although, in practice, the poets wrote only the atonic form corresponding to $/\ddot{a}/$, since the monophthong corresponded more generally in shape to standard French. In the modern dialects, we find a wide variation in the form that finally came to predominate. We see a remnant of the first stage in Rabiet. The syntactic doublets exist for a limited number of words, reflecting the loss of an earlier stage in which the pairs of doublets were more widespread. The second stage is found in Taverdet. Here, we see only the form which was eventually generalized, with no competing forms conditioned by sentence phonetics. By way of illustration, the following is a list of the present-day forms cited by Taverdet, along with their scripta form in the 18th century:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Scripta Form</th>
<th>Pronunciation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sölô 'soleil'</td>
<td>/sölô, sölöey, sölɛw/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neû 'nuit' NOCTE</td>
<td>/nè, nö, nèy, noey/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calô 'noîx'</td>
<td>/kalö, kalɛw/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clô 'clou'</td>
<td>/kyö, tyɛw/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitô 'putois'</td>
<td>/pitö, pitɛw/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queûtse 'jambe'</td>
<td>/kès, kös, kösɛs, këys, kès/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atô 'orteil'</td>
<td>/ëtö, atɛw/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feû 'feu' FOCU</td>
<td>/fè, fëy, fëy/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cueu 'cuit'</td>
<td>/kè, kö, koey, këy/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aitô 'aussi'</td>
<td>/ëtö, ëtɛw/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Obviously, each of the above examples contains a form which agrees with the 18th century graphemes; however, even within one restricted area, the form in use appears to have been chosen rather arbitrarily, and the modern form containing /œ/; which we have posited for the 18th century, is generally found in dialects not contiguous with Dijon.

2.5. Nasal Vowels.

1. The phoneme /œ/ is represented in the 18th century scripta by ūn, ain, ein, in; ai and ei + /n/; ain + /c/ and /j/; séne (P) 'sonne'; plène (P) 'pleine'; cuséne (V) 'cuisine' (cf., the rime cuseigne: faireigne (P) 'farine' with modern /küzên/ and ferên/); épéne (P) 'épine': caine (P) 'cane'; disaine (P) 'tisane' (mod. /dizên/; tein (P) 'tient'; chein (P) 'chien': rasin (P) 'raisin'; ansin (P) 'ainsi'; aimin (P) 'ami'; maitin (P) 'matin'. For the most part, the medieval scripta agrees with that of the 18th century. Goerlich32 says about I + nasal: "In molains (=moulin) MP. II No. (2mal) wird man wohl besser Suffixvertauschung annehmen."; however, in view of the modern /mlê/, we must assume that the scribe was attempting to reproduce the typical dialect pronunciation with /œ/.

In the case of /n'/, we find ai and ei before /n'/ resulting from N + yod in the stymon: écraigne (scriniu)
(P) 'hutte'; campagne (P); vaigne (P) 'vigne': as well as in those cases in which an intervocalic /n/ later became palatalized, cf., 2.7.3: faigne (P) 'fine'; fameigne (P) 'famine'; raiceigne (V) 'racine'; campagne varmeigne (P) 'vermine'. In addition to ai and ei, the medieval scripta also shows oi + /n/ (Gossen), a feature which must be compared to the frequency of the grapheme oin + /j/ and /c/: diemoinge 'dimanche'; venoinges 'vendange'; etc. The 18th century has exclusively ain + palatal: mainge (P) 'mange' (the modern form /méjé/ is the only form throughout the Côte-d'Or); grainge (P) 'grange'; fraincheman (P) 'franchement'; vendainge (P) 'vendange'. The last form is interesting since it appears to be a standard French borrowing which has been made to conform to the poet's notion of how the word should be in the dialect. The modern /vnədʒ/ is a direct continuation of the form venoinges cited above. The arbitrary nature of the forms borrowed from standard French is indicated by the rime in Piron ainge linge 'ange' - 'linge'. The grapheme oin + palatal is to be compared to the grapheme oi + palatal in the medieval scripta: boiche 'bouche'; Oiche 'Ouche'; soiche 'sèche', cf., p. 43 of this study.

The question now must be resolved as to the possibility of distinguishing two vowel heights for the phoneme /ə/. The modern dialect has a limited number of words,
mostly the result of A + M, N + E, U in Vulgar Latin, hav-
ing /È/: /pÈ/ 'pain'; /mÈ/ 'main'; /tevÈ/ 'taon'; etc. For
these words, Rabiet posits a development: MANU = /mÈn/ = /mÈn/ = /mÈ/, and cites as a living example of the de-
velopment the archaic /pÈdmÈn/ 'essuie-mains'. There is
not much in the 18th century scripta to justify the belief
that the poets distinguished two vowel heights. On the
one hand, /È/ appears in the scripta as ain (craigÈ
'craignait'), or oin (STRAME = Øtrowin, modern /etrÈ/
'paille'). The spelling tavane (P) 'taon' reflects a
form more common to the south of our region (FEW, XIII/1,1).
The answer lies in the rimes of Piron in which the modern
dialect distinguishes two heights: eussein:main 'eussent' -
'main'; main:annemin 'main' - 'ennemi'; whereas the poet
rimes indiscriminately because of the lack of contrast in
standard French, which by this time has only /È/.

2. The region of Burgundy is one in which original
AN and EN fell together, both resulting in /È/. This is
evident in the medieval scripta (Gossen), and the 18th
century scripta has gone even further by opting for the
grapheme an almost exclusively: ancor (P) 'encore'; an (P)
'an' and 'en'; ran (P) 'rien' (although there is no par-
ticular evidence in the medieval scripta pointing to
this development, FouchÈ notes the form /rÈ/ through-
out the region.); san (P) 'sans'; ansanne (P) 'ensemble';
fanne (P) 'femme'; tam (P) 'temps' (both the spelling with 
-m and the meaning suggest standard French influence, 
since in the modern dialect /tâ/ means 'ciel', cf., 
Robert-Juret35 for the same semantic shift).

Although Piron writes chaigne 'chêne' (probably under 
the influence of -aigne), the spelling chagne in Virgille 
corresponds to modern /can/. Robert-Juret37 also notes 
this pronunciation in the dialect of Tournus, as well 
as the form /côn/. We are, in effect, dealing with an 
extensive area in which there is confusion of /ə/ and 
/ø/. Examples from the 18th century scripta are not 
numerous, once again because of the influence of standard 
French, but one does note in Piron man Dieu 'mon Dieu' 
and bâne 'borgne'. Bruneau38 has a complete discussion 
of the problem in the area east of Burgundy. In addition, 
he cites medieval scripta evidence from Mézières: quelcanque 
'quelconque'; an 'on' (the common form in Ch. de Troyes); 
maisant 'maison'.

Piron does not record the nasal vowel in the words 
carre 'cendre', tarre 'tendre', and varredi 'vendredi'. 
For a discussion of this problem, see pp. 72-73.

3. Nasal /ɵ/ appears in the scripta as on:bon (P) 'bon'; dôn (P) 'donc'; voron (P) 'voudront'; busson (V) 
'buisson'; garçon (P) 'garçon', obviously standard 
French when compared to modern /gasnə/ from garçonnet.
One of the most common traits of the region is the development of VL closed E + nasal + -A. The medieval scripta gives ample evidence of the development to /ɔ/ (Lebel, poinne 'peine'; Goerlich, poine 'peine', àvoine 'avoine', roine 'reine'). We find in Piron: pone 'peine' (also spelled péne under standard French influence); aivonne 'avoine', and in addition, monne 'moine', a possible calque on French. The rime pone:cone 'peine' - 'corne' confirms the modern pronunciation. In the medieval period, Lebel notes, besides the more common foin, a spelling foing, which gains credence when compared to the statement in Rabiet: "Les personnes...m'ont parlé d'une forme très ancienne se reprochant de /fɔn/, pour foin, sans m'en garantir absolument l'exactitude." The form foin (P) had already made its way into the written language by the 18th century, and today one finds /fwɛ/ throughout the region.

We see a hybrid formation in genon (P) 'genou', the nasal /ɔ/ is taken by Rabiet as representing an earlier */jlon/', "...autant qu'on peut en juger par le dérivé /eljlon'ɛ/, agenouiller." which, if this is the case, is incorrect, since the derived form has undergone metathesis, cf., OF genoil. The form genon is the result of the influence of the nasal environment (FEW, IV, 113a) which cites many examples of the type genon to the south of Burgundy.
Two particular dialect developments are evident in the rime conte: éponte (V) 'conte' - 'épouvante', cf., OF espoenter from *EXPAVENTARE, and armona (P) 'almanach', a pronunciation confirmed by modern /armôna/.

4. The phoneme /ø/ is written un, (um) and eun: lundi (P) 'lundi'; venun (P) 'venu'; frachun (P) 'bois à brûler': leugne (P) 'luné'; pleume (P) 'plume'; breugne (P) 'brune'. As Gossen points out, the medieval scripta indicates that Burgundy belongs to the region in which the palatalization of U was impeded by the following nasal. He cites as examples chascon, chacoun, Ostum, etc., with the further comment: "Es erweist sich auf jeden Fall, dass das Phänomen auch in Burgund nicht völlig unbekannt war." However, forms containing UNU/A present a special problem in the 18th century scripta, as well as in the modern dialect. On the one hand, Piron has nûn 'nul' and chécun 'chacun' (modern /nô/ and /cekô/), as opposed to auqueune 'aucune' and auqu'êne 'aucune' (modern /okên/). Concerning the indefinite article, La Monnoye states in his Glossaire:

Ein. Un. Quelques-uns écrivent in, & én. Le Bourguignon dit même fort souvent un, qui a meilleure grace en quelques endroits. Cela dépend de l'oreille.
Stated in linguistic terms, La Monnoye is alluding to the modern situation in which /tɔ/ is a tonic form, and /tɔ(n) is atonic; cf., /trɔ̀ ë pé û sè fà katr/ 'trois et puis un ça fait quatre', as opposed to /é owaw/ 'un cheval' and /èn fàn/ 'une femme'. Although Piron writes plèn - plène 'plein(e)', the modern dialect has the curious alternation /pyð/ - /pyên/. Piron rimes feume: émeune 'fume' - 'amène', which is acceptable within the dialect; whereas the rime écume:pleume betrays an influence of literary French.

The 18th century scripta shows the spellings trumpai and tumbai 'tromper' - 'tomber', concerning which Gougenheim^40 states: "Il est difficile de déterminer si le son noté un était un oe nasal, comme aujourd'hui, ou un u nasal." La Monnoye, in his Glossaire, compares the pronunciation of retumbe with that of humble, a fact which relates the question to standard French and not to the Burgundian dialect, all the more because retumbe is a borrowing, since the common verb in the dialect is a reflex of CADERE.

2.6. Diphthongs.

1. The question of falling diphthongs has been treated under the appropriate vowel according to the evidence of the modern dialect (/ay/ under /e/ in 2.4.2., /aw/ under /o/ in 2.4.4., and /äu/ under /ɔ/ in 2.4.7.).
As was previously stated, it is impossible to posit the kinds of alternation found in Bourberain in the 19th century for the poetic material of the 18th century. It would be wrong to assume, however, that these alternations did not exist on the phonetic level since the phenomenon is so widespread. Bruneau finds it everywhere in the region he studied, and even draws attention to the dialect of Bourberain as the southernmost region of penetration for the alternation /maw/ (tonic) - /mō/ (atonic). Bruneau's explanation is that an echo vowel developed as a result of the lengthening of a stressed vowel, /y/ after /a/, /w/ after /o/, and, as in the case of Bourberain, /W/ after /ə/. Furthermore, according to Bruneau, the oppositions were neutralized "à l'intérieur d'un groupe linguistique," i.e., in all but stressed positions.

2. The rising diphthong resulting from -ELLU presents no special problem in the 18th century: cheitea (P) 'château'; oséaa (P) 'oiseau'; veaa (V) 'veau'; bea (P) beau'; aigneA (V) 'agneau'. It is clear that we have an underlying /ya/, although standard French has encroached on the later dialect; cf., /cataw/ 'château'; archaic /vya/ as above, now /vya/ 'veau', influenced by -eau.
2.7. **Consonants.** The development of the consonants in Burgundy, except for the well-known absence of a glide consonant in the secondary groups n - r, n - l (Gossen⁴², Fouché⁴³), is essentially like that of standard French. There are, however, three major trends discernible in the scripta of the 18th century which are either partially indicated in the medieval scripta, or more certainly, attested by the modern dialect. These are: 1) a high degree of metathesis especially with /r/, 2) the palatalization of intervocalic /l/ and /n/, 3) the loss of /r/ before dentals, and the loss of both /l/ and /r/ in final position. Contrary to what we have seen in the case of the vowels, there is an amazing fidelity to the pronunciation in the writing of the consonants. What was not pronounced, was simply not written — a fact which greatly eases the load on the linguist studying the scripta of any period.

As stated in 2.3., the consonants will be presented in the order: stops, fricatives, nasals, and liquids.

1. /p/. The phoneme /p/ occurs as in standard French: podri, also paidri (P) 'perdrix'; porsenaige (P) 'personnage'; épeule (P) 'appelle'; émeune (P) 'amène'.

2. /b/. The phoneme /b/ appears as in standard French: beuvo (P) 'buvait'; borgei (P) 'berger', modern
The retention of /b/ in *sambaidi* (P) 'samedi' is confirmed by the medieval scripta; cf., 1.5.1., as well as the modern dialect (*FEW*, XI/1, 2a). Both *caibesse* (P) 'bécasse' and *cadabre* (P) 'cadavre' would appear to be borrowings entering into the language by way of the ear rather than through writing.

3. /t/. As stated in 1.5.18, the retention of final -t is somewhat later than supposed (Bruneau). However, by the 18th century, final t has ceased to be written: *poin* (P) 'point'; *potan* (P) 'pourtant'; *doi* (P) 'doit'; *hau* (P) 'haut'; *fau* (P) 'faut'. The scripta shows *cor* - *cote* (P) 'court(e)' and *for* - *fote* 'fort(e)' (P) where the modern dialect has /kɔ/ - /kɔt/ and /fɔ/ - /fɔt/. Evidence for the modern /cti/ - /ctit/ 'chétif' - 'chétive' is found in Piron, *chaiti* - *chetite*. Note: the 18th century scripta does not record /t/ or /d/.

There is evidence pointing to the fact that these two phonemes were in existence in a limited number of words, especially in reflexes of VL, GL- and GL-.

4. /d/. Although as previously stated in 1.5.1 and 2.7., our region neither retained the nexus ND (mod. /prår/ from *PRENDERE, and /vnɔj/ 'vendange'), nor did it show an intercalated ą in secondary groups; therefore, the numerous examples cited by Goerlich from the medieval scripta show the influence of the scripta of Ile-de-France.
Weakening of an earlier $t$ is evident in the series
pidié 'pitié' (FEW, VIII, 438b, 442b), pidouse 'piteuse',
pidance 'pitance', and in the isolated word disaine
'tisane' (FEW, IX, 503). The shift probably started
with an original pitié, progressing through the stages
/pityé/ = */pidyé/ = /pid'e/, and extended to the other
forms with a back vowel. The modern dialect shows all
the above words with /d/. The case of sor - sode and
lor - lode 'sourd(e)', 'lourd(e)' is analogous to the
situation discussed under $t$ (2.7.3.), although in the
modern dialect, we find /sód/ for both genders. Again,
final -d was not inserted into the scripta as it was in
literary French in words like neu (P) 'noeud', etc.

5. /k/. The phoneme /k/ is rendered either by
cu- or qu- in the following examples from Piron: cueu,
also queure 'cuir'; queûsse 'jambe'; requelai 'reculer';
cueu 'cuit', and sometimes by ç- alone: cegneussi
'connut'; cœu 'cul'; œutte 'cuite'. The reflexes of
COGITARE are subject to the alternation cu- vs. ç-,
probably because the word was archaic, and confined
only to writing. The dialect is particularly clear in
examples like quemar (P) 'comme' and quemance (B)
'commence' in which we see an attempt to record a pro-
nunciation found today in /kmâ/, etc.
6. /g/. See 2.7.8 for a discussion of Germanic w.

7. /f/. Final, unpronounced f was not written:
neu (P) 'neuf'; beu (P) 'boeuf'; oeu (P) 'oeuf'; nor was it extended by analogy to soy 'soif', modern /sè/.

8. /v/. The 18th century scripta writes regularly vou (P) 'ou' and occasionally one finds lai vou (P) with the simple meaning of 'ou'. It is apparent from the modern dialect that the original combination of the semantic elements là + où required an adventitious v to relieve hiatus; cf., the famous Chanson de l'Escalade of Geneva (17th century), which begins: "Cé qué lai..." Bour-berain has /lavu/ as an interrogative, although the variations showing a reduction of /lavu/ definitely complicate the matter. The combination d'ù (P) 'd'ou' is probably the result of standard French.

The use of intercalated v to relieve hiatus is common in the verbal system: aivu (P) 'eu'; peu (P); etc., from earlier ahu and pehu. The forms voeu (voeu) (P) 'oui', modern /voy/ and /vway/ probably arouse as a result of sentence phonetics, i.e., in combinations in which the preceding word ended in a vowel. The rejection of hiatus might also account for tavane (P) 'taon', modern /tevè/, although the spelling seems to indicate a form alien to the region (FEW, XIII/1, 1).
Gossen rejects the few examples of Germanic \( \text{\~w} \)-
in a form other than \( gu- \) or \( g- \) (mostly in personal names) as "schlecht lokalisier." He sees, therefore, the overriding influence of the standard French scripta, reflecting a region where the development to /g/ is normal. Gossen's statement leaves unexplained the words évairai 'égarer' from Frankish WARON (FEW, XVII, 536b) and lou vairou 'loup-garou' from Frankish WERWULF (FEW, XVII, 569b), both of which are found in Piron. Rabiet succeeds in throwing some light on the question when he states:

La prononciation française (sc. /g/) se substitue peu à peu à cette ancienne prononciation (sc. /v/) du \( w \) germanique. Ainsi, on dit actuellement à Bourberain egerè, égarer. Mais, dans Aimé Piron, par exemple, la forme régulière du mot est évairè (sic). L'un de ses petits poèmes a pour titre Évaireman de lai peste.

We are, properly speaking, dealing with two isolated cases in which the standard language has not succeeded in ousting a purely regional form. We may add a third example in the form of éveure (P), which Mignard glosses as 'étourdis', thereby making a definite link with évairai (FEW, XVII, 537b).
Both /s/ and /z/ are written indifferently s or z. Despite the late retention of flexional -s, as witnessed by the medieval scripta, there is no evidence of -s in the 18th century scripta. The result is, therefore, a complete lack of distinction between singular and plural in the nominal flexion: pote (P) 'portes'; fanne (P) 'femmes'; aigneà (P) 'agneaux'; etc. This problem will be taken up more fully in the section on morphology. The occasional writing of an -s in liaison: beaC ovraige (V) 'beaux ouvrages'; froidurou zhivar (P) 'froids hivers' is a concession to the literary language, since the adjectival inflexion follows that of the noun in not distinguishing singular and plural. Concerning the question of liaison, Mignard states:

Comme les liaisons des mots entre eux sont peu pratiquées dans l'idiome bourguignon, la lettre z sert quelquefois à marquer celles qui sont absolument essentielles. Ainsi, les Bourguignons disent "faire des zaisse:" "prendre ses zabai," pour signifier prendre ses ébats. 48

Although Mignard's commentary is not generally accurate, he at least is speaking in terms confirmed by the usage of the scripta.

In intervocalic position, the use of z, conforming to a phonetic reality, is much more extensive: faizon
(P) 'faisons', modern /fazO/; dezO (also dezO) 'dessous', modern /dzÄW/ as a result of assimilation.

The s in osetan, ostan (P) 'autant' from aussi is found in the present-day form /ostâ/ (FEW, XIII/1, 936).

10. /c/ and /j/ present no special problems, both written, as in standard French, ch and g (j). The medieval scripta shows the hesitation in writing the result of -ANICA, -ENICA (diemoinge, diemoinche, Goerlich^49), but the earliest evidence shows only grange, greange, graange, which, in the 18th century, appears as grainge (P).

11. /m/. The use of graphic m does not differ from that of standard French. The spelling tam (P) 'temps', modern /tâ/ 'ciel', appears both graphically and semantically as a borrowing from literary French; cf., p. 89 of this study.

12. /n/. The problem of orthographic n is closely linked with the hesitation between the phoneme /n/ and /n/ in intervocalic position. On the one hand, the scripta used in Virgille is representative of the situation as found in Bourberain in that intervocalic –n– was palatalized to /n/ in the feminine of adjectives, whereas, in substantives, intervocalic /n/ is not palatalized: feigne 'fine'; divaigne 'divine', as opposed to faïrène 'farine'; cuséne 'cuisine' (Rabiet^50). On the other
hand, Piron has *cuzeigne* and *faireigne* (modern /kùzɛ̃/, /ferɛ̃/), as opposed to *épène* 'épine' and *tène* 'tiennent' (modern /ɛpɛ̃/, /tɛ̃/).

The n in *senon* (V) 'selon', 'à mesure que' ('Et, senon que le bru s'éprôche..." 'Et, à mesure que le bruit s'approche') shows the effect of assimilation resulting from the nasal environment (*FEW*, XI/1, 385b-486).

The metathesis of n is seen, as in other dialects (*FEW*, IV, 39b) in *genelôte* (P) 'petite poule' and *genelei* (P) 'poulailler' (modern /ʒlin'ɛʁ/), as opposed to *gelene* 'poule'.

13. /n/. As previously stated (2.7.12.), the passage of intervocalic /n/ to /n/ is indicated by the graph gn: *breugne* (P) 'brune'; *leûgne* (P) 'lune'; *meigne* (P) 'mine'; *fameigne* (P) 'famine'; etc. Goerlich51 cites sufficient examples to indicate that the change began during the Middle Ages. Concerning the situation in the 19th century, we have the following remark of Durandeau:

Les Bourguignons mouillent le plus de consonnes qu'ils peuvent; c'est ainsi que, dans cette intention, ils accompagnent d'un g la lettre n et écrivent, p. e., *mignute* pour minute;...52
According to our previous remark concerning the alternation of \(/n/\) and \(/n'/\) only in the adjectives, it is apparent that evidence from Bourberain contradicts Durandeau's statement. Piron appears to have written \(-gn-\) everywhere, and in his desire to make learned vocabulary conform to his concept of the dialect, we find: contignan 'continent'; infigni 'infini'; pénitance 'pénitence'; etc. The degree of hesitation must have been great, as we find instances in which an etymological \(/n/\) is written \(n\) (tène from TENEAT), and a rime such as besognepone (P) 'besogne' - 'peine' indicate the degree of vacillation.

We have at least one example of an early collapse of \(/n/ + /y/\) going to \(/n'/\) in the isolated word mugnei (P) 'meunier', borne out by the modern form \(/m\text{ùn}'ay/\), which, according to Rabiet, owes its \(/u/\) to the palatalization of \(/n/\).

14. /l/. Intervocalic /l/ shows the same tendency to become palatalized as was noted in the case of n. Durandeau continues the question of palatalization by adding:

...; c'est encore ainsi qu'ils emploient deux l à lieu d'un seul, comme dans "fillai," filer, au lieu de "filai," en prononçant "gliai;"
c'est encore de la sorte qu'ils prononcent "déglice" tout en écrivant délice.\textsuperscript{54}

The complete adherence of the scripta of the 18th century to this principle is evident from the frequency of the graph 11: difficille (P) 'difficile'; ville: fille (P); ville:ille (P) 'ville' - 'ille'; etc. Since the 18th century, /l/ has disappeared as in standard French, and today ville is pronounced /viy/. Piron also has the interesting rime velle:Farjonnelle, showing a different treatment of VL VILLA, evidence for which Rabiet finds preserved in the proverb /tö cmé mên è lè vèl/ 'tout chemin mène à la ville', cf., p. 65 of this study.

In the combination consonant + l, the scripta does not indicate the palatalization of l: blai (P) 'blé'; bleuve (V) 'bleu'; pleume (P) 'plume', today /byè/. /byöv/, /pyöm/; although Durandeau recommends that those reading the 18th century poets pronounce cloche as "clieuche", and clocher as "guyeuchi". There is no further information on the passage of VL CL- and GL- to modern /t/ and /d/, since the scripta uses only cl- and gl-: clö (P) 'clou', modern /tööv/ and glaice (P) 'glace', modern /d'ës/.

In initial position, /l/ has been absorbed in the modern dialect by the diphthong resulting from open E
in Vulgar Latin; cf., /yévr/ from LEPORÉ. The scripta has the standard orthography liévre (V).

The complete absence of an etymological final l is evident in the spellings lai quei (P) 'laquelle'; sau (P) 'sel'; egau (P) 'égal'; etc. The lack of final l is so strongly felt that, even in the case of an obvious scripta borrowing such as sei (V) 'sel' (normally sau), the final l is not written. The rime cié:marche-pié (V) 'ciel' is a further example of the loss of final l.

The form clôlan 'clouant', as found in Piron, is present in the modern dialect (/t′ülè/ 'clouer').

15. /r/. The instability of /r/ is evident in the hesitation in words such as: formai, fromai, formai (P) 'fermer' (modern /frômè/; fremi (P) 'fourmi' (modern /frômè/; formaige (P) 'fromage' (modern /frômêj/); Bregogne (P) 'Bourgogne'; etc. When considered in light of the modern dialect, the solution appears to be the tendency to create an initial cluster with /r/ as the second element, rather than a syllable closed by /r/.

In final position, the 18th century scripta, as well as the modern dialect, show the dropping of /r/: plaisi (P) 'plaisir'; vé (P) 'vers'; anvé (P) 'envers' (cf., travar below); hié (P) 'hier'; sarvitou (P) 'serviteur'; soti (P) 'sortir'. The /r/ was not restored in the verbal system, as in modern French, in those verbs.
in -IRE, although /r/ does persist in the type /bɔr/ 'boire', /krɔr/ 'croire', etc. The numerous instances in which an inorganic final -r is written are sufficient to indicate that it was no longer pronounced: clair (clar) (P) 'clé', also in the rime clar:soudar (V) 'clé' - 'soldat' (Goerlich notes the form clers from CLAVES in the medieval scripta); travers (V) 'travers'; mier (V) 'miel'; cier (P) 'ciel'; cartier (P) 'charité'; aivɔcar(P) 'avocat'; seur (P) 'seul' (modern /su/). Concerning words of the type aivɔcar, soudar, etc., Durandeau says:

Les Bourguignons ont si peu l'habitude de terminer leurs mots pas la voyelle a, qu'ils employent l'r pour éviter cela. Ils disent, p.e., aivɔcar pour avocat.

As indicated in 2.2.1., Durandeau, in his desire to recreate the dialect of the 18th century, has too readily assumed that a graphic r must have been pronounced, despite the evidence of the examples cited above. One of the earliest features of the Burgundian dialect for which there is concrete evidence in the medieval scripta is the loss of r before a dental consonant. Both Goerlich and Philipon cite enough examples
to assure us that we are dealing with a change that had
begun at least as early as the 13th century. As might
be expected, the scripta of the 18th century shows a
considerable amount of vacillation, a result of the
prevailing pronunciation, on the one hand, and the pres­
sure of conforming to a tradition, i.e., standard French,
which, in this most obvious case, was completely divergent.
Except for those cases in which metathesis comes into
play, we can distinguish three solutions in the scripta
for the loss or retention of implosive r: 1) that in
which r is absent, and the original quality of the Vulgar
Latin vowel is kept if the etymon has /e/: pote (P)
'porte'; code (P) 'corde'; fotte (P) 'forte'; maicredi
(P) 'mercredi'; paidri (P) 'perdrix', 2) that in which
r is absent, and the original /e/ has been lowered to
/a/: padan (P) 'perdant' (the modern dialect has both
/padr/, as under 1 above, and /padr/); ovate (P)
'ouverte', 3) that in which r is present, and an original
/e/ appears as /a/: personne (P) 'personne'; carvelle
(P) 'cervelle'; vartu (P) 'vertu'. The kinds of words
involved in the last category doubtless indicated bor­
rowed words made to conform to the poet's notion of what
the phonemic structure should be in the dialect. As for
the first two categories, there is no unity of treat­
ment, either in the 18th century, or in the modern dialect,
cf., /pedr/ - /padr/ 'perdre'. If there is a latent tendency toward uniformity, this tendency is the absence of r coupled with the lowering of former /e/, probably under the influence of words with an etymological /a/: /cad6/ 'chardon; /jad6/ 'jardin'; /at6W/ 'orteil'; etc.

As in other dialects (FEW, VII, 606a), assimilation is apparent from the earliest times in palai (P) 'parler' (Lebel: palle, palloit, paller); whereas, dissimilation is at work in abre (P) 'arbre', also attested in this form in the medieval scripta. Another example of dissimilation is vairin (P) 'venin' from VENENU (modern /ver/= and FEW, XIV, 234b) and anvairimée (P) 'envenimée'.

The dental-lingual pronunciation of /r/ is indicated by the passage of l to r in the words armone (V) 'aumône', cf., OF almosne and armona (P) 'almanach', modern /armôna/; as well as in the examples cited by Rabiet for the modern dialect.

2.8. Morphology. The treatment of the morphological features will follow that adopted for the modern dialect. The categories to be examined are: 1) substantives, 2) pronominals, 3) verbs, 4) indeclinables. It is hoped that, by using a uniform presentation, comparisons can be made between the scripta of the 18th century and the
modern spoken dialect.

1. There is no graphic distinction between singular and plural in the noun: *châi* (P) 'chat(s)'; *père* (P) 'père(s)'; *grenier* (P) 'grenier(s)'; *pays*; *bouf* (P) 'bouf(s)'; etc. The scripta, therefore, has no alternation, even in forms which show two stems in standard French: *euille* (P) 'œil' and 'yeux'; *chevaux* (P) 'cheval, -aux'; cf., medieval *chevaux* - *chevaux* in which the plural is marked, at least graphematically. Even words borrowed from the literary language conform to this pattern, *général* (P) 'général'.

The kind of alternation discussed on p. 145 is not evident in the 18th century corpus, cf., *chevaux* (P) 'cheval' (stressed) - *cheval de bois* (V) 'cheval de bois', although it may have existed on the phonetic level.

2. The adjective is like the noun in that there is absolutely no distinction between singular and plural, i.e., a distinction which cannot be attributed to the influence of literary French, rather than to the current state of the spoken dialect. However, in addition to the expected alternation resulting from the distinction feminine - masculine, there is an overriding influence of literary French which makes the interpretation of the underlying morphological structure much more complicated than in the nouns, where, as we have seen, literary
French has very little influence. The problem is further complicated by the fact that the paradigms are not always complete, and even in La Monnoye's Glossaire, it is rare to find both the masculine and the feminine cited. We can, nevertheless, discern the modern situation as discussed on p. 151.

In the majority of cases, the scripta shows a feminine form which differs from the masculine in that the former ends in a consonant which is lacking in the latter: darreire - darrei (P) 'dernière'- 'dernier'; grande - gran (P) 'grand(e)'; malaigne - mailin (P) 'maligne' - 'malin' (the underlying nasal is the same in both forms, i.e., /melən/ - /melə/, and fits into the present category); prête - proo (P) 'prêt(e)'; moillou - meillouse (P) 'meilleur(e)'; peste - peut (P) 'laid(e)'; chaitite - chaiti (P) 'chétif -ive'. It is apparent from this list that the written dialect has been made to conform to the model of literary French, especially if one considers the modern dialect in light of certain of the examples given above. For example, the modern dialect has an extensive category of adjectives in which the variation of forms depends not on the gender of the noun modified, but rather the initial phoneme of the noun modified. Of this category, we notice certain peculiarities of a nature which point directly to the modern
development, and bears no trace of standard French influence. By way of illustration, La Monnoye states in his Glossaire under the word Chêtit: "Chêtit devant une voyelle, chêt devant une consonne," and, in addition, recommends the same distribution for the word Tô. Piron has one clear example of the modern situation in grand sôtise, to which we can compare the sequence in Bourberain /ôn grâ fân/ 'une grande femme'.

The second major category is that of the adjectives which have an alternation in the stem for the two genders: frôche - frai (P) 'fraîche' - 'frais' (the masculine is borrowed from literary French); veille - vieu (P), and viei in Virgille, 'vieille' - 'vieux', cf., modern /vây/ for both genders; blainche - blanc (P) 'blanche' - 'blanc', modern /byêc/ - /byâ/. To this list must be added: cor - cote (P) 'court(e)'; lor - lode (P) 'lourd(e); sor - sode (P) 'sourd(e)', although their treatment is different in the modern dialect, cf., /kô/ - /kôt/, as opposed to /sôd/ for both genders. Cf. 2.7.15 for status of r before dentals.

3. The definite article is the same as in standard French, except for the combination à + leg, which makes ès, ès ebazoi (P) 'aux abois'. This feature is observable in the earliest documents (Gossen59, Lebel60) and certainly must be classified as a distinctive trait.
of the region.

4. The possessive adjectives are like those of literary French. In the plural, we find note and vote without r, forms which have influenced an analogical lote (lotte) in the third person plural, cf., modern /lót égliz/ 'leur(s) église(s) (FEW, IV, 551b and n.23). The form lote 'leur(s) is a recent formation, and we find the earlier lo - los as a continuation of medieval lour (Lebel61) used side by side with the modern formation.

5. The demonstrative adjectives are: masculine singular ce(t); feminine singular cette (ceute), cf., modern /stü fann? 'cette femme', whereas ceute, under the influence of literary French cette, suggests an underlying structure */söt fann/. In the plural, we see cé(s) as in standard French.

6. The pronominals will be discussed in the following order: 1) personal, 2) interrogative (relative), 3) demonstrative.

1. The personal pronouns betray the influence of literary French in their spelling, but their usage conforms perfectly with that of the modern dialect. The forms i, i', and je are used for both first person singular and plural, concerning which La Monnoye states:
En Bourguignon *i mainge*, *je mainge* sont équivalents pour signifier en François *je mange*... Les Bourguignons confondant le singulier avec le pluriel, mettent toujours *i* ou *je* à la place de *nous*.

Aside from making no distinction in the third person between singular and plural, there is no systematic distinction between masculine and feminine, i.e., *ai* + consonant = 'il, elle, ils, and elles', and the same is true of *el* and *ai l'* + vowel. The frequency of *elle* in the strict sense of the feminine is obviously the result of literary French.

The second person forms *tu* and *vo(s)* pose no special problem since they are reflected in the modern dialect by */t̥u/* and */v̥o(z)*. The 18th century scripta bears no evidence of the sandhi-variants */t̥/ and */w/* as seen in the modern forms */t̥e/* 'tu es' and */wét/* 'vous êtes'.

2. The distribution of the object pronouns is the same as in the modern dialect of Bourberain. Among the free forms (disjunctives), the only point of variance is in the third person forms. The medieval scripta shows a high degree of hesitation in the feminine singular, *li*, *ley*, and *lui* occurring as free variants in the construction *preposition + pronoun*. In the 18th century
scripta, the distinction lei feminine - lu masculine is firmly established, cf., san lei 'sans elle', po lu 'pour lui', etc. In the plural, the early documents indicate a rivalry between aus from ILLOS and lour from ILLORU: entre aux 'entre eux'; riere lour 'derrière eux' (Lebel 62). The 18th century scripta reflects the modern situation in that only lor occurs after prepositions.

The bound forms, i.e., pronominals used in verbal constructions as either proclitics or enclitics, are as they appear in the modern dialect. The proclitics are as in literary French, except for li 'lui' as an indirect object: Don le fuyar li fi prezan (V) 'Dont le fuyard lui (sc. à elle) fit présent'; and a few lines later: Marcure qui venoo li dire (V) 'Mercure qui venait lui (sc. à lui) dire'. These particular forms appear in the modern dialect, and are a continuation of OF, as in other dialects (FEW, IV, 550b and 554a). The enclitic forms are as in the modern dialect, with the hesitation between standard French moi and regional me clearly visible in examples such as: seù-moi (V) 'suis-moi'; seugué moi (P) 'suivez-moi'; as opposed to: croyé-me (P) 'croyez-moi'; di me voi (P) 'dis-moi vrai', for which one can posit an underlying /mê/ as seen in the modern dialect. Aside from these examples, the
pronominal system is very much under the influence of standard French.

3. The interrogatives are: *qui*, *que*, and *quoi*, showing the same distribution as in literary French. The neuter *quoi* appears either as *quoi*, under the influence of standard French, or as *quei*, reflecting the modern /ké/ 'as in /po ké far/ 'pour quoi faire?'.

The relatives *qui* and *que* have not yet fallen together as in the modern dialect in which /k/ serves in both cases. One could accept most readily the distinction's being maintained in the 18th century as a result of the literary language of prestige, since in the Virgille, there are a few examples of the modern situation; cf., "...ame que vive;" 'âme qui vive'. Both Piron and La Monnoye keep a strict "grammatical" separation between both works, i.e., "grammatical" in the sense of literary French. The modern dialect shows an extended use of /k/ replacing other pronominals; however, the 18th century still shows *vou* 'où' in functions now reserved for /k/ in Bourberain.

4. The demonstrative pronouns are: *cetu* 'celui'; *cetai* (cetei) 'celle'; and in the plural: *cō*, *ceu* 'ceux'. All these forms are reflected in modern /stu/, /sté/, and /sō/. Despite the continued competition between forms deriving from ECCILLE and ECCISTE in literary
French, cf., Gougenheim, there is no reason to believe that forms like "ceux-là" and "celle-ci" are anything except a reflection of the current dialect.

5. Other pronouns. The possessive pronouns of the type le mien, la mienne are as in the modern dialect, i.e., they are declined for the person only; gender and number are indicated by the prefixed article. Under Méné 'mien', La Monnoye gives the possible forms as: 

le mène le mien, la mène, la mienne, les miens, ou les miennes.

The remaining pronominals are as in literary French: rien; autre; etc. The form tret; cf., OF trestout, glossed by La Monnoye as "Tous sans exception," has survived into the modern dialect in the forms /tɔʁtɔː/ and /tɔʁtɔːt/. The conservative nature of the pronominal system is further noted in the retention of nûn 'personne' and d'augu'ein in the sense of 'quelques'. For a discussion of the reflexes of VL UNU/-A, cf., 2.5.4.

7. It is in the verbal system that we find the maximum point of contention between the dominant influence of the standard literary language and the desire to write the dialect in its "pure" state. The feeling on the part of the poets that there is a correct underlying form in the dialect is made manifest in the
following quotation from La Monnoye's *Glossaire*:

Vicu. Vécu. Quelques-uns ont dit vivu, s'im­imaginant qu'en patois il est permis de corrompre les mots à discrétion. C'est un abus. Le Bourguignon a ses règles comme le Fran­çois. A Dijon, où est l'Atticisme du Bourguignon, vicu est le terme d'usage pour vécu, & vican pour vivant.

La Monnoye's wish to maintain a high literary standard in the dialect is laudable, but the very fact that there is a constant confusion in the forms offers sufficient proof of the advanced state of decay in the dialect. The influence of standard French has so permeated the verbal system that it is almost impossible to find the "règles" as they apply to the written dialect. It would not be fruitful, at this juncture, to present a mere series of paradigms showing the various points of conflict; since, as it would become immediately apparent, most verbs have, in effect, two distinct paradigms. There is, however, a method of approach which brings order into that which appears to be chaos. If we confine our investigation to the trends observable in the 18th century scripta as they are mirrored in the modern dialect, we arrive at the following conclusions:
1) There is a tendency toward the uniformity of the semanteme, i.e., that portion of the verb which bears the semantic burden, reflected in the analogical extension of the dominant form throughout the paradigm, and 2) there is a reduction in personal endings made on the basis of a uniform morpheme in the singular as opposed to another morpheme in the plural. (Here, and in the discussion of the verbal system of Bourberain in Chapter III, the terminology is taken from A. Martinet, Eléments de linguistique générale, Paris, 1966).

As an illustration of the uniformity of the semanteme, we note the following conjugation of the verb faire (modern /fər/) in the present indicative: faï, fai, fai; faizon, faisé, faison (feson). In addition to the forms cited under the third person plural, we find fon, which, except for the fact that the modern dialect has /fə/, could be simply ascribed to the literary language. Moreover, we find: faise 'fasse'; faiso 'faisait'; faré 'fera'; faisi 'fit'; faisu 'fait' (past participle); faisan 'faisant'. All the above examples come from Piron, and must have constituted a "system" in his mind. It is not surprising to find that the forms in the singular of the present indicative are the same. The apparent anomalies are the result of the influence of standard French, e.g., gëne 'sonne'; émeune 'amène'; éleume
'allume' are typical of the dialect; whereas: émène 'amène'; laive 'lève' reveal the influence of the literary language. The forms of the plural, however, are indicative of the tendency, also discernible in the pronouns, to make the minimum number of distinctions. In the plural, the similarity of the forms of the third person to those of the first person is a result of the shift of accent to the morpheme, a fact amply documented by Fouché:\[64] velon 'veulent'; corron 'courent'; entron 'entrent'; aimon 'aiment'. Fouché, in the same place, also notes that map 311 (commencent) of the ALF shows the Department of Côte-d'Or divided between /-0/ and /-a/ as a result of the shift of accent. Furthermore, according to the same source, the area in which chántent became chantant has fant from *FACUNT, vant from *VADUNT and avant from *HABUNT, found today in Bourberain as /fâ/, /vâ/, and /â/; although the 18th century shows fon (besides feson), von (besides allon), and on. Today, the dialect of Bourberain has a system modelled completely after standard French in that there are separate forms for the first and third person plural. The explanation of the transition between the state seen in the 18th century and the modern may well be either the effect of a vertical analogy in the case of the verbs, i.e., -on of the first person was extended to the original -ant of the third
person, or Dijon belonged to the area where the result of the shift of accent was /-8/; whereas Bourberain lay in the zone of /-9/, the only vestiges of which are the three forms previously cited.

The imperfect indicative has been greatly simplified through the extension of -o (-oo) to all persons of the singular, and -ein to all those of the plural: faillo
'il fallait'; venoo 'je, tu venais, il venait'; etc.: pairoissem 'nous, vous, ils paraiss-ions, -iez, -aient'.

The early type of first person plural in -iesmes (disiesmes, aviesmes, Goerlich) is completely lacking; whereas the nasal development of the third person plural is attested in the medieval scripta as -eint (soleint, moveint).

As for the future-imperfect, the influence of standard French is much more evident. On the one hand, there is a greater hesitation in the form of the semanteme: voiré - varey 'verra'; revarey 'reviendra' - revénron 'reviendront'; sçairoi 'saurez' - sero 'saurait'. On the other hand, the inflexional morpheme is not consistent: vorey - voré 'voudra'; voiré 'verrez'; praré 'prendrez', as opposed to sçairoi 'saurez'; diroi 'direz'. The ending -oi in the second person plural is attested in the medieval scripta, cf., Goerlich, and Fouché incorrectly mentions the form as having died.
out in the 13th century. In the conditional, the
morpheme of the imperfect shows the same distribution,
with -o and -oo in the singular, and -ein in the plural.

The poets of the 18th century employ the present
as well as the imperfect subjunctive. In the present
subjunctive, the singular contrasts with the plural in
that the latter has a stressed morpheme affixed to the
semanteme; cf., the shift of stress in the present in-
dicative (p. 118): alle 'aille'; vaigne 'vienne'; téne
'tienne' - allein 'aillent'; travaillén 'travaillent';
retrôven 'retrouvent'. The forms for avoir (o singular,
and ein (ain) plural) and être (só singular, and sein
plural) follow the normal pattern as established in the
imperfect and the conditional. The imperfect subjunctive
shows the following forms in the singular: nogisse
'neigeât'; velisse 'voulut'; venisse 'vint'; trôvisse
'trouvât', and in the plural: tenissein 'tinsent';
eussein:main (P) 'eussent' - 'main'; cf., ôsse in
Virgille; missein 'missent'. Goerlich 68 gives many
examples from the medieval scripta, and Fouché 69 notes
the retention of the -iss- infix into the 16th century.
In addition, one finds similar forms in the western and
south-western dialects, thereby confirming the fact that
we are dealing with a relatively old feature.
In the preterit, the various classes of verbs show an extension of \( i \), an extremely widespread feature in the French dialects (Herzog\(^7\)): \textit{entri} 'entra'; \textit{anvoyi} 'envoya'; \textit{disi} 'dit'; \textit{veni} 'vint': \textit{faísire} 'firent'; \textit{voisire} 'virent'; \textit{fromire} 'fermèrent'. Even in the case of the preterit, the influence of literary French is evident in examples such as \textit{vinre} 'vinrent' and \textit{fire} 'firent'. The medieval scripta clearly indicates the early confusion prevalent in the preterit endings: \textit{aulit} 'alla'; \textit{jaillut} 'faillit'; \textit{batay} 'battit'; \textit{baterent} 'battirent'; \textit{venerent} 'vinrent' (Lebel\(^7\)); although the 18th century scripta has arbitrarily imposed the morpheme in \(-i\)-, probably because the tense is totally artificial, having been recreated to conform to the pattern of standard French, since in the spoken dialect, the tense had long since become obsolete.

The infinitive is essentially the same as in literary French, except that in those verbs coming from \(-\text{ARE}\), the infinitive ends in \(-è\) when preceded by a palatal, and in \(-\text{ai}\) in all other cases: \textit{caiché} 'cacher'; \textit{vudè} 'vider'; \textit{boisè} 'baiser', as opposed to: \textit{brelai} 'brûler'; \textit{sublai} 'siffler'; etc. It must be noted that the scripta is not consistent, because alongside the examples cited above, one finds: \textit{anviai} 'envoyer'; \textit{vaillai} 'veiller'; \textit{baillai} 'donner', among others. For
a discussion of the same distribution in the past participles see 2.4.3. In conformity with the loss of final -r as discussed in 2.7.15., our corpus shows: veloi 'vouloir'; choi 'tomber'; fuî 'fuir'; meuri 'mourir'; etc.

The past participle shows a high degree of instability. Piron uses both prenu and pri 'pris', whereas Virgille has prinse, modern /pré/, and parmi, parmaiit u 'permis'. Several features of the medieval scripta are confirmed in the 18th century in the matter of hiatus (p. 44): aivu 'eu' from older ahu; pevu 'pu' from older pehu, and the development of palatal + -ATA (2.4.1.): ecouchi: mélodie (P) 'accouchée' – 'mélodie'. However, the most noticeable tendency is in the extension of -u to form past participles: seugu 'suivi'; lisu 'lu'; voisu 'vu'; disu 'dit'; faisu 'fait', all of which except seugu (modern /sœgu/) have been replaced by the standard French forms in the present-day dialect. Once again, we see a prescriptive judgment on the part of La Monnoye in which he notes the fact that although one hears venu, venun is "plus élégant." For the same feature in other dialects see Herzog72.

The agreement of past participles follows the paradigm of the adjective, i.e., the agreement is made in the feminine: éleumée 'allumée'; avairimée
'envenimée', and the plural goes unmarked: coiffai 'coiffés'; lié 'liés', modern /lòyé/. The alternation soufar 'souffert' - ovate 'ouverte' is reminiscent of the adjectives of the type var - vate 'vert(s)' discussed on p. 110.

The present participle shows the influence of the past participle: vican (V) 'vivant'; voisan 'voyant'; seûgan 'suivant'; etc.

8. Properly speaking, the indeclinables are lexical items; however, since the present study does not include a section on the lexicon, they will be treated for the time being under the morphology. For the most part, the indeclinables are similar to those of literary French; consequently, only the ones offering special interest will be studied.

1. Adverbs. The form aitò 'aussi' is widespread (FEW, XIII/2, 125b), although ossi from standard French is also found. The confusion of comme and comment as found in the modern dialect is already current, leading to the probability that come and queme are modelled after standard French comme. Several forms which have since died out in standard French, but preserved in the dialect of Bourberain, are found in the 18th century corpus: maseù 'désormais' (OF maishui, modern /mazé/ and FEW, IV, 447b); tò des andées 'tout de suite' or 'l'un
après l'autre', an expression which Rabiet compares to modern /dézedé/, and further notes the occurrence of the form in Piron\textsuperscript{73}; nina 'non' (+ HABET, FEW, VII, 183a, modern /něně/).

2. Prepositions. Although aiv6 'avec' is found, the more common form is d'aiv6 (FEW, XXIV/1, 30b-31a), pointing to the agglutinated /devav/ found in the modern dialect. Both pour and par are rendered by p6, a situation which is confirmed by the modern dialect.

2.9. Syntax. Unfortunately, because of the restricted nature of poetry, the syntax is necessarily that portion which can be treated least adequately. The obvious model is the poetry written in literary French; consequently, the poets, with their imperfect knowledge of the dialect, did little to change the syntax. Even the very common feature of the medieval scripta, that of mixing the auxiliaries in the compound tenses; cf., il sont ahuz au conseil 'ils ont été au conseil'; soit ahue prise 'a été prise' (Lebel\textsuperscript{74}) is scrupulously avoided. Normally, we find the same distribution as in standard French: on s'a tuai 'on s'est tué', which, despite the appearance is "correct" standard French. We do find, nonetheless, several instances pointing to the medieval situation, as well as to the modern dialect: ai son etai 'ils ont été'; j'aito etai 'j'avais été'. These
latter examples are so few in number that it is evident the poets were consciously trying to conform to the usage of literary French, the prestige language.

The pronominals offer certain divergencies, most of which can be ascribed to the influence of standard French. In the interrogative, we find: érīve-t-ai? 'arrive-t-il?'; feussein-tai? 'fussent-ils?', as opposed to: faisein-tī? 'faisaient-ils?'; sēne-t-elle? 'sonne-t-elle?'; aivo-ti pevu? 'avait-il pu?', showing the influence of standard French.
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CHAPTER III

THE MODERN DIALECT

3.1 Introduction. The most complete linguistic study of the dialect around the area of Dijon is that of Abbé Rabiet, which appeared in various fascicles of the *Revue des Patois Gallo-romans* between the years 1887 and 1890. Although the study is organized with Latin forms as the point of departure, it is invaluable for the number of forms cited individually as well as in context. As we have already seen, there are certain aspects of the modern dialect that cannot be traced through the 18th century scripta, partly because they are later developments, and partly because the dialect of Dijon, as we see it through the scripta, was much more eclectic than the spoken dialect of a relatively isolated area. Nevertheless, we must base our observations on the modern phase of the language on the study of Rabiet because it is the only one which presents the dialect as a system, i.e., sufficiently complete in all aspects of phonology, morphology, and syntax to serve as a basis for comparison with the dialect of the 18th century.

In the absence of the projected *Nouvel Atlas linguistique bourguignon-comtois*, it has been necessary
to draw additional material from a work still in manuscript by Mr. Gérard Taverdet, *Les patois du Canton de Saint-Seine-l'Abbaye (Côte-d'Or)*, made during the summer of 1966. Also by Mr. Taverdet is the article, "Le Système des diphtongues dans les parlers dijonnais," *Revue de linguistique Romane*, 33 (1969), 95-109. This study is particularly useful in that it compares the modern system of diphthongs with the written evidence of the 17th and 18th centuries.

The last important work on the modern dialect is the venerable *ALF*, which shows data from the area around the city of Dijon (points 14, 16, 17, and 24).

3.2. The modern dialect. In his introduction, Rabiet describes the village of Bourberain as consisting of 680 inhabitants at the time of his study. In 1790, the village was detached from the former province of Champagne, and incorporated into the newly formed Department of Côte-d'Or. The dialect of Bourberain shows relatively little outside influence because of its distance from surrounding villages, and the circle of forests around Bourberain has prevented it from participating in the commerce of the region. Despite the proximity of Dijon (thirty-two kilometers), the inhabitants of Bourberain have not had a close relationship with the former provincial capital since they have remained largely self-
sufficient. The villagers have continued the same traditional skills throughout generations, working in either domestic trades or agriculture. The population has remained static, thereby permitting Rabiet a certain flexibility in the selection of his informants which, as we will see in the case of Taverdet, is a luxury not afforded to present-day linguists in dialect research. Besides being a native of Bourberain, Rabiet had a personal relationship with the subjects of his inquiry, all of whom were over thirty years of age, and whose families had long been established in the village. Rabiet further states that he would cite only those forms he remembers from his childhood or those he has recently gathered during the course of his inquiry, thereby excluding doubtful forms. Words which he recognizes as archaic, i.e., those used or remembered exclusively by the older generation, are marked "+", a fact which is important for the reconstruction of the dialect in the 18th century.

In Taverdet's study of 1966, just seventy-five years after that of Rabiet, the demise of the dialect around Dijon becomes immediately apparent. Mr. Taverdet carried out his field work in a region north-west of Dijon, a region which the author himself admits is not conducive to intensive research since the lack of
informants, in some cases not more than one in a village, results in little more than a sampling of the former dialect. The majority of the informants were born in the last decade of the 19th century, and the dialect can scarcely be described as living since the restricted number of speakers virtually precludes the dialect as a means of communication. By the winter of 1970, the author explained to me that the opportunity of verifying information gathered barely four years before was impossible because most of the informants had died. What meagre data are available are important because they indicate: 1) the effects of depopulation on the dialect, 2) the encroachment of standard French, 3) the preservation of a state of relative homogeneity of a dialect in an isolated area. The latter point is understood more fully if one realizes that the study of Abbé Rabiet, although carried out in an area thirty-two kilometers from the city of Dijon, and two hundred years after the period of intense literary composition in the dialect as represented by the poets of the 18th century, indicates more fully the stable nature of the dialect, than does a study coming only seventy-five years later in an area immediately adjacent to Dijon, but in a period of history which subjected dialects in general to the most stringent social pressures. The rapid deterioration of
the dialect over the past seventy-five years is evident in the decline in the number of speakers, as well as in the difficulty of those remaining speakers to remember dialect forms.

Be that as it may, the combination of these three synchronic studies yields an accurate appreciation of the dialect in its modern period. The earlier study of Rabiet is the most inclusive, and must serve as a basis for the examination and comparison of the scripta of the 17th and 18th centuries. Taverdet's recent studies throw valuable light on certain tendencies observable in the late 19th century; and more importantly, they focus on that area toward which the dialect was known to have receded in the final stage of its replacement by standard French in the city of Dijon.

3.3. Phonology. Oral vowels. The following is the standard vowel triangle of the dialect of Bourberain showing the oral vowels accompanied by a brief discussion of the phonemic status of their distribution:
All vowel phonemes appear both long and short.
The phonemic status of length can be seen in the com­
parison of minimal pairs such as: /tʰnɛ/ 'tournier' -
/t⁵nɛ/ 'tonner'; /ad'ɛ/ 'aidé' - /ad'ẽ/ 'aidée'; how­
ever, since there is a severe restriction on the occur­
rence of such minimal pairs, no definite conclusions
as to the phonemic status of vowel lengthening can be
made on the basis of the material presented by Rabiet.
1. The phoneme /i/ has as an allophone the semi­
consonant /y/.

1. /i/ - oral vowel: /vi/ 'vif' - /vɛ/ 'va';
/payi/ 'pays' - /payɛ/ 'payer'; /ki/ 'qui' - /ku/
'queue'.

2. /i/ - nasal vowel: /virɛ/ 'vire' - /vɛrɛ/
'viendra'; /vi/ 'voie' - /vɑ/ 'vent'.
3. /l/ appears as the head of a syllable, whereas /y/ occurs in the same syllable with a vowel which itself is the head of the syllable. For example, /âvi/ 'envoie' - /âvyô/ 'envoyons'; /yetô/ 'j'étais' - /i srô/ 'je serais'. The dialect permits no hiatus, which in all cases is resolved by the addition of /y/. The free variants /pôyô/ - /pôô/ 'pouvais' would seem to indicate a syllabic division of /pô-yô/ since, as we will see in the section treating the verbs, the semanteme of the majority of verbs has been reduced by analogy to that of the singular of the present indicative. This reduction has created a situation in which the semanteme remains constant throughout the conjugation, and the morphemes, i.e., tense markers, have been greatly reduced in number so that the usual contrast is merely that of singular as opposed to plural in the various tenses.

2. Both /é/ and /è/ are distinct phonemes as is evident by the comparison of the following minimal pairs:

1. /é/ - /è/: /lè/ 'la' - /lè/ 'les'; /mè/ 'ma' - /mè/ 'moi'; /sè/ 'sais' - /sè/ 'suis'.

2. /é/ and /è/ - other oral vowels: /néj/ 'najer' - /nôjè/ 'neiger'; /tè/ 'ta' - / tô/ 'toit'.

3. /é/ and /è/ - nasal vowel: /vè/ 'va' - /vô/ 'vent'; /dè/ 'des' - /dô/ 'dent'.
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3. The phoneme /a/ can be established on the basis of the following comparisons:

1. /a/ - oral vowel: /ma/ 'mais' - /m6/ 'mois'; /far/ 'faire' - /fdr/ 'foire'; /ta/ 'tard' - /tu/ 'tu'.

2. /a/ - nasal vowel: /cataw/ 'chateau' - /cêtau/ 'chanteau'; /a/ 'il est' - /â/ 'ont'.

4. Both /ë/ and /ê/ are distinct phonemes, as are their palatal counterparts, cf., 3.3.2. Their phonemic status is evident by the comparison of the following minimal pairs:

1. /ë/ - /ê/: /më/ 'mord' - /mê/; /lê/ 'leur' - /lê/ 'loi'; /tê/ 'tour' - /tê/ 'toit'.

2. /ë/ and /ê/ - other oral vowels: /sê/ 'soit' - /si/ 'si'; /sê/ 'haie' - /sû/ 'sur'.

3. /ë/ and /ê/ - nasal vowel: /vë/ 'vous' - /vû/ 'votre'; /sê/ 'soir' - /sû/ 'sont'.

5. The phoneme /u/ has as an allophone the semi-consonant /w/.

1. /u/ - oral vowel: /su/ 'seul' - /sê/ 'soir'; /méju/ 'mangeur' - /mêjé/ 'manger'; /fur/ 'foire' - /far/ 'faire'.

2. /u/ - nasal vowel: /nu/ 'noue' - /nû/ 'personne'; /pôru/ 'peureux' - /pôrô/ 'pourrions'.

3. The distribution of /u/ and /w/ is the same as that discussed in 3.3.1.3: /n/ 'noue' - /nû/
' nousons', which is a borrowing from standard French. On the other hand, the alternation: /võ vlé/ 'vous voulez' - /wét/ 'vous êtes' and 'vous avez' indicates that, in an allegro form, the labial environment causes the reduction of /(v)õ/ to /w/ + vowel.

6. The phoneme /U/ has as an allophone the semi-consonant /W/.

1. /U/ - oral vowel: /brU/ 'bruit' - /brè/ 'brass'; /êvU/ 'eu' - /êvõ/ 'avais'; /cU/ 'tombé' - /cé/ 'chez'.

2. /U/ - nasal vowel: /sõgU/ 'suivi' - /sõgõ/ 'suivons'; /võ/ 'voulu' - /võ/ 'voulaient'.

3. The distribution of /U/ and /W/ is the same in relationship to the syllabic head as that discussed in 3.3.1.3., and 3.3.5.3.: /jõ/ 'jouer' - /jû/ 'joue'. This alternation is observable in a few verbal forms only, thereby limiting the occurrences of /W/, since, corresponding to standard French forms such as: /pWi/ 'puits'; /lWi/ 'lui'; /nWi/ 'nuit'; /sWi/ 'suis', one finds in Bourberain: /pWi/; /lû/; /nay/; /sé/. See p. 46 and p. 79 of this study.

7. The phoneme /Ø/ can be established on the basis of the following comparisons:

1. /Ø/ - oral vowel: /mõ/ 'meurt' - /mõ/
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/kœre/ 'cueillerai' - /korè/ 'courrai'; /v8/ 'veut' - /v6/ 'vous'.


8. The phoneme /ä/ is rather rare in the phonological system, and occurs most generally in the falling diphthong /äW/ to be discussed in 3.6.5.; however, the phonemic status of /ä/ can be established by the following examples.

1. /ä/ - oral vowel: /mä/ 'mœr' - /m6/ 'mois'; /mœr/ 'mœre' - /mër/ 'mère'; /kœr/ 'cueillir' - /k6r/ 'courir'.

2. /ä/ - nasal vowel: /kä/ 'il coud' - /kâ/ 'quand'; /lä/ 'il lit' - /l6/ 'long'.

3. The phoneme /ä/ is unique in the phonological system in that it represents a fifth vowel height in the palatal order for which there is no counterpart in the velar order, thereby constituting a case vide in the system. Its phonemic function of distinction is limited to those cases in which a liquid is present in the underlying paradigm, cf., /kä/ 'il cuit' from /k6r/ 'cuire', /lä/ 'il lit' from /l6r/ 'lire'. If it were not for the frequent occurrences of /ä/ in the diphthong /äW/, as opposed to /aw/, cf., /säW/ 'cep', /saw/ 'sel', it might
be possible to posit /ʌ/ as an allophone of /a/ occurring in a specially defined environment of labials. It would be better, however, to leave further discussion of /ʌ/ to the section on diphthongs (3.6).

3.4. Nasal vowels. Since the dialect of Bourberain distinguishes five degrees of vowel height in the palatals, it has, at its disposal, the feature of openness vs. closeness in the case of nasalized /é/ and /è/, cf., /mè/ 'main' - /mé/ 'mis', fè/ 'faim' - /fè/ 'fin'. In addition, the presence of /ã/ in the palatal series serves to reinforce the need to keep /é/ and /è/ distinct; thereby assuring the distinctiveness of /é/ and /è/ as well. On the other hand, the feature of vowel height is neutralized in the case of /œ/, since the decreased sonority of the nasals places a limitation on the distinctiveness of height in nasalized velar vowels. Moreover, the lack of a velar counterpart for /ã/ has reduced the need for a clear phonemic differentiation between vowels of the velar series; consequently, nasalized /œ/ and /ø/ have fallen together into /œ/. If this is true, it is apparent that the nasalized realization of /œ/, i.e., /œ/ would be attracted by /œ/ into a more neutral articulation, rather than keep the tense lip position of /œ/. It is difficult, however, to
postulate the phonetic realization of /ʌ/ as opposed to /ɛ/, since Rabiet uses the symbols œ and œ*, although he may simply have failed to distinguish between /ʌ/ and * /œ/ in the dialect.

There is nothing notable in the alternation /a/ - /â/ which, because of the degree of laxness, retains its maximum distinctiveness in opposition to /æ/ in the palatal series.

3.5. Syllabic structure. The syllabic structure of Bourberain is very similar to that of, e.g., standard French. There does exist, however, a curious kind of alternation as can be seen in the comparison of the following examples: /lê rnuy/ 'la grenouille' - /ên ûrnuy/ 'une grenouille'; /ê rna/ 'un renard' - /ê grât ûrna/; as contrasted with: /ê mlâ/ 'un moulin' - /vôt mlâ/; /mô pnay/ 'mon panier' - /lôt pûnay/ 'leur panier'. There is a tendency on the part of the speakers to generalize one form, usually the fuller, thereby making possible forms such as /ên ûrna/ in which the form /ûrna/ is felt as the base form.

The second set of doublets would seem to indicate that /â/ has been extended throughout the system as an epenthetic vowel; however, upon closer examination, one finds an equal importance of /é/ in the verbal system, cf., /i sên/ 'je sonne' from /snè/ 'sonner'; /i fél/
'je file' from /flè/ 'filer'.

3.6. **Diphthongs and triphthongs.** The dialect of Bourberain possesses a wide range of diphthongs and triphthongs. The examples which follow give an indication of the variety of rising diphthongs and triphthongs:


2. Triphthongs: /pyåwù/ 'pluie'; /caryåW/ 'chariot'; /nyaw/ 'niais'.

3. Falling diphthongs: /mawlè/ 'mèler'; /bruynè/ 'bruiner'; /blåWt/ 'ailette'; /loy/ 'lie'; /fiy/ 'fille'.

4. Falling diphthongs in word final position. This kind of diphthong shows an alternation in tonic position with a monophthong in atonic position. The following table with examples will illustrate the extent of the alternations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tonic</th>
<th>Atonic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/-ay/</td>
<td>/-ê/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/-åW/</td>
<td>/-ê/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/-aw/</td>
<td>/-ê/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The types of alternation shown above occur in the following examples: /è bò lay/ 'un bon lit' - /è lè d pyôm/ 'un lit de plume'; /pay/ (tonic) - /pë/ (atonic) 'pis': /jâw/ (tonic) - /jö/ (atonic) 'jeu'; /kâw/ (tonic) - /kë/ (atonic) 'coup'; /trâw/ (tonic) - /trö/ (atonic) 'trop'; /êmcâw/ (tonic) - /êmcö/ (atonic) 'un peu'; /i yè fa maw/ 'je lui ai fait mal' - /è mò d dâ/ 'un mal de dent'; /el ê 'kutaw/ 'il a un couteau' - /sè kutò fë/ 'c'est un couteau fin'.

In addition to the type of alternation noted in the preceding paragraph, Taverdet\(^2\) gives examples of a similar kind of diphthongization in final nasalized syllables: /è bò mwatâw/ 'un beau mouton' - /è mwatö byâ/ 'un mouton blanc'; /dijâw/ - /dijö/ 'Dijon'. In the dialect of Bourberain, there is no evidence of diphthongization in nasal syllables. Rabiet notes, however, that the tendency among speakers of the dialect is to substitute the tonic form in all positions. Historically speaking, what we now observe on the synchronic level is little more than a remnant of a system that was once more fully developed, although not recorded in the 18th century scripta.

3.7. **Consonants.** The following table shows the arrangement of the nineteen consonant phonemes of Bourberain:
One is immediately struck by the symmetry of the arrangement of the consonant phonemes when compared to the vowels, cf., 3.3.

1. /p/ - /b/: /pd/ 'polt' - /bd/ 'boit'; /pU/ 'plus' - /bU/ 'bu'.

2. /t/ - /d/: /t$A$/ 'ciel' - /d$A$/ 'dent'; /tu/ 'tu' - /dU/ 'du'.

3. /t'/ - /d'/: /t'A$/ 'clou' - /d'A$/ 'glui'.

Minimal pairs based on the opposition voiced - voiceless are extremely rare, and occur only in initial position. In his system of transcription, Rabiet uses the symbols dy and ty. It should be noted here that Rabiet apparently had some afterthoughts about his original transcription of these two sounds because he
states, in a later section concerning the treatment of Latin CL and GL: "Il est à remarquer que le son y est intimement uni à t et d que ty dy ont plutôt la valeur de t d mouillés que de t + y, d + y. The phonemic status of /t/ and /d/ becomes clearer when compared with the oppositions possible based on the contrast /t/ - /d/ - /t'/ - /d'/: /d'ànê/ 'glaner' - /dànê/ 'damner'; /t'è/ 'clef' - /tè/ 'ta'. In other words, the functional load of the contrast, dental stop vs. palatalized dental stop, is much greater than that of voiced vs. voiceless.

4. /k/ - /g/: /kawl/ 'coiffe' - /gawl/ 'galle'; /krawl/ 'croule' - /grawl/ 'grule'.

5. /f/ - /v/: /fò/ 'fais' - /vò/ 'voix'; /fâ/ 'font' - /vâ/ 'vont'.

6. /s/ - /z/: /còsi/ 'sécher' - /cozi/ 'choisir'; /pòsò/ 'poisson' - /pòzò/ 'poison'.

7. /c/ - /j/: /câ/ 'champ' - /jâ/ 'gens'; /cô/ 'tombé' - /jû/ 'il joue'.

Among the sibilants, there appears to be a certain amount of instability, as indicated by the following examples of metathesis: /còsi/ - /sòci/ 'sécher'; /cozi/ - /soji/ - /coji/ 'choisir'; /câjé/ - /sâjé/ 'changer'. The existence of these free variants could indicate that the distinction between dental and palatal
sibilants (as in modern French /su/ 'sous' - /cu/ 'chou') is less clear because of the presence of the distinction dental vs. palatal in the stop series. There is no evidence, however, in the study of Rabiet, that the dental series may, in fact, be phonetically cacuminal.

8. /m/ - /n/: /mɒ/ 'mon' - /nɒ/ 'nous'; /nɒj/ 'neige' - /mɒj/ 'il panse'.

9. /n/ - /n/: /sɛn/ 'il sonne' - /sɛn/ 'signe'; /tɛn/ 'tine' - /tɛn/ 'tienne'.

10. /l/ - /r/: /lɔ/ 'long' - /rɔ/ 'rond'; /lɔ/ 'loi' - /rɔ/ 'roi'.

Rabiet\(x^4\) gives a few isolated examples of the passage of /r/ to /l/ (/mul/ 'mûre', /slɛz/ 'cerise'). These examples indicate that historically both /r/ and /l/ were pronounced as dentals. On the synchronic level, /r/ must be classified as an alveolar trill because of the predominance of this articulation over the uvular /r/ in those forms of French spoken outside the region of Paris. In the present-day speech of Dijon, one hears both types of /r/, with the less educated representing the original state in their use of trilled /r/.

3.8. Assimilation. Although Rabiet does not treat assimilation as a separate feature of the dialect, enough can be pieced together to state that there is, indeed,
evidence suggesting that Bourberain has regressive assimilation on the phonetic level. On the one hand, Rabiet records /jti/ 'chétif' in one place, and /cti/ in another. Examples of this kind are rare; however, they would seem to point to uncertainty on the part of Rabiet as to the nature of the sequence of sounds, whether voiced or unvoiced. On the other hand, he states:

Toute consonne sourde suivie de s ou z devient sonore, que le groupe soit initial ou médial: bžè, peser; vsu (fos sorium), pioche de vigneron; rebsawdè, rapsauder, ravauder; dsé plutôt que tsé, têter; gzâ (cocentem), souci, etc. 5

Nevertheless, Rabiet's transcriptions continue to reveal examples such as fsu, (see above), indicating either the existence of free variants, assimilated or unassimilated, in the dialect, or the inability of the hearer to discriminate. In any case, the author's knowledge of the etymology probably influenced his transcription of these words.

3.9. Sentence phonetics. In addition to the articles and other function words, the dialect of Bourberain possesses a great number of proclitics which are the result of sentence phonetics: /f6 kmè jto/ 'faux comme
un jeton*, in which the adverb /kmâ/ has been agglutinated to the indefinite article /é/; /à pêl (pê èl) evé ectè (ectè 8) pötâw d bûr/ 'et puis ils avaient acheté un pot de beurre'; /kàt èl évûl (a évûl) rtônô (rtônê ô) câ/ 'quand il a été retourné au champ'; /è pêl (pê èl) ëkô (é ëko) di/ 'et puis il a encore dit'. It is evident from these examples that lengthening replaces an elided vowel.

3.10. Morphology. In the following paragraphs, the major morphological features will be treated as in 2.21, i.e., in the order: 1) substantives, 2) pronominals, 3) verbs, 4) indeclinables. The discussion will include examples typifying the various word classes of the dialect, along with sandhi-variants where they exist.

1. Substantives. All nouns have been reduced to a base form used both in the singular and in the plural, thereby eliminating vestigual forms such as modern French un œil, des yeux and un cheval, des chevaux, which appear in the dialect in the singular and plural as /œy/ and /twaw/. The alternations discussed in 3.6.4. have nothing to do with number, and must be viewed as sandhi-variants based on sentence phonetics.

For the most part, the gender of nouns corresponds to that of its modern French equivalent. There are,
nonetheless, a few divergencies such as: /lè saw/ (f.) 'le sel'; /l frômê/ (m.) 'la fourmi'. Some of the differences of gender are the result of a difference of suffix, cf., /uzîr/ (f.) 'osier' (= -ière) and /pusîr/ (m.) 'poussière' (= -ier).

2. Adjectives. The declension of the adjective is reminiscent of that of the noun, except that the adjective has sandhi-variants based on the distinction feminine vs. masculine.

Like the noun, there is no distinction made between singular and plural. In the case of an adjective which precedes its noun, whether singular or plural, the fuller form (see below) is used if the noun begins with a vowel. For example, /vlè dé pût uzya/ 'voilà de laids oiseaux', in which the standard French sequence /lèz wazô/ is identified as plural by the presence of liaison, cannot be analyzed in the same manner in the dialect of Bourberain. If we isolate the sequence of adjective and noun, as in /bel abr/ or /ptit'afâ/, we see there is no distinguishing marker for plural or singular. Until an article or a verb is included in the sequence, as in /lè bel abr/ 'les beaux arbres' and /l bel abr/ 'le bel arbre', the original sequence remains unmarked. As is evident from the discussion of substantives, there is
less redundancy in Bourberain when compared to standard French, since, in the latter language, the sequences /bél oey/ and /bōz yō/ are both rendered by /bel ūy/ in our dialect.

There are three major types of adjectives used in construction with nouns of both genders.

1. Those which are the same in both genders: /prōwp/ 'propre'; /sōd/ 'sourd(e)'; /grā/ 'grand(e)'. It should be noted that in the case of /grā/, there is a form /grāt/ used as a predicative adjective, cf., /ën grā fān/ 'une grande femme' but /lē fān a grāt/ 'la femme est grande'; and also before nouns beginning with a vowel: /è grāt uzya/ 'un grand oiseau'.

2. Those in which the feminine form ends in a consonant which is absent in the masculine. In this type, the feminine form is defined as the fuller form: /dúr/ - /ðū/ 'dur(e)'; /ðtuz/ - /ðntu/ 'honteuse, -eux'; /byōv/ - /byō/ 'bleu(e)'; /mōyu/ - /mōyu/ 'meilleur(e)'; /fēn/ - /fē/ 'fin(e)'. The list of this type could be extended indefinitely since this alternation is the most common in the dialect. Another analogous kind of alternation is that in which the final vowel is lengthened in the feminine: /pedū/ - /pedū/ 'perdu(e)'.

3. Those in which there is an alternation of
stem in the two genders: /byòc/ 'blanche' - /byå/ 'blanc'; /sòc/ 'sèche' - /sáW. 'sec'; /bel/ 'belle' - /bya/ 'beau'.

3. Definite article. The forms of the definite article are like those of French, except when the plural article /lé/ - /léz/ is combined with the preposition /è/ 'à'. This combination results in /é/-/éz/ 'aux': /é fân/ 'aux femmes'; /éz òm/ 'aux hommes'.

4. Possessive adjectives. In the first five persons, the forms of the possessive adjective are the same as those of modern French. Examples taken from the paradigm of the first person singular will serve to illustrate the types of variation possible in the three persons of the singular: masc. sing. /mò/ + consonant - /mòn/ + vowel; fem. sing. /mè/ + consonant - /mèn/ + vowel; masc. and fem. pl. /mè/ + consonant - /mèz/ + vowel. In persons four through six, the forms are: masc. and fem. sing. /nòt/; masc. and fem. pl. /nò/ + consonant - /nòz/ + vowel. It must be noted that the forms corresponding to standard French 'leur(s)' in the above order are: /lòt/; /lò/ - /lòz/. The paradigm is further simplified by the nasalization of /o/ whenever it occurs with a nasal consonant, and by the extension of an underlying /è/ to all forms of the paradigm,
thereby eliminating the alternation of vowel quality one finds in standard French /nòtr/ - /nô/.


6. Pronominals. The pronominals of Bourberain can be reduced to three basic types according to their syntactic use: 1) personal, 2) interrogative (relative), 3) demonstrative.

1. Personal pronouns. The following table gives the subject pronouns for the three persons in the singular and the plural. The first form occurs before a verb beginning with a consonant, and the second is the sandhi-variant used before a vowel:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>/i/ - /y/</td>
<td>1. /i/ - /y/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>/tû/ - /ty/</td>
<td>2. /vô/ - /w/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>/è/ - /èl/ (m.)</td>
<td>3. /è/ - /èl/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/èl/ - /èll/ (f.)</td>
<td>/èl/ - /èll/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The problem of homonymity in relation to the verbs will be treated more fully in 3.7.; however, it should
be noted that the subject pronouns must be viewed as discontinuous verbal morphemes differentiating otherwise homonymous forms as in modern French. The above paradigm is to be taken as the distinguishing feature in those tenses which do not differentiate singular from plural by means of personal morphemes.

It is impossible from the data given to analyze the phonetic realization of /tU/ + vowel as either /t/ or /t/ + /y/.

2. Object pronouns. The object pronouns are divided into two classes: 1) free forms, i.e., disjunctives of the type, /n6/ i n v16 pa/ 'nous, nous ne voulons pas', and /è vè sà lay/ 'il vient sans elle', 2) bound forms, i.e., conjunctives in a phrase in which the head word is a verb, /è f6 l6 pôte/ 'il faut (le) leur porter'. The bound forms are further subdivided into proclitics, or forms occurring before the verb as the head; and enclitics, or forms occurring after the verbal head.

(a) Free Forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. /mò/</td>
<td>1. /n6/ - /n6z/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. /tò/</td>
<td>2. /vò/ - /vòz/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. /lù/ (m.)</td>
<td>3. /l6/ - /l6z/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/lay/ (f.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the plural, the sandī-variant /nøz/, etc. appear in phrases in which the following word, to which the pronoun is closely bound, begins with a vowel, cf., /nøz awt, i n vlø pa/ 'nous autres, nous ne voulons pas'.

(b) Bound Forms (proclitics)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. /m/</td>
<td>1. /nø/ - /nøz/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. /t/</td>
<td>2. /vø/ - /vøz/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. /l/ (m.)</td>
<td>3. /lé/ - /léz/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/lè/ - /l/ (f.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/yi/ - /y/</td>
<td>/lé/ - /léz/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once again, the variants /nøz/, etc., occur in the same environment as that explained above. The forms /l/ and /y/ appear before a vowel.

(c) Bound Forms (enclitics)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. /mè/ - /mø/</td>
<td>1. /nø/ - /nøz/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. /tè/ - /tø/</td>
<td>2. /vø/ - /vøz/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.a /lù/ - /l/ (m.)</td>
<td>3.a /lé/ - /léz/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a /lè/ (f.)</td>
<td>b /lé/ - /léz/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b /yi/ - /y/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The forms /mø/ and /tø/ are used in constructions in which another pronoun of the third person follows, cf.,
It is very difficult to arrive at a satisfactory description of the third person object pronouns. On the one hand, the fact that in proclitic and enclitic position the pronouns under 2.a are not used in constructions in which those under 2.b are present; cf., /i vè yi bayé/ 'je vais (le) lui donner', /bayé ló/ 'donnez (les) leur', would seem to point to a feeling on the part of the speakers for a pronoun class based on the notion of animate vs. inanimate, in which the inanimate pronoun remains unexpressed; rather than to a class distinction based on the opposition direct vs. indirect object. However, it should be noted that in Rabiet's examples, only constructions in which both forms are of the third person can be found. Otherwise, in cases in which other persons are present, both pronouns are expressed /bay mò lû/ donne-moi le. In the final analysis, a definitive description is impossible simply because there are not sufficient examples in the text, even in those describing a connected corpus. All the possible occurrences of pronoun combinations are not given, thereby creating an element of doubt as to the number of possible combinations.
3. Interrogative (relative). The interrogative pronoun has two forms which can be classified as free: /ki/ 'qui'; /ké/ 'quoi', cf., /pó ki/ 'pour qui?'; /pó ké far/ 'pour quoi faire?'. The bound forms are: /ki/ 'qui'; /k/ 'que'. In the third person, the form /ki a/ becomes /tya/; cf., /tya lè/ 'qui est là?'.

The dialect of Bourberain has only one relative pronoun /k/ which is used with the above-mentioned interrogatives, cf., /tya k a vma/ 'qui est-ce qui est venu?', /ka k 6 diré/ 'qu'est-ce qu'on dira?'. The pronoun /k/ also serves to introduce a subordinated element, cf., /s a lay k é palè/ 'c'est elle qui a parlé', /s cmé k é n'é pa deypar/ 'un chemin où il n'y a pas de pierres'.

4. Demonstrative pronouns. The demonstrative pronoun is declined in both genders in the singular, and has a single form in the plural: /stú/ 'celui' - /sté/ 'celle'; /sé/ 'ceux' and 'celles'. In addition, a further contrast is possible with the suffixing of /-sè/ to indicate that the pronoun represents a person or thing nearer the speaker, and, in like manner, /-lè/ is used to indicate a more remote location.

As a neuter demonstrative, /sè/ - /s/ combines readily with the following word: /sa vrè/ 'c'est vrai'; /sè bë owaw/ 'c'est un bon cheval'.
5. Other pronominals. One type of possessive pronoun follows a declension like that of the noun, i.e., the pronominal form is not declined for gender within the personal paradigm, and concord is possible only in the case of the prefixed definite article (cf., 3.22.3.): /l mën/ 'le mien'; /lè mën/ 'la mienne'; /lë mën/ 'les mien(ne)s'. The forms for the other persons of the singular are: /tèn/ and /sèn/. In the plural, we have: /nòtr/; /vòtr/; /lòtr/.

The remaining pronouns can be classified either as substantives in their declension because there is no variation in the stem: /râ/ 'rien'; /nô/ 'personne'; /awtr/ 'autre', or as adjectives like those in 3.23.3: /kèkèn/ - /kèkô/ 'quelqu'un(e); /törtôô/ - /törtôôt/ '(très) tous' - '(très) toutes'.

The pronouns corresponding to French un and une are: /ô/ - /ôô/; /ôn/ - /yên/. The sandhi-variants are used when the preceding word begins with a vowel: /è lôz â fôyô âkô yô/ 'ils leur en fallait encore un'; /èl ån â cêtè cekô yên/ 'ils en ont acheté chacun une'. As indefinite articles, the forms in the masculine are: /ô/ + consonant - /ôô/ + vowel, and in the feminine: /ôô/.

7. Verbs. The study of the verb is divided into two sections. In the first instance, we will examine the
semanteme, i.e., that portion of the verb which bears the semantic burden, from the point of view of the possible alternations in the thematic vowel. Our point of departure is the types of alternations found in the present indicative. It will then be seen how, in conjunction with an infixed morpheme added to the semanteme, the semanteme, in construction with the tense morpheme, is extended. In the second instance, we will study the personal morphemes used in forming the various tenses.

In the dialect of Bourberain, the effects of analogy have been much greater in reducing the possibilities of variation of the vowel of the semanteme than in standard French. Generally speaking, there are three kinds of semantemes in the present indicative: 1) those which show no alternation in the vowel: /m8/ - /m8r8/ 'meurs' - 'mourons'; /kr8v/ - /kr8v8/ 'crève' - 'crevons', 2) those which show an alternation between the vowel of the singular and that of the plural: /b8/ - /böv8/ 'bois' - 'buvons', 3) those having an alternation of vowel and "zero:" /fél/ - /fl8/ 'file' - 'filons'; /s8n/ - /sn8/ 'sonne' - 'sonnons'. In addition, this type of alternation requires that the third person plural be the same as that of the singular, i.e., with the vowel present: /fél/ 'filent'; /s8n/ 'sonnent'.
There are no cases in which the dialect presents a tri-partite alternation of vowel as in standard French, viens, venons, and viennent. Those forms most anomalous in the verbal system such as French faîtes and dîtes have been regularized on the basis of the prevailing form to /faré/ and /diré/.

It can be concluded from the foregoing that, in the Bourberain dialect, there is a marked tendency to reduce the number of possible variations of vowel to a minimum. This is plainly another example of the economy of expression of the dialect, eliminating redundancies of the French type: /vʊ/ - /vʊlʊ/ - /voel/ with three qualities, in favor of /vaw/ - /vayʊ/ - /vay/ with two. It remains now to indicate the distribution of the types of verbal semantemes over the various tense conjugations.

For those verbs having a single semanteme in the present indicative, cf., /cát-/, the semanteme is extended to the remaining conjugations. An affix /r/ is attached immediately to the semanteme in the future-conditional.

Verbs of the type /bʊ/ - /bʊv-/ and /fël/ - /fl-/ , having a vocalic alternation in the present indicative, use the form for the singular when the affix /r/ is present (future-conditional), and the semanteme for the plural in the case of the imperfect.
The dialect also makes use of certain consonantic alternations in the formation of tenses. In the case of the imperfect, there are a fixed number of patterns which may be considered as consisting of semanteme + affix + personal morpheme, as is the case in the future-conditional. Some of the more prominent kinds of alternations are the following:


4. Oral vowel - /z,s/: /fa/ - /faz-/ 'fais' - 'fais-'; /pyè/ - /pyèz-/ 'plais' - 'plais-'; /cè/ - /cèz-/ 'tome' - 'tomb-'; /rlû/ - /rlûz-/ 'reluis' - 'reluis-'. In the preceding examples, the presence of /s,z/ is to be understood as reflecting these phonemes and an underlying /-r/ in the infinitive; cf., /far/; /pyer/; /cér/; /rlûr/.

In the formation of the future and imperfect, the infix /r/ replaces the above-mentioned affixes of the imperfect, except in those cases in which /d/ is the
affix: /cöz/- /cér-; /kôy/- /kôr-; as opposed to: /etwédr/- /etwèdr-; /kud/- /kudr-, in which case, both affixes are present.

Naturally, there are a few verbs which cannot be reduced to a system, such as: /mâyw/- /môy/- /mâwr/- 'moudre'; however, one does see a consistency in the pattern of alternations used in the formation of the different tenses based on the concept: fixed semanteme + tense infix + personal morpheme. It only remains now to discuss the types of personal morpheme used in the formation of the tenses.

2. Analogy has played an important rôle in reducing the number of personal morphemes (for a definition of verbal morphemes, see 2.8.6.1.). It is only in the present indicative and the future that one finds an alternation of personal suffixed morphemes used to distinguish the three persons of the singular from those of the plural. In the remaining conjugations, the dialect opposes a fixed set of personal morphemes in the singular against another fixed set for the plural.

1. Present indicative. The morphemes in the present indicative are the same as in standard French. Persons 1, 2, 3, and 6 have a zero suffixed morpheme, whereas persons 4 and 5 and /-ô/ and /-ô/, cf., /i sarv/,
The verb /st/ 'être' is as follows:

/i sé/    /i sè/
/tyē/    /wēt/
/el a/    /èsə/

The verb /èvè/ is:

/yè/    /yè/
/tyē/    /wēt/
/el é/    /el â/

For a discussion of the use of these two verbs in compound tenses, cf., 3.9.2.

2. The future is formed as in standard French, except that, in person 5, the morpheme is /-é/, whereas in the full conjugation of /èvè/, we find a form borrowed from the verb /st/. Thus, a sample conjugation in the future is: /i bnirè/; /tù bnirè/; /è bnirè/; /i bnirè/; /vè bnirè/; /è bnirè/ 'bénir'.

3. In the remaining simple tenses under discussion, i.e., the conditional, the imperfect, and the present subjunctive, one personal morpheme in the present is contrasted with one personal morpheme for all persons in the plural. In the case of the conditional and the imperfect, the morphemes are: /-é/ singular - /-è/
plural. The simplification of the conjugation is paralleled by the reduction of personal pronouns. The tendency toward homonymity is alleviated by the fact that the collapse of the pronouns is one the horizontal plane, i.e., /i/ 'je' and 'nous', whereas the personal morphemes fuse on the vertical plane, i.e., singular vs. plural. We see, therefore, that examples such as /yet6/ 'j'étais' - /yetê/ 'nous étions'; /él étô/ 'il était' - /él etê/ 'ils étaient', are sufficiently differentiated to function at a level free from redundancy, and yet one not endangered by excessive homonymity.

The semantemes, when extended by the temporal infix, result in the following contrasts: /fazô/ - /farô/ 'faire'; /jèdô/ - /jèdrô/ 'geindre'; /kâyô/ - /kârô/ 'cuire'; /vlô/ - /vrô/ 'vouloir'. Only in the case of /kôrô/ is it impossible to tell whether the form is imperfect or conditional.

In the present subjunctive, the morpheme for the singular is zero, which contrasts with /ô/ in the plural: /i pal/ - /i palô/ 'parler'. The only verbs which do not conform to this pattern are: /sô/ - /sô/ 'être' and /ô/ - /ô/ 'avoir', showing the influence of morphemes of the conditional and the imperfect.

4. In a great many instances, the infinitive and
the past participle are identical. For those whose infinitives end in /è/ or /é/, the past participles also end in /è/ or /é/: /palè/ 'parler' and 'parlé'; /mèjè/ 'manger' and 'mangé'.

There are two possibilities for the class of verbs whose infinitive ends in /-i/ or /-ê/ if preceded by a nasal. In the first group, the infinitive and the past participle are identical: /sarvi/ 'servir'; /mòri/ 'mourir'; /kuvri/ 'couvrir'. In the second group, the alternation is between /è/ in the infinitive and /-ê/ in the past participle: /vnê/ - /vnê/ 'venir'; /tnê/ - /tnê/ 'tenir'.

There is a small group of verbs whose infinitives end in /-ô/. In these verbs, /-û/ is added to the combination of the semanteme and the imperfect infix: /yevô/ - /évû/ 'avoir'; /vlô/ - /vlû/ 'vouloir'; /vayô/ - /vayû/ 'valoir'. The verb 'être' has as its past participle /evû/. For the influence of /evô/ on /et/ in the compound tenses, cf., 2.9.2.

The last group contains those verbs whose infinitive ends in /-r/, or in which there is an underlying /-r/ occurring in special environments: /è fôyô a betr/ 'il fallait se battre' - /i vû knêt lè fûn/ 'je veux connaître la femme'. This example shows that the /-r/
of the infinitive occurs only before a pause, or when followed by a word beginning with a vowel, cf., /s metr é krüpť/.'se placer de manière à avoir les jambes ramassées'; elsewhere, the /-r/ does not occur. The two principle kinds of formation of the past participle for verbs of this sort are: 1) semanteme of the imperfect + /-ū/: /jèd-/ - /jèdū/ 'geindre'; /knēs-/ - /knēsū/ 'connaitre'; /köy-/ - /köyū/ 'cueillir', 2) a past participle which is the same as that of the singular of the present indicative: /bni/ 'bêni'; /fa/ 'fait'; /lā/ 'lu'; /tˈɔlɔ/ 'clos'.

Despite the obvious influence of analogy, there are a few past participles with an irregular formation: /bɔr/ - /bɔ/ 'boire'; /cér/ - /cū/ 'tomber'; /krɔr/ - /krū/ 'croire'.

It has already been mentioned in 3.3. that there is a basis for considering vowel length as phonemic. This observation is especially true in the case of past participles where the masculine form ends in a short vowel, and the feminine ends in a lengthened vowel. On the one hand, the dialect of Bourberain has no agreement of past participles of the standard French type, 'la maison que j'ai achetée est bien belle.', with a lengthened vowel in "style soutenu," or more clearly, 'les
pies que nous avons prises...", which in our dialect are: /là mazö k y é ec tè a bé bel/ and/lés eges k8 y ö prê/. However, the alternation does occur in past participles used as adjectives, cf., 3.8.2.1. Because of the restricted nature of this type of alternation, it is best to consider the matter one of morphophonemic conditioning dictated by the gender of the substantive being modified: /én üm pedû/-/én fân pedû/ 'un(e) homme (femme) perdu(e)'

5. The compound tenses are like those of standard French, and will be treated in 3.9.2., where it will be seen that, except for the auxiliary, the dialect of Bourberain presents no great difficulties.

8. Indeclinables. As previously stated, the indeclinables will be treated as belonging solely to the area of morphology. They have no inflection and few sandhi-variants, and fall into four main categories as follows:

1. Adverbs. A common class of adverbs is that which ends in /-mâ/: /vít'mâ/ 'vite'; /brâmâ/ 'bravement'; /prûp'mâ/ 'proprement'. Other adverbs of particular interest are: /etûw/ 'aussi', cf., OF atout; /ësè/ 'ici'; /estur/ 'à cette heure'; /edvâzyé/ 'avant-hier'; /mazé/ 'désormais' (restricted to negative sentences: /n'â n é mazé b'/ 'il n'y en a désormais plus guère'; /dézedé/
'l'un après l'autre'; /vôy/ 'oui'; /nâ/ and /nâni/ 'non'; /la/, /va/, /lavu/ 'ou'; cf., /la, va, lavu k tû vè/ 'ou vas-tu?'.

2. Prepositions. Generally speaking, the prepositions are the same as in modern French; however, there are several points of divergence which need to be pointed out: /dvê/ 'devant' and 'avant'; /pô/ 'pour' and 'par'; /kâ/ 'en même temps que', cf., /i partité kâ vê/ 'il partira en même temps que vous'.

3. Conjunctions. For the most part, the conjunctions in Bourberain offer no peculiarities: /si/ 'si'; /kâ/ - /kât/ 'quand'. There are certain examples which deserve to be mentioned separately: /mâ k/ 'lorsque', cf., OF mais que; /ôr k/ 'à moins que'; /va k/ 'tandis que', cf., /tyô bé sevâ va k lû è n sè râ/ 'tu es bien savant tandis que lui ne sait rien'.

4. Minor clause forms. These words are capable of forming independent sentences, and are usually classed as interjections: /vwê/ 'ouais'; /pwi/ 'pfft'.

3.3.1 Syntax. Certain aspects of syntax have already been touched upon under the various headings in the section on morphology. The brief sketch which follows will, therefore, treat only those aspects of syntax not already studied, aspects which are best seen in context.
Unfortunately, in Rabiet's treatment of syntax, he mentions interesting features which, upon closer examination, are not borne out by the actual usage of the dialect informants in the connected texts at the end of his study. It would seem, then, that the dialect, when studied connected speech, is more heavily influenced by standard French than one would be lead to believe by studying the examples cited in isolation. The reason for this is clear given Rabiet's knowledge of Latin, and his desire to structure the "grammar" using Latin as a point of departure; whereas the everyday usage betrays the influence of standard French.

The types of examples chosen for this study are ones which would diverge most markedly from similar constructions in standard French. The order followed is basically that of the order seen in the treatment of the individual items in the section on morphology.

1. Comparative and superlative. Although the dialect of Bourberain uses /pül/ 'plus' in comparisons much in the same way as French, it also has the construction: /él a bé ØjduW nö pa iyé/ 'il est beaucoup plus gai aujourd'hui qu'hier'. When comparing two verbal actions, /À pül/ precedes both actions: /À pül i l betó à pül à kriyś/ 'plus je le battais, plus il pleurait'.
In the elative, the formation is with the words /bë/ 'bien' and /net/: /è fa net frò/ 'il fait très froid'. In addition, a certain number of locutions are used in place of an elative construction. Rabiet assigns these formations to "l'imagination populaire" and they can be viewed as similes used as elatives. For example, /nò kmå kuku/ 'noir comme un coucou', /malûrû kmå le pyar/ 'malheureux comme les pierres', /måtu kmên erécu d dâ/ 'menteur comme un arracheur de dents'.

2. Verbs. In the active conjugation of compound tenses, the dialect uses only the verb /evò/ 'avoir': /i m é prômnë/ 'je me suis promené'; /èl é ôlë/ 'il est allé'; /è s é sawvë/ 'il s'est sauvé'.

On the other hand, the formation of the passive voice of the compound tenses is with the verb /et/ + /evû/: /i sè evû eplë/ 'j'ai été appelé; /è srë evû cesë/ 'ils auraient été chassés'. Confusion of this nature has become so great that the dialect has: /isë evû meled/ 'j'ai été malade', leading to the loss of a past participle for /et/. The ease with which the compound tenses have become confused in the choice of auxiliary verb is, in part, the result of the near homonymity of /evò/ and /et/.

3. Prepositions. A few prépositions have a unique usage in the dialect: /d è ki k s a s livr lë?/
'(d')à qui est ce livre-là?'; /s a d è mò/ 'c'est (d') à moi', in which the possessive relationship is further emphasized by the addition of de. Other examples show the presence or absence of a preposition in unexpected places: /wët bel è rgadè/ 'vous avez beau (à) regarder'; /ën pyés sà su/ 'une pièce de cent sous'.
1 The organization of the phonological material is that of A. Martinet as he applied it in *La Description phonologique d'Hauteville* (Savoie), Genève et Paris 1954.


CONCLUSION

The purpose of this dissertation has been to elucidate the theory of scripta study as perfected by Carl Theodor Gossen. In the first instance, we saw how the traditional approach to dialect study leads the linguist into the error of making unnecessary and, in the long run, invalid statements about the nature and development of language. Traditionalists base their observations on the fact that written texts from the medieval period show a diversity of phonological, morphological, and syntactic features which they ascribed to the nebulous concept of "dialect." Every diversity of spelling needed to be explained on the basis of sound change, as though the medieval scribe were conscious of the forces of change at work in the language. The error of the traditionalist school lies in its acceptance of the written form of a word as a phonetic reality. Every difference of spelling had to be explained by a particular sound law operative at the time the scribe was writing, thereby causing him to experiment with a graphic form which, in a certain sense, represented a modernization of an older
tradition established at a time when other sound laws were in effect.

In the scripta theory, the basic material is the written text as in the case of the older linguists. The point of departure, however, is entirely different. To better understand the evolution of language, it becomes necessary to realize than when dealing with written documents, the linguist has at his disposal, not a scientifically verifiable history of internal sound development as much as a history of a local tradition of writing which finds itself subjected to external pressures in the form of competing traditions which, for historical reasons, begin to encroach on the local tradition. Writing has always remained behind spoken language in its ability to keep pace with the normal evolution of sound. The greatest impetus for change in writing comes from the desire to conform to a standard which is culturally superior, and manifests itself through the artificial process of superimposing a borrowed form of writing on the local, traditional form. This is not to say that the linguist must merely content himself with observations about the external history of a region as reflected in the changing forms of writing. What the linguist can deduce from his material
is the manner in which the borrowed writing system is adapted in a particular region, a course of inquiry leading to the realization that the manner of applying the new tradition yields information about the underlying phonemic structure of the language. In one giant step, we have removed the study of historical linguistics from the level of parole, as exemplified by the older school, to the level of langue, as exemplified by the scripta method.

Our first attempt at analysis using the scripta technique was in the study of a medieval document from the city of Dijon. It was shown that certain tendencies in the language, as recorded on paper, could be systematized on the basis of the application of what we now recognize as intrusive graphemes on a language for which they were not originally intended.

In our next stage of inquiry, i.e., the status of the Burgundian dialect as found in the late 17th and early 18th centuries, we discovered that we were no longer dealing with a traditional scripta, as in the case of the medieval period, but rather with a wholly invented method of writing which was needed to revive a tradition of writing the local dialect, a tradition which had long since died out. The only model available
was that of the national literary language. Once again, certain tendencies reflecting the status of the local speech could be observed in the effort to record the dialect in poetic form. What we found, in effect, was an attempt to elevate a dying language to the status of a literary language. Since the only recognized literary language was that of the court and the salons of Paris, it is not surprising to find that Piron and the others drew their inspiration from this prestigious source. Nevertheless, we were able to define certain elements as truly representative of the Burgundian popular speech of the period.

The ability to identify the elements of the Burgundian dialect in its earlier written form is the result of the study made in the last part on the actual spoken language. Rabiet's studies of the spoken dialect, despite his limited approach, have given us invaluable insight into the status of the dialect on a recent synchronic level. Using synchronic information, we were better prepared to extend this information back to the 18th century so that we could better separate the intrusive scripta influences from the spontaneous attempt, on the part of Piron and others, to recreate a dead tradition.
As for the Burgundian dialect, we see that it is the history of a writing system which, since its inception in the 13th century, bears more and more the stamp of the culturally superior system emanating from the region of Paris. In its later phase, we see even more clearly the effect of the encroachment of standard French on the language of the local population. The spoken dialect is all but dead, thereby closing off one avenue of linguistic research. What remains is the pursuit of more thorough knowledge using those remnants of the French dialects as are available, coupled with the application of the scripta technique to the study of the various regional documents.
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