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1 Introduction

This paper examines the evolution in French of fused forms of the masculine singular definite article le with the prepositions de ‘of, from’, à ‘to, at’, and en ‘in’. The article first encliticized to the preposition and lost its vowel. Then, the development à+le > al > au with [I] vocalization is phonetically straightforward. However, de+le and en+le are problematic, presenting two sets of outcomes according to dialect area—one has the front rounded vowel [ɔ], which later raises to [y] (du, u); the other has the back rounded vowel [u] (dou, ou). Strikingly, the forms which ultimately triumph (du and ou) are drawn from different dialect areas. The fate of the three fused forms is also differential—ou disappears in the 16th century, du and au survive to this day. In this preliminary survey, we propose that the differential patterns of change encountered are the result of dialect-mixing and koineization.

2 The Data

We have three sources of relevant data at our disposal for the period c.1300: examples of closure of pretonic [ɔ] to [y] from reputable secondary sources such as Nyrop (1899-1930) and Pope (1934); the maps in Dees’ atlases of 13th century charters (Dees 1980) and literary manuscripts (Dees 1987); and the forms found in a group of Old French Bible manuscripts, some of which are dated or datable, and which cover the period c.1260-1340.

2.1 Secondary Sources

We begin with the general question of the closure of pretonic [ɔ] to [y] which results in the forms du and u. Below, we list some uncontroversial examples of this change, including tonic-pretonic alternations, given by Nyrop (1899-1930:1,§302), with datings derived from the standard dictionaries of Old French (Godefroy 1880-1902 (G); Wartburg 1928- (W); Tobler & Lommatzsch,1925- (TL)). It will be seen that the forms with the closed vowel are later than 1300, and are often rare. The, glosses given are Old/Middle French, not (necessarily) Modern French.

The development of [Ø] to [Y] in ‘secondary stressed syllables’ is also noted by Pope (1934: §543), who gives du and u as examples. She draws attention (§486) to a similar development affecting original pretonic [e] rounded to [Ø] under the influence of a following labial consonant (compare bevant > buvant ‘drinking’, femier > fumier ‘manure’, and jumeaux > jumeaux ‘twins’). Elsewhere (§843), she notes a geographical split in the development of del and el, alleging that [(d)Ø] > [(d)Y] is found in the North-Western and West Central regions and [(d)[Ø]] > [(d)[U]] in the Eastern, East Central, and Northern regions, with both outcomes present in the Central region, a conclusion supported by evidence from rhymes in the Roman de la Rose. It seems clear from the secondary sources that pretonic [Ø] > [Y] is a relatively late change, and that du and u are amongst the earliest items to be affected by it.

2.2 Atlas Data

Dees’s atlas of 13th century charters (1980: maps 42-45, 52-55), shows the following geographical distribution of the fused forms under consideration.

**de + le:** dou predominates from South-West to North-East, with a strong showing for del, deu and du taken together only in the areas corresponding to the modern Somme/Pas de Calais and Aisne, in Normandy, and in the région parisienne; the most usual form within these areas of strength is du, and not del or deu.

**en + le:** ou predominates in a swathe from South-West to North-East, with el, eu, hu, and u together being strong in the areas corresponding to the modern Nord, Aisne, and Somme/Pas-de-Calais, and in Normandy, Walloonia, and Hainaut. In these areas of strength, el seems to be the norm, with eu and to a lesser extent u being dominant only in Normandy.

The obvious difference in the two distributions is Paris, which has du and ou as its norms.

A slightly different picture emerges from Dees’s atlas of literary texts (1987: maps 84-85, 91-93), confirming the area of <ou>/[u] dominance for both de + le and en + le, but showing del as the norm in Wallonia, Hainaut, and Ardennes, el as rare, and huludv dominating the North and Paris.
2.3 Old French Bible Data

The Old French Bible is the earliest complete translation of the Bible in a western vernacular. It was composed in or near the Île de France, c.1220-1260, by an anonymous team of translators working from glossed Vulgate texts (Sneddon 1999a, 1999b, 2002). It was theologically uncontentious, and circulated amongst those wealthy enough to buy illuminated manuscripts.

The translation contains substantial glossing in some books (Genesis, Joshua, Judges), moderate glossing in others (Psalms, Gospels), and almost no glossing elsewhere. Its text was revised on more than one occasion, so that we have four states of text from the 13th century alone.

The data presented in the Appendix have been chosen to exemplify forms corresponding to de + le, en + le, sur ‘on’, buvant ‘drinking’, and buveur ‘drinker’. (The reasons for the inclusion of the last three items are discussed below.) Relevant forms found in Matthew chapters 5 and 11 have been cited, from a selection of manuscripts representing the four 13th century states of text and the two 14th century texts (c and e) which appear in Bible historiale manuscripts before c.1340. The order in which the manuscripts are quoted is by family (x, a, c, b, d, e), as shown in the stemma at the beginning of the Appendix. Paleographically-based dating information is also given, with a precise date where the manuscript is dated or datable.

In the manuscripts considered, we find the following forms:

- **de + le**: del is the norm until the end of the 13th century. Both du and dou gain ground after this date, the latter first appearing in an Eastern manuscript dated 1284 (BN fr. 12581).

- **en + le**: el is the norm in all manuscripts (v occurring only once in the sample, in a c.1300 manuscript from the North (Musée Condé 5)), except that ou occurs in the same Eastern manuscript as dou, in one other late 13th century manuscript which is less easily localizable (Pierpont Morgan M 494) and which consistently uses du, and in a manuscript written not long before 1341 (Ste-Geneviève 22) which also uses du.

The inference to be drawn is that del becomes the norm, replacing de before ou replaces el, and that this process is well under way by the mid 14th century. Sorlseur ‘on’ (modern sur) and bevant ‘drinking’, beveur ‘drinker’ (modern buvant, buveur) were also examined to see if these forms cast any light on the overall picture of the [ə] > [y] change. In the case of sorlseur...

---

1 In 1291-1295, an independent translation of Peter Comestor's *Historia Scholastica* was made by Guiart des Moulins. Not later than 1314, Parisian libraires had combined most of the Old Testament portions of des Moulins's text with Volume II (Proverbs to Revelation) of the *Old French Bible*. It is in these composite manuscripts that the three 14th century states of text are found.
(<SVPER), there is no instance of sur, but competition in a minority of manuscripts from the etymologically distinct sus (<SVRSVM). In the case of bevant and beveor, there is evidence that buvant appears at about the same time as du, but before buveor.

The oldest manuscript from which data were collected (BN fr. 899) has been localized to a workshop on the Île de la Cité c.1260 (Branner 1977:106; Rouse & Rouse 1991: note 56), and it uses del and el. Another manuscript, dated 1317 (Arsenal 5059), is said by its scribe to have been written in Paris; this mixes del and du, but consistently uses el. The interpretation which this seems to suggest is that the orthography of books prefers the older spellings <del> and <el>, but that the local speech habits of Paris, as attested by chart evidence, come to be adopted into book orthography, hence the 14th-century use of du and ou, with ou being accepted later than du. However, we may also note that the earliest Old French Bible manuscript to attest du (Mazarine 35) is the most Northern of the manuscripts, and attests du only once in the sample, behavior which one might expect if this were an innovation. If du is Northern, it could be appearing in Parisian books as a result of Northern influence. The three manuscripts which consistently use du (Pierpont Morgan M 494; BN fr. 398; Ste-Geneviève 22) are all later manuscripts of families linked to this Northern manuscript, so it would be possible to suggest that the form du, of whatever origin, was adopted in this family and thereafter copied from this consistent source.

It should be noted that, as well as the chronological analysis of these manuscripts, it is possible to consider them by textual family. Such an approach would suggest that some families (x, a, and, to an extent, c) are more conservative than others (b and its descendants).

2.4 Summary

In any event, and whatever the finer details of the analysis, the role of Paris here seems to be one of a melting pot, ultimately accepting the Northern and Western forms in [y] for de + le but not for en + le. The selection of one outcome in one form and of the other outcome in the other form, after a lengthy period of variation, betokens dialect-mixing and koineization.

3 Dialect-Mixing and Koineization

The phenomenon of koineization is discussed by Siegel (1985) and Trudgill (1986:107-108), who notes:
In dialect contact and dialect mixture situations there may be an enormous amount of variability in the early stages. However, as time passes, focusing takes place by means of a reduction of the forms available. This reduction takes place through the process of koinéization, which consists of the levelling out of minority and otherwise marked speech forms, and of simplification, which involves, crucially, a reduction in irregularities. The result of the focusing associated with koinéization is a historically mixed but synchronically stable dialect which contains elements from the different dialects that went into the mixture, as well as interdialectal forms that were present in none. [emphasis in original]

Moreover, the accommodation involved in dialect mixing is commonly incomplete, resulting in lexical diffusion (Trudgill 1986:58-60).

There is little doubt that, from the 12th century onwards, Paris experienced a rapid growth in population, with much in-migration from other oïl-speaking areas. In light of the findings of modern urban dialectology, Lodge (1999:55) hypothesizes that ‘the first stage in the development of urban speech in Paris was its gradual rise above the dialect continuum of northern Gallo-Romance through a process of dialect-mixing and eventual koinéization’. He correlates this process with the ‘pre-industrial’ phase of urban growth postulated by Hohenberg & Lees (1995) in their discussion of the rise of cities in Europe. This period runs from 1200 to 1500, and corresponds to the period from which we have taken our principal data.

These data, as presented above, are consistent with koinéization. The [ɔ] > [y] change appears to be lexically diffuse, with du (and possibly buvant, but not buveur) being in the van. Parisian ‘Middle French’, the ‘proto-standard’ of the modern language, selects du and ou, apparently from different dialect areas, for de + le and en + le, respectively. However, the manifestations of koinéization may run even deeper. We suggest that, in addition to explaining the differential development of the two fused forms, this process may also account for their differential fate subsequently.

3.1 The Disappearance of ou

Tuten (2000:102-104) observes the disappearance of many fused forms combining a preposition and the definite article in early Castilian and their replacement by more transparent sequences of preposition + article. For instance, no, ene, and eno ‘in the’ are all replaced by en el. He notes:

The ability to use contracted forms requires that the speaker learn either complex rules or more forms. Such complex knowledge is most effec-
tively passed on in stable communities.... In order to accommodate to their new and dialectally mixed communities, some speakers may have begun to eliminate those forms which were unfamiliar to many other speakers.... More likely still, both adult and child learners of the target variety of the new community would have tended to search for and reproduce forms which were consistently and frequently produced..., whose component parts also appeared separately in other contexts. The simplified production of such speakers would have further accelerated the demise of the contracted forms.

The Middle French fused form *ou disappeared during the course of the 16th century, and some earlier commentators have adumbrated a similar account for this development, albeit without the sociolinguistic framework. Sneyders de Vogel (1919:§389) and Ewert (1943:§463), for instance, both note the opacity of the relationship between the form *ou and the forms *en and *le, which are in some sense its constituents.

This type of development might also be related to work by Chambers on the acquisition of British English by young anglophone Canadians who had moved to Southern England. He claims (Chambers 1992:697)—that, in the acquisition of a new dialect, ‘distinct variants are acquired’ faster than... obscure variants’. Chambers is discussing the influence of literacy on dialect acquisition, and specifically whether or not a given variant is reflected in orthography; but it is not far-fetched to extend his conclusions to non-fusional (‘distinct’) vs. fusional (‘obscure’) variants.

However, the situation in French is somewhat different from the Castilian case discussed by Tuten, as, by the period in question, there is no longer any overt competition between *ou and the more ‘distinct’ and ‘consistent’ sequence *en le. One possibility might have been for *en le to be reintroduced on the analogy of en la and en l’ (a putative development which we might term ‘covert competition’); but, to this day, *en le is extremely rare in French (Grevisse 1993:§1002). What in fact happened was that a hitherto uncommon preposition—*dans (< DE INTVS) ‘in’—emerged to provide the relevant competition. Darmesteter (1890:181-185) charts this process, noting that the preposition *dans is virtually absent from literary French before about 1550, but rapidly becomes more frequent thereafter.

### 3.2 But What About *au and *du?

Probably the commonest development, then, is for *ou to be ousted by *dans *le, but *ou could also be replaced by *au (à + *le). Gougenheim (1951:164), for instance, notes that the modernized edition of the poems of Jean Lemaire de
Beiges (c.1473-c.1525) published in 1549 generally makes this substitution. It has left its mark in modern French oppositions such as *en mon nom* 'in my name' vs. *au nom de Pierre* 'in Pierre's name'. The standard account of this change is phonological: it was allegedly brought about by a partial merger of *lui* and *loi* (Zink 1997:71). This replacement of one fused form by another—and, more generally, the survival into the modern language of the fused forms *au* and *du*—might seem to pose problems for our claim that koïnes shun fusional opacity. What explanation can be offered for the survival of some fused forms but not others?

As in the case of *ou*, there is no overt competition between *au* and *du* on the one hand and the more 'distinct' and 'consistent' sequences *à le* and *de le* on the other. But, once again, 'covert competition' exists, and these more 'distinct' and 'consistent' sequences could have been introduced on the analogy of *à la, de la, à l', de l'. That they were not is perhaps due to two factors—frequency and iconicity. *À* and *de* occur more frequently than other prepositions; the fused forms may therefore have a greater 'lexical strength', in the sense of Bybee (1985:117-118), who suggests that items which occur more frequently in texts or discourse are more firmly entrenched in the mental representation of the lexicon. *Au* and *du* may also be seen as relatively iconic. In modern French, the primary function of *à* and *de* is arguably Case-marking (Jones 1996:377-378). This implies at least a partial shift in the value of these two items from Case-assigners to Case-markers, with a concomitant decrease in their semanticity. Some evidence of this shift is provided by the fact that *à* and *de* take over the non-objective functions of the oblique (morphological) case (dative and genitive, respectively) during the Old French period (Herslund 1980). As *Case* is a property of the DP/NP, fusion of *à* and *de* with some element of this phrase is more iconic than comparable fusion involving more 'semantic', less 'functional' prepositions, and might be more resilient for this reason. Compare, too, in this connection, the requirement that *à* and *de*, unlike most other prepositions, normally be repeated before each conjunct of a coordination (Grevisse 1993:§995), the existence of *y* and *en* as 'pro-PP[à+DP/NP]' and 'pro-PP[de+DP/NP]', respectively, and the status of *à* and *de* as complementizers.

*En* appears to occupy an intermediate position between *à/de* and other prepositions (Table 1). It, too, generally requires repetition before each conjunct of a coordination (Grévisse 1993:§995), and arguably functions as a complementizer when followed by the gerundive (compare *en faisant*, etc.). However, does not mark Case, and there is no pro-PP which systematically corresponds to it. More research is required in order to elucidate the exact status of *en*; but its intermediate position might account not only for the emergence of the fused form *ou*, but also for its relatively short lifespan.
4 Conclusion

Much more work needs to be done on these problems. In particular, a full survey of the issues should take into account the fused forms involving the plural definite article les: as, aux (à + les), des (de + les), and ës (en + les), as well as the existence, but ultimate disappearance, of comparable fused forms in which the second element is the personal pronoun le (Nyrop 1899-1930:II,§505). Nonetheless, we feel that we can already draw some tentative conclusions. The diachronic data point to the raising of pretonic [ø] to [y] being a lexically diffuse change, which, in particular, affects [dø] before most other items. Such lexical diffusion is characteristic of dialect-mixing. The differential evolution of del to dul* dou and el to oul* u in the French proto-standard may also be regarded as evidence of dialect-mixing and koineization. In addition, koineization may be an important factor in the disappearance of the fused forms of en + definite article, paralleling the proposals already made for early Castilian by Tuten. Du (and au) are arguably more resilient because of their greater frequency, and because their function of Case-marking is more tolerant of fusion. In other words, in the cases under consideration, fusion occurs for phonotactic reasons, presents different outcomes as a result of dialect-mixing, is threatened by dialect-mixing, but may be maintained because of frequency and morphosyntactic iconicity.

Appendix

a) Proposed relationship between main families of Old French Bible manuscripts:

```
x
 /|
 a  b
 /|
 c  d
 /|
    e
 /|
    f
```
b) Concorded extracts from the Old French Bible: Matthew chapters 5 and 11, with date and family of each manuscript

The manuscript transcriptions below aim at producing a diplomatic text within the constraints of the software used; word divisions are retained (with any exceptions indicated by [sic]), and, apart from clitics and elision, are mostly in accordance with modern practice. Hyphenation in the manuscripts is erratic, and for legibility has been supplied or deleted as necessary. Capitalization, punctuation, and lineation follow the manuscripts. The graphemes 'r' and 's' have two forms, with <r> and <s> the norm, and 'round r' (<®>) following round letters such as <o>, and 'short s' (<s>), if used, in word final position. Coloring of individual letter-forms (usually capitals) mostly occurs after a punctus (full stop), and is indicated by bold type.

The abbreviations are all indicated, and belong to the set inherited from Latin; some occur often, but all may be used to help the scribe keep within the column. The abbreviation for est is represented by <&>. The Tironian numbers are retained, <7> being used for et, and <9> at the beginning of a word for <co>, <com> or <con>; <9> at the end of a word is superscript, and represents <us> or, for some scribes, <&> after <u>. Final <&> itself may be superscript after any letter. Superscript vowels, depending on the word in which they occur, represent <er> or <ur> plus the vowel concerned. A bar <--> above a letter represents a nasal, a suspension (no letters after the bar), or a contraction (some letters after the bar); the bar may become a hook across the ascender of letters such as <ch> or <R>. A looped or hooked version of the bar (<<»>) is used for <er>, <er> or <ier>, and a bar on the stem of <p> (<®>) for <par> or <per>. Deletions are indicated by strikethrough, and insertions by "/' enclosing the insertion. Insertions in BN fr. 899 are in a later hand. The concordance does not respect manuscript lineation, but uses the supplied verse numbers for reference.

Rouen, Bibl. mun. 185 (family x; s.xiii/2)

5.48 come uo[tre pere] del ciel e[t parfez.
5.22 il/era col-pablej del feu denfer. [23]
5.14 c[el] la luffie del monde. la cite qui e[t
5.34 'len ne doit mie iufer del louden tout, ne par le ciel
5.12 g®nt loier el ciel. Si 9me il uo[ po®-]fuent
5.45 uo[tre pere qui e]l ciel q[1] fes jon Jouleill
5.29 tout ton co®] uo[el] el feu denfer.
5.30 tout to co®] uo[el el feu denfer.
5.19 tenuz po® re] petit el reaume del ciel].-7 cil qui le fera
5.20 uo[en terroir mie] el regne del ciel]. [21] vo] heuz oi
5.14 la cite qui e]l eur la montaigne po[ee ne puet
5.45 max. 7 pluet eur le] iu[te] 7 eur le] neant
5.15 jo® coueru-re. me] jo® chandelier q] elc alume a
5.15 chandoile 7 la mete jo® coueru-re. me] jo®
5.45 [on] souleill nelstre [o@ le] buen[7] [o@ le] max
5.45 [o@ le] buen[7] [o@ le] max. 7 pluet [eir le]
5.39 le tribulaci-on uient [o@ uo] q) uo] la recueez
11.19 uint emeniat 7 beuant. 7 il dient vez ci
11.18 uint ne menianz ne beuant. Cest a dire ne
11.18 a dire ne menianz ne beuant chole[7] p@eieuljes[7]
11.19 vez ci deuo@eo[7] beuo@ de uin. amif del publican[7]

Paris, BN, fr. 12581 (family x; dated 1284)
5.48 v)res per[1] dou ciel e(t g-faiz
5.19 tre] petiz ou reaumedou ciel. et ciz qui le fera 7
5.22 jot ilera corpables dou feu danfer. [23]
5.14 Vou] cles la lu-miere dou monde la cite qui e]t leur la
5.34 len ne doit mie iurer dou tout en tout ne par le ciel. quar
5.12 auroiz grant lojer ou ciel. Si come il vou
5.45 v)re per[1] qui e]t ou ciel qui fait lon joloi nelstre
5.29 que touz tel[ co@] vol] out feu danfer,
5.30 que touz tel] cors vol] out feu danfer.
5.19* tenuz pour tre] petiz ou reaume dou ciel. et ciz qui le
5.19 jelera apelez granz ou regne de] cels
5.15 [on] couverture, mes] leur chandelier que elle alume a
5.14 dou monde la cite qui e]t leur la montaigne po]e ne puett
5.45 [eir le] bons 7 [eir le] maueul[7] pluet [eir le]
11.19 li filz dome vint beuant 7 maniant. 7 il dient. veez
11.18 ne manianz. ne beuant ce]t a dire ne beuant ne
11.18 ce e]t a dire ne beuant ne manianz chole[7] p@eieuljes
11.19 Jehanz vint ne beuant ne manianz. ne beuant ce
11.19 home deu o@eoi [sic] 7 beueor de vin. Amif de publicanz 7

Brussels, Bibl. roy. 10516 (family a; s.xiii/ex)
5.22 [ot. il] sera coupable del feu denfer. [23]
5.22 [eront co@pa] del lu-gement
5.21 [era co@pa-bles] del lugement. cest a dire
5.14 e]le la lumiere del monde. la cite qui e]t leur la
5.45 de nostre per[1] qui e]t el ciel. qui fet lon joleill nelstre
5.12 grant [sic] loier el ciel si come il uoz
5.16 uoz pe-re] qui e]t el cielz [sic].
5.30 tout ton co@] uo] el feu denfer
5.29 tout ton co@] uo] el feu denfer.
5.20 vol nenterrez mie el reigne des cielz [21] vol au-z o"i
5.19 sera tenuz po@ tref petit el roiaume des cielz et cil
5.14 monde.. la cite qui e]t leur la montaigne po]ee ne puett
5.45 fet lon jolei nelstre [eir le] buen[7] 7 [eir le] max. 7
5.45 [eir le] max. 7 pluet [eir le] lu]tes. 7 [eir le] no-ient lu]tes.
5.45
5.39 le tribulacion un				jeur vof. que vof la recevez
11.18 uint nemie einz [sic] ne
11.19 li fil dome unt meniant. 7
11.18 cest a dire ne menianz ne

Paris, Bibl. de l'Arsenal 5059 (family c; dated 1317)

5.22 Il le-ra coupables
del feu denfer. [23] Donques
5.21 et doit eftre
del iugement. Cest a dire. Il
5.48 comme noltre pere
du ciel est parfeiz
5.14 cftes la lumie-re
du monde. La cte qui est
5.34 on ne doit mie iurer du tout en tout. ne par le ciel
5.12 auroiz gant loier
el ciel. Si comme il vouz
5.45 de voltre pere qui est
el ciel. qui feit jon folcil neftre
5.29 tout ton co@voi[pt] el feu denfer.
5.20 vouz nenterroiz mie el regne des cieulx. [21] Vouz auez
5.19 jera tenu po@ tres petit el roi-aume des ciez. Et cil qui le
5.19 jera apelez tres grans el roi-aume des ciez [20] le vouz di
5.15 defisous couvertures meix
5.14 La cite qui est
ejur la montaing-ne pofee ne puet
5.45 fo@ les bons. et
ejur les maueis. et pluet jo@ tes
5.39 je tribulatton vient jeur vouz; que vouz la re-ceuez
5.45 feit jon folcil nestre jo@ les bops. et jur les maueis
5.45 les maueises. et pluet
5.45 jo@ les iustes. [46] Se vouz

11.18 ne men-ians [sic] ne
11.19 Le fil domme vint
11.19 homme deoureour. et

Paris, BN, fr. 899 (family b; s.xiii/2)

5.10 car li roiaumes
del ciel et leur. [11] Vof
5.48 come uoltre pere
del ciel est parfeiz
5.22 jot; il Jera colpable del feu denfer. [23] Donque
5.35 car ele cte
del grand roi. ce est de deu. [36]
5.14 Vos elie] la cte
5.34 len ne doit mie iurer
del tout en tout. ne par le cie. car
5.12 auroiz grant loier,
el cie. Si com il vou
5.45 voulet pere qui est
5.29 tout ton co@ voi[pt] el feu de enfer.
5.30 tout ton co@ voi[pt] el feu denfer.
5.19 le-ra tenu po@ tres petit el reumie des cieix 7 cil qui le fera
5.19 jera apelez granzk
el regne de cie. [20] Ge
5.20 uol nenteroiz mie
el regne de cie. [21] Vos
5.15 fo@ couvertures. mef jeur chandelier que ele alume
5.14 qui 8 poee
5.45 jon folciel nef-tre jo@ les buen[7] jo@ le] mauvue/[7]
5.45 mauue/[7]. 7 pluet
5.45 nef-tre jo@ le] buen[7] jo@ le] neant iuj[7] jo@ le] mauue/[. 7 pluet
5.45 pluet jo@ le] iuj[7] jo@ le] neant iuj[. [46] Se
5.39 je tribulacion uient jo@ uof que uof la receueoz
11.19 meniants 7
beuants. 7 il dient
11.18 uint ne menianz ne
beuanz. ce eft a dire ne menianz
11.18 a dire ne menianz ne
beuanz cho[ef p@eieuf] 7 il
11.19 vez ci chome deuo@eo@ 7
beu-o® de vin. Ami[s] del publican

Paris, Bibl. Mazarine 35 (family b; s.xiii/ex)

5.22 [ot il [era courpable]/ del feu denfer. [23] don-que[ef je tu
5.35 car ele eft cite
del grant roi. ce eft de dieu. [36] 7
5.14 vou[e] la lumiere
del môde. la cite qui eft pòlee Jo®
5.34 len ne doit pà iurer du tout en tout ne par le ciel. car
5.45 de vos[tre pere qui e[t el ciel. qui fet [jon soleil luire Jo® le]
5.12 vou[aurez grant] lojier
el ciel si 9me il vou[e] po®[jurrent
5.29 tout ton co® voit] el feu denfer.
5.30 tout ton co® voit] el feu denfer.
5.20 vou[e] nenterrez mie
el regne del ciex. [21] vou[auez
5.19 tenuz po® ml]t pe-tit
el roiame del ciex. 7 cil qui le fera
5.19 [era a-pelez granz
el roiame del ciex. [20] ie vou[e] di
5.15 [oz couverture me] [eur chandelier. que ele a-lume
5.39 je tribulation] vient [eur vou[e que vou] la receuez
5.14 la cite qui eft pòlee Jo® la mon-taigne ne puet ejtre
5.45 qui fet [jon soleil luire Jo® le bon] 7 Jo® le mau® 7 pluet
5.45 jo® le mau® 7 pluet jo® le mau® 7 pluet jo® le mau®
5.45 luire jo® le bon] 7 Jo® le mau® 7 pluet jo® le mau®
5.45 pluet jo® le mau® 7 jo® le mau® neent iuj-tej. [46] Je vou/

New York, Pierpont Morgan Lib., M 494 (family b; s.xiii/ex)

5.48 come uostre pere du ciel et parfez
5.22 [ot. il [era co®pable] du feu denfer. [23] Don-que[ef je tu
5.35 car ele eft cite
du grant roi. ce eft de dieu. [36] 7
5.14 Vo[e] la lumiere du monde. La cite qui eft pòlee Jo
5.34 len ne doit mie iurer
du tout en tout ne par le ciel. car
5.45 uostre pere qui eft du ciel. qui fet [jon soleil nestre Ju
5.12 car uo[s] auroiz grant loier ou ciel Si come il uo] po®[juiront
5.29 tout ton co® aeo tuoi ou feu denfer.
5.30 tout ton co® uoif ou feu denfer.
5.19 tenuz po® trepetit [sic] ou reaume de] ciel, 7 cil qui le
5.19 [era ape-lez granz ou regne de] ciel. [20] le
5.39 je tribulation uient [eur uo] que uo] la receuoiz
5.15 jouz couverture Me[j] [eur chandelier que ele aume clarte
5.14 La cite qui eft pòlee Ju] la montaig-ne ne puet e`tre repouste.
5.45 fet [jon soleil nestre Ju] le bon® 7 Ju] le mau®
5.45 Ju] le mau® 7 pluet Ju] le mau® neant iuj-tej.
5.45 Ju] le bon® 7
11.18 ce est a dire ne manianz ne buuanz chose pœ-cieuje [sic]. 7 il
11.19 Li fuiz dome uint manianz 7 buuanz. 7 j dient uez ci ho-me
11.18 lahanjuint ne manianz ne buuâz ce est a dire ne manianz ne
11.19 uez ci ho-me deuo®eeur. 7 bœueur de vin. Ami[ de] pu-blican,

Paris, BN, fr. 398 (family d; s.xiii-xiv)

5.10 car li roiaumes du ciel est leur. [111] vouz croiz
5.48 9me voltre pe du ciel est parfet
5.22 il fera compables du feu denfer. [23] Donquef je tu
5.35 car ele est la cite du grant roi. [36] Et ne [ure] pa[r] par
5.14 vouf est la lumiere du monde. La cite qui est polee jus
5.34 len ne doit mie lurer di't tout en tout. ne par le ciel. car
5.45 voufere pere qui est el ciel qui fet jon souail nostre Ju
5.30 tout ton co® voit el feu f denfer.
5.20 vouf entrof mie el regne del ciex. [21] vouz auez oi
5.19 fera apelez granz el roiaume del cieul. [20] le vou di
5.19 tenuz pour tre[t] petit el roiaume del ciex. 7 cil qui le
5.45 fet jon lopail nel] [u le] bons. 7 ju] les maus. 7 pluet
5.45 nentre ju] le] bons. 7 ju] les maus. 7 pluet ju] le
5.39 je tribulation vient ju] vou] q) v9 la receuez
5.15 jouz couuerture. me] jus chandelier que ele alume clarte
5.14 la cite qui est polee jus la montaigne ne peut en[t]

ChantiJJy, Musee Condé 5 (family d; s.xiii-xiv)

5.48 9me voltre pe du ciel est p[ef]t
5.10 Car li roiaumes du ciel est leur. [111] v9 feroiz
5.22 il fera co®pables du feu denfer. [23] Donques f le tu
5.35 car ele est cite du grant Roy. ce est de dieu [36] 7 ne
5.14 la lusfe du monde. La cite qui est polee jus la
5.34 len ne doit mie lurer du tout en tout ne g le ciel car
5.29 que tout to co®s voit el feu denfer.
5.20 vous nenterroiz mie el regne del ciex. [21] vouz auez oi
5.19 tenuz pour trec[t] petit el roiaume del ciex. 7 cil qui
5.19 fera apelez granz el roiaume del ciex. [20] le voj di
5.45 u)re pere qui est ciel. qui fet jon jolele meltre [sic]
5.15 jouz couuerture Me] eur chandeli[e que ele alume clarte
5.39 tby-lacion. vjentel vous q) vol la receuoiz
5.45 mel]tre [sic] luz lebons 7 ju le bons [sic] 7 pluet ju le
5.45 [u le] bon[ [sic] 7 pluet ju le
5.45 7 pluet ju le luzes 7 ju le] nient lu]tes.
5.14 la cite qui est polee jus la montaigne se peut etre reposte
5.45 jon joleil meltre [sic] luz le bons 7 ju le bons [sic] 7 pluet

11.18 lehan vint ne buuant ne meniant. Cel a dire ne
le fuiz dome vint měniand 7 buuæt 7 Il dient uex ci home
Ceūt a dire ne buuæt ne meniand ne buule [sic]
ne meniand ne buule [sic] Æcicules chojes 7 il
home de vouereur [sic] 7 buueuer de vin 7 amjdel pu-blicans

Paris, Bibl. Ste-Genevieve 22 (family e; s.xiv/l, before 1341)

5.22 Jot il Jera copables du feu denfer. [23] Donques Je tu
5.35 car ce cjt cite du grant roy. ce cjt de dieu. [36] et
5.14 Vous eltes la lumiere du monde. La cite qui cjt pojee Jus
5.45 v)cere pere qui cjt ou cieel qui fait Jon Joleil naistre
5.12 aurez grant lojer ou cieel cjt cjt cft vous pourfuiront
5.29 tout ton co@ps voijt ou feu denfer.
5.20 vous nen-terrez mie ou regne des ciex. [21] vous auez
tenus pour moult petet ou royaume de ciex. Et cjt qui le
5.19 Jera appellez grant ou royaume des ciex. [20] Je vous
5.39 Se tribulacion vient leur vous que vous la receuez
5.45 fait Jon Joleil naistre Jo@ les bons 7 Jo@ les maus. et
5.45 les maus. et pluet Jo@ les iuues. [46] Se vous amez
5.45 naistre Jo@ les bons 7 Jo@ les maus. et pluet Jo@ les iuues.
5.15 Jous couverture mais Jus chandelier que elle alume
5.14 La cite qui cjt pojee Jus la möße-taigne ne puet

Ichans vint ne me)-ians ne buuans ce cjt a dire ne meniand ne
a dire ne meniand ne buuans chojes p@ecicules. Et il
dome vaint [sic] meniand et buuans. et il dient. vez ci home
il dient. vez ci home beueour et deuoure o@ [sic] de vin. amWs
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