THE MANUSCRIPTS OF THE FIRST REDACTION OF THE HISTOIRE ANCIENNE JUSQU’À CÉSAR (13TH CENTURY): TEXTUAL VARIATION AND LINGUISTIC CODING*

Histoire ancienne jusqu’à César (HA) is the title chosen by Paul Meyer for an early 13th-century Old French prose compilation, which survives in over eighty manuscripts.¹ These manuscripts were produced in the time span of roughly two centuries: from the first half of the 13th century to the beginning of the 15th century. The HA circulated widely: from Northern France to the Holy Land, and back to France via Italy and the Iberian Peninsula. Throughout its first two centuries of life, the HA underwent three major textual and structural transformations. In its current form, the first redaction of the HA (first quarter of the 13th century, Northern France) is a universal history, dealing with human events from the crea-

* An earlier version of this essay was presented at the The Values of French Language and Literature seminar in March 2017. I would like to thank the participants at the seminar, particularly Simon Gaunt, Adam Ledgeway and Fabio Zinelli, and the anonymous readers at MR for their comments.

tion to the Gallic wars. In the second redaction (second quarter of the 14th century, Naples), the *Histoire Ancienne* is genuinely ancient history, and the “matters” of Thebes, Aeneas and Rome are completed by the insertion of the fifth *mise en prose* of the *Roman de Troie* (the so-called *Prose 5*). The Biblical, part of the “oriental” and the Alexander sections, present in the first redaction, are omitted in the second redaction. Finally (15th century, France), the manuscripts of the third redaction keep the fifth prosification of Benoît de Sainte-More’s *Roman de Troie*, give a more complete account of the history of the Hebrews after Joseph, and retrieve the Alexander section.

The *HA* was not subject just to structural changes in its editorial project. As is normal in a medieval textual tradition, the text of the first redaction of the *HA* underwent variation on a smaller scale. A host of little changes took place at all levels of the linguistic spectrum: from graphemics and morphology, to lexis and syntax. This sort of variation did not generate a new redaction of the *HA*. Nonetheless, the modifications the text underwent are significant in that the adoption of new, idiosyncratic linguistic solutions.


4. See Rochebouet, *De la Terre Sainte au Val de Loire*, cit., p. 170, and n. 11 and 12. Rochebouet points out that the compilers of the third redaction use the so called *Chronique de Boudoin d’Avesnes* (end of the 13th century) to complete the Biblical and other sections of the *HA*. 317
provide the text with a score making the same text sound differently. Linguistic micro-variation does not happen randomly. The choice of a new word, e.g. a verb form or a different word order, is the result of a combination of conditions and expectations – i.e. linguistic competence, the education and “taste” of the scribe(s), different horizons d’attente –, but responds to grammatical constraints that end up reverberating on the text as a whole: along the way it is given a “form” and along the way it is copied, read, understood, (re)used.

In this article, I consider micro-variance in a selection of manuscripts of the first redaction HA. My purpose is to identify how linguistic phenomena intervene in textual variation. To reach this goal, I will analyse how the manuscripts deal with some specific syntactic: passive structures, the position of verbs in subordinate clauses, (non)expression of referential and expletive subject pronouns; clitics; grammatical words (adverbial locutions). In § 1, I will clarify the rationale behind the choice of the manuscripts and the syntactic phenomena under discussion.

1. Corpus and approach

In this article, the codex Paris, BNF, MS f. fr. 20125 (= P) is compared to a set of manuscripts of the HA. The criteria for inclusion of manuscripts in my corpus are as follows:

1) manuscript P preserves the most complete version of the first redaction of the HA; furthermore, it has a verse prologue, and nineteen verse sections;
2) to make the selection representative, I have chosen at least one manuscript from each of the manuscript families of the first redaction of the HA identified so far (see below);
3) the manuscripts either have a similar date of production, the late 13th century, or they mirror an exemplar that was produced during the 13th century.

For my purposes, it is crucial that they were compiled in a tight chronological window, since this enables a consideration of textual variation and linguistic change in synchrony.

5. For the sigla or the manuscripts of the HA see below Table 1.
6. The team working on the ERC-funded project The Values of French Language and Literature is preparing a complete semi-diplomatic transcription and a digital edition of MS f. fr. 20125, see <http://www.tvof.ac.uk/>. All the partial editions of the first redaction of the HA that have been published to date are based on this manuscript.
Although the place of production of P is disputed, the work of philologists and art historians on the *HA* confirms that the earliest manuscripts of the *HA* fall into two clearly defined groups, one produced in Acre and the other in Northern France. As for the first group (see below, i and ii), the precise relations between its manuscripts have yet to be established. However, analysis of the textual outline (contents and structure), of the cycles of miniatures, and of variant readings, allow the identification of the manuscript group’s basic features:

1. *MS f. fr. 20125 (= P).* Manuscript P has been variously dated from the 1270s to the late 1280s. It is thought to best reflect the oldest version of the *HA*. Its place of production is still uncertain. According to the most recent hypothesis, it might have been copied in France from a manuscript produced *Outremer*. On the other hand, the relationship between P’s cycle of miniatures and the cycle of the Acre manuscripts is not completely clear (see below, ii).

Rennes, Bibliothèque Municipale, MS 2331 (= Rennes), is a 15th-century manuscript, possibly produced in Brittany. Although Rennes is not a copy of P, the former is close to the latter, and is a key witness for the understanding of the textual configuration recorded in P.

Finally, a 14th-century Venetian manuscript: Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbi-

---


10. In de Visser-van Terwisga’s (group G) and in Oltrogge’s (group D) classifications, groups i and ii are not separated. However, the position of P in this group is distinct in various respects: for the quantity and organization of its textual contents, for the features of the miniature cycle, and, as we will see below, for its discursive and syntactic features.


13. See Rochebouet, *L’Histoire ancienne jusqu’à César*, cit., for an analysis of the scripta and phono-morphologic traits in P.

14. One of the major differences of Rennes in relation to P is the absence of the verse prologue.
bliothek, MS 2576 (= V), is a composite manuscript. This codex passes down a reworked version of the HA. However, it shares with P some textual and structural features: namely some, but not all the verse sections, and most importantly the prologue. Alongside parts that are completely rewritten, MS Vienna 2576 transmits sections bearing the same reading as P.\textsuperscript{15}

\textit{ii. Acre group.} The manuscripts of this group date from the 13th century. They were produced either in Acre or in Italy from exemplars produced Outremer. The manuscripts from Acre are: Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale, MS 10175 (= B); Dijon, Bibliothèque Municipale, MS 562 (= D); London, British Library, Additional 15268 (= L). These manuscripts share some textual traits with P, but also present structural differences (e.g. the verse sections are either omitted or prosified to varying degrees). Three further manuscripts are related to this group: Paris, BnF, MS f. fr. 168 (= P3); fr. 9682 (= Pa), and fr. 686 (= P10).\textsuperscript{16}

Alongside these manuscripts, I will also consider one manuscript of the “short version” of the first redaction of the HA: London, BL, Add. MS 19669. The manuscripts of this group are contemporary with the codices of i and ii. They pass down an abridged version of the HA-1st redaction.\textsuperscript{17}

\textit{iii. “Short version” - North-eastern France (“Flemish family”).} This group of manuscripts was made in the second half of the 13th century in North Eastern France. The group includes the following manuscripts: The Hague, Koninklijke Bibliotheek, MS 78 D 47; London, British Library, MS Add. 19669; Pommersfeld, Gräflisch-Schönbornsche Schlossbibliothek, MS 295; Aylsham, Blickling Hall 6931.

To sum up, my linguistic analysis focuses on the following manuscripts:\textsuperscript{18}


\textsuperscript{16.} On this last manuscript, see Zinelli, \textit{Au carrefour des traditions}, cit.

\textsuperscript{17.} The montage and “cut” of the “short version” seems to be based on recognisable patterns of discursive and syntactic selection and combination. In further research, I will return to the textual, discursive and syntactic conditions featuring the “short version”. This line of research will be particularly interesting in the consideration of the second and the third redactions of the HA.

\textsuperscript{18.} While the eight manuscripts listed in Table 1 have been consistently compared, I have not made a systematic use of W. In further work I will return to W and Paris, BnF, MS f. fr. 686 (= P10) both to verify the argument of this article and to develop research on the syntax of V. See Cambi, \textit{Note sull’ ‘Histoire ancienne jusqu’à César’}, cit.
### Table 1. Corpus of the manuscripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Shelfmark</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place of production</th>
<th>Siglum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 20125-group</td>
<td>Paris, BnF, MS f. fr. 20125</td>
<td>1270-1280</td>
<td>Northern France/Acre?</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rennes, BM, MS 2331</td>
<td>15th century</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Rennes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>London, BL, MS Add 15268</td>
<td>1275-1300</td>
<td>Acre</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brussels, KBR, MS 10175</td>
<td>1275-1300</td>
<td>Acre</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paris, BnF, MS f. fr. 9682</td>
<td>14th century</td>
<td>France?</td>
<td>Pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dijon, BM, MS 562</td>
<td>1275-1300</td>
<td>Acre</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. “Short version”</td>
<td>London, BL, MS Add. 19669</td>
<td>1275-1300</td>
<td>Northern France</td>
<td>L5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

guage is a language documented only by written texts. The notion of text language and the notion of scripta share common ground. Scholars who work on scripta tend to confine the analysis of a medieval language to features that may help us in locating a text in space and time. For this reason, studies in this field have privileged graphemics, phonomorphology and morphosyntax. Recently, Fabio Zinelli has argued for widening the scope to lexis, suggesting that lexemes may be both evidence for localising a text, and for distinguishing features of the written system in use in a given “region”. Thus, for example, depending on the parameters of the object of study (e.g. a manuscript or a textual tradition), words like arme, maronier or aigue are either North-Eastern forms confirming a hypothesis about the material place of production of a written record, or forms attested in North-Eastern records that are used in Outremer written documents. In the first case, the focus is on the features of the written system that may tell us something about medieval dialectology; in the second, the focus is on what the written system is teaching us about the textual culture adopted by a community regardless of their homeland.

To date syntax has barely featured in research on scripta. Syntax is rigid and less sensitive to diatopic variation than graphemics and lexis. On the other hand, studies on the history of syntax are more and more numerous.

'Margarita' lombarda. Edizione e analisi del testo trivulziano, Heidelberg, Winter, 2011 (particularly § 2: «Intertestualità e interdiscorsività»).

21. Fleischman, Discourse Pragmatics, cit., p. 251 n. 1; Id., Methodologies and Ideologies, cit., p. 34, and Wilhelm-de Monte-Wittum, Tradizioni testuali e tradizioni linguistiche, cit., p. vii.


and refined. Moreover, syntax has a close relation with the text’s discursive articulation. A text language is a linguistic manifestation involving grammatical competence as much as intertextuality. If the questions we are asking are not about where a text comes from or where a manuscript has been produced, but rather about textual typology and “genre”, then the syntactic features of texts (and their variation) become relevant. Thus an appraisal of syntactic change may be an essential component of the analysis of textual variation, and vice versa. Syntactic analysis of the same text passed down by different manuscripts can improve our knowledge about the grammatical system, while also allowing us to distinguish changes dependent on linguistic constraints (langue) from variation related to other factors: notably register and style. Because the relation between textual and syntactic variation, register and discursive organisation, is key to this article, I will refer to text language rather than scripta to include syntactic variation.

The term discursive tradition is linked with the notion of text language in that any written language is traditional by definition. Both text language and discursive tradition share an idea of language that considers that any text, as an expression of an individual or as an individual expression, implies linguistic (re)selection and (re)combination of existing (traditional) materials. This approach is appropriate in evaluating a compilation like the HA, a work in its own right, with structure and unity, but also a heterogeneous object based on different sources, languages, formulae and lexicon.

In her recent edition of the Persian section of the HA, Anne Rochebouet suggested that syntax distinguished P from the Acre manuscripts, which she used as control manuscripts for her edition.25 Two traits attracted her attention: the place of the verb in complementiser clauses (the verb often appearing in the third position, not the second, as expected), and the expression of a resumptive personal subject pronoun in coreferential contexts. Crucially, Rochebouet observes that the manuscripts she consulted differ in the treatment of these two syntactic features. Whereas manuscript P has both features, the Acre manuscripts tend to present the verb in the second position and to retain fewer resumptive pronouns. Both issues are linked to two typological features of Old French: the fact that in medieval French the verb tends to occupy the second position in subordinate clauses (V2), and that the expression of the subject is not obligatory (pro-drop).

25. According to the «Alexander Redivivus» collection, an editorial enterprise aimed at editing the HA (see the references to Gaullier-Bougassas and Rochebouet above, n. 1), the following are the control manuscripts: D, B, L, P3, Pa.
According to this characterisation of Old French, manuscript P preserves a linguistically “marked” version of the text (« older », as Rochebouet suggests), whereas the manuscripts of the Acre group pass down a text where the language tends to converge with what we know about later 13th-c. Old French prose texts.26

Currently, it is not possible to establish whether manuscript P reflects a peculiar or “archaic” form of the text, later “copyedited” to produce the version transmitted by contemporary manuscripts from Acre; or whether manuscript P reflects a deliberate stylistic refashioning (archaisant) of a text that already existed in the form we know from the Acre group. Whatever the case, manuscripts P, Rennes and, where relevant, the codices V and those of the shorter version (see examples taken from L5 below), present a text with a distinct profile in relation to the manuscripts of the Acre group.

Questions arise about the form and the genesis of the text, and about its audience. Sixty or more years after the presumed date of composition of the HA (i.e. beginning of the 13th century), there was still a public (albeit small) whose taste was open to a text with formal features that might have characteristics of the “original” of the HA, but features that were not to be successful in terms of the Fortleben of the text, of the history of French prose, or in the history of French language.

These features are not only syntactic. They are also inherent to the rhetoric and discursive articulation of the text. There are, for instance, ubiquitous signs of oral performance in the text, such as the numerous apostrophes to the audience. But we also have the use of syntactic structures famil-

26. See Rochebouet, L’ Histoire ancienne jusqu’à César’, cit., pp. 32-33: « C’est par sa syntaxe que P se distingue d’emblée des autres quatre manuscrits, car il a souvent recours à l’ordre sujet-complément-verbe dans les subordonnées introduites par un conjonctif [que, ‘that’]. La pratique est bien attestée en ancien français, mais ce qui retient l’attention est que cette position centrale du thème de la proposition est à la fois extrêmement fréquente dans P et presque systématiquement modifiée dans les manuscrits de contrôle […]. Le copiste de P est également friand des procédés de dislocation du sujet, et de la reprise redondante de ce dernier une fois antéposé (§ 5, Astiage face au berger, P: li rois quand il l’entendi si […] ; Pa: quant li rois l’entendi il […] ; D, B, L: Quant li rois entendi ce il […] ). On retrouve ces reprises lorsque le sujet est séparé de son verbe par une incise. On ne rencontre jamais en revanche ni ces dislocations, ni les pronoms redondants qui les accompagnent, dans les manuscrits de contrôle. On peut faire l’hypothèse qu’ils ont été gommés, non par chaque copiste mais par un modèle commun aux quatre manuscrits, ou qu’ils sont à l’inverse le résultat de modifications propres à P. Cette organisation de la chaîne linguistique particulière à P peut s’interpréter comme un indice du caractère plus ancien de l’état de la langue du manuscrit par rapport à celui des autres témoins». 
iar from epic or hagiographic texts in verse. I will pursue this line of research in further work. Here, and in anticipation of the analysis below in § 3, I will just mention the use in the HA of relative subject clauses detached from their antecedent (the so called relatives non contactuelles). The use of this kind of relative clause is frequent in versified texts where the antecedent and the relative are distributed in two hemistiches or over two lines, as for example:27

Por ce dit l’om en reprover:
Teus quide sa honte venger
Qui en dobles l’aoite e creist
(Chronique des ducs de Normandie, ll. 35953-55)

We find a version of this proverb in the HA, where a complementiser clause “quotes” an octosyllabic couplet, in which the second line is contained within the subject relative:

§ 698_05 (P f. 198vb)29

mais | ie ai souent oi dire [et] si est verites | provee que tels cuide uengier sa | honte qui m[o]lt durement lacroist [et] amonte

(mais je ai sovent oi dire, [et] si est verites provee, que tels cuide vengier sa honte qui m[o]lt durement l’acroist [et] amonte).

Passages in verse are interspersed in P. As the above example shows, the use of verse is not limited to parts of the text where the lines are marked as such: more or less metrically impeccable couplets are frequent and they are one of the formal features of the HA.30 In this instance, the manuscript tradition shows a different analysis of the couplet:


28. The proverb is well attested. See the following example from Raoul de Cambrai (quoted by Buridant, op. cit., § 476, p. 581): « Tex en ot joie, par le mien esciant, | Qui puis en ot le cuer triste e dolent ».

29. L5 f. 122v/a reads as P. In this article, the following conventions are adopted for semi-diplomatic transcription: reproduction of medieval punctuation; | indicates line breaks; abbreviations are expanded within square brackets. When a list of manuscripts is given, the manuscript transcribed is always the first one, while the following manuscripts in the list read as the first one (but for punctuation and line breaks).

30. In the HA, “detached” relatives play a combinatory role, similar to epic “formulae”. They represent the «lowest level unit of semantic composition» in the set of structures avail-

In the manuscripts of the Acre group (including Pa) and in Rennes, the inversion sa honte uengier (versus uengier sa honte P) generates a different couplet: «[et] si est verité provee | que tel cuide sa honte vengier». The difference between P and the rest of the tradition is structural as much as it is rhetorical. P (and L5) adapts the reprover (proverb) of the Chroniques to a new mold. The rhymes are changed and the couplet is framed within the closed syntactic unit formed by the complement clause and the detached relative.

It is possible that the frequent interruption of continuity of two coordinated elements we often find in P holds a relationship with the hyperbatons so typical of versified narrative texts of the end of the 12th and beginning of the 13th centuries. In the following example the syntactic link between the two main verbs (the doubling departirent/dessourerent) is broken by the insertion of the direct object (lor terres [et] lor habitations):

§ 241_01 (f. 55ra)

It is interesting to compare this short passage with the rest of the tradition:

Lors | departirent [et] deceurerent lor terres [et] lor | abitacions· (D f. 41vb, P f. 62rb, Pa ff. 47vb-48ra)31
lors departirent lor terres [et] lor | habitatons· (L5 f. 38rb)
Lors departirent lor po|ssessions· (P3 f. 50rb)32
Et lors departirent leurs terres | et leurs habitacions separerent (Rennes f. 57rb)

None of the manuscripts reads as P. The Acre group (including Pa) restitute


31. ‘And then they [= the two brothers Esau and Jacob] partitioned and chose their land and their houses’. The passage is not in L, where a folio is missing between f. 46 and f. 47 (which roughly corresponds to § 239 and § 240 of TVOF’s transcription of the text: available soon in http://www.tvof.ac.uk/).

32. P3 usually reads like the manuscripts of the Acre group. Apart from the textual variant, P3 f. 50ra is the only manuscript to have a miniature representing the negotiation between Jacob and Esau instead of the dying Isaac surrounded by his sons and family, as in P f. 55rb, D f. 40rb, B f. 61rb, Pa f. 47rb, and Rennes f. 57 rb. L5 f. 38ra has a misplaced quadripartite miniature with scenes from the life of Joseph which actually begins later, at f. 39ra.
the continuity between the verbs. P3 and L5 conflate the doubling in one verb. In Rennes, one of the conjunctions [et] disappears, and the verbs *departirent* and *separerent* (paraphrasing the “old” *desevrer*) are disposed symmetrically at the beginning and at the end of the clause. This produces a chiasm establishing coordination between two consecutive but distinct states of affairs: 1. *departirent leurs terres*, 2. *leurs habitations separerent*. The strong semantic and syntactic bond between the two verbs in P (and the Acre group) is thus broken.

I will come back to this difference in word order below in §3, wishing just to note here that the kind of hyperbaton we have in P is ubiquitous in late 12th and early 13th-c. versified literature. The verses are not an original innovation of P, as some irregularities in their transcription clearly indicate. While manuscript P normally sets verses out according to modern convention (one verse per line), there are cases in which verses are transcribed as prose (e.g. f. 321r/v). This layout for verse is frequent in Romance lyric manuscripts, but unusual for non-lyric genres. While this is evidence that P is a copy and raises questions about the progressive loss or prosification of the versified parts within the tradition of the *HA*, it is clear that in this as in other cases (see below §3) P preserves a form of the text distinct from the form the text takes in the other manuscripts, including the contemporary codices of the Acre group (including Pa and P3), Rennes, and L5.

The rest of this paper is structured as follows: in §2, I approach the relationship between thematic progression and organisation of the text. This section is concerned with the relationship between textual organisation and the way in which information is conveyed. The choice and use of personal pronouns and other proforms, like demonstratives, is in close relation with the signposting of narrative discretion: referential forms may start a

33. Consider for instance the following two passages from the *Roman de l’estoire dou Saint Graal*: “[…] par les diz / Fist des prophetes annuncier / Sa venue en terre, et huchier / Que diex son fil envoyerit / Ça jus aval […]” (ROBERT DE BORON, *Roman de l’estoire dou Saint Graal*, éd. par W.A. Nitze, Paris, Champion, 1927, vv. 4-8); “Et la maison si reampli / de la precïeuse flereur / Que chascuns d’eus se merveilla” (ibid., vv. 251-53).

In § 3, I will analyse features involved in discursive and clausal linkage strategies, particularly those including syntactic discontinuity. The following will be given attention: the position of constituents in passives, the position of the verb in subordinate clauses and the (non)expression of the personal subject pronouns. I will compare P with other manuscripts of the first redaction of the *HA*. As mentioned above, the aim is to explore how (micro)variation is sensitive to some syntactic features present in the textual tradition of the first redaction of the *HA*.

### 2. Segmentation of the narrative and thematic progression

In manuscript P and in most of the *HA*’s manuscript tradition, rubrics, together with initials, articulate the text’s main divisions. Intermingled visual and aural signals create an audio-visual medium. The editorial plan of the oldest manuscripts of the *HA* included text and a whole host of visual cues: ranging from the shape and type of the script to the miniatures.

For the sake of clarity, I will call paragraphs the textual strings between two rubrics. Manuscript P and other codices show that scribes were aware they needed to impose an order on the sequence of stories they were compiling (as is usual with a work of such dimensions).

---


36. The textual tradition of the *HA* does not divide it into books. However, a few manuscripts present traces of a correspondence between the codicological structure and the organisation of the contents in thematic units (e.g. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS f. fr. 17177). Some manuscripts distinguish between matières: e.g. Pa, where along with rubrics, initials and other decorative/functional devices, the workshop provided it with running titles (written by the same hand responsible for the body of the text) that map the work: e.g. « adan » (f. 3v), « de caym » (f. 4r), « eneas » (f. 135r) and so on.

37. At present, the label “paragraph” is applied to a codicological unit, and is not given a “narratological” interpretation along the lines of the “thematic paragraph” as defined in S. Fleischman, *Tense and Narrativity: from Medieval Performance to Modern Fiction*, Austin, Univ. of Texas Press, 1990.

38. On the episodic nature of long medieval narratives (« a consequence of being performed in multiple internally cohesive segments, much like television serials »), see Fleischman, *Tense and Narrativity*, cit. A fine analysis of the relation between story telling and the use of tenses in Old and Middle French, with considerations that help define “fiction” and historiography was already offered by D. Sutherland, *On the Use of Tenses in Old and Middle French*, 328
In manuscript P, a paragraph may start:

1) with a vocative (the narrator addressing the audience) the function of which is either to begin a new narrative unit or a digression (moralisation);
2) a “scene-setter”, typically an adverbial clause, expressing the spatial and temporal coordinates of the action (event or state of affairs);\(^{39}\)
3) a determiner phrase (including proper names and proforms) Recollecting of information already known to the audience.

These ways of beginning a paragraph concern how information (old and new) is packaged and delivered:

\((1a)\)

\[ \text{§ 614}_{01-03} \ (P \ f. 161v_{a-b}) \]

Li rois l’atins receut les presens [et] ilioneus se tuen sans plus di[re] [et] li rois pansa ne mie por les pre[sens queneas li auoit enuoies] mais por le mariage de sa fille E [et] savez vos por quoi il en pensoit [et] adonques porque qu’il lauoit otro[iee a donner premerainement par | lenorentment de sa feme qui estoit | roine [et] amata nomee a un mout | vaillant cheualier fort [et] hardi | turnus estoit apees fiz le roi dau[n]us de la cite dardea qui asses estoit | prouchaine de Laurente a celui [161v] ot li rois en | conuent si com je uos | di qu’il donroit lauine mais al[pres ot il responsive] de ses deus qu’il | neli donast mie ains la donroit a un estrange home qui uenroit a nauie en son roiaume Segnor [et] dames por ce pensa li rois latins | quar gries choze estoit


39. In generative accounts of Old French sentences, scene-setters are placed in an external position at the left-periphery, before hanging topics.

40. The passages in \((1a)-(1d)\) are in the following manuscripts: D f. 117v, B f. 155rb, L 139r-a139v, P3 ff. 146va-147va, Pa f. 145rb, Rennes ff. 163vb-164ra, with no relevant variants, apart from the fact that *Amata* is consistently spelled *Amara*. The punctuation of these manuscripts is more analytic, showing awareness of the syntactic breaks. See, for instance D f. 117va: « Leroi latin ressut les presenz [et] ilioneus se tut sans plus dire. Le roi | pensa ne mie por les presenz [que] eneas li auoit enuoies: mes por le mariage de | de sa fille | saues uoz por q[o]i il en pen|soie[nt] adonques. » As it is very often the case, L5 f. 99rb shows a more concise account: « Li rois latins recut les pre[senz [et] ylioneus setot sanz plus di[re] [et] li rois pansa non mie por les presen [que] que eneas li auoit enuoies mes por le mariage de sa fille | et sauez uos por q[uoi] | parce qu’il lauoit otroie a donner par | lenorentment de la reine sa fille qui ama[t]a | nomee a [et] me[o][lt] vaillant ch[eualie[r qui | turnus iert nomez fil leroi dau[nus | de la cite dardea qui estoit pres de lau[re[n]}ce a celui ot conuent li rois qu’il | do[n]roit lauine mes il or | respon de ses die[ux] | qui ne li | donast mie[ne] | einz la do[n]roit a | [et] home estrange qui uenroit a nauie en son roiaume por ce pensait li rois ou | il donroit sa fille ou a [et] home estrange de | sa contrere a [et] home estrange. » For an exhaustive survey and theoretical reflection on medieval punctuation, see A. Laverentiev, *Tendances de la punctuation dans les manuscrits et inamnables français en prose, du XIII au XV\textsuperscript{e} siècle*, 2 vols., Thèse de Doctorat, Lyon, École Normale Supérieure Lettres et Sciences Humaines.
(Li rois Latins receut les presens et Ilioneus se teut sans plus dire. Et li rois pensa ne mie por les presens qu’Eneas li avoit envoiés, mais por le mariage de sa fille. E savés vos por quoi il en pensoit adonques? Por ce qu’il l’avoit otroiee a doner premerainement par l’enortement de sa fême, qui estoit roine et Amata nomee, a un mout vaillant chivalier fort et hardi, Turnus estoit apelés, fiz le roi Daunus de la cite d’Ardea qui assés estoit prouchaine de Laurente. A celui [161va] ot li rois en convent, si com je vos di, qu’il li donroit Laivine. Mais après ot il respons de ses deus qu’il ne li donast mie, ains la donroit a un estrange home qui venroit a navie en son roiaume. Segnor et dames, por ce pensa li rois Latins quar griés choze estoit [...]).

Within the paragraph subunits are marked in the manuscript by linguistic and non-linguistic devices (i.e. decorated flourish blue initials, uppercase red letters). Other signs of punctuation, like the punctus interrogativus or the inverted semi-colon, may intervene to signal the modality of the string (i.e. interrogatives or exclamatives).

In (1a), not all features of P’s layout are reproduced: namely a blue initial signpost marking the beginning of a new paragraph. A determiner phrase (Li rois Latins) picks up the narration from where it was left at the end of the previous paragraph. We are at the heart of the Aeneas section. King Latin must take a decision about the future of his daughter Lavinia. A decision that will lead to a war and the killing of Turnus by Aeneas. The theme of the passage, the king’s preoccupation with the decision he has to make about his daughter, does not change over the passage. Crucial new information about Amata’s intentions as regards their daughter Lavinia, and about Turnus, the anti-Aeneas, is introduced in two steps.41 First, a direct interrogative addressed to the audience is the tool for the narrator to digress from the narrative line to supply more essential information. Secondly, the action that is the origin of the conflict between wife and husband over Lavinia’s future and then between Turnus and Aeneas, is given by means of a tailhead circular distribution of the elements of the passage (1b in italics):

(1b)
Por ce qu’il l’avoit otroiee a doner premerainement par l’enortement de sa fême, qui estoit roine et Amata nomee, a un mout vaillant chivalier fort et hardi, Turnus estoit apelés [...] A celui [161va] ot li rois en convent, si com je vos di, qu’il li donroit Laivine.

A further narratorial address to his audience completes the explicative digression on the cause of the king’s torment and of the war to come between Rutilians and Trojans:

(1c)  
§ 614_03-05 (P f. 161va)<sup>42</sup>  
Segnor | [et] dames por ce pensa li rois latins | quar gries choze estoit a sage hojme de desfaire ce quil auoit otroie dendroit le mariage en urs un | haut prince de la contree por un es|trange home· E plus gries choze | estoit encore destre contre la uolen|te a ses deus qui celui mariage desuoloient· Quant li rois latins | ot porce pense un petit il haussa | le visage; [et] si respondi haitieme[n]t | au message qui dite auoit la parole; [et] si dist troiens frere·

(Segnor et dames, por ce pensa li rois Latins quar griés choze estoit a sage home de desfaire ce qu’il avoit otroié, dendroit le mariage en vers un haut prince de la contree por un estrange home. E plus griés choze estoit encore d’estre contre la volenté a ses deus qui celui mariage desvoloient. Quant li rois Latins ot por ce pensé un petit, il haussa le visage, [et] si respondi haite[n]t au message qui dite avoit la parole, [et] si dist: « Troiens frere [...] »).

Vocatives and other emphatic expressions illustrated in (1b) and (1c) suggest that the narrative follows an unbroken thread, but not in a linear fashion: rather it is as if for the thread to be maintained, it had to be rewound at regular intervals. To move forwards the narrator constantly looks and makes us look back.<sup>43</sup>

Examples (1a) and (1c) show the informative digression taking the form of Latin’s inner thought. The king receives the presents from Ilioneus and remains in pensive silence. All the way through the paragraph, the verb penser operates as the thematic backbone. Indeed, the passage can be read focusing on inflected forms of penser as textual flags: so penser appears in coordination in § 614_01 [et] li rois pansa; within the interrogative that follows in § 614_02 « E savez vos por quoi il en pensoit adonques? » (the modality of the textual string is marked by the red initial and the punctus interrogativus); and finally, within a temporal clause, which resumes the narration and leaves the ground clear for action again, in the form of direct speech (1d):

<sup>42</sup> Cf. L5 f. 99rb: « Einz la do[n]roit | a + home estrange qui uenroit anauie | en son roiau-me | por ce pansoit li rois ou | il donroit sa fille ou a + haut home de | sa contree ou a + home estrange | Qua[nt] | lirois latins ot pans il respondi aume|saige· Biau frere ».

<sup>43</sup> Consider ubiquitous formulas such as « si com je vos aï dit ariere » or « si com je vos dirai avant », which strengthen narrative cohesion but without breaking the flow.
Quant li rois Latins ot porce pense un petit il haussa le visage et si respondi haitie-m[en]t au message qui dite avoit la parole et si dist: «Troiens frere […]».

In examples (1a)-(1d), while chronology structures the narrative line, it is the restitution of a cause-effect chain that allows the full comprehension of the state of affairs. Narratives like the HA tend to reduce the autonomy of the background in relation to the foreground. In grounding relevance is fully at stake only when dealing with reported speech. The marking up of interruptions, resumptions or new beginnings generates a recursive schema whereby textual boundaries determine the way the story is told and is intended to be perceived, understood and retained.

3. Discontinuous structures

Given this constraint on thematic linear progression, what is the redactor's room for manoeuvre to supply, deviate from, or elide information? In what follows, I will attempt an answer to this question relying on the notion of discontinuity. The terms “discontinuity” and “discontinuous structures” are used here to indicate the lack of textual continuity between de-

44. A trait that the HA shares with other 13th-century prose narratives: see B. Combettes, L'émergence du texte argumentatif en français: type de texte et diachronie, in Genre et Textes: déterminations, évolutions, confrontations. Études offertes à Jean-Michel Adam, éd. par M. Monte, Lyon, Presse Univ. de Lyon, 2015, pp. 225-37, at p. 232.

45. On discursive signals in French, see M. Hansen-B. Mosegaard, The Functions of Discourse Particles: A Study with Special Reference to Spoken French, Amsterdam, Benjamins, 1998; in Italian: C. Bazzenella, I segnali discorsivi, in Grammatica dell'italiano antico, a cura di L. Renzi e G. Salvi, Bologna, Il Mulino, 2010, pp. 1339-58 (with bibliography). See also Fleischman, Tense and Narrativity, cit., § 1.6.4: the use of a scene-setting adverbial clause to open a paragraph (or one of its subunits) is often referential «only to the linear disposition of the discourse: the adverb “now” often means “at this point of the narration”, while “next” and “then” function as textual sequencers».

46. In further work currently in preparation, I will analyse instances of reported speech and absolute structures in the framework of a broader reflection on ellipsis: i.e. omission of lexical material in syntactic contexts which may well require it. Ellipsis is often associated with the omission of conjunctions in parataxis and coordination (juxtaposition), but is also one of the main features of transition or “slipping” from indirect to direct speech.
pendent elements of syntactic groups. While I make no strong theoretical assumptions about what is or is not marked in structural terms, I use terms like “fronting” or “dislocation”, to highlight a peculiarity of the syntax of manuscript P in relation to the other manuscripts and texts or to what we know about the history of the syntax of French.47

3.1. Passives

Manuscript P shows a strong tendency to stuff the left of syntactic strings with information. This is done through the embedding of complements or clauses within the textual chain. Moreover, discontinuity reverberates throughout the tradition in different ways. In long strings like the passive structure in (2), up to two locutions can intervene within a relative clause, where, in turn, the logical subject (des aigues) is placed immediately after the grammatical subject (expressed by the relative subject pronoun qui), so that the auxiliary verb comes in third position and the lexical verb at the end of the clause:

(2) § 593_01 (P f. 150va)
Entrues quil sechoient lor | chozes qui des aigues si | com ie uos ai dit estoient |

47 In the literature, discontinuity and discontinuous distribution describe linguistic structures where configuration is not a prominent category in marking semantico-syntactic relationships between different lexical items: subject/object, predicate and so forth. See A. Ledge-way, From Latin to Romance: Morphosyntactic Typology and Change, Oxford, Oxford Univ. Press, 2012. Id., Late Latin Verb Second: The Sentential Word Order in the ‘Itinerarium Egeriae’ (in press), comes back to this issue analysing sentential word order in a late Latin work, the Itinerarium Egeriae. From this point of view, discontinuity is not a typological feature of Old French. Although the problem is still open, Old French is considered a Verb Second (V2) language: this means that if there are two noun phrases and a verb, an Old French sentence has the verb in the second position: SVO or OVS. See Ch. Marchello-Nizia, L’Evolution du français: ordre des mots, démonstratifs, accent tonique, Paris, Collin, 1995; B. Vance, Syntactic Change in Medieval French Verb-Second and Null Subjects, Dordrecht, Kluwer, 1997; E.C. Mathieu, The Left-Periphery in Old French, in Research on Old French: The State of the Art, ed. by D. Arteaga, Dordrecht, Springer, 2013, pp. 327-50; M. Zimmermann, Expletive and Referential Subject Pronouns in Medieval French, Berlin, De Gruyter, 2014. A final remark: the examples that follow derive from my research on subordination in Old French using the HA as a starting point and a case study. In line with recent scholarship, I define subordination as the asymmetrical relation between the “base” of a state of affairs (scene, event, action), and its “profile”, the base being the part of any state of affairs (scene, event, action) that is given cognitive prominence. For this terminology see R.W. Langacker, Foundations of Cognitive Grammar, vol. 2. Descriptive Application, Stanford, Stanford Univ. Press, 1991, and subsequently elaborated in S. Cristofaro, Subordination, Oxford, Oxford Univ. Press, 2003.
petit sen failloit ia corrupues | eneas monta sor une roche [et] si | esguarda par lamer

(Entrues qu’il sechoient lor chozes qui des aigues, si com je vos ai dit, estoient petit s’en faalloit ja corrompues, Eneas monta sor une roche et si esguarda par la mer […]).

In passives, the relation between the logical subject (i.e. the “real” subject of the lexical verb: in this case corrompre) and the patient (the grammatical subject, i.e. the subject with which the inflected form of the auxiliary [estoient] agrees) is inverted. Appearing “high” in the textual string, the logical subject (des aigues) is given a salient position. The textual tradition by and large mirrors the syntax of manuscript P. A partial exception is in manuscript Pa (f. 134v), which reads as follows:

(3a)
Entant come il | sechoient leur choses qui des aigues estoient moilliees si come ie uo[us] | ai dit· estoient poi sen failli ia corrompues· Eneas monta sur une roche [135a]

Through estoient moilliees, manuscript Pa (or its exemplar) sets a relation of cause and effect between corrosive agent (aigues) and patient (leur choses). Punctuated, the passage in Pa may read:

(3b)
Entant come il sechoient leur choses, qui des aigues estoient moilliees, si come ie vo[us] ai dit (estoient poi s’en failli ja corrompues), Eneas monta sur une roche […]

In (3b) the clause estoient poi s’en failli ja corrompues is interpreted as part of a parenthesis. In this case, Pa seems isolated. It is of course theoretically possible that P rewrote a stage of the text reflected by Pa. Whatever the case, what matters here is the existence of a link between textual variation and the disposition of the constituents in a passive clause with “raised” agent.

In (4a), the subject of the root clause, Adans, is separated from its auxiliary (fu) by the causal clause setting the premise (the original sin; the agent, God, is not mentioned):


334
Two passive clauses are coordinated by polysindenton. The pair of subjects *et il et tuit*… depends grammatically on the third-person singular passive periphrasis (*fu … enbatus*). However, the conditional in the adjunct subject relative has a regular third-person plural form, and is placed at the end of the string, being separated from *qui* by a prepositional phrase (*apres lui*).

In the case of both (2) and (4) the tradition tends to retain discontinuity, although not in the same way, as (3a) suggests. As the passage in (4b) shows, the textual tradition presents a slightly different combination of the elements:

(4b)
Adam po[r] | ung seul co[m]mandeme[nt] quil trespassa | fut mis hors de paradis et trebuche | en peine et labeur· et lui et to[us] ceulz | qui aprés lui uiendroient·

(Rennes f. 3va)

Car por un comandement q[ue] adam | trespassa il fu mis fors de paradis [et] enbatus enpoine· [et] tuit cil qui uendroi|ent apres lui· (D f. 3r, B f. 22r, P3 f. 3rb-3va, Pa f. 3rb)

Car | adam por un comandement quil | trespassa fu mis fors de paradis [et] emb- taut enpoine[nt] [et] il [et] tuit cil | qui aprés lui uindrent· (L f. 4r)

In P, the position of *Adam* as the subject of the main clause entails the expression of the personal subject pronoun within the relative object clause. The Acre manuscripts elaborate differently the cause/effect sequence. The conjunction *car* sets the premise clause of the causal explanation. Another order of the elements follows, with the overt presence of the third-person singular subject pronoun. In L the resumptive subject pronoun is not present.

A stemma may clarify the chronology of the variation displayed by examples (2)-(4). However, these examples show that there are syntactico-semantic factors in which variation is always present. This suggests that tex-

49. L5 f. 5ra reads as P.
tual variation can be sensitive to features like fronted constituents and segmentation of the textual string through adverbs or adverbial locutions.

3.2. Word order in subordinate complement clauses

As mentioned above, Anne Rochebouet noticed that fronting in declarative clauses and resumptive personal pronouns are traces of an « organisation de la chaîne linguistique particulière à P [qui] peut s’interpréter comme un indice du caractère plus ancien de l’état de la langue du manuscrit par rapport à celui des autres témoins ». Although this is far from being a frequent case in P, examples (5) to (9) below clarify the conditions whereby some complementiser finite clauses have the verb in the third position.

Example (5) confirms Rochebout remarks:

(5)
§ 703_01-02 (P f. 200r-200rb)
[et] si dient li plusor [et] conte[n]t | que il aiunt un ior que il estoie[n]t | essamble· si perdi li uns un coutelet que li autre li emblerent | Cil uint au roi [et] si li dist que il | son coutelet li feist rendre· quar | tolu li auoit ne sai li quels· [et] [200rb] emble [ensamble L5 f. 123va] par felonie·

([et] si dient li plusor [et] conte[n]t que il avint un jor que il estoie[n]t essamble, si perdi li uns un coutelet que li autre li emblerent. | Cil vint au roi [et] si li dist que il son coutelet li feist rendre, quar tolu li auoit, ne sai li quels, [et] emblé par felonie)53

Cil uint au rois si li | dist q[u]i[l] li feist rendre son cotel (D f. 146rb, B f. 189va, L f. 174va, Pa f. 182rb)54

(6)
§ 173_06 (P f. 40vb)
[et] si | iura esau a iacob quil celui uen|dage li tendroit fermement toz | les iors de sa uie

51. In a recent paper delivered for the seminar of the project The Values of French, Adam Ledgeway has studied cases of V1, V2 and V3 configurations in declarative and embedded complement clauses in the Eneas section of P. Although on a relatively limited sample (12,428 words = 10% ca. of the textual content of P), the results confirm that P presents a reduced number of cases of V3 order in complement clauses: 12,1% of V3 clauses, against the 85,6% of V2. The percentage of V3 is low but not insignificant. The study of P as a whole and its comparison with other manuscripts of the HA will give us a clearer idea of the frequency and contexts of V3.
52. Rochebouet, L’Histoire ancienne jusqu’à César’, cit., § 4, p. 87.
53. Rennes f. 203ra and L5 f. 123va read as P.
54. In P3, transcription of the HA is interrupted before the end of section Rome 1.
In (6), P and the Acre manuscripts have the same word order. The other manuscripts have the verb in the second position: Rennes and P3, Pa present the order SVO (the indirect object is always a clitic, *li/lui*). Notice that L5 has a OVS order, with V2 configuration.

(7)  
§ 619_04 (P f. 163vb)  
*Ja Turnus ne mezentius ne sen peussent esleecier que ie de lor gens ne lor feisse dommage· mais or proi ie nos deus quil de toi m’esleecent si que tu puisses repairer joious [et] en vie quaie ie ameroie asses meaus a morir que je ta mort veisse.*

*Ja turnus ne mezentius ne se peussent esioyr que de leurs gens ne leur feysse dommaige* (Rennes f. 166rb)

Again, (7) shows that P agrees with the Acre group (including P3 and Pa) as for the V3 order in a negative structure. Rennes “restitutes” the verb to the second position (being clitics, *ne leur* do not count).

In (8) and (9), none of the manuscripts retain P’s order, except L5:

(8)  
§ 705_06 (P f. 201ra)  
*Quant assemble fure[n]t tuit li rois astriagies qui oblique auoit la grant felonie [et]*

55. L5 f. 100va differs here: «Qvant uint aumouoir lareine plora [et] lirois acola son fil·he: biaux filz se [ie fuses aussi iones come ie soloie apaines] ten laissaise aller sanz moi ne ia sibien ne sesest gaitier turnus que ie ne li feisse | damaige grant».

56. Rochebouet, *L’Histoire ancienne jusqu’à César*, cit., § 6, p. 88. L5 f. 124ra reads as P.
la gra[n]t | desloiaute que il auoit faite: | charga a arpallum tote la cure | de la bataille [et] quil sa gent me[n]ast [et] ordenast [et] si comanda que | tuit a lui obeissent-

(Quant assembleé fure[n]t tuit li rois, Astriages, qui obliee avoit la grant felonie [et] la gra[n]t desloiaute que il auoit faite, charga a Arpallum tote la cure de la bataille [et] qu'il sa gent menast [et] ordenast [et] si comanda que tuit a lui obeissent)

qua[n]t | resemble furent tous le roy astia|jges qui oubliez avoit la grant | felonie et la grant desloiaute q[ue] | il auoit faite. Car ia a arpal[us] | de toute la bataille et qui | menast | et ordonnast sa gent et si co[m]ma[n]da | que tous alui obeyssent. (Rennes f. 204ra)


Q[ua]nt tos | furent assemble [Quant assemble furent tuit Pa f. 183ra]: le roi astia|ges | q[u]i auoit obliee la g[ra]nt desloiaute [et] la felonie· charia a arpal[us] li | q[u]i il menast sa gent [et] ordenast· [et] si comanda q[ue] tos obeyscent alui· (L f. 175rb, Pa f. 183ra)

§ 705_08 (P f. 201ra)
Lors lor dist q[ue] | il sparticum deuoient aidier [et] re|tenir a segnor [et] si le nomas­sent Cyrum tres ore [des ore L5 f. 124rb] en auant

(Lors lor dist q[ue] il Sparticum devoient aidier [et] retenir a segnor, [et] si le nomassent Cyrum tres ore en avant)

Lors lor dist | qui deuoient aidier sparticum [et] tenir a {segnor· (D f. 146vb, B f. 190rb, L f. 175rb)

Lors leur dist | quil deuoit ayder a sparticum | et le tenir a seigneur· (Rennes f. 204rb)
Lors | leur dist quil deuoient aidier et tenir [183rb] a seignor sparticum· (Pa f. 183ra-183rb)

In (9), a different word order entails some significant formal differences: hyperbathon in the Acre group; coordination of two distinct clauses in Rennes (aydier a sparticum + le tenir a seigneur); in Pa, sparticum as direct object (declined as a Latin accusative) is placed at the end of the clause, after a se­gnor.

57. ROCHEBOUET, L' ‘Histoire ancienne jusqu'à César,’ cit., § 6, p. 88. L5 f. 124rb reads as P.
58. Notice the prepositional accusative with aidier.
In all these examples, the word order with raised subject and direct object (SOV) occurs with commissive (expressing a promise) or directive (expressing an order) verbs, or, in (7), locutions taking the imperfective subjunctive (hence with the same semantic value and illocutionary force as commissive and directive verbs): ne s’en peussent esleecier que ie […] ne lor feisse […]. In the same example, this is confirmed by the complementiser phrase introduced by proi ie (followed by qu’il de toi m’esleecent). Finally, the chiastic structure of the comparative ie […] meaus […] que ie […] appears with the repetition of the first-person singular pronoun and the consequent verb final.

Anne Rochebouet observed that her control manuscripts did not have the same configuration as P. The above examples confirm her observation, while complementing it with further information. In (6), manuscript Rennes shows the raising of the direct object but does not make use of the resumptive personal subject pronoun ([…] que ceste uente lui te[n]droit ferme touz les iors de sa vie). Similarly, in (7) Rennes does not repeat the personal subject pronoun (que de leurs [gens ne leur feysse dommage]). In (8), Rennes and one of the Acre manuscripts, L, have the SVO order for the following: et qui menast et ordonnast sa gent. Manuscript D shows a different combination of the elements, with the direct object placed between the two coordinated verbs: [et] q[ui]l menast sa gent [et] ordenast.\(^{59}\) The word order with verb in the third position within a complement clause tends to isolate manuscript P (and often L5) from the rest of the tradition, which behaves differently according to a series of small-scale but relevant choices, as we also saw in (9).

Verb final order does not feature only in complement clauses. In the following example, the verb in third position is found in an adverbial clause:

(10)

§ 797_08 (P f. 234ra)\(^{60}\)

Et | quant il ceaus ot uencus il en ala | as dranceiens-

(Et quant il ceaus ot vencus, il en ala as dranceiens […]

et quant il ot yceulz vaincus il | sen ala aux daceiens (Rennes f. 236ra)

[et] quant il ot uencu ciaus il sen ala | as draceryens (D f. 172ra, B f. 218ra, L f. 203ra, Pa f. 213rb).

Again, the tradition confirms Rochebouet’s schema opposing P to the rest

\(^{59}\) In this case, it is manuscript D that has the marked order.

\(^{60}\) L5 f. 150ra reads as P.
of the Acre manuscripts. Other examples of the same pattern can be found elsewhere, as for example in the relative object clause in (11):\textsuperscript{61}

\begin{align*}
(11) \\
\S\ 216\_07 (P f. 50b) \\
[et] bien saches queles neme siue[n]t | mie por amor queles uers moi a|ient com eles funt par lor enfa[n]s | qui auec moi enuient-
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
(\{et\} bien sachés qu’eles ne me sive[n]t mie por amor qu’eles vers moi aient, com eles funt par lor enfa[n]s qui avec moi en viennent) \\
et bien sachies que| elles ne me | siuient mie pour lamour quilz | layent envers moy tant co[m]me | elles font pour leurs enfans q[ui] | auecques moy sen vien-
\end{align*}

(ne[n]t) (Rennes f. 51v)

\begin{align*}
[et] bien saches [Et saches L f. 43ra] q[ue] elles ne me | siuent mie tant por amor q[ue]elles aient | uers moi [a moi Pa f. 43ra]: come por les enfans q[ui] auec | moi 
\end{align*}

uiuient (D f. 37ra, B f. 57va, L f. 43ra, P3 f. 45rb, Pa f. 43ra)

\begin{align*}
[et] bien saiches queles ne me sieuent | mie por amor queles aient enu[er]s moi | 
tant com por lor enfanz qui auoc moi | enuiennent (L5 f. 35ra)
\end{align*}

In this case, none of the manuscripts (not even Rennes or L5) read like P, with the exception of V:

ebien sakes q[ue]le neme siue[n]t par amors q[ue]lle u[er] moy [30v]b aient come ele font par lor enfans queuc moy e[n]uienent | (V f. 30va-30vb)\textsuperscript{62}

In (12), the conclusive relative clause with the verb-final word order in P (and V)\textsuperscript{63} is differently “paraphrased” throughout the tradition:

\begin{align*}
(12) \\
\S\ 231\_05 (P ff. 52rb-53va) \\
E quant ce fu fait· il sespar|sent par la uile si detrenchere[n]t [53va] toz les homes qu'il 
\end{align*}

trouverent sa[n]s | les femes [et] sans les petiz anfans | qu'il en prisons en menerent-

(E quant ce fu fait, il s’esparsent par la vile, si detrenchere[n]t [53va] toz les homes qu’il troverent sa[n]s les femes [et] sans les petiz anfans qu’il en prisons en menerent)

\begin{align*}
61. & Notice that all the manuscripts present the subject relative clause that ends the passage with the verb in third position. \\
62. & Since it is a composite, factitious codex, V requires an independent study. However, this and other examples in this paper confirm that when P and V share the same version of the HA, they also seem to share similar sources. See example (14) below. \\
\end{align*}
THE HISTOIRE ANCIENNE JUSQU’À CÉSAR

[et] q[u]e\nt ce fu | fet il sespandirent par la uille\- [et] si detren\cherent to\s les homes q[u]i\l trou\vent\- sans | les f\emes: [et] les petit\s enfanz q[u]i\l pris\ssons | en m\enerent (D f. 39va, B f. 60rb)

Et q[u]e\nt ce fu fait il sespandirent par | la uille\-[au]al la uille Pa f. 46ra \[et] si de\trencher\nt to\s les \ si detrencher\nt to\z les\ homes q[u]i\l trou\vent\- sans les f\emes\- \[et] les petit\s enfanz q[u]i\l en\mener\nt [m\ener\nt P3 f. 48ra] | pris\ssons [qui\l prist\nt \[et] en mener\nt \[et\ P3 f. 46ra] (L f. 45vb, P3 f. 48ra, Pa f. 46ra)

[et] q[u]e\nt cefu fert | il sespandirent par\mi la uille\- [et] detran\cher\nt to\z l\shomes qui\l trou\vent\- sanz | les f\ames \[et\] sanz les petit\s anfanz qui\l en\men\nt pris\- (L5 f. 37rb)

et quant ce | fu fait ilz s\sspendirent par la ville \ si detra\ncher\nt to\z l\shomes \ et occirent sans les femmes et en\[55rb]\hans qui\l en\mener\nt [m\ener\nt P3 f. 48ra] (Rennes f. 55ra-55rb)

Finally, the same pattern can be observed in the following negative clause:

(13)
§ 229_02 (P f. 53ra)
li pl\[us\]or \[se] teurent qui de tel choze preu | conseiller nesi sauoient

(li plus\[or se teurent qui de tel choze preu conseiller ne si sauoient […])

li pl[u\]sor | seteure[n]t q[ue]detel cose par co[n]seiller ne sauoie[n]\t (W f. 32ra)

plusieurs deulz se \t\ren\t qui de telle chose pas co[n]seillier ne sauoient (Rennes f. 54vb)

li plusor seturent qui | decesto\e chose consillier nesoren\t (L5 f. 36ra)

Li pluissors se turent q[u]i de ceste chose ne | sauoient mie [pas P3 f. 48ra] as\es conseillier\t (D f. 39rb, B ff. 59vb-60ra, L f. 45va, P3 f. 48ra, Pa f. 45vb)

Although it is not a case of verb final in subordination, (14) is an example of how strong continuity in a noun phrase can be interrupted by the insertion of the verb (ou Rachal sa fille estoit L5 / ou sa fille Rachel estoit Rennes / ou Rachel estoit sa fille P), whereas this is not the case in the other manuscripts, including L5 (but not V): 64

(14)
§ 216_13 (P f. 50rb)
Lors reuint la | ou rachel estoit sa fille qui les | deus en auoit aportes-

64. Again V f. 30vb reads like P: «Lors e[n]uint laon rachel estoit sa fille q[ue]le diex | enauoi[n]\t aportes».

341
Lors reuint la ou Rachel estoit sa fille qui les dieux en auoit aportez (Rennes f. 52ra)

lors reuint la ou rah|chal sa fille estoit qui auoit les dieux ap|portez· (L5 f. 35ra)

Lors [Et lors Pa f. 43rb] rejuin [reuint B f. 57va, L f. 43rb, uint P3 f. 45rb] la ou estoit sa fille rachel q[ui] les dex | auoit [ot L f. 43rb, en auoit P3 f. 45rb] enportes (D f. 37ra, B f. 57va, L f. 43rb, P3 f. 45rb, Pa f. 43rb)

In (14) the verb separates the noun phrase and the modifier/head order of the elements of the nominal group is inverted: whereas in P sa fille is in apposition, in other manuscripts the proper name is the attribute (or modifier).

In light of examples (5) to (14), it is interesting to observe that Rennes sometimes presents the marked order of the elements, against the rest of the tradition, including P:

(15)
§ 1207_01 (P f. 362va)
La fu si fimbria | menes a desesperance quil sossist | a ses mains meismement dune | espee ens ou temple esculapii·

(La fu si Fimbria menés a desesperance qu’il s’ossist a ses mains meismement d’une espee ens ou temple Esculapii)65

la fu si | symbria menez adesesperance quil soc|cist ases mains meismement dune espee | enz outemple esculapui (L5 f. 233ra)

La fu fimbria si menes | a desesperance qu[ui] [qui] B f. 322va, L f. 310va] meismement socist a | ces mains dune espee· el temple escapulij· [esculapij Pa f. 319vb] (D f. 265rb, B f. 322va, L f. 310va, Pa f. 319vb)

La fut fimbria | si mal mene a desesperance q(ue) | lui meismes a ses mains socist | dune espee (Rennes f. 361va)

Examples like (15), together with cases like (5) and (6), offer more evidence supporting the hypothesis of the existence of an exemplar mirroring a stage of the text from which P and Rennes independently derive and which they independently reproduce or modify.

3.3. *(Non)expression of the subject and impersonal verbs*

In this section, my purpose is to focus on the *(non)expression of the subject in the textual tradition of the *HA.* I will consider cases in which making sense of a passage depends on how we interpret the presence/absence of the subject (be it nominal or pronominal).

As noted, the second main syntactic feature of manuscript P highlighted by Rochebouet is the presence of a referential pronoun in contexts where its antecedent is easily identifiable. In the following examples, the personal pronoun resumes the expressed nominal subject from which it is separated by the presence of lexical material, like the adverbial clause in (16):

(16)
§ 700_11 (P f. 199va)
Quant en|si lot mariee la damaoisele fu as|ses tost ensainte· [et] astiages q[ua]nt il le sot il fist guarder [et] sauoir | quel enfant ele auroit au ior q[u]e | ele seroit delivree·

(Quant ensi l’ot mariee, la damaoisele fu asses tost ensainte, [et] Astiages, q[ua]nt il le sot, il fist guarder [et] savoir quel enfant elle auroit au ior q[u]e ele seroit delivree)

As expected, the word order and the use of the resumptive pronoun are preserved throughout the tradition. In Old French, the expression of the subject pronoun with topicalised and highly accessible subjects is frequent. Furthermore, the frequency of the expression of coreferential subject pronouns in embedded clauses is much higher than in root clauses. In light of this, the presence of the subject pronoun in subordinates like the one shown here is not surprising.

It is interesting, then, to observe the behaviour of other manuscripts in similar contexts. In the following example, we observe that the personal pronoun (in *il laisserent/laisserent*) is expressed in manuscript P (including Rennes, V, L5) but not in the rest of the tradition:

66. The most comprehensive study on the topic to date is in Zimmermann, op. cit.
67. According to Zimmermann, op. cit., this is one of the peculiar traits of Old French, and distinguishes it from Italian and Spanish, which are considered prototypical pro-drop languages.
(17)
§ 231_04 (P f. 53 rb)
E quant uint a la vespree cil de la ville qui gius auoient toute iour fait ieux de diuerces manieres deuant lor ydole et deuant lor ymage, il laisserent la feste si mangerent assez et burent selon lor usage et puis se coucherent

Et quant vint a la vespree cil de la ville qui gius auoient toute iour fait ieux de diuerces manieres deuant lor ydole et deuant lor ymage, il laisserent la feste si mangerent assez et burent selon lor usage et puis se coucherent (Plancher, Rennes f. 55 r, Vienna f. 32 r, Paris f. 46 r)

I will consider the non-expression of the expletive pronoun with the impersonal verb below, in example (21) and commentary.

In (18), the subject pronoun 1sg frames a prepositional phrase with a “strong” pronoun (a toi) and a weak series of oblique pronouns in chiasmus:

(18)
§ 637_12 (P f. 173 rb)
Mais por lamor que je auoie a toi le tauoie ie donee [et] otroiee [Mes por lamor que je auoie a toi, le t'auoie je donee [et] otroiee] 68

Manuscript Rennes reads like P but avoids the repetition of the 1sg subject pronoun:

mas | pour lamour que iauoie a toy | la tauoie donee et attrioee (Rennes f. 176 r)

68. As for le in (19), a direct object, feminine, singular, see Ch.-Th. Gossen, Grammaire de l’ancien picard, Paris, Klincksieck, 1976, § 65, pp. 121-22.
As for the rest of the manuscripts, the Acre group (including P3 and Pa) expresses the *ie* subject and shows the modern order dative/accusative:

(19)
Mes por lamor q[ue] ie auoi a | toi ie te lauoie donee [et] otroiee (D f. 126vb, B f. 164ra, L f. 150va, P3 f. 158vb, Pa f. 157ra)

As far as the order of the group of oblique clitic pronouns is concerned, the Old French order accusative/dative is the norm in P.

In (20), the double clitic occurs in proclisis, at the start of the clause; this position is allowed by the fronting of the prepositional phrase (*por ce*):

(20)
§ 591_04 (P f. 149va)
Por ce leuos di | ie ore [encore, *in other manuscripts*] que ie uoill que uos saches | que de iaphet [et] de troiens orfent | li francois totes ores comensance-

(Por ce le vos di je ore que je voill que vos sachés que de Japhet et des troiens orent li francois totes ores comensance […]\(^69\))

Notice the postverbal position of the subject pronoun in the matrix clause and, once again, the expression of the subject pronoun in an embedded context.

The interest of the passage presented in example (21) rests on the interpretation of the impersonal verb *anuiter* (*to get dark*).\(^70\)

(21)
§ 590_07-08 (P f. 149rb)
mais norent | mie les trois parties dou jor corues | quant il lor leva sitres orible tem|peste et si grande conques a paines | oi nus hom parler de plus crueuse | quar il

---

\(^69\). L5 f. 93ra reads differently: «Porçe uos dige que deiaphet | [et] des troiens orent li françois coumence|ment».  

simon ventura

samblois que tuit li maistre | ·iii· uent uentassent [et] si feissent lor | pooirs et lor forces de la mer esmovoir | [et] de la hautece trosques en abisme· | [et] adonc anuita enaes et sa compagnie· E quant la nuis fu uenue a|donc comensa a toner et a eclistrer | si fort et si pesme tans a faire auec | ce de plueuies conques […]

(Mais n’oren mie les trois parties dou jor corues, quant il lor leva si tres orible tempeste et si grande c’oonsques a paines oï nus hom parler de plus crueuse quar il samblois que tuit li maestre ·iii· vent ventassent. Et si feïssent lor pooirs et lor forces de la mer esmovoir et de la hautece trosques en abisme, et adonc anuita Eneas et sa compagnie. E quant la nuis fu uenue, adonc comensa a toner et a eclistrer si fort et si pesme tans a faire […] c’oonsques […]).

According to the dictionaries, the verb anuiter may be used in three ways. 1) As an impersonal verb, with or without the expression of its expletive subject. 2) It may appear in an intransitive (inaccusative) construction, associated with an external subject which is not an agent: e.g. la nuis anuite (see below 23, 24, 25). 3) It can be used in an inergative construction with an external subject coded as an agent (‘someone spends the night somewhere’).

The segmentation of the string in manuscript P (i.e. the punctus after Eneas et sa c. and the upper case red letter ∞ for the conjunction that starts the following “segment”) suggests at least three ways to make sense of the passage. First, Eneas et sa compagnie are the subjects of anuita. In this case, the verb anuiter would mean ‘to spend the night’. This is how Godefroy interprets this passage from the HA.71 The faute d’accord between a third person singular conjugated verb (anuita) and a plural subject is not necessarily an issue: this is a frequent phenomenon in the HA and more broadly in medieval French texts. The Anglo-Norman Dictionary on line, s.v. has a case of anuiter (‘to spend the night’): see, e.g., the 14th-c. Holkman Bible: Jhesus entrat en Betanie & anuytoyt dedenz: in this case, Jhesus is the subject.72 However, anuiter is used there in a dynamic and clearly defined spatial context (verb of movement entra + preposition dedenz). This is not the case in (21). Not only is there no spatial reference, but it has to be supplied by contextual inference.

71. Gdf s.v. refers to the passage in (22). A further example that does not seem entirely relevant is referred to in FEW, vii 214b (nox): Floriant et Florete (ca. 1275): Floriant et Florete, ed. by H.F. Williams, Ann Arbor, Univ. of Michigan Publications, 1947, v. 7060: « Ne vous poez pas anuiter ».

A second possibility would be to consider Eneas et sa compagnie as complements of anuiter. In which case, we should suppose a progressive meaning associated with anuiter: ‘it got dark on Eneas and his companions’. The use of intransitive anuiter elsewhere with la nuis as subject and the dative pronoun, li, would support this interpretation:

(22)
§ 418_05-06 (P f. 94va)
tant que ce vint a la quarte nuit qu’il torna son chemin vers la mer a destre, et mout sesmerueilloit en lui meisme quentot le ior deuant nauoit ueu borc ne chasteau ne uille. Cele nuis li anuita mout orrible quar li airs trobla et obscuri de grant maniere, et il entra ioste la mer en une forest pleniere (= Rennes f. 95ra)

Here anuiter is an intransitive verb with two overt arguments: a subject, la nuis, and a complement (li). The other manuscripts read as P: the structure therefore is not problematic. Dictionaries give various examples of anuiter used exactly as in (22). See the following two cases taken from TL, s.v. anuiter (1 407):

(23)
Ja mais ne cuit que il m’anuit | Nule (= Nule nuis), quant j’istrai de cesti (Lai de l’Ombre, v. 462)

(24)
Cis jors qui ne puet anuiter (Roman de la Rose, v. 20943)

In both cases the subjects (la nuis and le jors) are semantically redundant. Nonetheless they give a dynamic nuance to anuiter, which could fit also in (21). Example (24) from the Roman de la Rose does not have the complement. The fact that the datives in (22) and (23) are pronominal rather than
nominal may not be a problem since non-prepositional datives with noun phrases are attested in P (but not retained in manuscripts where the preposition is given) as shown in (25):

$\text{(25)}$

\[\S\ 1131\_04 \ (P \ f. \ 340r)\]  
Et il fist tant qu'il par traison | prist le roi iugurta si le fist loier | [et] enchaenier si le liura silla

(Et il [= li roi Bocus] fist tant qu'il par traison prist le roi Jugurta, si le fist loier [et] enchaenier, si le liura Silla [...])

Notice that the argumental structure of the predicate in (25) is different from \textit{anuiter}: \textit{liurer} is a transitive verb requiring a subject and both a direct and indirect object. When \textit{anuiter} means ‘to get dark on someone’ (as in examples 23, 24), we may infer that the superficial expression of the subject is also a requirement. In (21), the predicate \textit{anuita} has no subject. For this interpretation to be fully satisfactory, there should be a correspondence between the non-expressed subject in (21) and \textit{cele nuis} as subject in cases like (22). If this is true, then the structures \textit{la nuis anuita} + [dat.], and [Ø] \textit{anuita Eneas et sa compaignie} are analogous. We might then ask whether the determiner phrase within the adverbial temporal clause that follows, \textit{quan la nuit fu venue} (21), an anaphora resuming the state of affairs introduced by \textit{anuita}, renders the expression of the subject unnecessary:

$\text{(26)}$

[…\textit{anuita}…] E quant la nuis fu venue

My hypothesis is that verbs like \textit{anuiter} are inherently impersonal. First, it is very frequent to have an expletive null subject in structures where an impersonal verb is preceded by lexical material like an adverb: e.g. \textit{Adonc anuita} [Ø] in (21). Secondly, periphrasis like \textit{la nuis le jour anuite}, with a redundant subject, are variations that do not actually modify the impersonal structure, since \textit{la nuis/le jours} are not referential in a way that is similar to expletive subjects. There is one difference, however: the non-expression of the expletive subject is a possibility of the grammar of manuscript P, whereas the expression of the (quasi)nonreferential subject \textit{la nuis anuite} (or \textit{il anuite}) + dative is systematic. If this is the case, then \textit{anuita} here is constructed as an impersonal verb \textit{without} expletive subject. The consequence would be that the passage is not complete, the lacking bit being in the other manuscripts.

73. Cf. D f. 248rb: « si le liura a cylla ».
This difference in structure (anuiter with or without overt subject) probably explains why the manuscripts read the passage differently. Indeed, the variant readings suggest that we have here a textual problem that may be related to how this verb is read. Consider Rennes’s rendering of this passage (which is replicated by the Acre mss, including P3 and Pa):

\[
(27)
\]

Mes norent mie \[pas L f. 130ra, Pa f. 133va\] les ·iij· p[ar]\s | del ior corues q[ua]nt il lor leua \[q[ui]\] lor leua L f. 130ra] si tres orible \[et\] s a poi-

nes oyst p[ar]\l\er] nus hom de plus cruouse\[-\] [de plus grant ne deplus \[et\] cruouse\[-\] Pa f. 133va] Car il se[m]\l\o\it q\[ue]\ toz les ·iij· mestres uenz uenta\[cent\[-\] \[et\] si feicent lor pooir \[et\] lor force \[leuer force \[et\] leur po[ir] L f. 130ra] de | la mer esmouoir de la hautece iusq\[ue]\ en la\[bisme\[-\] \[et\] donc anuita\[-\] Eneas \[et\] sa co[m]\[gnie orent g[ra]\nt paer\[-\] \[et\] q[ua]\nt la nuit fu uenue\[-\] donc comensa a torner \[et\] a tonner \[et\] a esp[ar]\l] \[et\] si pesme tens a faire (D f. 108va, B f. 144va-144vb, L f. 130ra, Rennes f. 150ra-150rb, P3 f. 134vb, Pa f. 133va)\]

en abisme\[-\] Et donc anuita\[-\] Eneas et sa compaignie orent grant paour\[-\] et quant la nuit fut [150rb] venue donc commença a tonner […] (Rennes, f. 150ra-150rb)

In light of this, two hypotheses are possible. Either P (or its exemplar) has a lacuna corresponding to the loss of orent grant paour, or the exemplar of Rennes and the other manuscripts did not understand the passage as it is preserved in P and rewrote it.\textsuperscript{75} In either case, we have here further evidence for a separation of P from the rest of the tradition. This is all the more interesting given the close textual relationship between Rennes and P. The implication should be that the lacuna or the rewriting took place at a very early stage in the textual tradition.

3.4. Demonstratives

Example (28) presents a different textual issue. Here rather than the non-expression of the subject, the concentration of referential forms (cohesive demonstratives, personal pronouns, etc.) may be the source of the difficulty in the passage:

\[
74. \text{Different phrasing in} \ L f. 93ra: \text{“mais norent mie m[o]lt erre quant uneg[ra]nt | tem}
\]

\text{peste uint m[o]lt horrible [et] coumenca | atoner [et] afaire sipemse tens que nus ne | leporroit}

\text{croire”}.\]

\[
75. \text{Which would then be a variant significant for stemmatic purposes.}\]
§ 608_17-18 (P f. 158rb-158ra)
Teseus dist au roi son père qu’ensi le feroit il se li deu len [158ra] laissoient reporter la vie mais q[u]nn[t il fu uenus en crete li rois minos auoit une fille adriana estoit nomée celle, quant elle vit theseus si bel [et] de si grant proce. Elle len [ama forment] [et] si li dist
(Teseus dist au roi son père qu’ensi le feroit il se li deu l’en [158ra] laissoient rapporter la vie. Mais quant il fu venus en Crete li rois Minos avoit une fille, Adriana estoit nomée. Cele, quant elle vit Theseus si bel et de si grant proce. ele l’en ama forment et si li dist [...]).

Although presenting the same text, comparison with other manuscripts reveals an interesting difference in punctuation:

(29)

Thus P has a punctus after cele, whereas the manuscripts of the Acre group (including P3) and Rennes have a punctuation mark before the demonstrative. Pa and L5 read differently:

Theseus dist a son père q[u] en le feroit il se li dieu len laissoie[n]t [raporter la vie. Quant il fu uenus [en crete] li rois minos auoit [une fille adriana estoit nomée. Celle [uil theseus si bel et de si tres grant proesse que elle le nama forment... [et] si li dist (Pa f. 142va)

Theseus li dist que si fe[roit il se li dieu uoloient Q[u]nn[t il fu uenuz [en crete lirois minos auoit une fille adriana estoit nomée. Q[u]nn[t elle uit theseus si [bel ele lama m[ol][et] si li dist (L5 f. 97vb)

In Pa the demonstrative pronoun introduces a consecutive and not a temporal clause. In L5 the demonstrative is not present, allowing the repetition of two clauses with the same structure (Q[u]nn[t il [... ] / Q[u]nn[t ele [... ]). Pa and L5 illustrate a way to cope with a difficult passage through the elimination of either the demonstrative or the temporal adverb.

While the use of a resumptive pronoun is no surprise in contexts like (28), and whereas the expression of the subject in subordinate clauses is
largely expected, the use of the demonstrative *cele* is more problematic. There are three possibilities:

1) Marked expression of the demonstrative pronoun at the end of the clause: [...] *une fille: Adriana estoit nomee, cele. Quant ele [...]*, ele [...];

2) Topicalised expression of the demonstrative to open a new clause: [...] *une fille, Adriana estoit nomee. Cele, quant ele [...]*, ele [...];

3) The oscillating position of the punctus indicates the difficulty found by the scribes in interpreting a faulty passage.76

The following examples are cases of verbal periphrasis comparable to *estre nome(e)*, with the participle in final position and with a demonstrative pronoun beginning a new clause:

(30a)
§ 722_01 (P f. 207rb)
[et] si estoit iu|dit par droit non apelee· Ceste estoit | caste dame et bone de la ligne.
[et] si estoit iudic | par droit nom apelee· Ceste [Cest L f. 181ra] estoit chas|te dame
[et] bone de la ligne (D f. 151va)77

(30b)
§ 792_03 (P f. 232va)
mais ni auoit | celui qui len osast araisner ne | faire nulle semblance fors que | uns tres
| stos sous parmenius auoit a nom· Cil parla au roi as|ses pauserouement [et] sili dist· |

mais | ny auoit cellui qui lui en osast p(ar)ler | ne riens dire ne faire nul sembla(n)t |
| fors que vng tout seul homme· par|menius auoit a nom. Cestui p(ar)la | au roy assez
| paoureusement et si li dist· (Rennes f. 235rb)

(30c)
§ 1234_02-03 (P f. 370ra)
Segnor [et] | dames cil iulius cesar dont uos |aues oi parler maintes fois ot | une fille
iulia fu nomee qui m[o]lt | fu bele [et] de grant segnorie· Cesti | auoit eue pompeius
a feme mais | morte estoit adonques

76. It seems possible that Pa (see above) reworked the passage regularising it.
77. Identical punctuation in B f. 195va, L f. 181ra, Rennes f. 201va, Pa f. 189rb, L5 f. 130ra.
78. Same punctuation in the following: D f. 170vb, B f. 217ra, L f. 202ra, Pa f. 212rb, L5 f. 149ra. Pa has the same punctuation as the other manuscripts, but shows slightly different phrasing (closer, but not identical, to P and Rennes): «Mais ni auoit celui qui leu ozast araisner ne | faire nulle semblance· fors que un | tout soul home parmenius auoit no[m] | Cil parla au roi asses paurosement et | si li dist». L5 reads verbatim as P.
(Segnor [et] dames cil Iulius Cesar, dont vos aues oï parler maintes fois, ot une fille, Iulia fu nomee, qui m[o]lt fu bele [et] de grant segnorie. Cesti avoit eue Pompeius a femme, mais morte estoit adonques […]

Seigneurs cesti | Jullius cesar dont vous auez oy | parler mainte ffois ot vne | fille Julia fut nommee qui | moult fut belle et de grant seignorie: Ceste avoit eue Pompeius | a femme: mais morte | estoit adonques: (Rennes f. 370ra)


(30d)
§ 610_07 (P f. 159vb-159va)

(Segnor [et] dames, de celle terre o Eneas ariva, estoit sires uns rois, Latinus [159va] estoit apeles, qui null oir n'auoit fors c'une mout tres belle fille: cele estoit Laivine apelee. Li rois Latinus ses peres estoit ja auques d'aâge […]80

Seignors de celle terre ou | eneas ariua estoit sires un roi: latinus estoit apeles: [un roi q[iii] latinus estoit apeles: L f. 137vb] q[iii] n'auoit nul hoir: mes une tres | belle fille: Celle estoit apelee laivine: Le roi latin son per estoit ia daage: (D f. 116ra, B f. 154ra, L f. 137vb, P3 f. 145ra, Pa f. 143va)81
de celle terre estoit sires liois latins | quin'auoit nul oir fors une belle fille: qui laivine estoit apelee: liois latins | ses peres estoit auques daaige (L5 f. 98rb)

Examples (16) and (31) show the same trait: a subject noun phrase is resummed by a personal pronoun subject after an adverbial temporal clause:

(16)
§ 700_1182
Quant en si lot mariee la damoisele fu as|ses tost ensainte: [et] astiages q[ua]nt | il le

79. Manuscripts L and L5 do not have the Caesar section.
80. Same punctuation in Rennes f. 161vb.
81. P3 f. 145ra reads differently: «Seignors de celle | terre ou eneas ariua estoit sires | et rois latinus estoit appellez qui».
82. Cf. also the following P § 602_02 (f. 154vb): «Li rois, quant il le sot, fu mout dolans et tantost rasambla ses gens».
sot il fist guarder [et] savoir quel enfant ele auroit au ior q[u]e ele seroit delivree· (= D f. 145\(\nu\)b and the rest of the mss)

(Quant ensi l’ot mariee, la damoisele fu asses tost ensainte, [et] Astiages, q[ua]nt il le sot, il fist guarder [et] savoir quel enfant ele auroit au ior q[u]e ele seroit de·livree)

(31a) § 703_11 (P f. 200rb)\(^83\)
Onques sparticus | quant il oi le roi astiages parler il ne sespoordi de nulle choze ains | respondi [et] dist que il roi lauoient fait [et] por ce en uoloit daus | tenir iustice·

(Onques Sparticus, quant il oi le roi astiages parler, il ne s’espoöri de nulle choze, ains respondi [et] dist que il roi l’avoient fait, [et] por ce en voïlot d’as tenir justice)

Onq[ue]\(\)s sparticus q[ua]\(\)nt il oy le roi astiages parler [parler ensi· B f. 189rb, ensi parler L f. 174vb] ne sespoeri de nulle chose· [rien] Pa f. 182va | Ainz respondi [et] dist q[ui]l lauoient fet roi | [et] porce en uoloit diaus tenir iustise· (D f. 146rb, B f. 189vb, L f. 174vb, Pa f. 182va)\(^84\)

(31b) § 704_01 (P f. 200va)\(^85\)
li rois quant | il lentendi si sen esmerueilla m[o]lt [et] si en ot grant ire enuers celui | cui il lot premerainement coma\(\)n[n]de a ocire·

(Li rois, quant il l’entendi, si s’en esmerveilla m[o]lt, [et] si en ot grant ire envers celui cui il l’ot premerainement coma\(\)n[n]de a ocire)

li rois q[ua]\(\)nt il en\(\)tendi ce si sen m[er]uilla m[o]lt [et] en ot grant | ire enuers celui cui il lot premiereme[n]t | coumande a occirre (L5 f. 123vb)

Q[ua]\(\)nt li rois entendi ce il | se merueilla m[o]lt· [et] si en ot g[r]ant irre [ [et] si ot grant irre L f. 175ra] uers [celui q[ui]]l ot premierement comande a oc|cirre· (D f. 146va, B f. 190ra, L f. 175ra)\(^86\)

Despite having the order Adverb/ Subject as in the manuscripts of the Acre group, Pa (f. 182(va) reads like P:

Quant li rois len|tendi si sen merueilla moult et si en | ot grant ire enuers celui a cui il ot p[re]\(\)merainement comande a occirre lenfa[n]t· |

It follows that a paradigm may be established, where a nominal subject is

\(^83\) Rochebouet, L’‘Histoire ancienne jusqu’à César’, cit., § 4.
\(^84\) L5 f. 123vb reads like P.
\(^85\) Rochebouet, L’‘Histoire ancienne jusqu’à César’, cit., § 5.
\(^86\) Rennes f. 203va-203vb reads like P.
separated from the verb by an adverbial clause, in which case a resumptive personal pronoun is often expressed:

\[
\begin{align*}
(16) & \quad \text{[et] Astiages} \quad \text{quant il […]} \quad \text{il fist garder […]} \\
(31a) & \quad \text{sparticus} \quad \text{quant il […]} \quad \text{il ne sespoori […]} \\
(31b) & \quad \text{li rois} \quad \text{quant il […]} \quad \text{si sen esmerueilla}
\end{align*}
\]

Similarly, \textit{cele} may be considered the topicalised subject in (28) and (29):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[…] une fille, Adriana estoit nomee. Cele, quant ele […]}, \quad \text{ele […]}
\end{align*}
\]

The punctuation practice of manuscript P could contradict this interpretation. The punctus after \textit{cele} indicates a syntactic break between \textit{cele} and the adverbial temporal clause that follows, which is often the case in manuscript P. It is normal when a demonstrative pronoun in P begins a new clause that it is preceded by a punctus (see examples 30a to 30d). However, while the presence of punctuation in P allows us to make an interpretive hypothesis, the absence of punctuation makes things more complicated. As it is often the case in medieval punctuation, the scribe of P does not always mark the distinction between two syntactic units by punctuation:

\[
\begin{align*}
(32) & \quad \text{§ 799_03 (P f. 234rb)}^{87} \\
\text{Et a|donc auoit il un maistre philoso|phie· Callistenen estoit nomes· | cil auoit este} \\
\text{ses compains en es|cole sous aristocle son maistre ce|lui fist il ocire·}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(Et adonc avoit il un maistre philosophie, Callistenen estoit nomes. Cil avoit esté} \\
\text{ses compains en escole sous Aristocle son maistre. Celui fist il ocire)}^{88}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Il auoit ·j· maistre phi|lozophe· calistenem estoit nomme} \\
\text{Cestui auoit est son compaignon en | lescole soubz arisote son maistre· | Cellui fist il occire [Celui fist ocirre}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{D f. 172ra, B f. 218ra] (Rennes f. 237ra)}^{89}
\end{align*}
\]

\textit{87}. From this perspective, the punctuation of the other manuscripts shows a correspondence between syntactic breaks and use of punctuation.

\textit{88}. L5 f. 150rb: «Et donc auoit il mestre philoso|phie». 

\textit{89}. Same punctuation as in Rennes in the following: D f. 172ra, B f. 218ra, Pa f. 215ra, L5 f. 150rb (it reads verbatim like P, but adds the punctus before \textit{Celui}, the last demonstrative pronoun at the end of the passage). L ff. 203rb-204ra omits the passage (= § 799_03 and § 799_04, according to the reference system of the TVOF edition of P). Another example where a demonstrative subject pronoun signposts the start of a new clause: no punctuation mark (apart from the line break) highlights the syntactic pause: § 912_01 (P f. 274va): «Or auint apres ceste
In (32) a punctus “regularly” separates *al avoit* from what precedes; however, no punctuation marks the strong syntactic pause between the clause finishing in *son maistre* and the following clause *celui fist il oire*. In light of this, while we may say that punctuation marks a break between *celle* and the *quant*-clause that follows, we cannot safely state that the absence of punctuation makes the demonstrative *celle* part of the preceding textual string.

The *tournure* in P is clumsy, as is demonstrated by the hesitation of the scribes in placing the punctuation (before/after *celle*). Manuscripts Pa and L5 have a correct text: it could be evidence for two attempts to cope with a textual problem present in their sources. But in absence of a stemma, we cannot rule out that either Pa or L5 inherit the good reading from a lost exemplar. In any case, the very fact that Pa and L5 cope with the situation keeping either one or the other of the textual hurdles, subsequently adapting the rest, is consistent with the presence of both the demonstrative and the adverbial temporal clause throughout the tradition. While the possibility of a rare construction with *celle* positioned at the end of the clause cannot be ruled out, this would be unparalleled in manuscript P and heavily marked here. Finally, the evidence gathered above regarding *celle* as topicalised subject of the new string seems plausible but infelicitous. Which makes a slip at a high stage of the textual transmission (or even authorial) not impossible. Examples (30) and (31) show the frequency of constructions with clause initial demonstratives, followed by adverbial clauses and resumptive pronouns. I think that it would not be so difficult to imagine that (28) and (29) reproduce a text where a scribe, under the influence of so many analogous *tournures*, may have added by mistake either the demonstrative (cf. reading in L5) or the adverbial clause (cf. Pa).

3.5. Pronoun or adverb?

In the following example, the manuscripts hesitate in trying to make sense of a difficult passage involving the use of a personal pronoun or of a form that looks like a personal pronoun:

(33)
§ 621_16 (P f. 165ra)
[et] te iur ni|se se sort oz deus que si tu me ra|maines mon pere si que ie le uoi|e ia
naurai si grant honor ne si | grant segnorie que ie ne meite dou | tot en ton conseill
de ce que ie aue|rai affaire [et] si te donrai ·ij· riches | copes dor· [et] si te [et] si li deu
des|confiture quen cartage | ot un noueau empere|or hasdrubal fu apeles par no[m] | cis as-
sambla grans gens [et] gra[n]s os».
The interpretation of *ie* in *et| departir iene| ti faudra*... is problematic. In this case, the variant reading is of little help. The double negative structure put in the mouth of Ascanius in manuscript P is not present in the other manuscripts, where the phrasing differs:

(34)

Et si te iure nis[us] | sur tous noz dieux que se tu me | ramaine mon pere que ie le voie | ia naurai si grant honnour ne | si grant seignorie que ie ne mette | du tout en tout en ton conseil de | ce que iaurai a faire et si te don|nerai i|j| riches copes [...] et se les dieux nous | donnent tel eur que nous puis|sions conquerter lombardie et | la proie prendre et departir| ie | te donnera le riche destrier sur | quoy tu voiz turnus cheuau|cher et son riche escu et son ri|che heaume (Rennes f. 167va, Pa f. 148va)

Et si te iure nisus sor toz noz| desq|ue| ce | tu me remains mon pere q|ue| ie le uoie| ia | naurai si g|ra|nt honor ne si g|ra|nt segnorie | q|ue| ie ne met dout tot ne mon conseill de ce q|ue| | ie beera a fere; [et] si te donra i|j| riches | copes [...] [et] se les | dex noz donent tel eur q|ue| noz puissions co[n]querre lombardie [et] la proie prendre| ie | te donrai le riche destrier sur quoi tu uois | turnus seoir| [et] son riche escu [et] son riche | heaume» (D f. 120r, L f. 143r)

Et si te iure nisus sor toz | les dieux que se tu nous ramenes | mon pere ie naurai si grant honor | ne si grant seignorie que ie ne | mete dout tout en ton conseill de | ce que ie pensera a faire- Et si te donra90 • i|j| coupes dor et91 riches [...] Et se les diex nouz donent tel he|ur que nouz co[n]questons lombar|die| et la proe prendre ie te donrai | le riche destrier sur quoi tu voiz tur|nus seoir et son riche escu et son riche hyalme (P3 f. 150rb)

The manuscripts of the Acre group (including Pa and P3) and Rennes keep the first, but not the second double negative. Invariably, *ie* < *ego* is the subject of *donrai*. This co-ordinates with the series of inflected forms of *donner* that follow: *et si te donnai i|j| riches copes, et se les dex nos donent*, and just a little later the last words of the long list of riches that Ascanius is promising Ni|sus: *et sor tot ce te donnai je une partie de la terre que li rois Latinus a or en sa baillie* (§ 621_16). While it is not possible to say whether P has a rewriting of what we find in the rest of the tradition or vice versa, P may well preserve the lectio difficilior.

90. *Sic.*
91. Expunctuated.
There are two possibilities. The first is \( ie = je < \text{ego} \), as in the rest of the tradition. If this is the case, \textit{faudra} is a first-person singular of the indicative future of \textit{falloir}. The -\textit{a} ending for the first-person singular is attested in Picard.\(^92\) This would be consistent with other Northern and North-Eastern forms present in P. In this context, the occurrence of the oblique clitic \textit{ti} would support the supposition: again, \textit{ti} is well attested in Picard documents.\(^93\)

A second hypothesis would imply \( ie < \text{iAM} \). On the one hand, \textit{ie} may be a banal mistake for \textit{ia} (\textit{iAM}). A minimal correction, \( ie \ ne > j[a] \ ne (\text{< iAM NON}) \), would give: \( \ldots \text{et departir}, j[a] \ ne \ t'i \ faudra \ que \ tu \ n'aies \ldots \). This could well be the sense of the passage. The next example highlights the similarities between two structures in the passage exemplified in (33):

\begin{equation}
\text{(35)}
\end{equation}

\[ \ldots \text{si tu me ramaines mon pere si que ie le voie, ja n'avrai si grant honor ne si grant segnorie que je ne meite dou tot en ton conseill de ce que je ave[rai a ffaire, [et] si te donrai} \ldots \]

\[ \ldots [\text{et}] \text{si li deu nos done[n]} \text{t eur que nos puissons conq[u]erre Lombardie [et] la proie prendre [et] departir, je} [= ja] \text{ne ti faudra que tu n'aies le riche destrier [\ldots] } \]

In P, the grammatical group \textit{iene} (\text{< iAM NON}) is written in one word. In this case, the grapheme \texttt{e} reflects the phonetic weakening of final /a/. The neutralisation of /a/ (\text{\textipa{\textael}}), final vowel of word or syllable, is a common phenomenon in French. However, the graphic representation of this phenomenon in the specific group \textit{iene} < \textit{iAM NON}, seems otherwise unattested. Nonetheless, three points make plausible the hypothesis that \textit{ie ne} is an adverbial locution. First, manuscript P features numerous cases of graphemic oscillation between final \texttt{a/e} in other grammatical words (particularly clitics: hence with a weak/absent lexical accent): for example, P makes frequent use of the Picard definite and personal pronoun clitic \texttt{le} for feminine singular \textit{la}. Secondly, although unattested in P, adverbs like \textit{jemais} (\text{< iAM MAGIS}), which is analogous to \textit{ie ne} (\text{< iAM NON}) in terms of word formation and phono-morphological context, are attested in the \textit{Dictionnaire Etymologique de l’Ancien Français} (s.v. \textit{ja}). Thirdly, and crucially, manuscript P has

\(^{92}\) See Buridant, op. cit., § 217.3, p. 270.

\(^{93}\) And in P, at least in one case: § 265.05 (P f. 60rb): «Si dirai un sou petit de iudas son fill por meaus continuer [et] suir apres la matere [et] lestorie· puis reuendra [reuiendra D f. 44vrb] a ioseph qui menes en estoit en seruage en egypte·». Cf. Gossen, op. cit., § 65, p. 124.
at least one other occurrence of \( i e \ ne = ja \ ne \). Here \( ie \ ne \) appears again in coordination with \( ia \ ne \):

(36)

\[ \text{§ 788.05 (P f. 231v)} \]

E por ce fist il [\(=\) Daires] letres faire que il en\(\text{u}\)oia au roi alixandre\(\text{-} \) [et] si li manda que il de sa mere [et] de sa feme [et] de ses serors [et] de ses fils [et] de ses filles eust merci [et] il li rendroit [et] li don\(\text{r}\)oit tot le tresor de perse [et] le tresor de mede\(-\) o il auoit dor [et] dargent [et] de pierres precioses mout tres grant habundance\(-\) mais alixan\(\text{d}\)res meïmes li remanda par ses letres propres qua ce ne s\'atendist mie\(-\) quar ie ne li rendroit ne ia | ne les raueroit en toz les iors de sa vie:

\[ \text{(E por ce fist il [\(=\) Daires] letres faire que il envoia au roi Alixandre. \(\text{Et}\) si li manda que il de sa mere [et] de sa feme [et] de ses serors [et] de ses fils [et] de ses filles, eüst merci, [et] il li rendroit [et] li donroit tot le tresor de Perse [et] le tresor de Mede, o il auoit d\(\text{o}\)r [et] d\(\text{a}\)rgent [et] de pierres precioses mout tres grant habundance. Mais Alixandres meïmes li remanda par ses lettres propres qua ce ne s\'atendist mie, quar \(ie \ ne li rendroit ne ia\) \(ia\) \(ne\) les raueroit en toz les iors de sa vie)} \]

In this case, the manuscripts read unanimously \(ia \ ne \ldots \) \(ia \ ne \ldots\):

(37)

Mes alixandre meïmes li remanda par ces letres preupres [que] ace ne s\'atendist mie\(-\) Car ia ne li ren\(\text{d}\)roit ne ia ne les rauoït en toz les iors de sa vie\(-\) (Rennes f. 170ra)

mais alixandres meïmes liremanda par ses letres propres qua ce ne s\'atendist mie\(-\) Car ia ne li randroit ne ia ne les rauoït | entoz les ior\(\text{z}\) desauie\(-\) (D f. 148ra)

Gaullier Baugassas corrects manuscript P, printing: \(quar \ ja \ ne \ li \ rendroit\).\(^{94}\) But if what I have argued is correct, the reading of \(P\) may be retained in both cases.

On linguistic grounds, De Visser-van Terwisga, followed by Rochebouet, have contended that manuscript \(P\) preserves a stage of the first redaction of the \(HA\) older than that of the Acre manuscripts. To be more precise, De Visser-van Terwisga considered that some of \(P\)'s idiosyncratic forms are traces of a geographically located and chronologically older linguistic stratum: according to her analysis, the data account for a version of the text compiled before 1260s in Northern France (in an area having Lille as its main political and cultural centre).

\(^{94}\) With a note after first \(ja\), stating: «je, corrigé d\'après B, D, P, Pa (L folio manquant)» (GAULLIER-BOUGASSAS, ed. cit., § 31, 20, p. 137).
Among the traits she considered, the following are particularly relevant: the rhyme *matire : dire* (verses 254-55 of the prologue); the possessive *sen* for *son*, of which there is only one instance in the Thebes section; the diphthongation in reflexes of Latin *A* in words like *tiel* (prologue) or *siel* (< *sale*, P f. 31v). 95 To these features, we could add some peculiar lexical forms like *crebe* (< *kreppia*) for *creche*, or the verb *laiier* (for *laisser*), both clearly documented in North-Eastern sources. 96 All these features are consistent with a documentary geographical distribution that spans the Hainault and the Pas-de-Calais.

A form like *ie ne*, in (35) and (37), seems very rare. However, as noted, we find *je/ge* (< *iam*) along with *mais/mes* < *magis*, while *gemais, jemais* or *jemés* are consistently attested in texts located in the East or in the South-East. In stratigraphic terms, if the parallelism between the two syntagmatic compounds (*ie+ne* and *je/ge+m ais*) holds, we have evidence here for an Eastern trait: which would be consistent with the Haute-Marne stratum identified by de Visser-van Terwisga.


96. As for *crebe*, see FEW, xvi 391b, s.v. *krippia*; as for *laiier*, see Buridant, *Grammaire nouvelle de l’ancien français*, cit., § 227, p. 285.
Apart from its geographic component, there is another angle from which we may consider rare or peculiar forms like *ie ne*. It is interesting that a morphologic trait like the first-person plural ending in *-omes* (instead of *-ons*), documented in Northern sources (i.e. older stratum according to de Visser-van Terwisga), is to be found in the verse sections and in the parts in which it is the narrator that addresses the reader, or in direct reported speech. Let us examine briefly the implications of the first-person plural ending in *-omes*.

First, as for the verse sections of manuscript P, see the following couplet from the Prologue (vv. 87-88):

(39)

C’est ce que la mort aprochomes
E nos cors acompaigneromes·

Secondly, we have *-omes* forms in direct reported speech in manuscript P, but the feature is not present in parallel passages in other manuscripts:

(40)

§ 235_02
[et] puis si nos en iromes en betel (P f. 54ra)
irones (D f. 39vb)

§ 1227_02
O uos deu que nos aoromes en nos contrees ie uos pri (P f. 367vb)
aorons (D f. 269ra)

§ 1244_03
[et] qui uenut estoient en la terre de gale que nos ore apelomes borgoigne (P f. 373rb)

The *-omes* morpheme in the following narratorial intervention is again absent from other manuscripts:

(41)

§ 3_22 (P f. 5va)
[et] se nos ses comans trespassomes por quoi nos lamendomes par uerea confession· [et] par penita[n]ce· nos en serons mis [et] herbergie parmanablement ou regne de tenebres·

[et] se nos | ces comans trespassions par quoi nos | ne lamendons […] (D f. 3ra, L f. 4rb)
Et se nous ses com[m]mandeme[n]s | auo[n]s trespass et trespassons po[r]quoi | ne no[u]s amendons […] (Rennes f. 3va)
Is the presence of a trait like -omes in rhyme, direct reported speech and in narratorial interventions consistent with a tendency to treat the voiced parts of the text differently from the rest? In this regard, it is not without interest that in both cases ie ne appears in reported speech: direct in (37), indirect in (40). Furthermore, examples like (37) and (41) show once more that manuscripts P and Rennes behave differently in relation to the same trait. It is possible that manuscript Rennes “modernised” forms like ie ne and -omes, and this seems likely for examples (37) and (41). However, the fact that ie ne has not been retained by any of the manuscripts, including Rennes, makes it plausible to suppose that the rephrasing and editing of the passages in the above examples has taken place quite early, which would confirm both the separation and the relative antiquity of the textual and linguistic outline of manuscript P. On the other hand, the linguistic and formal data on which I have commented, combined with the considerations about the older linguistic strata documented by de Visser-van Terwisga, point to the existence of an exemplar, common to manuscript Rennes and the Acre manuscripts, sharing traits that distinguish it from the version of P.

4. Conclusion: time, space, style

What do the above examples teach us about the HA’s early transmission? What do the formal and linguistic features I have discussed tell us about how the first “editors” of the HA intended it to be experienced (as opposed to just read)? If we can assume that a manuscript is more than a textual repository, then manuscripts are “informants”, albeit of a special kind. As shown in various recent work on Old French and other medieval varieties of Romance languages (namely Old Italian), the assessment of the linguistic traits in manuscripts can be fruitful at all levels of the analysis, including syntax.97

First, on the basis of the evidence gathered, we can say that as early as the 1280s, the HA was accessible in three forms: the P version, the Acre version and the “shorter” version (in this paper represented by the reading from L5). Manuscripts V (when relevant) and Rennes have a text closer to P than the rest of the tradition. However, Rennes proves to be more active than V. Although it is a manuscript whose antecedent bears strong similar-

---

97. See Buridant, op. cit.; Wilhelm-de Monte-Wittum, op. cit.; E. De Roberto, Varie
ities to manuscript P, Rennes often behaves like the Acre manuscripts when faced with the structures considered in § 3. Despite being part of the short version group, L5 very often reads like P: which suggests that both P and the short version worked from similar sources. In the second place, by the end of the 13th century, a series of idiosyncratic linguistic options (like *ie ne [...], -omes, crebe*), were preserved almost exclusively by P. To understand and retain them required a copyist with suitable familiarity or competence.

In recent approaches to the linguistic analysis of medieval Romance languages, documentary or practical texts are opposed to literary texts in a broader sense (romance, narrative prose, didactic prose...). Documentary records would offer «un meilleur témoignage» for the appraisal of linguistic data in time and space. It is true that we can better date and locate documentary records in the vernacular, as compared to literary texts. From this point of view, the documentary is essential in trying to fix the coordinates of a linguistic trait in time and space. However, if we are interested in understanding other dimensions of linguistic variation, e.g. diaphasic: register and style, and diamesic (medium), we need a corpus whereby Old French is a name for a reality subject to internal differentiation as much as to lines of continuity across time and geographic domains. Elisa De Roberto has recently suggested an approach that would allow us to focus on the linguistic “behaviour” that may be inferred from textual evidence: most notably on the basis of comparative analysis of a representative corpus of manuscripts. In his *Grammaire nouvelle de l’ancien français*, Claude Buridant made a first attempt that goes in this direction: his goal was to reflect on how medieval textuality may enlighten us about the perception of variation in time and space, as much as in register, and therefore about the fixity of traditions: “generic”, discursive, etc. In the light of this, a “literary” corpus should also be considered.

From this perspective, some interesting tendencies emerge from the

98. Very often, but not always: see example (15).
101. See De Roberto, *Varietà medievali e descrizione del sistema*, cit. This approach was strongly recommended by Fleischman, *Methodologies and Ideologies*, cit., p. 33.
manuscripts I have examined in this article. For example, the presence of linguistic traits marked diatopically tends to increase in verses, reported speech and in the parts in which the narrative is interrupted by the narrator who “speaks in his own voice”: it is as if the medium guided the selection. What is more, this tendency is systematically attenuated in the manuscripts. In a similar vein, dislocations, hyperbaton or other idiosyncratic clausal or phrasal word order may sometimes echo *tournures* that recall the versified literary tradition of the end of the 12th and the beginning of 13th century. This makes for a prose redolent of verse. As we have seen this was also a trait that was not retained by the manuscripts. Is this a hint as how, and according to what lines of grammatical and rhetorical change, prosification took place? Was P’s scribe (or the scribe of his exemplar) nodding to medieval audiences well accustomed to epics and versified hagiography? Did features linguistically pertaining to different “levels” coalesce in a textual configuration suitable for oral performance? Was the absence of these features in most of the manuscript tradition pointing to a different audience and horizon of expectations?

The purpose of this paper was twofold: first, to improve our understanding of the “letter” of the text of the *HA*; secondly, to start a systematic survey of the linguistic conditions for microvariation. These aims are framed by research on the relationship between textual and linguistic variation through manuscripts. The goal is to enlighten what manuscripts may *tell* us about the relation between grammar and textual variation. By “grammar”, I do not mean here a closed and normative system, but rather a system of systems. The study of the grammar of a text reveals how different syntactic phenomena related to discourse (i.e. norm, tradition, register, style) interact with other levels of the analysis (graphemics, phono-morphology, lexicon) and crystallise on the manuscript page.
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