



Provided by the author(s) and University of Galway in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite the published version when available.

Title	Gescryfte met letteren na elcx's geval Gegraueert en oic dyveerssche ymagyen: Uses of Code-Switching in Dutch and French
Author(s)	Emerson, Catherine
Publication Date	2017-11-01
Publication Information	Emerson, Catherine. (2017). Gescryfte met letteren na elcx's geval Gegraueert en oic dyveerssche ymagyen: Uses of Code-Switching in Dutch and French. In Adrian Armstrong & Elsa Strietman (Eds.), <i>The multilingual muse : transcultural poetics in the Burgundian Netherlands</i> . Cambridge: Legenda.
Publisher	Legenda
Link to publisher's version	http://www.mhra.org.uk/publications/Multilingual-Muse
Item record	http://hdl.handle.net/10379/15711

Downloaded 2024-04-23T09:30:30Z

Some rights reserved. For more information, please see the item record link above.



CHAPTER 2



‘Gescryfte met letteren na elcx’s geval gegrauert en oic dyveerssche ymagyen’: Uses of Code-Switching in Dutch and French

Catherine Emerson

The quotation which forms the title of this contribution, from Anthonis de Roovere’s *Droom van Roovere op die doot van hertoge Kaerle van Borgognnyen saleger gedachten*, illustrates something which we think we know about transcultural poetics in a multilingual society.¹ Poets are not constrained by linguistic boundaries in their search for novel poetic forms or material, and, in a literary culture that prizes verbal dexterity, we can expect that they will not be constrained by linguistic boundaries in their choice of vocabulary either.² At first sight, De Roovere’s line appears to contain evidence of language contact: words such as *gegrauert*, *dyveersch*, and *ymagyen* come to Dutch from French — or possibly Latin — and seem to suggest that the author is enlarging his vocabulary by engaging in what linguists might term ‘code-switching’: the ‘use of material from two (or more) languages by a single speaker in the same conversation.’³ Initially presumed to be a consequence of speakers’ shortcomings in one language, code-switching is now recognized as implying a large degree of verbal competence, such as one might expect in administrative circles in a society like the Burgundian Netherlands.⁴ The three poets examined in this chapter, De Roovere himself, George Chastelain, and Jean Molinet, come from three distinct linguistic backgrounds, but can all be presumed (with a greater or lesser degree of certainty, as will be demonstrated) to have been familiar with the three languages of Burgundian society: Dutch, French, and Latin. The varying way in which they deploy vocabulary from one language in matrix texts in another language suggests conscious and deliberate choice indicating a different set of cultural values attached to each of the three languages.

Before embarking on this analysis, however, it is important to note that the use of the term code-switching requires some circumspection. On the one hand, it might be argued that code-switching is a verbal phenomenon only, and cannot really be studied in a written environment, where different constraints operate. Clearly, the use of a word or phrase in another language has a different implication

when an author has sat down and considered its use, particularly in something as constructed as a poem, from its meaning when a speaker makes a decision on the spot to switch into another language, possibly in the light of cues from an interlocutor. However, linguistically, the phenomena turn out to be quite similar. Herbert Schendl has examined a range of texts produced in Norman England and found that the types of switches found are the same in the medieval written and the contemporary oral corpus.⁵ The same, that is, apart from one of the most common sorts of switch, the emblematic switch, tags such as 'yeah', 'right', 'you know', and negative and affirmative particles — the sort of language habit that it is hard to suppress, even when one is speaking another language. Emblematic switches make up anything from ten to thirty per cent of code-switches in modern oral studies and they are almost entirely absent from Schendl's corpus.⁶ Schendl attributes this to the difference between spoken and written language, which seems plausible. Otherwise, he affirms that medieval written language in a multilingual society employs the same sorts of switches as modern spoken language.

Another difficulty, which appears to face all linguists who address the question of code-switching and which seems particularly complicated in the case of a historical corpus, is that of distinguishing switches from borrowings. At the extremes the two seem very different: a conversation that begins in one language and ends in another has clearly undergone a switch, but the shorter the portion of discourse that is from a second language, the harder it is to say whether the speaker — or indeed the writer — perceives it to be a switch into another language or an adoption of a foreign element to enrich the matrix language. Questioning speakers as to how they perceive their own language use has not provided very reliable information on this point, and this is even harder in a historical investigation, where the speakers and writers are long dead.⁷ Besides, linguists are divided on the extent to which single-word borrowings and switches can be distinguished, and on the importance of drawing the distinction. As will be demonstrated here, there is a great deal of overlap between the two phenomena, as is the case in modern contexts: Donald Winford points to studies that suggest that speakers in modern Brussels (to take just one example) who use the largest number of borrowed words are also likely to employ more switches.⁸ We can, of course, distinguish words that originally come from one language but have been in current use in another for some time from those which appear to be used for the first time by a given writer. However, even here, it is difficult to know in the case of established borrowings whether that writer perceives such words as borrowed or whether they are seen as fully integrated into the lexis of the matrix language. To take the example of the title again, *ymagyen* is a word in church Latin that is also found in French literature and in Dutch.⁹ When De Roovere uses it, is he consciously selecting a word from another language (and, if so, which?) or is he simply using the Dutch word without awareness of its origins? Such questions are difficult to answer, but we need to bear them in mind when considering the semantic impact of a switched or borrowed word. The question is, of course, further complicated if we consider the impact that a borrowed word might have on a reader or listener, particularly if we assume a reader whose degree

of competence in the relevant language differs significantly from that of the poet. A reader with no familiarity with the language from which borrowed elements derive will have a very different experience of a poem from someone who is completely bilingual, and both may be unable to access an experience of understanding with effort that the poet may have envisaged.

The three writers considered in this chapter each had a different relationship to the two vernaculars of the Burgundian Netherlands. George Chastelain was a native speaker of Dutch, working in French; Jean Molinet, his successor as official ducal poet and historiographer, also worked in French but it was his first language; Anthonis de Roovere worked in Dutch and, according to his first editor, spoke nothing else.¹⁰ It is much rarer to find the fourth permutation: a poet whose native language was French but who worked in Dutch, for reasons which will become apparent in the course of this article, which will concentrate on examples taken from Chastelain, Molinet, and De Roovere. Each of the three men had a different working relationship to the vernaculars of the Burgundian Netherlands and a different familiarity with them: Chastelain had grown up in a Dutch-speaking environment, Molinet in a French-speaking one where there was frequent contact with Dutch. As for De Roovere, Eduard de Dene's affirmations regarding De Roovere's linguistic competence were made in a particular context, which means that we should perhaps not take them at face value. Firstly, De Dene did not necessarily intend to represent the truth of De Roovere's expertise in other languages, since his description aims to report the possible reasons why De Roovere had not found a publisher, in contrast to those poets who had written in French.¹¹ The pejorative terms stressing De Roovere's simplicity and lack of learning indicate that this is not De Dene's own view. Moreover, De Dene has a particular polemical purpose in seeking to portray the vitality of the Dutch language tradition, stressing De Roovere's natural genius and that of his fellow countrymen. We do not necessarily need to accept that De Roovere had no French, nor even that De Dene seriously meant to suggest that this was the case. De Roovere certainly had a great deal of cultural contact with the francophone ducal court. Johan Oosterman has detailed De Roovere's pension, which he carefully describes as having been granted on behalf of Duke Charles, and its effect on De Roovere's political positions.¹² At the same time, there are clear influences of francophone literary forms in his writing, both in his poetry and in his chronicle.¹³ Whether this exposure to the francophone world translated into fluency in French cannot be determined, but evidence from his poems suggests that he knew enough French at least to adopt individual words.

By examining a sample of the work of these three poets, it is possible to draw some general conclusions about the status of the two vernaculars in Burgundian poetry. It is easy to assume that French was favoured, because it was the language of the court, but this can be nuanced. There is clear evidence that an individual's facility in both vernaculars was prized, both practically and culturally. Charles Armstrong cites a number of instances where knowing both French and Dutch was an advantage to an individual's career, and numerous scholars have pointed out the

extent to which this was increasingly considered the ideal in the administration of the Valois dukes of Burgundy.¹⁴ Moreover, when Jean Molinet and Olivier de La Marche enthusiastically point out that George Chastelain is a native speaker of Dutch but writes fluently in French, they do so in terms that celebrate his competence in both languages.¹⁵ According to Molinet, Chastelain was ‘prompt en trois langaiges’ [eloquent in three languages].¹⁶ Estelle Doudet points out that this phrase is consciously ambiguous: while actually referring to the three Burgundian administrative languages of Latin, French, and Dutch, it implies that Chastelain was fluent in the three sacred languages of Hebrew, Greek, and Latin.¹⁷ Molinet is not simply expressing his admiration of an author who is able to write well in a language other than his own here; he is celebrating multilingualism as cultural capital. Chastelain is impressive not simply because he is skilled, but because he is a skilled multilinguist.

In doing so, Molinet draws attention to the importance of the third language of the Burgundian Netherlands, Latin. Latin was the language of the Church, of diplomacy, and of university education.¹⁸ It was the way in which the Burgundian state communicated with the outside world, but it was also a way in which it communicated internally. Charles Armstrong cites several cases where speakers of different dialects of Dutch had their correspondence translated into Latin in order to avoid ambiguity.¹⁹ In a world where much of the education was delivered by the Church and many of the opportunities for reading were either devotional or liturgical, being literate often meant knowing Latin. So, as in Norman England, there was a triad of languages, and speakers who mastered more than one could enlarge their vocabulary by employing borrowings from or switches into either of the others.²⁰

The analogy between Chastelain’s three languages and the three languages of scripture, however, hints that the poet was not unrestricted in the sorts of switches that could be made. In scriptural exegesis it was held that each of the divine languages had a different role to play in the revelation of God’s plan, and this attitude seems to be echoed in other medieval multilingual settings as well as in contemporary multilingual societies.²¹ Thus Schendl reports that most switches in Anglo-Norman texts take place between Latin, occupying the high status language position, and one of the two vernaculars, English or French, although there are also some instances of switching taking place between the vernaculars.²² The same is true of the poets studied here, where switches between the vernacular and Latin are more frequent than switches between the two vernaculars. However, this general picture can be refined to give a more detailed picture of the relative positions of the three languages in the Burgundian Netherlands.

Firstly, many scholars who have worked on the vocabulary of Chastelain and Molinet, the first two Burgundian *indiciaires*, official historians to the dukes, have commented on the amount of Dutch in their lexis.²³ Both writers are known for their verbosity and their use of recondite vocabulary. However, in both cases the use of rare words in Latin far exceeds their employment of the same strategy in Dutch. Because Dutch vocabulary is less common in French writers of the period,

it is seen as remarkable, but this should not allow us to overlook the fact that poets turn to Dutch much less frequently than to Latin. Moreover, Dutch borrowings and switches are used in a very specific set of circumstances. Firstly, they are found much more frequently in the prose than in the verse of the *indiciaires* and much more often in their chronicles than in their other works. In general these Dutch elements fulfil one of two functions, which can both loosely be described as ‘lending local colour’. Either they designate a local word for an item that is perceived as being characteristic of the place — a dyke or a dune in Chastelain’s chronicles; a boat, a bulwark, or again a dyke in those of Molinet²⁴ — or they quote words actually spoken on a particular occasion, as when Chastelain describes the crowd welcoming Charles the Bold into Ghent: ‘Et alors tout d’une voix crièrent contre-mont: Héé! Wille-comme! Wille-comme!, bienviagné, bienviagné monseigneur’ [And then with a single voice, they cried out, *Hey, Welcome! Welcome. Welcome, Welcome My Lord*].²⁵ In the first case, it appears that the Dutch word is used partly because the author has no other word with which to evoke a particular landscape. Dykes and dunes belong to the Dutch-speaking north, and so to describe this landscape a writer must use this language. The point is reinforced when we realize that these Dutch loan-words have entered the modern French vocabulary, indicating that they designate something for which there is no native word in French, or something that occurs much more frequently in Dutch, so that the Dutch word has been preferred.²⁶ Additionally, there are many more Dutch words in Chastelain’s and Molinet’s chronicles than would normally be the case in French because the chroniclers are writing about a society where objects are frequently named in Dutch. Doudet has pointed out that Chastelain often uses a phrase containing synonyms in Dutch and French, such as ‘doyens et hoefmans’ [deans and chief officers].²⁷ This allows the author to convey the cultural specificity of the society described, without sacrificing clarity to a francophone readership. It also, as Doudet suggests, places the chronicler on an almost ethnographic footing in his reporting, positioning him as a mediator between the netherlandophone subjects of his narrative and his francophone readers.²⁸ In addition, it allows Chastelain to display his verbal dexterity and the extent of his vocabulary.

When Chastelain quotes words spoken in Dutch, he creates an impression of verisimilitude. These were the words really spoken, he implies, and so this is a faithful account of what took place. Of course he could, and does, translate remarks, or paraphrase them in French, but conveying them in the original language lends colour to the account. It also has a rhetorical force, persuading the reader of the objectively factual nature of what is narrated. Perhaps poetry is not supposed to be factual in the same way, and this is one reason why Dutch words are much less in evidence in the poetry of both Chastelain and Molinet. Noël Dupire cites some instances in Molinet’s poetry, for example when he renounces beer drinking in favour of wine:

Fy de brassin, de queute, de briemart,
De foudrine, de cervoise et de let;
Fy de galant, de miel, de hacquebart,
D’amboursebier, de biere et citouillet
De ripauppé et de coqueplumet,

Fy de perré, d'ambours, de houppedalle,
 De cherise, de cidre, de goudalle
 Et de fontaine a tous abandonnee,
 Car desormés, pour mieux emplir me dalle,
 Je me tenray a la bonne vinee.²⁹

[Pooh to brew, to light ale, to Bremen's best;
 To sloe gin, to unhopped beer, and to milk;³⁰
 Pooh to muscat, to mead, to weak beer,
 To amber ale, to beer, and Bremen-style brews,
 To plonk and paintstripper;
 Pooh to perry, Hamburg's produce, and hoppy ale,
 Cherry beer, cider, heavy,
 And to the fountain that everyone can drink from;
 From now on, to better fill my throat,
 I'll stick to good vintages.]

Briemart, *hacquebart*, *amboursebier*, *ambours*, *goudale*, and we could probably add *houppedalle*: Molinet knows his beers, and names them using their Dutch names. This is the equivalent of the prose usage of Dutch, where a regionally specific word is used to give precision in the meaning (not just quality beer, but the sort of quality beer appreciated by Dutch-speakers). However, it is one of the rare instances where we find an evocation of regional specificity in francophone poetry, and therefore one of the rare cases where words are unambiguously and consciously borrowed from Dutch.

Elsewhere, we find both poets writing in French using words with generally Germanic or specifically Dutch roots, without much indication of whether they are considered as foreign loans. *Estrif* [strife], for example, was presumably sufficiently established in French by this stage for speakers to regard it as a native lexical element, though someone whose first language was Dutch, like Chastelain, might still recognize it as a cognate of *strijd*.³¹ His use of the rarer *estriyée* in a line in *Le Miroer des nobles hommes de France* might come from a desire to use a word form which was less recognizably related to Dutch.³² At the same time it might equally stem from exigencies of metre and rhyme: particularly since *estriyée* appears in the final rhyme position: 'Voit-on bien sourdre une dure estriyée' [we see a bitter struggle arise]. Similar considerations may be behind Chastelain's use of one of his few Dutch words in poetry, *remme* [cord], in the *Dit de verité*, where it appears in a rhyme position, rhyming with *baptême* and with the line that follows:

La où foy une, un fons et un baptême
 Un bers, un sang, un lien doit estraindre
 Et traire tout ensemble à une remme
 Là vient malheur qui les regnans achemme
 Et fait leurs cœurs enfroidir et refraindre.³³

[There where one faith, one font, and one baptism,
 One cradle, one blood, and one bond should draw together,
 Pulling all together with one cord,
 There comes misfortune, which shames rulers
 And cools and calms the ardour of their hearts.]

The rhyme-word *achemme*, which appears in the source as *schemme*, has caused some problems for Kervyn de Lettenhove, Chastelain's editor, partly because the meaning is not clear, but also because the line is hypometric, which suggests a faulty reading. The editor attempts to resolve the dilemma by emending it to *achesmer*, 'to decorate', whilst acknowledging that this does not seem to fit the context of the stanza. It seems much more plausible that it is also a Dutch loan-word, formed from *schemen*, a cognate of the English 'shame'. The significance of two Dutch words in prominent final rhyme positions could be interpreted as conveying some sort of message, perhaps located socio-linguistically, about the shaming of rulers; but we must be cautious, since phonological similarities mean that once one loan-word is employed in a final position, loans from the same language may present themselves to complete the rhyme.

Whilst interesting, these momentary switches into Dutch pale into insignificance when compared with the extensive recourse that both Chastelain and Molinet have to the vocabulary of Latin. Latin loan-words make up by far the greatest element in the lexical innovation of both poets, and Molinet in particular employs extensive shifts between Latin and French in macaronic poems. A favourite technique of Molinet's is to build up a Latin prayer, acrostic-style, using the first word of a verse or stanza in Latin, while the rest of the poem is in French.³⁴ The poem can thus be read in two ways: vertically it makes up one sentence in Latin, but horizontally, the Latin and the French interact to convey a message that in most cases makes sense. I say in most cases, because it is sometimes possible to read a line without reference to the meaning of the Latin, either because the French text does not integrate the Latin or because it repeats it. Examples of both can be found in the poet's *Pater Noster*, which opens with the couplet:

Pater noster, vray amateur,
Nostre Dieu, nostre plasmateur³⁵

[*Our Father*, true lover,
Our God, our creator]

and later contains the lines:

Adveniat regnum tuum
Et si fort nous esvertuon
Que gagnons le regne des cieulx. (vv. 57–59)

[*Thy Kingdom come*
And may we deploy all our strength
So that we attain the kingdom of heaven.]

In the second example, the French even seems to contradict the Latin, in that Molinet envisages the believer as ascending to heaven, while the prayer speaks of heaven coming to the believer. In any case, lexically and syntactically, the sentence does not integrate the Latin and the French, even though the switch into French takes place at a conjunction, which implies continuity. If the definition of code-switching requires that the switch take place within the same conversation, does an incoherent or unlinked set of statements, in which different languages mark

different perspectives, really qualify as an example of code-switching? The first example is even more complex, in that the terms that follow the Latin, *amateur*, *Dieu*, and *plasmateur* (the last a learned borrowing from Greek, meaning ‘creator’), translate and gloss the Latin phrase *Pater noster*. A father is someone who creates and loves, and this is why God is called a father. There is no doubt here that the subject-matter is the same, since it is repeated. Molinet uses three nouns to translate the Latin and to explain what it means, but is this code-switching? One could argue that it is not, because it is not necessary to understand the Latin to understand the poet’s message and so the poem is not fully bilingual. However, this sort of practice, where a switch contains the same information as has previously been enunciated in the other language, is typical of modern oral code-switching and in fact constitutes one of the most common types of switches in the language of bilingual speakers.³⁶ We have seen that Chastelain performs the same sort of switch in Dutch when writing prose, giving the local Dutch term and its French equivalent. Given the status of Latin as the specialist language of religion, we can argue that in this case too Molinet’s switch performs the same function: allowing the poet to use the specialist term (regional when he uses Dutch, ecclesiastical when he uses Latin) and explain its meaning, or how he understands its meaning, in French.

Elsewhere in *Pater Noster* we find Molinet switching from Latin to French without providing a translation. So, for example:

Debitoribus nostris sont
 Les cinq sens naturels qui font
 A l’ame trop grant vitupere. (vv. 183–85)

[*Those who lead us into temptation* are
 The five natural senses which do
 Very great damage to the soul.]

Lexically this makes sense: the Latin words have the same meaning in the sentence as they would if they were French words. However, Molinet does not respect the grammatical quality of the Latin element, which is dative — an indirect object, governed by the preceding verb *dimittimus*. By making it the subject of the verb *être*, he demonstrates that it is the meaning of the words used in the switch which is significant, not their form.

A comparison with a poem by Anthonis de Roovere, also called *Pater Noster* and also operating under the same macaronic constraint, reveals a similar picture. In De Roovere’s poem, the Latin elements are more closely grouped, since he places a Latin word at the beginning of every verse, rather than a word or two at the start of each stanza, as Molinet does. Nevertheless, we see the same sorts of switches that we found in Molinet — and others that we did not see. The first stanza serves as an illustration:

Pater eewich sonder beghinsel
 Noster zijdy sonder insel
 Qui ons gheeft dat eewich leuen
 Es dat wy die sonden vergheuen
 In aerdtrijk worden Marien sone

Celis/Schepper vanden throone
 Sanctificetur eewelijcke
 Nomen Jesu op aerdtrijcke
 Tuum is al luyde oft stille
 Adveniat Heere my uwen wille
 Regnum naer dit corte leuen
 Tuum moet dy mijnder sielen gheuen
 Fiat lieue Heere Godt
 Voluntas te behoudene v ghebodt.³⁷

[*Father* eternal without beginning
Ours be you without end
Who grants us, that we might live forever
Art so we forgive sins
On earth become Mary's son
In Heaven creator of the throne
Hallowed be eternally
The Name of Jesus on Earth
Thine is everything, whether loud or quiet
May it come, Lord, your will to me
The Kingdom after this short life
Of yours may you give my soul
Be done, dear Lord God
Your Will, to keep your command.]

Here, there has been a greater effort to respect the grammatical quality of the words used, and not just their lexical meaning. *Celis*, for example, seems to retain the sense of the preposition *in*, providing a contrast between the earthly and the heavenly domain in De Roovere's text. There are other complexities too, not seen in Molinet's poem. The way that De Roovere has chosen to impose the acrostic constraint, as a single-word element at the start of each verse, means that he is obliged to use words from all grammatical categories, such as relatives like *qui* and prepositions like *in*, which Molinet subsumes into phrases that he deploys as a single element. By contrast, De Roovere takes these individual words and employs them just as he would their Dutch equivalents. Indeed, the meaning of *in* is identical in Dutch and in Latin, and so the switch site here is blurred: it is not clear where Latin ends and Dutch begins. The use of *in* in the initial position of the verse signals that it must be understood as a Latin word, since all words in this position are Latin, but nothing else about the word indicates that a switch has taken place. In the previous verse, *Es* is simultaneously the second person singular present indicative of the Latin verb *esse* and a Dutch relative, part of 'es dat'. Depending on whether the reader is reading vertically, the Latin prayer, or horizontally, the Dutch poem, the element has a different meaning. Later in the poem, the Latin conjunction *et* stands for the Dutch pronoun *het* ('et is tijd') with similar effect.

Like Molinet, then, De Roovere makes intelligent and innovative use of switches between Latin and the vernacular to achieve poetic effect. The fact that both poets do this, is further testament — if any were needed — to the formal influence of poems in one vernacular on those in the other. However, as in Norman England,

regardless of the influence of French poetic *form* on Dutch and vice versa, most of the *linguistic* switches take place between the vernacular and Latin. We can conclude that this is because, in the Burgundian Netherlands as in Norman England, Latin was the high-status literary language. However, we should also note that this is especially true in devotional poems, where the influence of church Latin might be expected to be strongest. When Molinet writes about drinking, for example, he uses a little Dutch.

By contrast, De Roovere employs French borrowings more frequently. Or rather, he uses words with a Romance origin that have most likely come via French. It is sometimes difficult to tell whether such elements are to be considered French or Latin words. The ‘imagyen’ of the *Droom van Roovere* is a case in point. The palatalization of the *g* suggests that it has entered Dutch via French, rather than coming straight from Latin *imago*. The nativization displayed in the addition of the Dutch plural suffix, suggests that it is being treated as a borrowing rather than a switch: De Roovere does not switch into French when discussing the statues he sees in his dream, but he uses French vocabulary to describe them. Like Chastelain, we find him using groups of such borrowed words in rhyme positions, particularly in this poem, in clusters of French-inspired rhyme-words, ‘ymageneringe’/‘arguwerynge’, ‘Vysieren’/‘Obedieren’.³⁸ This last seems directly borrowed from Latin, since it contains the etymological *d*, but it may be a learned back-formation comparable to the large number of etymological letters being reinserted into French words in the period. There are other words in De Roovere’s vocabulary, for example *tyrannen* (v. 38), which are spelled in a way that reflects their etymology (the *γ* appearing as in Greek) but where the meaning demonstrates awareness of the French usage, where it is exclusively applied to violent leaders. We cannot measure the contribution of the scribe to such decisions but it is surely significant: the *γ* may have been used to create a visual impression on the page, or to remove ambiguity, or the scribe may have had a greater — or lesser — awareness of etymology than the poet, and may have therefore opted for a particular orthography which may not have been that of the poet. Such examples illustrate how hard it is to disentangle French from classical borrowings in De Roovere’s poetry. This reflects the linguistic similarity of French and Latin, of course, but also the similarity in status, since De Roovere turns to both when looking for a specialist word, particularly in the lexical field of religion.

Context is clearly very important here: De Roovere’s borrowings are much more unequivocally Latin in his macaronic devotional poems, much more influenced by French when he is writing about the death of the duke and the reaction surrounding the court. Molinet and Chastelain use numerous Latin borrowings, but Latin switches also occur mainly in devotional poetry. Dutch borrowings and switches occur in prose or very occasionally in poems describing everyday life. The two vernaculars of the Burgundian Netherlands, therefore, do not occupy the same place in the literary culture, even though all our poets have the linguistic resources to draw on both. Dutch appears in a French context only where it describes the environment and practices of the Dutch-speaking populace. This is not often

considered a proper subject for poetry, and so recourse to Dutch in French poetry is rare. French is the principal language of the court, to some extent the language of literature, and is a vehicle for Latin vocabulary in Dutch. It appears in some Dutch-language poetry but is often substantially nativized. For poets writing in both French and Dutch, Latin is the high-status language; and it is to Latin, rather than to either of the vernaculars, that they turn for preference.

Notes to Chapter 2

1. 'Decorated with letters engraved in every way, and also diverse images', Anthonis de Roovere, *De gedichten*, ed. by J. J. Mak (Zwolle: Tjeenk Willink, 1955), pp. 351–59 (p. 352). All translations are my own.
2. For an exploration of interlinguistic formal influences, see Oosterman, 'Tussen twee wateren zwem ik'.
3. Sarah G. Thomason, *Language Contact: An Introduction* (Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2001), p. 132.
4. Shana Poplack, 'Sometimes I'll Start a Sentence in Spanish *y termino en español*: Toward a Typology of Code-switching' [1980], in *The Bilingualism Reader*, ed. by Li Wei (London: Routledge, 2000), pp. 221–56.
5. Herbert Schendl, 'Syntactic Constraints on Code-Switching in Medieval Texts', in *Placing Middle English in Context*, ed. by Irma Taavitsainen and others (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2000), pp. 67–86.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 78.
7. Suzanne Romaine, *Bilingualism*, 2nd edn (Malden: Blackwell, 1989).
8. Donald Winford, *An Introduction to Contact Linguistics* (Malden: Blackwell, 2003), pp. 37–39. The research referred to is reported in Jeanine Treffers-Daller, 'Borrowing and Shift-induced Interference: Contrasting Patterns in French-Germanic Contact in Brussels and Strasbourg', *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 2.1 (1999), 1–22.
9. For etymological information relating to Dutch, see the *Geïntegreerde taal-bank*, combining the *Oudnederlands woordenboek* (2009), the *Vroegmiddelnederlands woordenboek*, the *Middelnederlandsch woordenboek*, the *Woordenboek der Nederlandsche taal*, and the *Woordenboek der Friese taal*: Instituut voor Nederlandse Lexicologie, *De geïntegreerde taal-bank*, <<http://gtb.inl.nl>> [accessed 9 July 2014]. The *Vroegmiddelnederlands woordenboek* gives the etymology of *image* as Vulgar Latin through French, with the earliest use attested in 1285. The *Dictionnaire étymologique de l'ancien français* lists *image* as a word appearing in the early eleventh century, also from Latin: <<http://www.deaf-page.de>> [accessed 9 July 2014].
10. Anthonis de Roovere, *Rethoricale wercken van Anthonis de Roovere, Brugghelinck, Vlaemsch doctoore ende gheestich Poete*, ed. by Eduard de Dene (Antwerp: Jan van Ghelen, 1562), fols a2^v–a3^r: 'maer een idiotz ende simpel leeck ongheleert ambachsman was, niet hebbende dan zijn vlaemsche ingheboren lanttale oft spraecke' [[he] was merely an uneducated man, a simple unschooled lay craftsman, possessing only the Flemish language or speech of his native land].
11. A complete transcription of De Dene's 'Foreword' can be found in 'De *Chronike van den lande van Vlaendre*: Studie van het handschrift en uitgave van f^o 148v. tot f^o 415v', ed. by Simon Vandekerckhove, 2 vols (unpublished thesis, University of Ghent, 2007), 1, 66–67.
12. Johan Oosterman, 'Oh Flanders, Weep! Anthonis de Roovere and Charles the Bold', in *The Growth of Authority in the Medieval West*, ed. by Martin Gosman, Arjo Vanderjagt and Jan Veenstra (Groningen: Forsten, 1999), pp. 257–67.
13. Oosterman, 'Tussen twee wateren wateren zwem ik'.
14. Armstrong, 'The Language Question in the Low Countries'; Degroote, 'Taaltoestanden in de Bourgondische Nederlanden'; Luc Hommel, *Marie de Bourgogne ou le grand héritage* (Brussels: Goemaere; Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1951), pp. 154–56. See also Dirk Schoenaers's contribution to this volume (Chapter 1).

15. La Marche describes Chastelain as 'natif flameng, toutesfois mettant par escript en langage franchois' [a Flemish native nevertheless writing in the French language] (Olivier de La Marche, *Mémoires*, ed. by Henri Beaune and Jean d'Arbaumont, 4 vols (Paris: Société de l'Histoire de France, 1883–88), I, 14).
16. Molinet, *Chroniques*, ed. by Doutrepoint and Jodogne, II, 593.
17. Doudet, *Poétique de George Chastelain (1415–1475)*, p. 121.
18. For an exploration of the significance of the universities in the Burgundian administration, see Francis Rapp, 'Universités et principautés: les états bourguignons', in *À la cour de Bourgogne: le duc, son entourage, son train*, ed. by Jean-Marie Cauchies (Turnhout: Brepols, 1998), pp. 51–65.
19. Armstrong, 'The Language Question in the Low Countries', p. 190.
20. Schendl, 'Syntactic Constraints on Code-Switching in Medieval Texts', especially pp. 78–80.
21. Irvén M. Resnick, 'Lingua dei, lingua hominis: Sacred Language and Medieval Texts', *Viator*, 21 (1990), 51–74.
22. Schendl, 'Syntactic Constraints on Code-Switching in Medieval Texts', p. 79.
23. For instance, Kenneth Urwin, *Georges Chastelain: la vie, les œuvres* (Paris: André, 1937), p. 87: 'Le flamand exerçait une influence considérable sur le français, surtout dans la région que connaissait notre auteur. Des mots d'origine néerlandaise furent très employés'.
24. Georges Chastelain, *Œuvres*, ed. by Joseph Marie Bruno Constantin Kervyn de Lettenhove, 8 vols (Brussels: Heussner, 1863–66), IV, 27; VI, 87; I, 71. Noël Dupire, *Jean Molinet: la vie — les œuvres* (Paris: Droz, 1932), pp. 241, 254; see Molinet, *Chroniques*, ed. by Doutrepoint and Jodogne, II, 316; I, 31; I, 41.
25. Chastelain, *Œuvres*, ed. by Kervyn de Lettenhove, v, 269.
26. The *Trésor de la langue française* gives no synonym for *dune*, but gives *levée* as a synonym for *digue*, adding that it is much rarer than the word derived from Dutch: <<http://atilf.atilf.fr/>> [accessed 9 July 2014].
27. Chastelain, *Œuvres*, ed. by Kervyn de Lettenhove, II, 223.
28. Doudet, *Poétique de George Chastelain (1415–1475)*, pp. 127–28.
29. Jean Molinet, 'Response a Anthoine Busnois', in *Faictz et dictz*, ed. by Noël Dupire, 3 vols (Paris: Société des Anciens Textes Français, 1936–39), II, 798–801 (vv. 81–90). This poem is discussed in Adrian Armstrong, 'Boire chez (et avec) Molinet', in *Jean Molinet et son temps: Actes des rencontres internationales de Dunkerque, Lille et Gand (8–10 novembre 2007)*, ed. by Jean Devaux, Estelle Doudet, and Élodie Lecuppre-Desjardin (Turnhout: Brepols, 2013), pp. 237–48 (p. 241).
30. The *Dictionnaire du moyen français* lists *let* only as a variant spelling of *lait*, so I have translated accordingly. See ATILF CNRS/Université de Lorraine, *Dictionnaire du moyen français*, 2012 version, <<http://www.atilf.fr/dmf/>> [accessed 9 July 2014].
31. Frédéric Godefroy, *Dictionnaire de l'ancienne langue française et de tous ses dialectes du IX^e au XV^e siècle*, 10 vols (Paris: Vieweg, 1880–1902), III, 652–53, lists many examples of the word from before 1300.
32. Chastelain, *Œuvres*, ed. by Kervyn de Lettenhove, VI, 204–15 (p. 208). *Estrivée* also appears in the *Dictionnaire de l'ancienne langue française*, and in the *Dictionnaire du moyen français*, though in both cases with fewer cited examples. The words were clearly both in use, with *estrif* being more frequently employed than *estrivée*.
33. Chastelain, *Œuvres*, ed. by Kervyn de Lettenhove, VI, 219–42 (p. 223).
34. This is not unusual in devotional poetry of the period. It is discussed, along with a variety of more complex forms, in Gérard Gros, *Le Poète marial et l'art graphique: étude sur les jeux de lettres dans les poèmes pieux du Moyen Âge* (Caen: Paradigme, 1993).
35. Molinet, *Faictz et dictz*, II, 491–98 (vv. 1–2). Further references are supplied in the text.
36. Winford, *An Introduction to Contact Linguistics*, p. 117. The study cited is Peter Auer, 'The Pragmatics of Code-Switching: A Sequential Approach', in *One Speaker, Two Languages*, ed. by Lesley Milroy and Pieter Muysken (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), pp. 115–35 (p. 120).
37. Anthonis de Roovere, 'Pater Noster', in *De gedichten*, ed. by Mak, pp. 216–18 (vv. 1–14).
38. De Roovere, *De gedichten*, ed. by Mak, pp. 351–59 (vv. 4–5, 29–30).