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Abstract

The origin of weak $u$ vocalism in verbal systems of the Romance language group has never been completely clear. The form is rare in C.L. and its extension is most usually attributed to an $-ui -utum$ correspondence which arose and spread in V.L., although the reasons for and mechanisms of this development have remained uncertain. Documentary evidence supporting the extension of weak $u$ forms starts with the time of the Roman Empire, but many gaps remain in our knowledge and these are inadequately filled by the sparse records of early Romance.

This study seeks to clarify the situation in two ways. Initially it returns to the Latin roots of weak $u$ development and, from this investigation, it appears that the $dedi$ form was at least as important as the $-ui$ verbs in causing the spread of $u$ vocalism. It then follows the many ramifications in the Romance tongues, taking a particular interest in regional and dialectal diversity. The synthesis of the varied phonetic and analogical repatterning available on a wide scale provides the basis for a more detailed investigation of the French, Franco-Provençal and Occitan zones.

Regarding the medieval state of development of the Gallo-Romance area itself, influential grammarians have usually based their conclusions primarily on literary sources in describing the language, although charters have not been excluded. Debate has centred on whether weak $u$ forms could have evolved phonetically from Latin and, if so, how, or on whether analogy played a decisive rôle. However, in recent years, much non-literary medieval material preserved in French archives has been published for the first time; and this study, while acknowledging the insights offered by former work, has taken full advantage of this new situation in order to undertake a re-examination of forms attested in Gallo-Romance, using charters as the primary source. The accuracy of information about chronological and dialectal variation is better assured by such a method and a frequency count is included as an additional indicator of influential forms. The examples thus collected and classified allow patterns and trends present in the language to emerge, and
these suggest that the progression of weak $u$ spread was gradual and uneven in Gallo-Romance, much of it probably being analogical. As a preterite form, $u$ vocalism obtained a foothold only in certain northern zones, although the power of these areas was such that its diffusion as part of the future national standard language was assured.
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General Introduction

The spread of weak-\textit{u} forms in the Gallo-Romance zone involved numerous modifications of the verbal paradigm. It is best understood as the regional expression of many such movements that affected Romance verbal morphology within the perfective systems. Menéndez Pidal calls verbal history "La fonética turbada por la analogía" (p. 231). These two major forces for change have been constantly at work in verbal patterning from the period of the Latin Empire to the present day. The first originates in habits of articulation, while the second comes into play because mutual interference tends to occur between the morphological devices available within the structure of any given language. In this work these changes will be examined from two complementary angles. Gallo-Romance developments will be related to restructurings which go back to the Latin period and affect numerous Romance languages. This will afford the basis for a more intensive investigation of regional creations using textual material from the early literary period of the Gallo-Romance zones.

The initial unity or differentiation of Latin has been much debated (Omeltchenko, 19–29). Certainly C.L. may give an illusion of stability, like any language with a literary canon, because it preserves a carefully elaborated written form and establishes a tradition that is resistant to change. However, the classical norm is not absolutely fixed (Lindsay, 503) and several more recent scholars have supported the view that regional variety evolved early in the spoken language, "la différenciation du latin parlé selon les régions et, en conséquence, les débuts de l'individualisation et de la formation des divers idiomes romans remontent jusqu'au IIe siècle de notre ère, sinon encore plus haut" (Straka, 245). It is useful to bear in mind that whatever differentiation arose, the written norm remained as a stabilizing and unifying factor for many centuries.

When change affects only lexical items, it often develops untrammeled. However, verbal morphology is far less flexible. Apart from the lexeme contained in the base, the
verbal form may include markers of time or aspect and of person. These abstract markers are patterned to show relationships and are transferable from one verb base to another within any given system, e.g., Fr. volurent, valurent (C.L. voluerunt, valuerunt). Their very constancy serves to make them recognisable, so that once usage has become fixed, patterns as a whole only modify slowly and variants may co-exist for hundreds of years. When these fall within the scope of written records, their behaviour can be observed. This study, by means of a limited sample, traces the evolution of u vocalism within the ère, ère conjugations of C.L., the Romance languages, and more particularly the Gallo-Romance group of tongues. The changes which already affected the perfective systems of Latin itself lay a foundation for a brief survey of development in both western and eastern Romance languages. This has been included so that the continuity and originality of the Gallo-Romance system may both become more readily apparent. However, the main part of the work concentrates on the examination of the earliest Gallo-Romance literature and charters in an effort to shed further light on the history of weak- u vocalism contained in their verbal forms. During the early literary period, language was relatively uncontrolled by a norm in these territories and variations are common.

En ancien français . . . un écrivain . . . était en droit d'utiliser à peu près librement en fait d'expressions et de constructions toutes les virtualités incluses dans la morphologie. . . . Ce fait n'était possible qu'à une époque où la langue fonctionnait en dehors du contrôle des grammairiens. (Wagner, 46).

There is a certain tension between spontaneous growth on the one hand and stylized control on the other, particularly in the French dialects, but both these factors can contribute to an understanding of the mechanisms by which - u vocalism spread in Gallo-Romance.
1.1 LATIN – BASIC STRUCTURES

Classical Latin has been taken as the starting point in this work because it is conveniently standardized and can provide a point of comparison from which to begin. This choice in no way implies that any particular Romance form developed from a specific Classical Latin form. In the literary language, the perfect was expressed by various morphological possibilities. These could occur in verbs as a regular or predictable feature for the class or they could be irregular, that is unpredictable from the infectum and infinitive.

Of the regular types –avi and –ivi occur in conjugations I and IV respectively, the v component providing the mark of the perfective. Stress occurs on the flexion, so that these types are said to be weak. In the II conjugation u distinguishes the perfect of the regular –ui type, while the III conjugation uses x (or s), also known as the sigmatic, for its regular formation.

Both these groups have a paradigm with alternating stress, so that in P.1., P.3. and P.6. the root bears the tonic accent. However the II and III conjugations also contain a host of irregular verbs, some of them with irregular stems, such as the reduplicated type (cecidit, or the long vowel type (lēgi). Clearly there are two basic divisions which can be made:

a) flexional stress
b) stem stress

Within the second group, the root may be:

a) identical to the infectum, e.g., monet, monuit
b) different from the infectum, e.g., cadit, cecidit

Like the weak perfects in –vi (a) does not have a differentiated radical. Type (b) arises
from the inherited forms of Indo-European which had, "un thème bâti directement sur la racine verbale, indépendamment de l'infectum" (Ernout, 295–6). This vestige of a former system supplied Latin with reduplication and vocalic alternation as ways of forming the perfect. Meanwhile, yet another I.E. form, the aorist sigmatic, was adopted into the Latin system as a preterite. As Latin evolved, various attempts were made to regularize these diverse forms insofar as they were experienced as anomalies within the language. So, for example, the general movement towards the abandoning of reduplicated forms can be discerned as early as the second century B.C. (Lindsay, 503). Remodellings of various sorts continued throughout the Imperial era. The realignments of the perfects in the ère and ère conjugations can be traced to their lack of homogeneity. The C.L. distribution in grammars is based on forms of the infinitive and infectum (Väänänen, 135). However, since this does not automatically correspond to a grouping in the perfectum, confusion is likely to arise.

1.2 V.L. CHANGES

The Romance languages show divergent developments from Latin (Williams, 11) whether classical or vulgar is taken as the starting point. The latter is rather difficult to define (Väänänen, 3) but for practical purposes can be used as a label to classify anything which departs from the standard literary form. Initially we will note changes which affect a wide area.

1.21 CHANGES IN TENSE STRUCTURE

"Words do not exist in isolation in a speaker's mind," says Palmer, "but cluster in associational groups. All members of such a group will tend to uniformity of syntactical behaviour" (Palmer, 284). This remark can be applied equally to morphological behaviour. The Latin perfects were far from unified and this caused redistribution of forms when confusion arose regarding the category to which a verb should belong.
However, Palmer's comment draws attention to a wider question. Not only were new identities established within the paradigms, but also the role of the paradigms themselves was in flux. The relationships between tenses and forms was modified even during the period of the Empire. In C.L. an aspectual differentiation had been maintained within the verbal system. This is illustrated in Table 1. The phonetic changes which came about during the V.L. to Romance period caused the system to break down. For example, haberem, habuerem and habuerim became so similar in pronunciation that they fell into disuse (Brunot, 86). A new system evolved in which the basis of grouping was connected with time (Väänänen, 131).

Table 1: Changes in the C.L. Tense System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mood</th>
<th>Imperfective</th>
<th>Perfective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>habeo</td>
<td>habui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Pres. Ind.)</td>
<td>(Perfect)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative</td>
<td>habebo</td>
<td>habuero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Fut.)</td>
<td>(Fut. Perfect)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>habebo</td>
<td>habueram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past</td>
<td>habebam</td>
<td>habueram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Imp.)</td>
<td>(Pluperfect)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past</td>
<td>habeam</td>
<td>habuerim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pres./Fut.</td>
<td>(Pres. Subj.)</td>
<td>(Perfect Subj.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjunctive</td>
<td>habeerem</td>
<td>habuissem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Imp. Subj.)</td>
<td>(Pluperf. Subj.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

--- retained as past tense
--- sometimes retained

Within this past tense system, the C.L. forms for the perfect, imperfect and pluperfect subjunctive survived in all Romance zones, while the pluperfect retained a limited extension. Their precise meaning may vary from area to area.

Meanwhile, during the years when Latin was extending its frontiers, a new periphrastic tense became increasingly important. "Ou a eu recours pour indiquer l'aspect
"acquis" states Vaananen (p. 131) "à la périphrase formée de **habeo** + participe passé à l'accusatif." By the end of the Empire this had assumed the full status of a tense (E. Bourciez, 117). It tended to be in competition with the preterite as time went by, because both expressed rather closely related concepts. The past participle, with which the new compound tense was formed, was very actively involved in restructuring movements. In C.L. there was not necessarily a formal link between preterite and past participle, although this was not excluded either:

\[ \text{cecdi} : \text{caesum}, \text{rex} : \text{rectum}, \text{habui} : \text{habitum} \quad (\text{but risi} : \text{risum}) \]

In the Romance languages, some kind of formal identity may evolve in an attempt to consolidate group recognisability:

- **Fr.**\textit{ est} : \textit{eu}
- **Occit.**\textit{ agues} : \textit{agut}

although the actual feature chosen to establish the identity varies from language to language.

### 1.22 Changes within Paradigms

When we turn from the general verbal system to its individual parts, it is obvious that extensive changes took place at this level too. These can be indicated under two main headings:

- **a)** phonetic, e.g., \textit{ivi} > \textit{ii} \quad \textit{ui} > \textit{wi}
- **b)** analogical, e.g.
  1) \textit{sublátum} \quad \rightarrow \quad \textit{tóllitum}
      (remodelled on present stem)
  2) \textit{récpit} \quad \rightarrow \quad \textit{recipit}
      (stress change, Lindsay, 164)

### 1.221 Models of Phonetic Change

Many of the changes which occurred in Latin can be attributed to developments in stress patterning which favoured syncope. These began quite early, "Les philologues
datent l'accent d'intensité du 1er au 2e siècle de notre ère, mais il est probable que la tendance à substituer l'accent d'intensité à l'accent musical commence à se faire sentir dès la République.” (Matte, 68).

Often phonetic change may introduce diversity into paradigms which are differentially stressed. Thus, the unstressed u in pārui may develop to [w] in *parwi and be reinforced as in parvi (Italian v. Grandgent, 101), while pretonic u in parùsti may develop as in *parwisti and then be lost completely, as in Italian paresti.

Phonetic change usually affects most of the instances of a similar sound group during the time it is operative, e.g., unaccented u before a vowel --> w (Grandgent, 65):

\[ habuit \rightarrow a\beta \text{w}it : \text{eccum} \text{lst}a = \text{eccu} - \text{ista} \rightarrow \text{questa} [\text{kwesta}] \] (Italian).

1.222 MODELS OF ANALOGICAL CHANGE

b) Analogical change, on the other hand, tends to form or re-establish identities between groups which possess morphological markers, such as verbal paradigms. In principle analogy is possible when several markers are available to express the same function (Herman, 125). Thus:

cantabam

ba = imperfect (and this is the only Latin marker available except for eram, which is unlikely to replace ba since it is already in use as a pluperfect flexion). Analogical change is most unlikely, because no readily usable choice exists, but:

cantabam

m = P.I. in this context. However other P.I. markers exist in the Latin system, e.g.,
cant-o, cant-avi

Therefore o, i and m can all express the same grammatical category of P.I., increasing the chances of analogical exchanges.

Herman believes that languages often seek to express unity of grammatical category by morphological means, although success is not guaranteed. For example, French
restructured its perfect paradigm patterns, but failed to achieve unity, maintaining several irregular sub-systems. Analogy does not usually function by taking several old rules and welding them into one. Instead a single form is likely to spread out and invade others of the same grammatical class. The result is less variety, but increased recognisability for the group.

1.23 ANALOGICAL CHANGE IN V.I. PERFECTIVE FORMS

Actions of an analogical nature are very important in the history of the Latin irregular perfective forms. They include:

a) class change

b) stress change

1.231 CLASS CHANGE

It has already been stated that C.I. had multiple perfective markers. In the case of the preterites, these were of the following types:

1. amavi
2. delevi = flexional (or wk.) stress
3. audivi
4. mónui
5. réxi
6. cúcurri
7. véni
8. mórtuus sum (deponent)

The verbs with flexional (or weak) stress were completely regular in their formation. The AR and IR types proved particularly vigorous in most Romance languages and their successors are actively used to form new verbs (Väänänen, 135).

In Roman times, the regular class was capable of attracting verbs from the irregular group. Thus,
In these cases class change involves a simultaneous stress change, i.e., from strong to weak but affects only individual verbs, not a whole group. Within the strong forms, the range of variety was such that internal restructuring was not at all uncommon. Thus, class changes are already attested in V.L. writings:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{legi} & \rightarrow \text{legui} \text{ (CIL VIII, 20394).} \\
\text{bibi} & \rightarrow \text{bibuit} \text{ (CIL XII, 2040).}
\end{align*}
\]

These movements within the strong classes are somewhat unpredictable and may differ from one area to another. Although there has been a long-term tendency to replace irregular verbs by various weak formations in several Romance languages (e.g., Spanish, French, Occitan, Rumanian), some zones retain strong forms more readily (e.g., Italian, Sardinian). The preference is probably related to the general stress structure of the languages concerned.

1.232 STRESS CHANGE

However, a peculiarity of V.L. seems to have been the creation of a weak form based on the originally strong \textit{dare} compounds. In C.L. this type appear as \textit{crédidi}, \textit{vëndidi}, and there is evidence that the form spread, particularly to verbs with radicals in \textit{-nd}, by analogy with \textit{vëndidi}. Thus \textit{descéndidi} and \textit{abscóndidi} are attested in Latin authors in the first century B.C. (Väänänen, 143) where they replace C.L. \textit{descendi} and \textit{abscondi}, which were poorly differentiated from the present tense.

However, the outcome in the Gallo–Românce zone, as well as in Italy, suggests that the form of the simple \textit{dedi} replaced \textit{–didi} (Anglade, 294; Meyer–Lübke, 1895:331). The form is attested in V.L. and appears to be relatively early:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{battederit} & \text{ (Lex. Sal. 35: 4 cod 5, v. Väänänen, 143)} \\
\text{caderunt} & \text{ (Reichenau Glosses.) (shortened \textit{dedi} form)} \\
\text{crededi} & \text{ (Gregoire de Tours 6th C., v. Wahlgren, 21)}
\end{align*}
\]
perdedi (CIL III 8447, v. Väänänen, 143)

incendederit (Lex. Sal. 16:1 cod 2, v. ibid.)

reddedit (CIL IV 6464, v. ibid.)

videderunt (from Vulgate ed. Mk. XVI:14, v. Wahlgren, 22)

As a result of this stress change, the whole group joined the pattern of the weak conjugations.

1.24 STRUCTURAL CHANGE IN THE V.L. P.P.

When we turn to the past participle, the problem of restructuring is also quite complex. The rise of the periphrastic tenses increased the importance of this form. "All verbs had to have one," notes Grandgent (p. 146) "Whether C.L. afforded a model or not." The spread of the –útum/–ūtum past participles is of particular importance in this study, because the weak –ūtum form enjoyed a wide extension in the Romance languages and exerted a strong influence in the Gallo–Romance zone.

In C.L. there were weak participles, stressed on their thematic vowel, which corresponded to their conjugation:

- am-–a-tum
- del-–e-tum
- aud-–i-tum

and strong participles:

- II conj. mōn-–i-tum regular –ui and –didi type.
- III conj. crēd-–i-tum
- mis-–sum sigmatic and t type (common in C.L. III)
- vic-–tum

The strong groups are not mutually exclusive. It has already been noted that reduplicated
preterites could vary in older forms of Latin, e.g., *concredui* (Casina, 479, v. Dardel, 67). New participle forms could arise in V.L., e.g., *creduta* (CIL VIII, 15811).

Influences for remodelling could come from:

a) the *infectum*

b) the *perfectum*

c) the participle

d) the patterns of other verbs within either the strong or weak systems.

The principal types of change are:

1. Alignment to a regular weak category:

   *implicita* $\rightarrow$ *implicátum* (Väänänen, 144)

   *dómitus* $\rightarrow$ *domátus* (Väänänen, 144)

2. Alignment to another strong category (unusual):

   *spársum* $\rightarrow$ *spárturn* (Mourin 1975:120, Wahlgren, 92).

3. The creation of a new participle in -ítum or -útum

   *tólítum, credítum*

The reasons for change may be:

1. To supply a need in the case of a deficient verb:

   *vólítum, *pótítum

2. To eliminate a slightly "abnormal" form and/or create a correspondence between the preterite and P.P.:

   *sepeli(v)i* $: *sepelatóum* $\leftarrow$ *C.L. sepátum*

   *crevi* $: *crevítum* $\leftarrow$ *C.L. crétum*

   *solvi* $: solvítum$ $\leftarrow$ *C.L. solútum*

   *tuli* $: tulítum$ $\leftarrow$ *C.L. sublátum*

3. To replace an irregular stem:

   *tuli* $: sublatum$ $\rightarrow$ *tólítum*

4. To provide a characteristic weak form:
ATTESTED TYPES OF P.P. CHANGE

Various hypotheses exist concerning the creation of new participle forms. Mourin (1974:191-2) remarks that unless a word is attested it is very difficult to establish which forms do indeed go back to V.L. except on the basis of an irregular outcome in a Romance language. The number of attested forms is limited. However, the following exist:

- tultus (<-- tollitus) (CGL, Wahlgren, 13)
- solvitus (Leges Burgundionum 33,7, Wahlgren, 13)
- Valutius, Valutia (proper name CIL VI, 28315)
- Venitus (proper name CIL VIII, 9212)
- Volutius (Wahlgren, 20)
- Creduta (proper name CIL VIII, 15811, 15840)
- battutus (Wahlgren, 21)
- incenduta (Väänänen, 144)
- molutus (ibid., 144)
- pendutus (ibid., 144)
- reddutus (CIL VIII, 1700).

The evidence available suggests that in the earlier period of the Empire, there was no widespread movement towards weak forms in the traditionally strong verbs, although individual realignments could occur. However, it is reasonably certain that the strong -itum form enjoyed an initial extension (Mourin 1975:116-7). The outcome in various Romance languages supports this:

- *solvitum (Tuscan assolto, scioltò, Castilian resuelto)
- *volvitum (Tuscan volto, Castilian vuelto)
- *venitum (Sardinian bënnidu)
- *volltum (Sardinian bölflu)

However, it seems that this participle form was not very successful on a Pan-Romance
level, although some of its successors do still exist. Examples are more frequent in the Italian dialects and above all in Sardinian, where radical stress remained common. However, the *shtum form had the misfortune of becoming too similar to the *tum P.P. which was connected with the sigmatic.

"Le type -ltus portait dans la voyelle atone de la penultième la cause de sa propre extinction. À mesure que nous approchons de l'époque romane, cette voyelle s'efface, grâce aux lois de la syncope" (Wahlgren, 19). If one examines the -tum types of C.L. which are connected with -ui verbs, one discovers that they do not survive unless they modify their class, e.g., tentum --> * tenutum. Meanwhile, in individual languages, some verbs do show a tendency later to go to sigmatic forms when a participle evolved from (l)tum has survived:

*tollitum > tultus, tolitus (Väänänen, 222), > tolio (Italian, Grandgent, 154), pret. tolse (Meyer-Lübke 1895:372).
*móvitum > motto (Italian) --> mosso (Italian).
*sóvitum > (as)solto (Italian) pret. assolsi V.L. solsit OF. sout, sols, Occitan, sols.
*vólitum --> volto (Italian) pret. volsi
*vólltum --> tulosuto (Italian) pret. tulosi (Italian), vost (O.F.), I.S. vausist (O.F.)

These restructurings belong to individual Romance languages and some may be relatively late. They are common in the 13th C. The tendency goes back to V.L., however, since solsit is attested. The fact that the -tum P.P. was linked with the sigmatics could well have led to hesitations and re-alignments. In Sardinia, a satisfactory solution was found and the *ltum type was retained, although this could involve a restructuring of the radical to make it distinctive (v. 2.4). However, it seems highly likely that in other areas a new form was sought, and that the -utum P.P. was pressed into service. This participle originated in the C.L. III conjugation and belonged to a small group of verbs with thematic u, e.g., minuo - minui - minútum. Meyer-Lübke (1927:203) suggests that C.L. fututu(m) or V.L. battutu(m) might have been more popular models.
The flexional \( u \), added to verbs where \( u \) was non-thematic originally, acted as a distinctive past marker and dispensed with the need for a differentiated perfect radical.

1.25 **THE ORIGINS OF THE \(-UTUM\) P.P.**

The process by which the \(-utum\) form spread is not clear, but it was certainly adopted by the \(-ui\) and \(dedi\) class of verb. It has usually been assumed that the \(-ui\) class of verb caused the spread of \(-utum\) forms because a correspondence of the type \(h\acute{a}bui, hab\acute{u}tum\) occurred in V.L. (Meyer-Lübke, 1927:203). This may in fact be the case, but it is difficult to supply any evidence. Inscriptions show that exchange was possible between the \(-ui\) and \(dedi\) classes, which both shared a C.L. \(-ltum\) P.P.:

\[
\text{credutum} \quad (\text{CIL VIII, 9212}) \\
\text{batederit} \quad (\text{Väätänen, 143})
\]

Attested samples of \(-utum\) suggest it was strongly associated with both the \(-ui\) and \(dedi\) class, with possibly more coming from the latter formation in the V.L. period. When assessing the origin of the \(-utum\) spread, it is useful to consider:

a) stress patterning  
b) phonetic change  
c) the link between the preterite (strong person, weak person) and the past participle.

1.251 **STRESS PATTERNING**

The \(ui\) verbs originally had alternating stress patterning in the preterite. The changes in V.L. and their relationships to C.L. are illustrated in Table 2.

Because of their spelling, which differs from that of C.L., it is possible to collect examples of weak \(-d\acute{e}di\) and \(\acute{u}tum\) types from V.L. texts. This is not so for \(-ui\) and there is no concrete evidence that it ever evolved a weak \(u\) form in V.L., although it
Table 2: Stress Changes in the V.L. -ui, -didi Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preterite</th>
<th>P.P.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.L. strong</td>
<td>V.L. weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ui</td>
<td>-dédi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-didi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

may have developed one later in French and Rumanian. It seems unlikely that a uniformly weak stress was adopted anywhere during the Latin period, although Meyer-Lübke did suggest such a shift for Rumanian (1895:358). In recent times, this theory has been questioned by R. de Dardel, who attributes the developments in these two regions to analogical action and believes the u suffix forms of the perfect were strongly influenced by the -ítum P.P. (p. 31). Elsewhere, there is ample evidence of surviving strong forms, e.g., Castilian hube, Italian ebbe, Occitan ac, O.F. ot/out, Spanish ove, etc. However, it is possible that the presence of a liquid or nasal on the end of the radical blocked a u sound onto the flexion (Fouche, 310-11) and that this helped an alignment to weak stress for verbs which fell into this category, e.g. parut. While such a form is perhaps applicable to French, and even this is debated (v. 3.5124), there is no evidence for such a preterite type in V.L. However, it is true that some attested -útum participles do belong to verbs with intervocalic liquid or nasal for the -ui class, e.g., Valuta, Volutius, Venetus (v. 3.5123). Of course, weak forms are well attested in the -dedi preterites, e.g., condedi CIL III, 9546; tradedet CIL III, 9601. Dedi originated in the C.L. III conjugation and this is also the source of the C.L. -útum P.P. with its thematic u vowel, which corresponds to the thematic patterning of the regular -átum, ítum types. The Latin -dedi type was reduced to -det (Väänänen, 143) although the dating of this is uncertain. At this point it could well have paralleled the -ai, -ii forms in the speaker's mind, thus facilitating the acceptance of a correspondence:
Although the thematic vowel $u$ does not match $e$, the weak patterning is present and the advantage of $u$ is that it is well differentiated from $a/i$. The thematic vowel $e$, as found in *delēvi*, tended to be lost, $e$ being naturally more unstable than $u$ for phonetic reasons.

1.252 PHONETIC EVOLUTION

At the phonetic level, the development of the *hābūi, *habūtum* correspondence must be supposed to have occurred early, maybe even from the first century A.D. onwards, during the period when $-$u$ was vocalic. Phonetic modifications due to stress would be likely to blur this relationship, e.g., *hāβwi, habūtum*. Similarly, in the weak forms, whether [w] was maintained or discarded (Fouché, 312–3), the type *habisti $\rightarrow$ avesti* (Italian) or *habwisti $\rightarrow$ awis* (Walloon) does not really match *habūtum* either.

1.253 INTERACTION OF PRET. AND P.P.

It has already been mentioned that the formal link between preterite and P.P. is not constant in C.L. However, the Romance languages may reinforce this relationship. The behaviour of the verb *solvēre* illustrates problems which can arise connected with both phonetic development and the establishment of a preterite–P.P. link. *Solvēre* may have two Latin preterite forms. *Solvī*, the C.L. form, is usually considered disyllabic. Thus "Seu soluit crines, fuis decet esse capillis" (Tibullus III, 8, l. 9) could be either disyllabic or trisyllabic, but is usually treated as the former. However, instances arise when there is no choice and the trisyllabic reading must be accepted, e.g., "Quod zonam soluit diu ligatam" (Catullus, lib, 1. 3). Fordyce comments, "soluit: the trisyllabic value is not an artificial diaeresis but the original" (Catullus, Commentary p. 92). The C.L. *solvi* illustrates the tendency of *ui* to evolve phonetically to [wi] (cf. Appendix Probi, *vacui non vaqui*, Väänänen 46). The presence of *solui* with trisyllabic value recurs much later in the fifth
century A.D., when it is condemned by the grammarian Consentius, "Num ecce nonne videtur per diaeresin facere barbarismum, qui, ut dicat solvit, quod est disyllabum, dicit soluit?" (Ars Consentii, Kiel, vol. V 392, 35). As this verb was derived from sé luo, u was originally a thematic form for the verb and the C.L. P.P. was -utum. In composition the u evolved to v in C.L. and a corresponding P.P. *sólvitum was created (v. 1.241). However, it has been noted that -útum became confused with -tum, which usually accompanied a sigmatic. This is a likely motivation for such analogical change as solserit, solserunt, which probably dates from at least the sixth century (Lex Salica LVIII: 3, v. Wahlgren, 13).

It is possible that some of these variations were regional. However, the vacillations of solvère are reflected in the behaviour of several Romance languages and call for the following observations:

a) A link may be established between the preterite and past participle by restructurings which either form may initiate:

\[
\begin{align*}
solvi & \rightarrow *solvitum \\
\text{solsit} & \leftarrow *\text{sol(vi)tu(m)}
\end{align*}
\]

b) This verb actually lost its -utum P.P. as did volvo (Italian, volsi : volto). Probably the -utum type had not attained widespread popularity when this change occurred. It seems likely that some motivation other than a mere ui - utum correspondence was needed in order to trigger change in other classes.

1.26 REGIONAL VARIETY

In more general terms, the correspondence established between preterite and P.P. forms may vary from language to language, or region to region. Italian affords an example of diversity where several forms may survive in parallel to the present day:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{assolvei, assoluto} \\
\text{assolsi, assolto.}
\end{align*}
\]
Variety is characteristic of areas that have not imposed a rigid literary form. In the case of Italian, geminates, evolved from the -ui class, are also linked to the uto P.P., although there is no formal resemblance:

\textit{ebbe, avuto}

However, a formal correspondence may be preferred by some languages such as French:

\textit{mu, mut}

\textit{paru, parut}

The V.L. changes which have been outlined in the course of this chapter were continued and developed according to the genius of each individual Romance language.
2.1 INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY LIST

In this study a series of verbs has been selected to illustrate the behaviour of forms which undergo weak $u$ influence in the texts of the Gallo–Romance zone. While omitting any verbs which offer few examples, the list detailed in Table 3 includes a good selection of representative types. The development of these verbs will now be outlined briefly for the major Romance languages other than those of Gaul. The following points will receive special mention:

1. When do the earliest records of the language appear?
2. How does the language treat a) $ére, ère$ distinctions? b) the $didi$/$dedi$ type?
3. Does the language favour strong or weak forms?
4. Is a $-utum$ past participle adopted?
5. Do any weak $u$ forms appear in the preterite?
6. Does the language have a literary norm?

2.2 RUMANIAN: GENERAL VIEW

Balkan Romance remained in isolation from other Romance languages during its early formative period. No written records of its development exist prior to the 16th C. In more recent times, particularly during the 18th C. and 19th C., it has been strongly influenced by French (Rosetti, 144). The limited scope of records and lack of early evidence invites caution when evaluating Rumanian verbs. However, archaic forms may still be present dialectally and can afford valuable insights into verbal restructuring.

Of the 30 verbs in the study list of this work, 20 are represented by the same stem as in the Gallo–Romance zone. In Rumanian C.L. $scire$ was maintained instead of $sapère$, while the remaining 8 verbs have been ousted by non–Romance forms in this
area. The class distribution of the verb list appears in Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3: Verbs of the Principal Study List</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>C.L. I</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C.L. II</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ui type</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>habère</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>debère</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iacère</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parère</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>posse (V.L.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tenère</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>valère</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>valère (esse)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C.L. III</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ui or v type</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>solvere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>noscere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crescere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sapère</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C.L. IV</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ventre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vestre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deponent</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Irregular</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>s type</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>s type</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>movère</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manère</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>movère</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>didi/redup.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cadère</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mittère</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>cadère</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>mittère</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>noce sequentially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>currère</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>currère</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>credère</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>credère</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reddère</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vendère</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>reddère</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>vendère</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>-cipère</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>legère</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>rumpère</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>vivère</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>mori</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>tollère</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.21 REALIGNMENTS OF CLASS

The verbs of C.L. I have undergone restructuring in Rumanian and are irregular. Although belonging to C.L. II *maneo* had a C.L. preterite and P.P. in s. It has aligned to the strong sigmatic category in Rumanian. Similarly certain other verbs, with radical ending in *d* and which were assimilated to the C.L. III *dedi* type in French, go

---

1 *debu*, *valui*, *misi*, *cucurri*, -*cepi*, *sustuli*, *vestivi*, *vixi*. 
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rumanian</th>
<th>u type</th>
<th>s type</th>
<th>other</th>
<th>P.P.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>C.L. I</strong></td>
<td>(R = regional)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a sta (steti)</td>
<td>statui</td>
<td>stetii (R)</td>
<td>stat († statut)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a redă (reddidi)</td>
<td>redădui</td>
<td>redăi (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C.L. II</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a avea (habui)</td>
<td>avuséi</td>
<td>avuséi</td>
<td>avut</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a zăcea (iacui)</td>
<td>zăceui</td>
<td>zăceui</td>
<td>zăcut</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a părea (parui)</td>
<td>păreu</td>
<td>păreu</td>
<td>părut</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a putea (potui)</td>
<td>putui</td>
<td>putui</td>
<td>putut</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a țină (tenui)</td>
<td>ținui</td>
<td>ținui</td>
<td>ținut</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a vrăea (volui)</td>
<td>vrăui</td>
<td>vrăui</td>
<td>vrut</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a vedea (vidi)</td>
<td>văzui</td>
<td>văzui</td>
<td>văzut</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a rămâne (mansi)</td>
<td>rămâsei</td>
<td>rămâsei</td>
<td>râmás</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>irregular</strong></td>
<td>fui</td>
<td>fuséi</td>
<td>fost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a fi (fui)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C.L. III</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a cunoaste (cognovi)</td>
<td>cunoscui</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a crește (crevi)</td>
<td>crescui</td>
<td>crescut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a absolvi [late](solvi)</td>
<td>absolvii</td>
<td>absolvit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a cădeă (cecidi)</td>
<td>căzui</td>
<td>căzut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a crede (credidi)</td>
<td>crezui</td>
<td>crezut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a vinde (vendidi)</td>
<td>vindui</td>
<td>vindut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a alege [late](-legi)</td>
<td>aleséi</td>
<td>alés</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a muri (mortuus sum)</td>
<td>morii</td>
<td>morit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a rupe (rupi)</td>
<td>rupséi</td>
<td>rupt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C.L. IV</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a veni (veni)</td>
<td>venii</td>
<td>venit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a ști (scivi)</td>
<td>știui</td>
<td>știut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

to the sigmatic class in Rumanian on the basis of their C.L. P.P., which is of the s or t type.

e.g., (de)pinde (pependi, pensum) --> depinséi
toårce (torsi, tortum) -- > torséi (Lombard, 254–6).

In the C.L. III group, the strong –ltum participle originally provided common ground for the didi group and cognovi, crevi, solvi, which developed –ltum participles in V.L. (Mourin, 1975: 118).

Balkan Romance favours weak forms and extended the use of the –útum P.P. inherited from V.L. as a replacement for –ltum. It seems very likely that the –útum participle caused the wide spread of weak u in the preterite forms. For modern Rumanian, Pop notes, "Les formes du passé simple s'obtiennent d'habitude par la transformation du participe passé qui perd le t: tacut 'tu' tacui 'je tus'" (Pop, 253). The forms of P.I. căzúi P.P. cazut have undergone restructuring of the radical (Lombard, 258, Pop, 265). The strong P.P. rupt, which is part of a common group in Rumanian, has helped maintain a sigmatic form for rupse (Mourin, 1974: 203). The deponent morior aligns to the i type in this language zone. From the C.L. IV conjugation venire is maintained in the i type, but scire, which possesses an i infinitive, has developed u in the perfect and P.P. Mourin thinks that the behaviour of a sti has influenced by the form of the present stiu (1975: 129).

2.22 TYPES OF RESTRUCTURING

Like other other Romance languages, Rumanian has preserved the Latin –are and –ire conjugations. Individual verbs of the –ère and –ëre conjugations undergo some realignments, but, as groups, the two are not merged. Basically the –ère class provides the foundation for the Rumanian weak u type, while the ëre verbs continue a sigmatic category with strong stress on some persons. The weak persons of the sigmatic class adopt e as a thematic vowel. These verbs always have a strong past participle (Lombard, 252). Similarly the weak u preterites always have a matching past participle. Rumanian is one of the languages which have reinforced the formal resemblance linking the preterite and past participle.
In Balkan Romance the *dedi* group did not enjoy a separate development as in O.F., although it is attested in V.L., e.g., *reddedi* (CIL III, 7553), *perdedi* (CIL III, 8447). Those verbs with a C.L. -*itum* P.P. develop the -*utum* P.P. of V.L. and, together with most verbs of the *ève* class, produce a uniformly weak preterite stressed on the thematic *u*. When the C.L. participle of an *ève* verb was sigmatic, this caused alignment to the corresponding *s* class in Rumanian, e.g., *pensum, responsum*.

Overall, Rumanian has levelled irregular forms, so that few occur in the standard language, "Le roumain a montré une grande tendance à régulariser ses parfaits, et une préférence marquée pour les formes faibles" (E. Bourciez, 574). Rumanian chose to create a formal resemblance between preterite and P.P. and maintained a sigmatic form, with matching strong participle, while the weak *u* participle also corresponds to a weak *u* preterite with flexional stress. Some verbs possess two sets of forms, one standard and the other regional. Remodelling can be observed from the 16th C. (Rosetti, 102). These changes are basically a type of regularization. Pop states that the preterite paradigms "ne reflètent qu’en une mesure très réduite celles du latin . . . divers patois (dans le Banat) et les dialectes (aroumain et méglénite) conservent une bonne partie de ces anciennes formes" (Pop, 252). Regarding analogical changes, Mourin points out that thematic *e* was used mainly for weak forms of the sigmatic. Certain non-sigmatic verbs which have evolved an etymological *e* in Old Rumanian were realigned.

"La voyelle d’élargissement *e* des formes roumaines attestées ou attendues *vedesi* (< vidisti), *steteşi* (< stetisti) et *dedeşi* (< dedisti) a été remplacé par la voyelle *u*, et il en est résulté une modification vocalique du radical (*stătuşi, dăduşi*) ou des modifications vocalique et consonantique (*văzuşi*). (Mourin, 1974: 212)

Also affected are *feceşi* --> *făcuşi* (Pop, 252) and *vineşi* --> *venişi*. The strong past participle *fapt* (< factum), which is still available in zones using strong forms, developed a weak participle *făcut* by the 16th C. (Rosetti, 102). The weak P.P. *vazut* is already attested in a letter of 1521 (Rosetti, 112). However, widespread use of the new
analogical forms does not occur until later according to Rosetti (p. 153), "Les formes nouvelles, facui, facusi etc. zisei [analogical weak P.I. sigmatic, v. Mourin 1978: 32], dădui etc. s'imposent dans la 2ème moitié du 18e siècle et au début du 19e siècle." The analogical usage does not affect all areas. Thus Rosetti records the conservation of the strong Latin type fecit > fețe in Arumanian (p. 176). A avea and a fi are both irregular. Lombard (pp. 271–3) indicates these verbs take both weak u and sigmatic forms. However, Pop (pp. 273, 276) remarks that fusėi is the standard form for a fi, while avui is the usual type for a avea. Mourin states that the s paradigm for a fi derives from an old pluperfect (1975: 127).

2.23 RECENT TRENDS IN RUMANIAN

In referring to the so-called "strong perfects" Lombard admits, "En outre, l'accentuation actuelle de ces parfaits est en partie hésitante; certains Roumains disent 1. pusei 2. pusesi; et certains 4. puserâm etc." (Lombard, 253) If unchecked by grammarians, it looks as if a regularisation of the alternating accent would come about. In any case, this kind of evidence shows how the mechanisms of stress shift are at work in a present day situation. Some Rumanian speaking areas have replaced the preterite by the compound past in the modern language, but, as in French, dialectal usage may differ from the official standard, "L'aroumain a conservé l'aoriste (parfait simple) là où le dacoroumain emploie la forme composée" (Rosetti, 40). Dialectal forms provide useful evidence about the way some Rumanian verbs developed before they were affected by analogy. Of all the occidental languages, French is most likely to have influenced choices if restructuring occurred. (Rosetti, 144–5, 179).

---

3 The correct form is P.1 pusei P.4. puserâm
2.3 **ITALIAN: GENERAL VIEW**

The political history of the Italian peninsula has tended to militate against centralization and favour dialectal diversity. Early examples of Italian survive from the 11th and 12th C., but only become plentiful in the 13th C., when a real literary development begins. In Italian the ëre and ëre groups do not evolve separately into recognisable blocks. Instead there is a good deal of internal restructuring, which may result in the co-existence of multiple forms, these being distributed into four main types. All the verbs of the Gallo–Romance zone in the main study list possess counterparts in Italian. Table 5 indicates the distribution of C.L. forms into the various Italian categories.

2.31 **PRETERITE FORMS**

a) **Doubled Consonants**

Italian had a tendency to geminate a consonant which preceded u (Grandgent, 101), e.g., jacui > giacqui. The [w] sound itself was lost after a labial or dental, e.g., habuit > abbe --> ebbe. Ebbi, giacqui, tenni and volli represent original -ui verbs in the study list, but analogical restructuring has caused losses from and additions to this group. Geminates often, but not invariably, possess -uto past participles.

b) **The dedi type**

Numerous strong verbs of C.L. II and III accept analogical weak forms, -ei based on dedi, or -etti, evolved from stetti. These are always linked to an -uto particle, but may exist alongside alternate paradigms for the same verb:

pret. crese, creddi, credei, credetti P.P. creduto

pret. assolsi, assolvei, assolvetti P.P. assolto, assoluto

c) **The Sigmatic Type**

The stress pattern of Italian easily accommodates a strong paradigm, so that sigmatics thrive in the language. The class may attract -ui or dedi verbs, e.g.,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Italian</th>
<th>geminate</th>
<th>dedi</th>
<th>s/other</th>
<th>P.P.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>C.L. I</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stare</td>
<td>stetti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>stato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C.L. II</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avere</td>
<td>ebbi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>avuto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dovere</td>
<td>giacqui</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dovuto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>giacere</td>
<td>giacqui</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>giaciuto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>apparito</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>potere</td>
<td>† potti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>potuto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tenere</td>
<td>tenni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tenuto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>valere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>valso,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>volere</td>
<td>volli</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>valuto,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vedere</td>
<td>† viddi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>† volsuto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ri)manere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>irregular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>essere</td>
<td>fui</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>stato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C.L. III</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mettere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>misi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conoscere</td>
<td>conobbi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>messo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crescere</td>
<td>crebbi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>conosciuto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sapere</td>
<td>seppi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cresciuto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(as)solvere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cadere</td>
<td>caddi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>saputo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>corrente</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>credere</td>
<td>† creddi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>asolsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rendere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>assolto,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vendere</td>
<td>† ricevvi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>assoluto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ricevare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>venduto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leggere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ricevuto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C.L. IV</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>venire</td>
<td>venni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>venuto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vestire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>vestito,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>togliere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tolto</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*pars* modelled on *corsi* (Meyer-Lübke, 1927:200) and *resi* modelled on *presi.*
Sigmatics always have a corresponding participle in s or, occasionally -to.

d) Other Classes

Parui evolved to parvi in Italian, because u was reinforced and became v (cf. Walloon tinve, v. Fouché, 322). This originally had an accompanying -uto participle (Rohlfs, 1949:421 but the modern language has abandoned this for an analogical sigmatic form, probably modelled on correre (Meyer–Lübke, 1927:200). Modern vidi formerly possessed a geminate viddi (Dante, Inferno, VII, 20), which may warrant a reconstruction *vidui (Meyer–Lübke, 1895:383). However, a -ui preterite type does not occur in other Romance languages and the geminate is probably analogical. The viddi type is still very common dialectally (A.I.S., Map 1699).

2.32 ADOPTION OF THE -UTUM P.P.

Meyer–Lübke (1927:202–3) indicates that weak forms gain ground in the Italian past participle, although strong forms remain relatively common. The regular conjugations may account for some realignments:

crepato (≠ crepitus/crepui)

segato (≠ sectus/secui)

However, the most notable innovation is the spread of the -utum P.P. for Italian ere verbs (mixed C.L. ère, ère). Unlike French, Italian does not produce a weak perfect corresponding to verbs of the -ui class, but even so a weak participle in -uto is extremely common. Various explanations have been offered for the spread of the -utum P.P. Parallelism with a Latin -ui preterite or regularization on the pattern of thematic a/i vowels have been invoked as factors. Within the context of Italian, an additional motivation seems plausible. In speaking of the strong participle, Meyer–Lübke notes that the -tus type of Latin has not been preserved in Italian as well as the sigmatics. Since Italian usually differentiated -ui and s classes, it is possible that the language tried to
re-establish a difference between the \(-\text{\textl{\textus}}\) and \(-\text{\textl{\textus}}\) participles, which had become alike through syncope. Some verbs may have become inconveniently similar e.g., volere (\(\overset{\uparrow}{\text{volsi}},\) volsuto \(\rightarrow\) valli, voluto), volgere (volsi, volto), although these forms occur in the literary period and are not necessarily representative of tendencies in the early Empire. However, it is interesting to note that irregular \(-\text{\textl{\textui}}\) types of C.L. II with \(t\) P.P. are particularly subject to analogical re-alignment in Italian and several are lost, e.g., lugeo (luctum), doceo (doctum). Similarly the \(v\) type of perfect with \(t\) P.P. also realigns.

Table 6: Restructuring of Italian \(-to\) P.P.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C.L.</th>
<th>Pret.</th>
<th>P.P.</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>misceo - ui - mixtum</td>
<td>mescei</td>
<td>(-uto)</td>
<td>dedi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teneo - ui - tentum</td>
<td>tenni</td>
<td>(-uto)</td>
<td>geminate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>torreo - ui - tostum</td>
<td>tostai</td>
<td>(-ato)</td>
<td>are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>torqueo -orsi - tortum</td>
<td>orsi</td>
<td>(-so)</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moveo - movi - motum</td>
<td>mossi</td>
<td>(-so)</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cresco - crevi - cretum</td>
<td>crebbi</td>
<td>(-uto)</td>
<td>geminate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.321 SPREAD OF \(-\text{\textl{\textutum}}\) P.P.

These examples indicate that a problem existed, but that various solutions were adopted. What does seem clear is that the \(-\text{\textl{\textutum}}\) P.P. was felt to be incompatible with preterites of the \(-\text{\textui}\) and \(-\text{\textdedi}\) classes. Whatever the actual mechanism of its adoption, the \(-\text{\textutum}\) type is very well established in present day Italian.

a) From the Latin II conjugation, the form occurs with the \(-\text{\textui}\) class, i.e., avuto, giacuto, tenuto, valuto and voluto. The last two verbs also have sigmatic forms to match sigmatic preterites, although this is archaic for volere. Meyer-Lübke (1927:206) notes that, "Il volsuto del Cellini (e di vari dialetti) = volso + voluto." Like remazut in Occitan or remasus in French (\(v\). study list) this is a
mixed type which duplicates suffixes. It is paralleled by *vissuto* in the verbs from the III conjugation. As Meyer-Lübke remarks (1927:206), "Da notare *vissuto*, che è un compromesso tra la forma forte *visso* . . . e la debole *vivuto*. La qual forma *vivuto* ritorna, effettivamente, in testi ant. dell'Alta Italia, v. Ascoli, Arch. Glott. III, 268."

b) Amongst the -ui C.L. verbs in the study list, only *parere* does not have an -uto P.P. Meyer-Lübke believes that this is due to interference from *corso*, "che si trasse dietro *parso*" (1927:204). However, Rohlfs gives examples of *currutu* dialectally and indicates *paruto*, *renduto* and *legiutto* as old literary forms (1949, 421).

c) -ui verbs which have adopted weak dedi forms in the preterite naturally have the -uto participle, since this is normal for the dedi class, e.g., *dovuto*, *potuto*.

d) Although its modern preterite is irregular C.L. II *videre* also develops with the option of a weak participle *veduto*. The type is linked to a *videdi* form, with matching -utum P.P. (Wahlgren, 22, v. 1.232) and later with a geminate preterite. This verb may also have the visto type participle common in Occitan and this is frequent dialectally (A.I.S., Map 1250). It is accompanied by a sigmatic preterite in certain cases (A.I.S., Map 1699 - Sicily).

e) In the Latin IV conjugation -uto occurs in *venuto* (assimilated to the tenere pattern) and archaically in *vestuto*. Meyer-Lübke (1927:203) notes that †*vestuto* occurs dialectally in Tuscan at Lucca and that this corresponds to French usage. Grandgent furnishes additional information. "In Sicilian -uto is applied to all the fourth conjugation, and some of these Sicilian participles were not infrequently used by Tuscan poets, e.g., *vestuto* (Dante)" (p. 154). Sicilian was a literary prestige model in the 13th C. because of the influence of the court of Frederick II at Palermo.
Basically the \textit{-uto} participle occurs with both geminate and 
\textit{ei} forms. It is by no means restricted to C.L. II. In the C.L. III conjugation we find \textit{conosciuto}, \textit{cresciuto}, \textit{saputo}, \textit{caduto}, \textit{creduto}, \textit{venduto}, \textit{ricevuto} and \textit{vissuto}. \textit{Assoluto} is available as well as \textit{assolto}. The verbs represented obviously overlap those with weak \textit{u} participles in G–R, but the extension of \textit{u} is in fiercer competition with sigmatics, particularly noticeable in the case of verbs with Latin sigmatic participles, e.g., Italian \textit{diffendere} C.L. \textit{defendi}, \textit{defensum}. The \textit{-utum} types inherited from Latin may have been remodelled in Italian. This seems obvious in the case of \textit{cresciuto} or \textit{conosciuto}, where the present radical has been used. This view is supported by Mourin (1975:118), "De telles formes sont refaites dans chaque langue, tout comme les résultats si divergents que sont roum. \textit{cunoscut}, toscan, \textit{conosciuto} et ancien castillan \textit{conoçudo}.”

2.33 \textbf{RECENT USAGE IN ITALIAN}

The A.I.S. information about recent usage shows regional variety from verb to verb. No obvious overall trend emerges, although the \textit{-uto} type is very widespread in the compound past. Useful maps include:

\begin{itemize}
\item no. 1595 (creduto), no. 1617 (caduto)
\item no. 1652 (saputo), no. 1669 (potuto)
\end{itemize}

In the extreme south, the preterite was preferred by speakers, e.g., \textit{mi kadi} for \textit{mi è caduto} (no. 1617), \textit{sappi} for \textit{ho saputo} (no. 1652).

2.34 \textbf{CONCLUSIONS}

The characteristics which distinguish the Italian zone can be summarized as follows:

1. The literary norm is quite conservative. Devoto notes, (p. 235) "A persistent propensity for archaic latinate models." However, at a local level, great dialectal variety prevails and standardization has not been imposed in the Italian
peninsula.

2. In Northern Italy, as in France, the simple past has been more or less abandoned in the spoken language.

3. Where the preterite is maintained, a strong perfect can survive for both \(-ui\) and sigmatic types.

4. The \(\text{dedi}\) formation is very popular and, in conjunction with the \(-etti\) type, indicates a move in favour of weak forms.

5. A correspondence has been established in Italian so that sigmatic preterites are accompanied by a participle in \(s\) or \(i\), while other verbs of the \(ere\) conjugation have \(-uto\). Doublets may be created e.g., \(persi, perso, perdei, perduto\).

6. No formal identity is established between \(-uto\) and the preterites it accompanies.

2.4 MAIN FEATURES OF SARDINIAN

Sardinian, attested from the 11th C. onwards, has several dialect zones and this is reflected in the variety of spellings in Table 7. Literary Logudorese contains the most archaic features. In the old language, C.L. II and III did not develop separately and distinctively, but joined other irregulars in one class with strong stress on both preterite and participle. Like Italian, Sardinian evolved geminates in the irregular class. A correspondence arose between the preterite and P.P., but as in Occitan and Catalan a consonantal feature, often the gemination, was chosen to establish identity (Wagner, 33). As in Gallo–Romance, analogical restructuring may occur to reinforce the chosen link, e.g., \(\text{appit} : \text{appidu} : \text{appesi}\). Although there is ample evidence of strong participle forms derived from the \(-ltum\) type on the island, the weak \(-utum\) participle is absent. In many ways, early Sardinian is the antithesis of a move towards weak perfect identity based on \(u\) vocalism of the type which developed in Rumanian and French. The lack of an \(-utum\) participle is interesting and may suggest that the extension of \(u\) types does not
belong to the earliest period of Romance development and that it therefore never reached Sardinia. On the other hand, regional choices could have influenced the growth of Romance at an early date, introducing differentiation at a local level.

2.5 SPANISH AND PORTUGUESE: GENERAL VIEW

In the Iberian Peninsula Castilian, which was originally the dialect of the northwestern area around Burgos, was standardized as the official Spanish language by Alfonso X in 1253, in the wake of military conquests. Portuguese remained distinct on the western fringe and contains evidence of more archaic, phonetically evolved forms in some instances, though both languages show a marked tendency to analogical restructuring and regularization.

2.51 TENDENCIES IN IBERIAN RESTRUCTURING

Castilian is attested in glosses as early as the tenth century and these already contain indications that irregular verbs of C.L. II and III had aligned to the / i / vocalism of the C.L. IV paradigm, e.g., decir, vivir. The Glosas silenses also provide information about the preterite and past participle of cadère and tollère in this region:

- fuerit lapsus : kadutu fuere
- emersisse : ke cadiot
- proibiatur : betatu lo ajat tolitu

In modern times Castilian and Portuguese tend to substitute weak forms for strong in both the preterite and past participle.

2.52 PHONETIC AND ANALOGICAL PRETERITE FORMS

Portuguese has maintained a separate / e / category of preterite, which accommodates numerous irregular verbs of C.L. e.g., dever, but Castilian has carried regularization a stage further and, like Franco-Provençal, has extended the / i / vocalism of C.L. IV into the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sardinian</th>
<th>Old Preterite</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>P.P.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>C.L. I</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>istare</td>
<td>stet(i)it ID 15, istat</td>
<td></td>
<td>istetidus, stetida ID 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C.L. II</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avere (tènnere)</td>
<td>ap(p)it</td>
<td>appesi deppesi ID 20</td>
<td>appidi'u, appita ID 24, dép(p)idu ID 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>debere</td>
<td>paruit ID 15</td>
<td></td>
<td>pàrfidu ID 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yakere*</td>
<td>parsit ID 16</td>
<td></td>
<td>parsu ID 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pàrrere</td>
<td>potti ID 15</td>
<td></td>
<td>potti'du ID 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pòd're, pòtère</td>
<td>tenni ID 15</td>
<td></td>
<td>tentu ID 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tènnere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>bálfi'du ID 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bàlere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>bòffi ID 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bòliri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>vidiu, bittu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>videre</td>
<td>vidit ID 15</td>
<td></td>
<td>bìsu ID 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manere</td>
<td>remasit ID 16</td>
<td></td>
<td>romasido(s) ID 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>irregular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>òssere</td>
<td>fui ID 16-17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C.L. III</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mittere</td>
<td>misi ID 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kònnòskere</td>
<td>kersit ID 16</td>
<td></td>
<td>konottu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>krèskere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kérfi'du ID 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sàpiri*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>assoldiu ID 26, assoltu ID 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assòlvere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kàiri*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kùrrere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>krèdere</td>
<td>kerui ID 15</td>
<td>krettesi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rèndere</td>
<td>vendi, -isti ID 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bèndere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C.L. III</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reçivere *</td>
<td>lessirunt ID 16</td>
<td></td>
<td>lessu, lesidu ID 24 mortu ID 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lègere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mòrrere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bivere *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C.L. IV</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bènnere</td>
<td>benni ID 15</td>
<td></td>
<td>bènnidu ID 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vestire *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = no examples available in sources used.
ID = Italia Dialettale (see Wagner).
paradigms inherited from C.L. II and III, e.g., debi, vendi. There is evidence of alternate regional varieties such as Old Leonese metéo, vendéo (Menéndez Pidal, 274), or modern Aragonese podeba (Nagore, 114). For these forms a detailed study of Leonese charters of the 13th C. also exists (Staaf, 296–7). However, strong preterites still remain, and, as in Gallo–Romance, they were even more frequent in former times. The strong preterites of Old Portuguese did not develop any uniform vocalic identity and almost all have adopted a weak paradigm in the modern language. Castilian, on the other hand, has maintained a small group of common strong verbs. Nine of them adopt u as their stem vowel, six use i, while traje stands in isolation. The u vocalism of these Castilian strong preterites developed phonetically in P.I. of verbs with tonic o in C.L., i.e., pude (< potui), conuvo (<*conovui, conovi) (Menéndez Pidal, 277). Old Spanish provides more regional variety than the present standard language (Staaf, 306–8). This is illustrated by both charters and literature. Thus, in the 12th C. Poema de mio Cid on the 13th C. works of Gonzalo de Berceo, forms such as ovo, sovo, tovo are normal. Later these are analogically aligned to the pude type. In the 13th C. Libro de Apolonio one can find P.3. sopó, supo and P.6. sopieron in the same text.

For estar the common early preterite P.3. is estido (Cid, Berceo), but the 14th C. works of Don Juan Manuel or J. Ruiz have both estide and estude. In Ruiz’s Libro de Buen Amor, estide comes from the older ms. (intro. xxxviii). Ultimately these old preterite forms became anduve, cupe, conduje, estuve, hube, supe, tuve by analogy. The i type was spread in parallel manner from an original dixi form (Menéndez Pidal, 232–3). Analogical modifications were also undertaken to introduce uniformity into the preterite paradigm of ser and this verb is attested with different forms according to region or period (Menéndez Pidal, 279). Since the Middle Ages Castilian has regularized numerous previously strong verbs on the weak pattern, e.g., yaci, creci. Attested old strong forms are indicated in Table 8. Volui, misi and sustuli are lost in standard Castilian, being replaced by querer, poner and llevar, although toller existed in Old
Table 8: Spanish Verb List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>St. u pret.</th>
<th>wk. i/other</th>
<th>t form</th>
<th>P.P.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>C.L. I</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>estar</td>
<td>estuve</td>
<td></td>
<td>estide, estove</td>
<td>estado, † estudo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C.L. II</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haber (aver)</td>
<td>hube</td>
<td></td>
<td>ove</td>
<td>habido, † avudo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deber</td>
<td>debí</td>
<td></td>
<td>yacé</td>
<td>yacido</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parecer</td>
<td>pareci</td>
<td></td>
<td>pude</td>
<td>podido</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poder</td>
<td>pude</td>
<td></td>
<td>tove</td>
<td>tenido, † tenudo, † tovido</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tener</td>
<td>tuve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>valer</td>
<td>valé</td>
<td></td>
<td>remase</td>
<td>† remesa (noun)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ver</td>
<td>vi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>†(re)maner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>irregular</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ser</td>
<td>fui</td>
<td></td>
<td>fui, fui, sio</td>
<td>sio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C.L. III</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meter</td>
<td>meti</td>
<td></td>
<td>metéo (León)</td>
<td>† metedo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conocer</td>
<td>conocí</td>
<td></td>
<td>conuve</td>
<td>conocido, † conocido</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crecer</td>
<td>creci</td>
<td></td>
<td>crove</td>
<td>crecido</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saber</td>
<td>supe</td>
<td></td>
<td>sope</td>
<td>sabido, † sabido</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(re)solver</td>
<td>resolví</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>† suelto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caer</td>
<td>cai</td>
<td></td>
<td>caído</td>
<td>† caduto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>correr</td>
<td>corrió</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>corrido</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C.L. III</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crecer</td>
<td>creí</td>
<td></td>
<td>creído</td>
<td>rendido, † rendido</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rendir</td>
<td>rindi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rendido, † rendido</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vender</td>
<td>vendí</td>
<td></td>
<td>vendéo (León)</td>
<td>vendido, † vendido</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recibir</td>
<td>recibí</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>recibido, † recibido</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leer</td>
<td>lei</td>
<td></td>
<td>leído, † leudo</td>
<td>muerto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>morir</td>
<td>muri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>muerto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>romper</td>
<td>rompi</td>
<td></td>
<td>roto, rompido, † rompido, † rompudo</td>
<td>vivido</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vivir</td>
<td>viví</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C.L. IV</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>venir</td>
<td>vine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>venido</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vestir</td>
<td>vestí</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>vestido</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9: Portuguese Verb List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Portuguese</th>
<th>St. pret.</th>
<th>wk. dedi/other</th>
<th>t form</th>
<th>P.P.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>C.L. I</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>estar</td>
<td>estive</td>
<td>stede</td>
<td></td>
<td>estado, † estudo*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C.L. II</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haver</td>
<td>houve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>havido</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dever</td>
<td>devi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>devido</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jazer</td>
<td>jazi</td>
<td>jougue, jouve</td>
<td></td>
<td>jadio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parecer</td>
<td>pareci</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>parecido</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poder</td>
<td>pude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ter</td>
<td>tive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tido, † teudo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>valer</td>
<td>vali</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>valido</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ver</td>
<td>vi</td>
<td>remanesci</td>
<td>mas</td>
<td>remanescido</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-manescer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>irregular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ser</td>
<td>fui</td>
<td></td>
<td>sive</td>
<td>sido</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C.L. III</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meter</td>
<td>meti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>metido</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conhecer</td>
<td>conheci</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>conhecido</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crescer</td>
<td>crescì</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>crescido</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saber</td>
<td>soube</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sabido</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>solver</td>
<td>solvi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>soluto, solto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cair († caer)</td>
<td>cai</td>
<td>cadeu</td>
<td>caído</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>correr</td>
<td>corri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>corrido</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crer</td>
<td>crive,</td>
<td></td>
<td>crido</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I.S. crevesse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>render</td>
<td>rendì</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rendido</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vender</td>
<td>vendì</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>vendido</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(re)ceber</td>
<td>-coube</td>
<td>recebì</td>
<td></td>
<td>recebido</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C.L. IV</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ler</td>
<td>lí</td>
<td>(e)leito</td>
<td></td>
<td>lido</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>morrer</td>
<td>morrí</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>morto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>romper</td>
<td>rompi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rompido, † róto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viver</td>
<td>vivì</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>vivido</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vir</td>
<td>vim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>vindo, † viudo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vestir</td>
<td>vestì</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>vestido</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tolher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>† tolheito</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*all the C.L. II and III conjugation verbs take † udo P.P. unless they have a strong form.
When we turn to the past participle, it is noticeable that the -utum type, so popular in most areas, is absent from modern Spanish and Portuguese. This was not formerly the case and -udo is attested in older Spanish texts, although its occurrence is somewhat sporadic. It appears in the Cid poem as metudo and vencudo, although metido and vencido occur too. Tenudo is attested in the works of Don Juan Manuel, while the Libro de Buen Amor has several on assonance, entendudo, arrepentudo, perdudo. Wahlgren gives a fuller list of forms available and synthesizes the findings of previous scholars regarding the history and regional distribution of the -udo P.P. He holds that an important key to understanding the presence of -udo and its decline lies in the dedi - utum correspondence and adds,

... nous avons tout lieu de croire qu'en Espagne, comme dans la plupart des pays romans, des participes tel que ... rendudo, vendudo etc. ont eu originairement à leur côté des parfaits du type en dedi et que, pour l'explication du parfait de la deuxième conjugation portugaise et espagnole, on doit justement remonter à ce type (Wahlgren, 157, cf. Staaf, 297).

The preterite paradigm derived from dedi maintained a distinct existence in León and certain northern regions, where -udo was predominant. "Les participios desinentes en -udo se hallan frecuentemente en textos leoneses y a veces en las obras de Berceo y Alfonso X y en Aragón. Se usan únicamente en el norte y sólo en la época antigua" (Hanssen, 120, cf. Menéndez Pidal, 1950: 257). However, the form gradually disappeared. Georges remarks, "The -udo type first became rare in prose; but as a qualifier (referring especially to persons), it maintained a certain vitality, probably supported by the (denominal) abundantial -udo adjectives (e.g., barbudo 'heavily bearded')" (p. 35).

Within the verbal system the -udo participle was doomed because the Toledan model, which became dominant, confused the dedi and -ir paradigms and since the latter had an -ido participle, -udo became an anomaly and was discarded. Portuguese also lost the old -udo formation, despite its separate er class, although it continued up to the
15th C. in this country (E. Bourciez, 444). The reason for the change is not clear, but could have been due to Spanish influence (Wahlgren, 159).

2.53 THE STRONG PARTICIPLES

The strong participles that remain alive in the Iberian peninsula are mainly *t* types, e.g., *factum > hecho* (hecho), but may be *-ltum* forms, e.g., *volvitum > vuelto*, *solvitum > suelto*. The latter, as previously noted, are departures from C.L. *-utum*.

Weak forms are predominant in Castilian and Menéndez Pidal believes that strong forms may die out eventually. "La tendencia uniformadora se manifiesta en la creación de los participios débiles modernos en vez de los fuertes arcaicos ... y en la admisión de duplicados como *rompido* . . . que probablemente acabarán por desterrar a los fuertes correspondientes" (p. 282). Portuguese maintains a similar variety of strong forms.

Previously it possessed *eleito* and *roto*, which parallel O.F., but these have developed regular weak forms by analogy (Williams, 185–6). A recent study of Aragonese indicates that weak participles are replacing strong ones in this zone at the present time, e.g., *esleito : esleylu, muerto : morlu, puesto : podlu, tuerto : torziu* (Nagore, 111).

2.54 CONCLUSIONS FOR SPANISH AND PORTUGUESE

Within the Spanish and Portuguese verbal paradigms, analogical restructuring is quite common. Initial impetus for change often seem to have come from the preterite, which is frequent. Remodelling may even occur on the basis of the preterite stem, e.g., *tovido* (Wahlgren, 236), although this is not widespread. The *-udo* participle, regionally common in León, did not maintain itself alongside the Castilian *i* preterite. The alignment of certain irregular Castilian verbs to radical *u* vocalism seems to occur when *udo* is already in sharp decline or residual. It is likely that the forms were not widely used synchronically or that they were concentrated in different dialect zones. In general, the participle is in a weaker position within the tense systems of Portuguese and Spanish
than it is in French, Rumanian or Northern Italian, where the compound past has usurped the simple tense in the spoken language. The preterite is widely maintained as a standard past tense in the Iberian Peninsula.
Chapter 3

BACKGROUND TO GALLO-ROMANCE DEVELOPMENTS

3.1 INTRODUCTION TO GALLO-ROMANCE

The Gallo-Romance zone has its own particular characteristics which differentiate it from other Romance regions. For the verbs in the study list, the whole area remains close to Italian in its choice of lexical items from the common Latin fund. In its usage of morphological features, the territory can be divided into the three basic zones of:

a) French
b) Franco-Provençal
c) Occitan.

Each has its own distinctive way of treating the -ui, -didi and other strong preterites. All zones accept the V.L. -utum P.P. although its relationship to the preterite differs in each area. The ère and ère distinctions of Latin were confused in the entire Gallo-Romance region.

3.2 OCCITAN

Although Occitan had a literary form in the period of the Troubadours and at least until the sixteenth century, there was never a rigorous standardization of the language. Consequently texts often contain a range of variants, or the author may have felt free to choose from several forms, e.g., "et ella correu ad un balcon e laissest se cazer jos, et enaissi moric. La nouvella cors per Rossillon . . ." (B. Occ, 239, 1–3).

3.21 -UI VERBS IN OCCITAN

In Old Provençal the -ui verbs maintained a strong preterite, characterized by a guttural g in the weak persons, unvoiced to c in the strong, e.g., ac, agues (Anglade, 309). It is probable that this guttural evolved phonetically except for the forms with a
radical ending in \( p \), e.g., \( saup \) (Anglade, 309, cf. Grafström, 133). Ronjat questions this (177–8). According to him \(*aub\) and \(*pouit\) would be a logical parallel to \( saup \). He maintains an analogical influence through \( plac \) and \( jac \) whose forms pose no phonetic problems (cf. Old Castilian \( plogo, jogo, [Cid] \)). Although there is a difference of opinion over \( aver, dever, \) etc., certain of these formations are obviously analogical, e.g., \( estec, correc \) (Mourin, 1974:210–11).

3.22 **DEDI VERBS IN OCCITAN**

Old Provençal standardized a guttural ending on a number of irregular non-sigmatic verbs, e.g., \( venc \). The preterite form of the \(-didi\) verbs became weak in this area and passed to \(-dédii\). Occitan even managed to extend this form to the entire preterite of the regular \(-ar\) verbs. Although it does not infringe on \(-ui\) territory, the \( dedi \) class maintains \( creire \) in Occitan and also takes in various irregular types of C.L. such as \( viure \) (Anglade, 296–8).

3.23 **THE \(-TUM\) P.P. IN OCCITAN**

The \(-utum\) past participle occurs in both the \(-ui\) and \( dedi \) categories. Within the \(-ui\) category an extensive remodelling has occurred which links the preterite to the past participle form by means of the guttural. As Wahlgren (p. 222) notes "Le thème du parfait faible avec son consonantisme caractéristique s'introduit au participe." Certain verbs had evolved in a phonetically parallel manner, e.g., \( jaguist : jagut \). This helped trigger an analogical movement of the type \( aguist : agut \neq aut \) ( \(<*habutum\) (cf. Grafström, 142–3). This guttural became extremely popular in Occitan and could spread to \( dedi \) or strong forms, e.g., \( cregut = crezut \) (Anglade, 296). There is an obvious desire to establish an identity between the preterite and past participle within the \(-ui\) category of this zone, but this occurs at the level of the consonant. The participle provides the only weak \( u \) formation. Once a morpheme has become established in any zone, it may tend
to attract analogical restructurings within that particular language. Such a form does not imply that any V.L. parallel ever existed, e.g., *metud, remazut*.

3.3 **FRANCO–PROVENÇAL**

Of the three major linguistic divisions of Gaul, the area occupied by Franco–Provençal is the least well-defined. No real tradition of writing in the vernacular developed in this region until relatively late. One or two literary works remain, including the 10th C. fragment of a version of the *Roman d'Alexandre*. Numerous charters and legal documents occur from the 13th C. onwards, but some of these show signs of a varying degree of French influence.

3.3.1 **-UI VERBS IN FRANCO–PROVENÇAL**

The preterite of the -ui verbs suffered some assimilation to the IV conjugation here (Philipon, 1901:249–53). A strong type remains in force for *aveir, poveir* etc., but where a weak form occurs this tends to be a weak -i type, e.g., *parit*. There is no standardization of a weak u perfect and indeed, when such forms occur, it is probable that they are due to French influence.

3.3.2 **DEDI VERBS IN FRANCO–PROVENÇAL**

The -didi category may have retained an original stem stress in Franco–Provençal (Philipon, 1901:277). However, it also was invaded by IV conjugation and adopted weak -i forms.

3.3.3 **THE -UTUM P.P. IN FRANCO–PROVENÇAL**

The -utum past participle is present for both the -ui and dedi type of verb.
3.4 OLD FRENCH

The earliest text of the French dialect zone containing relevant material is the *Cantilène de Ste. Eulalie*, written about 880 A.D. A literary tradition grew up in Northern France from the 10th C. onwards, although all the early examples are in the Walloon–Picard or Anglo–Norman dialects rather than *francien*, which only rose to prominence from the 12th C. onwards. Vernacular charters are introduced in the early 13th C. and become common several decades later. The dialects of Northern France undergo considerable modifications during their development from the earliest period to the establishment of a standardized literary norm. Some of these changes may be conditioned by phonetic factors, while others may be clearly analogical. As always, some cases remain uncertain.

3.41 -UI VERBS IN OLD FRENCH

From the earliest days of the literary period, O.F. possessed a *u* preterite for some verbs of the *-ui* class, e.g., *parut, dut*. However, for others strong forms remained available, e.g., *ot, pot, sot*, etc. During the transition from Old to Modern French these forms were aligned to the vocalism of the weak *u* type, e.g., *eut, put, sut*. In addition, verbs which did not necessarily possess a *-u* preterite in O.F. could be remodelled and join this class in Middle French, e.g., *voulut, mourut*.

3.42 DEDI VERBS IN OLD FRENCH

A conjugation based on a weak *dédi* form was still alive in O.F., but was lost by assimilation to the weak *i* category as these forms spread from central French in a movement completed in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries (Fouché, 270–71). Originally the form could vary from area to area, e.g., *vendiet* or *vendet* (Fouché, 264–5). The class not only comprised the successors of *dédi* compounds, but had taken in some other forms, e.g., *battre, rompre* (Fouché, 267). *Battederit* is attested in V.L. (Väänänen, 143).
Fouché states that these verbs developed a weak *dedi* ending through changes caused because their radical ended in a geminate or other consonant cluster, e.g., *battui* --> *batei* (Fouché, 267). This type seldom adopts a *u* preterite, although *vécut* does do so, but the group sometimes vacillates and creates alternatives in Middle French.

3.43 THE -UTUM P.P. IN OLD FRENCH

The -*utum* past participle accompanies verbs of the *ui* and *dedi* classes for both primary and secondary forms. It may also accept new analogical restructurings, such as strong to weak shifts, e.g., *mors* --> *mordu*.

3.5 INTRODUCTION TO DETAILED STUDY OF NORTHERN FORMS

A detailed presentation of the forms of 30 verbs found in Gallo-Romance texts will be undertaken in Chapter 4. As a preliminary to this section, a more detailed summary of useful research already available for the French dialect zones, where a strong tendency to weak *u* forms is evident, will now follow.

Various theories of phonetic development have tried to explain the extension of weak *u* forms in the preterite up to and including the O.F. period. Hypotheses concerning the mechanisms of analogical restructuring and its causes can direct attention to the following areas:

a) internal restructuring within the paradigm
b) external influence from another preterite form
c) interaction of the preterite and past participle.

3.51 THE *U* PRETERITE IN OLD FRENCH

There is no real consensus of opinion about how the weak *u* form first became established in the Northern French preterites. By assembling samples from the earliest literary period one can conclude that:
a) Uniform *u* vocalism is already in place for some verbs in persons which retained differential stress in the alternating verbs:

- *dut* (S. Alexis, 291)
- *reco* (S. Alexis, 215)
- *recut* (S. Alexis, 98)
- *par* (Rou II, 1631)

b) Except in the N.E. Picard and Walloon region, thematic *u* occurs on the rare weak forms of *ui* class verbs, insofar as these are attested (v. Table 21).

Examples are:

P.2. *geus*  
P.4. *eusmes*  
P.5. *creutes*

This type may be in competition with an *i* form:

P.5. *deuiens* (Walloon), P.5. *chaistes, creistes*

In both cases a wider range of examples is available from the imperfect subjunctive.

3.511 PHONETIC THEORIES OF DEVELOPMENT

Fouche (p. 310-11) has proposed fairly complex models of phonetic evolution in an effort to explain the presence of stressed vocalic *u* in the weak preterite forms. He believes that a labialisation of *l* in contact with *w* caused a passage to *û* in the case of the weak persons of *parui* or other verbs having a stem which ended in a liquid or nasal, e.g., *parwist* $\rightarrow$ *parust*. He presumes that the strong persons were then aligned on the model of *fui, fü*. Andrieux and Baumgartner (p. 179) follow the theory for verbs where the *w* was blocked on the flexion, "On peut supposer que ce groupe de parfaits a reçu la structure accentuelle des passés faibles où l'accent porte constamment sur l'élément qui suit la consonne finale de base." They consider that it is at this point that a correspondence occurred between the new weak *u* preterite form and the *-utum* P.P. Although it is not stated, this conclusion almost certainly refers only to Northern Gaul.

As for the verbs which retained alternating stress, Fouche also proposes a labialization of *wi* $\rightarrow$ *wû* $\rightarrow$ *û* $\rightarrow$ *û* for the weak persons of Latin verbs of the *habère* type (p. 314). This would be limited to, "tout le domaine d'Ofl, à l'exception du Nord-Est." Fouche accepts the likelihood of regional variety (p. 313). He gives various
Walloon examples to illustrate that \( w \) did not necessarily become \( ū \). Thus, in the Walloon – N.E. Picard zone, the type \( awis, awimes \), etc., is common (Fouché, 319, cf. Wilmotte, 64, 70). Moreover, it is even possible that \( w \) dropped completely in some Walloon regions and that \( v \) is a continuation of \( b \) or \( p \), e.g., \( aus, devis \) (Fouché, 313). For the LMNR group, a type of reinforcement may occur, so that instead of labialization to \( ū \), or complete loss (e.g., \( tenir \)), a labiodental \( v \) evolves, e.g., \( tinve, vinve \) (Fouché, 322).

The outcome of the \( -ūtum \) P.P. in French is less problematic than the history of the preterite. Often the form can be accepted as a direct phonetic development from V.L. e.g., \( credutum > creu, venutum > venu \) (Valutius). \( *valutum > valu \). Even if they are not attested, it is presumed that many \( -ūtum \) forms existed, e.g., \( *conovutum > coneu \) (Mourin 1975:117). Some slight restructurings may have taken place, e.g., \( *saputum --> seu \) (Mourin 1975:125, 1980:181) but in any case these do not affect the weak \( u \) vocalism.

3.5.12 ANALOGICAL THEORIES OF DEVELOPMENT

It has already been noted that verbal systems are particularly open to the action of analogy, which works towards establishing group identities, while phonetic developments may easily cause divergent forms to evolve, even within a single paradigm. Mention will now be made of certain analogical theories which relate more specifically to French.

Restructuring caused by external factors (e.g., the influence of another verb) may well cause internal restructuring within a paradigm and the various types of analogical action are not mutually exclusive. However, for convenience three main tendencies will be illustrated under separate headings, classified according to which feature is of primary interest in the example.
3.5121 INTERNAL RESTRUCTURING

Under this title, we will examine the levelling of stress patterns which took place within the paradigms of the sigmatic preterites of the central zone in Old and Middle French, since this action had parallels in the strong alternating -ui verbs. Ekblom (pp. 11–12) shows that the sigmatics with a weak form of the mis, mesis type were able to align to the strong i verbs of the fis, fesis category because parallels existed between most persons (Fouché, 276; 275, 283). Within the strong i group voir did not have intervocalic s and its form caused an interference, which resulted in the type veis, feis, meis (Fouché, 292) by the 13th C. in the Ile de France. Alternation was still maintained, i.e., mis, meîs. However, around this time the pretonic e began to be lost and this corresponds to a similar structural action in the -ui class of verbs. The overall result was the loss of the strong conjugation in the preterite and the adoption of a paradigm which had uniform stress. Fouché remarks, "La langue semble avoir obéi à une tendance qui la poussait à régulariser l'accentuation à l'intérieur des paradigmes et à simplifier ainsi la conjugaison" (p. 292). In the case of the -ui verbs this internal restructuring worked to promote the spread of a uniform u vocalism in any verbs that had retained alternating forms until this period, e.g., sot, sout, seut --> sut. The sigmatic form itself disappeared as a class because its distinctive marker had been s. Some verbs, apparently unable to remodel because of their phonetic structure, were lost altogether, e.g., ardre. Other were redistributed. In some cases these restructurings acted in favour of the -ui class (Ekblom, 105). "Des variantes appartenant à la classe en -ui ont remplacé les prétérits en -si . . ." He cites eslîst (Ps Oxf.) and eslûrent (Sax. Ltr.) noting that, "Dans la suite, la forme en ui a prévalu et s'est maintenue jusqu'à nos jours." In other instances, the form of the verb itself helped realignment, e.g., conclût.

3.5122 EXTERNAL INFLUENCES

The influence of the être paradigm is somewhat problematic. Schwan proposed it as a source of analogy for the remodelling of the u preterites, "L'û des désinences
toniques des parfaits en *ui* paraît être dû à l'influence du parfait du verbe *estre*" (p. 213). He states that a *u* which originated in P.I. of the V.L. paradigm had spread to the other persons of *être* in French. This uniformly stressed paradigm is supposed to have served as a model for the *dui, dut* type (Wahlgren, 164). Meyer-Lübke and Brunot came to accept this view, though the latter seems to have been uncomfortable with it because the *u* of *être* was itself analogical in all but P.I. of the paradigm (Brunot, 205–6) and the other persons "n'ont pu répandre un *u* qu'elles-mêmes n'ont pu que recevoir d'ailleurs." Nonetheless, unification did take place, using a stressed *u* and in the case of *être* the P.P. cannot be evoked as a model. An analogy due to P.I. seems possible since this type of restructuring occurs in other Romance languages e.g., Castilian (Mourin 1978:27). A similar phenomenon may also have affected French *conui, mui* where P.I. influences the vocalism of P.3. and P.6. (Mourin 1978:1, 27). The alignment of the *être* paradigm to vocalic *u* took place at an early date in Northern France, since it is attested from the earliest texts:

P.1. (S. Alexis) P.2. (Rol.) P.3. (Eulalie, Jonas, S. Leger)
P.4. (Rol.) P.5. (Rol.) P.6. (S. Leger)

and so it could indeed have influenced other verbs at any later date. The problem remains unsolved. J. Bourciez presents a more convincing case for the action of *être* in the formation of the weak *o* paradigm in the Gascon area (p. 66). For the French zone Wahlgren concluded "il est possible que le parfait *fui* ait joué quelque rôle dans le développement des formes faibles . . . quoique . . . la marche de l’analogie ne nous semble pas bien clair" (p. 165). No recent contribution has elucidated the matter further. However, two important facts can be borne in mind:

1. *Être* possessed a preterite with a fixed stress and *u* vocalism at an early date.
2. The verb is of extremely frequent occurrence (v. 4.251).

It is impossible to eliminate it as a contributing factor to weak *u* spread in the northern zones.
3.5123 INTERACTION OF PRETERITE AND P.P. - WAHLGREN

This type of analogical interaction has been explored in detail by Wahlgren, who comments

L’histoire de nos parfaits et de nos participes nous montre . . . une double réciprocité . . . dans leur rapport mutuel. Les participes latin-vulgares *soltus *voltus amenèrent des parfaits sigmatiques *solsi *volsi qui à leur tour ont donné naissance, dans le français, aux participes correspondants en s (Wahlgren, 258).

Giving numerous examples he concludes (p. 259) "Dans les langues romanes, cette formation et cette reformation . . . se répètent assez souvent." Wahlgren expresses the opinion that the general phonetic shape of a word may cause contamination "La ressemblance de sons entre deux ou plusieurs verbes les unit et fait se rapprocher leur conjugaison" (p. 259). However, individual languages tend to favour certain formation, so that Italian, for example, readily extends sigmatic forms if there is one available from the V.L. system, e.g., *cursu(m) --> *corsi, *corso. Faced with a similar type of restructuring, French preferred weak forms, so that whereas Italian modelled the preterite of *descendit on the P.P. *descensum and obtained a sigmatic preterite, French chose to use the likeness of the radical ending -nd, as a means of aligning this verb group to the *dedi type. A correspondence between preterite and past participle is usually established in French, -ui and *dedi types sharing a weak u participle and sigmatics having a strong participle.

When more than one form is in competition, doublets may occur e.g., *vouloir, *soudre, lire. Wahlgren’s research led him to acknowledge a close correspondence between preterite and P.P. behaviour (p. 250). He notes that the strong participle and sigmatic preterite tend to support each other’s survival. Similarly he believes that a weak preterite and weak participle tend to reinforce the form’s viability. In terms of the -ui category of verb, the alignment to a weak preterite is restricted to certain Romance zones only,

Cependant, ce n’est que dans le français, dans quelques parlers du Midi de la France (p. ex. le gascon de l’Ouest, le patois d’Onex) et dans le roumain que ce rapport se fait sentir, à proprement parler, tandis que dans les autres
langues romanes, par suite des lois phonétiques, le type -ui a perdu dès l’origine, ses traits constitutifs et en même temps son importance comme type spécial du parfait. (Wahlgren, 255)

Wahlgren holds that the -utum participle was responsible for the weak u perfect form, even for the valui type. "Dans la class valui, le participe passé amena, dès une époque très ancienne, un paradigme entièrement faible, qui se substitua à la flexion primitive forte, type *vail" (p. 256 cf. Suchier’s theory p. 171). Within the literary period the French preterite system continues its remodelling activities, although this was a gradual process and forms which were to become dominant did not do so all at once. Nor is it necessary to assume that all changes were set in motion for a single reason or occurred in a similar way. The phonetic composition of each verb was likely to influence its fate.

3.5124 INTERACTION OF PRETERITE AND P.P. – MOURIN

The articles of L. Mourin have dwelt upon the mechanisms of analogical restructurings in more recent times, although he approaches the problem from a slightly different perspective from Wahlgren and explicitly rejects certain phonetic theories of development (1978:1, 36).

En français le passage du groupe wi à la voyelle u ne peut avoir été purement phonétique dans les parfaits en u tels que 2. *habwis (< habuisti), volis (< voluisti), vesquis (< *viscuisti). Un tel passage aura été favorisé par l’action du participe.

He claims that the participle’s action can be used to explain the r types (1978:1, 36, n. 76) although he also seems to favour an analogy from connaissons : connut : paraissons : parut (1974:211). As for the I radicals, Mourin notes that these tend to give rise to sigmatics as doublets because their perfect became poorly differentiated from the present, e.g., volt (present, vuelt) -- > volst (1974:205). Ultimately they may well adopt a u form based on the P.P. as a solution, e.g., volut, solut. In other cases some kind of regularization may have occurred under the participle’s influence e.g., valut, moulut, mourut. The hypothesis cannot be demonstrated for parut, which is the only French form
available from the earliest literary period, but *vécut* and *voulut* certainly illustrate such a change at a later date.

Another type of remodelling, which spreads the use of a recognisable group marker, may involve a different sort of development. In French, a polarisation occurs concerning the use of thematic vowels in the preterite for irregular verbs of the *ère, ère* classes which had developed with alternating stress. Basically an *i*, inherited from Latin, seems to have been used for all weak forms where the radical ended in a consonant (except *voir*) (1978:2, 578). This would include the sigmatic types e.g., *desimes, valstes* and also Walloon forms such as *dewimes*. Old Imperfect subjunctives indicate that this type of formation was still available for *pouvoir* (*pod(e)ir*) in O.F. e.g., *podist* (Jonas, 16). The formation existed parallel to irregular forms with uniform weak stress e.g., *vesquirent* or the extensive *dedi* class e.g., *vendimes*.

In contrast, a special group with thematic *u* is characterised by a lack of intervocalic consonant, e.g., *deümes* etc. Mourin (1978:1, 36) denies that these weak forms evolved phonetically, but states that *eüs* etc. assumed that form through the influence of the P.P. He thinks that this development was encouraged through structural parallelism with the *i/ei* type (*fis, fe(s)ks*). Mourin accepts a phonetic development for P.I. of *mui, conui* (1974:212, 1978:1, 26) which was extended to P.3 and P.6. An alternating pattern *uéti* was established. The potential of *u* as a group marker increased due to:
1. analogical internal restructuring which extended the phonetically evolved P.I.
2. the external influence of the P.P., which acted on the weak forms without stem-final consonant.

Mourin states that the *u* vocalic timbre of most *ui* perfects, e.g., *jut, reçut* is due to a remodelling on the weak forms, which in turn were influenced by the participle (1974:212; 1978:1, 30). The loss of intervocalic consonants is common in French, e.g., *caderunt* (Reichenau Glosses) *cadit* (S. Leger) *cait* (Rol). When this occurs, the verb in question may be a candidate for alignment to the *u* group if such a move is supported
by the P.P. e.g., *cheoir*. It is possible to attribute *u* forms occurring in *estar* to the same sort of hesitation (Mourin 1974:213). Meanwhile, from the twelfth to thirteenth centuries, in central France, the sigmatic class lost its stem final consonant, which had been a distinctive group marker. In the ensuing re-distribution of forms, resemblances to other verbs could determine both alignment and survival (Mourin 1978:2, 576), e.g., *conclut* (Ekblom, 23), which was easily assimilated to the *u* types. One sigmatic group survived with an alternating stress which paralleled that of the -ui group, *u/eu : i/ei*. These two were both reduced to *u* and *i* respectively and both were linked to a corresponding past participle. The vowel of the participle is assimilated to the preterite radical in this case:

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
  & prit & pris & sut \\
  & mit & mis & cru \\
\end{array}
\]

The *i* category may suffer from lack of differentiation from the present in some cases, e.g., *rit, dit*. This may have determined the passage to the *u* category for a verb having a doublet, e.g., *lit --> lut*.

3.6 SUMMARY OF ROMANCE RESTRUCTURING

Many preterites and past participles show variation in Gallo-Romance during the period which extends from the ninth to sixteenth centuries. Such restructuring has been a common occurrence in the past tense systems of Latin and the Romance languages. Among the various types of change, the substitution of weak forms for strong irregular ones has been in progression in all areas, although literary varieties of Sardinian and Italian have maintained more strong forms than other languages. Both preterite and past participle forms are affected and these tend to evolve with some kind of formal or regular pattern of relationship.
3.61 ROMANCE PRETERITE CHANGE

The modification of some strong preterites inherited from C.L. II and III began early, during the period of the Empire, when, for example, stress shift constituted a type of "regularisation," e.g., *credidi* --*->* *credédi* (G. de Tours). This particular form was widespread and extended from Balkan to Ibero Romance, but other more localized developments include the *-etti* pattern of Italian and the weak guttural models of later Occitan and Catalan. Not all realignments and regularizations are new creations. Spanish, Portuguese and Franco-Provençal often adapted their irregular paradigms to the Latin IV conjugation with its regular weak *i* forms. The overall tendency of these changes was to increase regularity within the verbal systems of the preterite and P.P. Only French and Rumanian evolved a weak *u* vocalism as a characteristic type within their preterite forms. In Rumanian the conjugation is uniformly weak and regular. However, in addition, French alone created a vocalic correspondence in *u* between a weak type of paradigm and an irregular paradigm with stem stress.

3.62 ROMANCE PARTICIPLE CHANGE

The strong past participles of C.L. were also subject to change. As Väänänen notes, "Pour le participe passé . . . les formes accentuées sur la terminaison tendent à prévaloir" (p. 144). The popular *-ütum* creation is attested from the time of the Empire and occurs in different verbal classes:

- C.L. II *valitum* --*->* *valätia* (CIL VI, 28315)
- C.L. III *redditum* --*->* *reddütus* (CIL VIII, 1700)
- C.L. IV *sepáltus* --*->* *sepelütta* (CIL VIII, 15639).

Its successors are to be found in all Romance areas except Sardinia, although Spanish and Portuguese discontinued this type between the thirteenth and sixteenth centuries.
3.63 GALLO-ROMANCE PRETERITE AND P.P.

Each Gallo-Romance area adopted a different solution as it evolved its own preterite system from the Latin base. In classical literary Provençal, a guttural, caused by the velarizing effect of unstressed *u* became a marker linking the preterite, I.S. and P.P. of the *-ui* class verbs. Modern literary Rhodanien has carried regularization much further and extended the guttural element plus a weak flexion to all paradigms, except those of the first conjugation.

Franco-Provençal never developed a literature to rival that of the other areas of Gaul. In its early documents, it retained forms which can be considered dialectal and which may be comparable with Rhetian e.g., *recet, receit, cret* (croire) (Meyer-Lübke 1895:422). Where weak forms were used to displace irregulars, Franco-Provençal preferred analogical re-alignment to the Latin IV conjugation. It is quite possible that any weak *u* forms found in the texts of this zone are due to French influence, since many of the texts are as late as the 14th C. Within the preterite paradigms of O.F. itself, weak *u* forms gradually progressed. Increased uniformity arose between three separate types of forms:

1. In the oldest attested versions of the language, this timbre was constant on the weak persons of many *-ui* class preterites, except in the N.E. Picard and Walloon area, where it remained *i* (Linskill, 126), e.g., *ôimes* (Rol.): *owins* (Walloon d.1274).

2. Several relatively common strong irregular verbs immobilized their stress alternation at an early date and adopted *u* vocalism on the radical:
   
   *fut* (Eulalie) *dut* (S. Alexis) *co)nut* (Rol.)
   
   *(es)mut* (Rol.) *estut* (S. Leger, Rol.)

   Other early evidence for this type includes:
   
   *(re)ceut* (S. Alexis) *(apar)curent (Rou) *jut* (Rol.)

   Alternate peripheral forms exist for some of these verbs:
mot (Frag. Alex.) joth (S. Leger).

3. Several irregular verbs of the \textit{ui} class with a stem ending in a liquid or nasal immobilized their stress pattern by standardizing a weak \textit{u} flexion which paralleled the form of regular verbs e.g., \textit{parut, valut}.

In the Gallo–Roman zone, the weak \textit{u} participle is present in all areas, but the corresponding weak \textit{u} preterite is only characteristic of the French dialect area. The weak \textit{u} participle is attested in the earliest texts throughout the Gallo–Roman region, although it extends its scope during the literary period. It may be attached to strong forms as a suffix or simply replace them, in which case it is often remodelled on the present stem:

- \textit{remes} $\rightarrow$ \textit{remazut} (Occ.)
- \textit{mis} $\rightarrow$ \textit{metud} (Occ.–Gascon)
- \textit{rot} $\rightarrow$ \textit{rompu} (Fr.–Prov., Fr.)
- \textit{sous} $\rightarrow$ \textit{solu} (Fr.)

A distinctive stem may be experienced as superfluous once the suffix is attached. In the French dialect areas the weak \textit{u} participles were already very firmly established in the \textit{–ui} and \textit{dedi} classes during the earliest literary period. As time went by, they spread and replaced alternate forms, some of which may have been regional in nature. These include:

a) sigmatic and \textit{t} forms:

- \textit{sous} $\rightarrow$ \textit{solu}
- \textit{cors} $\rightarrow$ \textit{coulu}
- \textit{rot} $\rightarrow$ \textit{rompu}

b) western \textit{–eit} forms:

- \textit{ca(d)eit} $\rightarrow$ \textit{chu}
- \textit{tol(l)eit} $\rightarrow$ \textit{tolu}

c) miscellaneous \textit{i} types:

- \textit{choit} (Ht. Mn.) $\rightarrow$ \textit{chu}
rechi (Wal.) —> reçu
lit —> lu
vesti —> vêtu

3.64 CONCLUSION

In the appendix, examples of 30 selected verbs have been grouped into a study list compiled from the most ancient literary and legal texts available. By using concrete examples regional, chronological and frequency variations may become more apparent. When useful, the patterning behaviour of individual verbs may be compared to V.L. or Romance counterparts. In the final chapter the relative merits of various theories of development set forth in the preceding pages can then be evaluated in the light of the examples studied.
Chapter 4

A DETAILED STUDY OF GALLO-ROMANCE DEVELOPMENTS BASED ON EARLY TEXTUAL EVIDENCE

4.1 INTRODUCTION TO THE COMPOSITION OF THE STUDY LIST

Data illustrating the situation of u vocalism in medieval Gallo-Romance has been collected from as many areas as possible within the scope of this study. The verbs come from both literary and non-literary documents. The main concern has been to use the oldest sources available, while also collecting a variety of dialectal usages. Charters represent the three main Gallo-Romance regions. In the northern area these have been divided into 12 dialectal zones. Their dates vary from:

1034 - 1200 for Occitan
1260 - 1416 for Franco-Provencal
ca. 1218 - 1345 for French (14th C. limited to Burgundy)

Within the zones further subdivision is limited to the grouping of examples by spelling type. The literary texts include the Chanson de Roland and all works prior to this date, while extracts from anthologies and later works have been added to provide further and varied evidence.

4.11 COMPARISON OF SOURCES

As a reliable source of useful philological information, the charter is considered superior to the literary work for several reasons. As Carolus-Barré (intro. lxviii) states, the charter is often original, is usually dated and sometimes even located within the text, while in other cases external evidence can permit identification of its place of origin. Wuest compares the charter favourably with the literary source saying, "Comme la transmission des œuvres littéraires est toujours assez complexe on fait bien de leur préférer les chartes, dont nous possédons plus fréquemment le texte original" (p. 46). The literary
manuscript often journeys from one region to another, until one finds oneself, "devant un mélange inextricable de plusieurs traditions graphiques." However, literary texts offer a wider range of vocabulary than charters and some are older, providing the only evidence available about more archaic stages of the language. Poetry provides an additional guide to pronunciation through the study of assonance and rhyme as well as by the use of the syllable count. Nor is the use of charters entirely devoid of difficulty. As Wuest acknowledges, "Nous savons que nous ne devons jamais attendre des textes médiévaux la transcription exacte d'un dialecte particulier. Au contraire, une norme supra-régionale s'y mélange partout avec des dialectalisme plus ou moins nombreux" (Wuest, 43).

Charters were produced by the literate minority of the day and represented an educated usage, which may have been influenced by Latin, or certain scribal traditions. The language of charters themselves is often quite rigidly fixed, abounding in formulas which may have been transmitted "en bloc". A possible example is, "oguimes et receguimes" in the La Rochelle charters which persists alongside francien forms in the same document. In addition, there is no guarantee, other than internal, that the scribe is from the region where the charter is produced or kept. Thus, a charter from Lyon or Forez may be totally francien in character. However, by obtaining many examples, it is possible to offset this difficulty and identify charters which depart noticeably from the general trend of an area.

4.12 THE INTERPRETATION OF SPELLING

The actual spelling of the O.F. period sometimes shows wide fluctuation, even in the same document by the same scribe. Wuest comments that standardized spelling only really developed as printing progressed (p. 45). It is no easy task to interpret the pronunciation of what is written in the medieval charters. However, Wuest suggests that writing followed pronunciation more closely in the Middle Ages and that spelling hesitations are likely to remain as witnesses to contemporary confusions (p. 46).
4.13 STATUS OF INDIVIDUAL DIALECTS

The prestige attached to various dialects may also influence usage, especially in the later examples. While Anglo-Normal and Picard both enjoyed periods of ascendancy and affluence, the dialect of the Ile de France became dominant after the reign of Louis-Auguste and scribes began to imitate these forms in preference to using their own dialectal language. However, despite these numerous considerations, which must always be borne in mind and which should lead to a certain caution, a fairly clear picture of the usage of the past participle and preterite forms may be discerned from the examples set forward in the following pages.

4.2 FREQUENCY ANALYSIS

It is possible to analyse the contents of the study list in various ways. Initially several numerical comparisons will be presented.

4.21 GLOBAL FREQUENCY BY GRAMMATICAL GROUP

Frequency of occurrence can be considered either at the level of an entire group, such as the P.P., or at that of the individual verb. The totals of the entire list are given in Table 10, where the most frequent form is also indicated. This shows that the P.P. is the most common form for 15 verbs, followed fairly closely by the preterite in the case of 13 verbs, while only 2 verbs favour the I.S. in a particular way.

4.22 GLOBAL FREQUENCY IN CHARTERS AND LITERATURE

If the list is broken down still further, as in Table 11, it becomes apparent that there is some difference in usage between the charters and the literary sources. The P.P. is most common in the charters for 20 verbs, while the preterite is most common in literature in 18 cases. The verbs themselves are not evenly distributed, for some, such as vendre, occur almost exclusively in the charters, whilst others, such as manoir, tolire,
gesir tend to feature in literary works. This may create a slight imbalance in the attested examples of some verbs (e.g., a sigmatic P.P. of courir is never found in the charters), but as a rule the literary and charter samples tend to complement each other.

Table 10: Most Frequent Verbal Forms in Gallo-Romance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>P.P.</th>
<th>Pret</th>
<th>I.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avoir</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>connaître</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>croître</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>devoir</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>être</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gesir</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paraître</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pouvoir</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>savoir</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soudre</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tenir</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>142</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>valoir</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vouloir</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manoir</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mettre</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cheoir</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>courir</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>croire</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ester</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rendre</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vendre</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-cevoir</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>124</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-lire</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mourir</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rompre</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tolir</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>venir</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vetir</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vivre</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voir</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 15 13 2

• • □ = most frequent form
Table 11: Separated Charter—Literature Totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>P.P.</th>
<th>Pret</th>
<th>I.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ch.</td>
<td>Lit.</td>
<td>Ch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avoir</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>connaître</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>croître</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>être</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>600+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>devoir</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gésir</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paraître</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pouvoir</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>savoir</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soudre</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tenir</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>valoir</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vouloir</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manoir</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mettre</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cheoir</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>courir</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>croire</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ester</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rendre</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vendre</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–cevoir</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–lire</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mourir</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rompre</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tolir</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>venir</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vêtir</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vivre</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voir</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of examples collected in the course of this study is limited. Therefore any conclusions drawn from numerical comparison are not to be taken as absolute. However, if general trends stand out, they may help build up the overall picture, especially when
taken in conjunction with other material. Each of the three main verbal forms will now be examined individually.

4.23 GLOBAL P.P. FREQUENCY

This is the most common form for 15 verbs. Indeed, it is overwhelmingly frequent in some cases. If we examine verbs yielding high numbers of samples in the charters the following percentages are obtained.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>% P.P.</th>
<th>% Pret.</th>
<th>% I.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>560</td>
<td>connaître</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>730</td>
<td>tenir</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>554</td>
<td>-cevoir</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>446</td>
<td>vendre</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>vêtir</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If we take the overall figures for all the verbs, we see that the position of the past participle is very strong generally. Two totals have been calculated to make a special allowance for être, for which an abnormally high number of preterites occur in the charters.

The figures suggest that:

1. Although a verb which is extremely frequent may unbalance the percentages, this may be representative of its influence.

2. The P.P. occurs more than the preterite, especially if one discounts être. This is particularly evident in the charters.

3. Because it is very common, the P.P. could well be in a favourable situation for exerting analogical influence on other forms, although this does not mean that it automatically does so.
Table 13: Comparative Frequency of Pret., P.P., and L.S.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Verbs</th>
<th>All Verbs</th>
<th>- Être</th>
<th>- Être</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P.P.</td>
<td>pret.</td>
<td>I.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>charter</td>
<td>2841</td>
<td>1548</td>
<td>746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>literature</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>1189</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3208</td>
<td>2737</td>
<td>1086</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| charter   | 7031      |
| literature| 5918      |

| charter   | 89%       | 56%     | 69%     | 88%       | 49%     | 68%     |
| literature| 11%       | 44%     | 31%     | 12%       | 51%     | 32%     |
| Total     | 46%       | 39%     | 15%     | 51%       | 33%     | 16%     |

4.23.1 **Weak Form Frequency in the P.P.**

Besides being frequent, the P.P. is also often a weak form. Table 14 will give a survey of the strong-weak distribution of the P.P. in the Gallo–Romance zone. Where a variety of forms exists for one verb, the most frequent is indicated by an asterisk. Where certain verbs are not attested in the main list an example has been supplied from Anglade or Philipon together with the page number. This table shows that the vast majority of participles take a weak form. Among the verbs with strong forms only *mourir* and *mettre* (standard Occitan) and *soudre* (Occitan) do not also have weak forms. There is a tendency for the signitics to have matching strong forms, the strong is predominant in four cases (2 French, 2 Occitan), while the weak is more frequent in eight cases (4 French, 3 Franco-Provençal, 1 Occitan). The verbs possessing strong forms often have them for both French and Occitan, or even the whole Gallo–Romance zone. Only *tollir*, *voir* and possibly *gésir* show signs of a divergent treatment by Occitan.

4.23.2 **Weak U Frequency in the Northern P.P.**

In standard Old Provençal, although most participles for the Latin -*ui* verbs are weak *u* types, these correspond to a strong, preterite, i.e., *ac – agut*. The vocalism of
Table 14: Occurrence of Strong and Weak Past Participles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>avoir</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>connaître</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>croire</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>devoir</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gésir</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>A 335</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>A 335</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paraître</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>A 339</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>P 253</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pouvoir</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>P 245</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>savoir</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soudre</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tenir</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>valoir</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vouloir</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manoir</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>(Gascon)</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mettre</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-cevoir</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-lire</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mourir</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>P 260</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rompre</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>A 296</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tolir</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>P 255</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>venir</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vêtr</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vivre</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voir</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>P 246</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A = Anglade  
P = Philipon 1901  
* = more frequent

the weak form does not affect the preterite at any time, although the guttural associated with the -ui class begins to spread from the 12th C. onwards.

However, in the French dialect zone during the same period, the relationship of the two tenses is somewhat different and the preterite does in fact correspond to the vocalism of the participle from pre-literary times for some verbs:

P.3. dût P.P. deu
P.3. parut P.P. paru
Numerical comparisons may suggest which verbal forms possess a majority of weak \( u \) types. Table 15 singles out verbs for which the weak \( u \) form is the exclusive type during the period running from the 9th to 15th C. Unfortunately, some of these verbs are poorly attested and this has been indicated by the symbol \( \dagger \). The distribution obtained suggests that the weak \( u \) form has its stronghold in the past participle. It is prevalent in verbs of the Latin -\( u i \) class and in the \( d e d i \) category.

In the northern zone, the participles which do not belong to the weak \( u \) category are of two main types, strong or weak \( i \):

1) **Strong**

These may be \( s \) forms, formerly characteristic of the Latin III conjugation. They may be derived from C.L. participles, e.g., *courir* or from V.L. developments, e.g., *soudre*, but both developed weak \( u \) alternatives in O.F. *Soudre*, now fallen into disuse as a simple verb, has retained a compound with two past participles into Modern French. *Résolu* is the common form, but *résous* has been maintained as chemistry terminology. *Mourir*, which has an irregular strong P.P., kept this form intact, only developing analogical *mournu* dialectally. Wahlgren attributes the survival of *mort* to adjectival usage, which protected the form from the analogical action so common in verbal forms (p. 190). Other strong participles that occur belong to *lire* and *rompre*, but these also possess weak \( u \) forms in medieval French.

2) **\( i \) types**

The verbs *cheoir*, *tolir* and *vêtir* possess non-\( u \) forms, attested in the oldest range of texts. *Vêtir* can be considered primarily as an -\( ir \) verb, which developed a participle in \( u \). *Cheoir* and *tolir* have a Western form -\( eit \) in such texts as *La Chanson de Roland*. All these verbs develop weak \( u \) forms by analogy.
4.24 PRETERITE FREQUENCY

This tense appears more often in literary sources than in the charters. Certain ancient texts, predating and including La Chanson de Roland, offer evidence of a more archaic stage in the development of the language. However, this is not always the case and indeed the literary samples span a period from the 9th to 15th C. with the charters
occupying the middle ground.

4.241 COMMON PRETERITE FORMS

As Table 10 shows, the preterite is the best attested form for some verbs. In particular this group includes avoir, être, savoir and vouloir. The percentage distribution for these 4 verbs is shown in diagram

Table 16: Most Frequent Preterite Forms in G-R.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>P.P.</th>
<th>Pret</th>
<th>I.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>940</td>
<td>avoir</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1109</td>
<td>être</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>savoir</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>vouloir</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The behaviour of avoir, savoir and vouloir will be dealt with in more detail elsewhere. Numerically and in terms of percentage the preterite form of être is very frequent indeed. Other verbs may have patterned themselves on it by analogy, a view firmly adopted by J. Bourciez in regard to the wk-o forms of Gascon (pp. 65-6). As an absolute figure, the presence of être is even higher, as the count only includes the earliest literary texts up to the Chanson de Roland, the charters of Oise, Haute-Marne, the Vosges and Lyonnais districts, the Brunel collection of Occitan texts and the charters of BEC vol. 44.

4.242 NORTHERN PRETERITES

Both sigmatics and some ui verbs maintain strong preterites in the earlier texts of the northern zone, but the -ui class exhibits form variation from the outset and the sigmatics undergo a major remodelling from the 13th C. onwards. Some of these changes can be attributed to the loss of stem final or intervocalic single consonants, which differentiates the French dialects from their Occitan counterparts. Table 15 has shown that
verbs which always have $u$ vocalism in the preterite are less common than those with weak $u$ participles. Five verbs have $u$ preterites at all times, seven if Picard–Walloon variants are excluded, but of these only three are attested in large quantities, *connaître*, *recevoir* and the irregular *être*. Most of the other 23 verbs in the list, including some of the Latin $-ui$ class, may possess $u$ preterites, but they also have other types and these are very varied. They can be divided according to basic Latin class and subdivided following their development, as shown in Table 17.

**Table 17: Verbs with Possible $u$ Participle but other Preterite in O.F.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Alignment</th>
<th>Verb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>-ui</td>
<td>strong</td>
<td>avoir, gésir, pouvoir, savoir, vouloir (also plaisir)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-ui/v</td>
<td>sigmatic</td>
<td>soudre, vouloir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>-ui</td>
<td>irregular i</td>
<td>tenir (and venir by analogy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>-ui</td>
<td>wk $-i$</td>
<td>paraître</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>dedi</td>
<td>wk $-e/i$</td>
<td>cheoir, rendre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>dedi</td>
<td>wk $-e/i$</td>
<td>croire, vendre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>other</td>
<td>wk $-e/i$</td>
<td>tolir, vivre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>other</td>
<td>wk $-i$</td>
<td>vestir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>other</td>
<td>$-i$</td>
<td>mourir, vivre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>other</td>
<td>$-i$</td>
<td>voir</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E = early text (up to *Roland*)
L = later text (after *Roland*)

It appears that the $ui$ class is less unified in its preterite forms than in the corresponding past participles. Other classes of verb are not really characterized by weak $u$ preterites, even in Modern French and where they occur they may well be analogical formations, e.g., *cheoir, croire, lire, mourir, vivre*. Not all such alignments are necessarily late developments. However, a comparison with other Romance languages is a useful precaution before attributing hypothetical V.L. $-ui$ forms to verbs which develop $u$ preterites, e.g., *morui* is extremely unlikely.
If we turn to the Franco-Provençal zone, there is decidedly less adherence to the weak *u* form than in the North. As Philipon says (1901:279), "Les parfaits en –*ui* de II ont été étendus par analogie à quelques verbes de III, mais ce mode de formation a pris beaucoup moins d'extension en Lyonnais qu'en français." Excluding *être*, all the verbs which form their preterite exclusively in *u* in attested examples in the French dialects do *not* do so in Lyon. Even *connaitre*, which possesses some weak *u* preterite forms also has P.4. *connoißimos*, P.6. *connoissippi*nt (p. 249) in this region. Table 18 shows the Franco-Provençal distribution of types with *u* vocalism for the preterite and past participle using the 5 verbs which are always attested with *u* in the Northern zone, plus *devoir* and the frequently attested *recevoir*, which also always have *u*, except in the Picard–Walloon i region. Philipon's work has been consulted to supply examples of forms which are absent from the main list.

Table 18: Occurrence of Franco-Provençal *u* Forms in Preterite and P.P.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Preterite</th>
<th>P.P.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>connaitre</em></td>
<td>mixed</td>
<td>+u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>croître</em></td>
<td>–u</td>
<td>+u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>devoir</em></td>
<td>no e.g.</td>
<td>+u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>être</em></td>
<td>+u</td>
<td>–u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>valoir</em></td>
<td>–u</td>
<td>+u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ester</em></td>
<td>–u</td>
<td>–u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>recevoir</em></td>
<td>–u</td>
<td>mixed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No preterite examples are available for *devoir*. However, it is obvious that the P.P. of the verb is more likely to have a *u* form that the preterite, with the exception of *être* and *ester*. The series *avoir, devoir, savoir, pouvoir*, which does not necessarily have a *u* preterite in Franco-Provençal, nonetheless has the weak *u* participle in this zone.
4.244 OCCITAN PRETERITES

In medieval standard Occitan, the -ui class had extended itself to take in such verbs as tolre and venir, which assumed the guttural element, tolc, venc. Weak forms had not replaced the strong preterites and it is not useful to make a comparison of individual verbs, as no significant variation occurs until slightly later (v. 4.331-4.335).

4.25 FREQUENCY OF I.S.

This tense differs from the preterite and the P.P. in that it is always a weak form. It is less well-attested overall.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 19: Frequency of I.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All verbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- être</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For pouvoir and valoir, the I.S. is the most frequent form. Table 10 shows that it has a relatively high incidence in the modal verbs. Expressed as a percentage this gives the following results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 20: I.S. in Modal Verbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (all tenses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% I.S.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.251 NORTHERN I.S.

In the Northern zone the extension of weak u forms in the -ui class of verbs is greater than it would seem from Table 15. This form is in fact the usual one for avoir,
devoir, pouvoir and savoir. However, pouvoir has an alternate weak -i form and the N-E Picard–Walloon areas has an i form as part of its regular paradigm.

4.252 FRANCO–PROVENÇAL I.S.

The main verb list contains few examples for the Franco–Provençal zone. Philipon indicates u forms for avoir, devoir and savoir (1901:243–6). Pouvoir is mixed u and i types, while vouloir has mixed s and i types as in French.

4.253 OCCITAN I.S.

In the Occitan zone, verbs of the ui class form the I.S. by using their guttural base evolved from unstressed u (Anglade, 310). Certain verbs that did not belong to the -ui category in C.L. accept the paradigm of this group in Occitan. These include recebre, which follows the pattern of saber, tole and also venir, by analogy with tener. Courir, which varies between -ui and sigmatic preterite usage in Occitan is unattested as an I.S. form in the texts investigated. The case of cazer is ambiguous and it seems likely that the forms should be considered as a mixture of -ui and dedi paradigms.

4.254 THE I.S. AS INDICATOR OF PRETERITE USAGE

In general terms the imperfect subjunctive may serve as a useful indicator of preterite usage. J. Bourciez (p. 92) notes, "Toutes les fois que les formes du parfait font défaut quelque part, celles de l'imparfait du subj. sont en principe valables pour attester l'usage sur un point donné." These comparisons are a guide. However, where analogical restructuring has taken place, the two tenses are not necessarily changed simultaneously (e.g., a sigmatic I.S. of vouloir continues alongside a weak u preterite in the 15th C. in the Northern zone).

4.26 SUMMARY OF FREQUENCY SURVEY

To summarize, the following facts emerge from this brief frequency survey:

1. The weak u P.P. is popular in the Gallo–Romance area, occurring for verbs
evolved from the Latin \(-ui\) or \(dedi\) classes, as well as those aligned to these groups by analogy.

2. The P.P. is the most commonly attested form in the samples collected.

3. \(\text{\`etre}\) is of extremely high frequency, especially as a preterite.

4. Most verbs with C.L. or early V.L. \(ui\), \(v\) or \(dedi\) preterites standardize \(u\) participles in G–R. An exception is \(\text{`etre}\). However, some verbs, such as \(\text{cheoir}\) or \(\text{soudre}\) are variable.

5. In medieval Occitan \(-ui\) preterites are strong and contain a guttural sound, while Franco-Provencal prefers weak \(-i\) types for this category. In the French dialects, some verbs of the \(-ui/\-v\) class have possessed a preterite with \(u\) vocalism in all persons from preliterary times. However, the class includes four other types of preterite formation. The type with weak \(u\) vocalism can be considered as peculiar to the French dialects of Gallo-Romance.

6. In the north the weak \(u\) form is common in the I.S. paradigms of the \(-ui\) class, but exists alongside weak \(i\) and sigmatic forms for some verbs, e.g., \(\text{pouvoir}, \text{vouloir}\). In Occitan the velarization of unstressed \(u\) has given rise to the guttural trait used as the base form for the preterite and I.S. in verbs of the \(-ui\) class. The weak \(u\) is absent from both tenses and only occurs in the participle.

4.3 FORM COMBINATIONS IN GALLO-ROMANCE

The verb list will also help to clarify how G–R used the basic "building blocks" provided by the Latin system and recombined them in its own verbal paradigms. Each main zone will be treated separately.
4.31 NORTHERN U PRETERITE

In modern standard French u vocalism, present in P.P., preterite and I.S., characterises almost all verbs of the -ui class, e.g., pu, pus, pusse. Obvious exceptions in this study are tenir and venir, while nooci, which has an OF P.P. neu, has been excluded since it does not develop a u preterite and is poorly attested. However, in the medieval period, this means of relationship by u vocalism was not so marked and the preterite showed the most diversity among the forms under consideration. Restructuring and class change occur within the medieval era and there is no reason to suppose that they were a new phenomenon. Because of this fact and because of the scant evidence before the 11th C. it is sometimes difficult to decide if a form goes back to V.L. or if it is a more recent creation of the French system.

4.311 EARLY ATTESTATIONS

For the -ui class, the examples gathered show that a u correspondence existed in the P.P., preterite and I.S. from the earliest literary period for:

connaître (S. Alexis, Rol.)

croître (Rou)

devoir (S. Alexis, Rol., excluding Walloon)

paraître (no attested I.S.)

This group includes paraître, which possibly developed its preterite phonetically from Latin forms, a view accepted by Fouché or Andrieux and Baumgartner, but rejected by Mourin (v. 3.511, 3.5123). Other verbs that align to this group, such as valoir, courir possess alternate forms in the early medieval period. However, connaître, croître, and devoir do not fall into this class, but are attested with a -u on the radical of the strong forms in S. Alexis, Roland and Rou. Fouché offers a phonetic explanation of the development of croître (p. 308) and connaître, devoir (pp. 315-6). Having done this, he notes the discrepancy which exists between the predicted deut form and the dut which actually occurs. He groups this with ot and pot and says the vocalism arises due to the
interference of P.1. This matter will be discussed in more detail in reference to *avoir* and *pouvoir* (v. 4.51).

### 4.312 STRESS STRUCTURES

As a preliminary to understanding the behaviour of the northern French patterns, it is useful to list the stress structures of the French dialect zone. The so-called "strong" verbs had survived in the early language. The sigmatics had an alternation of the type P.3. *mist* P.5. *meistes.* For the *-ui* class, the list affords the examples P.2. *geüs,* P.3. *joth/put* and P.4. *rejeumes.* The weak persons are poorly attested in the charters and early literature, but the collected examples offer no great surprises and can probably be taken as representative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>avoir</em></td>
<td>oûmes (Rol.)</td>
<td>aumes, eumes (C)</td>
<td>owins (Wal.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>connaitre</em></td>
<td>conêumes (S. Alexis)</td>
<td>conoumes (C)</td>
<td>deviens (C., Wal.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>devoir</em></td>
<td>geus (Bart.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>gësin</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>rejeumes (Bart.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>pouvoir</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>peusmes (Nim.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>sauvoir</em></td>
<td>volsis (Rou)</td>
<td></td>
<td>sceustes (15th C.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>vouloir</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>vo(I)sistes (Rou)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>cheoir</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>chaistes (Bart.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>croire</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>creistes (Rou)</td>
<td>creutes (Adam)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Returning to the *-ui* class, we have noted that verbs such as P.3. *parut, corut, valut* had fixed stress available from pre-literary times and this corresponded to the pattern of the common weak forms. *Tenir, soudre* and *vouloir* did not possess alternating *u* preterite forms and *être* had fixed radical stress. However, in their weak persons, the other verbs in the sample have a radical ending in a vowel. *Croître* is not attested in the preterite,
but the I.S. supplies a form with pre-tonic e stem. The radical vowel of these verbs was e in central French, although it could be o or a elsewhere. To this was attached a flexion, which was usually weak u, e.g., P.2. ge-ūs P.4. pe-ūmes, cone-ūmes although it could be -i in certain cases. Andrieux and Baumgartner (p. 160) offer a preterite in i for pouvoir, but this is not otherwise available in the present study list. When we turn to strong forms, we find the following in P.3. for the -ui class:

- avoir - aut, out, eut, ot
- connaître - conut
- croître - crut
- devoir - dut
- gesir - jut, giut, joth
- pouvoir - pout, peut, pot
- savoir - sout, sol

4.313 FLUCTUATIONS

By including the whole study list, a table can be drawn up to show 10 verbs possessing forms which fluctuate significantly in form or orthography between early medieval French and more modern usage. The table uses 11th to 14th C. O.F. P.3. samples, which have been chosen because this person is the most frequent, followed by the 15th C. counterpart and lastly the modern form for purposes of comparison.

4.3131 FLUCTUATIONS IN AVOIR, POUVOIR, SAVOIR TYPE

This table shows that the verbs avoir, pouvoir and savoir have a strong form in their early preterite of which the vowel is written as o. This factor is constant, even when dialectal variation au, ou, eu appears in the weak persons. The written form o is attested in the 11th C. in the ms. of S. Leger, which also includes an isolated examples of gesir, joth. A strong form written with a u also occurs in S. Leger, i.e., aut. In the 12th C. Anglo-Norman mss. of S. Alexis and La Chanson de Roland, this appears as
Table 22: Verbs that Adopt u Vocalisms During the French Literary Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Old French</th>
<th>15th C. (Rickard)</th>
<th>Modern French</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>avoir</td>
<td>aut, out, eut, ot</td>
<td>eut, ot</td>
<td>eut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gesir</td>
<td>jut, giut, joth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pouvoir</td>
<td>pout, peut, pot</td>
<td>peut, pot</td>
<td>put</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>savoir</td>
<td>sout, sot</td>
<td>sceut</td>
<td>sut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vouloir</td>
<td>volt, vout, vost</td>
<td>voulut</td>
<td>voulut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cheoir</td>
<td>cadit, cait, choi</td>
<td>cheut</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>croire</td>
<td>crei, croi, crut</td>
<td>crut</td>
<td>crut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-lire</td>
<td>enluit (Walloon) eslist</td>
<td>leut, lisy, lysit</td>
<td>lut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mourir</td>
<td>murut, mori, mourit</td>
<td>morut</td>
<td>mourut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vivre</td>
<td>visquet, vesqui</td>
<td>vesqui</td>
<td>vécut</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

out (also sout, pout), with the ot form appearing just once in Roland. By the period of the earliest 13th C. charters, it is very unusual to find an ot form, although this does occur in Poitou and Normandy. It is common in Lyon and Forez during the later 13th to 14th C. period. The standard charter spelling for these verbs includes a u in the strong forms. This was written as eu in the Picard and Central type or ou, au in peripheral zones, ou predominating in the West and au in the east, though these are not mutually exclusive. Gossen’s research lends general support to this view, but includes no comment on the au forms (Carte 1, p. 9). However, in literature, simple o orthography, e.g., pot, is normal throughout the period and is found right up to the 15th C. The charters of the central area always use eu from the 13th C. The restructuring of these forms will be considered in more detail later (v. 4.51). At present, it is sufficient to note that two forms existed alongside each other and that the vocalism of the weak u eventually became standard in both literary and non-literary works. As in the case of dut, fut, crut, it occupied the radical.

4.3132 FLUCTUATIONS IN THE VOULOIR TYPE

Vouloir illustrates analogical change quite clearly, because the process takes place within the literary period and the verb is relatively frequent. The earliest P.3. examples of this verb have volt and this continues in literary usage, even at a period when the
charters always indicate the vocalisation of l, vouit. Whatever sound this represents, it does not cause an alignment to the weak u class. A sigmatic form existed in the weak persons of vouloir and this spread into P.3. and remained popular throughout the later medieval period. By the 15th C. the preterite was indeed aligned to the weak u form but through direct replacement by an analogical form modelled on the P.P., voulut. The I.S. still remained as a sigmatic for some time after this.

4.3133 FLUCTUATION IN CROIRE, CHEOIR

Cheoir and croire both fluctuate between weak i or u forms, although u is earlier for croire, appearing for example in Huon de Bordeaux, while the alignment of cheoir is later. Certain texts maintain an original intervocalic d in both verbs, accompanied by i forms:

creidre (Eulalie) P.3. cadit (S. Leger) cadeir (Roland)

It seems likely that both verbs evolved from a dedi type in northern G–R. Nonetheless, they both develop weak u paradigms. Wace, Rou contains 9 examples of i preterites and although the work contains an example of P.3. crut, significantly it is from a late ms. (Duchesne 79, 17th C.). Holden notes, "Wace ne connaît que le parfait en i des verbes cheeir, creire et leurs composés" (Rou, intro. 184). The earliest attested P.3. crut from a charter occurs in the Oise area in 1272. Cheoir also appears as an i preterite in the oldest texts:

ceciderunt : caderunt (Reichenau Glosses)

incidit : intus cadit (ibid.)

The example of P.6. chaurent from Bartsch is the oldest u form for this verb in the list. Unfortunately the preterite is not attested in the northern charters. A P.I. chey can be found in Rickard as late as the 15th C. and this is supported by the I.S. available from the same period. Croire has a weak u participle from preliterary times, so this could have influenced the preterite remodelling in the medieval period. The similarity of croître may have caused some interference as well, since this verb has a u preterite from
the pre-literary era. According to Mourin's theory some northern irregular verbs tend to adopt u vocalism when phonetic developments cause the loss of their stem final consonant and this could apply to cheoir and croire. The distribution of the i types and the additional evidence of the I.S. lend support to the idea that they were widespread, rather than localised dialectal forms.

4.3134 FLUCTUATION IN LIRE

Lire fluctuates throughout the medieval period. Preterite forms are rare in the study list, but Andrieux and Baumgartner place the verb with sigmatics in O.F. (pp. 174–5). In the 15th C. it appears as P.3. listis in Rickard, a form which may be based on the present stem (Wahlgren, 135). The presence of a u participle is well attested in the 13th C. charters and probably determined the ultimate victory of u forms in the preterite, though lire continued unstable for some time (v. 4.34, 4.43).

4.3135 FLUCTUATION IN MOURIR

Mourir only possesses a strong participle in the standard language, although mouru is very common dialectally. This situation has been explored in detail by Wahlgren (pp. 190–91), who notes that the adjectival character of mort may have preserved it from analogical levelling. In early documents mourir often appears with an i preterite as well as u. Some influence from the paradigm of courir or paroir is probable. Gradually the u form prevailed in the preterite of mourir and may have influenced vivre, with which it is linked semantically. In all older documents this latter verb occurs with an i form in the preterite and a weak u past participle. In the 15th C., it was also an i verb, so that its alignment to the weak u group can be considered a late analogical phenomenon. Vaugelas notes that there is confusion (Manz, 191–2). This 17th C. grammarian allows the u preterite for P.3. and P.6. only. However, the usage is far from rigid and Vaugelas recommends that euphony be taken into account, especially by those with literary aspirations. Thus he remarks, "P. ex. j'aimerois mieux dire, 'il vesquit et mourut
chrestiennement' que non pas, 'il *vescut et *mournu' à cause de la rudesse de ces deux mêmes terminaisons." Nonetheless *u was victorious in both forms and it certainly seems likely that the semantic connection between the verbs encouraged a parallel development.

4.3.14 CONCLUSIONS

The survey of the preterite in the French zone extends over a longer period than that undertaken in other areas. However, it is still true that many developments in the formation of the language occurred in pre-literary times. Hypotheses, which may be more or less well-founded, have evolved to explain the origin of the weak *u* perfects, but often they cannot be proved by attested examples. In the literary period, the following types of restructuring may be observed:

1. An attempt to modify stress patterns and regularize irregular verbs:
   (early) *volt/vout* -- > *vost
   (late) *vout/vost* -- > *voulut*

   In the first case, the sigmatic stem of the weak form has exercised analogy on the strong persons. The second change, belonging to the period when the sigmatics were forced to restructure, substitutes an analogical form using the regular present base. *Soudre*, poorly attested as a preterite in the study list, also follows this movement, e.g., absols (S. Leger) -- > *absou(l)s* et *absolus* (Manz, 164) continued in modern French as *je résolus, f absolus*.

2. The adoption of a weak *u* form by verbs which lack a final radical consonant owing to phonetic developments:
   *cadit* (S. Leger) -- > cait, chai -- > *cheut* (15th C.)

3. Increased uniformity of final vocalic timbre and loss of alternating forms in strong verbs of the *-ui* class having *u* forms in the weak persons of their preterite:
   *pout/peut/pot* -- > *put*

4. The adoption of *u* preterite forms by verbs with *i* preterites, due to analogical
factors:

*mourir, vivre, tolir*

In conclusion, it can be noted that French, like Occitan, ultimately lost the alternating strong perfect derived from Latin. However, it maintained an *i/u* polarization between many of its irregular forms, although analogical realignments in the literary period resulted in overall gains for the *u* class.

4.32 FRANCO-PROVENÇAL PRETERITE

The development of the Latin III conjugation and in particular the Latin *-didi* class of preterite in the Lyon district differs from that of the rest of the Gallo-Romance area. Philipon 1901:276) notes:

Le parfait . . . paraît avoir été formé en ancien français sur le simple *dēdi* qui en bas latin avait remplacé *-didi* dans les composés de *do*. Les formes lyonnaises, au contraire, pourraient dériver de *-didi*; *rendet, rendett* . . . dans Marguerite d'Oigt - *eit* s'est réduit à *-it; rendit*.

He also states (p. 277) that "Les verbes dérivés des composés de *do* (sont) accentués à la 3 pers. sing. du parfait sur la voyelle radicale." He claims that this stress was maintained for other verbs of the III conjugation.

However, the *-ire* conjugation plays an extensive analogical rôle in the Franco-Provençal area and so in fact the stress pattern may change, "Un très grand nombre de verbes dérivés de verbes primitifs latins (verbes en *ère*) ont en lyonnais un parfait secondaire, c'est à dire accentué à la 3 pers. sing. non pas sur la voyelle du radical, mais sur la désinence" (Philipon 1901:278).

As usual, these analogical restructurings are not totally uniform, "Cette désinence *-ivi* a pénétré dans III de différentes façons; ou bien elle s'est ajoutée au thème de l'indicatif prés., ou bien, et c'est là le cas le plus fréquent, elle est venu se juxtaposer au thème des parfaits sigmatiques" (1901:278-9)

a) *corrit, recevit*
b) rema(n)sit

In addition, it is possible to find the formation in some of the -ui class, e.g., creissit (croître), apparit. Even within the -u preterites, the weak u seems conspicuously absent from many forms. Philipon offers the following two examples which are not available on the study list:

boire (V.L. bibuit v. Brunot, 88) P.3. bit, bevit (1901:249)

plaire P.3. plaisit (1901:253)

Of the verbs that do possess u vocalism conoistre is the only one to have it on a strong person. Avoir and savoir have weak u forms for the weak persons, but the strong at, orent, sot, sorent type for P.3. and P.6., P.1. being unattested. For the weak persons, au represents the vowel sound, e.g., aumes, saumes, with just one example of au in P.6. aurent (1901:243). An analogical omes occurs in P.4.

4.321 THE PRETERITE - FRANCO-PROVENCAL

Pouvoir, as well as having the form P.3. pot, also possesses types where the vocalic timbre is written as /y in this region. Philipon (p. 275) notes that this is a combination *potu + ivit, saying, "Ici, comme dans les cas analogues, c'est la désinence romane venue de -tvi qui s'est ajoutée au thème roman venu de potui; quant à tirer poyt de potuit avec rejet d'accent, ot, habuit et sot, sapuit s'y opposent." The overall conclusion is that the weak u form was not popular in the preterite of the Franco-Provençal zone and that the -ir verb enjoyed a greater potential for analogical extension.

4.33 OCCITAN PRETERITE

In old Provençal the -ui class of verb was associated with a perfective system which had evolved a guttural element as the distinctive feature of its type. During the medieval period, strong alternating forms were fully alive and were standard, but, as in French, a movement towards weak paradigms began to occur and such forms are attested
sporadically from the 12th C. Brunel notes, "À la prem. pers. sing. apparaît vers 1170 une désinence non étymologique en i (fesi, presi, aigui etc.) qui reste rare et ne caractérise aucune région" (intro. xlv). At the same time, strong forms could become weak forms by using endings from another conjugation:

L’adjonction de désinences accentuées est fréquente, surtout à la trois. pers. plur. Elles sont empruntées aux parfaits en -edi; dissero, ... solsero ... etc., combinées parfois avec le g des parfaits en -ui; escadegro. Le phénomène analogue pour la 3 pers. sing. est un peu plus rare; asolbeg ... escazec. (Brunel, intro. xlv)

4.331 THE GUTTURAL IN STANDARD OCCITAN

The guttural element attaching to the -ui class spread out to other verbs and was used in the composition of various sorts of weak form. This phenomenon will now be illustrated by samples from the list:

**Standard Occitan**

A weak P.l. develops in verbs of the -ui class:

agui ← tengui, vengui

saubi, receubi (Recebre follows the pattern of saber).

The -c of the strong form occurs in verbs which possess other formations for P.3.:

escadec - also occurs as cazet of the dedi type.

correc - also attested as a sigmatic

estec - usually estet

vendec - normally vendet

legic - -ir verb

moric/g - -ir verb

The stress may also move to the weak position in P.6., e.g., escadegro (Brunel, intro. xlv).
4.332 THE GUTTURAL IN GASCON

Gascon

The Gascon zone is particularly favourable to weak forms and develops a special o type. J. Bourciez believes that this arose from the crossing of the weak stem of aver with the endings of esser (pp. 65–6). Insofar as it maintains a guttural marker, it can be considered an extension of the -ui type paradigm. The following varieties occur in the study list:

a) P.3. May adopt the accented ending on the dedi pattern with the guttural characteristic of the -ui class as an ending:
   solbeg, arseubeg, redeg

b) Gascon weak o forms may use the preterite base of the -ui class:
   tengo, convingo, bieco, vengoren

c) They may also duplicate this by adding a second perfect marker:
   puguoc

d) The weak o form extends beyond the -ui class in Gascon. However, the fact that it marks the perfect may cause the guttural associated with the -ui verbs to be discarded and the radical may be aligned to the present (J. Bourciez, 89):
   prometo
   receboron, arceberen

   although in the case of recebre the preterite base is also common, e.g.,
   rescuberen.

4.333 THE GUTTURAL IN POITEVIN

This zone is especially notable in that it has well-attested weak guttural forms for P.1., P.3. and P.6. attached to flexions modelled on the pattern of the northern dialects. For P.1. the form is associated with -ui verbs of the habui category:

ogui (with the initial o common in the west)
tengui, vougui (vouloir)

recegui, sagui (assimilated to this group)

P.3. has:

oguit, aguit, poguit

The ending -imes replaces Occitan -em in P.4.:

aguimes, receguimes (not agem, receubem)

A wider variety of verbs is attested in P.6.

aguirent, apareguirent, avenguirent, tenguirent, poguiron.

4.334 MORE RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN OCCITAN

This brief presentation of assorted examples illustrates the Occitan tendency to abandon strong irregular forms in favour of weak, regular ones, often by using analogical forms stemming from original -ui perfects. Although barely begun in the 12th C., this movement to weak forms is complete in the modern language, "Dans tous les parlers actuels, la désinence a attiré l'accent" (Ronjat, 180). In the Occitan area any clear distinction between strong sigmatic, strong i and guttural forms was lost:

Rhodanien

(i) vi : veguère
(s) dis : diguère
(u) aic : aguère (Ford, 88).

Gascon

vi : beyouy (Barèges)

dis : digouy (Béarnais)


In modern literary Occitan, the distinctive marker of the irregular preterite group is consonantal. This feature, noted as g has spread beyond irregular strong types and embraces the dedi and -ir class, e.g., finigue, rendegue. However, in the western reaches of the Occitan zone, certain dialects of Gascon have adapted their irregular perfects to weak forms by means of stress shift and the adoption of u vocalism. Ronjat offers some tentative reasons for all these changes:
Le préterit primitif ne distinguait pas toujours toutes les personnes; il pouvait à certaines personnes se confondre avec le prés; il manquait d'omogénéité dans les désinences et même parfois dans le tême. Finalement il s'est presque partout régularisé . . . (Ronjat, 181)

4.335 CONCLUSIONS

A serious examination of the evolution of old to modern Occitan is beyond the chronological scope of this study, but a limited summary of developments is useful in that it allows a comparison to be drawn with the mechanisms for change that were operative in the French zone. Both areas show a marked desire to abandon the old alternating irregular forms inherited from Latin and both are involved in extensive analogical restructuring. The vigour of the verbal group evolved from the Latin \(-ui\) class is affirmed in both regions. In Occitan the diversity of formal solutions adopted, involving stress shifts or various types of suffixing, suggests that regional developments work in favour of variety when no literary norm intervenes.

4.34 NORTHERN \(U\) P.P.

The characteristic past participle for the French dialect zone for the Latin \(-ui\) class is weak \(u\), the only exception being soudre (C.L. solutum) which developed an analogical sigmatic in numerous Romance languages (v. 1.253). The weak \(u\) form is also standard for the regular \(dedi\) class verbs with \(-re\) infinitive. When the verbal stem ended in a nasal, a liquid, \(r\) or a consonant cluster, the final consonant was maintained, e.g., paru, tenu, volu, vendu, vescu. In other cases it was lost. Many of the \(-utum\) participles have evolved phonetically from V.L. *Saputus and *-ciputus, which could have been expected to evolve differently, as in Occitan, have been aligned to the *habutum type, but in these cases the \(u\) vocalism is not affected.
4.341 TYPES OF EXTENSION OF U P.P.

However, several verbs which probably did not have V.L. -utum participles join this category in French. These include a series of strong participles, which restructure their base on the present tense:

\[ \text{rot} \rightarrow \text{rompu} \]
\[ \text{(des)cusz} \rightarrow \text{count} \]
\[ \text{sous} \rightarrow \text{(re)solu (resous remaining in chemistry)} \]
\[ \text{mors} \rightarrow \text{mordu} \]

As in Occitan, a sigmatic may Compound a weak \text{u} suffix to an \text{s} base:

\[ \text{remasus} = \text{remas} + \text{us} \]

Besides the analogical restructuring using the \text{u} suffix, which replaces sigmatic or strong participles, there are several other variations attested within this language zone. Occasionally verbs may have both weak \text{u} and some other form, e.g., \text{lire}, \text{cheoir}, \text{tolir}, \text{vestir}. The evidence suggests that \text{lire} originally had /i/ vocalism, but lost its intervocalic consonant and became open to analogical realignment.\(^3\) A range of forms using \text{u}, \text{s} or neither suffix can be drawn from early texts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 23: Variable Forms for Lire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Past Part.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>esleu (H–Mn. 1232)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eslit (Rou Vos. 1261)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aliz (Vos. 1259)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both \text{Cheoir} and \text{Tolir} possess an \text{-eit} form, which is mentioned as a western dialectal

\(^3\) A parallel may exist in Portuguese, where Williams calls \text{ler} a "pseudo weak" preterite, noting that this was a strong verb which became associated with weak types because its phonetically evolved form caused confusion, "The radical vowel became also the vowel of the ending and helped to give the tense the appearance of a weak preterite" (Williams, 199).
feature by Fouché (p. 377). Most of the attested forms are in fact western, although this type also appears for cheoir in the charters of Haute-Marne. The behaviour of Portuguese and Italian supports the view that these forms evolved by analogy with the *benedictu, collectu* model, e.g., Old Portuguese, *tolheito* (Williams, 186), Italian, *cogliere, togliere* (Fouché, 378). Both *u* and *-eit* forms are represented in early writings, but the latter declines, so that it is rare as a participle by the time of the charters, where it is generally abandoned in favour of *u* vocalism. *Vestir* adopted a *u* participle for a reason which is not obvious. However, a parallel movement, based on the Sicilian literary model, can be noted in Italian (v. 2.321). *Ester* always has a *u* participle in O.F. This is almost certainly analogical, although the cause is uncertain. The *u* alignment may serve to differentiate the participle from that used with *estre* or may be influenced by the fact that the verb lost its stem final consonant.

4.342 CONCLUSIONS

There is more standardization of participle forms in the northern zone as time goes by, so that the greatest variety is found in earlier texts. Weak forms become increasingly popular.

4.35 FRANCO-PROVENCAL U P.P.

Philipon does not make any specific comments about the P.P. in the Lyon area. The examples collected in this study, although they are less plentiful than those obtained for the other two language zones, show much similarity to the rest of the Gallo-Romance region. Table 14 indicates that where they possess both a strong and a weak form, then the weak one is more frequent. The weak *u* type is very widespread. Some of the examples are as late as the 15th C. and many tend to be aligned to the French form, without intervocalic guttural, although a part of Forez prefers Occitan.
FORMS WHICH DIFFER FROM O.F.

The following forms differentiate Franco-Provençal from the northern zone:

a) *Toudre* (northern *tolir*) attested in Philipon (p. 225) has a strong participle, as Occitan. The verb uses some sigmatic forms in the region and, as Wahlgren (p. 250) notes, these often have a strong participle.

b) *Corrogu* is an example of an Occitan form from Forez.

c) *Creyssu* (*croître*) is a local form built on the present stem. It survives in a noun form into the modern patois of Lyon, *cressues, croyssue* (Puitspelu, 107–108).

d) *Miset* (mettre) is an eccentric form, not conforming to any obvious pattern.

e) *faiti, feiti* (DLF Lyon 30;21) is probably aligned to the *-ir* conjugation. This is fairly common in Franco-Provençal.

f) *tramyssez* (transmettre) and *receptez* illustrate still another ending which is sometimes found in Franco-Provençal texts. This resembles the French *é* type for the common *-er* verb.

g) *rece(p)t*. This frequent form can be considered as a strong type, although the fact that it is a compound may mean it was perceived as a weak type. It could well be the analogical model for *miset*. FEW (vol. 10, p. 148) notes that the Latin noun *receptus* gave rise to a verb *rece(p)ter*, which co-existed extensively with *receivre* in O.F. An additional complication is that a Latin *recepto -avi* (Lewis and Short, 1531) also existed for this verb.

CONCLUSIONS

However, these examples must not obscure the fact that the weak *u* P.P. is extremely common and indeed the usual form for verbs deriving from the Latin II and III conjugations. This is all the more significant, because the *u* vocalism for the preterite is far less usual in Franco-Provençal than in French. This reinforces the claim that the past participle is a likely motivating force affected change in the direction of weak *u*
forms.

4.36 **OCCITAN U P.P.**

In Old Provençal -ui and dedi class verbs usually possessed a participle derived from V.L. -utum. This V.L. type could develop phonetically into Occitan, e.g., avut (or aut), attested 88 times in Bruneil. However, there are also 10 charter examples of agut and 10 literary ones. Bruneil notes, "Pour les verbes à parfait en -ui, les exemples sont nombreux de participes encore formés sur le radical du présent, les formes établies sur le radical du parfait sont encore loin de la généralité qu'elles acquerront plus tard, surtout pour le verbe aver" (intro. xlvi). Mourin, leaning heavily on the work of Wahlgren undertaken some 50 years earlier, believes that the origin of these g forms is largely analogical, extending from the placui type, which developed a guttural participle phonetically from *placutum (1975:124, cf. Wahlgren, 223). This matched the preterite in such a way that an easily recognisable correspondence was evident to the speaker.

Grafström notes that this analogical spread in Occitan replaced the matching presence of unstressed u, which occurred in both written forms of the perfectum during the Latin period,

> Les rapports étroits entre ces deux formes du perfectum s'exprimaient donc phonétiquement par la correspondance -ui -utus (présence de u). L'évolution phonétique fit disparaître cette correspondance dans un cas comme ac, avut. Il est naturel que la langue l'ait remplacée par une autre en créant agut.

(Grafström, 143)

He does not deal with the problem of synchronizing the phonetic evolution of the -ui preterite with the creation of the -utum participle (v. 1.252).

4.361 **TYPES OF EXTENSION OF U P.P.**

In Occitan, the -ut suffix became tremendously popular and could be attached to a variety of base forms. It was common to substitute the perfective stem because of the formal correspondence described above. The following examples illustrate various tendencies:
a) *Sauput*. The original Latin unstressed \(-u\) has been assimilated to the preterite base, which has been used to form a matching participle with the addition of the weak \(-ut\) suffix. The consonant of the present is also attested (Ronjat, 183). However, in the Gascon area *sabut* occurs frequently and this does not use the preterite stem.

b) *Recebre* normally follows a pattern similar to *saber*, with \(-cebut\) available as a parallel to *sabut*. Meanwhile, Poitou has created an analogical *recegu*, patterned on the guttural group.

c) Compounding can occur. *Cazut*, *(es)cadut* use the present base + \(ut\), but *cadegut* adds a preterite marker to the base before finishing with \(-ut\). This can happen in the case of verbs which are not of the \(-ui\) category. In fact the evidence indicates that *cazer* was not necessarily in this class (Wahlgren, 143), but the history of this verb is somewhat unclear. The I.S. supports a non-guttural type, though the strong *es* ending is noted (Anglade, 325).

d) The suffix may extend to what are basically sigmatic forms. These may compound or be attached to some other base, e.g., *remazut*, *tramesut* (sigmatic perfective + \(ut\)), *metud* (infinitive base + \(ut\)).

e) *Legir* contains a guttural which goes back to its Latin source. In Occitan it belongs to the \(-ir\) class (Anglade, 291). Nonetheless, due to its guttural element, it shows great fluctuation in the P.P. and develops a form in \(-ut\).

f) Verbs which have a strong P.P. may be given weak *u* forms by analogy. Table 14 has already indicated the popularity of the weak participle. The strong form *vist* occurs most commonly for the Occitan *vezet*. However *vezut* is created on the present stem and even *vegut* is attested in the list. Similarly *tolt* is paralleled by *torud* in Gascon and *tolgut* in standard
Occitan. It seems possible that the $-gu$ type was perceived as characteristic of the participle of the irregular verb by some speakers and not only of the $-ui$ and $dedi$ class.

g) The case of $estar$ shows that weak $u$ could extend to an $-ar$ verb, $estut$ being attested in Brunel. In conclusion, it must be noted that the weak $u$ form may occur without intervocalic consonant in Occitan, though this is relatively rare. The Brunel charters yield examples of $creut$ (croire) and $receut$.

4.362 CONCLUSIONS

In Occitan the correspondence between participle and preterite expressed through the perfective unstressed $u$ was changed due to phonetic developments. The language sought to re-establish some kind of identity and the most common and effective creation was a consonantal guttural sound evolved from the velarizing effect of unstressed $u$. This came to be perceived as a kind of characteristic past tense marker and enjoyed an ever greater success as time went by. Meanwhile, the weak $u$ suffix, developed from $-utum$ was confined to the participle forms. It was popular and extended beyond the $-ui$ and $dedi$ classes, but never affected the flexion of the preterite–I.S. paradigms.

4.37 INTRODUCTION TO THE I.S.

In most cases this corresponds to the weak form of the preterite. Therefore, it needs specific comment only where it differs from preterite usage or where it supplies additional evidence about a form which varies in the preterite.

4.371 THE I.S. IN THE FRENCH DIALECTS

In the northern zone, Walloon accords a characteristic dialectal treatment to verbs such as $avoir$. This is well-attested in early texts and the study list includes examples of $awist$, $owist$, $ewist$, etc. This form also applies to $devoir$, $pouvoir$ (powist, Wal. p. 70) and
savoir. Otherwise the most common form for all these types is the weak u type. Table 24 illustrates verbs which show some kind of variation in thematic patterning, showing what sort of form occurs, together with the earliest example and a numerical comparison when two types exist alongside each other.

Table 24: Attested Old I.S. Forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>+ u</th>
<th></th>
<th>+ i</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>pouvoir</td>
<td>C. S.W. d.1230 (x133)</td>
<td>pouvoir</td>
<td>L. Jon. 10th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>valoir</td>
<td>C. H–Mn. d.1258</td>
<td>valoir</td>
<td>C. H–Mn. d.1269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(sigmatic)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1 type)</td>
<td>L. S. Alexis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>vouloir</td>
<td>C. H–Mn. d.1269</td>
<td>vouloir</td>
<td>C. Oise d.1250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(sigmatic)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1 type)</td>
<td>L. S. Alexis/Rou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>choisir</td>
<td>L. Rou</td>
<td>choisir</td>
<td>L. Rou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>croire</td>
<td>L. Tristan</td>
<td>croire</td>
<td>L. Tristan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C. Norm d.1278(x3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>C. Norm d.1278(x3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>mourir</td>
<td>L. Rou</td>
<td>mourir</td>
<td>L. Rou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C. Poit. d.1274(x7)</td>
<td></td>
<td>C. Poit. d.1274(x7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>vivre</td>
<td>C. S.W. d.1250</td>
<td>vivre</td>
<td>C. S.W. d.1250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.372 THE I.S. IN FRANCO–PROVENCAL

The limited evidence of the Franco–Provençal zone tends to confirm the behaviour of its preterites. In the study list osse, which is a late form, lends additional support to the non-u spelling of P.I. aveir. Voleir has a sigmatic in this region, which parallels the French usage, although the volist type is attested in Fribourg in 1384. Creire occurs with a thematic -i in the I.S. Philipon supplies additional evidence and indicates that paraître, playre both possess thematic -i (1901:253). This is also the case for most of the I.S. forms of poir (p. 244). In this matter, it differs from aveir, saveir, deveir, which generally support the weak u form.
4.373 **THE I.S. IN OCCITAN**

*U* may be absent from the orthography of verbs derived from the Latin *-ui* class, since the vowel is not pronounced and syncope may occur, e.g., P.4. *decsem = deguessem*. In the Gascon zone, the flexion of *esser* is used in the I.S., as in the preterite, for all the weak *o* types, e.g., *agos, agosen*. It is not unusual for the present radical to be adopted for these forms, e.g., *podos, podossa* (Occitan, *pogues*). *Remaner* illustrates the fact that an *-ui* guttural may spread into the sigmatic class by analogy. Only sigmatic preterites are found for this verb in the study list and the Standard Occitan I.S. is of the P.2. *remases* type. However, P.3. *remagues* also occurs in the I.S. and Gascon has *armangos*.

4.4 **INTRODUCTION TO AREA DISTRIBUTION**

When the forms of individual verbs show variation, it is useful to distribute them by area to see if any regional trends occur. However, two main limitations are inherent in the present study list. These are that the Oise region, which straddles the Francièn–Picard border and also skirts the Norman region on one side, contains dialectal variation, but has been maintained as a single zone because the areas are undifferentiated in the source (v. Carolus–Barre). In addition numerous literary examples are omitted, because their origin is unsure or disputed. Besides the above factors, the uneven distribution of P.P. preterite, I.S. and noun makes the evaluation of weak *u* location difficult to judge. For example, an area may only contain attested participles and this may give it a high *u* score. Obviously this could prove deceptive. Thus, the figures are only useful for any overall trends which emerge. The incidence of Poitevin forms in *La Passion de Sainte Catherine* can be monitored, because it is the only literary text marked in this zone. *Saint Leger* is included near the Picard–Walloon border. Otherwise only *Saint Alexis, La Chanson de Roland* and Wace, *Rou*, have been included on a regular basis. Other literary sources are indicated as necessary.
4.41 *AVOIR GROUP* - PRET., P.P., I.S.

In the first map, the sample has been restricted to the northern and Franco-Provençal areas. Although Maps 1 and 2 concentrate on *avoir* the spelling tendency which they illustrate may be discernable in other verbs, e.g., P.P. *crau* (Haute-Marne). *Devoir, pouvoir* and *savoir* are shown in Maps 3, 4 and 5. The group *avoir, devoir, savoir* and *pouvoir*, which also includes weak i forms, shows regional differentiation in the orthography and probably the pronunciation of their initial vowel sound. This may throw some light on how the forms developed. In the study list, *avoir* is the best-attested of these verbs and the distribution of its forms is illustrated in Map 1. This shows clearly that *eu* is a central form, though it radiates out to other areas. The peripheral forms contain two main tendencies. One has preserved the Latin *a*. In south Poitou and Forez, this may parallel Occitan usage and appear as *ag*-. As a diphthong the *au* is only found in the east. The other common form in *o* exists in all four corners of the French zone. *Ou* is considered as continuing the Latin *au* form (Naudeau, 42, n. 136). In the medieval period, it is particularly well-attested in the west.

4.42 *CHEOIR*

*Cheoir* fluctuates between weak i and weak u types, and examples of nouns, preterites and participles are found in Map 6.

a) In the charters a noun form, which shows considerable orthographic variation, is frequent. Grandsaignes d'Hauterive (p. 239) lists the word as *eschéote*, noting that it derives from the P.P. of *écheoir*. He also adds, "devenu par la suite *échute*. Resté en anglais, *eschæat* déshérence." The noun is present in five areas, but is most common in the documents of Haute-Marne and Poitou. In the last-mentioned region *eschaet* appears without variant and in the Vosges only *eschiet* is attested, but in Haute-Marne the orthography goes through a series ranging from *acheoite* to *eschoite, achooite, eschooite* and *eschoote*. This
Map 3. Devoir

Legend
+ Literary Forms
could possibly represent the oi varying through a w sound to oo in this area.

b) The past participle is usually cheu by the time the charters are being written. However, a participle which matches their respective noun forms also occurs in Poitou (eschaet) and Haute-Marne (eschoet, -it). The rest of the weak -i samples come from literary sources, including Roland and Rou, which are accepted as being of western origin. Only these two are included on the map, as the location of the other works is not definitively established. Chaurent is a preterite in u, which comes from an early document (Li Sermon S. Bernard, 12th C., Metz. v. Pope, 493). All the other preterites possess weak -i forms in the early texts. By totalling all the area located forms available for cheoir, the following weak u distribution is obtained.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>+ u</th>
<th>- u</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walloon</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oise</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franco-Provençal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vosges</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picard</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poitou</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-Norman</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haute-Marne</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franche Comté</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occitan</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.43 LIRE

Lire occurs more frequently as a compound, eslière, elere. Greimas (p. 252) explains that the s arises from a popular Latin exlegere. This consonant is not always present. The same author notes the presence of an esliser, stemming from a popular
Map 7. Lire.
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Latin *exlectiare*, built on *electus*. Such an infinitive is not found in the study list, but could be the basis of the 15th C. forms already presented in Table 22.

a) The charters possess numerous noun forms, *e(s)lu, eslit, esliz*, which have the sense of "an elected person." These nouns occur with some weak *u* forms in all the areas where they are attested, except the Occitan zone. They also have an *i* vocalism in the Walloon region, Haute-Marne and Normandy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>+ u</th>
<th>- u</th>
<th>% + u</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norman</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walloon</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haute-Marne</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) The weak *u* form is more common in the P.P. Nonetheless *i* forms occur in the Vosges, Normandy and the Walloon area, as well as in Franco-Provençal and Occitan. By comparing the overall frequency of weak *u* and other forms in the P.P. and noun, it is clear that the P.P. prefers the weak *u* type. This probably reflects the fact that the verbal form is more open to analogical change. Table 27 compares the area distribution of these two forms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>+ u</th>
<th>- u</th>
<th>% + u</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P.P.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franco-Provençal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occitan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franco-Provençal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occitan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While the low amounts in some areas may render these particular statistics unreliable, a general table can be drawn up to indicate which areas prefer weak $u$ out of the aggregate of forms attested.

Table 28: Lire—Global Area Totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>+ $u$</th>
<th>- $u$</th>
<th>% + $u$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burgundy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poitou</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haute-Marne</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franco-Provençal</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picard</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vosges</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walloon</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occitan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.44 *VESTIR*

The verb *vestir* usually has a weak $i$ P.P. in the Occitan zone and a weak $u$ P.P. in the French area. However, occasional $i$ types occur in the north, being common in the extreme N.E. Map 8 contains details of the P.P. only, since the preterite is uniformly in $i$.

4.45 *SOUDRE*

*Soudre* illustrated in Map 9 is attested as a sigmatic verb, both as a simple form and in compounds. It also shows a move towards weak $u$ and although this type is not very well attested in early sources, it does ultimately replace the other form for general use in such compounds as *résolu*. 
Table 29: Vestir—Area P.P. Totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>+ u</th>
<th>- u</th>
<th>% + u</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burgundy</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oise</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-Norman</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poitou</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haute-Marne</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franche-Comté</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vosges</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picard</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franco-Provençal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walloon</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Border</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occitan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.46 CROIRE

Croire is illustrated in Map 10. Both the Picard i- examples are from Huon de Bordeaux. In reality the Oise example includes Picard dialect, so the following figures should be evaluated with this in mind.

4.47 OVERALL COMPARISON OF TOTALS

From the series of maps, it is apparent that no uniform trend emerges. At a first glance it is obvious that the Walloon and Norman areas tend to include more non-u forms than elsewhere. However, some of the other areas seem to exchange places according to the verb studied. By adding together all the samples collected, the following distribution is obtained. Berry and the western zone have been eliminated on account of too few examples.

The above list includes verbs already illustrated by maps having a form variation which may prove dialectal in some cases. In order to include a wider range and in an attempt to make the result more representative of general spread, a second list has been devised
Map 10. Croire
### Table 30: *Soudre*—Area P.P. Totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>+ u</th>
<th>- u</th>
<th>% + u</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oise</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-Norman</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poitou</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picard</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walloon</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vosges</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occitan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 31: *Croire*—Global Area Totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>+ u</th>
<th>- u</th>
<th>% + u</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oise</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haute-Marne</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walloon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poitou</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franco-Provençal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-Norman</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picard</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occitan</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 32: Global Occurrence of Weak *u* (short list)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>+ u</th>
<th>- u</th>
<th>% + u</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burgundy</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oise</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poitou</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franche-Comté</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vosges</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haute-Marne</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franco-Provençal</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-Norman</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picard</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walloon</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normandy</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
which includes the verbs croître, gésir, paraître, valoir, courir, recevoir, mourir, rompre, tolir. This choice is based on the fact that they do have variable forms in the tenses selected. The modals have not been included because of the extra size of the sample and problems inherent in interpreting the material. In fact it is unlikely that they would provide useful additional area distribution information and would merely confirm a tendency to non-\(u\) forms in Walloon. The second list results in the following order:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>+ u</th>
<th>- u</th>
<th>% + u</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burgundy</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oise</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vosges</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poitou</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haute-Marne</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franche-Comté</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picard</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-Norman</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normandy</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walloon</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franco-Provençal</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.48 GENERAL CONCLUSION

Several observations can be made about this list:

1. It removes Franco-Provençal to the foot of the list, thus reflecting its frequent non-\(u\) preterite and also allowing for regional peculiarities, e.g., receivre.

2. The fact that Walloon is frequently resistant to weak \(u\) forms is confirmed. This is also the case for Normandy, but the figures are more balanced due to the wider sample.

3. The case of the Picard area is ambiguous. It has already been mentioned that the Oise area is partly Picard and, if this sample were accurately distributed, this would undoubtedly increase the Picard weak \(u\) ratio.
4. As a whole the Burgundian examples are later than those of the Oise area. Therefore, it is more likely that the Oise region led weak u spread.

5. The lowest-scoring areas in the French dialect zone contain most of the literary and earliest texts.

4.49 INTRODUCTION TO PROBLEMS CONCERNING INDIVIDUAL VERBS

Within the study list, être accounts for 22.85% of all verbal occurrences. Although considerably less frequent, avoir, pouvoir, savoir and vouloir, taken together, constitute another 15.7% of all attested forms and can be considered very common.

4.491 THE AVOIR, POUVOIR, SAVOIR GROUP

The previous section contains limited discussion of these modal verbs. However, within the -ui class they obviously form an important block and are especially frequent as auxiliaries. Herman even suggests that the lack of unified radical may have continued longer because these paradigms often functioned as auxiliary rather than independent verbal forms. Originally their preterites were not aligned to weak u vocalism. Because of its initial Latin vowel e, devoir was already in possession of u vocalism through phonetic (P.1.) and analogical development in pre-literary times (Fouché, 315–6). Avoir, pouvoir and savoir developed as a group. In the early literary period they were still strong verbs. The restructuring of their vocalism arose with the loss of differentiation between strong and weak forms. However, determining where and when this happened by means of their orthographic representation proves difficult. Literary material presents forms which may not correspond to the phonetic reality at a synchronic level. By the time of the 13th C. charters a standard spelling for all persons may have been in place in the central zone, although several persons are poorly attested. At this period, it is likely that these forms could represent a uniform u sound (Fouché, 324–4). E. Bourciez (p. 341) makes the following observations concerning this group of -ui perfects. He notes that the strong stress was kept on P.1., P.3. and P.6. and as a result:
Il se produisit des faits d'assimilation complexes, et une fusion partielle de la désinence avec la voyelle du radical, qui s'opéra d'après des formules phonétiques, \( œ = \acute{a} + w, o = \acute{a} + w, ūi = \acute{e} + wi, ĥ = \grave{e} + w; \)
autrement dit, le résultat fut différent suivant que la voyelle du radical était \( a \), ou bien \( e, o \). On obtient d'une part \( a. Fr. œt, ť̄œ, ťœ, ťõuœ, ťœstœ, ťœnt \), d'autre part \( ūiœ, ťœsœ, ťœt ... \):

The earliest literary text available which gives written evidence about these northern preterites is S. Leger, available in an 11th C. ms. This contains:

- aut (and ōc, ōt, ōth, ōct), auret
- pod, pot
- sat, soth, sowrent
- joth (< jacuit, v. Linskill, 124)

The only occurrence on assonance is on lines 39 to 40, "Et sans Letgiers sempre fud bons / Sempre fist bien o que el pod." It seems likely this sound should be interpreted as \( õ \) (v. Pope, 89, Latin ō, Ṽ). In the text the only I.S. which occurs is of the owist type (assonance l. 88), where \( u \) is a bilabial fricative. Linskill hesitates about what sound to attribute to \( oœt, pœt \) etc. He notes the pluperfects auret, pœuret in Eulalie, which offer previous evidence of the development of these verbs. The possibility of comparison is very limited. Pot also occurs in the Alexander fragment from the Franco-Provençal zone at an early date. However, in the north the other earliest texts, S. Alexis and La Chanson de Roland have been best preserved in Anglo-Norman mss. Linskill wonders, "Faut-il attribuer à la graphie ŏ tous ces verbes la valeur de œu, démontrée pour les mêmes cas dans les autres anciens textes?" He thinks this is likely and believes that sowrent (l. 116) supports this view. Of course the spelling aut also occurs for avoir in S. Léger. In a general description of the development of the -ui verbs Pope (p. 379) describes how tonic \( a \) and \( i \) were rounded to \( œ \) and \( ū \) respectively in contact with \( w \).

She states,

\[ W \text{ was combined in a diphthong with preceding } œ \text{ in the third persons singular and plural and elsewhere merged in the vowel it rounded.} \]

**awwi < habûr > ŏi**
awet < habüit > out. In the later 12th C. (under the influence of the 1st person?) the diphthongal forms in -o- ourent were replaced by forms in -ot and grent.

Andrieux and Baumgartner (p. 169) regard a move from ou --> o as an attempt to regularize the base form. They note that o is the only radical to occur in P.I. and regard the resulting system as unbalanced, "Le déséquilibre ainsi existant peut expliquer la réduction de ou à o P.3. et P.6., qui serait, dans cette perspective, un fait de système."

A primitive out, ourent certainly exists in Anglo-Norman, although a further complication arises as to how this is to be pronounced. Pope (p. 477) reminds the reader of the variety of graphical notations,

these Anglo-Norman forms may be only graphical, because in the later 12th C. the diphthong ou had levelled to u and u had velarised to the same sound. All three forms of the termination remained in use in later Anglo-Norman - ot - out - ut (- eut)

This latter form is considered to be Picard in origin (Andrieux, 161). "En Picard, là où /ow/ s'est différencié en /ew/ > /ø/, sont attestées . . . des formes eut, peut . . . etc." The study of assonance can act as a guide in the interpretation of graphic representations. The early evidence is not very plentiful. However, La Chanson de Roland places out and pout on o assonance in laisses xciii, cxx, and ccxxxvi (this would also be the case for poet).

Naudeau (p. 42, n. 16), commenting on the dialectal differentiation between western zones makes this point, "La diphthongue ou (< lat. au) tend à se réduire à o dans le nord-ouest dès les premiers textes cf. Ch. Rol. out habuit : porz : los *lausu : cors (laisse xciii)." He thinks that this reduction had not taken place at that point in the S.W. It certainly seems that development could have varied from region to region.

Graphic representation in literature may have been conservative or stylised.

It is not really clear if out, ot are both to be considered as possible phonetic developments of habuit or not. Pope and Fouché consider ot analogical, probably based
on the vocalism of P.1. ôi. Bourciez and Naudeau imply that the ô form could be the phonetic continuer of a previous out. Fouche (316, n. 1) explains that w was maintained in P.3. However, it is possible that this was not the case in some areas. The debate may have been biased by the quantity of Anglo-Norman or western texts, which provide much of the earliest evidence about O.F. It is obvious that the graphic evidence for an ô, pot form is just as early or earlier than that for an out form. Therefore, it seems best to consider that the early strong forms of avoir (and group) should not be regarded as having an alignment to u vocalism, even if u is present in their orthography. Literary standards are disconcerting and do not correspond to charter usage. Scribal practice may vary, even within a stanza, e.g., Wace III 5239 "Quant il orent al pont failli / N'i out si proz ne si hardi / Qui n'eüst poor de perir." In her section on analogical action, Pope notes that sound change had introduced great diversity into the paradigm of the perfect of avoir by the 13th C., so that it was pronounced: (we) oi, (ëüs) eus, ot, êumes, êüstes, òrent

It seems unlikely that such a paradigm ever really existed in a single place and time, but rather we are in the presence of varying scribal and regional traditions. In literature, ô, pot, etc. appear in the central area right through the 13th C. and even up to the 15th C. although they are totally absent from the central charters of the same period. We are certainly dealing with separate scribal conventions and it seems probable that the literary usage had already been superseded in the everyday language. The ultimate result involves a levelling of stress patterns and the adoption of weak u vocalism by the radicals of P.1., P.3. and P.6. The overall uniform result was probably obtained in several stages. In the first place, verbs of the -ui class lost their final stem vowel (Fouche, 323). This destroyed alternating stress and opened the way to alignment of the whole paradigm to one single vocalic timbre. Fouche (p. 324) states that this phenomenon appears in Anglo-Norman as early as 1160-70. He believes that the vocalism of the strong persons aligned to that of the weak persons by analogy with the pattern of ëtre,
once the radical final e had been lost. Charters from the Vosges region indicate loss of stem radical e in the I.S. *pusse* (d.1259), *pust* (d.1240). However, the e is often maintained in spelling even if it was not pronounced. Evidence for alignment of P.3. and P.6. to a uniform vocalism is found in the charters of Picardy and Oise in *eut* S. Quentin d.1219 (also other Picard and Norman examples)

*eurent* d.1218— (all Picard)

*paurent* Haute-Marne d.1257

*peurent* Oise d.1263

*seurent* Oise d.1263 (includes Picard)

Meanwhile *pot, sot* are found in charters of the Vosges and Norman regions, with *po(h)ut* in Poitou and Anglo-Norman. P.1. is very poorly attested in the charters for *avoir* (and group). *Dui* still occurs in Oise in 1282. Fouché (p. 324) notes that by the end of the 12th C. this form was beginning to lose its final i, being given a substitute s, by analogy with the sigmatic class. The i type is still common in charters in the 13th C., e.g., P.1. *voluy* Oise d.1282, but it may also drop, e.g., P.1. *reconoīs* Haute-Marne d.1257. From the meagre evidence in the charters it is impossible to discover if any particular person of the verb led the analogical swing. Regarding the model on which such changes were based, the presence of *voluy* pleads strongly in favour of the P.P. This influence is also posited for the *avoir* group (Fouché, 323). Because in this case the movement causes u vocalism to fall onto the stem, subsequent analogy with *être* is quite probable. The overall effect of these changes within the preterite was a unified vocalic timbre in u for verbs of the *avoir* class.

4.410 **VOULOIR**

In the early O.F. period, it was not a foregone conclusion that verbs deriving from the Latin *-ui* class would adopt weak u forms, nor that other irregular verbs, e.g., *vivre* would align to this category. Indeed, within the *-ui* class, *tenir* and *venir* had
adopted a different solution, although evidence of an original -ui form exists in Walloon, vinve, tinve (Andrieux, 161). During the literary period, the development of vouloir follows more than one pattern. The earliest attested weak u form of this verb is as a P.P. volu occurring in both Oise and Haute-Marne in 1264. Only eighteen years later a preterite P. voluy is found in Oise. These are paralleled by vougu (P.P.) and P.l. vougui from Poitou in 1229 and 1261 respectively. The preterites seem to be isolated examples, because the weak u form which became standard French only appeared in general usage in the 15th C. Originally a form had existed which is exemplified by P.3. volt (Eulalie, 24) and P.6. voldrent (Eulalie, 3). An I.S. of the same kind is found in the following forms:

1) volisse S. Alexis, 202
3) volist Rou III:1061, (C) Fribourg d.1370.
b) volissant (C) Fribourg d.1370

The early form volt was vocalised to vout. This can be illustrated by, "Alquanz dient que Tirel volt / Ferir un cerf qui trespassout" (Rou, III, 10065). This assonance shows parallelism with the western imperfect indicative or the preterite of avoir (cf. Rou, III, 9371–2). Not surprisingly, an analogical vot, parallel to ot and pot also occurs in Rou (III, 797) or Gormund et Isembart (l. 224). Vorrent may also be used as well (v. Nim.). The literary texts preserve a spelling that is archaic. The volt form never occurs in the charters and this is illustrated by separating the preterite totals for literature and the charters.

The earliest sigmatics are found in the I.S., e.g., S. Alexis (49), Roland (332) and the preterite weak persons, e.g., Rou, (III, 7913, 8220). At a later date, they spread into the preterite P.3., but are not attested in P.6. The vout and vost forms which appear in the charters may originate in the same area. The difference is not a regional one and this is confirmed by the distribution of the I.S., where the sigmatic is the usual form. Vouloir was aligned to the weak u forms by analogy during the period when sigmatic verbs
Table 34: Forms of Vouloir in O.F.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>S</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>voc. l</th>
<th>weak u</th>
<th>other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P.1.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 C (13c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.2.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.3.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>43 L</td>
<td>5 C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 L (15c)</td>
<td>8 L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.4.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.5.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>1 L</td>
<td>1 L (15c)</td>
<td>3 L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.6.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>50 L</td>
<td>1 L</td>
<td>5 L (15c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals | 11 | L   | 50 L   | 1 L    | 5 L (15c) | 11 L   |

L = literature, C = Charter

underwent major restructuring.

4.411 GENERAL CONCLUSIONS OF THE DETAILED STUDY

a) Comparisons of examples taken from both charters and literature illustrate differences in numerical frequency or form, as well as points of contact, that exist between the two.

b) Overall the most frequent forms are past participles and the preterite paradigm of être.

c) In the early medieval period, from the 10th C. to the 13th C., forms develop more freely than at a later date and morphological variety is more common than in the modern standard literary languages.

d) Some differences in usage may be due to regional preferences of an analogical or phonetic nature.
5.1 INTRODUCTION

In the light of examples drawn from the study list and group tables drawn up in Chapter IV, we will now re-examine suggestions dealing with early development which were presented in Chapter III.

5.2 THE NORTHERN PRETERITE

Structurally the preterites present several types of remodelling.

a) It is difficult to gather sufficient information about the weak persons of the preterite, due to their infrequent occurrence in the texts available. The few examples allow one to affirm that when an intervocalic consonant or stem final semi-vowel is present, then flexional i is preserved (v. Table 21), e.g., owins, deuiens, volsistes. This is confirmed by reference to the more abundant material furnished by I.S., e.g., podist, morist, vesquist, vausist, volsist, volist (v. Table 24). This would also apply to numerous verbs which do not ultimately adopt u vocalism, e.g., tenis, tenimes or any of the verbs of the dedi class, e.g., vandimes, rendimes.

b) However, in the north-western mss. the I.S. examples of avoir, devoir, savoir and even pouvoir, which also has i variants, show preliterary alignment to the flexional u timbre. These verbs lost their stem final consonant. When this happens to other verbs which still possess flexional i in early texts, they become open to u alignments, e.g., P.S. creistes, creutes (cf. infinitive, concreidre [Eul.], credre [S. Leger], creire [Roland]).
5.21 CONCLUSIONS

In later cases, this suggests the intervention of analogy, but can one presume that this was so in earlier changes? It is true that the *u* participle was always available as a model and its action is clear in the case of late changes such as *vivre, vouloir*, but, in earlier cases, the pattern of *u* forms was relatively unestablished and so the motivation for change is less sure. Verbs with a primary or secondary *v* (*w*) sound in their makeup seem to have been particularly affected. A labializing tendency of the *wi* $\rightarrow$ *wu* type as suggested by Fouche could have been a feature of some zones and could have preceded the perception of a useful correspondence with the *u* participle (v. 3.511). On the other hand, the participle itself may have exerted analogical pressure, polarising preterite forms into a system differentiated from the sigmatic forms by vocalic timbre. The identity with the participle may also have provided a better way of distinguishing past and present forms (cf., S. Alexis *receit*, l. 283, *receut*, l. 119). Since preterite–participle linking occurs in Occitan, formal analogical interaction in the *u* category seems perfectly feasible. However, since the choice of *u* identity is limited in extension, it is possible that there was some phonetically conditioned predisposition to this choice in the French dialect zone. The rather slow diffusion of the *u* forms may argue in favour of a limited spontaneous development at an early date, followed by a more systematic polarization as time went by. Nonetheless, the available evidence is limited and neither theory can be demonstrated conclusively. The developments of P.l. *dui (co)nui, mui* are normally accepted as a regular phonetic outcome of the Latin *debui, -novi, movi* in the French zone (Fouché, 315–6, cf., Mourin 1978:1, 27). Consistent *u* vocalism also occurs on the radical of *receut* (S. Alexis) from the earliest texts, although a non-labialized N.E. version, *reciut* (S. Leger) is attested on assonance with *vint* (Linskill, 126, cf., Fouché, 319–320). Fouché states that the rhymes of the Oxford and Cambridge Psalters show that *eu* is to be pronounced [u] in *receut* (v. 5.4).
5.22 STRUCTURAL PARALLELS WITH THE CASTILIAN PRETERITE

A comparison with certain Castilian verbs which extended $u$ vocalism in the radical of strong forms under the influence of phonetically developed $potui$ (pude) *conovui (conuvo) (Menéndez Pidal, 277) indicates that this patterning change is not limited to French. In Spanish the analogy occurs during the literary period and can be monitored, e.g., $ove$ $-->$ $hube$. However, it was an isolated phenomenon of the irregular system in this language and failed to link with a weak $u$ preterite type. The P.P. $-udo$ form was almost certainly in decline by the time the preterite shift took place and, in any case, the predominant dialect, Castilian, favoured weak $i$ forms.

5.3 U VOCALISM IN THE FRENCH PRETERITE

The French situation differed considerably from the Castilian tendencies and the $u$ vocalism established itself as a link between preterite, P.P. and I.S. forms.

5.31 IMMOBILIZATION OF STRESS

In the case of many so-called strong verbs, this not only involved a change of vocalic timbre in the preterite, but also a redistribution of internal stress patterning, so that the characteristic vocalism of the weak flexion, i.e., the weak persons or P.P., spread to the stem and was immobilized there, e.g., $dut$. The result of this was a strengthening of internal uniformity within their paradigm. However, the irregular strong verbs did not behave in only one way and there is evidence that they tended to form sub-groups, rather than one clearly recognisable category, e.g., the $avoir$ group.

5.32 ÊTRE IN O.F.

It has already been noted that the extension of $u$ vocalism in ëtre is very ancient in O.F., occurring in the oldest texts, $Eulalie$, $Jonas$, $La Passion de Clermont$ and $La Vie de S. Leger$. In his introduction to the latter, Linskill notes, "La voyelle tonique de la
3e personne, qui phonétiquement devrait être o, est, comme on le voit, régulièrement celle de la 1ère personne *fui*, où elle a été normalement influencée par l'*i* long final" (p. 119). Mourin (1978:1, 27) states that this type of analogical restructuring occurs in French, Old Spanish and the Engadine Rheto-Romance dialect, "Le parfait du verbe *esse* étend par analogie la fermeture en *u* des personnes 1. et 2. dans plusieurs langues."

Although an alternate form with *i* can be found in French, the *u* vocalism is earlier and much more common in the literary language. Other verbs which are only attested with the *être* type pattern, such as *dui*, *dut*, *conui*, *conut* presumably developed their uniform *u* vocalism through a similar process of analogical levelling. In these cases, it is always possible that the participle may have exercised some influence. However such an action cannot be proposed to explain the *u* vocalism of *être*, since this verb has no corresponding participle, but borrows that of the verb *ester*.

5.33 ESTER IN O.F.

The behaviour of this form is curious and raises certain problems. In O.F. it occurs with *u* vocalism in place on both the preterite and past participle, e.g., *estut* (S. Leger 111, assonance *fust*). The *u* vocalism never occurs for the participle used with *être*, although basically they have the same origin (cf., Anglade, 218, 317 for Occitan). In the south, Brunel attests a *u* participle for *estar* from the Toulouse area. The case for analogical restructuring seems very strong and it is difficult to argue in favour of a phonetic development. In French Mourin believes that, "Les timbres *u* de *esteus* et *estut* sont dus à l'analogie" (1974:213) and holds that this is already due to the polarization of the verbal system into *i* or *u* vocalism, corresponding to the presence or absence of a stem final consonant. Whether such a view can be held for this very early period seems dubious and it would certainly have to accommodate numerous exceptions, e.g., *cheoir* and *i* forms of *pooir* (pouvoir). Nonetheless, this does not alter the fact that analogical realignments are likely for *ester*. In some regions *stetit* developed phonetically. "Lès
résultats phonétiques de stetti sont attestés ... en roumain (stete), portugais (stede), 
 ancien castillan (estiedo) et ancien provençal (estet)" (Mourin 1974:193, n. 4). Even so, in numerous areas, it also has a definite tendency to align to the -ui class during the literary period:

Old Castilian, estiedo/estido ---&gt; estudo (Mourin 1974:209)

Catalan (Valencian), estagut (DCVB, 520, although other dialects have estat)

Roumanian, stetesî ---&gt; statusî

Occitan, estat ---&gt; estut (isolated // estec?)

The case of O.F. is earlier than any of these. The preterite parallels the vocalism of être, but u seems to have been used as a differentiator between ester and être for the participle, where it was probably analogical too. The balance between pressure to align the paradigm internally (dut) and external pressure from the participle is difficult to determine in most cases, but it does seem that the participle cannot have been the initiator for être and ester.

5.34 CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN PRETERITE AND P.P.

A correspondence between the preterite and participle certainly exists in most cases, but what made it possible?

a) The paradigm of fui, fus, fut supplies the earliest evidence in O.F. of a verb with a uniformly u stressed preterite paradigm. The phonetic evolution of the dui, nui, comui types allowed these verbs to form a group with fui so that they could have laid the foundation for a link between the preterite, I.S. and P.P. systems based on u vocalism.

b) Yet another group of verbs has been proposed as leader in weak u alignment. This includes verbs of the -ui class such as parut, valut. The special characteristic of these verbs is that their stress is weak and uniform, corresponding entirely to that of the u participle, but also to the patterning of
the regular verbal systems. The \( u \) form is usually considered to date from preliterary times. However, a certain problem arises, because the preterites available for these verbs are not nearly as common as \textit{connaitre} or \textit{devoir}. Nor do they occur in the very earliest texts. It is true that \textit{parut} occurs in Wace, \textit{Rou} or \textit{aparat} in the \textit{Voyage de Charlemagne} (l. 672), where one also finds \textit{corut}. Wace provides a P.l. \textit{valui} (Bart. 25, 269), although how this is to be interpreted is problematic, since it occurs on assonance with \textit{fui} in an \textit{i} series. Similarly \textit{murut}, \textit{mururent} occurs in the same author, although in this case \textit{i} alternatives exist in the same text and are certainly attested elsewhere. Fouché suggested a labialization model to account for the creation of the \textit{parut}, \textit{valut} type, but Mourin has contested this view and holds that the participle was responsible for the adoption of \textit{u} vocalism (Mourin 1978:36, n. 76). The range of examples available is not extensive or early enough to prove decisive. However, the fact that the preterites resemble the participles so closely and that numerous verbs of this group have attested variants may add to the credibility of the analogy model. For example Mourin argues convincingly against an original \textit{u} preterite for \textit{valoir} (1978:36, n. 76, cf. Wahlgren in 3.5123) and this verb occurs with a variety of I.S. sigmatic forms in the charters, thus demonstrating that the northern dialects had not finally standardized the weak \textit{u} forms by the 13th C.

5.341 PRET. AND P.P. DURING THE LITERARY PERIOD

In the three types of environment where \textit{u} vocalism was established, the rôle of the P.P. has been mentioned. It is invariably difficult to determine how changes came about in the preliterary period. However, in the case of the P.P. one can at least observe how this form exerts analogical influence during the literary period. The arguments for the priority of the participle in aiding weak \textit{u} spread are strong. Almost all preterites with \textit{u} vocalism have a \textit{u} participle, the only exceptions being \textit{être} and
mourir, although the latter does possess a dialectal mouru. The reverse does not hold true. Weak u participles often occur without u preterites, even in Modern French:
tenu-tint; vêtu-vêtit; vaincu-vainquit.

In O.F. this state of affairs was even more obvious:

seu - sol (same Norman document d.1278)
creu - crei (Rou)
vo(u)lu - voli, vost

It can also be remarked that weak u participles tend to maintain that status, rather than realigning to other groups. The preterite, on the other hand, tends to fluctuate, and the influence of the participle becomes obvious in some later changes:

volt, vost --> volut.

5.342 CONCLUSIONS

However, was the P.P. necessarily influential in introducing u vocalism in all cases? The answer must be nuanced. Mourin supports analogical interference by the participle, both on the vocalism of the weak persons of the -ui preterites and on the weak u forms developed in verbs that possess a radical ending with a liquid or nasal (1978:69, n. 76). Nonetheless, he accepts the phonetic development of P.l. for the dui, conui type. As we have seen, by the time the oldest extant manuscripts of S. Alexis or La Chanson de Roland were produced, a group of verbs with u vocalism in the preterite was in place in Anglo-Norman, while S. Leger provides slightly earlier evidence for the N.E. corner of France, indicating that the u spread had not become strongly implanted in this area at this time. Indeed the only preterite form available which is obviously of the u timbre is for ester (instud:fust). An I.S. form available for avoir confirms i vocalism for S. Leger:

ouist : revenist (S. Leger, 1.87-8) ouisse (S. Alexis, 1.226).

Unfortunately, there is no example of the parui, valui type. Although an isolated example, the presence of istud : fust may reflect the influence of être and confirm that u
vocalism was established by this analogy, at least in some cases. It is even possible that a useful correspondence between the common weak *u* participles and their preterite counterparts was not perceived until *u* vocalism, phonetically evolved in P.1. of verbs such as *dui, conui* was analogically extended to unify the whole paradigm on the *être* pattern, or through some semantic link with *être* in the case of *ester*. The potential for a system of formal correspondence was created and there is little doubt that the participle did ultimately exert analogical influence. However, in the early literary period the preterite *u* system was not stable, but was evolving and spreading. This is indicated by the fact that many of the verbs involved in *u* alignment have more than one attested form. Those which vary between *i* and *u* include *cheoir, croire, lire, vivre, mourir*. Another group of verbs may have sigmatic variants, i.e., *soudre, vouloir, valoir, lire, gésir*. Meanwhile the very important group of auxiliaries *avoir, pouvoir* and *savoir* seems to have formed a special series apart, attracting parallel forms for *gésir, mouvoir, plaisir* and, in some cases, *vouloir*.

5.4 ORTHOGRAPHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

The difficulty of interpreting the orthography of the modals has been discussed in 4.51. At what date the vocalism of the strong persons was reduced to a *u* sound may be disguised by conservative scribal tradition. The 13th C. ms. of the *Voyage de Charlemagne* supports *u* alignment: "Si uus leusez fait i ust felunie" (Aebischer, 689) or "Des put ben li reis ius de la tur decendre" (l. 794). Although many literary works predate the charters, few possess manuscripts prior to the 13th C., so that there is always a limited possibility of the interference of contemporary speech habits.
5.5 GENERAL CONCLUSIONS ABOUT PRET. U SPREAD

The types of u alignment will now be summarized, with notes on chronology.

1. The preterite paradigms evolved from fui, steti were aligned to u vocalism in preliterary times for all northern zones where they are attested. Meanwhile the paradigms which developed from debui – cipui, crevi, movi, (cog)–novi adopted uniform u vocalism which first appeared in mss. of the N.W. regions.

2. U vocalism is present on the flexion of the weak persons of many verbs of the –ui class from pre-literary times, except in the N.E., e.g., coneumes, creutes, geus, oumes, peusmes (v. Table 21). Pouvoir and croire have i variants, even in other areas (v. Table 24).

3. The preterite parut is in place from preliterary times and has no early counter examples, but neither does it appear in the very earliest texts. Valut, corut, murut already occur in early manuscripts, but possess variants.

4. The strong preterite forms of the avoir group begin to align to u vocalism and unify their stress pattern at some time prior to the 13th C.

5. Numerous other verbs, which may possess i or sigmatic forms in the early texts of some areas, adopt u preterites due to analogical pressures during the period stretching from the 13th to the 14th C., e.g., vécut, voulu.

5.6 CHRONOLOGICAL FACTORS CONCERNING FRENCH AND OCCITAN

The language used in the earliest major works written in Occitan and French differs considerably from that employed by the 16th C. In addition, the balance of power between the two had shifted in favour of French. The examination of the behaviour of individual verbs has helped build a picture of varied changes within the perfective systems of Gallo–Romance from the earliest texts up to the 14th C. However, these changes can also be viewed as a part of wider general trends.
5.6 MAIN CHANGES IN THE PERFECT SYSTEM OF GALLO-ROMANCE

All three language divisions of Gallo-Romance maintained strong preterites into the literary period, but then abandoned them in favour of weak paradigms or standardized stress. Each zone chose its own particular solution. Later literary Rhodanien chose flexional stress, preceded by a characteristic guttural element, while Franco-Provençal, insofar as it remained distinct from French or Occitan, favoured regularization on the pattern of C.L. IV. French adopted a less uniform solution and an unusual feature of the old irregular strong forms is that they may develop the vocalism associated with the P.P. or weak persons in stem position. This produces a uniform stress, but may mean that the vocalic timbre of the combined stem/flexion carries semantic weight at a lexical level:

fit, fût

dit, dut

mit, mut

5.7 GENERAL PHONETIC TRENDS OF O.F.

There is a considerable variety of forms in the early O.F. preterite systems. However, over a period of several hundred years, phonetic and analogical changes worked together to bring about an increasing uniformity. The phonetic factors undoubtedly affected individual paradigms, but acted as part of wider tendencies within the language. For example, the loss of stem final consonants was increasingly common in French from the 10th or 11th C. onwards and was part of a movement which favoured open syllables. In the case of the irregular verbs, structural changes followed on the loss of intervocalic s and the dropping of pretonic i, so that irregular verbs which were affected became increasingly polarised in a parallel type of paradigm, which had either i or u as its characteristic vowel. These verbs, which were differentiated on the radical, paralleled the vocalism of verbs with weak stress in i or u and also the participles, which, in the case
of the many irregular \(-ui\) verbs, were also devoid of stem final consonant.

5.71 VOCALIC POLARIZATION

Indeed, it is noticeable that many past participles with consonant clusters disappear at the end of the O.F. period, as the preference for the open syllable makes itself felt (Mourin, 1980:4), e.g., \(tolt\), \(ars\), \(sols\), \(escons\). Amongst other types which have remained, the consonant is now only pronounced in the feminine; e.g., \(dit(e)\), \(pris(e)\), \(plaint(e)\). Some have been remodelled completely, e.g., \(tors\) \(\rightarrow\) \(tordu\) (Manz, 178–9). However, a small group in \([r]\) constitutes an exception to this general movement, e.g., \(mort\), \(offert\).

Nonetheless, it is clear that the vocalic element assumed additional importance during the period stretching from the 10th to 16th C. (Matte 63, 123). Such a time was favourable to the extension of forms with a vocalic timbre. In the case of the irregular past tense systems \(u\) was particularly well placed as a differentiator from other tenses:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{dott} & - \text{du(t)} \\
\text{plait} & - \text{plu(t)} \\
\text{a} & - \text{eu(t)}
\end{align*}
\]

This may not always be the case for the inchoatives or irregular \(i\) types

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{mets} & - \text{mis} \\
\text{prend} & - \text{pris} \\
\text{dit} & - \text{dit} \\
\text{but} & \quad \text{finit} - \text{finit}
\end{align*}
\]

The inadequate differentiation between present and past forms of certain \(i\) types may have played in favour of the \(u\) category during the realignments of the 14th to the 16th C. e.g., \(lis\), \(lus\).

5.8 VARIATION IN \(U\) SPREAD

However, it is by no means certain that the spread of weak \(u\) vocalism occurred as a regular and automatic progression, unimpeded by fluctuations and hesitations. It is likely that regional variation was still common among educated speakers up to the 17th
C. The imposition of a norm seems to have been alien to the ideas of some of the earlier grammarians, who were content to describe observed speech. However, by the 17th C. grammarians were interfering actively to create a more prestigious variety of literary language and condemning other usages.

5.81 REGIONAL AND LITERARY VARIETY

The investigation undertaken in the study list supports the idea that some regional variation existed. The earliest texts, largely from the Norman, Anglo–Norman and Picard zones, contain the greatest numbers of alternate non-\( u \) forms. However, since they also do contain \( u \) forms, it can be presumed that these early examples stem from the dialects concerned. By the 13th C., when the analysis of charters is included, then the Oise region obtains the highest score for weak \( u \) forms. Basically, the weak \( u \) forms embrace the whole of the northern area except the N.E. corner. The lack of early examples for the Ile de France makes it difficult to compare this zone with others in terms of literature. However, by the 13th C. charters, the \( francien \) dialect had assumed pre-eminence and at that point, it certainly seems to have been a leader in the spread of weak \( u \) forms. By the 13th C., literature had developed conventions e.g., \( pot, volt \), which did not correspond to charter usage, as found in the same areas. The latter maintained more freedom at this stage and continued to reflect hesitations or changes in the language in their orthography. The charters maintain sufficient variation to support the claim that many scribes had not adopted \( francien \) by the 13th C. although its influence was certainly spreading. The remarks of grammarians of the 16th and 17th C. lead one to conclude that educated people became more and more preoccupied with prestige models in language, increasingly inclined to legislate in favour of court usage and intolerant towards dialectal variation. This tendency manifests itself ultimately in a rather rigid standardization. Overall this acted in favour of the weak \( u \) forms during the period of fluctuation, but in Modern French it has meant that the \( u \) class of preterite and P.P. is
fossilized and no longer extends its domain.

5.82 ATTITUDES TO VARIETY

In the period of the early grammarians, when forms were still fluctuating, it is interesting to study the attitudes and opinions concerning:

1. The role of usage
2. A prestige norm
   a) area model
   b) scholarly model
   c) social model
3. The status of dialects other than francien
4. The relationship of the preterite to the composite past.

5.821 THE ROLE OF USAGE

In 1604 du Val offers both *vesqui* and *vescu* and adds, "On peut néanmoins se servir de tous les deux, puisque l'usage les a mis en crédit" (Manz, 191). This fairly liberal attitude, shared by Vaugelas, was still maintained by Dupleix in 1651,

Nonobstant que . . . *vesquit* et *vescus* aient leurs partisans, et qu'aïnss l'usage en soit partagé il me semble pourtant qu'il y a plus de raison de dire *vesquis* que *vescus*; parce que *vescus* ne se distingue pas tant du pret. parf. *f'ai vescu* que *vesquis* . . . Il est vrai que *courir* fait *f'ai couru* et *je courus* . . . C'est pourquoi je laisse cela à la liberté de chacun. (Manz, 192)

Interestingly this author sees no advantage in P.P., preterite identity, although this correspondence was finally imposed. Early grammarians cited in Manz accept alternative *i, u* usage in the case of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P.P.</th>
<th>P.P.</th>
<th>pr.</th>
<th>pr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>batty</em>, <em>battu</em></td>
<td><em>bouilly</em>, <em>bouillu</em></td>
<td><em>chalut</em>, <em>cheussit</em></td>
<td><em>cousis</em>, <em>cousus</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faye</td>
<td>Cotgrave</td>
<td>Abrégé</td>
<td>Cotgrave</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
pr. *feris, ferus* Meigret/Palsgrave
pr. *moulis, moulus* Pillot
pr. *paissi, paissu* Wetzlius, Faye
pr. *ponnis, ponnu* Palsgrave/Meigret
P.P. *senty, sentu* Wodroephe
pr. *taysis, teus* Palsgrave
pr. *tissis, tissus* Wetzlius

pr. = preterite

Only verbs which are not included in the study list appear here.

5.822 THE PRESTIGE NORM - AREA, SCHOLARLY, SOCIAL

a) As a prestige language, the central dialect of the Ile de France has exerted an enormous influence on other regional forms of speech, at least since the advent of more widespread education. However, from the 13th C. onwards, the pressure to conform to the standard of educated Parisian usage was already making itself felt. At what period this became preponderant is unclear. Aebischer, in his introduction to the *Voyage of Charlemagne*, insists that all the early examples of *langue d'oïl* are "regional," in the sense that they originated in the Norman, Anglo–Norman and Picard speaking zones, which were prosperous enough to support the early literary production. By the time the 13th C. charters appear, regional variation is still quite noticeable, although the encroachment of central forms cannot be discounted. Dees believes that wide variation was still usual prior to 1300:

> la lecture . . . de cet ensemble de documents du 13e siècle ne nous avait permis de voir ni koiné, ni scripta, nous étions . . . profondément convaincu que les deux notions ne correspondent à aucune réalité observable pour la période antérieur à 1300. (Dees 1985:89)

In the study list, regional divergence is readily noticeable for the verbal forms examined. Some areas, such as the Poitevin zone including La Rochelle and the Picard–Walloon
dialect regions possess well defined traits which distinguish their whole verbal system. However, interference from central forms is not absent. Examples taken from these places illustrate this point. The text for Walloon originates in the Namur region and contains the characteristic *owist, owissent, conuist* type of form, but *conurent* also appears as a preterite in the same text (Wilmotte, 147 d.1272). A document from La Rochelle, Poitou, dated 1265, furnishes ample local forms, but also contains "standard" ones (La Du, Charter 215):

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{ogui, recegui : receu} \\
\text{vauguissent : vausist} \\
\text{vougui} \\
\text{tenguui}
\end{align*} \]

This type of hesitation may apply to a "set formula":

"non ogue et de non recetie peccune" (no. 216)

"non ogue et de non recetie peccune" (no. 218)

but this is not necessarily the case. In other dialect zones variations occur but may be more sporadic or isolated in nature, at least as regards the verbal paradigm. The 13th C. charters reflect a state of language in transition, but in the centuries which followed there can be little doubt that the balance tilted against regionalisms, at least in the literary language, although of course present day isoglosses still support the dialectal existence of forms which parallel those of the 13th C. charters (Pignon, Map 28).

Refined usage, as defined by Ménage in 1673, took the Parisian standard as its model, "Nous disons en Anjou, 'La poulle a ponds . . .' on dit à Paris, 'La poulle a pondu, un œuf pondu' et c'est comme ça qu'il faut parler" (Manz, 115).

b) Another influence which makes itself felt in the literary language is the introduction of latinate models. Since the Latin language remained in common use as a scholarly medium and was particularly familiar to clerics and scribes, it is not surprising that classical usage may have influenced spelling, or even the maintenance or introduction of
certain forms. In 1674 Patou comments, "J'ai remarqué que le peuple ne dit jamais resolvons, resolvez . . . il dit resoudons, resoudez. Pour moi, j'ai toujours été de cet avis . . . il est certain que resolvons et resolvant ont été faits par ceux qui veulent montrer qu'ils savent du Latin, et qui aiment mieux parler Latin que français" (Manz, 166). This kind of interference could even account for the competition which arose between the participle forms sous and solu.

c) Another powerful normalizing influence came from the Court. According to Vaugelas, writing in 1647, "lors que la Cour en quelque lieu du monde que ce soit parle d'une façon et la ville d'une autre, il faut suivre la façon de la Cour" (Manz, 58). As Vaugelas notes, this choice was arbitrary and followed simply for its social prestige,

"Il est vrai que selon la raison il faudrait dire, cent mille écus vaillant et non pas vaillant . . . mais l'usage plus fort que la raison dans les langues fait dire à la cour et escrire à tous les bons auteurs c. m. éc. vaillant et non pas valant. C'est en Poitou principalement où l'on dit valant. (Manz, 187)

5.823 THE STATUS OF DIALECTS OTHER THAN FRANCIEN

Early grammarians, such as Palsgrave, were fairly tolerant about variants. This attitude did not last, but gave way to a more rigid and critical stance, which poked fun at provincial usage. De la Noue mocks Breton speech (Manz, 76), Grammont says the Walloons "parlent mal français" (ibid., 76) and Thomas Corneille disowns his native Norman speech (ibid., 77). There is ample evidence of an increasing tendency to interfere with the verbal paradigm and recommend approved usages. This led to greater orderliness and probably accentuated the polarization which already existed between i and u forms. The latter reached the degree of extension which they have in Modern French some time during the Classical period. It had been a very long process and Herman expresses this perspective when he writes:

La création du système verbal français à partir du système verbal Latin a duré presque un millénaire et elle a nécessité une série inombrable de changements analogiques, de simplifications de regroupements analogiques, un nombre
considerable de règles, de types de flexion nouveaux à créer etc., toute une série de changements qui se croisaient, se soutenaient, se contredisaient etc. (p. 167)

5.824 THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE PRETERITE TO THE COMPOSITE PAST

However, having stabilized its system and in some sense stultified growth, French did not maintain all its paradigms in regular use. It is possible that the preterite, I.S. system that the language had evolved was just too irregular. It has been noted that modern literary Occitan adopted increased regularization in its preterite system. This was also the case for Castilian and, interestingly enough, these languages have managed to maintain the preterite as a spoken form. Standard French, meanwhile, extended the use of periphrastic forms, thus giving even more prominence to the participle. Whether this began early enough to affect many of the preterites in their period of fluctuation is debatable, but the 17th C. witness of Vaugelas actually indicates what sort of hesitation occurred, in this case for the preterite of *vesqui, vescut*, "Quelques uns n'ont pris d'autre parti que d'éviter tant qu'il se peut ce prétérit et de se servir de l'autre que les grammairiens appellent indefiny ou composé, j'ay vescu" (cited by Wahlgren, 272).

5.9 CONCLUSIONS

The conclusions to be drawn from the second half of the present chapter are that the French *u* system increased in favour during its later period of extension, aided by a tendency of the language to prefer open syllables and also by the fact that it was an excellent differentiator from both sigmatic and present tense paradigms. The ability of the *u* suffix to attach to a regular stem allowed the *u* category to lay claim to several sigmatics which were forced to restructure their base, due to the loss of characteristic *s*. Weak *u* vocalism seems to have enjoyed preference as a standard form of the central region, so that it continued to displace other regional variants, although probably at a slow rate. In Modern French, the *u* category has ceased to be productive, although it
remains vigorous enough as a participial and adjectival form. Its extension reached a peak during the classical period of the language.
GENERAL CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study has been to examine the extension of weak u vocalism in medieval Gallo-Romance. Useful comparative evidence, collected from other Romance languages, has also been synthesized, so that evaluation of developments in the G–R zone could proceed from a wide perspective. The detailed study of preterite u spread applies more specifically to the Northern French dialects.

Past studies have presented divergent opinions about the development of u vocalism, some authors, such as Fouche, holding the French development to be by and large phonetically evolved from V.L., others, like Wahlgren, believing that the feature owes a great deal to analogical restructurings within verbal systems. The data available for early forms does not always lend itself to easy interpretation for various reasons. In the first place some examples date from the preliterary period, so that their origin remains a subject of hypothesis. Further difficulties may arise because forms remain inadequately localised or are not chronologically ordered. Seldom do authorities, such as Meyer-Lübke in his *Grammaire des langues romanes* or Fouche in his *Le verbe français*, really quantify their examples, so that rare forms are cited on the same footing as very common paradigms.

The present study has sought to minimize these problems in the following ways:

1. The structural patterns of G–R are compared with the patterns of development in V.L. or other Romance languages and the phonetic or analogical nature of types of change is noted.

2. The charters and all texts up to the *Chanson de Roland* are examined in their entirety. Some supplementary material is also included as indicated, but the quantities of examples found are recorded, so that frequency can be determined.

3. All information from charters is located by area. This is correlated to literary forms and allows the recognition of varied regional development.

4. Chronological information is included for all charter forms. Literature can be
situated less precisely and both sets of forms are noted separately, so that any

differences in usage become apparent.

The results of the detailed study of G−R confirm that the −utum P.P. is well established
throughout the region. Occitan and French, like Latin, tend to create a formal
correspondence between the forms of their perfective systems. However, it is principally in
the northern dialect zones, excluding the extreme N.E. and Walloon, that this
correspondence takes on the form of u vocalism. Considerable diversity exists among the
earliest written records of French and there is good reason to believe that dialectal
variety was more obvious up to the 13th C. It has been impossible to determine if any
one area led the extension of u vocalism, because the earliest data is too limited, but
the feature certainly occurs in Picard, Norman and Anglo−Norman texts. At a later date,
it is firmly established around Paris and in the Oise area, which lack adequate earlier
records, and it continues to spread from this source.

The preterite of être and weak u participle forms occur very frequently in the
texts investigated, but u vocalism is absent from many early French preterites. Analogical
restructuring seems likely to be the cause of weak u propagation in many instances. A
development due to phonetic means alone is to be excluded for some verbs of the
French u preterite system e.g., mourir. It is not warranted by comparative study nor by
early examples and the suggestion may have been based on an erroneous concept of
Latin ui −utum spread in V.L. However, a phonetic development can be accepted for a
limited number of other verbs such as dui. The success of this feature in the French
system may be due to a fortuitous combination of developments arising synchronically,
whereby phonetic and analogical processes mutually reinforced each other. The present
study has been unable to demonstrate this, as insufficient evidence is available. However
such a hypothesis finds structural parallels in the inter−paradigmatic guttural spread due to
a combination of phonetic and analogical factors in Occitan and in the internal
restructurings of Castilian irregular preterites, evolved from the êre − êre classes.
While this study has provided much detailed information about the spread of u vocalism in the perfective verbal systems of G–R, it was nonetheless limited by circumstances. Certain complementary or additional pieces of research would undoubtedly clarify the situation even further.

1. An adequate, well-documented chronological synthesis dealing with the extent and relationship of *ui – utum, dedi – utum* spread in V.L., as well as the theories of phonetic development and stress patterning within these classes would fill a gap in information currently available.

2. Detailed studies of other Romance languages, based on a wide sample and dealing specifically with dialectal and diachronic development of the perfective system, would certainly yield interesting grounds for further comparison between patterning devices and structural change within the various systems.

3. Within the G–R zone itself it would be useful to analyse even more data, especially additional charters which are constantly being published and additional literature located by area. Hopefully the methods of computer collation and distribution undertaken by A. Dees (1980) may render this task more straightforward in due course.

In studies of V.L. and medieval language, problems inevitably arise from the sheer volume and variety of material that could be investigated. This project only examined a small, but significant, fraction of the abundant sources available for research. However, I express optimism about the usefulness of the methods of regional and chronological analysis, I believe they have a proven advantage in clarifying the progression, hesitations and patterns of language change, and I hope that other such studies will complement these findings in the future.
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Chapter 7
APPENDIX

7.1 PRINCIPAL VERB STUDY LIST

Northern Dialect Area Numbers

1. Burgundy
2. Franche Comté
3. Vosges
4. Haute-Marne/Champagne
5. Walloon Area
6. Picard (including part of Oise)
7. Ile de France (including part of Oise)
8. Berry
9. Normandy
10. Anglo-Norman Area
11. West
12. South-west, Poitou, Saintonge

Occitan Dialect Area Numbers

1. Marche
2. Limousin
3. Périgord
4. Auvergne
5. Velay
6. Vivarais
7. Gevaudan
8. Rouergue
9. Quercy
10. Albigeois
11. Valentinnois
12. Pays d’Orange, Pays de Carpentras, Pays d’Avignon
13. Pays de Sisteron
14. Pays de Marseille
15. Usège, Ninois
16. Lodevois, Pays de S. Pons
17. Narbonnais
18. Toulousain
19. Agenais
20. Comminges

App-20 = Girart de Roussillon

Notes
1. Abbreviations found in the appendix appear under author or area in the Bibliography.
2. For each example the earliest attested form is given with its date.
3. Area numbers are attached to authors by a hyphen.
4. Numbers locating charters or other works, or parts of works, are separated from their
page, column or line location by a semi-colon.
**AVOIR**

Oise 189;9 d.1285

Infinitive: HAVEIR Jon 1 AVER Leg 94 AVEIR Rol 565 AVOER W.2. d.1299

**Past Participle**

**Northern Zone**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td>Bur 43 1;11 d.1256(+21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>var. hau</td>
<td>Vos 140;17 d.1271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ahu etc.</td>
<td>H–Mn 90;1 d.1278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OU</td>
<td>Poit 109;6 d.1238(+1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>out</td>
<td>Alex 109, Rol 864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oud</td>
<td>Rol 267(+1), Bart 12;45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU(T)</td>
<td>Sch–5 X;4 d.1239</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Locations:**

- Bur 41 II;p.577(+5)
- Wal 11;10, Pic.2 32;7(+1)
- Pic.3 L;8, Oise 5;8(23)
- Norm 1021 col.1;21(+3)
- Ber 8(+2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(C) W.2. 3;14, Poit 6;20(+53)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Franco-Provençal Zone**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HAHU</td>
<td>Aeb 25;88 d.1285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OU</td>
<td>Ly 38i;7 d.1389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEU</td>
<td>Ly 32;10 d.1350–1401(+15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fz 18;32 d.1358(+1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aeb 13;48 d.1398(+2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) Ly 38b;7 d.1361–90(+1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>Aeb 13;48 d.1398(+2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Occitan Zone**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AVUT</td>
<td>Bru 42;6 d.1145–(+76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(L) App 5;169 d.1182</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avot</td>
<td>Bru–8 195;30 d.1182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUT</td>
<td>Bru–8 110;3 d.1170–95(+8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGUT</td>
<td>Bru 292;8 d.1195–(+9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(L) Bo 108, App 108;48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agud</td>
<td>Gasc 17;19 d.1251(+6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agu</td>
<td>Poit 214;14 d.1259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OGU</td>
<td>Poit 107;7 d.1229–93(+8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) Sch–12 60;18 d.1250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>Poit 107;7 d.1229–93(+8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals**

- Northern Zone = 126
- Franco-Provençal Zone = 25
- Occitan Zone = 119

**Preterite**

**Northern Zone**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. OI</td>
<td>Alex 441, Rol 1366(+1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rou III;7624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. OT</td>
<td>Poit 108;2 d.1230(+3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Norm 1222;37 d.1272(+2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. ORENT
(L)  Leg 63(+4), Rol 1569
   Rou II;201(+2), Cour 14(+8)
   Ric-7 17;64 15th C.
   AUT
(L)  Leg 25(+7)
4. (H)AUMES
(C)  Bur 43 p.521;15(+1), Vos 51;8
6. AURENT
(C)  H-Mn 75;20 d.1275
   H-Mn 75;20 d.1275
   ROU 62(+3) var. oul.
   Rou II;6(+3) var. oul.
   Voy 59(+16)

4. OUMES
(L)  Rol 2178
6. OUURRENT
(L)  Rou 1411, Rou II;21(+2), Voy 415
1. EU
(L)  Bart 23;125(+1)
   euc
   Bart 76b;164
3. EUT
(C)  Pic.1 6;2 d.1219(+1)
   locations:
   (C)  Pic.1 8;60(+1), Pic.2 29;133
   Oise 57;14(+3), Norm 1021
   col.1;33
   (L)  Bart 56;452(+5)
4. EU(S)MES
(C)  Poit 165;15 d.1256
   locations:
(C)  Vos 56;2, Oise 75;31(+1)
   Norm 1029 col.2:p.333, Sch-2 3;27
   (L)  Rou III;10680, Voy 665
6. EURENT
(C)  Pic.1 3;13 d.1218(+9)
   locations:
   (C)  Pic.1 3;57, Oise 55;13
   (L)  Bart 19;160(+4), Rou III;120
Miscellaneous
3. OG
(L)  Cler 42 10th C.
OC
(L)  Leg 63
OCT
(L)  Leg 164(+1)
4. OWINS
(C)  Wal 14;23 d.1274

Franco-Provençal Zone
3. AB
   OT
   (C)  Ly 32;7 d.1343–93(+11)
   (C)  Fz 6;26 d.1290(–+43)
   (L)  Aeb 6;65 13th C.(+14)
   OUIT
   (C)  Fz 6;121 d.1290(+1)

Occitan Zone
1. AIG
   (C)  Bru 121;5 d.1170
   (L)  Foi 84(+1)
   AIC
   (C)  Bru 202;22 d.1182(+5)
3. AG
   (C)  Bru 1;27 d.1034(+14)
   (L)  Bo 28, Foi 443(+10)
   AC
   (C)  Bru 7;8 d.1102(+7)
   (L)  App 7;342(+1), Bo 34(+1)
6. AGRO(N)
   (C)  Bru 82;6 d.1157(+17)
1. AIGUI
   (C)  Bru 266;15 d.1192(+1)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>AGUIT</td>
<td>Cath</td>
<td>1726</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>AGUEM</td>
<td>Bru</td>
<td>134;7</td>
<td>d.1172(+8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>AGES</td>
<td>App</td>
<td>94;14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>AGUrent</td>
<td>Poit</td>
<td>108;6</td>
<td>d.1230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>AGO</td>
<td>Gasc</td>
<td>24;1</td>
<td>d.1288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>AGON</td>
<td>Gasc</td>
<td>27;14</td>
<td>d.1252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>OGUI</td>
<td>S.W.</td>
<td>p.143</td>
<td>d.1225(+3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>OGUIT</td>
<td>Poit</td>
<td>108;2</td>
<td>(+2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>OGUISMES</td>
<td>S.W.2;11</td>
<td>d.1225</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Person**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northern Zone</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franco-Provençal Zone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occitan Zone</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Imperfect Subjunctive**

**Northern Zone**

1. **AUSSE**
   - (C) Vos 112;1 d.1266
   - Sch-1 48;2 d.1273
   - 1

2. **AHUST**
   - (C) H-Mn 137;14 d.1262(+1)
   - Bur 43 II;4(+2), Vos 50;6(+1)
   - 5

   **AUUISSET**
   - (L) Eul 27 9th C.
   - 5

   **AUIST**
   - (C) Vos 13;2 d.1249
   - 5

   **AWIST**
   - (C) Wal 7;13 d.1258(+2)
   - 5

3. **(H)AUSSIENS**
   - (C) Bur 43 VI;31 d.1262
   - Vos 107;2 d.1265
   - hahusiens
   - Bur 39 VIII;9 d.1315
   - 3

4. **AHUSSENT**
   - (C) Bur 43 XII;25 d.1330
   - aussent
   - Sch-3 61;3 d.1269
   - 2

   **AWISSENT**
   - (C) Wal 17;31 d.1276
   - 1

5. **OUSSE**
   - (C) S.W. 5;3 d.1232
   - (L) Alex 226(+2), Rol 691
   - 5

6. **OUIST**
   - (L) Leg 88

   **OWIST**
   - (C) Wal 1;3 d.1236(+1)
   - 3

   **OUST**
   - (L) Rol 899(+1), Bart 12;15
   - ohust
   - Poit 13;3 d.1239(+2)
   - 6

4. **OUS(S)UM**
   - (L) Rol 1103(+2)
   - uussom
   - (C) Poit 169;3 d.1259(+1)
   - 5

6. **OUSSENT**
   - (L) Rol 688

   **OWISSENT**
   - (C) Wal 12;36 d.1272
   - uissent
   - (L) Bart 87b;133
   - 2

1. **EUSSE**
   - (C) H-Mn 1;27 d.1232
   - locations:
     - Pic.2 20;4(+2), Oise 29;11(+4)
     - Norm 927 col.2;23(+2)
     - Poit 120;2(+5)
     - 18
3. EUST
   locations:
   Vos 12;6 (+2), Wal 4;15 col.2
   Pic.1 J;33 (+2), Pic.2 1;3 (+6)
   Oise 1;7 (+11)
   Norm 927 col.1;10 (+5)
   Ber 15;5 (+1), Poit 21;5 73 (+19)
   Sch 4;11 37;10 (+3)

EWIST
   (C)  Wal 15;4 d.1280
   (L)  Bart 36;220 (+1)

4. EUSSIENS
   locations:
   Bur 43 VI;31 (+2), Pic.1 M;5
   var. (h)–ons
   Pic.2 33;4, Sch 6–12 6;28 (+1)
   Oise 160;2 (+1)
   Norm 1209 col.1;38
   Poit 89;6 (+19)

EUISSONS
   (L)  Bart 87 b;15

5. EUSCIES
   (C)  Bart 56;128

6. EUSSENT
   locations:
   Bur 41 VIII;19 (+3), Vos 76;5
   var. (h)–eint
   Pic.1 N;21 (+2), Pic.2 37;3 (+1)
   Oise 160;2 (+1)
   Norm 927 col.1;38
   Poit 89;6 (+19)

EWISSENT
   (C)  Wal 6;27 d.1248 (+1)

Franco-Provençal Zone
1. OSSE
   (C)  Ly 37;157 d.1389 (+1)

3. AGUES
   (C)  Fz 1;7 d.1270
   AHUST
   (C)  Aeb 25;70 d.1285
   aust
   (L)  Aeb 6;121
   EUST
   (C)  Ly 36;27 d.1384
   ehust
   (C)  Aeb 35;16 d.1372 (+1)

Occitan Zone
1. AGUES
   (C)  Bru 152;20 d.1176 (+6)
   –essa
   (L)  Cath 1829 (+1)
   ages
   (C)  Bru–8 208;6 d.1183 (+1)

2. AGUESSAS
   (L)  App 8;102

3. AGUES
   (L)  Bru 11;10 d.1105 (+11)
   var. ag(u)es(s)
   (L)  Bo 178 (+1)
   –uis agges
   Foi 80 (+1)
   AGUIST
   (L)  Cath 628 (+6)
   AGOS
   (C)  Gasc 17;22 d.1251 (+2)

4. ACS(SEM)
   (C)  Bru 137;12 d.1173 (+11)
   var. axem
   (L)  App 94;14
   agsem
   (C)  Bru–8 475;6 d.1184
   AGUISSEM
   (C)  Poit 108;13 d.1230

6. AGUESSO
   (C)  Bru–8 41;12 d.1143 (+3)
   var. –en-an–ant
   (L)  App 119;106, Cath 412 (+1)
   AGOSEN
   (C)  Gasc 21;35 d.1260 (+1)

Other –Wk u +Wk u
1. OGUISSE (C) S.W. 5;8 d.1232
oguesse (L) Poit 211;2 d.1248–59(+2)
(L) App 1;592
3. OGUES (C) Bru-8 15;32d d.1120
OGUIST (C) S.W. 10;4 d.1250(+2)
Poit 214;7 d.1259(+1)
Sch-12 60;14 d.1250
(L) App-20 1;310
5. OGUISSENT miscellaneous
3. ENGEST (L) App-20 1;570

Person

Northern Zone 1 2 3 4 5 6
Franco-Provençal Zone 25 85 42 1 58
Occitan Zone 2 6 1

Totals

Preterite
Northern Zone = 182
Franco-Provençal Zone = 81
Occitan Zone = 105

Imperfect Subjunctive
Northern Zone = 211
Franco-Provençal Zone = 9
Occitan Zone = 82

POUVOIR
Podir(L) Bart 2;9 IXth C.

Noun
POUOIR Vos 23;4 d.1253, POEIR 6;24 d.1240, POOIR 109;9 d.1266, POEIR W.2. 9;12 d.1292, POAIR 7;292 d.1268, PODER 11;6 d.1299

Past Participle
Northern Zone
POU
L) Bart 90b;144 15th C.

Occitan Zone
POGUT (L) App 119;5

Totals
Northern Zone = 1
### Occitan Zone

#### Preterite

##### Northern Zone

1. **POI**
   - **locations:**
   - Alex 395
   - Rol 1365, Rou III; 11429
   - Ami 989, Nim 906, Bart 27;174

3. **POD**
   - **PO**
     - Leg; 40
     - Vos 41;4 d.1256
     - Norm 927 col.2;13 ca.1278
   - **OUT**
     - Leg 141(+3)
     - Bart 8;58(+4)
     - Rou II;541(+2)
     - Voy 408, Gor 312
     - Perc 367(+2), Cath 885(+2)

##### Occitan Zone

1. **POC**
   - **UEC**
     - App 3;277
     - IEAP 40;22
     - B.Occ 255;24
   - **OC**
     - Foi 67(+3)

3. **POG**
   - **OC**
     - App 11;9(+2)
   - **OT**
     - App 9;6(+2)
   - **OUT**
     - App 20;1230
     - Gasc 46;p.105 d.1256
     - Cath 676

##### Franco-Provençal Zone

3. **POT**
   - Frag 40 12th C.
   - Aeb 7;90 13th C.

### Other - Wk u + Wk u

**Totals**
Northern Zone = 67
Franco-Provençal Zone = 2
Occitan Zone = 25

Imperfect Subjunctive

Northern Zone

1. PEUSSE (C)
   locations: (C)
   Date Range 1250–1308
   PEUSSE (C)
   locations: (C)
   var. pusse
   (L) Nim 101
   (L) Bart 56;121
   (L) Bart 17;181
   PEUSSES (L)
   PEUSSIES (L)
   PEUSSIES (L)
   PEUSSIES (L)

2. PEUSSIES (L)
   PEUSSIES (L)
   PEUSSIES (L)
   PEUSSIES (L)

3. PODIST (L)
   POUST (C)
   POUST (C)
   POUST (C)
   POUST (C)

4. PEUSSOM (C)
   peusom (C)
   peusom (C)
   peusom (C)
   peusom (C)

5. PEUSSIES (L)
   PEUSSIES (L)
   PEUSSIES (L)
   PEUSSIES (L)

6. PEUSSENT (C)
   POISSIENS (C)
   POISSIENS (C)
   POISSIENS (C)
   POISSIENS (C)

7. PEUSSIES (L)
   PEUSSIES (L)
   PEUSSIES (L)
   PEUSSIES (L)

Other – Wk u + Wk u
locations:  
(C) Bur 41 VII:12  
Vos 50;6, Pic.2 15;9  
Pic.3 51;109  
Sch=7 2;58, Oise 9;15  
Sch=10 80;10  
Poit 31;36(+7)  
(L) Bart 36;174  

pussent  
(C) Vos 98;3 d.1263(+4)  
peuscent  
(C) Sch=6 9;27 d.1269  
PAEUSSENT  
(C) Sch=2 63;p.51 d.1270  
POUSSENT  
(L) Poit 96;15 d.1261(+8)  

poessant  
(L) Cath 1460  
POGSSEN  
(C) Poit 156;20 d.1247  

Franco-Provençal Zone  
6. POUSANT  
(C) Aeb 34;24 d.1370  

Occitan Zone  
1. POGUES  
(C) Bru=8-10 194;27 d.1182(+7)  
(L) App 21;9(+2), Cath 351  
pogas  
(C) Bru=8 208;15 d.1183  
POGUISSE  
(C) S.W. 5;18 d.1232  
3. POGUES  
(C) Bru 5;13 ca.1080(+9)  
(L) App 69;15(+1)  
Bo 93  
pog(g)es  
(C) Bru=20 97;2 ca.1160  
(L) App 89;4, Foi 498(+1)  
POGUISSE  
(C) S.W. 5;16 d.1232  
(L) Cath 692(+1)  
POGUES  
(L) B.Occ 403;25  
PODOSSA  
(C) Gasc 17;p.22 d.1251(+1)  
PUIST  
(L) App 48;35  

4. POCEM  
(C) Bru=8 378;9 d.1168(+4)  
var. poxera  
POGSEM  
(L) Bru=8 265;10 d.1192  
5. POGUES  
(L) App 100;167  
6. POGUESSETZ  
(C) Bru 13;52 ca.1109(+1)  
(L) App 118;92  
POGUESSETZ  
(C) Gasc 46;p.105 d.1256  
pogossan  
(C) Gasc 57;8 d.1237  
pod-  
(C) Gasc 17;p.22 d.1251(+1)  

Totals  
Northern Zone = 149  
Franco-Provençal Zone = 1  
Occitan Zone = 63  

SAVOIR  
(C) Vos 1;1 d.1235
Infinitive: SAVIR Bart 2;9 9th C.
SABER Bru-8 39;p.44 d.1142, SAVEIR Rol 1581

Noun
SABER Bo 33, SAVEIR Rol 234
SABUA Fz 1;22 d.1270 SAU Vos 78;8 d.1261
SEUE Oise 174;14 d.1283 SEHU Poit 93;9 d.1284
SEGU S.W. 9;p.152 d.1245

Past Participle
Northern Zone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEU</td>
<td>Sch-4</td>
<td>34;40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Norm 927</td>
<td>col.1;42 ca.1278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rou II;2265(+2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Franco-Provençal Zone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCEU</td>
<td>Fz 29;4</td>
<td>d.1381</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Occitan Zone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAUBUT</td>
<td>Bru-8-10</td>
<td>174;1 d.1180(+5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sauput</td>
<td>App 60;36(+2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cath 2280(+1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SABUT</td>
<td>Bru-20</td>
<td>346;1 ca.1200(+7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SABEDORA</td>
<td>Gasc 8;1</td>
<td>d.1236</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals
Northern Zone = 5
Franco-Provençal Zone = 1
Occitan Zone = 31

Preterite
Northern Zone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOI</td>
<td>Bart 24</td>
<td>133(+1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOU</td>
<td>Nim 650, Cath 553</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cath 564</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOT</td>
<td>Vos 41;4 d.1256</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Norm 927 col.2;65 d.1278</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leg 77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bart 18;12, Nim 801(+3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cath 2131, Perc 452(+5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soth</td>
<td>Leg 89(+1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUT</td>
<td>Alex 273, Rol 1024</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rou II;161(+2), Bart 12;4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCEUSTES</td>
<td>Bart 96b;6 15th C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEURENT</td>
<td>Oise 57;17 d.1263</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pic.2 33;8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOWRENT</td>
<td>Leg 116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOURENT</td>
<td>Alex 28(+1), Rou II;4416</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOURENT</td>
<td>Rou II;114(+2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-unt</td>
<td>Cath 9272</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other -Wk u +Wk u
### Occitan Zone

1. **SAUP**
   - (L) App 5:228
   - saubi

2. **SAGUI**
   - (L) Cath 250

3. **SAUP**
   - (L) App 63:17(+3)
   - sap

4. **SAUB**
   - (L) Foi 230

5. **SOT**
   - (L) App-20 1;130(+1)

6. **SOUT**
   - (L) App-20 1;215

6. **SAUPRON**
   - (L) App 108;4

6. **SAUBRO**
   - (L) App 116;34

### Totals
- **Northern Zone** = 40
- **Occitan Zone** = 14

### Imperfect Subjunctive

#### Northern Zone

1. **SOUSSE**
   - (L) Alex 486

2. **SEUSES**
   - (L) Perc 1496(+3)

3. **SEUST**
   - (L) Rou III;101(+2), Perc 1456

4. **SEUISSIEMMES**
   - (C) Sch-5 10;80 d.1239

5. **SEUISSENT**
   - (C) Sch-5 10;78 d.1239

6. **SEUSSENT**
   - (C) Poit 234;17 d.1298

#### Occitan Zone

1. **SAUBES**
   - (L) App 18;33(+1)

2. **SOBES**
   - (L) App-20 1;213

3. **SAUPES**
   - (L) App 100;49 d.1278(+3)

4. **SABES**
   - (L) App 122d;18

5. **SAUBESSETZ**
   - (L) App 65;86

6. **SAUPESSON**
   - (L) App 4;181(+1)

### Totals
- **Northern Zone** = 23
- **Occitan Zone** = 13
CONNAITRE
Quenoître H–Mn 215;11 d.1266

Infinitive: RECOGNOSTRE Cler 80 CONUISTRE Rol 530

Past Participle
Northern Zone
(RE)CONEU locations:
var. quenu cognu etc.

Pic.3 6;16 d.1219(+2)
Bur 41 III;4(+21), Vos 17;5(+52)
H–Mn 72;1(+76), Wal 7;2(+15)
Pic.1  H;39(+6), Pic.2 21;3(+9)
Sch–7 1;12(+1) Oise 4;3(+13)
Ber 6(+2), Poit 55;1(+22)
(L) Bart 13;20(+5) 242

reco(g)nuï (L) Vos 12;2(+7), H–Mn 202;12 9
COGNE (C) H–Mn 71;2 d.1257 1
CONNIE (C) Pic.1  J;2 d.1290 1

Franco-Provençal Zone
COGNEYSSOUS (C) Ly 25;9 d.1355 4
CONOGU (C) Fz 1;42 d.1270–72(+2)

Occitan Zone
CONOGUT (C) Bru 42;1 d.1145(+17)
Gasc 7;1 d.1235(+45)
W.2 11;2 d.1299, Poit 156;1(+1)
(L) App 5;245(+5) 73

Totals
Northern Zone = 253
Franco-Provençal Zone = 4
Occitan Zone = 73

Preterite
Northern Zone
1. –COGNEUS (L) H–Mn 71;6 d.1257
   cognui
   cognu
   H–Mn 97;4 d.1258
   Oise 83;7 d.1268
   Bart 32;21(+3) 7

2. –COUNUT (C) Pic.3 30;2 d.1244(+2)
   locations:
   var. –quenut
   –coignut
   Bur 39;2;3(+4), H–Mn 199;8(+1)
   Wal p.110;6, Pic.1 H;19
   Oise 3;4(+11), Ber 9;2
   Sch–9–11 70;3(+3)
   W.2. 8;3, Poit 24;2(+31)
   (L) Alex 215(+1), Rol 2875(+1)
   Bart 21;62(+7) 79

4. CONOUMES (C) Poit 235;3 d.1300(+2)
   –eumes (L) Alex 360 4

6. –CON(E)URENT (C) Pic.3 2;22 d.1218(+6)
locations: Vos 45;7, H–Mn 82;2
Wal 17;39(+4), Pic.1 H;13(+2)
Sch–6–7–11–12 34;16(+4)
Oise 55;15(+16)
Ber 16, Poit 40;4(+40)
(L) Alex 115(+3). Bart 86;183

Franco-Provençal Zone
1. COGNUI (L) Aeb 6;132 13th C 1
6. –CONURENT (L) Aeb 6;400 1

Occitan Zone
1. CONUC (C) Bru–8 259;9 d.1191(+1) 1
CONGUI (C) Poit 226;2 d.1287 1
3. CONOC/G (C) Bru–3–8–9–18 119;10 d.1170(+6)
(L) App 3;316(+4), Foi 310(+1) 14
COINUT (L) App–20 1;575 1
–CONOGO (C) Gasc 53;8 d.1234(+11) 12
4. CONOUEM (L) App 116;38
CONEGUIMES (C) Poit 213;3 d.1256(+1) 3
6. RECONOGUO (C) Bru–18 330;4 d.1200(+1) 2
CONOGRO(N) (L) App 5;340(+2)
des–
CONOGUOREN (C) Gasc 59;11 d.1240(+1)
–eren
W.2. 2;5 d.1299 4

Totals
Northern Zone=176
Franco-Provençal Zone=2
Occitan Zone=42

Imperfect Subjunctive
Northern Zone
3. CONNEUST (C) H–Mn 256;9 d.1269 2
Cun–
CO(G)NUIST (L) Bart 25;47
(C) Wal 11;21 d.1272(+1) 2

Occitan Zone
1. CONOGUES (L) App 42b;8 1
3. CONOGUES (L) App 16;39(+1)
coinegis App–20 1;524(+1) 4
6. CONOGOSSEN (C) Gasc 17;p.25 d.1251 1

Totals
Northern Zone=4
Occitan Zone=6

CROITRE

Infinitive: ACRESTRE Bart 62;3 CREISTRE Rol 980

Noun
CREU(Z) (C) H-Mn 237;29

Past Participle

**Northern Zone**

CREU (C) Bur-2 43 VIII;3 d.1290
Vos 31;6 d.1255(+1)
H-Mn 172;5 d.1264(+3)
Sch-11 72;31 d.1294
a-des-Vos 31;6 d.1255(+2)
CRU (L) Bart 72;121, Rou II;3954(+2) 12
(C) Pic.2 33;40 d.1320 1

Franco-Provencal Zone

CRET (C) Ly 37;109 d.1389 1
CREYSU (C) Ly 34;335 d.1364 1
CREU (C) Fz 30;30 d.1389 1

Occitan Zone

CREGUT (L) App 52;35 3
-z-Foi 367(+1)

Totals
Northern Zone=13
Franco-Provencal Zone=3
Occitan Zone=3

Preterite

**Northern Zone**

3. CRUT (L) Bart 31;94, Rou C.A.;230(+4) 6
6. CRURENT (L) Rou II;1610(+1) 2

Franco-Provencal Zone

3. CREISSIT (C) Ly 32;45 d.1350
creisit Ly 37;134 d.1389
creisit (L) Aeb 7;31 3

Occitan Zone

3. CREC (C) Bru-8 159;3 d.1177
-g (L) App 387(+2), Foi 536 5

Totals
Northern Zone=8
Franco-Provencal Zone=3
Occitan Zone=5

Imperfect Subjunctive

**Northern Zone**

3. CREUST (L) Bart 51b;13, Rou II;1649(+1) 3

DEVOIR

Ly 38;6 d.1389

Past Participle
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northern Zone</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>Sch-11 65:8</td>
<td>d.1267</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dehu</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bur 41 XIII;29</td>
<td>d.1345</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pic.2 29;94</td>
<td>d.1310</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Poit 202;9</td>
<td>d.1268 (+40)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHIU (C)</td>
<td>Ly 34;566</td>
<td>d.1364</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>var. dehu, deu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diheu etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEUBZ (C)</td>
<td>Fz 42;1</td>
<td>d.1497</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Franco-Provencal Zone</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEGUT (L)</td>
<td>App 33;56</td>
<td>d.1282</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>degu</td>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>Poit 217;18</td>
<td>d.1265</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occitan Zone</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEC</td>
<td>(C) Bru-8</td>
<td>17;4 ca.1120 (+2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deg</td>
<td>(L) App</td>
<td>21;29 (+1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEGRO (C)</td>
<td>Bru-8 296;6</td>
<td>d.1183 (+1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Zone = 44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franco-Provencal Zone = 36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occitan Zone = 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preterite</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northern Zone</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. DUI (C)</td>
<td>Wal XI:p 115</td>
<td>d.1267</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oise 168;17</td>
<td>d.1282</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bart 25;295 (+1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(L) Bart 19;279</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. düT (C)</td>
<td>Vos 41;9</td>
<td>d.1256</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Norm 665;1</td>
<td>ca.1260 (+1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alex 291, Rol 333</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perc 4729 (+1), Bart 19;304 (+3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(L) Poit 174;22</td>
<td>d.1277</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(L) Bart 87b;100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. DEUJENS (C)</td>
<td>Wal IX;11</td>
<td>d.1263 (+3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(L) Bart 14;44, Perc 3335</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. DURENT (L)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occitan Zone</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. DEC (C)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. DEGRO (C)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Zone = 24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occitan Zone = 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Imperfect Subjunctive</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northern Zone</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. DEUSSE (C)</td>
<td>Oise 64;14</td>
<td>d.1263</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poit 215;61</td>
<td>d.1261</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(L) Bart 19;311</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. DOUS(S)ES (L)</td>
<td>Alex 318 (+2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEUSSES (L)</td>
<td>Bart 58;261</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strong - Wk u + Wk u
3. DEUST (C) W.2. 1;11 d.1238
   locations: (C) Bur, Pic.1, Pic.3, Oise(+1)
               Norm(+2), W.2., Poit(+5)

   DOUST (L) Alex 355

4. DEHUSSAINS (C) Bur 43 XI;8 d.1307
   DEHUSSIENS (C) Norm 1029 col.1:35 d.1259

   DOUSSOM (C) Poit 188;40 d.1254
   doussum (L) Alex 620

   DEUISSIONS (L) Bart 86;278

5. DOUS(S)EZ (L) Alex 353(+1)
   DEUSSIEZ (L) Bart 34;35

6. DEUSSENT (C) Bur 41 VII;11 d.1275
   Vos 50;6 d.1257, Oise 165;3 d.1257
   Poit 96;5(4) d.1257

   deusset (L) Bart 28;56
   doussent (C) H-Mn 12;2 d.1244
   doussint (C) H-Mn 149;12 d.1263

Occitan Zone
1. DEGES (C) Bru 208;7 ca.1183
   degues (L) App 5;225

3. DEGUES (C) Bru 41;28(+2) ca.1143
   deges (L) App 107;33(+1)

   DEGOS (C) Gasc 60;3.127(+1) d.1243

   DEGUIST (C) Poit 156;83 d.1247
   Sch-12 60;5 d.1250

4. DECSEM (C) Bru-8 454;7 d.1181
   degsem Bru-8 475;6 d.1184

5. DEGUESSES (L) Cath 584
5. DEGUESSES (L) Cath 584

6. DEGUESSE (C) Bru 369;8 ca.1160

Totals
Northern Zone=46
Occitan Zone=16

ÊTRE
ESTRE W.2. 7;14 d.1286

Infinitive: ETRE H-Mn 47;8 d.1254 IESTRE Bart 18;31

Because of the large number of samples, an abbreviated format has been adopted for this verb and Occitan examples are only included in the P.P., since the preterite does not contain u forms.

Past Participle
Northern Zone
E(S)TE (C) Pic.3 6;8 d.1219(+2)
   locations: (C) Bur(+2), Vos, Pic.1(+3), Pic.2(+4)
               Oise(+20), Ber(+1), W.2.
               Poit(+34), Sch(+12)
Strong -Wk u +Wk u

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>estei</td>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>Bur 43 II; 5 d.1272(+1), Vos(+1)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>este(i)t</td>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>Wal p.71 d.1237(+1), Sch-4(+2)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>esté</td>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>Poit 2; 23 d.1281</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Franco-Provençal Zone

ITA
(C) Ly(+11), Aeb(+2) | 15 |
(L) Aeb | 1 |
ESTE
(C) Ly p.324 d.1378(+1) | 38 |
(L) Fz(+34), Aeb | 1 |
istez
(C) Ly 34;574 d.1364-5 | 1 |

Occitan Zone

ESTAT
(C) Bru 315;16(+2) | 3 |
ESTUDAS
(C) Bru 343;18 | 1 |

Totals
Northern Zone = 98
Franco-Provençal Zone = 55
Occitan Zone = 4

Preterite
Only one sample of location is given with each form

Northern Zone

1. FUI (L) Rol 2371
2. FUS (L) Rol 1961
3. FUT (L) Eul 1 9th C.
   fui(d) (L) Leg 13
   fui(t) (C) Vos 37;16 d.1256
   fuet (C) H-Mn 34;12 d.1232
   fu(s)t (C) Ber 10
   fahu (C) W.2. p.285 d.1238
   fau (C) W.2. p.291 d.1277
4. FUMES (L) Rol 2146
   fusmes (C) Oise 58;7
5. FURENT (L) Leg 80
   furet (C) Vos 19;20 d.1251
   fures (C) Vos 26;7 d.1254

Franco-Provençal Zone

3. FU(T) (C) Ly 253; p.232 d.1398-1401
   FO (C) Fz 6;43 d.1290
6. FURONT (C) Ly 22c;250 p.232
   furent (C) Ly 38; p.514 d.1389

Totals
Northern Zone = 758
Franco-Provençal Zone = 36

Imperfect Subjunctive

Northern Zone

1. FUSSE (C) Oise 125;2 d.1276
   fuisse (L) Bart 40;20
2. FUSSES (L) Cler 35
feusses (L) Bart 93c;22
3. FUST (L) Leg 32
fut, fuist (L) Bart 82;5
4. FUSSIEMMES (C) Sch-5 10;84 d.1239
feussions (C) Oise 161;37 d.1282
5. FUSTES (L) Rol 350
FUISSEZ (L) Bart 22;54
6. FUSSENT (L) Alex 164
fissent (C) Oise 117;7 d.1274
feussent (C) Oise 176;22 d.1284

Totals
Northern Zone = 158

GESIR

Past Participle
Northern Zone
GEUD (L) Alex 487, Bart 47;63
JEU (L) Alex 274, Rou III;630(+1)
JUT (L) Bart 56;118 6

Preterite
Northern Zone
1. JUI (L) Rou III;643 1
2. GEUS (L) Bart 19;177 1
3. GIUT (C) Pic.3 15;2 d.1234 1
   JOTH (L) Leg 163 1
   JUT (L) Rol 2375, Rou II;1037(+2) 5
4. REJEUMES (L) Bart 24;217 1
6. JURENT (L) Rol 3653, Rou II;1047(+1) 4
   Nim 836
Occitan Zone
3. JAG (L) Cler 236(+1), Foi 87
   JAC (L) App-20 1;386(+1) 5

Totals
Northern Zone = 13
Occitan Zone = 5

Imperfect Subjunctive
Northern Zone
3. GEUST (L) Bart 60;147 1

PARAITRE

Infinitive: PAROIR Bart 62c;2 PARER App 4;98

Past Participle
Northern Zone
APAR(E)U(T)  (L)  Alex  409(+2), Rol 2037

Preterite

Northern Zone
3. (AP)PARUT  (C)  Poit  232;14 d.1294
   (L)  Bart  21;35(+1), Rou II;1631(+5)
   Cath  1728(+1)
APPARI  (L)  Bart  87a;67
6. (COM)PARURENT  (C)  Pic.1 S;122 d.1298
   var. ap-
   (L)  Rou III;5424

Franco-Provençal Zone
3. AP(P)ARIT  (L)  Aeb  6;126 13th C. (+1), Cath 429

Occitan Zone
3. PAREC  (L)  App  63;43(+2), B.Occ 68;19(+1)
6. APAREGUIRENT  (L)  Cath  2607

Totals
Northern Zone=15
Franco-Provençal Zone=3
Occitan Zone=6

Soudre

Infinitive: ASOLBER  (C) Bru–20 172;28 d.1179
ASSOLVRE  Bru–8 315;12 d.1198
ASSORRE  Vos 92;7 d.1262
ASAURRE  Sch–4 34;44 d.1289
ASSOLER  Vos 19;12 d.1251
SAURE  (L)  Bart 56;466

Noun
ASOUT  (C)  Bru–8 229;5 d.1196

Past Participle

Northern Zone
ASOLEE  (C)  Vos 38;3 d.1256
SOTE  (C)  Wal 6;5 p.140 d.1264
SOUSSE  (C)  Oise 49;6 d.1261(+2)
sous  (L)  Rou III;4994
ABSOUT  (C)  Poit  202;52 d.1268
ASOLS  (L)  Rol 340(+4)
SOLU  (C)  Oise 35;23 d.1258(+2)
Poit  60;45 d.1285
pour-  Oise 126;14 d.1276(+2)
par-  (C)  Oise 102;3 d.1271
POURSOLUEZ  (C)  Oise 133;10 d.1277
A(B)SOLU(THE)  (L)  Alex 410, Rol 2311

Occitan Zone
SOLT

(C) Bru-8 296:5 ca.1195(+4)
Gasc 37;p.87 d.1268

asolt

(C) Gasc 48;p.109 d.1258;(2)

SOLS

(C) Gasc 47;20 d.1256

asols

(C) Bru-8 162;19 d.1178

SOUT

(C) Bru-8-18 185;5 ca.1180(+7)
(L) App 70;45(+1)

as-

(C) Bru-10-18 141;3 d.1174(+7)
Gasc 22;p.38 d.1281(+1) 22

Totals
Northern Zone = 23
Occitan Zone = 31

Preterite
Northern Zone

3. ABSOLS

(L) Leg 226 1

Occitan Zone

3. SOLS

(C) Bru-8 298;53 ca.1195
as(s)-

(C) Bru-8-9-18 104;1 d.1165(+14)
SOLC

(C) Bru-18 301;1 d.1196(+2)
SOLBE

(C) Bru-20 346;9 ca.1200
asolbeg

Bru-20 172;16 d.1179
SO(L)BO

(C) Gasc 5:3 d.1189(+1)
ASSOUBO

Gasc p.292 d.1252 5

6. SOLSERO

(C) Bru-8-18 507;9 d.1191(+1)
as(s)-

Bru-8-18 149;13 d.1176(+5)
SOLSO

Bru-18 525;1 d.1197 9

Totals
Northern Zone = 1
Occitan Zone = 33

TENIR
H-Mn 161;13 d.1263

Part Participle
Northern Zone

TENU

locations:

(C) Wal 1;6 d.1236(+13)

(C) Bur 39 1;p.485(+2), Vos(+28)
H-Mn 21;9(+78), Pic.1 A;34(+10),
Pic.2 7;20(+16)
Sch-7 II;61, Pic.3 22;35(+2)
Oise(+126), W.2. 1;11(+16)
S.W. 1;p.143(+12), Poit 36;11(+75)

(L) Alex 407, Rol 2310(+2)
Bart 8;146 395

tenui

(C) Vos 125;11 d.1269(+4)
H-Mn 26;8 6

tenuez

(C) H-Mn 20;9 d.1249, Poit 223;30 2
**Franco-Provencal Zone**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>verb</th>
<th>source</th>
<th>date</th>
<th>notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TENU</td>
<td>Ly 24;5</td>
<td>d.1351-2</td>
<td>Strong -Wk u + Wk u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fz 14;6(+6), Gasc 25;11(+5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aeb 6;31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TENGU</td>
<td>Fz 1;32</td>
<td>d.1270(+5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Occitan Zone**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>verb</th>
<th>source</th>
<th>date</th>
<th>notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TENGUT</td>
<td>Bru 119;13</td>
<td>d.1170(+34)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>App 62b;1(+2), S.W. 2;3</td>
<td>Poit 156;158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teguz/t</td>
<td>Foi 372(+1), App 107;40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tengud</td>
<td>Gasc 17;25</td>
<td>d.1251(+42)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>var. artengud</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals**

- Northern Zone = 403
- Franco-Provencal Zone = 49
- Occitan Zone = 88

Preterite and Imperfect Subjunctive in i only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>verb</th>
<th>source</th>
<th>date</th>
<th>notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VALU</td>
<td>Bart 25;269</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAL(L)UT</td>
<td>H-Mn 75;54</td>
<td>d.1257</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Noun

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>noun</th>
<th>source</th>
<th>date</th>
<th>notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAISVALENZA</td>
<td>Bru=18 300;10</td>
<td>d.1196</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAISVALEUSSA</td>
<td>Bru=8-10 141;8</td>
<td>d.1174</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VALUE</td>
<td>Oise 191;71</td>
<td>d.1284</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Past Participle

**Northern Zone**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>verb</th>
<th>source</th>
<th>date</th>
<th>notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VALU(T)</td>
<td>Wal II;12</td>
<td>d.1248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bart 26;107(+1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Occitan Zone**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>verb</th>
<th>source</th>
<th>date</th>
<th>notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VALGUT</td>
<td>App 5;246(+2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Preterite

**Northern Zone**

1. VALUI | Bart 25;269 |       |       |
2. VAL(L)UT | H-Mn 75;54 | d.1257 |       |
Franco-Provençal Zone
3. VALIT  (L) Aeb 7;77

Occitan Zone
3. VALC  (L) App 86;1(+1)
      \-g
5. VALGUETZ  (L) App 7;255 ca.1215
6. VALGRO  (C) Bru-8 518;34 ca.1195

Totals
Northern Zone=3
Franco-Provençal Zone=1
Occitan Zone=5

Imperfect Subjunctive
Northern Zone
3. VASIT  (C) Sch-2 43;3 d.1270
   VAUSIST  (C) H-Mn 83;7 d.1258(+1)
   VALLIST  (L) Ric 2;54 15th C.
   VAUSISIST  (L) Ric 32a;122 15th C.
6. VAIIISS(I)ENT  (C) H-Mn 238;8 d.1269(+1)
   VAUSSISSERT  (C) H-Mn 241;12 d.1269(+1)

Occitan Zone
3. VALGUES  (C) Bru-8 17;3 ca.1120
   BALOS  (C) Gasc 27;p.50 d.1252
   VALOSSAN  (C) Gasc 37;p.88 d.1268

Totals
Northern Zone=10
Occitan Zone=3

VOULOIR
Ric 3;86 15th C.

Infinitive: VOLEIR Bart 24;23, Ly 28;4 d.1351

Noun
VOLOIR  (L) Bart 41b;82

Past Participle
Northern Zone
VOLU  (C) Bur 39 VIII;9 d.1315
       H-Mn 171;21 d.1264
       Pic.2 5;197 d.1267
       Oise 67;2 d.1264
       Ber 15;5 d.1295
       Poit 159;37 d.1280(+1)
volui  Bur 43 1X;40 d.1314
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vuillui</td>
<td>Bur 43</td>
<td>VI;3 d.1292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VouUT</td>
<td>Oise 101;29</td>
<td>d.1271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Norm-7</td>
<td>852;25 d.1295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Norm-9</td>
<td>1006;18 d.1282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rou II;2988</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Franco-Provençal Zone</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VouLU</td>
<td>Fz 43;30</td>
<td>d.1410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occitan Zone</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VouGU</td>
<td>Poit 107;13</td>
<td>d.1229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VouLGUT</td>
<td>App 25;29(+2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Zone=13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franco-Provençal Zone=1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occitan Zone=4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preterite</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northern Zone</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. VouLU</td>
<td>Oise 168;19</td>
<td>d.1282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOLS</td>
<td>Bart 18;21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOS</td>
<td>Bart 79;33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. VOLSIS</td>
<td>Rou III;7913</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. VOLT</td>
<td>Eul 24 9th C., Alex 54(+4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rol 440(+14), Rou III;206(+2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nim 52(+3), Bart 19;321(+7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ric 17;52 15th C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vol</td>
<td>Cler 41(+1), Leg 57(+3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vot</td>
<td>Rou III;797(+1), Nim 171;6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bart 8;56(+1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOUT</td>
<td>Oise 7 6;20 d.1249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Norm 1222 XIII;7-8 d.1272(+1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sch 9 75;23 d.1298</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W.2. 8;15 d.1290</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vouLT</td>
<td>Rou II;4367, Bart 86;248(+1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOST</td>
<td>Oise 7 129;7 d.1277</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W.1. p.434;4 d.1200-25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ber 12;6 d.1288</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poit 81;9 d.1286(+3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bart 20;137(+1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>volst</td>
<td>Adam 289</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vousT</td>
<td>Oise 5 8;13 d.1250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bart 28;418</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOULUT</td>
<td>Bart 99;14 15th C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ric 37;25 15th C. (+1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ric 39;71 15th C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voulu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. VOSISTES</td>
<td>Rou III;7027(+1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>volts</td>
<td>Rou III;8220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vousistes</td>
<td>Bart 44;27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vousistes</td>
<td>Ric 3;89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOLDRENT</td>
<td>Eul 3 9th C.(+1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rou III;675(+2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voudrent</td>
<td>Rou II;113</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOLRENT</td>
<td>(L) Bart 20;156(+1)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOR(R)ENT</td>
<td>Nim 835, Bart 41b;78(+1)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOUlURENT</td>
<td>(L) Ric 15;46 15th C.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Franco-Provençal Zone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Century</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. VOLGUESMES</td>
<td>(C) Fz 2;1 d.1270</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Occitan Zone

1. VOLC (C) Bru- 85 ca.1160(+1) | 2
   VOLGUI (L) App 21;32
   VOUGUI (C) Poit 215;59 d.1261(+1) | 3
2. VOLGUIST (L) App 8;175, Bo 87
3. VOLC (C) Bru-2-8-9 15;34 ca.1120(+3)
   (L) App 62;32(+2) | 7
4. BOLGE (C) Gasc 9;10 d.1248 | 1
6. VOLGRON (L) App 9;199(+2)
   vol(g)run Foi 259
   voltrun Cath 36 | 5

### Totals

- Northern Zone=93
- Franco-Provençal Zone=1
- Occitan Zone=20

### Pluperfect

3. VOLDRET (L) Eul 21 9th C.
   voldrat Cler 53 10th C. | 2

### Imperfect Subjunctive

#### Northern Zone

1. VOLISSE (C) Alex 202 | 1
   VAUSIZE (C) Oise 10;3 d.1250(+1) | 2
   VOUS(S)ISSE (C) Oise 125;12 d.1276
   (L) Rou II;3916, Bart 75c;115
   vosisse (C) Poit 148;13 d.1296 | 4
   VOULSISSE (L) Rou II;2312
   vol- Perc 796 | 2
3. VOSIST (C) Bur 41 1;4 d.1255
   -ss-
   (L) Bart 34;68(+1) | 4
   VOUS(S)IST (C) Vos 124;8 d.1269(+1)
   vuo-vaux- H-Mn 195;5 d.1265
   Pic.2 25;60 d.1295(+2)
   -ssit
   (L) Oise 129;12 d.1277
   Norm 864;18 d.1275
   (L) Bart 37;304(+3) | 12
   VOLSIST (L) Alex 49, Rol 332(+1)
   Rou III;1958(+2), Ami 1136
   Perc 706(+1)
   vou-veu-
   Rou II;185(+3) | 13
   VOLIST (L) Rou III;1061 | 1
   VOUlSIST Bart 93a;48 | 1
4. **VOSSISSIEMES**
   - essiens
   - issum
   VAUSSISSION(S)
   vous-
   - ions

5. **VOSSISSENT**
   - ant
   volsissent

6. **VOS(S)ISSENT**
   - ant
   vous-
   - ions

---

**Franco-Provençal Zone**

3. **VOUSIST**
   VOLIST
   VOUCHIT
   - sit

6. **VOSISANT**
   VOLISSANT

**Occitan Zone**

1. **VOLGUES**
   VOLGUSSSE
   - essa

2. **VOLGUES(S)ES**
   - ges

3. **VOLGUES**
   - ges

5. **VOLGUSSSETZ**
   - gesetz

6. **VOLGUSSSIO**
Northern Zone = 64
Franco = Provençal = 7
Occitan Zone = 26

**MANOIR**

Infinitive: REMAINDRE Bart 28;394, REMANER App 5;380

Past Participle

**Northern Zone**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REMES</td>
<td>(C) S.W. 5;16 d.1232, Alex 61(+1), Rol 5, Rou III;1134(+3), Nim 120(+4), Gor, 516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reme(i)s</td>
<td>Perc 1148(+2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>remainz</td>
<td>Ric 34;113(+3) 15th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMASUS</td>
<td>(L) Gor 614, Bart 72;118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Occitan Zone**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REMAS</td>
<td>(C) App 9;28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMAZUT</td>
<td>(L) App 5;188(+2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals

Northern Zone = 21
Occitan Zone = 4

Preterite

**Northern Zone**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. REMES</td>
<td>(L) Bart 29;22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. REMEST</td>
<td>(C) W.L. p.433;12 d.1200–25, (L) Alex 93(+2), Rou II;2911(+2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- mist, - mest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. REMESTRENT</td>
<td>(L) Rou III;9272, Nim 1469(+1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Occitan Zone**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. REMAS</td>
<td>(C) Bru 429;15 d.1178(+12), (L) App 4;152(+2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- romas, - remas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. REMAZO</td>
<td>(L) App 7;37 ca.1215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROMARON</td>
<td>(L) App 118;127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMASERON</td>
<td>(L) App 120;67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMASTRENT</td>
<td>(L) App 20 1;614</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals

Northern Zone = 17
Occitan Zone = 22
Imperfect Subjunctive

Northern Zone

3. REMAINSIST  (C) Poit 215:65 d.1261(+1)  (L) Rou III;1959(+2)  5

Occitan Zone

2. REMASES  (C) Bru–8 81;11 d.1157  App–20 1;718  2
3. REMAGUES  (C) Bru–19 306;17 d.1197  1
   ARMANGOS  (C) Gasc 21;13 d.1260  1
6. REMASESO  (C) Bru–10 238;16  1

Totals
Northern Zone = 5
Occitan Zone = 5

Mettre
Rol 3592

Past Participle

Northern Zone

MIS  (L) Cler 169  Rol 1753  2

Franco-Provençal Zone

MIS  (C) Ly 33;20 d.1350  1
MISET  (C) Ly 34;889 d.1364–5  1

Occitan Zone

MES  (L) Bo 111
   (C) Bru 96;1 ca.1160(+9)
   (L) App 16;6(+1)
pro–  (C) Gasc 34;30 d.1256  12
METUD  (C) Gasc 17p.25 d.1251(+7)
pro–  (C) Gasc 50 p.111 d.1259(+5)
REMETUTZ  (L) B.Occ 417;7
TRAMESUT  (L) G.Ros 4569  16

Totals
Northern Zone = 2
Franco-Provençal Zone = 2
Occitan Zone = 28

Preterite

Northern Zone

1. MIS  (L) Gor 351  1
3. MIST  (L) Leg 22  1
4. MEISSIENS  (L) H–Mn 245;25 d.1269  1
5. MEISTES  (L) Bart 44;19  1
6. MESDRENT  (L) Cler 130
   MISTRENT  (L) Bart 25;225  2

Strong –Wk u + Wk u
### Franco-Provencal Zone

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>METT</td>
<td>(C) Ly 34;889 d.1364-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>MESSIيون</td>
<td>(C) Ly 33;26 d.1350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Occitan Zone

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>MIS</td>
<td>(C) Bru-8 340;5 d.1200,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>METU</td>
<td>(C) Gasc 47;17 d.1256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>TRAMESIST</td>
<td>(L) B.Occ 16;12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>MES</td>
<td>(L) Bo 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(C) Bru 56;1 ca.1148(+8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(L) App 60;38(+1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PROMETO</td>
<td>(C) Gasc 58;32 d.1238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>MESEM</td>
<td>(C) Bru-8 441;5 d.1179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>MESPREN</td>
<td>(L) Bo 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MESERO</td>
<td>(C) Bru 132;3 d.1171(+2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-n</td>
<td>(L) App 8;88(+1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEIRO(N)</td>
<td>(C) Bru-8-10 55;11 ca.1148(+2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>meron</td>
<td>(L) App 9;198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEO</td>
<td>(C) Bru-18 300;17 d.1196</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals**

- Northern Zone = 6
- Franco-Provençal Zone = 2
- Occitan = 28

### Imperfect Subjunctive

#### Northern Zone

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>MEISSE</td>
<td>(L) Bart 71;8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>(DE)MEIST</td>
<td>(L) Bart 25;160(+1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>MEISSENT</td>
<td>(L) Bart 49;72(+2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Occitan Zone

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>MEZES</td>
<td>(L) App 82;15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>METEZAN</td>
<td>(L) App 108;25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals**

- Northern Zone = 6
- Occitan Zone = 2

### CHEOIR

(a)cheoir(C) Vos 50;7 d. 1257

Infinitive: CAER(C) Bru-9 273;5 CHAER(L) Aeb 6;184

ESCHAIR(C) Pic.3 34;8 d.1247 CHEIR(C) Ly 34;334 d.1364

CADEIR Rol 3551, CAEIR 3453, CAIR 3486, CHAIR 2034

#### Noun

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESCH(E)OITE</td>
<td>(C) H-Mn 34;3 d.1252(+6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>var. acht as</td>
<td>(C) Bur 43 IX;p.503 d.1308</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESCHIET</td>
<td>(C) Vos 37;15 d.1256</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-aest</td>
<td>(C) Sch-11 LXVI;25 d.1268</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-aet</td>
<td>(C) Poit 215;62 d.1261(+4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ESCHOO(I)TE (C)  H–Mn  179;7  d.1264(+2)  Strong – Wk  u  + Wk  u  3
A(S)CHEU  (C)  Vos  43;4  d.1257(+4)  5
es–  Vos  9;3  d.1244

Past Participle
Northern Zone

CHEU  (C)  H–Mn  1;28(+1)  d.1232
locations:  var.(es)keu
var.cheutez

CAIET  (L)  Bart  25;428
chait  Adam  318
chaet  Rou III;8162(+2)
choiez  Rou II;2751
choiet  Tris  2076(+1)
 cadeit  Bart  16;56

Fz  19;4  d.1394(+2)
Aeb  43;38  d.1410–1418
Aeb  6;382

Occitan Zone

(ES)CADEGUT  (C)  Bru–8  441;5  d.1179(+3)
(L)  Bo  72  Foi  448
Foi  448
caz–  (L)  App  111;57
ESCADUD  (C)  Gasc p.161  d.1262
cazut  (L)  App  17;37(+2)
chaagut  (L)  App–20  1;377(+1)

CHAUT  (L)  App–20  1;547

Totals
Northern Zone=50
Franco-Provençal Zone = 4
Occitan Zone=14

Preterite
Northern Zone
1.  CAI  (L)  Bart  23;106
(EN)CHAI  (L)  Tris  482, Ami  985
| 3. CADIT  | (L) Ric 24;92(+1) 15th C. |
| CAIT     | (L) Rol 333, Bart 17;68(+3) |
| (EN)CHAI | (L) Rou II;355(+5) Tris 730, Nim 344(+2) Ami 691 |
| CHOI     | Tris 3169 |
| CHEUT    | Ric 12;99 15th C. |
| 5. CHAISTES | (L) Bart 24;161 |
| 6. CHAIRENT | (L) Rou III;4704 |

| chaistrent | (L) Bart 41a;65 Ric 30;80 15th C. |
| CHAURENT  | (L) Cath 1504 4 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occitan Zone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. ESCADEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESCAZEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cazet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. ESCADEGRO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cadegrent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>casegron</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals**

- Northern Zone = 30
- Occitan Zone = 15

**Imperfect Subjunctive**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Northern Zone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. CHAIST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cheisse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### COURIR

Courir Ric 8;113 15th C.

Infinitive: CORRE Rol 79

#### Past Participle

**Northern Zone**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Page/Line</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(EN)CORUT</td>
<td>(C) Oise</td>
<td>136;15</td>
<td>d.1277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an-</td>
<td>(C) Bur</td>
<td>39 VIII; p.490</td>
<td>d.1315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sec-</td>
<td>(L) Bart</td>
<td>37;104</td>
<td>Adam 520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(EN)COURUT</td>
<td>(C) Oise</td>
<td>101;15</td>
<td>d.1271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Norm 1222 col.1;23 d.1272(+3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Poit 227;21 d.1289(+4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sec-</td>
<td>(L) Bart</td>
<td>37;104</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURUT</td>
<td>(L) Rol</td>
<td>2086</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(DES)CUST</td>
<td>(L) Rol</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>res-</td>
<td>(L) Bart</td>
<td>12;18(+1)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cour 1357, Rou III; 9964</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Franco-Provençal Zone**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Page/Line</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COR(R)U</td>
<td>(C) Fz</td>
<td>38;27</td>
<td>d.1388(+1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(EN)CORROGU</td>
<td>(C) Fz</td>
<td>1;41</td>
<td>d.1270(+1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Occitan Zone**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Page/Line</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CORREGU(T)</td>
<td>(L) App</td>
<td>186;23</td>
<td>ca.1215(+1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>en-</td>
<td>(C) Gasc</td>
<td>17;p.25</td>
<td>d.1251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECORRIT</td>
<td>(L) B.Occ</td>
<td>408;30</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals

Northern Zone = 21
Franco-Provençal Zone = 4
Occitan Zone = 4

#### Preterite

**Northern Zone**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Page/Line</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. CORUI</td>
<td>(L) Bart</td>
<td>28;343</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. CORRUT</td>
<td>(C) Vos</td>
<td>1;11 d.1235(+2)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>corut</td>
<td></td>
<td>Norm-10 927 col.2;63</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURUT</td>
<td>(L) Bart</td>
<td>14;53(+1), Adam 327</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. COR(R)URENT</td>
<td>(L) Bart</td>
<td>49;91, Ami 1095(+1)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESCOSTRENT</td>
<td>(L) Rou</td>
<td>III;8446</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rou III; 8349</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Occitan Zone**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Page/Line</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. CORS</td>
<td>(L) B.Occ</td>
<td>239;3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORREC</td>
<td>(L) B.Occ</td>
<td>238;38</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals

Northern Zone = 13
Occitan Zone = 2

Imperfect Subjunctive
3. CORUST (C) Norm 927 col.2;4 d.1278

CROIRE
H-Mn 258;31 d.1269

Infinitive: CONCREIDRE Eul 21 9th C., CREDRE Leg 186
CREIRE Rol 987, Bru-16 221;12 d.1185

Past Participle
Northern Zone
CREU (C) H-Mn 122;12 d.1260(+5)
locations:
  Wal p.160;18  13th C.
  Oise 68;20 d.1264(+16)
  Poit 114;14 d.1257(+27)
  (L) Rol 2088, Rou II;1001(+2)
  Adam 1265

  (C) H-Mn 273;24 d.1270

  crauz (C) H-Mn 273;24 d.1270

  (C) H-Mn 273;24 d.1270

  (L) B.Occ 18;27(+1)

Franco-Provencal Zone
CREU (C) Ly 24;9 d.1351(+3)

Occitan Zone
CREZUD (C) Bru–8 78;42 d.1157
  Gasc 21;p.33 d.1260(+1)

  s– (L) App 52;41(+2)
  g– (C) Gasc 55;15 d.1236
  CREUT (C) Bru–19 306;2 d.1197
  (L) B.Occ 18;27(+1)

Totals
Northern Zone = 58
Franco-Provencal Zone = 4
Occitan Zone = 10

Preterite
Northern Zone
1. CREI (L) Rou III;7515(+2)
CRUI (L) Hu 3314
3. CROIT (C) Oise 111;34 d.1272
   (L) Rou II;3612
   re– Bart 33;83
   CREI Rou C.A.;131(+1)
   croi Rou II;209(+1)
5. CREISTES (L) Rou III;7030
CREUTES (L) Adam 540
6. CREIRENT (L) Rou III;5059
   –ant–unt (L) Cath 1709(+2)
   CRURENT (L) Ric 29;119 15th C.
### Franco-Provençal Zone

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>CREERONT</td>
<td>(L) Aeb 6;345(+1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CREIRONT</td>
<td>(L) Aeb 6;403</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Occitan Zone

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>CREDET</td>
<td>(L) Bo 46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CREZET</td>
<td>(L) IEAP 50;12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CREET</td>
<td>(L) B.Occ 19;9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>CREEREN</td>
<td>(L) B. Occ 14;31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Totals

- Northern Zone = 18
- Franco-Provençal Zone = 3
- Occitan Zone = 4

### Imperfect Subjunctive

#### Northern Zone

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CREUSSE</td>
<td>(C) Norm 927 col.2;23 ca.1278</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(L) Bart 78;207</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CREISSE</td>
<td>(L) Hu 449</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>CREIST</td>
<td>(L) Rou III:6734, Hu 3121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CREUST</td>
<td>(L) Tris 119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>CREISEZ</td>
<td>(L) Rol 1728 creissiez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(L) Gor 532(+2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Franco-Provençal Zone

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>CREISSANT</td>
<td>(L) Aeb 6;372</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Occitan Zone

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>CREESES</td>
<td>(L) Cath 226(+1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>CREEZES</td>
<td>(L) IEAP 54;21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>CREESEN</td>
<td>(L) Bo 24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Totals

- Northern Zone = 10
- Franco-Provençal Zone = 1
- Occitan Zone = 4

### ESTER

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(L) Cler 158</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Infinitive: ISTAR(C) Bru-14 9;9 d.1103

#### Past Participle

#### Northern Zone

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AR(R)ESTUT</td>
<td>(L) Bart 25;305(+1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
#### Occitan Zone

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ESTUT</td>
<td>(C) Bru-18 343;18 ca.1200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ESTAT</td>
<td>(L) App 40;25(+2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-d</td>
<td>(C) Gasc 17;p.21 d.1251(+1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Strong 

- Wk u 
- + Wk u
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Preterite</th>
<th>Imperfect Subjunctive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northern Zone</td>
<td>Occitan Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ESTED</td>
<td>(L) Cler 61(+2)</td>
<td>1. ESTEY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISTUD</td>
<td>(L) Leg 111</td>
<td>(L) App 25;41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTUT</td>
<td>(L) Rol 671(+2), Rou III;3040(+2) Bart 13;24(+2)</td>
<td>3. ESTETH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(C) Bru 160;6 d.1177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>estet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(L) App 3:518(+1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. ESTERENT</td>
<td>(L) Cler 37</td>
<td>ESTEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTURENT</td>
<td>(L) Rou II;1041(+2), Bart 13;31</td>
<td>(L) App 7;93(+1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franco-Provençal Zone</td>
<td>6. ESTERONT</td>
<td>6. ESTERONNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(C) Fz 28;606 d.1388</td>
<td>(C) Fz 28;606 d.1388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occitan Zone</td>
<td>1. ESTEY</td>
<td>1. ESTEY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ESTETH</td>
<td>(C) Bru 160;6 d.1177</td>
<td>(C) Bru 18 343;12 ca.1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>estet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(L) App 3:518(+1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals**

Northern Zone = 2
Occitan Zone = 8

**Preterite**

**Northern Zone**

3. ESTED  
ISTUD  
ESTUT  
6. ESTERENT  
ESTURENT

**Franco-Provençal Zone**

6. ESTERONT

**Occitan Zone**

1. ESTEY  
3. ESTETH  
estet  
6. ESTERO(N)

**Imperfect Subjunctive**

**Northern Zone**

3. ESTEUST

**Occitan Zone**

3. ESTES

**RENDRE**

(C)Vos 9;10 d.1244, Rol 3012

Infinitive: REDRE (L) Cler 143 10th C.
Vos 44;7 d.1257

**Past Participle**

**All Zones**

RENDU  
locations:

(C) Pic.3 5;29 d.1218  
(Bru(+1), Luch(+17), Ly(+17)  
Fz(+11), Aeb(+2), Vos  
H–Mn(+1), Sch–5(+11)  
Pic.1(+2), Pic.2(+5), Pic.3(+1)  
Sch–7(+11), Ber  
Sch–W.1(+1), Poit(+55)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preterite</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northern Zone</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RED</td>
<td>(C) Cler 45(+1)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RENDE(T)</td>
<td>(L) Leg 26(+1)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RENDI(T)</td>
<td>(C) Poit 215;68 d.1261</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Wal(+1), Pic.1, Oise, Ber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>locations:</td>
<td>(L) Rol 1046</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. RENDIMES</td>
<td>(C) Wal 10;15 d.1266</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. RENDIRENT</td>
<td>(C) Pic.3 1;9 d.1218(+2)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Pic.2(+1), Wal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Franco-Provençal Zone</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. RENDIT</td>
<td>(C) Fz 19;1 d.1394</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occitan Zone</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. REDET</td>
<td>(C) Bru-8 278;41 d.1195</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-g</td>
<td>(C) Bru-20 97;5 d.1160</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARREDO</td>
<td>(C) Gasc 35;p.82 d.1256</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. REDERON</td>
<td>(C) Bru;8 207;10 d.1183(+1)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Zone</td>
<td>= 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franco-Provençal Zone</td>
<td>= 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occitan Zone</td>
<td>= 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Imperfect Subjunctive</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northern Zone</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. RENDISSE</td>
<td>(L) Bart 20;111</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. RENDIST</td>
<td>(C) Poit 232;6 d.1296</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sch-4, Rou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>locations:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. RENDISSENT</td>
<td>(C) Wal X;p.146 d.1272(+1)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occitan Zone</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. REDES</td>
<td>(C) Bru-2-8 350;14 ca.1120(+3)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rendes</td>
<td>(L) App 17;36</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. RETCEM</td>
<td>(C) Bru-8 176;19 d.1180</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. REDESSO</td>
<td>(C) Bru-18 203;18 d.1183</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARRENDOSSAN</td>
<td>(C) Gasc 55;11 d.1236</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Zone</td>
<td>= 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occitan Zone</td>
<td>= 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VENDRE
Bart 39;9

Infinitive: VANDRE Vos 6;18 d.1247

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Past Participle</th>
<th>Infinitive: VANDRE</th>
<th>Vos 6;18 d.1247</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VENDU (C)</td>
<td>Pic.3 2;3 d.1218</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all locations</td>
<td>vandu (C)</td>
<td>H–Mn 3;2 d.1233(+22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vondui (C)</td>
<td>Bur 33;15 d.1288</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vendut (L)</td>
<td>Rol 2035</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Preterite

Northern Zone

1. VENDI (C)
   S.W. 5; p.148 d.1232
   Pic.1 M;26 d.1293

2. VENDII (T) (C)
   Pic.3 27;2 d.1243(+5)
   H–Mn(vandi), Pic.1(+6)

3. VENDIMES (C)
   Bur 43 VI;6 d.1262
   Oise, Poit(+6)

4. VENDIRENT (C)
   Pic.3 5;27 d.1218(+10)
   Sch–11 69;4 d.1269(+1)
   Poit 11;3 d.1279(+11)

5. VANDERENT (C)
   H–Mn 75;2 d.1257

Franco-Provençal Zone

3. VENDIT (C) Ly 34;698 d.1364
   Fz 19;8 d.1394

Occitan Zone.

1. VENDEI (C)
   Bru 262;24 d.1191

2. VENDET (C)
   Bru 15;26 ca.1120(+6)
   Bru 104;1 d.1165(+7)
   ( + 3)

6. VENDEREN (C)
   Bru 157;1 d.1177(+7)
   Bru–18 309;2 d.1197
   VENDERUN (C)
   Bru–5–7 156 ca.1176(+1)

Totals

Northern Zone=51
Franco-Provençal Zone=2
Occitan Zone=29

Imperfect Subjunctive

Northern Zone

1. VENDISSE (C) Oise 125;12 d.1276

3. VENDISSE (C) Oise 9;14 d.1250

Occitan Zone

6. VENDESSON (C) Bru 115;5 d.1168
-CEVOIR
Recevoir Pic.3 41;4 d.1250

Infinitive: RECOIVRE Vos 10;6 d.1244
RECIIVRE Vos 25;11 d.1253, Ly 25;4 d.1355
RECEUVRE Rol 1178, (per-)Bart 27;90, (dec-)Bart 25;298
APARCEVEIR Bart 25;276 RECEVIR Ly 34;895 d.1365
RECEUVRE Ly 34;949 d.1365
RECEPTER Bur 43 IV;4 d.1279

Past Participle
Northern Zone
RECEU (C) Vos 21;4 d.1251(+15)
locations: (C) Bur(+26), H–Mn(+31), Wal(+6)
var. recehu, rechut Oise(+47), Ber, W.2.(+1), Poit(+31)
& other compounds (L) Rol(+1), Rou(+13), Bart 194
RECHI (C) Wal 15;34 d.1280

Franco-Provengal Zone
RECEU (C) Ly 40b;2 d.1396(+15)
 – re-de Fz 18;66 d.1358(+7)
Aeb 23;3 d.1271
conceu (L) Aeb 6;106(+1)
var. recieu, reciouz, reczehu, ressiou, recehu(+10)
resseu (C) Ly 12;113 d.1386–92(+7) 45
RECEUT (C) Ly 30;302 d.1345(+2)
recep Fz 4;12 d.1288
Ly 48;31 d.1361(+2) 8
RECET (C) Ly 29;301 d.1343(+9)
reset, recezet Fz 4;12 d.1288(+3) 14
RECEPTER (C) Fz 28;418 d.1388(+64) 65

Occitan Zone
RECEUBUT (C) Bru 163;13 d.1178(+35)
– uput Bru 59;64 d.1150(+32)
– de-per (L) App 8;217(+5) 74
RECEUT (C) Bru–8–9 95;7 d.1160(+2) 3
DECEBUT (C) Bru 152;11 d.1176
– ud (C) Gasc 35;5 d.1256(+5)
arcebudz Gasc 17;7 d.1251
recebud Gasc 22;p.39 d.1281(+6)
W.2. 2;6 d.1299 16
RECEGÜ (C) Poit 107;7 d.1229(+4) 5

Totals
Northern Zone = 195
Franco-Provengal Zone = 132
Occitan Zone = 98

Preterite
Northern Zone
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. RECEUI</th>
<th>(C) Norm 927 col.1:61 ca.1278</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(L) Cath 548, Bart 24;289(+2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rechui</td>
<td>(C) Oise 38;44 d.1259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recehu</td>
<td>(C) Poit 19;1 d.1254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APERCEU</td>
<td>(L) Bart 24;135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. RECIU(T)</td>
<td>(L) Leg 21(+3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECUT</td>
<td>(C) Pic.3 20;6 d.1236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>var. de-ap-per-con</td>
<td>Oise 6;20 d.1249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poit 48;3 d.1298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(L) Alex 98, Rol 2825(+1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rou III;4685(+7), Bart 21;59(+5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECEUT</td>
<td>(C) Oise 187;9 d.1285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(L) Alex 119, Rou III 1185(+2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apar-de-</td>
<td>(L) Bart 14;77 (+3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recehut</td>
<td>(C) Bur 41 XII;17 d.1339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECEVIT</td>
<td>(L) Cath 2646(+1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Preterite**

**Northern Zone**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. RESUMES</th>
<th>(C) Vos 131;4 d.1270</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rec-</td>
<td>Wal 10;10 d.1265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECUM</td>
<td>(C) Poit 208;8 d.1230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. RECH(E)URENT</td>
<td>Wal 4;5 d.1248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>locations:</td>
<td>Pic.1, Sch–7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCURENT</td>
<td>(L) Bart 19;330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aper-apar-</td>
<td>Rou III 8175(+3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Franco-Provençal Zone**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. RECEVYS</th>
<th>(C) Ly 47;63 d.1230</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. RECEVRES</td>
<td>(C) Ly 34;570 d.1364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. RECEVIT</td>
<td>(C) Ly 34;498 d.1364(+6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECIT</td>
<td>(C) Ly 47;60 d.1320(+8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>receit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECEU</td>
<td>(C) Fz 39;6 d.1399</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Occitan Zone**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. RECEGUI</th>
<th>(C) S.W. 1;p.143 d.1225</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poit 201;10 d.1248(+7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECEUBI</td>
<td>(L) App 7;87 ca.1215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECEUBIST</td>
<td>(L) App 106;73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. RECEUP</td>
<td>(C) Bru 95;7 d.1160(+17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(L) App 122b:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–b</td>
<td>(C) Bru 65;4 d.1151(+4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARSEUBEG</td>
<td>(C) Bru 481;5 d.1186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. RECEUBEM</td>
<td>(C) Bru–8 289;18 d.1195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECEGUIMES</td>
<td>(C) S.W. 2;11 d.1225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poit 114;8 d.1257(+2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. RECEUBRO</td>
<td>(C) Bru–8 133;6 d.1172(+1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–p-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APERCEUBRON</td>
<td>(L) App 121;19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECEBRO</td>
<td>(L) App 7;324 ca.1215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECEUBEREN</td>
<td>(C) Bru–20 488 d.1187</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strong –Wk u +Wk u
arceberen  (C)  Bru=20  172;25 d.1179  
RECEBORON  Gasc 46;15 d.1256  
recebon  Gasc 35;p.83 d.1256  

Totals  
Northern Zone = 56  
Franco-Provençal Zone = 19  
Occitan Zone = 49  

Imperfect Subjunctive  

Northern Zone  
1. RECEUST  (C)  Poit 189;22 d.1269  

Occitan Zone  
3. RECEUBES  (C)  Bru=10−18  27;5 d.1135(+1)  
6. RECEBOSEN  (C)  Gasc 46;14 d.1256  
APERCEUBESSAN  (L)  App 122b;10  

Totals  
Northern Zone = 1  
Occitan Zone = 4  

-LIRE  
H−Mn 275;23 d. pre−1277  

Infinitive: LEGIR  Bru 3;19 d.1053, Foi 1  
ESLIERE  Ly 25;9 d.1355  ELERE  Ly 42a;1 d.1386  
LEYRE  Frag 98  

Noun  

Northern Zone  
ELLU  (C)  Vos 137;1 d.1270(+1)  
alu  
ESLEU  (C)  Sch−4 XL;8 d.1261(+1)  
Norm 927 col.1;6 d.1278  
Poit 39;19 d.1275(+2)  
esluj  Wal VI;1 p.75 d.1249  
enliut  Wal VIII;6 p.76 d.1259  
ESLIZ  (C)  H−Mn 234;23 d.1268(+1)  
Wal IV;2 p.73 d.1248(+5)  
Norm 927 col.1;10 ca.1278(+13)  
enliet  Wal II;p.137 d.1248  

Franco-Provençal Zone  
ELU  (C)  Ly 35;62 d.1377(+3)  

Past Participle  

Northern Zone  
(ES)LEU  (C)  H−Mn 1;14 d.1232(+7)  
locations:  
Bur 39 VIII;9(+1)  
Sch−5 XVII;10(+1)  
var. eslehu  Pic.2 31;129, Oise 1;2(+1)  

Strong  −Wk u + Wk u  

1
enleut etc.  

Norm 1021 col.1;23(+4)  
W.2. 9;p.296, Poit 96;2(+7)  
(L) Bart 52a;66(+2)  

LIT  
(C) Vos 80;2 d.1261  
(L) Rou III;8, Bart 17;222  
eslit  
(L) Rou III;901(+2), Bart 87a;28(+1)  
aliz  
(C) Vos 63;16 d.1259(+1)  
lieses  
(C) Wal XVII;14 d.1276  

Franco-Provençal Zone  
ESLEU  
(C) Ly 24;23 d.1351-2(+2)  

var. eslieu  
ELLIEZ  
(C) Ly 48;9 d.1361  
ESLIET  
(C) Aeb 35;74 d.1372  

Occitan Zone  
ELEGUT  
(L) App 109f;10(+1)  
ESLUT  
(C) Gasc 36;p.85 d.1259  
ELEGIT  
(L) App 7;160(+1)  
ELIG  
(L) App 6;160  
ESLEIT  
(L) App 108;148  
alieit  
(C) Gasc 21;p.37 d.1260(+1)  

Totals  
Northern Zone=43  
Franco-Provençal Zone=5  
Occitan Zone=8  

Preterite  
Northern Zone  
3. ENLUIT  
(C) Wal 9;4 d.1263  

ESLIST  
(L) Bart 14;78  
6. L(E)URENT  
(C) H-Mn 75;34 d.1257(+1)  

Occitan zone  
3. LEGO  
(C) Bru 348;21 ca.1200  

LEGIC  
(L) App 117;52  
6. ALHEGON  
(C) Gasc 21;p.37 d.1260  

Totals  
Northern Zone=4  
Occitan Zone=3  

Imperfect Subjunctive  
3. ESLIST  
(C) Pic.3 26;8 d.1242  

MOURIR  
Rou II 970  

Infinitive: MURIR Cler 215  
MORIR App 11;16, Bart 23;46
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participle Type</th>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Past Participle</td>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>MORT</td>
<td>Eul 18 9th C.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Occitan</td>
<td>MOR(T)</td>
<td>App 7;107(+2)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preterite</td>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>MURUT</td>
<td>Rou III;112(+6)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>morut, mourut</td>
<td>Ric 8;11 !5th C. (+1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MORI</td>
<td>Bart 17;215</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MOURIT</td>
<td>Bart 80:36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>murit</td>
<td>Cath 760(+5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MORURENT</td>
<td>Rou III 8018</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mururent</td>
<td>Bart 26;6, Ric 16;61 15th C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Franco-Provencal</td>
<td>MORURENT</td>
<td>Aeb 6;401</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Occitan</td>
<td>MORI(G)</td>
<td>Bru–8–10 54;4 d.1148(+1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>moric</td>
<td>App 122b;22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MURIT</td>
<td>Bru–3 225;14 d.1185</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperfect Subjunctive</td>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>MOURUSSE</td>
<td>Bart 61;196</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MORUST</td>
<td>Rou III;5450(+1), Bart 19;53(+1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MOSRIST</td>
<td>Poit 190;22 d.1274</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>morist</td>
<td>Pic.3 21;11 d.1237(+1)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>murist</td>
<td>Poit 5;6 d.1283</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MORUSSIEZ</td>
<td>Bur 41 VII;23 d.1275</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MORISINS</td>
<td>H–Mn 100;6 d.1259</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MORUSSIEZ</td>
<td>Rou II;2405</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MORUSSENT</td>
<td>Rou II;2385</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MORUSSENT</td>
<td>Ric 19;26</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals**
- Northern Zone = 22
- Franco-Provencal Zone = 1
- Occitan Zone = 7

**Imparfait Subjonctif**

**Northern Zone**

1. MOURUSSE (L) Bart 61;196
2. MORUST (L) Rou III;5450(+1), Bart 19;53(+1)
3. MOSRIST (C) Poit 190;22 d.1274
4. MORUSSIEZ (L) Rou II;2405
5. MORUSSIEZ (L) Rou II;2385
6. MORUSSENT (L) Ric 19;26

**Totals**
- Northern Zone = 16

ROMPRE
H–Mn 77:7 d.1258

Infinitive: DERUMPRE Alex 428

Past Participle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RUMPREL</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Cler</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUMPUT</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Rol</td>
<td>1300(+7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEROMPU</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Rou</td>
<td>III:8769</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| CORRUMPU   | C      | Poit     | 96;3 d.1261(+6) | 48
| ROUT       | L      | Bart     | 19;32(+2) | 4   |
| DESROT     | L      | Cour     | 2146  |       |

Franco-Provencal Zone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROMPU</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Ly</td>
<td>43a:5 d.1387</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fz</td>
<td>47;15 d.1410(+2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aeb</td>
<td>26;30 d.1465</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROT</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Ly</td>
<td>33;19 d.1350(+1)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Occitan Zone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROT</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>App–20</td>
<td>1;492, B.Occ 44;6(+2)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals

Northern Zone = 22
Franco-Provencal Zone = 7
Occitan Zone = 4

Preterite

Northern zone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROMPIE</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Cour</td>
<td>2152</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUMPET</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Bart</td>
<td>8;158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROMPERENT</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Cath</td>
<td>2119</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Franco-Provencal Zone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROMPIT</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Ly</td>
<td>39k;3 d.1393</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Occitan Zone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RUMPED</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Foi</td>
<td>567</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORROMPET</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>App</td>
<td>8;174</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals

Northern Zone = 3
Franco-Provencal Zone = 1
Occitan Zone = 2

TOLIR

Eul 22 9th C.

Infinitive: TOLRE Bru–8 41;55 ca.1143

Past Participle

Northern zone
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOLU</td>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>Pic.2 31;158 d.1315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>var. tollu</td>
<td>(L)</td>
<td>Leg 229, Alex 108, Rol 1962(+2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOLEIT</td>
<td>(L)</td>
<td>Rol 2490, Rou III;1269(+4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>var. -oit</td>
<td>(L)</td>
<td>Adam 392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occitan Zone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOLT</td>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>Bru-8 41;27 ca.1148(+1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(L)</td>
<td>App 63;80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tout</td>
<td>(L)</td>
<td>App 17;13(+3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOLGUT</td>
<td>(L)</td>
<td>App 78;18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TORUD</td>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>Gasc 27;p.50 d.1252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Zone = 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occitan Zone = 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Preterite

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. TOLI</td>
<td>(L)</td>
<td>Bart 14;72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. TOLIT</td>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>H-Mn 216;21 d.1266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ll-</td>
<td>(L)</td>
<td>Rol 1488(+2), Rou III;1272(+3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bart 21;124(+1), Cath 921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. TOLIRENT</td>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>Pic.2 29;35 d.1310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ll-</td>
<td>(L)</td>
<td>Rou III;308(+1), Bart 79;40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ric 6;72 15th C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Occitan Zone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. TOLQUIST</td>
<td>(L)</td>
<td>App 106;72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. TOLOC</td>
<td>(L)</td>
<td>App 17;5(+3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ge-</td>
<td>(L)</td>
<td>Foi 544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. TOLGRONT</td>
<td>(L)</td>
<td>App 90;33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals

| Northern Zone = 17 |
| Occitan Zone = 7 |

Imperfect Subjunctive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. TOLGUES</td>
<td>B.Occ 57;19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOLOS</td>
<td>Gasc 21;p.34 d.1260</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VENIR

This follows the same pattern as TENIR

VÉTIR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noun</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VESTI</td>
<td>Wal 2;p.137 d.1248(+12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Past Participle

Strong -Wk u + Wk u
### Northern Zone

**VESTU**
- (C) Poit 210;7 d.1248(+56)
- (C) Bur 39 1;10(+14), Vos 40;30(+5)
  - H-Mn 160;7(+26), Pic.1 N;9
  - Pic.2 7;15, Oise 14;5(+10)
  - S.W. 9;10

**Date Range 1248–1293**
- (L) Bart 26;18, Alex 582, Rol 384(+8)
  - Rou III;7973(+2) 133

**VESTI**
- (C) Sch–3 23;4 d.1231
- locations: Bur 43 IX;13, Vos 127;14
  - H–Mn 188;8(+2), Wal IV;16
  - p.138(+9)
  - Pic.1 F;33, Poit 213;7

**Date Range 1231–1310**
- (L) Cler;104, Leg;145, Bart 82;74

### Franco-Provençal Zone

**VESTU**
- (L) Aeb 6;47

**VESTI**
- (L) Aeb 6;385

### Occitan Zone

**VESTIT**
- (C) Bru 15;7 ca.1120(+15)
- (L) App 7;125 ca.1215
  - Bo 207, Foi 199

**bestid**
- (C) Gasc 50;26 d.1259(+3)

### Totals
- Northern Zone = 154
- Franco-Provençal Zone = 2
- Occitan Zone = 22

### Preterite

- -IR type in all cases

### Totals
- Northern Zone = 19
- Occitan Zone = 6

### VIVER

Rou II;1129
Infinitive: VIURE Cler 119, VIEURE Fz 28;623 d.1388

### Past Participle

#### Northern Zone

**VESQUU**
- (L) Rou III;405(+3)
- var. vesc(h)u(t) Bart 24;27(+1)

#### Occitan Zone

**VISCUT**
- (L) App 107;44, B.Occ 395;1

### Preterite
Northern Zone

3. VISQUET (L) Leg 49, Cath 238
   vesquiet
VESQUI (C) Norm 665;17 ca.1260
   (L) Rou C.A.;198(+2)
   Ric 17;98 15th C.

6. VESQUIRENT (L) Rou III 1425(+1), Bart 247
   veyquirent

Occitan Zone

1. VESQUEI (L) App–20 1;395
   visquei
3. VISQUET (L) B.Occ 41;9
6. VISQUERON 8L) App 119;115

Totals
Northern Zone = 12
Occitan Zone = 5

Imperfect Subjunctive

Northern Zone

3. VESQUIST (C) S.W 10;16 d.1250
   Poit 116;21 d.1266(+1)
   (L) Rou III 1308(+1)

6. VESQUISSENT (L) Rou II;621, Ric 19;72 15th C.

Occitan Zone

3. VISQUEST (L) App–20 1;317
5. VISQUESSETZ L) App 82;44

Totals
Northern Zone = 7
Occitan Zone = 2

VOIR

Infinitive: VEDER Cler 52, Bo 122
VEDEIR Rol 270, VEEIR Rol 1104

Noun

VEU(E) (C) Pic.3 6;17 d.1219
   Oise 174;1 d.1283
   Norm 665;20 d.1260

Past Participle

Northern Zone

VEDUD (L) Cler 210, Alex 395
VEU (C) Oise 6;18 d.1249(+6)

locations:

var. vehu, vahu
   H–Mn 68;6(+9), Wal p.161
vau, veouz, veuez
   Pic.2 34;42(+1), Ber 19;5
   W.2. 5;10(+1), Poit 96;2(+14)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Range 1249–1321</th>
<th>Strong (-\text{Wk u} +\text{Wk u})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VEU(D)</td>
<td>(\text{Rol 1960}(+4), \text{Rou III;406}(+2))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bart 14;56(+2)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Franco-Provençal Zone**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VEU</th>
<th>(\text{Aeb 7;138})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Occitan Zone**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VIST</th>
<th>(\text{Bru-8 480;9 d.1185}(+2))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>var. bist</td>
<td>(\text{Gasc 17;p27 d.1251}(+1))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vis</td>
<td>(\text{App 41;15}(+4))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEZUT</td>
<td>(\text{App 14;45}(+1))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vezuz</td>
<td>(\text{IEAP 19;24})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEGUT</td>
<td>(\text{IEAP 14;58})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEUT</td>
<td>(\text{Bo 106})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>(\text{Northern Zone=57})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(\text{Franco-Provençal Zone=1})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(\text{Occitan Zone=16})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strong \(i\) verb in preterite with matching subjunctive

**Preterite**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>(\text{Northern Zone=61})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(\text{Franco-Provençal Zone=12})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(\text{Occitan Zone=34})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Imperfect Subjunctive**

| Northern Zone=18 |
| Occitan Zone=7 |