The Forms and Functions of Multilingual Practices in Early Modern School Drama from the King's School, Canterbury

Aleksi Mäkilähde

MA Thesis

University of Turku

School of Languages and Translation Studies

English; English Philology

April 2012

Käsittelen tutkimuksessani monikielisyyden ilmenemistä Canterburyn katedraalikoulun oppilaiden 1600-luvun loppupuoliskolla esittämissä näytelmissä, jotka löytyvät käsikirjoituksesta Lit.Ms.E41 (Canterburyn katedraalin arkisto). Tämä käsikirjoitus sisältää puheita ja näytelmiä, joiden kielinä ovat englanti, latina ja vähemmissä määrin myös kreikka. Useissa näytelmissä esiintyy koodinvaihtoa näiden kielten välillä, ja tutkielmassani selvitän, millaisia syntaktisia ilmenemismuotoja ja pragmaattisia merkityksiä koodinvaihdolla on.

Teoreettinen viitekehykseni on yhdistelmä filologista ja lingvististä lähestymistapaa. Olen sisällyttänyt tutkielmaani aiemman koodinvaihdon tutkimuksen lisäksi Brownin ja Levinsonin kohteliaisuusteorian, jonka avulla erityisesti puhujien välisiin sosiaalisiin suhteisiin liittyviä koodinvaihdon funktioita voidaan luokitella. Koska historiallinen koodinvaihto on tutkimusaiheena vielä melko tuore, käsittelen perusteellisesti erilaisia metodologisia ratkaisuja. Valitsemani metodi yhdistää perinteisen filologisen lähiluvun pragmaattiseen analyysiin, jonka kautta työssäni vaikuttavat muun muassa rationaalisuuden ja empatian käsitteet.

Analyysini perusteella kävi ilmi, että erityisen yleinen koodinvaihdon funktio on mahdollistaa intertekstuaalisuus, jolla edelleen voidaan ilmaista esimerkiksi solidaarisuutta eli sosiaalista läheisyyttä tai loukata puhuteltavaa. Solidaarisuus oli myös ilman intertekstuaalisuutta yleinen koodinvaihdon funktio. Näiden lisäksi koodinvaihdon funktioita olivat muun muassa kasvoja uhkaavat teot, eufemismit, stilistiset efektit sekä diskurssin avustaminen. Syntaktisten ilmenemismuotojen osalta keskeisin havainto oli, että koodinvaihdon ja lainaamisen erottaminen ei ole tarpeellista tai edes kannattavaa kaikissa tilanteissa. Lisäksi voitiin todeta, että valittu metodi soveltui hyvin aineiston analysoimiseen, ja sitä tulisi soveltaa mahdollisuuksien mukaan laajempaan materiaaliin sekä muiden pragmaattisten ilmiöiden tutkimiseen.

Asiasanat: englannin kieli, kielihistoria, koodinvaihto, koulu, latinan kieli, monikielisyys, muinaiskreikka, näytelmäkirjallisuus, pragmatiikka, uusi aika

Table of contents

List of abbreviations

D   social distance of S & H

FTA   face-threatening act

H   addressee

P   relative power of S and H

R   absolute ranking of the imposition

S   speaker

W_x weightiness of an FTA x

List of tables

1. Introduction

The linguistic landscape of Britain in the Medieval and Early Modern periods was very different from the present situation in which Britain is for the most part a *monoglossic* society, as the language that is used for any and all purposes is English. From the beginning of the first Roman conquests in the Islands in the first century B.C., Britain has been to some extent inhabited by native speakers of more than one language, with a number of its inhabitants being competent in several languages through acquisition or formal education. In other words, both the nation and a part of its habitants have been *bilingual* or *multilingual*. The linguistic situation was different from the modern one in earlier periods as Britain was also a *polyglossic* society, so that different languages were used for different purposes and in different situations. In multilingual Anglo-Saxon Britain the languages were Old English (with its regional and social varieties) and Latin, with Norse being used by the Viking settlers and Celtic surviving as a minority language. After the Norman Conquest in the 11th century the situation changed drastically, with French and Latin as the prestigious languages, while English remained the language of the majority. In the beginning of the Early Modern period around the year 1500, English had taken over some of its former functions, but Parisian French still held its place as a prestigious language, while Latin survived as the dominant language of, for example, religion, science and learning. This meant that Latin was not only a language that was studied in school – it was also the medium for studying.

One phenomenon which is a consequence of this type of linguistic situation is the mixing of two or more languages in speech or writing. Some communicative situations may require or predict the use of a certain language, or languages may be mixed as a discourse strategy to achieve a certain effect or meaning. This *code-switching* is a strategy available to any individuals who can switch between two linguistic varieties, for example by using a more relaxed speech style when talking with family members or friends and a more formal style when talking in public.

An interesting testament to the multilingual practices of Early Modern Britain is a manuscript from the King's School, Canterbury (Lit.Ms.E41, Canterbury Cathedral

Archives), henceforth referred to as the *Orationes* manuscript, which includes plays and speeches written by the students and staff of the school. In this book, we find texts written solely in Latin or English, but also many texts that have been written in combinations of English, Latin and Greek. A project initiated by Professors Anthony Johnson (University of Oulu/Åbo Akademi) and Jyri Vaahtera (University of Turku) aims at producing a scholarly edition and commentary of this manuscript. I have been contributing to the Orationes Project by transcribing and partly commentating on a selection of plays from the manuscript, which has given me a broad view of multilingual features present in the plays. By analysing the functions of switches between languages systematically, it is possible to arrive at a better understanding of the linguistic strategies available to this speech community, their practices and preferences, and their attitudes towards the languages in question.

In this thesis my aim is to analyse the syntactic structures and pragmatic functions of code-switching and other multilingual phenomena found in the Christmas plays of the *Orationes* manuscript. The analysis aims to explain how language mixing manifests itself in the texts, and why code-switching is used and what functions and meanings it has in different contexts. My research questions are thus:

> 1) How does code-switching manifest itself as far as syntactic forms and structure are considered?
> 2) What are the functions and pragmatic meanings of code-switching?

My first hypothesis is that there are switches on both the macro-level (e.g. between distinct parts of a single play) and the micro-level (e.g. within one speech act), and that their functions are primarily connected to characterisation and the demands of the genre or the topic. Since the linguistic phenomenon has not been studied extensively especially in historical contexts, and since this is also true of the material, this study is an important contribution to the studies on multilingualism in Early Modern Britain. In addition to the aforementioned goals, this thesis will also serve as a methodological experiment in a field which attracts studies with varied approaches, and it applies well-defined modern pragmatic theory to marginally studied historical material in the form of face theory. For this thesis I have chosen to apply the politeness theory of Penelope Brown and Stephen Levinson, which provides a model for ex-

plaining the underlying motives for code-switching connected to social status and social power in particular. Since my second hypothesis, based on previous studies, is that code-switching and other multilingual practices are employed for functions beyond the scope of these two factors, I will also include the general framework of multilingualism studies in my analysis. It is then the case that this study is both philological, as far as I will focus on textual interpretation, and linguistic, as far as the findings are explained or can be explained by general linguistic theory. The methodology employed in this thesis could be described then as *pragmaphilological*, which is defined here as combining the fields of *philology* and *historical pragmatics*. The former of these relates to the traditional material-driven philological research, while the latter relates to the study of contextual meaning from the point of view of historical linguistics. This matter will be further discussed with other methodological considerations.

I shall begin in chapter 2 with an overview of the historical and cultural background, focusing firstly on the shared history of English and the Classical languages, and secondly on the educational system and the realities of school life in Early Modern Britain. I will also introduce my material at this point by describing the *Orationes* manuscript and looking especially at the general class of plays from which I have chosen my texts. In chapter 3 I will present the theoretical framework for my study, starting with code-switching and following up with politeness theory. Combining the insights from the previous subsections, I shall then argue for the methods chosen for this study while presenting problems that must be acknowledged in multilingual studies. Chapter 4 contains my analysis of the individual texts. Here I have chosen to combine the analyses of both the morphosyntactic features and the pragmatic functions of code-switching into a single section. In chapter 5 I will summarise the results of this study and present them in wider context, and I also aim to provide a comprehensive account of code-switching as a whole and discuss the implications of the results. In addition, I shall evaluate the methodology chosen for this study and discuss possible problems and ways to solve them in future studies. Finally in chapter 6 I will offer some concluding remarks and further implications for future studies.

2. Historical and cultural background

2.1. Latin and Greek in Britain

Before discussing the status of the Classical languages in Early Modern Britain, it is worth examining their shared history with English in some detail. In order to understand the linguistic situation of a certain period we must be able to explain why and how that situation had come about. The only way to answer these questions is to adopt a diachronic viewpoint and show how changes in the linguistic systems and the historical and cultural settings resulted in the current situation. Though it may be a cliché, we must begin with the ancient Romans.

The shared history of Latin and the English language begins as early as in the first century B.C. when soldiers from the expanding Roman Empire came into contact with Germanic tribes. Although these tribes had not yet spread to the Isles, the dialects that they spoke would later become the ancestors of what is now the English language. In the conquered Germanic areas Romans applied their usual language policy, which meant that they did not endeavour to oppress the local languages, yet Latin was the language of local administration and of course the native language of the occupying soldiers and settlers (Herman 2000: 10-11). It is therefore not surprising that many words were borrowed into the Germanic dialects from Latin. It is worth noting that the source language for these borrowings was not Classical Latin or even the everyday urban dialect of Rome, but *Vulgar Latin*[1], the variety spoken by the occupying soldiers, settlers, administration and merchants (ibid.; Strang 1970: 388). When the Romans had made contact with the Germanic tribes in the north, Julius Caesar made an expedition to Britain in the middle of the first century B.C. with moderate success (Baugh & Cable 2002: 45-46), and thus there was a Latin influence on the Celtic tribes in Britain from this time onwards.

---

[1] As a linguistic term *Vulgar Latin* is highly problematic and controversial, and therefore in this thesis it will be used to refer in general to the spoken varieties of the majority population that differed from the norms of literary Classical Latin. For an account of the problems with this term and possible definitions see Herman (2000: 1-8).

When Britain – that is, the province of *Britannia* comprising approximately the modern areas of England and Wales (Herman 2000: 10) – finally came under Roman rule in the second quarter of the first century A.D., the Empire brought its culture, customs and language with it. Similar to other conquered areas, there were bound to be a number of people who became to some extent bilingual, and the introduction of a new culture ensured that there were many words borrowed from Latin (Strang 1970: 390; Baugh & Cable 2002: 46-47). The occupation also left a stamp on the map of Britain, as many modern place names still show traces of Roman origin, although the actual form might have changed several times due to changes in the language (Baugh & Cable 2002: 82). The linguistic situation witnessed a complete overhaul when the Romans left Britain in 410 and Germanic tribes started to arrive in the middle of the century, forcing the natives to relocate themselves especially to Wales (Strang 1970: 355, 376-377). The language that would become the majority language in the area was the dialect or dialects spoken by the new arrivals, and as was indicated earlier, their language had been affected by Latin and Roman culture before this. It is probable that Latin remained the official language and the language of the upper classes for some time after the conquests (Strang 1970: 390), but Herman (2010: 12) concludes that it quickly disappeared as a spoken language. Thus the direct influence and presence of Latin diminished for some time, as Anglo-Saxon was used for most sociolinguistic functions and in all spheres of life.

The next contact with Latin came with the arrival of Christian missionaries. The king of Kent was the first to convert into this new religion (Strang 1970: 355), and the other kingdoms followed suit, so that by the beginning of the 8th century most of Britain had adopted Christianity (Strang 1970: 359). New institutions and practices meant that there was again a need for new vocabulary, which was taken from the spheres of both church administration and education, since the cathedral school system was also adopted in Britain. Words borrowed during this period include for example *mæsse* 'mass', *sanct* 'saint' and *offrian* 'sacrifice' (Strang 1970: 367). In addition to changes in the linguistic system, Christianity brought forth several changes in the social and cultural spheres as well. Amongst these Strang mentions firstly the Roman alphabet that would surpass the runic alphabet, and secondly the idea of a single unified English people (1970: 355). From the 8th century onwards this unified people also had to endure attacks by the Scandinavian Vikings, who eventually man-

aged to establish themselves in Britain. In the border areas there was bound to be contact between the two groups of people, which meant that some speakers were probably competent in both Anglo-Saxon and the Scandinavian languages, and bilingualism was bound to be even more common after the unification of the two groups in 1016 (Strang 1970: 282-283, 317-319).

Halfway through the 10th century, the Benedictine monastic revival and the revitalisation of learning ensured that there was another large intake of loanwords relating to religion and science, but this time the source language was Classical Latin (Baugh & Cable 2002: 87-90). Examples of these more scholarly words are such as *philosoph* 'philosopher' and *camell* 'camel' (Strang 1970: 314). Because of this multiplicity and variety of borrowing, Latin loanwords in English from different periods differ in both their form and the semantic sphere to which they belong. In addition to this, Latin influenced English through *semantic loans* and *loan-formations*. The former, also known as *loan-translations*, are words that have had their semantic range altered analogically according to the model of another language (Strang 1970: 368). An example of this in English would be *Lord* referring to the Judeo-Christian deity, the meaning being based on the model of Latin *Dominus*. The latter category, loan-formations, contains words that have been formed from native elements but according to the model of another language, an example of this being *mildheort* 'kind-hearted' which is a rendering of Latin *misericors* (Strang 1970: 368-369). It becomes clear that the cultural influence transmitted through Latin was as important as the influence on the linguistic system of English.

When the Anglo-Saxon and Viking dynasties came to an end in 1066 after the Battle of Hastings, the linguistic landscape of Britain faced drastic changes as William the Conqueror brought his court with him from Normandy. As was stated above, Anglo-Saxon had been the majority language employed for all possible purposes and spheres of life, and the dialect of Wessex had eventually gained the status of a prestige variety towards the end of the millenium (Strang 1970: 284). This meant that the standard written language was based on this particular variety, and it was the language of official documentation (ibid.). Since the changes were mostly confined to the upper levels of society, English remained the majority language, but its sociolinguistic status fell as many of its former functions were taken over by the languages of

the new ruling elite. The everyday language spoken by them was Norman French, and it was also employed for most of the documentary and administrative purposes in addition to Latin, which was the official language of legislation (Strang 1970: 216). However, it should be stressed that even though the highest secular and clerical offices were held by the Normans, there is no reason to doubt that for the English-speaking lower and middle classes the vernacular was important for a great variety of functions. Many of the English were bound to be learned, intellectual and able to use their own language as sophisticatedly as was necessary (Strang 1970: 216). Nevertheless, compared to the rich literary tradition of the preceding centuries, the use of English was definitely limited.

The next major change started in the 13th century with the loss of Normandy, which was to have major consequences on the linguistic and cultural situation. Anglo-Norman French did not have any prestige in other countries, and now that the mixed population of Britain had severed its ties to Normandy, there was no functional reason to preserve this language (Crespo 2000: 25-26; Strang 1970: 217-218). In addition, when the plague raged during the 14th century resulting in a loss of workforce, the social status of the majority population rose steadily (Crespo 2000: 30; Strang 1970: 156). Better social fluidity ensured the advent of a new English-speaking middle class, whose language started to gain prestige, while French lost ground as an official language but remained an important language for the nobility (Baugh & Cable 2002: 149-150; Strang 1970: 218-219). However, Latin had cemented its status as the most important lingua franca in Europe, and it was especially the language associated with science, education and religion. There were therefore a number of reasons to continue its use in Britain together with the vernacular.

By the beginning of the Early Modern period around the year 1500, the status of English had been strengthened, and its codification would increase particularly at the end of the period. Nevertheless, Latin continued to be used for certain purposes or genres, and in fact its association with, for example, scientific writing is still apparent today because novel terminology is being formed from Latin words, and in medicine it remains the language for analytic notation. Barber (1976: 68) stresses that English had surpassed Latin as the language of poetry and prose fiction, but it should be added that even scientific literature was produced for an English-speaking audience

(Voigts 1989: 95). Since these were also produced in great numbers especially after the arrival of printing, it would be erroneous to claim that English was devoid of any serious literary status. However, this does not mean that contemporary attitudes are irrelevant; on the contrary, they are very important for the topic of this thesis. Some saw English as unsuitable for scholarly discourse, while others argued that people should be allowed to use their native tongue for any and all purposes (Barber 1976: 66-68, 72-75). A popular argument in favour of English was that both the Romans and the Greeks had used their native tongues for the most part, borrowing words from other languages if it seemed necessary, and that the Romans had not written their science in Greek but Latin (Barber 1976: 72-75). This argument is slightly flawed, since the Romans did in fact use Greek especially for scientific writing, Cicero being an important advocate for the prestige of Latin even in genres such as rhetoric and philosophy (Adams 2002: 339-340). Nevertheless, the comparison is a very apt one, since the Romans struggled with exactly the same problem as the English. From the 17th century onwards the question was not anymore whether English should be used for all types of literature (Barber 1976: 76), as the discussion shifted to the type of English that should be used. This would eventually lead to the standardisation of the language.

The standardisation and codification of English meant that literature on language usage was bound to surface. The need for dictionaries in English is partly explainable by the sheer number of loanwords that were often of a more learned character (Barber 1976: 106-111). In addition to dictionaries, many English grammars appeared during this period, but for the most part they were written in Latin. There were two reasons for this: first, foreigners learning English could use these books written in the common lingua franca, no matter what their own native tongue was, and second, English-speaking children studied their native language in order to facilitate the learning of Latin (Nevalainen 2006: 16). There were also Latin grammars written in English, but these were to be used only in the beginning, when the students would not be able to read grammars written in Latin. I will return to the subject of grammar books in the following section.

Rather little has been said of Greek thus far, so a number of comments must be devoted to it. As has become clear by now, Latin and French are the two most im-

portant languages that have influenced English throughout its history, even though it is of course the case that a great number of languages, especially Celtic and Norse, have contributed to the history of English. In these cases, there has been a contact between two peoples, but in the case of Greek, the language has reached the Isles by the means of written texts and through other languages. Barber (1976: 124) states that Latin was not only the medieval language of scholarship, but it was also the most researched language of the period. During the Early Modern period, however, interest towards Greek grew (ibid.), and even today it is one of the most important languages for coining scientific terminology. Greek texts had of course been read ever since the rise of the Roman Empire, because to the Romans, Greek was a prestigious language and Greek literature some of the finest that was available. In fact, Löfsted (1959: 15) argues that "the ancient world during its last centuries was largely bilingual", and even earlier Greek-Latin bilingualism was a common trait. Because of the continuous contact between these languages, a great number of Greek words had been borrowed into Latin especially in the spheres of science and Christianity (Löfstedt 1959: 88-89), which is how words such as *bishop* (Old English *bisceop* from Latin *episcopus* and originally from Greek ἐπίσκοπος, *episkopos*) entered the English language. In Britain for people on the upper levels of society, Greek was of course a necessary language, since Classical knowledge and literature was in effect bilingual.

At the end of this diachronic survey we can return once more to the following questions: why is it necessary to know the shared history of the Classical languages and English in such detail? Why do we have to begin with the ancient Romans? When we look at the linguistic situation of 17th century Britain and try to make sense of it, it is worth bearing in mind that this situation was not a novel one by any means, for multilingualism and contact with Latin had been the norm in the Isles for centuries before. It is therefore clear that multilingualism, which manifested itself in everyday communication, be it in speech or on the page, must have been quite natural for the Early Modern English speakers just as it had been to their predecessors. If we consider for example higher education and science, there was hardly any period of time when the Classical languages were not influencing the English language and the inhabitants of Britain. Even during the Anglo-Saxon period Latin was the most im-

portant source language for loanwords in this sphere, as was discussed above. Evidently Classical languages were not foreign languages comparable to, for example, German or Spanish, but rather necessary and required skills for people on the higher levels of society. This situation is comparable to both ancient Rome and many modern societies. In Rome, even though Classical Latin was a high prestige language, Greek was the insider language of the nobility, and it was also associated with certain genres such as rhetoric and medicine, as was stated above. In fact, many members of the elite were competent to such extent that it is appropriate to call them *academically bilingual*. Today it is English that has taken over the role as both the most important world language and the lingua franca of higher education and science in addition to its status as the first or second language of a multitude of speakers. The difference between the current situation and that of Early Modern Britain is that Latin was practically a dead language by that time and had no native speakers. Its status was preserved by both tradition and practical needs.

2.2. Education and Schola Regia Cantuariensis

A few remarks on the manner of education in Early Modern Britain were given above, but since my material pertains to a particular educational system and school life by virtue of its origin, production and themes, I will discuss these matters in further detail. I will begin with the particularities of the educational system and follow this with a short introduction to the King's School, Canterbury (in Latin *Schola Regia Cantuariensis*), concentrating on the factors most important for the current topic.

For most of the Early Modern period, the domain of the school room was definitely occupied by Latin. In addition to learning to read and write Latin, children read the Latin classics and familiarised themselves with the Classical traditions of rhetoric and philosophy (Barber 1976: 67, 101). Latin was considered essential for the upper levels of society, and in universities the sole language of interest was still Latin, which was the pan-European language of scholarship. Knowledge of Latin and of Classical literature was seen as a prerequisite for improving one's status, and therefore many parents sent their children to grammar schools to learn at least the rudi-

ments of Latin (Barber 1976: 69). Of those who went to schools, some would leave before learning any Latin, some after learning the basics, and yet others would go the distance and achieve a high competence (ibid.). In addition to grammar (i.e. Latin grammar), the two most important subjects for primary studies were rhetoric and logic (Barber 1976: 101). This triplet, also known as the *trivium* or trivial arts, formed the basis of what was known as the *artes liberales*, or the arts befitting free men. Everyone would begin with these three, and later on pupils would move on to other liberal arts such as mathematics. It goes without saying that the basic works of rhetoric were written by Classical authors, and therefore the works of writers such as Cicero and Quintilian could be read in schools in addition to textbooks on rhetoric that began to appear in the 16th century (ibid.).

As was mentioned in 2.1, the number of English grammars grew especially in the 16th century. This was partly due to the simple need of books that could be used to learn English before moving on to Latin, and partly due to the increased interest in the codification and standardisation of English (Barber 1976: 112-113). If we take into consideration the history of Latin in Britain and in Europe in general as the language of scholarship, it is no wonder that grammars of English, whether they were written in Latin or the vernacular, were influenced by the Classical grammatical tradition and the existing grammars of Latin and Greek (Barber 1976: 113-114). Even though the adapted models were not satisfactorily applicable to English, the similarity of the grammatical descriptions meant that moving on to Latin grammar was made somewhat easier. Since the students had to both study Latin grammar and read Latin texts, it is likely that they were able to attain a high level of competence. It was also common for the pupils to speak Latin in school, but Barber (1976: 67) notes that this tradition was probably on the decline near to the end of the 17th century.

Against this general picture we must then examine the King's School, Canterbury. Fortunately, the history of the school is well-known, and official documents provide an important insight to the traditions and the schooling system. We know, for example, that in 1682 a list of orders containing the following information on the curricula was issued forth (Woodruff & Cape 1908: 133-134). The students would begin with Latin grammar and works of, for example, Dionysius Cato, Aesop, Erasmus, Ovid, Terence and Cicero. Later to this would be added Greek grammar and other authors

such as Virgil, Horace, Isocrates, Homer and Hesiod, in addition to which the students had to make extempore speeches in both Latin and Greek. The curriculum was probably not much different before this, since the reading list and the order of learning were similar in other schools (Woodruff & Cape 1908: 114-116). In the list of orders, William Lily's grammar is explicitly mentioned, and although it is impossible to know for certain which version of this book was used, Lily's grammar had been the only official school grammar in the southern regions (Woodruff & Cape 1908: 87), and according to Barber (1976: 113-114) it was the standard Latin school grammar of this period.

Of the students and staff themselves, we know that when the school was founded (or re-founded, as it had existed from Anglo-Saxon times onwards) and incorporated to the cathedral by a Royal Charter in 1541 during the reign of King Henry VIII, there were to be two teachers of grammar and fifty King's Scholars in the school (Woodruff & Cape 1908: 46-51). These fifty Scholars were boys of nine to fifteen years of age, who had been granted a scholarship of four to five years in the school (Woodruff & Cape 1908: 48), and in the beginning of the 17th century procedures for electing the Scholars and testing their skills were laid down (Woodruff & Cape 1908: 103-104). In addition to this group there were the Commoners, who had to pay tuition fees. Woodruff and Cape do not report any details on their numbers, but Edwards (1957: 104) believes that there were approximately an equal number of Scholars and Commoners. One of the two teachers was the headmaster, who taught the upper forms, and the other was the usher, who taught the lower forms (Woodruff & Cape 1908: 49, 133-134). Since the number of students was quite high considering that there were only two teachers, monitors were selected from amongst the older students to act as tutors and to keep an eye on the boys, especially outside of the schoolroom (Woodruff & Cape 1908: 104, 117; Edwards 1957: 95).

The tradition that is most relevant for the current topic concerns the plays, speeches and disputations held regularly at the school. Before Lent there was a contest called *bellum grammaticale* 'grammatical battle' between a number of the King's Scholars and an equal number of the Commoners, in which two students were selected as the Victors (Woodruff & Cape 1908: 129-131). These students had to regularly obtain half-holidays for the whole school by producing verses, and they could also obtain

additional holidays for their friends (ibid.; Edwards 1957: 103-104). The performances took place on one of the four annual speech days, on which the students produced plays or speeches in prose and verse. To some extent, these were merely tradition, but the Lenten disputations were not the only ones with a practical goal, as the speeches delivered in winter aimed at procuring a short holiday for the students before Christmas (Woodruff & Cape 1908: 128), while speeches on the 29th of May, the King's Birthday known as the Oak Apple Day, were to demonstrate the loyalty of the school (Edwards 1957: 102). Most of our information on these speech days comes from a book compiled by George Lovejoy, who was the headmaster from 1665 to 1684 (Woodruff & Cape 1908: 124-126, 137) and who made it a habit of recording the speeches and the plays in his book. In the next section I will introduce this manuscript, elaborate on the speech days and describe in detail the plays that I have chosen to analyse in this thesis.

2.3. The *Orationes* manuscript

The material for this study comes from the *Orationes* manuscript (Lit.Ms.E41, Canterbury Cathedral Archives), a 17th century book that belonged to George Lovejoy, who was at the time the headmaster of King's School. The full title of the manuscript is *Orationes, & Carmina, aliaq[ue][2] Exercitia, Quæ composita fuerunt In nativitatem, et reditum regis Caroli secundi. In sulphuream Papistarum conspirationem[3]. In hyemalem Scholarium missionem. In Quadragesimalis victoriæ gratiam. et publicè habita Coram Decano, & Canonicis, aliisq[ue] Auditoribus, à Scholasticis in regia Schola Cantuariæ*. This translates as "Speeches, poems and other exercises, which were composed for the birthday and return of King Charles II, for the sulphurous Papal conspiracy, for the wintry release of the scholars, for the fortieth day victory[4], and which were performed publicly in the presence of the Dean with members of the clergy and others listening, by the scholars in the King's School, Canterbury." Under this title is written the name of the owner: *Georgio Lovejoy AM. archididascalo[5]*, 'the headmaster'. As the title indicates, the manuscript

---

[2] Square brackets are used to indicate abbreviations or brevigraphs that have been expanded.
[3] i.e. The Gunpowder Plot.
[4] This refers to the forty days of fasting during Lent.
[5] A Latin borrowing from Greek, literally 'chief teacher'.

contains speeches both in prose and verse and dramatic works acted by the students during several years. The languages used in the texts are English, Latin and Greek. Some of the texts are written wholly in one language, or with a number of words or a section in another language, but there are also plays where the language is switched constantly. The main language for any text is Latin or English (although it will become evident that sometimes it is difficult to establish which one it actually is), as Greek is used more sparingly.

The four reasons or motives for performances mentioned in the title indicate both the structure of the manuscript itself, and the system of performing plays and speeches in the school discussed shortly in the previous section. The times for performances were the 29th of May, the 5th of November, at the beginning of the Christmas break, and at the beginning of Lent (Edwards 1957: 102; Woodruff & Cape 1908: 125). Each theme had its own day, and so for example the restoration of Charles II to power was celebrated on the king's birthday at the end of spring, while Christmas plays were often associated with school life and especially the pains of studying grammar. The texts have been organised to go in full yearly cycles, so that there are four plays for each year, but we do not know whether the cycles are complete or if there have been changes made in order to maintain the structure, or if there are indeed complete cycles missing. The first of the texts are likely from 1665 and the last from 1684 (Johnson & Vaahtera 2012), but there are no explicit references to the years in the plays themselves, and dating is therefore difficult, though some of the years have been verified by internal evidence or for example by consulting the school's records (ibid.).

The authorship of the texts is hard to establish precisely. They have probably been copied to the book well after the individual performances (indicated by the wording of their titles), and therefore they should be approached with caution. If there has been any editing done later, we have no records stating this. The authorship is a complicated matter, since the title of the manuscript and the titles of some individual plays merely state that the students were the actors, but the people who actually composed each play are not mentioned explicitly, with some exceptions to be discussed shortly. Because the texts were to some extent exercises (also evident from the word *exercitia*), it is probable that the students had to compose them by themselves. However, since the audience included high-ranking people (which is evident

from the title, but cf. also Woodruff & Cape 1908: 126), it is likely that the teachers together or Lovejoy alone went through the texts in order to edit them or to apply censorship when needed (cf. Woodruff & Cape 1908: 132-133), or they might even have had a larger role, so that the prologues and epilogues would then have been written by the staff, especially in those cases where the text contains only a set of speeches in addition to these. An indication of the possible censoring of the plays comes from the list of orders of 1682 mentioned in section 2.2, in which it is stated that no play should be acted in the school without consulting the Dean of the cathedral (Woodruff & Cape 1908: 132-134).

Regarding the attitudes and values that show through from the plays, we can safely state that they originated from the school as an institute or from Lovejoy as the head of the institute, but the very sincere feelings demonstrated in many plays depicting or commenting on the harsh realities of school life most likely come from the students themselves. Furthermore, even though Woodruff and Cape (1908: 127) claim that the texts "cannot be taken as exact samples of the attainments of the boys", I would argue that the comprehensive reading list of the students, the extempore production of speeches as a part of both the curriculum and obtaining half-holidays, and the general educational situation of the period all indicate that the boys were able to attain a very high competence especially in Latin. Without any conclusive evidence it is the most reasonable to assume that Lovejoy was at least an invisible hand guiding the plays, but there is no reason to assume that the students did not actively participate in producing the contents and the form of the plays.

2.3.1. The Christmas plays

There are seventeen Christmas plays of varying lengths in the manuscript, some of them originals by the students and others adaptations of plays by major authors. Most of the plays are unnamed, and since referring to the years or even relative order of the plays is cumbersome, I have given a title for each play for referential purposes. I have devised the titles based on the contents and the theme of each play. Appendix 1 contains a list of the relative order of the plays, probable years for the performances (see Johnson & Vaahtera 2012), folio numbers, and the reference title. Some of the

adapted plays are included in a complete form in the manuscript, while others have only the title with the possible addition of a prologue and an epilogue. In some cases the adapted play is only one part of the whole performance, so that there may be a short comedic dialogue or speeches in addition to it. Since the focus of this study is on the linguistic practices of the school community, I have not included the adapted plays in the more detailed analysis, but I do comment on any additional parts such as prologues, if relevant. Some of the plays in general, and some parts common to all plays in particular, attract code-switching, which means that my analysis is not going to cover all of the plays completely.

The plays that have been adapted from earlier works are *The Cheats* (Year 5, f. 115r[6]) by John Wilson, *Amor in Labyrintho* (Year 9, f. 229v) of unknown origin, *Captivi a Plauto* (Year 10, ff. 254v-255r) by Plautus, *A Contention for Honour and Riches* (Year 13, ff. 345v-356v) by James Shirley, and *The Female Prelate & The Spanish Fryar* (Year 15, f. 413v) adapted from plays by Elkanah Settle and John Dryden. Of these *Captivi a Plauto* includes an added prologue and an epilogue, and *A Contention for Honour and Riches* includes a part with a set of speeches. In addition to these, *Anni Tempora & Wine, Beer, Ale* (Year 2, ff. 37r-47r) is divided into two parts, of which the beverage play is not an original. The others have only a title and possibly information about the time of performance. Of the original works, the most interesting for the current topic are those plays or parts that relate to studying and school life. These include *Captivi Grammaticales & Professionary Options* (Year 1, ff. 4r-16r), *Certamen Doctrinale* (Year 4, ff. 87r-94r), *Captivi* (Year 6, ff. 144r-149v), *Ars Poetica* (Year 7, 171r-183v), *Colloquium de Rhetorica* (Year 8, ff. 197r-201v), *Discipuli et Rustici* (Year 11, ff. 279r-294r), and *Grammaticae Partes I* (Year 12, ff. 319r-327v). Of these I have chosen four plays to analyse in detail: *Certamen Doctrinale, Captivi, Discipuli et Rustici* and *Grammaticae Partes I*, which I will now describe in chronological order.

Certamen Doctrinale is a typical Christmas play as far as its structure is concerned, consisting of two parts, one mainly in Latin and the other mainly in English. The Lat-

---

[6] Folio numbers refer to the original foliation of the manuscript.

in part opens with a *Prologus*[7](f. 87v), who sets the scene for the rest of the performance:

> (1) Nam certamen erit hodie, Quodnam, inter tria doctrinæ fælicioris instrumenta, palmam optimè mereatur. [For there will be a battle today, regarding which instrument of the more felicitous discipline deserves victory the most.][8]

<div align="right">(f. 87v)</div>

This refers to the division of Classical rhetoric to *natura* (natural ability), *ars* (theoretical knowledge) and *exercitatio* (practice), and the dispute concerning their relative importance. Even though these are common terms, it is likely that the students would have come into contact with them in some of the basic rhetorical manuals of the Early Modern period, such as Cicero's treatise on rhetoric, *De oratore* (Barber 1976: 101). The main part of the text consists of sections for each of them to have an apologia (ff. 87v-89v), after which in a section called *Pars Moderatoria* (ff. 90r-92v) their arguments are weighed and further developed – apparently by several speakers. These fulfil then the traditional slot of speeches that are an integral part of every year's play. After this comes a section titled *A Dialogue betwixt four schoolfellows* (ff. 92v-94r), which is mostly in English, and in which the students chat about the hardships of school life and studying and long for the coming holiday. Sections similar to this are included in *Grammaticae Partes I* and *Discipuli et Rustici*.

Captivi exemplifies again a form that can be described as typical of the Christmas plays. It consists of three parts or levels: firstly, there is an introductory dialogue between two characters, Lorarius and Claviger (the usher who taught the rudiments of grammar, as was discussed in section 2.2), which sets the tone for the rest of the performance, and which is interrupted in the middle by *Prologus* (f. 144r), a short speech by another actor. Secondly, after these come the *Orationes* (ff. 144v-147v), speeches in both prose and verse, which were performed by one or more actors, but it is not possible to ascertain this, since the speakers are not identified at all. All of these parts are written in Latin with some Greek here and there. Thirdly, after the

---

[7] This refers at the same time to both a section and the person reciting the prologue.

[8] I have provided translations inside square brackets. When there are code-switches within the translations, they are italicised. Orthographic conventions have been retained, but line division is indicated only for verse. All of the speech prefixes have been standardised and are represented by colons. The symbol between a character's name Angled lines indicate interlineation.

speeches comes a part titled *A Dialogue Betwixt eight Youths* (ff. 147v-149r), which has English as its base language. After this we get a short *Epilogus* in Latin, again with some Greek interspersed (f. 149v), and this belongs with the prologue hierarchically on the highest textual level. The main theme of the play is the comparison between the boys in the school and captives in a prison. The *Prologus* is one of the captives, and he begs a leave for all of them to recount their tales of misery, and the comparison is well exemplified by phrases such as the following:

(2)   Lor: Quantum equidem ipse ex candido judicum horum nunc vultu possum augurari veniam impetrasti pro Captivis ut loquantur liberè quid passi sint in Tulliano nostro [As far as I can predict from the radiant looks of these judges, you have obtained a permission on behalf of the Captives, so that they would speak freely of what they have endured in our Tullianum]

(f. 144v)

The judges mentioned here are the audience, to whom the speeches are then addressed. The thematic of the play is enforced by comparing the school to Tullianum, which was the underground execution chamber of Rome's state prison. Another example of this thematic is *in hoc Musarum ergastulo* 'in this penitentiary of the Muses' (f. 145r). As many other plays, *Captivi* includes vivid descriptions of the hardships of school life, the underlying argument being that the students should be given a holiday, but the part written in English is not actually related to this theme of captivity. In this part, a student called Dan goes around asking other students why they are still studying as Christmas holiday is nearing, and what they aspire to become in the future. This jousting of different professions, or here rather mocking of almost every profession, is similar to the speeches in *Captivi Grammaticales & Professionary Options*.

Compared to the other Christmas plays, *Discipuli et Rustici* is quite different, although it shares the same overall structure as the other plays. It includes prologues in both English and Latin (ff. 279v-280r), a dialogue part in the style of the other plays (ff. 280r-282r), a short speech in the middle (ff. 282r-282v), a long play instead of the number of speeches (ff. 282v-293v) and a short epilogue (f. 294r). The dialogue has English as its base language, but there is Latin interspersed similar to the dialogues in other plays. There is also a part where two students recite poems, one in

English and the other in Latin, and this part is most likely an allusion to the disputations held in the school. The longer play is a special case, since it is a rare example of a Christmas play that is not merely a succession of speeches. The main plot focuses on a play that the students, Grammatulus, Eugenius and Philaster, are trying to arrange with the villagers (*rustici*), Blunt and Knobbs, and which they eventually get to act near to the end. During this, an elderly man (*senex rusticus*) called Credulio brings his son Jacky to the school in hopes that he would be accepted as a scholar by the headmaster, Philoponus. There is plenty of switching between English and Latin, and many characters use both languages during some point of the play.

Grammaticae Partes I has a structure similar to *Certamen Doctrinale*, as was indicated, but the order of the parts is reversed. It begins with the stage command *Enter three Scholars*, and one of these three called Sam states that he is tormented by *[a] thing which is worser then death*: grammar (f. 319r). The three scholars discuss different aspects of grammar mostly in English, with Sam complaining how complicated everything is and the others trying to convince him that everything is really quite simple. After the dialogue we get a short verse *Prologus* (f. 320r) welcoming the audience properly, and after this the longer part with Latin speeches begins (f. 320v). The speeches are titled *Orthographia* (ibid.), *Etymologia* (f. 321r), *Syntaxis* (f. 322r) and *Prosodia* (f. 322v), which indicate the division of grammar into four parts (cf. BI, 1). After the speeches and some discussion similar to that of *Pars Moderatoria* in *Certamen Doctrinale*, we get a Latin dialogue between four students on the hardships of school life in general (f. 326r), and finally the play ends with a verse epilogue (f. 327v). As with *Certamen Doctrinale* and *Captivi*, the different parts are not connected except for a couple of remarks that will be discussed later.

3. Theoretical framework

3.1. Preliminaries

Since this study applies a combination of philological, pragmatic and sociolinguistic methods and theories, I will present here definitions of basic concepts and terms. In

addition, practices and definitions vary significantly between each sub-discipline, and therefore I will address some of the problems that arise from the lack of consensus. It is not my aim, however, to discuss the definitions that other researchers have adopted in detail, but the preliminary definitions given in earlier sections are in many ways inadequate, and elaboration is then justified. There are also several terms which will be introduced in the following sections and which will not be discussed here, as they either demand that the reader is familiar with the terms introduced here, or their definitions belong more naturally within the discussion of the features or phenomena which they describe.

To begin with, the field of *pragmatics* need not be discussed in any detail, but in this thesis the area of research governed by this discipline is connected with *pragmatic meaning* or *meaning in context*. What *pragmatic meaning* encompasses then is all the aspects of meaning that are recoverable only when context is taken fully into account (e.g. Cruse 2011: 18; Clark 1996: 391). These aspects include, for example, the referents of deictic expressions (e.g. even though *me* denotes the accusative 1st person singular – as far as grammatical semantics is concerned – and thence usually the current speaker, the real-world referent is always a specific individual), but the single feature that is of interest to the present topic is the function of any given utterance. In my view, the different parts of meaning interact in this manner: lexical and grammatical meaning is the basis for syntactic meaning, while syntactic meaning is the basis for pragmatic meaning. This means that structural necessity – the importance to understand the meanings of individual building blocks – increases when we move from an utterance to individual words. In other words, even with a very flexible notion of compositionality, the smallest meaningful linguistic particles are ultimately the building blocks for meaning on higher levels. However, the communicative function of language is tied most strongly to the pragmatic meaning of an utterance (cf. Clark 1996: 148-154). To give an example, if I want to insult someone, the act of insulting is situated on the level of pragmatic meaning, and in order to insult anyone successfully, it is necessary that the addressee understands the meaning of this level. In other words, the addressee needs to understand that he is being insulted. The notions of *speaker meaning* (what the speaker intends to mean) and *hearer meaning* (how the hearer interprets the message) are both taken in this thesis to be combined under

meaning or *function*, which is then seen to be the essence of pragmatic meaning. This approach is similar to the one proposed by Clark (1996: 125-154).

Moving now to sociolinguistic matters, the notions that must be dealt with here are connected with language varieties and situations where several languages are used by an individual or within a single speech community. As will become clear in the following chapters, it is beneficial to include different languages and varieties of one language in the same study, because it seems that the same pragmatic functions can be tied to switches between two languages and between two language varieties. Although the topic of this thesis is switching between three distinct languages, examples will later show that the line between two languages may get blurred, and in those situations it is helpful to be able to move away from the confines of *language*. Secondly, as was shown in chapter 1, the term *polyglossic* usually refers to a society or a situation in which several languages are used for different purposes (but note here what was just said about *languages*), while *multilingual* denotes both societies that contain a significant number of speakers of more than one native language, and speakers who have in their repertoire more than one language (researchers do not agree on these definitions, cf. Romaine 1995: 23, 33-38). Since this distinction will be present in other terminology (cf. section 3.2.2), I have chosen to use *multilingual* as an umbrella term for both situations. In the same vein, I have already touched upon the issue of *academic multilingualism*, which refers to a situation in which a speaker has acquired a high level of proficiency in one language mostly through formal education. In this thesis I have opted for a rather broad definition of multilingualism, and will not treat academically multilingual speakers as a special group.

3.2. Code-switching and multilingual practices

Gumperz defines code-switching[9] as "the juxtaposition within the same speech exchange of passages of speech belonging to two different grammatical systems or subsystems" (1982: 59). However, because it is possible to analyse code-switching between, for example, phonological systems or sociolinguistic varieties, it is better to define code-switching as the juxtaposition of two different linguistic systems or sub-

---

[9] I have adopted here this particular spelling, but other conventions are also used, and I have retained the original form of each author whenever possible.

systems. Even though Gumperz initially associates code-switching with spoken language (which is also apparent from his term *conversational code switching*), there are written texts surviving since ancient times showing that this phenomenon is not tied to any particular medium. Since this definition of code-switching is very broad, it is possible to include situations in which, for example, a scribe changes the script or the font is changed in a printed text. Because the first studies on code-switching focused on spontaneous spoken language in bilingual communication, the phenomenon is most strongly associated with situations in which the speakers switch between two *native* languages, or in other words languages that they have learned as children through acquisition instead of formal teaching. However, it is equally valid to analyse situations where speakers switch between different varieties or dialects of one language, or switch between for example their native language and a foreign language (cf. Myers-Scotton 1998b: 6). The language or code that forms the basis of the utterance is termed the *recipient* (or *base* or *matrix*) *language*, while the other language is called the *source* (or *embedded*) *language* (Winford 2010: 171; Romaine 1995: 144-145; Myers-Scotton 1993: 3).

I shall begin by describing general morphosyntactic features of code-switching, in addition to studies that have focused on identifying and defining code-switching and searching for universal syntactic constraints. Next, I shall present theories and models for explaining and categorising the functions of code-switching. Since researchers have attempted to analyse these functions with both theory-driven and data-driven approaches, I shall include also some models that are not based on a particular theory, but they are rather the results of data-driven analyses. Finally, I shall introduce a selection of studies on code-switching in historical English texts.

3.2.1. Syntactic features of code-switching

Code-switching can first be divided into *intersentential* and *intrasentential switching* (Myers-Scotton 1993: 3-5). The former are switches between sentences or larger units, and the latter are switches within a sentence, for example between phrases or morphemes. It should be noted that even this preliminary definition is not universally accepted, since for example Hunt (2000: 132) considers *tag-switches* such as interjections a separate group, an approach shared by, for example, Schendl (2000: 88).

Intersentential switching includes those situations in which a new discourse participant joins the conversation, and the linguistic code has to be switched in order to include this new person in the communicative situation. Switching on the macro-level – for example when the situation or setting changes – is also intersentential switching. When written material is considered, this would include instances in which long sections of the text or for example marginalia are written in a different language than other sections. *Intrasentential switches* include for example switched phrases, lexemes and even individual morphemes such as grammatical affixes, which could be exemplified with the production of humorous pseudo-Latin names such as *Naughtius Maximus* (cf. also Wenzel 1994: 3). Of all intrasentential switches, probably the most readily apparent to monolinguals are switched lexemes that are used when there is no equivalent for the word in the other language, or when translating the word is difficult. Some researchers have also adopted the notion of *code-mixing* to cover all or most of intrasentential switching (Myers-Scotton 1993: 23-24, cf. Hunt 2000: 134). Switches of this kind are sometimes hard to distinguish from loanwords, and therefore it is important to acknowledge and define the relationship between loanwords and code-switching in any study of multilingual conversation. In fact, this is one of the main areas of multilingual research, and a question which has elicited many different responses.

Most researchers consider borrowing and code-switching to be on the same continuum (see for example Myers-Scotton 1993: 163, cf. Kalliokoski 1995: 4), but otherwise opinions differ vastly. According to Myers-Scotton loanwords and code-switches are "part of the same developmental continuum" affected by identical production procedures, but their lexical entries must differ, because "[borrowed] forms become part of the mental lexicon of the [matrix language], while [codeswitching] forms do not" (1993: 163). This is in effect a psycholinguistic definition, as it implies that code-switches are basically part of the mental lexicon of their source language, while borrowed forms are then part of both the *matrix* (i.e. *recipient* or *base*) language and the *embedded* (i.e. *source*) language mental lexicons[10]. In fact, this difference is the only reason for her to differentiate between these two types of forms (Myers-Scotton 1993: 192). In any case, her view is that both phenomena should be

---

[10] Here it is sufficient for the present topic to merely acknowledge that the idea of multiple mental lexicons is not uncontroversial.

studied together, since in many studies switches of single lexemes have been classi-
fied as loanwords even before the analysis, and this approach fails to appreciate the
interplay of code-switching and borrowing and the relationship between them (1993:
163-165). This approach is shared amongst others by Stroud (1992: 149), who argues
that the structural ambiguity of multilingual expressions is a crucial part of their
functions. On this methodological problem I agree with both Myers-Scotton and
Stroud in concluding that both types should be included in the analysis if possible,
and if they are differentiated, then the relationship between them should be consid-
ered.

To Myers-Scotton (1993: 168-176) the relationship between code-switching and bor-
rowing is of following nature: loanwords can be divided traditionally into *cultural
forms* and *core forms*. The former are words which do not have a clear correspondent
in the matrix language, and they usually refer to ideas, objects or concepts that are
highly culture-specific. The latter are then words that have a satisfactory counterpart
in the matrix language. Cultural forms are more common than core forms, because
they are used to fill lexical gaps, and they enter the matrix language – as it were –
abruptly, while core forms enter through code-switching over a longer period of
time. This also means that cultural forms appear initially with a relatively high fre-
quency, while core forms become gradually frequent. For this reason Myers-Scotton
argues for relative frequency as the criterion for distinguishing between borrowing
and code-switching, instead of phonological or morphosyntactic features (1993:
194). On the problems of this approach Winford (2010: 182) comments that "fre-
quency counts are inconclusive, and the distinction between a switch and a borrow-
ing is not transparent to bilinguals" and that "[i]t seems best … to treat lexical
switches and lexical borrowings as manifestations of the more general phenomenon
of borrowing under [recipient language] agentivity", and this is indeed desirable if
there is no theoretical model into which the phenomena must be fitted (as is the case
with Myers-Scotton's own model). Furthermore, Schendl reports on the problems of
distinguishing between code-switching and borrowing in historical texts in general
(2000: 86), and on the caveats of frequency studies in particular (2000: 89-91).

Although the universal syntactic constraints of code-switching have received much
attention from researchers, the topic is not central to my thesis, and therefore I will

only discuss some of the general arguments and implications that have risen from these studies. Gumperz (1982: 86) began with the assumption that "if code switching is meaningful it must be subject to some forms of linguistic regularity", and he tried to find unacceptable switches using bilingual speakers as judges. In summarising the results from Gumperz (1982: 87-90), I have used his examples, which employ English as the metalanguage and indicate code-switching by underlining. The results show that, for example, in a subject-predicate construction any noun phrase acting as the subject can be switched except personal pronouns, so that *My uncle Sam from San Jose is the oldest* is acceptable but *He is the oldest is not. A somewhat similar case is the constraint on subject-embedded relative clauses, which must be followed by a personal pronoun in a switched phrase. This means that **The man who was here yesterday didn't come today* is ungrammatical, while *The man who was here yesterday he didn't come today* is acceptable. For some reason Gumperz fails to stress the fact that the acceptable form is now structured as a topic-comment sentence, which means that the two parts are structurally independent and a constraint here would be surprising. In verb phrases the verb complement can be switched as in *You should go to the field*, but the switch cannot occur between the auxiliary and the main verb as in **You should go to the field*. Finally, there cannot be a switch in the middle of an idiomatic phrase, and therefore **They like bread and butter* is ungrammatical. The reason for this is that idiomatic phrases are non-compositional (Cruse 2011: 83-86). Even though Gumperz found several syntactic constraints, he concludes that they "are in turn motivated by underlying factors which depend more on certain aspects of surface form or on pragmatics than on structural or grammatical characteristics as such" (1982: 89-91). In other words, the switch is seen as ungrammatical if it does not display a clearly understandable function.

Poplack has also studied grammaticality in code-switching in several different contexts. She has tried to show that "the incorporation of both functional and linguistic factors into a single model is necessary to account for code-switching behaviour" (1980: 585). What she means by *linguistic* should be understood as *grammatical* constraints. Her hypothesis was that since tag-switches were less constrained, nonfluent bilinguals would tend to use these instead of intrasentential switches, which could more easily lead to ungrammaticality. Poplack states that it was striking that of all the switches in the data, almost none of them was ungrammatical, but Kalliokoski

amongst others doubts whether it is wise to even talk about grammatical switching without in-depth research into the syntax of spoken language and without typologically varied evidence (Kalliokoski 1995: 3-4; cf. Romaine 1995: 160-161). Even though syntactic constraints are very problematic to study, I completely agree with Gumperz on the fact that there are constraints that can have syntactic, semantic and pragmatic reasons. The notion of *normativity* is central to studies in all linguistic disciplines (Itkonen 2003: 15-17 and 136-137; Clark 1996: 75-77), and in pragmatics this is usually associated with coherence and, as it were, making sense in conversation, although a great deal of pragmatic meaning is achieved through nonconventional language usage (Clark 1996: 77-81). Since pragmatic constraints were thought to be as universal as any other constraints (Gumperz 1982: 90), it is reasonable to assume that the majority of the pragmatic functions discussed in the next section apply to more than a single linguistic situation.

3.2.2. Pragmatic functions of code-switching

The functions of code-switching have been studied from numerous different perspectives, with both theoretically oriented approaches and data-driven approaches, some studies focusing on a selection of functions and others endeavouring to account for the whole spectrum of pragmatic nuances associated with switched passages. Because of this, it is impossible to describe any generally accepted models, functional categories or approaches, and therefore I have selected as a logical starting point the seminal work by Gumperz (1982), in which he attempts to provide some preliminary categories for functions and to discuss how these functions could be approached. After this initial account, I shall move on to another similar but more recent classification of functions resulting from extensive studies on a great number of data. Finally, I shall present a more theoretical approach to code-switching.

According to Gumperz, code-switching can be divided functionally to *situational* and *metaphorical code-switching* (1982: 60-61). He connects the former with diglossia, in which one language is used, for example, at home and another language for public speaking, at work and so on. This group includes then switches motivated by changes in the communicative situation (hence the term), and this can also include the re-

quirements of a topic or a genre. Typically these switches are then intersentential, spanning often long stretches of conversation, but sometimes only brief sections. Metaphorical code-switching (which Gumperz also refers to as *conversational code-switching*, a term which I will not employ here for sake of clarity) is in turn motivated by the desire to achieve certain communicative effect, or in other words pragmatic meaning. In his preliminary analysis of code-switching functions, Gumperz takes into account only metaphorical switching, but there is much to be said about analysing the pragmatic meaning of situational switching, especially in those situations where it is employed for a stylistic effect.

Gumperz identified the functions of code-switching by analysing three language situations: between German and Slovenian on the border of Austria and former Yugoslavia, between English and Hindi in Delhi, and between English and Chicano Spanish in California. The preliminary typological analysis revealed the following six functions (Gumperz 1982: 75-84): *quotations*, *addressee specification*, *interjections*, *reiteration*, *message qualification* and *personalisation versus objectivisation*. *Quotations* as a category is fairly self-explanatory, but it is worth noting that it is not a simple category, since not all speakers are quoted in their original language, and sometimes the quotation may be signalled by code-switching even if neither of the languages is the one originally used by the person being quoted. *Addressee specification* includes instances where the code is switched to either invite more people into the conversation or to address only certain individuals. By extension this also includes those cases where participants are actively excluded from conversation, but Gumperz does not mention this explicitly. *Interjections* are short replies or comments that include for example intrasentential sentence fillers such as *you know*, and also instances where the speaker has first said something in one code and the addressee gives a short reply to this in another code. *Reiteration* means that the speaker repeats the previous message in another code, either translating it literally or modifying it slightly. As the underlying motives for these switches, Gumperz sees a need to either clarify the message or to emphasise it. *Message qualification* is a somewhat unclear category, but it includes at least *complements* (such as in *That man, the one with the telescope*) and *switched predicates*, which, as Romaine notes (1995: 163), refer basically to topic-comment constructions (cf. section 3.2.1). Therefore qualifications can be used to give detailed information on the topic. The final category, *personalisation*

versus objectivisation, is fairly complicated and needs to be described in greater detail.

Gumperz mentions several subcategories of *personalisation versus objectivisation*, which make it the largest group of the ones that he discusses, and of which he says the following:

> [T]he code contrast here seems to relate to such things as: the distinction between talk about action and talk as action, the degree of speaker involvement in, or distance from, a message, whether a statement reflects personal opinion or knowledge, whether it refers to specific instances or has the authority of generally known fact.
>
> (Gumperz 1982: 80)

His examples of these contain situations where people discuss shared expenses, argue or dispute, and talk about their personal problems (1982: 80-81). Later he goes to add even more subcategories that are not easily classifiable, and as one enlightening example he discusses situations in which semantically identical imperatives in two languages, produced one after the other, differ in the sense that one of them implies a personal appeal while the other implies asymmetric power relations (1982: 91-94). In fact, the distinction between *we and they codes* (or personalisation and objectivisation) is one that has been approached several times since Gumperz's study, and for example Davidson (2003) has analysed power that is associated with particular social groups. Finally, it should be mentioned that Gumperz considers the functions of code switching to be universal regardless of the languages or speakers involved (1982: 84, 90; cf. Stroud 1992: 151-152 for some cautionary remarks). Since Gumperz has stressed that the categories are not exhaustive (1982: 81-82) and that the aim of the study was to construct a preliminary typology (1982: 75), there is no reason to criticise his approach in detail. However, the typology is somewhat unbalanced, and some of the categories such as reiteration and quotations do not represent pragmatic meanings per se. Since Gumperz (1982: 76) identifies quotations by reporting verbs or other factors, the whole class is actually connected to the syntax of the sentences in which the quotations appear. These issues will be discussed more in the following sections.

Lately code-switching has also been studied extensively in historical contexts. Adams (2002) has studied code-switching between Latin and a host of other languages in the Roman Empire, and especially between Latin and Greek in the letters of Cicero. His material is purely written, while Gumperz focused only on spoken language. Adams (2002: 301-304) presents a preliminary division of the most general switches into the following groups: *establishing a relationship with an addressee*, *expressing identity*, *responding to a particular topic* and *stylistic effect*, all of which are all fairly self-explanatory. The first of these, *establishing a relationship with an addressee*, comprises roughly Gumperz's personalisation versus objectivisation and addressee specification, since the switches are all related to the ways that the relationship between the speaker and the addressee is negotiated. The second, *expressing identity*, overlaps with the first category, and Adams concedes that it is very hard to draw any distinction between them. The third, *restrictions of a topic*, can be classified under situational code-switching, while the fourth, *stylistic effect*, will be discussed in conjunction with its only subcategory. The more specific functions that Adams has identified include *solidarity*, (2002: 312, 322), *coding or exclusion*, *distancing or euphemism*, *fixed expressions*, *filling a semantic gap*, *scientific terminology* and *stylistic evocation of the exotic* (2002: 329-342), but he does also explain some code-switching in terms of, for example, power relations (2002: 383-396).

Adams exemplifies *solidarity* with the practice of the Roman nobility to use Greek to emphasise a common educational and social background (2002: 321-322). Since Greek was not known by everyone, it could also be used for *exclusion* or *coding* to ensure privacy for a letter (2002: 329-330). It should be noted that Adams does not discuss here cases where exclusion could mean, as it were, reverse addressee specification. As an interesting example of *euphemism*, Adams (2002: 332) discusses Cicero's letter to his wife Terentia, in which he switches to Greek when explaining that he has been vomiting bile[11] to soften the expression. Regarding *fixed expressions*, Adams (2002: 337) mentions that in Cicero's letters Greek proverbs are especially numerous, and sometimes they may be only partly quoted if the addressee is presumed to know the proverb in question. *Filling a semantic gap* is clearly connected

---

[11] Cic. *Fam*. 14,7,1. References to Classical works are given with conventional abbreviations. The system for Latin texts is based on the one used in Thesaurus Linguae Latinae, while the Greek references are formed after the Oxford Classical Dictionary. The bibliography includes a list of editions for all of the cited works and the abbreviation that are associated with each edition.

to the cultural borrowings discussed in section 3.2.1 above, and if a particular genre was conceived as Greek of origin, it is not surprising to find several borrowings or switches even if the base language was changed. If we compare these lists with the functions identified by Gumperz, we can see that Adams has introduced coding as an important category missing from Gumperz, and he has also extended the range of stylistic effect to cover a considerable amount of ground.

Adams's study is very much material-driven and he does not explicitly apply any particular theoretical approach to his material. This might be connected in some ways to the fact that his classification lacks a clear structure and several of the categories overlap to the extent that one can be seen as a subcategory of another, but Adams does not address this problem clearly. It is also possible that the functions are not in a taxonomy, but rather that they exemplify different aspects that are interconnected. Let us consider the example of Cicero's vomit: medicine was for a long time a distinctly Greek area both as a scientific genre and a practice. It is therefore possible that this was a phrase that a doctor had used as a medical term, and it may have been one that Terentia would understand. It is unarguable that Greek provides here a euphemistic effect, but it is impossible to decide without further evidence if this was Cicero's intention or merely a happy coincidence. In a parallel case Cicero mentions in a letter to Atticus (Cic. *Att*. 10,13,1) that Antony was taking laxative medicine (περὶ κοιλιολυσίαν γίνεσθαι, *peri koiliolysian ginesthai*), on which Adams (2002: 331) comments that "[t]he term has the additional interest that it is medical, and medical subject matter is sometimes implicated in switches of code". The same overlapping of functions can be seen in connection with fixed expressions.

As was indicated above, Adams does acknowledge the special case of quotations that are left unfinished, but even in other cases it is very clear that quotations are merely the means for achieving either solidarity (or in-group effect) or distancing (or out-group effect). The problem in these cases is not the fact that Adams lists several functions, but the fact that he does not address their interplay sufficiently. Furthermore, some of Adams's explanations rely too heavily on stylistic explanations when there is also a practical alternative. For example, he mentions the Byzantine army in his discussion of code-switching as a symbol for authority, noting that orders were

often given in Latin and not Greek, which was the first language of most soldiers (Adams 2002: 393-396). Undeniably Latin had these sorts of connotations, but it was also practical to use a single language for orders, and Latin had traditionally been the language of military commands throughout the Empire – even in places where Greek was the main language, such as Egypt (cf. Adams 2002: 608-609). The same argument holds for Adams's treatment of judges' verdicts in Greek areas. He sees a switch into Latin emphasising the judge's power or status (Adams 2002: 384), but again, what we have here is probably situational switching, in which the switch is also performative in the sense that it makes the verdict legally binding (cf. Cruse 2011: 366-368). Finally, it should be stressed that even though Adams's classification suffers from a lack of clear structure and some unfortunate analyses, it is nevertheless extensive and representative, and his material is drawn from a great number of different genres and linguistic situation. It will be interesting to find out how the present study will function with the categories that he has argued for.

Finally, as a more theoretical approach to the functions of code-switching I will present the Markedness Model of Carol Myers-Scotton. Before elaborating on the theory itself, the concept of *markedness* needs to be discussed. Markedness is a basic concept in linguistics, and it is especially important in structuralism. It can refer to slightly different concepts, so that markedness may be defined in terms of, for example, the number of distinctive features or frequency (cf. Myers-Scotton 1998b: 4-5). Myers-Scotton's definition of markedness focuses on the expectations of the speech community and the predictability of some feature, so that an *unmarked* choice is the predictable or expected one, while the *marked* choice is an unexpected one (Myers-Scotton 1998b: 5-6). To some extent, this is similar to Trubetzkoy's (1958: 141) concept of *natural unmarkedness*, in which the unmarked choice is the one that requires the least deviation from a neutral state. Myers-Scotton stresses the fact that her definition does not refer to any absolute polarities, as the choices "fall along a continuum as more or less umarked ... [and] there is not necessarily a single unmarked or marked choice, although there is often a dominant unmarked choice" (1998b: 5). It is clear that markedness in code-switching is related especially to the situational switches discussed above, but the Markedness Model is not limited to only those types of switches.

At the heart of the Markedness Model are *rights and obligations sets* (RO sets), which basically contain the expectations of the participants in a given situation and are therefore another term for *norms* (Myers-Scotton 1998c: 23-24; cf. the discussion of normativity in section 3.2.1). Following the model given by Grice's *cooperative principle* (Grice 1975: 45), Myers-Scotton has formulated a *negotiation principle*, which speakers and hearers are expected to follow in order to achieve successful communication. The principle states that the speakers should make choices that index the RO sets that they wish to apply for the current situation (Myers-Scotton 1998c: 21). In other words, the conversational participants need to negotiate which rights and obligations are valid for any speech exchange. The theory further contains a set of five maxims, which the speakers follow. The *Unmarked Choice Maxim* states that speakers should make choices that index the unmarked RO set, when they want to first establish or affirm the set. The *Marked Choice Maxim*, then, states that choices that index a marked RO set should be made when the speaker wants to establish a new RO set as the unmarked set. When it is not clear what the unmarked RO set is, speakers should follow the *Exploratory Choice Maxim* to establish several candidates for the unmarked set. The *Deference Maxim* states that if there is a need for an expression of respect, a code that expresses deference should be chosen for that function. Finally, the *Virtuosity Maxim* states that the code should be switched in order to include all the necessary participants in the conversation. The previous form of the theory included an additional maxim (the *Multiple-Identities Maxim*), which stated that the speakers should make exploratory choices also in order to establish a multiple identity for themselves (Scotton 1989: 126). A detailed discussion of these maxims and their application is not possible due to the length of this thesis, but it has to be added that speakers may also act against the maxims for various reasons, and therefore they may, for example, flout the deference maxim in order to be impolite (Scotton 1989: 127-132). It should be pointed out that violating and flouting the maxims is also a major part of Grice's original theory (1975: 49). In addition to spontaneous conversation, Myers-Scotton's model should also be applicable to works of fiction, and with "a little modification" to the writers of literary texts (Myers-Scotton 1998c: 26).

Since the Markedness Model has received a respectable amount of criticism, I will concentrate only on some of the main arguments relevant to code-switching in addi-

tion to my own criticism. Wei (1998: 159-161) focuses on the attempts of the participants to maintain conversation and to organise discourse through code-switching – a function that is not covered by the abovementioned maxims. She doubts that there would always be any predetermined RO sets that the speakers are trying to index, and argues that switching happens "not because of some external value attached to those particular languages, but because the alternation itself signals ... how [bilingual speakers] wish their utterances to be interpreted" (Wei 1998: 161). I agree that the Markedness Model is not completely applicable to "local generation of social meaning" (Wei 1998: 161), but more importantly, I fully agree with the fact that the theory should include code-switching which is used to facilitate the organisation of discourse. In addition to this, some of the analyses proposed by Myers-Scotton seem to rely too heavily on the maxims to uncover other possibilities of meaning. For example, she analyses a conversation that took place in Montreal between bilingual speakers of English and French (Scotton 1989: 127). In this example, speaker A asks in French if there is a place selling newspapers nearby. As there is no response from speaker B, A switches to English and reiterates the question. Now B asks for a confirmation in French (*Un journal?* 'A newspaper?'), to which A replies again in French (*Oui* 'yes'). Finally, speaker B begins his last turn by answering in English, and then he adds some details in French. Myers-Scotton states that this "seemingly baffling code-switching ... can be explained as an instance of following the multiple-identities maxim" (ibid.), but this is not very convincing. The first switch by A to English is used to facilitate the discourse, and it adheres to the virtuosity maxim, while B's first question in French is explainable by the fact that B is trying to reconstruct A's original question. The final reply starts then in English, because that is the answer to A's first successful question, while the final switch to French could be seen as politeness towards A, since it is the language that A originally used.

Since the Markedness Model is very problematic to apply without radical changes, I do not apply it as such to my material. However, I will present some comparisons in later sections to further the argument that the model is not capable of handling all possible instances of code-switching. Nevertheless, the concept of markedness itself is very useful and almost unavoidable for the analysis, and therefore I refer to it several times in the following sections. Myers-Scotton's model represents the most theo-

retical approach to code-switching, since most of the studies discussed in the next section take the material as their starting point.

3.2.3. Multilingualism in historical English texts

There have been a number of studies devoted to multilingualism in historical English texts, but as code-switching in general has only been studied extensively from the 80's onwards, most of these studies focus on rather small samples of data, or aim to account for only specific features of code-switching. Yet it is helpful that the approaches have been so varied, because there are many studies that can be used for comparison, and there have also been studies on both literary and non-literary genres, allowing one to find parallels and general trends. The identification of general trends has also been the contribution of extensive corpus studies.

The study whose material comes closest to my own is Hans-Jürgen Diller's (1997) article on code-switching patterns and functions in medieval English drama. In this article he accounts for the use of different languages in drama, taking into account the different communicative layers of this genre. For example, communication can take place between the dramatis personae or between them and the audience, and naturally the functions are different in each case. Latin is "the language of divine authority and therefore of prefabricated components", which means that Latin is often used in biblical quotations (Diller 1997: 515, cf. 509). In mystery cycle plays Hebrew is also used for quotations, but outside of this genre it is generally not used. Finally, French has connotations of power, courtesy and learning (Diller 1997: 514). This is due to the high status of French and association with the nobility as has been discussed in section 2.1. Diller notes also that French "is used by potentates speaking to one another … or wishing to impress monolinguals or peripheral bilinguals" (1997: 519), which shows that language choices serve as important tools for characterisation. Compared to Latin, with which it shared the prestige status, French was a language that could be used to differentiate people, while Latin actually unified people from all social strata (ibid.). Diller's account is not very detailed or exhaustive, but it serves as a starting point which shows how different languages may have in-

herently different functions in code-switching, and the study is also an important contribution to the study of multilingualism in drama in general.

There have also been studies on other literary genres, such as Davidson's (2003) study on, amongst others, *The Canterbury Tales* and *Piers Plowman*. Davidson analysed switching from the point of view of the "we" and "they" codes, and the ways in which speakers negotiate power and identity through code-switching. Her most central conclusion is that even speakers who possess an imperfect competence in some language can switch into it in order to signal authority, to restrict membership, and to negotiate identity (Davidson 2003: 482). One of her examples from *The Canterbury Tales* concerns the Wife of Bath, a woman of easy virtue, who uses an intrasentential switch into French when discussing her genitalia (Davidson 2003: 476). In the framework of Adams, this would be classifiable as a euphemistic switch. However, Davidson argues that "since the Wife generally speaks unequivocally about sex ... in the end, [the switch] emphasizes her outgroup status" (ibid.). In other words, this is a case of a somewhat failed code-switch, which is used then as a literary device to elicit a humorous or thought-evoking situation for the readers.

There has also been extensive research on non-literary texts, and for example Laura Wright has studied multilingualism in later medieval business writing, which encompasses such genres as bills, accounts and inventories. According to Wright (2000: 149-150), code-switching is the norm in these text types, and in addition to merely using words from two different languages, writers would employ the system of *abbreviation and suspension*, which here refers especially to the use of brevigraphs (for words such as *per*) and special symbols used instead of affixes to carry some grammatical meaning (such as case and number). English could be used for nouns and adjectives, and even though Latin was available for any part of speech, it was the obligatory choice for function words. The system of abbreviation and suspension then serves "to background the Romance morphology and foreground the English, and Latin/English, stems" (Wright 2000: 150). These stems were often interpretable as either Latin or English since their written forms were identical to a considerable extent, which was the result of the prolonged contact between English and Latin discussed in section 2.1. Wright argues that code-switching in these texts is "compulsory … and regulated, although not predictable" (2000: 151), and this system of writing

made it possible for people of several linguistic backgrounds to read the texts regardless of the level of competence in Latin grammar. This was of course a useful feature in a multilingual society. It is clear that when studying multilingualism in texts such as these it is not relevant to concentrate on the functions of individual switches, but to examine the text as a whole, with the main function being connected to the code-switching phenomenon as a whole.

As was mentioned in the preceding sections, scientific writing is a genre that was for a long time Latin's domain, which is why it comes as no surprise that it is also a genre that often attracts multilingual practices. Tony Hunt (2000) has analysed code-switching in medieval medical texts and suggested a classification of switch types. His taxonomy includes the following categories: code-mixing, intersentenial switching between rubrics and the text itself, and *synonyma* (Hunt 2000: 133-134). This last category is a novel one, and it comprises switches whose function is to identify plants by their various names, a function which can be achieved with, for example, glosses. What is particularly interesting in his results is that so many different forms of code-switching are found in a single genre, while for some others there may be more restrictions on the form, as is the case with dramatic texts discussed above. In the same vein, medieval religious prose and sermons exhibit mainly intersentential switches, while in legal writing it was apparently normal to use formulaic expressions in Latin, and from the 17th century we find documentation on anatomical lectures with intrasentential switches from Latin to English (Schendl 2000: 80-83). Even though general tendencies are only observable through extensive corpus studies, it nevertheless seems to be that code-switching strategies may differ from one genre to another.

Since the number of studies on historical multilingualism has recently been on the growth, I will summarise here only two more studies of particular genres, focusing on the ones most relevant for the current topic. One of the first genres explicitly studied for multilingualism was religious writing, which has strong connections with Latin, as was mentioned in section 2.1. Wenzel (1994) contributed to this area by studying bilingual sermons in Late-Medieval Britain. He argues that bilingualism was not restricted only to the confines of written production, but that the sermons were actually preached by bilingual speakers to other bilinguals (Wenzel 1994: 124-125). Pos-

sibly the most important insight of this study is that these texts with code-switching "came about not as an intentional stylistic device but as the natural result of written discourse by fluent bilingual speakers" (Wenzel 1994: 127). In other words, switching between the languages was an unmarked discourse strategy for the speakers. As a very different type of genre, Nurmi and Pahta have studied the correspondence of Thomas Twining (born in 1734), and the relation of code-switching to the roles assumed by the writer and the reader. The functions of the switches and the languages used for each function varied from recipient to recipient (Nurmi & Pahta 2010: 152-156), and it is notable that competence in the chosen language was not always required (2011: 154). The social roles analysed in this study can also been seen in some of Cicero's letters that Adams analysed and that were discussed in section 3.2.2. For example, both Cicero and Twining could emphasise their shared scholarly background with the recipient by switching to a language most associated with scholarly activities.

As can be seen, there have been several different approaches proposed for studying historical code-switching by philologists and linguists, but it is important to remember that this phenomenon is also familiar to many other scholars. In fact, manuscript scholars have been discussing the aspect of multilingualism in historical texts for a long time. Some earlier studies show a limited selection of terms borrowed from modern multilingualism studies, but the situation has been changing since (Voigts 1996: 817-819). As an example, Voigts (1989) has studied the use of originally Latin brevigraphs in medieval English medical texts, and she gives a twofold explanation for their use. First, "science has always been heavily dependent on sign and symbol, the essence, for example, of algebraic and geometrical notation" (Voigts 1989: 94-95), and it is one of the advantages of symbols that they are often not confined to any particular language. Second, in the 15th century Latin was no more the sole language of science, as English was gaining ground on that area amongst others – a situation which resulted in a number of mixed texts (ibid.). If we consider an everyday example such as an ampersand, it is possible in a mixed text to read it as either *et* (which would cover both Latin and French) or *and*. When using the ampersand, then, it is not always necessary to decide which of these forms has in fact been abbreviated.

Voigts also provides a classificatory taxonomy of mixed text types. According to her, on the one hand texts may be written in basically one language while providing interpolation in the other language to aid the reader, and on the other hand, switching between languages may be exploited in some way, so that parts written in different languages may differ according to their specific contents, or one may be a translation of the other. She includes as a separate group also those texts which show that "languages were also mixed unconsciously" and she argues that it is possible that "when the translator came to a Latin word or phrase for which he did not have a ready vernacular equivalent … he left the Latin untranslated and plunged ahead with his task" (Voigts 1989: 96-97). I agree that the scribe may not have attempted to produce any stylistic effect with the code-switch, but I see words as *signat* fulfilling a similar role as the symbols, being semi-fixed phrases (cf. Wright 2000). Voigts actually points to a similar conclusion when she exemplifies how a symbol could easily stand for several different words (1989: 97). The idea of unconscious or even unmotivated code-switching has also been put forward by Adams amongst others (2002: 405-406), but as was shown above in connection with business writing in medieval England, the function is not always connected to the single switches themselves.

3.3. Face and politeness

Many of the functions of code-switching are clearly related to social status and social power, and therefore I have chosen to apply a pragmatic theory dealing with these factors to my material. The theory in question is the politeness theory of Penelope Brown and Stephen C. Levinson, originally formulated in 1978, which accounts for the linguistic choices that conversational participants make by referring to every person's common social wants. Even though their theory focuses on politeness, the core ideas and principles behind their argument can be applied to a wider set of acts. The model includes explicitly code-switching as one strategy for achieving politeness of a certain kind, but as will become clear later on, it is possible to apply their theory as a whole in a flexible manner to multilingual material. I will begin by discussing their theory in detail, providing criticism at relevant points. I will then move on to theories on impoliteness strategies that complement their model in the form it will be used in

this study. Finally, I will present some previous research that has applied politeness theory on both literary and historical material.

3.3.1. Politeness theory

In the heart of the theory is the concept of *face*. Brown and Levinson (1987: 61) define it as "the public self-image that every [adult] member [of a society] wants to claim for himself", and it consists of two aspects: *positive face* and *negative face*. Furthermore, face is seen as something that can be maintained, threatened, enhanced or lost. *Positive face* is defined as "the positive consistent self-image or 'personality' (crucially including the desire that this self-image be appreciated and approved of) claimed by interactants" (ibid.), while *negative face* is defined as "the basic claim to territories, personal preserves, rights to non-distraction – i.e. to freedom of action and freedom from imposition" (ibid.). In addition to face, people are also assumed to have "certain rational capacities, in particular consistent modes of reasoning from ends to the means that will achieve those ends", and the knowledge that all other members of a society have both face and these rational capacities (ibid.). These are formal premises of the theory, but since they are rather abstract, they need some elaboration.

In addition to the purely formal premises of the theory, Brown and Levinson give both aspects of face definitions that are easier to comprehend in practice, as they are both defined in terms of basic *wants*. Positive face is then "the want of every [competent adult] member that his wants be desirable to at least some others", while negative face is "the want of every [member] that his actions be unimpended by others" (Brown & Levinson 1987: 62). In other words, negative face consists of the basic needs or wants to act freely, while positive face consists of the need or want to be admired or liked by other members of the society. The theoretical background behind these definitions is mostly out of the scope of this study, and therefore it will suffice to provide some caveats and notes for their application. First, the idea behind face in interaction is that people can come to the conclusion – with the aid of the rational capacities just mentioned – that it is beneficial for all members to try and maintain each other's face, since that is the only way for a member to make sure that his own

face will be maintained (Brown & Levinson 1987: 61-62). Second, the notion of face (and rationality) is taken to be universal, but the details of the concepts may differ from culture to culture, so that negative and positive face may differ in the order of importance, or the contents of either type of face may differ.

Considering face in interaction, it is obvious that participants will inevitably threaten each other's or their own face at some points, i.e. they will perform *face-threatening acts* (*FTA*s). Politeness, then, serves as the instrument for softening FTAs, so that face could be maintained as far as possible. Of course, since this theory or model is concerned with *rational actors* (to be discussed in due course), it is clear that sometimes it is not beneficial or necessary for a participant to maintain face. In fact, FTAs performed even without redress – that is, without any politeness strategy – are also an important part of communication strategies. It is worth noting here that Brown and Levinson accept as premises the Gricean notion of the cooperative principle, conversational maxims and conversational implicature (Grice 1975), relying on them at some points during their argument (cf. e.g. 1987: 94-95 for the inclusion of the maxims in this model, and 1987: 3-7 for an added commentary on the Gricean framework). The notion of the maxims and the fact that people flout or violate them constantly is comparable to that of face being constantly threatened.

Brown and Levinson divide FTAs into categories depending on whether they threaten the face of the speaker (S) or the addressee (H), and whether they threaten positive or negative face (1987: 65-68). Acts that threaten positive face include those that indicate negative evaluation of the addressee's face or wants, such as criticism, ridicule, insults and complaints, and those that indicate indifference towards the addressee's face, such as expressions of violent emotions, mention of taboo or dangerous topics, boasting, and disregard for co-operation. Acts that threaten negative face include firstly those that predicate some act that would be performed by the addressee (and thereby put pressure on him to perform that act), such as orders, requests, suggestions and threats. Secondly a similar threat is presented by those acts that predicate a future act that would be performed by the speaker and that would be beneficial to the hearer (therefore putting pressure on him to accept this and risk incurring debt), such as offers and promises. Lastly, some acts indicate that the speaker has a positive or negative desire towards the addressee or his goods (in a very broad

sense), such as compliments, expressions of envy, and expressions of negative emotion towards the addressee. All of these threats are connected to the *addressee's* face wants, and some of them also imply threats towards the *speaker's* face. Acts that threaten[12] the speaker's positive face include apologies, acceptances of compliments, breakdown of physical control, self-humiliation, admissions of guilt, and emotion leakage. Acts that threaten the speaker's negative face include expressions of thanks, acceptances of apologies or offers, responses to any prior *faux pas*, and unwilling promises.

A number of details should be noted here. First, it is possible for an act to threaten both negative and positive face simultaneously, as is the case with e.g. expressions of violent or negative emotions. A pair of acts, such as an apology followed by its acceptance, may also threaten both the speaker's and the hearer's face. In fact, balancing between maintaining and threatening face and choosing which strategies to use is the essence of politeness. Finally, it should be noted at this stage that even though participants have, as rational actors, an option not to perform any FTAs, Brown and Levinson state that they have not included this strategy in their analysis. The reasons for this are that speakers fail to achieve their desires by following this strategy, and that "there are naturally no interesting linguistic reflexes of this last-ditch strategy" (1987: 72). Even though much could be said about silence in conversation and situations in which participants cannot perform FTAs even if they would want to, I will follow the same path and not discuss them any further. In any case, it will have become clear by now, and it is intuitively apparent, that a society would not work if no-one's face was ever threatened.

Having now established the need for both FTAs and maintenance of face, I will move on to the politeness strategies themselves. First of all, speakers go through a decision chain, where they must first decide whether or not to do the FTA. If they choose to do it, they can do it *off record* or *on record*, the latter choice leading again to a decision whether to do it with or without *redressive action*, i.e. with or without positive or negative politeness (Brown & Levinson 1987: 68-71). I will not discuss

---

[12] In fact, Brown and Levinson use also the words *offend* and *damage* when describing FTAs towards the speaker, but here I have not made any distinction between them, since the actual result of the act – i.e. its effect on participants' face – is only deducible when acts are assessed in context. This means taking into account possible reactions of the participants.

the payoffs of each choice here, but to summarise briefly, the advantage of off-record strategies is that the speaker can avoid accountability for the implications, while on-record payoffs are related to clarity, efficiency and the opportunity to satisfy or maintain face explicitly. Because even the partial lists of linguistic strategies available to speakers are long and oftentimes not related to the current study regarding all details, I will here illustrate the main groups of strategies and give brief examples of each.

Positive politeness can be divided into three groups of strategies, of which the first consists of acts by which the speaker can somehow fulfil the addressee's wants. This can be achieved by giving, for example, goods or sympathy (Brown & Levinson 1987: 129). The second group consists of strategies that indicate that the speaker and the addressee are co-operators. Realisations include such as being optimistic in assuming cooperation, offers and promises, the use of inclusive pronouns, or asserting reciprocity (Brown & Levinson 1987: 125-129). The final group includes strategies that claim *common ground* with the addressee, including then such strategies as avoiding disagreement, exaggerating sympathy with the addressee, small talk, and joking (Brown & Levinson 1987: 103-124). In addition to these, the speaker may use in-group identity markers such as address forms that imply closeness, or an in-group dialect or language, or jargon or slang (i.e. an in-group linguistic code) to claim common ground. Brown & Levinson explicitly discuss code-switching as an instrument for this, and indeed if we consider the discussion on the functions of code-switching by Gumperz and Adams, it is clear that claiming common ground seems to be one of its more prominent functions (cf. Clark 1996: 92-121 for an in-depth discussion of *common ground*). Discussing code-switching, Brown & Levinson (1987:110) also state that "switches into a code associated with external relations may, amongst other things, signal an FTA accompanied with negative politeness … [o]r it may simply signal a withdrawal of positive politeness", and further that "[a] switch in English into a spurious dialect … [may be used] to soften an FTA or turn it into a joke" (1987: 111). Both of these are then distancing strategies, but they operate on different relations. Negative politeness code-switching indicates the relative social distance or distribution of power between the speaker and the addressee, while humorous switches indicate that the speaker is distancing himself from the act which he is performing. These notions will become clearer when I discuss the formal premises of the theory.

As the preceding discussion has implied, negative politeness is connected to distancing and avoidance. One distinct strategy that can be used for avoidance, but which is left outside the notion of negative politeness, is to do the FTA off record. It was stated earlier that there are distinct advantages to being indirect, as the speaker avoids full commitment to any implicated meaning. All of the strategies included in this category are in essence violations of the conversational maxims, and those that violate the maxims of quality, quantity or relation invite conversational implicature, while those that violate the maxim of manner result in ambiguity (Brown & Levinson 1987: 211-213). However, since the strategies are deducible from the maxims themselves, it not necessary to discuss them further here. Instead, to move on to negative politeness, there are four groups of strategies associated with it. First of these contains those strategies that let the speaker avoid making assumptions of the addressee's wants. These can be realised with, for example, questions and hedging (Brown & Levinson 1987: 144-172). Second group contains acts that either give the addressee an option not to do a certain act, such as being pessimistic about his future actions, or minimize the threat (Brown & Levinson 1987: 172-187). These strategies include those that give deference to the addressee, such as humbling oneself by using special honorifics (e.g. *Sir*) or distancing address forms. The third class contains strategies that indicate the speaker's negative emotions towards the FTA, such as apologies (Brown & Levinson 1987: 187-190). Finally, the fourth option is to redress other wants of the addressee outside of the FTA, and this can be done for instance by explicitly stating the speaker's willingness to incur a debt or to not indebt the addressee (Brown & Levinson: 209-211). Examining these strategies, it is clear that several of them serve a quid pro quo function. This means that e.g. by threatening his own negative face by incurring a debt, the speaker may redress the addressee's negative face, and the latter is therefore more likely to perform the required act, which simultaneously satisfies the speaker's positive face wants.

Finally, let us consider briefly the rational capacities that form part of the premises for this theory. It is indeed the case that it would be possible to leave all of this on the level of a mere presupposition, but in fact the discussion of the rational actor model and the reasoning that conversationalists go through are a very significant part of the theory, both on formal terms and on the terms of ratio, and therefore they deserve to

be discussed. Firstly, Brown & Levinson include in their model the notion of *rationality* (1987: 64-65, 87-91). This is a central concept in pragmatics, which has been defined in many ways. Itkonen explains it thus:

> What the agent **wants** is his **goal**, and he **believes** that his action will serve as a **means** for attaining the goal. This formulation presupposes that the agent himself sees his own action as **rational** (i.e. as an **adequate** means for attaining the goal), even if it is, in fact, irrational. But we can **understand** this (irrational) action, only if we **empathize** with the agent, i.e. if we 'rethink his thoughts' and learn to **see** the action **as** rational (although we, at the same time, fully well know that it **is**, in fact, irrational).
>
> (Itkonen 2003: 58; emphasis in the original)

Itkonen, while discussing the concept of agent's knowledge more broadly, gives here also a definition for *empathy*, which is included indirectly in the premises of politeness theory in the form of knowledge about other members' rational capacities.

Secondly, Brown and Levinson (1987: 75-76) include the following factors that are used to calculate the severity of an FTA: *social distance* (*D*) of S & H, *relative power* (*P*) of S and H, and the *absolute ranking* (*R*) of the imposition. Brown and Levinson also state that they are only interested in the values presumed by the actors − not in any evaluations by researchers. Furthermore, these factors of course vary in intensity depending on the culture and the situation. With these provisos, they propose that the *weightiness W_x* of an FTA x is calculated with the following formula: $W_x = D(S,H) + P(H,S) + R_x$. This formula is shown here merely to further explain how the theory works in practice. First, depending on the factor that is the cause for the weightiness of the FTA, the politeness strategies may differ, as we have also seen to be the case. Second, the addressee is − by definition − able to work out this formula and consider its implications. Let us consider a situation where two equal intimates are in interaction, and the speaker begins to ask for something by adding together several politeness strategies, such as thus: *I'm sorry to disturb you, but I was merely wondering if it would by any chance be possible − and I would not burden you but I'm in deep trouble...* Because the addressee knows the values of D and P (i.e. that they are low), it is rational of him to conclude that the value of R must be very high (cf. Brown & Levinson 1987: 81). Now, if the addressee is to understand that the speaker is merely joking and thence actually reinforcing D and P, then this can be taken to be a case of maintaining positive face. However, another option is that the speaker is implying that the addressee would actually consider this trivial matter to

have a high R value, and thence this superficially polite form would actually be an FTA. It can be inferred from this that context plays a significant role in studying the connection between face and code-switching, which in turn justifies the application of philological interpretative methods in conjunction with them.

3.3.2. Impoliteness and criticism of the politeness theory

The model discussed in the previous section focused on the strategies that can be employed to avoid impoliteness. As was mentioned, it is possible to approach deliberate impoliteness from the perspective of Brown and Levinson's theory, but it is fair to say that it gives one a rather poor set of tools for it compared to the tools for studying politeness. As a response to the lack of focus on this particular area, several studies on impoliteness theory have emerged. For the present purpose I have chosen to discuss the framework of Jonathan Culpeper (2011). Due to limitations of space, I will not discuss the theory as a whole, but will instead focus on only two aspects that are crucial for the current topic. In a pilot study conducted on a single play, I discovered that the notion of a face-threatening act was problematic, since no difference is made between situations where face is threatened, attacked or lost. This problem has been noticed by several researchers, and I will now discuss shortly how the terminology could be modified to take this into account.

In Culpeper's view, *face-threatening act* is intimately connected with politeness instead of impoliteness, since threats "herald future damage" and the whole concept of politeness is based around the phenomenon that people take into account the fact that their acts may be threatening to the hearer's face (2011: 118). Combined with the fact that all utterances and situations are potentially face-threatening, Culpeper argues that *face-attack* is a better term for acts of impoliteness (ibid.). I agree that there is a distinction, but the reason for this is that there should be a way of making a distinction between acts that are primarily aimed at damaging someone's face and acts that are merely potential threats. The term does not become vacuous because of the fact that any situation is potentially face-threatening, since it must not be the case that people see every situation as such. This may affect the classification of some acts as inherently face-threatening, but here we are talking about two different things.

Intentionality should be taken into account, because otherwise we cannot differentiate between accidental and deliberate impoliteness. In section 3.1 I argued that pragmatic meaning should include both the notions of speaker meaning (intention) and hearer meaning (interpretation). If there is a difference between them, as there must always be in cases of miscommunication, then there should also be a way to formalise and describe this difference.

Another distinction that needs to be made is between acts that threaten face and acts that *damage* face. Culpeper (2011: 118) states that "[impoliteness] is constituted by words and actions which themselves are taken as damaging face", but it is not clear whether he means that these are, then, acts that result in face loss or whether they are acts that are seen as potentially face-damaging – a definition that would match Brown and Levinson's definition of an FTA. Surely impoliteness cannot always result in damage. For example, if the hearer fails to notice that the speaker was trying to offend him, there cannot be any loss of face. Since there seems to be no straightforward way of distinguishing between threats, attacks and loss or damage, contextual information must be applied in order to define how the situation is viewed by the participants. After all, in Goffman's original definition ([1967] 1982: 5-7) face is always negotiated by the conversational participants, and therefore we have to examine how their actions reflect possible changes in the setting.

3.3.3. Applications of face and politeness theory

Steven Gross (2000) has studied code-switching in Chicano literature by applying the politeness theory of Brown and Levinson in addition to the Markedness Model of Myers-Scotton discussed in section 3.2.2. In his study, Gross focuses on the intentions of the characters especially in situations in which low-status individuals (bilingual speakers of Spanish and English) have to interact with high-status individuals (monolingual English speakers) such as teachers or lawyers. One of the main functions of code-switching in these situations is to perform an FTA towards the negative face of the monolingual English speaker by indexing the RO set which includes the bilinguals as the powerful participants (Gross 2000: 1294-1296). On these occasions it is crucial that there are several Spanish speakers taking part in the conversation, as

otherwise it would not be possible to exclude the English speaker from it – there would be no conversation. In actuality, the speakers are not only attacking the face of the monolingual speaker, because they also enhance their own face from the point of view of the other bilinguals (Gross 2000: 1296). In other words, Spanish is employed to draw a distinction between two groups of people, which then results in face-enhancement from the point of view of the bilinguals, and face damage from the point of view of the monolinguals.

Even though these analyses seem to be correct in most cases, Gross leaves out other functions that are perceivable in individual switches, which seems to be a direct result from following the theoretical models too rigorously. For example, during one conversation between bilingual gang members and a monolingual lawyer, the lawyer tries to leave as he thinks that his clients are being uncooperative (Gross 2000: 1294). One of the gang members tries to prevent him from leaving, and then two members switch to Spanish in order to comment on the lawyer to each other, which leads to the lawyer becoming angry. Gross explains that the gang members perform an FTA by not allowing the lawyer to leave and by using an insider code, and they "intend their linguistic act to serve as a catalyst for seizing control of the direction of the discourse" (ibid.). I fully agree that this is the function of all the FTAs combined, but if we examine the individual switches, it becomes obvious that the code is also switched because of the contents of the utterances, and therefore the switches are used for coding. It is crucial to notice that the FTA could have been performed regardless of the contents of the utterance, as it is the code itself that excludes the lawyer from the conversation. However, insulting comments in English might have resulted in the lawyer leaving, which was clearly not the aim of the boys.

Finally, to conclude the section on face and politeness I will discuss some of the particularities of applying this theoretical framework to historical material. I have chosen to discuss Nevala's (2004) study on address forms and their socio-pragmatic functions in Early Modern English correspondence, because address forms constitute a discourse strategy similar to code-switching. Even though Brown and Levinson's model is supposed to be universal, its application to historical material needs to be tested. Therefore it is encouraging that in Nevala's study their theory "has proved useful and flexible [and it] allows not only the analysis of the use of politeness in

many contemporary societies, but also in historical England" (2004: 78). Nevala further states that "the fact that the model includes the variables of power and distance helps the analysis of social, interpersonal and hierarchical factors in the choice of address" (ibid.). This coincides with my own views, as a preliminary study on a single Christmas play showed clearly that the inclusion of these variables in the analysis itself aids the categorisation and the differentiation of functions. One problem that Nevala (2004: 79) notes in the theory is that "separating power and distance can be difficult, especially in historical material", which refers to the fact that social power and social distance often coincide. It seems that the best way to approach the material is then to take into account both the more static variables such as the occupations of the participants, and the more ephemeral and negotiable factors such as common ground or temporary power (cf. Nevala 2004: 262). Another problem is that there are cases where the discourse strategies under scrutiny are not analysable in terms of politeness or the variables of the model (Nevala 2004: 263). I completely agree with Nevala, who concludes that "[t]he analysis based on a single theory often must, and can, be supplemented by using other models" (ibid.). Politeness is merely a part of the whole spectrum of pragmatic phenomena, and even though certain discourse strategies are most often associated with either politeness or the variables of power and distance, it does not mean that they would be automatically restricted to them.

3.4. Methodology

For this study I have chosen a methodology that aims to incorporate both theory-driven and data-driven approaches. This means on the one hand that fitting the findings into a single theoretical model or pre-fixed categories is not an end in itself. A number of explanatory devices will be employed if the analysis demands it. On the other hand, a pragmaphilological approach is ideal, since sociolinguistic phenomena are explained with sociolinguistic and pragmatic theories. This makes it possible to connect the argumentation to broader issues of communication and interaction, while taking into account the historical, cultural and social background and the particularities of the material itself. I have chosen to present the findings without grouping them separately according to, for example, situational or metaphoric switches. The reason for this is the overlap of the categories, and as was argued in connection with

Adams's study, situational and metaphoric functions may be present at the same time. Since no single categorisation is completely satisfactory, I have chosen apply an abductive method by first using the whole set of categories discussed above and proposing changes based on the results.

One of the advantages of including pragmatic theory in the analysis in addition to the philological categorisation and explanation of multilingual practices is that the results are then comparable to those from studies dedicated to other sociolinguistic or pragmatic features. Code-switching is one of several equal discourse strategies in addition to such as address forms and prosody in conversation (Gumperz 1982: 206; Nevala 2004). By examining these strategies with the aid of face theory we are able to construct a picture of different discourse strategies and their usage in a chosen cultural and social context. One the one hand, as code-switching was shown to have a substantial variety of functions, one might want to concentrate on only one of these – such as solidarity – and for such an analysis a single theory such as the Markedness Model may prove satisfactory. However, since the material in question displays a variety of functions, it is counterproductive to try and fit all the findings into one model by force. In the approach chosen for the present study, this is avoided by taking into account several levels of meaning. On the other hand, a purely material-driven approach without linguistic theory is not equipped to explain the underlying rationality behind the actions under scrutiny.

The levels of meaning were discussed in connection with the notion of pragmatic meaning in general, and the literature review provided some examples on these. If face theory is then applied to the functions discussed in 3.2.2., we can find situations in which, for example, a code choice signals solidarity, and the reason for signalling solidarity is to achieve positive politeness (which may in turn be explained with other goals that the speaker has and so on). There is clearly a hierarchy here, although the levels of the hierarchy themselves may have fuzzy edges, or be on a continuum. It is unnecessary to go into any theoretical argument here, as my intention is merely to show how the different levels of meaning function together. This is important both for showing how code-switching relates to the communicative levels and for establishing a theoretical basis for the different categories of functions. Consider for example the following rationalisation chain: S wants X (for example some goods) from

H, and knows that by doing A (face redress), H is more likely to provide him with X (because of, for example, H's positive evaluation of S or because H feels that he is under an obligation). To achieve A, S opts for the superstrategy B (positive politeness), which includes a substrategy C (claiming common ground, which could be classified as solidarity), which is in turn achievable by the linguistic form D (code-switching into a shared language). By taking each step in the chain and analysing it as a separate level, we will arrive at a schematic representation of the levels of pragmatic functions.

The communicative level which is represented by a spatiotemporal linguistic realisation could be called the *surface level*, while the others would be *deep levels*. We could have on the surface level, for example, the function or meaning of solidarity achieved through the *means* or the *instrument* of code-switching. On the first deep level the function could then be positive politeness achieved through a positive politeness strategy (cf. Brown & Levinson 1987: 101-102). On the second deep level the function could be to achieve positive evaluation by the addressee, and the means for this would be face redress in general. It becomes apparent that the levels and their hierarchy reflect the rational actor model (Itkonen 2003: 58). On one of the deepest levels this structure could then be illustrated with language acting as the means for communication. Table 1 illustrates this schematic view:

Communicative level	Means/instrument	Function/meaning
Surface level	code-switching	solidarity
Deep level-1	positive politeness strategy	positive politeness
Deep level-2	face redress	positive evaluation by H
Deep level-n	language	communication

Table 1. A schematic representation of the levels of meaning

The levels in the table are not meant to be absolute or reflect reality, but instead they represent possible rationalisation chains. The deepest level is shown merely to enforce the point that language is ultimately an instrument for achieving something (cf. e.g. Clark 1996: 3; Lyons [1977] 1978: 32-33). Probably no rationality chain of this sort starts from such a deep level. It should also be stressed once more that this chain

does not imply or presuppose any conscious effort or planning by the speaker. Neither is it implied that the speaker has to *act* according to the rationalisation chain, but merely that the speaker has to rationalise that if he does not change his goals or if there are no other goals that take precedence, it would be irrational for him not to do the act that fulfils the goal (Itkonen 1983: 49-53).

Recalling the initial division of switches by Gumperz to situational and metaphorical, it becomes clear that this schematic representation becomes more complicated. As was argued in conjunction with the case discussed by Adams (2002: 332), in which Cicero switched to Greek in a letter to his wife when describing his illness, situational and metaphorical meaning or function may coincide, and the chain of reasoning becomes harder to follow precisely. Adding to this the special features of drama discussed by Diller, one switch can (and should) be analysed by examining the interaction both between the dramatis personae and between them (or the play as a whole) and the audience. Hence, the levels of meaning should not be applied as such, and in the present study they will serve as a tool set for further classifying the different categories of meaning.

Finally, the concept of *layering* or *layers of actions* must be discussed very briefly. As was mentioned, Diller noted how the different communicative axes of a dramatic work have to be studied separately, as they may display several different functions. Clark (1996: 353-384) argues that in conversation in general and in works of fiction in particular there are several layers of action, the upper levels being grounded on the lower levels. If we take a situation such as the acting of a play, the bottom layer consists of the actors acting and the audience watching the play. Another layer then consists of the actions taken by the characters that the actors are playing. Even though we know that the actors are only acting, we act as if the actions taken by them happened on the same layer as the one that we situate. This explains why we often feel emotional when we are immersed in a work of literature (Clark 1996: 366-367), and since we pretend that the actions are real on some layer, we can apply rationality and empathy in order to make sense of the actions taken on the other layers. To summarise this section, the selection of methodology and theoretical framework for this thesis, as was argued above, takes into account the particular features of the linguistic

phenomenon and the genre, and socio-historical and cultural factors by applying both philological and linguistic approaches.

4. Analyses of individual plays

In the following sections I will present analyses of the chosen plays. The methodology in these sections favours the philological approach, as I endeavour to explain the functions in context and to present a collection of findings than can then be discussed in further detail. Due to the limitations of length, I will not analyse all of the cases of code-switching in the texts. Instead, I will focus on both presenting as many different categories as possible and elaborating on the functions that seem to be the most prevalent. In each section I will begin with the more common functions and move gradually to the more complicated or marginal functions. The main idea of this whole chapter is to provide commentary for the examples in order to facilitate further discussion. Translations are given in square brackets after the Latin or Greek passages with possible commentary for the English parts. Transliterations for the Greek examples are given in Appendix 2, while a complete list of the examples is found in Appendix 3.

4.1. *Captivi*

Since *Captivi* comprises two distinct parts, I will start by analysing the part titled *A Dialogue Betwixt eight Youths*, which has English as its base language. The dialogue begins thus:

> (3)   Dan: Intermission! Intermission! Tis a word upon the wheel, and doth satisfie appetite aboue all Spring varieties, Summer's beauty, Autumne's grapes, or Winter's black-puddings. Tis a fat Ocium that my gutts wamble for.
>
> <div align="right">(f. 147v)</div>

Here we find a word that repeats countless times in the plays: *ocium* 'idleness'. To begin with, the spelling differs from the English borrowing *otium*, but the word is not Classical Latin either, since that form would be identical with the one borrowed into

<div align="right">52</div>

English. However, the pronunciation of these two different forms, *ocium* and *otium*, would not differ in Vulgar or Medieval Latin, since the vowel in the middle would first become a semivowel, and starting with palatalization both pronunciations /ki/ and /ti/ could end up as /ts/ (Herman 2000: 43-44). In other words, neither orthography nor pronunciation can fully decide the status of *ocium*, but the form is either English or Medieval Latin. This word is also used many times in the Latin part of the play, and it is possible then to analyse it as either a borrowing or a switch, but in both cases its use exemplifies a tradition of referring to the holiday by its Latin name in the school, which is then functionally a situational switch. Another example of such a formulaic use is the following:

(4)   Nay the Virtuosi, notwithstanding all their miracles, haue not yet allotted to them ten thousand pounds per Annum

(f. 148v)

In this example, *per Annum* 'yearly' is used instead of its English counterpart, and it is also one of the phrases that oftentimes appear in Latin in *Orationes*. As with *ocium*, it can then be classified as a situational switch. In addition to these, there are not many intrasentential switches in this part of *Captivi*.

Next, two students called Dan and Herb have been arguing in the dialogue, and we have the following pair of lines by them:

(5)   [Dan:] Farwel; take heed of Latine. Cave ne titubes, mandataq[ue] frangas [Be careful that you do not stumble and break your commission].

(f. 147v)

(6)   Herb: But, Friend, remember, if you miss of your mark – Plus fati valet hora benigni Quàm si te Veneris commendet Epistola Marti. Therefore mock on. [A moment of benignant fate is of more avail to you than a letter of recommendation from Venus to Mars.]

(f. 147v)

What we have here is disputation aided by quotations from eminent sources. The quotation in (5) is from a poem by Horace (Hor. *Epist*. 1,13,19), in which he instructs a messenger how to deliver his works to the Emperor. The breaking of commission here could refer either to failing to fulfil his duty or to damaging the scrolls them-

selves. In the play, however, the meaning is more abstract, as it refers to a failure in the choice of profession. The switch in (6) is a quotation from Juvenal's satire (Iuv. 16,4-5), in which he discusses the life of soldiers. The line has been changed slightly by dropping out the conjunction *etenim* 'for' and changing the pronoun from *nos* 'us' to *te* 'you'. Code-switching with quotations is very frequent in *Orationes*, and the reason in this context is that they give authority to the arguments of each party – that is, they are used for face enhancement. Indicative of this is the line *take heed of Latine*, which shows the authority of the language itself. If Dan's line from Horace is analysed in terms of face, it is an FTA directed towards Herb's positive face, but this function is not dependent on the code choice but the contents of the utterance. In fact, since both characters share the same linguistic competence, a switch into Latin could not be, for example, an FTA towards the addressee's negative face, but in this context it cannot be a claim for solidarity either. However, when we move to another communicative axis, between the play and the audience, the function can be analysed as both a claim for solidarity and a boasting with knowledge. The former of these maintains or enhances the positive face of the boys and the audience at the same time by claiming common ground, while the latter enhances only the positive face of the boys. Solidarity is the more likely one, since knowing that these quotations come from venerated authors is a prerequisite for understanding their full meaning. Even though Brown & Levinson discussed the effect of switching to the insider language in connection with positive politeness (1987: 110-111), the situation here is more complicated. The omission of any explanation for the quotations shows that the speakers implicitly assume that the audience do not need them, but at the same time quotations also elevate the speakers' status, so that the social distance variable is claimed to be considerably lower than what would be expected.

This analysis is applicable to other instances, too. When another student, John, states that he wants to be a scholar, Dan retorts with the following:

> (7)   Dan: Fool, hast thou so much learning, and yet hast forgot that scrap of Grammar Nihili, vel pro nihilo habentur literæ. Adeo ut sub palliolo plerunq[ue] sordido lateat sapientia. [Learning is considered worthless and good for nothing. It is for this reason that wisdom commonly hides under a filthy cloak.] But Scholars imagine any thing Concipiunt æthera mente [They perceive the firmament in their minds]. Imagination is their wealth: some of them would be poor else.

Here the situation is different from examples (5) and (6), where the contents were not strictly related to the topic, but the function is basically the same. What is worth noting here is that the first two sentences in Latin do not come from the same source. The first is from a grammar book on Latin syntax, while the second is a common proverb that has been modified to serve as the explanation of both why scholars choose to use wear rags and why they have to wear them. A likely candidate for the source of this quotation – as far the students at King's School are concerned – is Cicero (Cic. *Tusc.* 3,23,56), but in his work poverty is seen as a more positive feature. The last switch is in Gumperzian terms a reiteration of sorts, in which the concrete idea is expressed in more poetic terms. It is likely that this line comes from Ovid (Met. 1.777), but it is not a quotation in the same sense as the ones in examples (5) and (6), because the quotation has been modified from its verse form to fit better into the prose text.

It was mentioned in section 2.3.1 that the Latin parts contain some switches into Greek. They are used for the same types of functions as the switches from English to Latin. As an example of situational switches that are in effect fixed phrases we have the following from a speech where the orator is lamenting over the hardships of wintry coldness:

(8)   Sensus hebetat, cerebrum lædit, ingenium obtundit, nosq[ue] ad omne opus scholasticum plane ineptos reddit. Utinam igitur Θεο[ς] ἀπὸ μηχανῆς adesset tandem qui auxiliatricem extendens manum nos jam a limbo tanti frigoris, et tenebrarum liberaret! [It dulls the senses, damages the brain, blunts talents, and renders us plainly inept for all school work. If only there was then a *god from the machine*, who extending a helping hand would now finally free us from such a cold and dark limbo!]

This is an example of a switch whose reason lies in the semantic domain, as there was no Latin equivalent for this in the Classical period. Calling it a borrowing is problematic at least in this instance, since firstly, it is a complex noun phrase and not a single lexeme. Secondly, the Greek form is retained both in orthography (i.e. in the use of Greek script) and in phonology. The Latin loan translation (which is at the

same time a loan-formation) *Deus ex machina* is attested in English as early as the 17th century (OED, s.v. *deus ex machina, n.*), but the familiarity with the Greek original was most likely the reason for retaining the form here. In other words, there was no reason to translate the expression into Latin, as the Greek form was the unmarked one.

There are also examples of quotations that achieve the positive face enhancement function for both the speaker (or the author(s) of the play in general, depending on how one assessed the actual situation) and the audience:

> (9)　　Nec scimus nunc temporis quomodo id fiat melius quàm post studia diuturna, laxatis nunc Scholæ frænis, et solutis etiam nunc negotiorum vinculis. Hoc ut concedatur nobis, solum ὑμῖν ἐν γό[υ]νασι κεῖται, viri ornatissimi. [And we do not know how it could be better than at that time after long studies when the reins of school have been loosened and the ropes of labour opened. That we would be granted this, it only *depends on you*[13], most illustrious men.]
>
> (f. 145r)

This is a complicated case, since here we can see the overlap or interplay of several categories. On the one hand the Greek switch is a fixed or formulaic phrase, and on the other hand it is a quotation from Homer (Hom. *Il.* 17,514 and 20,435), who is a representative of Greek literature par excellence. In this way it is very much like *Concipiunt æthera mente* in example (7), as both of the lines have been slightly adjusted, but it is worth noting that while the Ovidian line has been adapted to the prose text, the Greek switch here retains its dactylic hexameter form. In other words, the former may be an allusion to Ovid, but the latter certainly is an allusion to Homer. This strategy is of course doubtless when the author is explicitly mentioned:

> (10)　　Nimium certè ocij non petimus. Vetat id Hesiodus noster dum sic præcipit, Μέτρα φυλά[σσ]ε[σ]θαι. Καιρὸς δ' ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἄρισ[τ]οσ. Opportunitas igitur temporis cessationem a studiis paulisper efflagitat. [Certainly we do not ask for too much leisure. Our Hesiod forbids it, when he commands thus: *Maintain due measure. Proportion is best in everything*. An opportune moment therefore demands idleness from studies.]
>
> (f. 146v)

---

[13] Literally: 'it rests on your knees'.

As the speaker quite clearly states, the Greek part is quoted from Hesiod (Hes. *Op.* 694). It is intriguing that the author is mentioned rather seldom, regardless of who it was. The function is slightly different here than in example (9), because in (9) the quoted line is used mainly for positive face enhancement or solidarity, while in example (10) we are dealing additionally with negative politeness. Because of the overlapping categories, this does not fit satisfactorily into any particular strategy that Brown & Levinson discuss, but in essence it combines the superstrategies of minimising the imposition (1987: 176-178) and communicating the reluctance of imposing on the addressees (1987: 187-209), as the judges (the audience) are being assured that the captives will not ask for excessive freedom and that they could not even ask for it, since they are advised otherwise by an eminent authority. This shows that the multiple layers of meaning may become clear only when text outside of the switch itself is considered.

As a final example from *Captivi* there is one sentence containing code-switching that is quite unlike the ones discussed above. One speaker has been listing all the terrible after-effects of studying grammar, and he has the following to say of prepositions:

(11)   Præpositionibus ὕσ[τ]ερον πρότερον arseverse abutuntur. [They abuse prepositions *topsy-turvy* arsy-versy.]
<div align="right">(f. 144v)</div>

Listed with other horrors of grammar, this statement is rather hard to interpret. There does exist a Latin word *arseverse*, which is an incantation for warding off fire, but I believe that here the form is merely a variant spelling of *arsy-versy*, since it is basically synonymous to ὕστερον πρότερον, *hysteron proteron* 'topsy-turvy'. What we have here, then, is a rare case of intrasentential code-switching from Latin to Greek, from Greek to English and back to Latin. The function is a stylistic one in that the juxtaposition itself results in a structure that could be described with these words. In other words, the whole sentence itself is rather arsy-versy. In this case the actual code choice does not matter, as long as it belongs to the common repertoire of the audience. Any relative prestige attached to a language does not alter the meaning of the switches. What makes example (11) even more complicated is that there is again

a possible candidate for the source of the Greek phrase, as far as the students are concerned, since Cicero uses it in one of his letters to Atticus (Cic. *Att*. 1,16,1). This means that the switch to Greek can also been seen as solidarity between the audience and the students.

4.2. *Certamen Doctrinale*

The English part of *Certamen Doctrinale*, titled *A Dialogue betwixt four schoolfellows*, differs from the corresponding one of *Captivi* in that the students are not engaging in disputations between each other. Instead, they discuss the hardships of studying in a friendly fashion. Many of the functions are comparable to those in *Captivi*, as can be seen from the following examples:

> (12) our teeth chatter in our head; our brains are soe frozen that wee cannot cry out with the Poet Est Deus in nobis, agitante calescimus illo [There is a god in us. When he moves, we become inflamed].
>
> (f. 93r)

> (13) I think, Iemmy, the fat's in thy head: but for the Ocium that must be obtained by our Superiours. With whom I hope Art will haue soe much power, if our Natures cannot prevail, as to grant us a relief from our hard taskmaster, or as they call him in greek Ἐργοδιώκτης [Taskmaster].
>
> (f. 93r)

There is again a quotation serving as an intersentential switch in example (12), this time coming from Ovid (Ov. *Fast*. 6,5). There are two points worth mentioning in this example: first, the identification of Ovid as *the Poet* might indicate that he was perceived as a particular favourite, especially since a similar reference is used in *Captivi Grammaticales & Professionary Options* (f. 6v) and in *Grammaticae Partes II* (f. 435r), albeit in the Latin form *Poeta*. However, the same word is also used for others such as Horace (f. 200r) and Virgil (f. 201v) in *Colloquium de Rhetorica*. Hence, this word does not help in identification, but it is again likely that the audience knew who was being quoted – or at least that the phrase is a quotation from some poet. Second, Ovid's original line has a figurative meaning (that is, the mind becomes inflamed), but here it is adapted with a concrete sense. I view these word

plays the same way as Adams views the fragmentary quotations (2002: 337) in that they emphasize solidarity or belonging to an in-group, and therefore they function for positive face enhancement.

The reiterated Greek translation of *taskmaster* in (13) would be hard to analyse if one were to omit the other texts from the study. This is a word used as a euphemistic nickname for the grammar teacher – most probably Lovejoy himself – and it appears also in *Captivi Grammatical & Professionary Options* (f. 4v) and *Orationes Hyemales* (f. 377v). There are also other euphemistic names that are used to refer to him, such as *Priscian* (e.g. f. 93r), and in fact this strategy does not differ from using such nicknames for the school itself, such as *Tullianum* in example (2). To sum up, Ἐργοδιώκτης, *Ergodiōktēs* serves as a useful euphemism, but it also has a solidarity function similar to *Ocium* in example (3).

As another example of reiteration, we have the following example:

> (14) To goe to school, to what purpose, to use illud Cassianum[14], Cui bono [that maxim of Cassius: to whose benefit]? Preferment sleeps in Ladies \lapps/; and what canst thou get by thy long doating nights studies, unless it be a little Latine, and Greek. And what advantage wilt thou get by that? only thou art a Scholar forsooth; and canst begg in Latine, and Greek.
>
> (f. 93v)

This section is interesting in terms of syntactic elements and motivation for code-switching. The noun phrase complement *illud Cassianum* 'that (phrase, maxim etc.) of Cassius' could well be in English, since there is no apparent reason in the words themselves to activate code-switching, and by using English the switch would no longer be intrasentential. However, the switch into Latin is actually a single unit, which has most likely been taken from a speech by Cicero (Cic. *Mil.* 32 or Cic. *Phil.* 2,35) in which he invokes this famous ideal, apparently promoted by Cassius, that in legal proceedings it is crucial to determine the real beneficiary in any situation. In addition to the obvious function of enhancing positive face as in several examples discussed above, the particular allusion to Cicero and legal activities provides a rhetoric overtone to the passage, and it is therefore classifiable as a stylistic switch. No-

---

[14] Lucius Cassius Longinus Ravilla was a Roman politician and judge in the 2nd century B.C.

table here is also the humoristic juxtaposition of stating that studying is good for nothing and using a Latin phrase for developing the argument at the same time.

Right before this we find a cluster of multilingual strategies, as Iemmy answers to Tony's complaints of being exhausted mentally and physically:

(15)   But if wee could haue time to play, it would be phisick for our witts, hearts, and backs too, that wee might be fit one day for our Priorums, and Posteriorums in the Academy. To which wee all aspire, but are loth to take pains to fit ourselves for soe happy a translation. To which Dick, I think thou'lt never attain, thou hast such an idle, and blockish pate For thou art altogether in As in præsenti, but knowest nothing of Propria quæ maribus.

(ff. 93r-93v)

First, there are two words that clearly have roots in Latin: *Priorums* and *Posteriorums*. They refer to the examinations taken on Aristotle's logic and philosophy of science (cf. OED, s.v. *Priorums* and s.v. *Posteriorums*). Most likely to the students and to their audience these words could have been used as code-switches, because they could deconstruct their structure and the meaning behind the words. The structure or form of these words is worth consideration, since both of them are in the plural genitive. The way of referring to a particular book in an ancient work with a genitive is a development found in Late Latin (Löfstedt 1959: 134-135), and in this case the whole referent of the word, *Liber priorum analyticorum* 'the book of prior analytics', is difficult to deduce without any further background information. That is to say, for a person who knows Latin well enough these words stand for a longer expression, while for those who know no Latin the form is completely inconsequential. However, even though the lexemes themselves could have been used either as loanwords or as switches, the English plural suffixes in both words indicate that they have been integrated to the recipient language and are therefore not instances of code-switching (cf. section 3.2.1). These are, then, special learned loanwords, which serve as a testimony to the multilingual society of the time.

Perhaps more opaque in example (15) are the phrases *As in præsenti* and *Propria quæ maribus*. The latter is an unfinished quotation from a grammar rule relating to

the genders of proper nouns. We can compare it with the following rule from William Lily's grammar:

(16)   Propria quæ maribus tribuuntur, mascula dicas. [Proper nouns denoting seas should be in the masculine gender.]

(Lily 1672: 12)

This is the first rule of the section, and incidentally it has given the name for the whole part of rules, both in common speech and in written works. For example, in a particular aid for the studying of grammar by Charles Hoole, the first section is called *Propria quæ maribus Explained* (Hoole 1657: 1). The switch in (15) could then be seen as merely referring to a particular work or a chapter by its title – very much similar to the abovementioned borrowings in (15) – but it is altogether likely that the students and their audience were aware of the rule itself in the Latin grammar. The other switch can be compared to this grammar rule relating to the conjugation of verbs:

(17)   As in praesenti perfectum format in avi [Verbs with *–as* in the present tense form their perfect with *–avi*]

(Lily 1672: 53)

The same comments are applicable here as with *Propria quæ maribus*, as the quotation is not comprehensible without knowing the rest of the rule, and this phrase was also used to refer to the whole section in grammar books. The exact source for them is not important, as in any case the function for the switch from the point of view of communication between the students and the audience is solidarity. Without understanding what the switches mean and the immense amount of common ground that has been presupposed, it is not possible to even know whether Dick's progress in his studies has indeed been slow or not.

From the point of view of the characters, the switch can hardly be analysed as a positive politeness strategy, since the main function of the whole utterance directed towards Dick is to threaten his positive face. The claim *thou hast such an idle, and blockish pate* indicates the speaker's negative evaluation of the addressee's personal characteristics – a part or an aspect of his positive face (Brown & Levinson 1987: 66). The sentence containing code-switching has a similar goal, as it is an expression

of ridicule. Since the other characters are supposed to recognise the switched phrases, it seems that on the one hand they are used to claim common ground with the other students. On the other hand they are used to perform an FTA by implying that, compared to the other students, Dick has a different relation with the two aspects of grammar referred to here. In other words, the pragmatic function of the utterance is face-related *exclusion*. However, this function is not attached only to the code-switch, but instead the switch enables Iemmy to perform the FTA by first asserting common ground with all the listeners. By using this somewhat indirect way of insulting Dick, Iemmy avoids a possible FTA towards his own positive face, because he does not mention explicitly his own progress in his studies, which might result in expressions of disapproval by the other listeners.

Near to the end of the dialogue we find a rather surprising function for a switch from English to Latin. As the students rejoice over the approaching holiday, a monitor arrives and reproaches them:

> (18)   [D:] And therefore farwell Priscian, and all his trinketts. Ocium! Ocium! Ocium!   Intrat Monitor.
> Mo: Quid vos hîc agitis, Pueri? mihi videmini garrire, et nugas agere. Tacete, vel vos docebo gnaviter quid sit Ocium canere, priusquam à Decano, et Præceptore ocium obtinuistis. [What are you doing here, boys? It seems to me that you are prating and playing the fools. Be quiet, or I will show you diligently what comes from celebrating over leisure before you have obtained it from the dean and the teacher.]
> T: Quæso ne mihi succenseas. Putavi enim Oratores satis lusus a majoribus nostris impetrâsse. [Please do not be angry with me, for I thought that the speakers had managed to procure sportive joys from our superiors.]
>
> (ff. 93v-94r)

As was mentioned in section 2.2, the students were required to speak Latin in school, and therefore the switch in the presence of a monitor would be classifiable as a situational switch. However, there is also a metaphorical function as far as the communicative axis between the characters is concerned, for the switch into Latin is an FTA that threatens the negative face of the four students. That is to say, it brings out the asymmetrical power relations between the younger students and the monitor. In this case Latin as an in-group identity marker is out of the question, because clearly the contents of the exchange show that there are no appeals to a low D-value. Instead,

there are several aspects connected to a high P-value and negative face. First, the monitor's threats predicate a future act A (whatever it may be that he intends to show the students) that will be done if the students do not do some future act B (in this case, be quiet), which then puts pressure on the addressees to do this act B (Brown & Levinson 1987: 65-66). Second, Tony begs for forgiveness and gives reasons for their misbehaviour, both of which Brown and Levinson (1987: 189-190) classify as negative politeness strategies. It is clear then that this exchange in general takes advantage of the asymmetrical power relations, as was argued above.

If we now consider the switch by the students in example (18) by taking into account the school customs, it is clear from the above analysis that there is no solidarity function to be found. Neither should the switch be analysed as only situational, as the students must switch into Latin if they are to avoid punishment. The monitor makes it perfectly clear that English is not tolerated:

(19)   Mo: Cur autem anglice loquimini, et non magis de studijs, rebus serijs, et honestis confabulamini? Ignoratis quorum in præsentia adestis? Nulli hîc adsunt, vel potius adesse debent, illiterati. [But why do you speak English, and why do you not instead talk about studies, of serious and respectable matters? Are you presently ignorant of such things? There is none – or better, there should be none – here lacking education.]
M: Doctissimi nonnunquam viri nugis, et indoctis stultorum sententijs, hoc præsertim tempore, gaudent. Et præterea hæc nostra garrulitas nihil mali intus habet.[Sometimes most learned men take pleasure in trifles and the unlearned ideas of fools – especially at this time. And therefore this prating of ours does not contain anything improper.]
Mo: Hoc instar omnium mihi displicet. Et, si Præceptor audiret, væ vestris natibus. Sed quinam docti sunt illi qui vestris confabulationibus tantopere delectantur? fortasse indocti, qui nullam nisi linguam anglicanam intelligunt. [This displeases me as much as everything else. And if the teacher heard this, woe to your buttocks! But who are then those learned men who are so delighted by your chatter? They are probably uneducated, as they do not understand anything but English.]
(f. 94r)

This passage is particularly insightful for its take on the general opinions on languages expressed by the students, but also for confirming the function of the code-switch. The fact that the students were speaking English is apparently indicative of the casual nature of their discourse, which brings out the comparison between the

two languages. The effect of the monitor's arrival and the switch into Latin is the same as a direct command, as the students are required to switch their language, too. This example shows very effectively how a situational switch should also be considered from the point of view of any possible metaphorical functions. Having concluded the discussion on the dialogue part, I will now move on to the Latin speeches.

The Latin part of the play with the speeches for *Ars*, *Natura* and *Exercitatio* contains only a few switches to Greek. One of them is a rather enlightening case of intrasentential switching:

> (20)   Quisquis enim Exercitationem contemnit similis est ijs, qui, cum reptare vix possint, volare tamen aggrediuntur asbq[ue] pennis. Aut etiam similis ijs, qui cum ὀ[υ]δε γράμματα sciunt, ὀ[υ]δε νεῖν, nec summo aquam pede tetigerunt: tamen sine cortice natare moliuntur. [For anyone who does not value exercise is similar to those who scarcely know how to crawl, and yet they set out to fly without wings. Or they are similar to those who know *neither the letters nor how to swim*, and have not touched water with the tip of their foot, yet they strive to swim without any aid.]
>
> (f. 89v)

The switched phrases function together as the object for *sciunt* 'they know', and it is because of the relatively free word order of Latin that the switches have been spread out. To understand the syntactic properties and the function of this switch, it must be noted that the idea expressed here is based on a Greek proverb. We find one version of this from Plato:

> (21)   τὸ λεγόμενον μήτε γράμματα μήτε νεῖν ἐπιστῶνται [as the saying goes, they know neither the letters nor how to swim]
>
> (Pl. *Leg.* 3,689d)

The choice of conjunction (i.e. ὀυδε *oude* or μήτε *mēte*) does not make any noticeable difference here, and the more notable fact is that the verb ἐπιστῶνται, *epistōntai* 'they know' is included. Even though the proverb may have been truncated to exclude the verb, it is curious that the passage in (20) should not have included a Greek verb instead of the Latin one. The status of this passage is further complicated as it must have been copied from Gabriel Harvey's 16th century treatise on rhetoric:

(22)   Verum si sine Exercitatione, studio, diligentia, commentatione, instrumentis meis nihil possunt, ne hiscere quidem: sed perinde faciunt, vt ij, qui cum reptare non queunt, volare tamen aggrediu[n]tur sine pennis: aut etiam ut ij, qui cum ὀ[υ]δε γράμματα sciunt, ὀυδε νεῖν, quod est Graecis hominibus in prouerbio, nec summo aquam pede vnquam tetigerunt, tamen sine cortice natare moliuntur [Truly, if they are not able to do anything without practice, study, diligence and preparation – my instruments – they cannot even open their mouths. Instead, they do just as those who cannot crawl, and yet they set out to fly without wings. Or they are similar to those who know *neither the letters nor how to swim*, as the Greek saying goes]

(Harvey 1577: 94)

The part with the code-switch has been reproduced almost without modification, and by comparing the two texts it becomes clear that the students have used Harvey's work as a basis for their speeches. The structure and several ideas have been borrowed from it, but it has to be stressed that the majority of the text is original, even if the argumentation is not. In fact, it is worth noting that Harvey employs switching into Greek quite often in his work. In (22) the switch resembles the partial quotations discussed by Adams (cf. section 3.2.2), as the readers are clearly expected to understand the meaning of the Greek passage without any explanation, and this was then the unmarked code choice for a quotation. Regarding the switch back to Latin on the verb, there are two possible reasons for this: first, even though it was shown in (21) that there were literary examples for this phrase, it is possible that the usual form of this proverb did not include the verb, because the meaning is clear even without it, and this way the form was not tied to any specific grammatical person or number. Second, the syntactic structure of the sentence may have contributed to this choice, since this way there is only a single code used on the level of the verb (with *sciunt*, *tetigerunt* and *moliuntur*), and the subject pronoun *qui* is in the same language as the verbs. This is not to say that there is a strict constraint on the switch, but rather that syntactic factors may have contributed to the choice in addition to pragmatic factors.

If we now consider the function of the adapted switch in *Certamen Doctrinale*, it is evident that the background provided by examples (21) and (22) complicates the analysis to some degree. It is impossible to say whether the majority of the audience would notice that this passage was not original, but it is safe to assume that it would

not have escaped the teachers' attention. However, it is of little consequence, since the solidarity function that I have proposed in similar cases is quite valid if the listeners were familiar with the proverb in general. If we want to propose another function such as a display of having read Harvey's work – a positive face enhancement strategy – it should be noted that this function is not connected specifically to the switch, but to the complete passage, and to be precise it would apply to the play as a whole as far as it is based on Harvey's work. To sum up, the code-switches have a solidarity function, which serves as a positive face enhancement strategy directed towards both the audience and the students. Here we find combined two strategies of claiming common ground: the use of in-group language and presupposition of common knowledge (i.e. the meaning of the proverb). As the original switches in example (22) did for Harvey, those in (20) display the unmarkedness of the code-choice for the students. I will return to the subject of markedness in section 5 with further evidence.

4.3. *Grammaticae Partes I*

As the English dialogue of *Grammaticae Partes I* is related not only to school matters in general, but to aspects of grammar in specific, one might expect to find a lot of terminology in Latin. This is not the case, however, and it is most likely that the roles of the three scholars in this dialogue were played by younger students, who had studied Latin mostly through English. As was mentioned in sections 2.1 and 2.2, the reason for learning the particularities of English grammar was to achieve a better understanding of the structure of Latin. The following examples show that the students are not merely talking about their studies in English, but they are talking about studying *in* English:

(23)　　**J**: Why, Sam, all that wee, or any speak is comprehended in Grammer.
　　　　S: Grammer? O woe is mee that ever I was sent from Hamburgh to learn either English, or Latine Grammer! There is a name of a thing that they call Noun, which would to God I had never heard, felt, or understood. One stands by itselfe. The other is held up by I know not what.

(f. 319r)

(24)   **S**: Fah! Fah! As for Number, though they call it Singular, or Plural, it hath brought upon mee innumerable troubles. And for your Cases, when I consider their signes A, The, Of, To, The, For, From, By, and Than, I am brought to a plain Delirium.

(f. 319r)

In example (23) it is explicitly stated that the students studied also English grammar, while in (24) the list of case markers shows how the grammatical description of some languages was superimposed on all others (cf. section 2.2). These examples were shown here to demonstrate that even though Latin seems to be in some plays the unmarked code choice for discussing grammar and especially when referring to grammar rules, the constraints are not present in all situations. In fact, it does not seem possible to allocate only one language the unmarked status, as both Latin and English are used at different points.

Right at the beginning of the dialogue we find a code-switch that is not related to grammar in any way, but is instead a reiteration followed by a switch back to the original code also reiterating the message:

(25)   **J**: How now Sam? What all amort?
        S: Ah, Jemmy, not only amort; but pene mortuus [almost dead]. For I am almost dead, and buried under the sad thoughts of my tormentor. A thing which is worser then death Grammer, Jemmy, Grammer.

(f. 319r)

Even though *amort* is used here in a figurative sense, the Latin switch is synonymous, while the switch back to English is a word-for-word translation. The Oxford English Dictionary places the first occurrence of *all amort* at the end of the 16th century, and as such it is quite a recent borrowing (OED s.v. *amort*). Whether the students or their audience were inclined to classify it as a French word is irrelevant regarding the function. The switches are employed here for intensifying reiteration, which can be classified as a stylistic code-switch. As with example (11), it is worth noting that the choice of a particular language for reiteration does not make a difference, as the function is not tied to any sociolinguistic or pragmatic factors associated with the particular languages used for switching. The meaning would be the same even if the order of the switched languages was changed, or if one of them was swapped for another language.

Stylistic switching in general seems to play a more significant role in this dialogue than in any other play, as wordplays such as puns are employed for humour. This is apparent in the following example, in which phonetically similar words are used together:

(26)   **S**: O Jemmy, They have engender'd so much trouble in my soul, that ingeminating Hic hæc hoc, I haue brought upon mee such a terrible Hiccough, that I cannot rest, nor sleep in the night. And I must begg the help of some good Doctor, lest I Hic hæc hoc myselfe into worse than nothing.

(f. 319v)

In this example the Latin pronouns *hic*, *haec* and *hoc* 'this' are not *used* but merely *mentioned*, which means that the words have a metalinguistic function (Lyons [1977] 1978: 5-6), as the forms are used in order to refer to the forms themselves. The list of words represents demonstrative pronouns that were also used when citing word forms to indicate the gender of a noun. In fact, they were presented in grammar books as articles (cf. Lily 1544: 4). Although one could argue for some solidarity function when references to learning grammar are in question, example (26) relies only on the phonetic similarity of *hiccough* for its effect, and therefore I would not analyse it as a case of intertextuality, even though Brown and Levinson state that jokes imply shared background (1987: 124). Instead, because it is not necessary to understand the pronouns in order to notice the phonetic similarity and to understand the joke in general, I see this as an instance of enhancing the positive face of the audience by claiming some other type of common ground. The situation is somewhat different in the following examples:

(27)   **J**: But what think you of the Participle, Adverb, Conjunction, Præposition, and Interjection?
        S: I think no better of them then Hui, vah, apagete [Hah! Ah! Away with you!]

(ff. 319v-320r)

(28)   **Jo**: But methinks, Sam, the Verb is very easy.
        S: Easye doe you call it? Personal, Impersonal. I am sure tædet it irketh is all the comfort I haue received yet.

(f. 319v)

The joke in (27) is that although Sam has expressed negative opinions regarding grammar studies, he quite aptly scorns interjections with appropriate words, as *hui* is an interjection "of scornyng", *uah* "of disdayning" and *apage* "of shunnyng" (Lily 1544: 46-47). In this case the stylistic function is more dependent on the common ground shared by the students and the audience, as more academic knowledge is needed to understand this passage than the one in (26). In (28) again the choice of an impersonal verb is the basis for the joke. This form may well be taken straight from a school book, as the same formulation is found in one book under the list of impersonal verbs:

(29)   And suche as haue no persons, be called impersonalles, as Tedet, it yrketh, oportet, it behoueth.

(Lily 1544: 18)

The solidarity function is not necessarily based on the audience recognising the exact source of the switched parts. It is sufficient to notice that they are rules learned in the schoolroom, which asserts common ground just as a direct quotation with a reference, and therefore the switches in examples (27), (28) and (29) are positive face enhancement strategies. As was argued, example (26) serves this function as well, but common ground is not asserted only through code-switching, but through the utterance as a whole. Furthermore, the meaning of the utterance does not rely on intertextuality but on the ability to notice the phonetic similarity of the key phrases.

In addition to the humorous switches relating to grammar topics, we find one quotation that is similar to the ones discussed in the preceding sections, but even here it is not merely the *languages* that are being juxtaposed:

(30)   **J**: But be you quiet, say nothing, whilst our Orators are pleading for our release from this our Purgatory.
S: If soe, then peace: and wee hope to catch a mouse. Retire and be gone in silence. But I am afraid of that old saying Parturiunt montes nascetur rediculus mus [The mountains are in labour, and a ridiculous mouse will be born].

(f. 320r)

The pleading refers to the Latin speeches that were to follow, and which were hoped to succeed in gaining a holiday from the dean. The Latin quotation is taken from a

poem by Horace (Hor. *Ars* 139), and it has later become a common proverb referring to great promises but disappointing results. As with several examples discussed in the previous sections, the audience is supposed to recognise the quotation and understand what it means, and therefore it enhances the positive face of the listeners. It also demonstrates the level of the students' learning, which again enhances their positive face. Claiming common ground is not, however, the only meaning of the switch, as it serves an additional stylistic function by being juxtaposed with *and wee hope to catch a mouse*. The mouse that is being referred to here is related to the *redicilus mus* 'ridiculous mouse' mentioned in the quotation.

4.4. *Discipuli et Rustici*

As was mentioned in section 2.3.1, *Discipuli et Rustici* is an atypical Christmas play, and therefore I will begin with the English dialogue between four students, which is closer to the style of the other plays. Near the beginning we find a clear example of situational code-switching:

> (31)   **Quar**: Why? I haue worne my lipps almost thredbare in kissing my hands that they might keep a mannerly proportion with my leggs: and was fain to screw my face, and gird my neck so long till my very eyes began to piss tears. At last, after many a cringe at a lamentable acclamation of Quæso, Præceptor, da mihi veniam abeundi mictum [I beg you Teacher, give me leave to go urinate], the honest man in black gave me a nodd, and out came Pilgarlick.
>
> (f. 280v)

As the students were required to speak Latin in school, it would be the unmarked code choice in the classroom. As Gumperz noted, even quotations and reported speech that are not taken from literary sources are often given in their original code (1982: 75-76), and therefore it is not surprising that where a direct quotation is used, there is no need to code-switch back from the original language. It is worth bearing in mind that a code-switch may actually indicate a situation in which the speaker did not deem it necessary to translate the message.

Another typical function, which is prevalent in the majority of the Christmas plays in general, is represented by the following examples, which include complete or partial quotations or allusions to grammar studies:

(32)   **Sec**: Noe, noe. That's too easie a punishment. Take such a slave, and first hang him up; then disrobe his podex, then claw his breech with peice of Qui mihi.

(f. 280r)

(33)   **Quar**: Noe matter. I'll put it to hazard. This martyrdome of books is a great device contra Omne quod exit in um seu Græcum, sive Latinum [against everything that ends in –um, be it either Greek or Latin].

(ff. 280v-281r)

(34)   **Sec**: Oh! How your Adverbs will swear, and curse, as by Pol, Ædepol, Hercle, and Mediusfidius too.

(f. 281r)

To begin with (32), the reason for the code-switch is that *Qui mihi* is the name of a poem and it is highly unlikely that there was any English equivalent in use. The name comes from the first words of the poem: *Puer qui es mihi discipulus* 'Boy, who art my student', and it was written by the eminent grammarian William Lily. The poem is a manual of etiquette for schoolboys, and it was sometimes included in books with Lily's grammar (e.g. Lily, Haine & Robertson 1687: 99). The example also contains the Latin borrowing *podex* 'arse', which is used as a euphemistic expression instead of a more vulgar word. The switch in (33) refers to the neuter gender, and the list of intrasentential switches in (34) is a list of swearwords. These can be compared with the following extracts from grammar books:

(35)   Attamen ex cunctis quæ diximus antè notandum, Omne quod exit in um, seu Græcum, sive Latinum, Esse genus neutrum [But of all of those that we have mentioned above it should be noted that everything that ends in –um, be it either Greek or Latin, is of neuter gender.]

(Lily 1672: 12)

(36)   Some of swearing, as Pol, ædepol, hercle, medius fidius.

(Lily 1544: 41)

As can be seen, (33) is a part of a certain grammar rule pertaining to the gender rules of nouns. This is a clear case of intertextuality which was intended to be noticed by

the audience, and therefore it is an example of a claim for common ground and a positive face enhancement strategy. This quotation is a prime example of a situation in which the switched passage needs background information to be understood at all. As far as (34) is considered, it is impossible to decide without other evidence, which books the students had used, but the similarity with (36) is most likely no accident. It is not uncommon that children learning new languages have to learn lists of some sort by heart even today, and the point of interest here is that this seems to be one such list. Therefore I see no difference in the functions of (33) or (34), both of them indicating solidarity through a claim for common ground.

It should be added that the intertextuality found in the above examples is foregrounded several times during the dialogue:

(37)　**Ter**: Give me your fist then. My pate is bigg with an excellent politick treason.
Sec: Against whom I pray?
Ter: Marry against the burch scepter of old Mr Lilly.

(f. 280v)

(38)　**Sec**: Our resolves are to make old Lilly dye like a martyr in the flames of his own Grammar.

(f. 280v)

These examples offer valuable information on the reading material of the students, but they are also of interest for comparing pragmatic functions. Without going into any more examples, it should be noted that considering the dialogue as a whole, intertextuality (and common ground) is not achieved only through code-switching, but several different strategies operating at the same time. Finally, the solidarity function of these switches is also applicable to the communication within the play between the dramatis personae. However, there is a slight difference of meaning, as the solidarity towards the audience elevates the status of the students, while solidarity between the students is solidarity between equals. In other words, although solidarity implies a low D-value, it is a different aspect of social distance that is affected in the different communicative axes.

Moving on to the play proper, there are several instances where the students chat with each other in a manner similar to the dialogue parts in each play. When the students want to express intimacy with the other students, one might expect that they do this by switching into Latin. There are, however, cases where a switch into English is used for this purpose:

(39) [**Eu**:] Et, ni fallor, maximè sollicita est, ne expectationibus vestris injuriam faceret. (Intrat Philaster) Quod si – [And if I am not mistaken, she is anxious about doing injustice to your expectations. (Philaster enters) But if –]
Phi: Quod si – Put on your hat my submissive peice of learned hypocrisie. I marvel what makes you soe humble this morning.
Eu: Phil, welcome.

(f. 283v)

As Latin was the language of the schoolroom, a switch into the marked code, English, is metaphorical distancing from this situation. This solidarity function stresses again a low D-value, and in this case what is implied is the two boys' friendship outside the school setting. This function is also achieved through the use of address forms *my submissive peice of learned hypocrisie* and *Phil* – both of which emphasise closeness and therefore function as positive face enhancement (Nevala 2004: 88; Brown & Levinson 1987: 107-108, cf. also 124). These two discourse strategies are then employed simultaneously for the same function.

In some cases, solidarity is achieved with Eugenius and Philaster switching from English to Latin, as in the following example, where they have been talking with the town crier (Præco):

(40) **Eu**: Nay, if your wits grow soe tart to abuse your best friends, Adjeu.
Præ: Sweet master, my lungs are at your perpetual service. Exit
Eu: Mirum est, Philaster, animadvertere appetitus hominum inexplebiles. Quorum (quasi tot furiis impulsi) mores flagitioso cuivis opprobrio mancipatos prostituunt, dummodo rem faciunt sibi, et opes congerant [It is astonishing to observe the insatiable desires of men, Philaster. As if incited by so many furies they prostitute their morals, selling them to anything shameful and dishonourable, as long as they themselves make money and collect riches.]
Ph: Eo scilicet dementiæ plerosq[ue] mortales adigit fames auri inexplebilis, ut lucro potius suo, quàm nomini, aut moribus consulant [Evidently for that reason the insatiable hunger for gold drives many

mortals to madness, so that they have more regard for their profit than for their name or their morals.]

The contents do not immediately seem to demand the switch, and since the town crier, who speaks only English, has left the stage, the pragmatic meaning must be connected to sociolinguistic factors between the students. The difference between (39) and (40) is that here the insider language does not emphasise the same type of intimacy as before, but instead it shows that Eugenius and Philaster have a shared educational background. These examples affirm Gumperz's argument that often "it is *the choice of code itself in a particular conversational context* which forces this interpretation [of personalisation]" (1982: 83; emphasis in the original), as either code may be used for solidarity, even though the nuances may differ.

Moving now away from solidarity, there are several points in the play where people of different social status get into arguments, and this naturally leads to FTAs. A few times code-switching is also chosen as the discourse strategy for this, and usually it produces humorous effects, as in the following example, where Grammatulus has just arrived on the scene speaking to himself in Latin, and Credulio and Trunks decide to address him:

(41) **Cr**: And verily he is a wonderous ready scholard at it. Young gentleman, may I presume to spur you a question, or two?
Gram: Mene, si placet, alloqueris? aut num quid me vis, obsecro? [Please, are you talking to me? Pray, what do you want from me now?]
Cr: Immò ego vult habere aliquid res, dic latinè with you. [Nay, I want do some business, speak Latin with you.]
Tr: Out, Mr Credulio, out, all to be out. You have forgotten those toys long since.

Grammatulus threatens Credulio's positive face when he does not switch to the language which is used to address him. This is a signal of Grammatulus's possible uncooperative attitude, and it also puts a constraint on Credulio to answer in Latin, which further threatens his negative face (Brown & Levinson 1987: 66-67). Credulio's answer in Latin is quite interesting for the current topic, since it is inelegant and grammatically incorrect, and therefore his attempt to repair his positive face

fails utterly. This results, of course, in actual face damage. As is evident from the following remark by Trunks, it was not only the case that the audience was to laugh at Credulio, as he was also humiliated within the confines of the play. In other words, on the one hand the audience can laugh at the idea of someone speaking incorrect Latin, and on the other hand the characters themselves, mainly Grammatulus, see him as committing a faux pas. As the conversation continues, we receive a confirmation for this interpretation:

(42)   **Cr**: Why truly to my knowledge I have not look'd on my Grannum these twonty good years.
Gra: I am confident therefore in my hopes, Grave S^r, you will excuse the rudeness of my answer. Our schoole statutes confine me to noe other dialect.

(f. 285v)

If we consider the character of Grammatulus, he is shown here to have threatened Credulio's face by accident, as he would assume everyone else to be able to speak Latin. In Gumperz's terms (1982: 77) the switch into English in (42) would be classifiable as addressee specification, while Adams (2002: 350) calls this *accommodation*, which is again a subtype of solidarity. The former is problematic, since it is not the addressee that changes, but the relation of the speaker to the addressee. The latter is also unsatisfactory, as it is better suited to situations such as those in examples (39) and (40), where solidarity is clearly the main function. However, it is quite simple to describe the situation using the notion of face: in (41) Grammatulus threatens Credulio's face by implying that he may be uncooperative, but his code-switch in (42) implies the opposite. Solidarity is connected to social closeness, and I do not see that this could be the case here, because other factors, such as the address form *Grave S^r*, belong to negative politeness (Brown & Levinson 1987: 179) and indicate social distance, i.e. a high D-value. A better term would be *inclusion*, which could then depending on the context be related to social status, or it could be used for structuring the discourse, i.e. *facilitative code-switching*.

At the end of the play there is another instance of code-switching used to perform an FTA, but this time the threat is directed towards the negative face of the addressees. The students have just finished the play that they acted with the villagers, when the

headmaster Philoponus arrives and is appalled by the ruckus he finds in the school. The students have been speaking English for some time now, but when Philoponus has uttered a few exasperated remarks to himself, he addresses his pupils:

(43)   [**Philoponus**:] Numen testor, Apollo, tuum! Quænam intemperiæ nostram agunt scholam? Quid sibi velint ignoti subselliorum incolæ? Quid cathedræ barbatâ graves reverentiâ? Bone Jupiter! itane fatis comparatum est, ut, quos ego hinc abiens reliqui impuberes, tam citò maturescerent, ut jamjam a pueris illico nascerentur Senes? Philaster, quis malus Genius literariam hanc adeò turbavit familiam? [Apollo, I call your power to witness! What insanity possesses our school? What does this mean: strangers occupying the benches? And how about the teacher's chairs loaded with bearded dignity? By Jove! Have the fates so arranged that those whom I left as youths have so quickly matured that now from boys they have instantly grown into old men? Philaster, what evil spirit has so disturbed this school family of ours?
Ph: Nobis, si placet, libris incumbentibus venerunt. [If you please, they came to us when we were devoted to our books.
Philo: Qui, malum! venerunt, impudens? [Damn it! Who came, you impudent fool?]

(f. 292v)

Initially it could be claimed that this is merely situational switching, since the students were required to speak Latin in school. In fact, at the beginning of the play Philoponus is instructing Grammatulus as he is leaving to attend to some matter:

(44)   **Gra**: En baculum, si placet, tibi. Et si quis interea absentem quæritet, pace tuâ te abiisse dicam. [There is your walking-stick, if you please. And if someone seeks you while you are away, I will tell them by your leave that you have gone away.]
Phi: Non ita nimis diu hinc abero. Quocirca, si per negotia liceat, expectet me domi quisquis convenire velit reversurum evestigiò. Atq[ue] audin? fac moneas Eugenium de epistola quam patri suo descriptam volui, ut ad reditum perficiatur. Satin memor es? [I shall not be away for very long. For that reason, my errand permitting, if anyone wants to meet me at home, he can expect me to return instantly. And do you hear? Remind Eugenius of the letter that I wanted to be written to his father, so that it is finished when I return. Will you remember all that?]
Gra: Dabo quidem operam ut satis. Num quid obsecro me vis præterea? [I shall certainly take care to remember it. Pray, what else do you want from me?]

(f. 282v)

Here the code-choice is only due to situational factors. There is no perceivable tension between the two characters, as the polite expressions *si placet* 'please' and *obsecro* 'pray' indicate only the asymmetrical power relations, i.e. a high P-value (Brown & Levinson 1987: 101, 178-187). In (43) the headmaster's impatience is evident from the harsh words *malum* 'damn it' and *impudens* 'impudent'. Moreover, in analysing the function of (43) there is a wider context that needs to be taken into consideration. Before this, the students have been free to do as they please and to use whatever language they choose. Latin has before this been to them a way to claim power in interaction, but in (43) they have no choice but to switch to Latin. The Latin of the headmaster is a metaphorical order to speak Latin, and therefore it is a threat to the students' negative face (Brown & Levinson 1987: 66). The situation continues when Philoponus addresses the elderly villagers regarding their business at the school:

> (45) **Philo**: Compellabo, ut sciam. Senes, ipsa salus vos sospitet. Num quis è vobis colloquium expetivit meum? [I will address them, so that I will find out. Elders, may health itself protect you. Which one of you was seeking a conference with me?]
> **Tr**: You are deceiv'd in us, godfather Black-coat. Speak to your children in latine. Wee are good old boyes in English.
> **Philo**: Lepidi sunt, ni male conjicio, et festivi admodum Senes. Proin quo magis fruar, alloquar, ut intelligant. [If I am not mistaken, they are charming and altogether pleasant elders. Therefore I will be the more delighted to speak so that they will understand.] Gentlemen, 'tis my happiness to see you soe merry within my libertyes.
>
> (f. 292v-293r)

This situation is similar to the one in examples (41) and (42), but here Philoponus explicitly comments on the code-switch that he is about to perform. This is an inclusive switch, which is used to facilitate the conversation by letting other speakers join in, and it also indicates cooperation and therefore it enhances the positive face of the addressees. Since I explained this type of switching in conjunction with examples (41) and (42), I will not dwell on it further, but will move on to the next switch in the same conversation, which affirms my analysis of example (43).

Now that the conversation has switched into English, Credulio mentions that he had brought his son to the school to be examined, and Trunks informs him of what has happened:

(46)   **Tr**: Mr Credulio, one of this Gentleman's scholars took the boyes examination, and thought him fitting for the Schoole
Philo: Nostin tu quis partes anticipavit meas Hujus examinando filiolum? [Do you know who took over my duties in examining the son of this man?]
Eu: Ni fallor, Grammatulus. Quocum ego non ita pridem deambulantem vidi puerulum. [If I am not mistaken, it was Grammatulus, with whom not long ago I saw the boy walk away.]
Philo: His approbation gives mee content. S^r, doth it please you to give mee my entrance for your Jacky; as a pledge of what you will pay me hereafter for his education.

(f. 293r)

Whereas in (43) Philoponus did not actually switch languages – the switch was tied to the situation – here he switches from English to Latin in order to address Eugenius. Again, as with example (44) there is no indication of any tension between the characters anymore, but this hardly affects the function of the switch. This is still an FTA to the students' negative face. As with (43), the students are no longer portrayed as being in control of the events and perhaps possessing the most power in interaction, as they are now constrained to the utmost degree: they cannot speak without being spoken to, and they cannot answer in any other language than Latin. To them, competence in Latin can on the one hand grant them interactional power and social status, but on the other hand they are not always free to choose the language of interaction. Therefore it is not the case that bilingualism automatically results in more power in communication.

As can be seen from example (44) and as was argued in section 3.2.1, situational switching is usually intersentential, and moreover the switch takes place over a long stretch of discourse. However, in the play within the play there are a number of intrasentential switches that are tied to the demands of the genre. Blunt is playing the role of a justice of peace, and Knobbs is his servant. Trunks is accused of not having raised his hat when meeting Blunt, in addition to appearing drunk in public and taking oaths lightly. When Knobbs reads out the sentence, he switches into Latin when referring to the particular statute in question:

(47)   **Kn**: Imprimis for contempt of authority, You are adjudged by the Statute De scandalo Magnatum equorum [concerning slander against

horse magnates] made anno domini Guilielmi imperatoris octavo, vigesimo quarto die Novembris Quadragintesimoq[ue] to sit in the Town pidgeon holes like a Stock dove until you hatch a brood of better manners – Item for being overtaken with a cup of Nimis, your pennance is to drink nothing but, fair water as long as the discretion of your Magistrate shall think fitting. Lastly for being a Swearer.

(f. 291v)

The phrase *De scandalo Magnatum equorum* refers to the name of the statute and *anno domini Guilielmi imperatoris octavo, vigesimo quarto die Novembris Quadragintesimoq[ue]* to the day that is was made official. Both of these expressions are types of formulae that would be used in order to follow the legal protocol, which is exactly the same explanation that I gave to the switches into Latin when pronouncing verdicts in Greek areas in section 3.2.2 (cf. also Schendl 2000: 82-83). It is true that there existed a *statute de scandalis magnatum*, which could be applied in a case of slander against a high-ranking person (Coventry & Hughes 1832, s.v. *scandalum magnatum*), but the expression of the date seems to refer to nothing actual at all. The metaphorical function of both switches becomes apparent when we take into account the layering of actions discussed in section 3.4 (Clark 1996: 353-360, 364-366): on the top layer, the servant's switch is situational and probably mandatory, while on the layer below it, Knobbs switches into Latin in order to provide authenticity to his character. On the bottom layer, the level on which the students are acting and the audience are watching, the switch is used ultimately to provide a humorous effect by using complicated legalese. It should be added that this humorous effect is dependent on both the fact that Latin was the unmarked language of the law, and that on the other layers of action the switch is perceived as a successful and not a humorous switch (cf. Clark 1996: 366-367). Both Blunt and Knobbs have been portrayed as buffoons, and this further enhances that characterisation.

In addition to the aforementioned phrases, the words *Imprimis* and *Item* are also technical terms. Firstly, if we consider their functions, they are used similarly as the longer switched phrases in example (47), but on the layer of the play within the play they also organise the discourse (cf. Schendl 2000: 82-83). In other words, they are facilitative switches. Secondly, they occupy the grey area on the continuum between loanwords and code-switching, because they have been for a long time in frequent use in English (OED s.v. *imprimis, adv.* and *item, adv.*). I will return to the problems

that these words present in section 5.2, but suffice to say they represent a case in which it is not desirable to make a distinction between borrowing and switching, especially if we consider the functions of these words. It does not matter at all whether they are to the speakers or the hearers established loanwords or not, as all of their functions, both situational and metaphorical, remain the same regardless of the status of the items themselves.

5. Discussion

In the preceding sections I dealt with the four Christmas plays separately, but in the following three sections I will address all of the findings and problems of the analysis together as a whole. I will also relate the discussion to the socio-historical background and the theoretical framework of this thesis in order to answer my research questions and to draw conclusions relating to other matters that have appeared during the process. For this section I have inverted the logical order of the research questions, since the discussion on form relies heavily on the discussion on functions. Therefore, I will begin with the functions of multilingual practices in section 5.1 and continue in 5.2 with their syntactic forms. In 5.3 I will re-evaluate my methodology and the theoretical framework in addition to addressing the implications for future studies.

5.1. Functions of multilingual practices

In this section I will discuss the functions of code-switching that were found in the analysis, bringing together the findings and comparing several instances of the main types of functions. I will begin with some of the more common and typical functions and move progressively towards the rarer functions. However, due to the limitations of space I will not discuss all of the functions again in this section. Instead, I will focus on the aspects that demand more discussion and comparison.

It seems that the most common types of switches passages in the plays were quotations from Classical authors. Most frequently these were analysed as achieving intertextuality, which was then most often employed for enhancing the positive face of

the speaker or both the speaker and the hearer. If we look at the function more close-ly, there are usually two different types of face-enhancing strategies that can be per-ceived simultaneously. On the one hand, the students were most likely required to show their learning during the speech days, and from that point of view intertextuali-ty would enhance their own positive face. On the other hand, since the quotations assume and claim common ground, they also imply social intimacy or a low D-value, which then results in solidarity. In the case of the audience, the students assume that they understand what is being discussed, and therefore they imply that the audience have skills in the Classical languages and know Classical literature, which enhances the positive face of the audience. From the point of view of the students, the common ground that they are claimed to share with the audience implies that they are in some ways similar, which then results in the aforementioned assumption of a low D-value. Since the audience consisted of people of high social status, as was mentioned in sec-tion 2.3, the students are able to raise their own status temporarily. These are then cases of *self-face-enhancement* or *self-promotion*. This type of function was not in fact discussed by Adams (2002), who nevertheless focused on other types of solidari-ty to a notable degree (e.g. 2002: 322-323). I am more inclined to associate it with the negotiation of power and status studied by Davidson (2003) and discussed in sec-tion 3.2.3, but the difference is that here the switch also enhances the positive face of the audience. In other words, intertextuality functions both as solidarity and as self-promotion, the two functions being distinguished according to whose positive face they enhance.

In order to fully understand how solidarity through intertextuality works, it is neces-sary to examine how the quotations are constructed. First, the list of quoted authors contains the following names: Cicero, Hesiod, Homer, Horace, Juvenal and Ovid. Depending on how example (20) is analysed, we could add Plato to this list, but due to the fact that the whole of example (20) has been adapted from the passage by Ga-briel Harvey in example (22), this does not seem advisable. Now, all of the authors that were quoted in the text can be found in the school curriculum discussed in sec-tion 2.2, but sometimes it is stated more explicitly which works by the said authors the students should read. Of Cicero's works, only *De Officiis* and his speeches are explicitly mentioned (Woodruff & Cape 1908: 133), which means that there is no evidence in the school documents that *Tusculanae Disputationes* or his letters were

read. However, there are explicit comments regarding his letters in *Grammaticae Partes I* (f. 325v) and *Colloquium de Rhetorica* (f. 199v), which demonstrate that the students most likely read the letters as a part of their education. In addition to this, Cicero's letters were used in other countries as elementary reading material (Lagus 1890: 13, 21, 28, 41, 56, 67-68), which makes it possible that they would have been used also in the King's School. Second, if these instances were to have a solidarity function, what was it precisely that the audience were required to notice in them? In chapter 4 it was shown that a clear minority of the quotations included the name of the author, the only one being Hesiod in example (10), but several of them indicated in some way that the switched passage was a quotation, such as the phrase *hast [thou] forgot that scrap of Grammar* in example (7) and *the Poet* in example (14). In fact, it is enough for the audience to notice that the switched passage is a quotation, and even such a vague reference as *the Poet*, discussed in section 4.2, does narrow down the list of possible authors.

Since quoting from ancient authors is such a prevalent feature in these plays, there is reason to believe that there are also quotations that are not signalled by overt code-switching. This is exactly what we find in the plays, such as the following example from *Captivi*:

(48)   Illos spero nihil aliud prolocuturos quàm quod et multum prosit ipsis et vobis non parum placeat. Illud enim apud benevolos Auditores semper obtinuit / Non displicuisse merentur / Festinant dominis qui placuisse suis. [I expect them to say nothing but what will both greatly benefit themselves and give you pleasure in no small quantity. Surely that has always obtained benevolent listeners. / Those do not deserve to displease, / Who hasten to please their masters.]

(f. 144r)

The poem is modified from Martial's original (Mart. *Epigr*. 31(32),1-2) as the first verse starts in the middle, the speakers are in the plural, and they address not Caesar but their patrons. However, the original metre has been preserved even though the number of syllables has been altered. The situation is similar to the unfinished quotations discussed by Adams (2002: 337), as it is assumed that the hearers are able to draw a connection between the two versions. Even though this example does not display a formal code-switch, I would argue that lines such as these are very important

and insightful for multilingualism studies. First, example (48) gives indication on the possible reading material of the students and the reading habits in general of the upper classes, just as the ones that include code-switching. Second, if we compare this with other cases of intertextuality, we can predict that regardless of the base language this quotation would be presented in its Latin form. In other words, there would be a *code constraint* or *tendency*. This is similar to the concepts of situational switching, semantic constraints on code-switching and markedness, discussed in sections 3.2.1 and 3.2.2.

In some cases the quotation has been modified not only to suit the current situation, but to serve an additional function, as in the following example:

> (49)   Artifices, qui corporis tantum labores exercent, recreant se nonnunquam, et cessant à laboribus. An non æquum est igitur ut studiosi aliquando id faciant? Certè, ut mihi videtur, æquissimum. Nam, ut inquit Cicero oratorum summus, Graviora sunt illa quæ persequimur ingenio, ac ratione, quàm quæ viribus. [Artisans, who occupy themselves with so great bodily toil, refresh themselves often and cease from working. Is it not then fair that students do this sometimes? Certainly, it seems to me, it is most fair. For as the most distinguished orator Cicero says, those things that we pursue with intellect and reason are more burdensome than those that we pursue with our strength.]
>
> (f. 146r)

It seems that the students have chosen a very good source for their argument, and the quotation is formally very close to the original. The only difference is that, instead of *graviora* 'more burdensome', Cicero said of intellectual pursuits that they were *gratiora* 'more pleasing' (Cic. *Off.* 2,46). The joke is apparent only to those who have read the passage in question, and this group would presumably include the learned part of the audience, since, as was mentioned above, *De Officiis* was part of the curriculum. Now, there is no code-switch to be detected in this passage either, but just like example (48) it serves as evidence for the reading habits of the students, and there is also a clear code constraint for two reasons. As was argued above, quoting ancient authors in their original language was an unmarked choice for the students, but in addition the humorous effect is only apparent in Latin, since *graviora* and *gratiora* are phonetically similar. These examples show that if only code-switched pas-

sages in the strictest sense are included in an analysis, valuable information on the multilingual practices is lost.

Returning now to the question of what intertextuality actually comprises, another type of solidarity strategy was very prevalent in the texts, namely references to grammar and grammar books. In these cases, the audience need only recognise the fact that the switched passages relate to these topics, and even though sources for these switches could be located, it is not feasible to claim that the students have necessarily taken the passages from the books. This is because they are drawing from a shared pool of knowledge that is served in similar form to all children who study grammar. In fact, it is not even necessary to remember exactly what a certain rule refers to, but considering the historical and cultural background of these plays it is hardly convincing that either the audience or the boys themselves would not have known what they were talking about. In some cases, knowing the exact meaning of the grammatical quotations is central to understanding the meaning of the whole utterance, as was shown in conjunction with *As in præsenti* and *Propria quæ maribus* in example (15). The references to grammar are then similar to the cases where the switched passage is actually a common proverb or a saying, such as in examples (7), (20) and (30). These instances often overlap with the cases where a source can be identified, and in those cases the range of common ground is different for those speakers who know the phrase as a proverb and for those who know it also from its original context.

The other type of solidarity function that was analysed in the plays was that between two social equals. In the dialogue parts of the plays there were often quotations similar to the ones addressed to the audience, but their primary function was not analysed as solidarity in any of the cases. Since intertextuality implies presupposed background knowledge from the hearer, it is always a claim for common ground between the students, and therefore the positive face-enhancement function is also present. It is of course possible to use intertextuality without the audience noticing it, but in that case the solidarity function would fail. There were instances where characters used code-switching as a solidarity function without any intertextuality, namely in examples (39) and (40). As I argued in section 4.4, there is a difference between situations where the students switch from Latin to English and vice versa to signal social inti-

macy. When they switch from Latin to English they indicate that they are friends and have a shared background without the context of the school, as a switch away from the language of studying signals also a move away from the school situation. When they switch from English to Latin, it is the shared educational background that is being claimed. In other words, even though in both instances indicate a low D-value, the implied similarities are of different kinds. These examples show firstly that functions are not always tied to specific languages, and secondly that other discourse strategies and features such as address forms should also be taken into consideration.

As was said above, intertextuality in the dialogues does not primarily indicate solidarity between equals, or at least not the same kind of solidarity as between the students and the audience. One of the functions was to create a humorous effect with references to grammatical features or specific grammar rules as in examples (26), (27), (28), or to proverbs or quotations from Classical authors as in example (30). Again, these are of course positive face-enhancement strategies, because "jokes are based on mutual shared background knowledge and values, [and therefore they] may be used to stress that shared background or those shared values" (Brown & Levinson 1987: 124). The humour in these examples seems to be situated on the axis between the students and the audience, while from the point of view of the characters themselves the references to grammar are situational switches. Even though the switches in the dialogue part of *Discipuli et Rustici* were mostly used for solidarity, the use of *Qui mihi* in (33) carries also a humorous meaning, since a round of spanking with a book does sound rather amusing.

Intertextual switches into Latin were also used to perform FTAs, as in examples (5), (6), (7) and (15). These were all directed towards the positive face of the hearer, but there were some differences between the examples. In (5) and (6) the quotations from Classical authors serve as face-enhancement for the speakers. Brown and Levinson do not discuss this phenomenon, but using their framework it could be explained by arguing that the speaker is claiming common ground between himself and the person being quoted, which implies similarity with the author and therefore a low D-value, which then temporarily elevates the status of the speaker. In other words, the situation is the same as the one discussed above where the students claim common ground with the audience. Similar face-enhancement is also to some extent part

of example (7), where the quotations have been taken out of their original context in order to change their meanings and to manipulate them in order to strengthen the argument. This is of course only applicable to the communicative axis between the characters; between the students and the audience, the modified switches are used for solidarity. In (15) there is no appeal to any eminent authors, but instead there is a claim for common ground between the speaker and the other students excluding Dick.

As was discussed in section 3.3.2, Brown and Levinson's model does not offer adequate tools for analysing impoliteness, and the four examples discussed above demonstrate this quite aptly. Since in the context of examples (5) and (6) Dan and Herb have already been arguing for some time, there is firstly no reason to give the code-switched passages any special status. In other words, the general function of threatening the other participant's face is achieved through several different strategies throughout the conversation. Secondly, it is not immediately clear why these acts threaten the addressee's face. The most logical explanation would be that in (5) Dan expresses disapproval of Herb's choice of profession, while in (6) Herb shows disagreement with Dan's evaluation (Brown & Levinson 1987: 66). However, this function is then actually connected to only the *contents* of the utterance, while code-switching only *enables* the speaker to use the quotations. These examples show again how focusing on only the actual code-switching limits the analysis, and in fact I would argue that these instances should be taken equally into account in studies on multilingualism, even though it is not the act of code-switching itself that produces the FTAs. In other words, the FTA is not the result of code-switching, but the particular strategy chosen for the expression of impoliteness is only possible through code-switching. Even though the code has to be switched in order to be impolite, it is not the language that is offensive. Thirdly, as the discussion in section 3.3.2 indicates, these are not actually *threats* to the hearer's face but *attacks*, since one of their main functions is to insult the addressee. There is no indication of face-loss in these instances, but the back-and-forth jousting displays the characteristic of each participant trying to reclaim compensation for the FTAs by enhancing his own face and simultaneously attacking the addressee's face.

Compared to examples (5), (6) and (7), the FTA in (15) is somewhat different. It functions as social exclusion, as was argued in section 4.2, meaning that in addition to ridicule (Brown & Levinson 1987: 66), Iemmy implies that Dick is to some extent dissimilar to the others. This is an indication of a higher D-value than in the case of the other students. Being that the characters are perceived as if they were rational beings (cf. section 3.4), they use empathy to reason that the speaker must be trying to be impolite towards Dick. Finally, it should be noted that one could argue that example (15) is merely a case of friendly jesting, which would actually be an instance of positive politeness that would lessen the abovementioned FTA (Brown & Levinson 1987: 104 and 124). There are in fact several instances in the same dialogue where the students attack each other's face without there being any arguments, but in this case I see the face-enhancement effect coming from the general practice of jesting rather than the individual instances being positive politeness strategies. This is apparent from the following response by Dick to Iemmy's accusations:

(50)   D: You need not talk of my blockish pate. For I scarse know any one in the Schoole such a Rakehell [i.e. 'a rascal'], and Truant as thou art. Thou'lt doe no thing without the Clavigers[15] come to rouze you out of your bed, and to dragg thee to school as a bear to the stake.

(f. 93v)

The need for Dick to reclaim his face by reciprocal attacks against Iemmy's positive face is similar to examples (5) and (6), but the FTAs are completely separate from the main discussion. To sum up the argument, it seems that the function of the switches in (15) is to perform an FTA, even if their impact may be somewhat lessened by the fact that it is a form of friendly jousting with words.

Moving now away from intertextuality, there were also other instances in which the function of code-switching was to perform an FTA. In examples (18), (19), (43) and (46) the FTAs threatened the addressees' negative face, while in (41) the FTA threatened both the addressee's positive and negative face. As was discussed in the previous sections, threats or attacks against the hearer's negative face are interesting in this context, because bilingual competence does not solely result in additional inter-

---

[15] As was mentioned in sections 2.2 and 2.3.1, *Claviger* refers to the usher, who taught the rudiments of grammar.

actional power and social status. It is also notable that in all of the instances where only negative face is threatened, the aggressor is part of the school staff: a monitor in (18) and (19), and the headmaster in (43) and (46). Since the thematic contents of most of the Christmas plays focus on the hardships of school life, it is not surprising that some scenes of reproach would be shown during the performances. In addition, only in the case of (46) the aggressor himself switches languages; in other cases only the base language of the situation changes. To be more precise, there is a change in the markedness of each language to the extent that the linguistic choice is made in order to avoid physical punishment. In this context markedness and unmarkedness differ slightly from Trubetzkoy's (1958: 141) definition of natural unmarkedness discussed in section 3.2.2, as the unmarked form is the one that the norms of linguistic behaviour state (cf. Itkonen 2003: 15-17 and 136-137; Clark 1996: 75-77). The argument developed here means in effect that the function of an FTA would be present even if there was no switch in language by any participants, as long as the markedness of the code choice changes. Even though I criticised Myers-Scotton's Markedness Model in section 3.2.2, the terminology that emphasises *code choices* instead of merely switching (Myers-Scotton 1998: 21; cf. Scotton 1989: 115) should be commended. I will return to this subject in section 5.3.

The FTA towards Credulio's face in example (41) was discussed in some detail in section 4.4, so only a few words need to be said about it here. First of all, if we compare this situation to the FTAs in examples (5), (6), (7) and (15), it seems quite clear from the context that Grammatulus does indeed perform a face-threatening act instead of an attack. In other words, it is not probable that the FTA is performed intentionally. One might argue that this is not the case, and that he intended to insult Credulio, but contextual and comparative evidence seems to refute this interpretation. Firstly, Grammatulus uses the same polite expression *si placet* 'please' and *obsecro* 'pray' that he used when addressing the headmaster in example (44), and these clearly indicate deference (Brown & Levinson 1987: 101 and 178-187). Secondly, of all the other examples of FTAs, none of them contains any indication of negative politeness, though there are instead cases of positive politeness address forms, such as the generic term *Friend* in (6) and the possible nickname *Dick* in (13) (Brown & Levinson 1987: 107-110; Nevala 2004: 88-90), and the insult *Fool* in (7). Thirdly, the situation is almost identical to example (45) in which Philoponus addresses

Credulio and Trunks in Latin. Again, judging by the context and the polite formula-tion of his utterance, there is no reason to analyse it as a deliberate attack. Of course, the possible psychology of the characters is of no concern to us – only the meaning negotiated between the actors and the audience is important, and it seems to point quite clearly to an unintentional FTA. What actually damages Credulio's face is his own failure to produce correct Latin, and I see a connection between this and the French euphemism of the Wife of Bath discussed in section 3.2.3. Davidson (2003: 476) argued that a switch into French fails to elevate the Wife's status, and it further emphasises the fact that she does not belong to the higher levels of society. I added that the switch into French is therefore humoristic from the point of view of the read-er, and in the case of Credulio it is the audience that get to laugh at him. On the communicative axis between the actors and the audience, then, the switch also func-tions as a claim for solidarity just as any other joke.

Some of the plays contained euphemistic switches in the style of Wife of Bath men-tioned above. The ones mentioned in the analyses were Ἐργοδιώκτης 'Taskmaster' in example (13) and *podex* 'arse'[16] in example (32). The former is used as a nick-name of a sort, and it therefore serves a solidarity function, as was argued above. The latter is used as a more typical case of euphemism to avoid universal taboo subjects together with *breech*, which refers to the same part of human anatomy, and both of them therefore enhance or maintain the hearer's positive face (Brown & Levinson 1987: 67) as well as the positive face of the speaker, who is shown to care about the addressee's face wants (Brown & Levinson 1987: 103-104). The switch in (31) to Latin when discussing urination cannot be analysed a euphemism, since in addition to *mictum* 'to urinate' the utterance includes the expression *my very eyes began to piss tears*. There is, however, one more case where the switch could be analysed also as a euphemism, namely the solidarity switch into Latin in example (40). Eugenius talks about prostituting morals, and it could be argued that the reason why this is in Latin is due to the fact that putting this sort of material in the mouth of a schoolboy would be too shocking in English. This does seem plausible, but I would still argue

---

[16] The Oxford English Dictionary's first reference to *podex* is from the year 1601, but it is worth bear-ing in mind that the citation is taken from Ben Johnson, who is infamous for his spontaneous Latin borrowings (OED s.v. *podex, n.*).

that there is also a solidarity function which is completely separate from the contents of the switch. This is not problematic, since the former functions takes place on the communicative axis between the actors and the audience, while the latter is situated on the one between the characters of the play. It is important to realise that in general euphemism is not tied to any single language, as in most cases any prestigious language can be used to achieve the same function. The choice of code is then dictated mostly by the expected competence of the audience.

Finally, the stylistic switches in examples (11) and (25) remain to be discussed. Even though both of these use code-switching for reiteration, the nuances differ. In (25) the switch is somewhat simpler and perhaps a stereotypical case of reiteration, as it is used to lend stress to the matter under discussion by emphasising the reiterated expression – a feature which is also a typical rhetorical device. If we analyse it in terms of face, it is possible to say that it enhances the positive face of the speaker by displaying his rhetorical skills. However, the context of the switch and the whole of the communicative situation need to be taken into consideration, since otherwise the analysis will be inaccurate. If we examine the function of this switch from the point of view of the characters, its function is primarily related to trying to convince the hearer, while from the point of view of the audience the students are displaying the skills that they have been taught in school. The switches in example (11) serve the same communicative function between the actors and the audience, but here the switch does not serve as an emphatic device. Rather, the statement itself serves as an example of what has been discussed.

5.2. Forms of multilingual practices

The three questions relating to the syntactic forms of code-switching (as discussed in section 3.2.1) concerned the following factors: the morpho-syntactic forms of code-switching, the relation between switching and borrowing, and the (universal) constraints on switching. I will discuss these questions in relation to my material and the findings of the analysis, beginning with borrowing and code-switching. I will then discuss briefly the connection of the forms and functions together with some comments on the constraints.

There were a number of cases in the examples where a word or a phrase could be classified as either a borrowing or a switch, and in which furthermore the function was not dependent on the decision to classify the form as one or the other. In other words, even if it suddenly became clear that an unclear form was definitely a borrowing, the analysis of its function would not be affected. The immediate problem is then, obviously, how to decide whether a form is a borrowing or a switch. One way would be to examine whether the forms have been assimilated to the phonological and morphological constraints of the recipient language. Another way is to use frequency (and ultimately psycholinguistic factors, cf. section 3.2.1) for making the decision. This approach is individualistic, as it relies on the ways that individual speakers understand the status of each form. Yet another way is to examine whether the speech community as a whole has the form in their inventory, which would indicate that its status has been solidified. In this case, frequency is also an important factor. If we analyse the problematic forms found in the analyses, it becomes clear that none of these approaches is satisfactory on its own.

To begin with, two of the most problematic and illustrative cases, *imprimis* and *item,* were presented in example (47). I already established in section 4.4 that they occupy the grey area on the continuum between borrowing and switching, and that their function could not decide the matter. If we analyse the words taking into account their historical development, we are able to see that it is actually almost impossible to decide which category they represent. Of the two words, *imprimis* is slightly more complicated, since it can be either a borrowing that cannot be analysed further into elements, or a regularly assimilated form of *in primis* that was used already in Classical Latin. However, its usage as a listing word is attested only in Late and Medieval Latin (Löfstedt 1959: 111-112). *Item*, then, is formally and semantically identical both in different varieties of Latin and in English. This means that the status of *imprimis* could be decided according to psycholinguistic factors, since (philologically uneducated) speakers should not be able to use it in English in its Classical meaning of 'especially', but in its later meaning of 'firstly'. Nor should they be able to deconstruct the form to show how assimilation has produced the word. However, this would only prove that the speakers are not switching into *Classical* Latin, as the word is both formally and semantically identical in Medieval Latin and English.

If we consider the other grey area cases, we can see again that they present similar problems. I discussed the problems with *ocium* in section 4.1, and retrospectively the phonological problems it presents are similar to the ones presented by *imprimis*. Even though both of these words were given a similar analysis regarding their function – they were both situational – the difference is that *imprimis* is ultimately constrained by the requirements of genre conventions shared by the whole of the English speakers in Britain, while *ocium* is constrained by the smaller speech community, which comprises the school and those affiliated to it. If *ocium* is classified as a borrowing, it should in fact be classified as a cultural borrowing, since it refers not to idleness in general but to a school holiday. It also differs from *imprimis* in that it is a much later borrowing in English, and the Oxford English Dictionary gives 1611 as the first occurrence of the word (OED s.v. *otium, n.*). Example (18) illustrates the status of the expression quite well, as *ocium* is found in both the English and the Latin passages. In other cases phonological and morphological factors are clearer, as is the case with Ἐργοδιώκτης, *Ergodiōktēs* 'taskmaster' in example (13) and the pair of *Priorums* and *Posteriorums*. In the case of Ἐργοδιώκτης, even though the word is not a loanword from the point of view of Britain as a whole, it may have been used frequently enough to be classified as one from the point of view of the school community.

If we consider the different ways of distinguishing between borrowings and switching discussed above, we can firstly conclude that morphological and phonological factors cannot solve the problem completely. Secondly, in the case of *Item* and *Imprimis*, psycholinguistic matters are to some extent applicable to both of the words, but in the case of *Item* the only question that could be asked is whether the speakers feel that the word is Latin, English or both. Semantic information could only decide the status of *Imprimis*, and even in its case we might only prove that if this is a case of switching, the switch is made into a certain variety of Latin and not another. Thirdly, if we consider how the speech community itself viewed these words, we have to concede that both the students and their audience most likely had these words in their repertoire, which would indicate that they are actually used as loanwords.

Even from these few examples it becomes clear that it is indeed impossible to make a clear distinction between borrowing and switching in a synchronic study, as for example Gardner-Chloros has noted (2010: 195). As was discussed in section 3.2.1, Winford (2010: 182) amongst others believes that switching of single lexemes and borrowing should be seen as subcategories under a single bilingual strategy. From the pragmatic point of view this seems reasonable, but it should be noted that all that Winford's statement does is combine the two phenomena under one umbrella term; it does not actually define how they differ from each other. Since this question continues to be debated in even the most recent studies, it is worth mentioning that similar approaches have been discussed much earlier. For example, Hermann Paul addresses the topic from a somewhat different perspective in his *Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte*, originally published in 1880, as he does not differentiate between switching and borrowing as such. One of his frequent dichotomies is that between *usual* and *occasional* usage of forms (Paul 1960: 75-76), which he applies also to situations in which languages are mixed. In his view, as with any other linguistic change, a form is first used occasionally (that is, by individual speakers) and gradually the form may become usual (that is, shared by the community) and therefore also more useful (Paul 1960: 393-394). Myers-Scotton (1993: 168-176) described the same situation by stating that borrowings are the result of initial code-switching. Paul's notion of bilingualism is very broad, and he includes in his discussion speakers who could be classified as academically bilingual (cf. Paul 1960: 390-403), as has been done in this thesis. He notes (1960: 396) that the new words are often introduced by people who have a high competence in the source language, and therefore they may retain the original pronunciation and even continue to do so even if the word has been accepted by the rest of the community and been modified to fit the recipient language system.

It seems, then, that the idea of code-switching and borrowing on a shared continuum is unavoidable. However, I would like to reformulate Gardner-Chloros's (2010: 195) claim that a clear distinction cannot be made in a synchronic study (cf. Stroud 1992: 149). Most of the examples discussed in the previous sections are easily identified as code-switching, such as the quotations from ancient authors. Similarly, the examples contain a plethora of borrowings that were not mentioned at all in the analysis, because it is undeniable that they are used as established borrowings. It is only the grey

area that rejects any clear distinction, but this is only natural when we are dealing with a continuum. Unlike Winford, I would also include in this grey area even longer expressions such as *per Annum* 'per year' and Θεο[ς] ἀπὸ μηχανῆς, *Theos apo mēkhanēs* 'God from the machine', because they function as single units. To sum up this discussion, at least in a synchronic study of functions, the grey area needs to be taken into consideration in addition to the clear cases.

Moving on to the actual syntactic forms of multilingual expressions, it is notable that there were no clear connections between the form of a switch and its function. If we examine the few cases of single lexeme switches, there are several functions that are achieved through them. As was indicated above, *Ocium* and *per Annum* can be seen as cultural borrowings, which are basically switches that have a facilitative function. In example (25), *amort* and *pene mortus* 'almost dead' were used for a stylistic effect, while *podex* 'arse' and Ἐργοδιώκτης are euphemistic expressions. *Imprimis* and *Item* in example (47) were analysed both as enhancing the humorous stylistic effect of the longer passage (and ultimately then serving a solidarity function between the audience and the students), and as facilitative switches, depending on the layer of action. Intersentential switches showed as much variation, which is apparent from the number of different functions that quotations can have. The only general tendencies that can be detected from the material are then the abundant use of intersentential switching for quotations from ancient authors and single lexemes used to replace other single lexemes for euphemistic expressions. Situational switching is also often associated with those cases in which the base language itself changes (cf. Gumperz 1987: 60-61), but as was pointed out in the previous sections, even single lexemes such as *Imprimis* can be analysed as situational switching.

There were not nearly enough examples to state in any convincing fashion how the switches were constrained, but some of the cases provide interesting comparative material for the study of code-switching structure nevertheless. One of these is the switching in example (20), reproduced here as example (51) in an abbreviated form:

> (51)   Aut etiam similis ijs, qui cum ὀ[υ]δε γράμματα sciunt, ὀ[υ]δε νεῖν, nec summo aquam pede tetigerunt: tamen sine cortice natare moliuntur.

If we examine this example linearly, the switching pattern is Latin-Greek-Latin-Greek-Latin. However, if the syntax is taken into consideration, the Greek parts form together the object of *sciunt* 'they know'. It is then also possible to analyse example (51) as containing only a single switch to Greek and then back to Latin. This may seem counterintuitive, since we can clearly see that there is a Latin word inserted between the Greek phrases, but both Latin and Greek have considerably freer word-order than English, and it is not advisable to impose the grammatical description of one language on others without taking into consideration their particular structures.

5.3. Methodological reconsiderations

The methodology chosen for this study was explicated and argued for in section 3.4. In the following section I will briefly evaluate the chosen methodology both in the terms of the approach itself, namely pragmaphilology, and the theoretical framework consisting of face theory and general pragmatic theory. I will begin with face and politeness and follow this with a discussion on the methodology in general and the implications for future studies on multilingualism.

Face theory in the form of Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness theory was mostly very useful for the analysis. The notions of negative and positive face provided the basis for the classification of the functions of multilingual practices, and the variables of power and distance further allowed me to explicate the differences between each category by referring to these variables. The theory was also flexible enough to be supplemented with parts of other models, with the inclusion of concepts such as markedness. However, as was indicated in 3.3.2, there are some problems with face theory and especially Brown and Levinson's model. Firstly, the difference between a face-*threatening act* and an *attack* is not made clear, and in general impoliteness phenomena are not discussed in detail. In addition to this, especially facilitative functions are not analysable within the theory. In a way this is natural, as multilingualism phenomena can be applied for a whole spectrum of functions, and a broader theory would most likely suffer in explicit explanatory power. For example, the Markedness

Model seems too broad to be applied without the inclusion of other, more explicit, theories. Face theory, then, needs supplementation only when the strategy under scrutiny does not relate at all to the negotiated relationship between the speaker and the addressee. This does not mean that face theory could not be applied to, for example, facilitative switching that is used to organise the discourse, as successful discourse in itself would count as maintaining face. However, as it happens, facilitative functions seem to co-occur with other functions that are face-related.

The theory also proved to be applicable to historical material and even to dramatic texts, which are by nature complicated. When we are studying a historical setting – or for that matter, any setting that is somehow foreign to us – it is especially crucial to take the context into account when applying the theory to the material. As Brown and Levinson stated (1987: 61-62), the exact nature of face and its division into negative and positive parts may differ from culture to culture. Therefore it is by definition necessary to take the social backgrounds of the participants into consideration. The textual context (or *co-text*) is not nearly enough, since in order to understand, for example, how the plays studied in this thesis were understood by their audience, we must know what kind of people were watching the plays and what their linguistic repertoires and expectations regarding the performances were like. An analysis based on strict conversation analysis is therefore not possible in these situations, as it has been shown and argued for in the previous sections that for the most part, multilingual practices are employed for sociolinguistic matters such as expressing solidarity between the speaker and the hearer. Since we have no record of the reactions of the audience, we must endeavour to understand the material through empathy and the rational actor model discussed in sections 3.3.1 and 3.4. By applying them, we attempt to perceive the communicative situation through the eyes of the participants themselves and to understand how they viewed the interaction. This is ultimately the reason for discussing and studying the socio-historical background of the communicative situation.

In my initial discussion of the methodology in section 3.4 I introduced the idea of the levels of meaning. The basic idea behind this was that certain functions and strategies are situated on different levels depending on their placement on a rationalisation chain. In other words, the goals of the deeper levels coincide with the means of the

levels above them. For example, my first goal (G1) is to make the hearer see me in positive light. I will achieve this by means (M1) of indicating that I consider that we are equals (i.e. the D-value is low) and that I also have a positive evaluation of the hearer. The means now become my new goal (G2=M1), and to achieve this new goal, I will switch into a language that we both share (M2). Now, the means become gradually the goals of the successive levels until we arrive at the surface level represented by a linguistic realisation. If we now revisit the functions that were discussed in section 5.1, it becomes clear how these levels were present in the analysis. If the speaker wanted to express solidarity (G1), he could use quotations in a different language (M1). In these cases, code-switching was the means (M2) to realise the linguistic form or, as it were, to achieve the goal of producing the quotation (G2=M1). In other cases, quotations with code-switching were used to achieve impoliteness. From this it becomes obvious that solidarity and FTAs are located on a deeper level than quotations, which are in these cases also on a deeper level than code-switching. The inclusion of these levels in the discussion is not to provide irrelevant metatheoretical commentary, but to explain not only *what* is said in a switched code, but *why* it is said. Merely stating that code-switching is often used with quotations does not explain at all why the speakers prefer to use the original code with the quotations. Furthermore, the utterances must be analysed in their proper context and the function of the whole utterance must be taken into account. Otherwise we will end up with vacuous comments that do not in fact explain anything.

Another methodological problem that was addressed in section 3.4 was the number of different communicative axes that are present due to the nature of the genre studied in this thesis. This is what Clark termed the layering of actions. In many cases it was argued that the multilingual practices had different functions depending on which communicative axis we analysed. A prime case is example (41), in which Credulio tries to speak Latin, but fails in his exploits. Here the presence of the different perspectives is rather transparent, since the humour is situated on the axis between the students and the audience, while the attempt to save Credulio's face is located on the level of the play itself. In some cases, however, the situation is more complicated. The fact that the individual texts were called Christmas *plays* disguises the fact that many of the examples come from the parts that are actually speeches directed at the audience. The border between reality and fiction becomes fuzzy espe-

cially in *Captivi*, which is mostly structured as a succession of speeches used to obtain a holiday from the dean, but the students are at the same time playing the roles of the captives in a horrible prison called *the School*. If we attempted to remove the examples from their context without discussing the thematic of the plays in general, the layering of action would also disappear, especially when the layers are already hard to discern.

If we now evaluate the methodology chosen for this study, it seems evident that a combination of philological and linguistic approaches provides both exact results and fruitful discussion. In addition to the inclusion of the socio-historical and cultural context in general, the philological aspect can also be discerned in the way that intertextuality has been included in this study. The philological 'close reading' is the basis of this thesis, and it provides the initial results that are then organised and further analysed by the application of linguistic and pragmatic theory. The combination of the notions of face, empathy, rationality, the levels of meaning and the layering of action together form not only the method for understanding the functions of multilingual practices but also the instrument for formalising and organising the findings. In addition to being explicit and structured, it has also the advantage of being applicable to studies of other discourse strategies such as address forms or intertextuality in general, as was indicated in the preceding sections. The framework should also be applicable to any situation regardless of the demands of the genre or cultural differences, and even cases that are problematic for face theory can be treated with the application of the other basic concepts such as rationality. The functions that were presented in this study are not exhaustive, and more studies are needed to supplement these findings. I believe that by approaching various historical texts with these methods will provide interesting and relevant results for multilingualism studies in particular, and for pragmatic studies in general.

6. Conclusion

At the beginning of this study I set out to study how multilingualism manifests itself in a set of Christmas plays in the *Orationes* manuscript, and what functions the multilingual practices had. In order to provide a historical background for the study, I

discussed at length the history of the Classical languages in Britain, following this with a discussion on the Early Modern school system and the special practices and systems of the Kings School, Canterbury. For my theoretical framework, I discussed on the one hand code-switching and other multilingual practices, and on the other hand the notion of face, particularly in connection with Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness theory. The length of these sections in the whole thesis is quite high, but as has been shown several times in the preceding sections, this is unavoidable if we wish to produce an accurate analysis of the phenomena under scrutiny. Since multilingualism, especially in historical texts, is a rather recent field of study, I also deemed it necessary to discuss in detail the methodological apparatus chosen for this study.

As far as my two research questions are concerned, the following were the main findings of this study. Multilingualism in general and code-switching in particular manifested itself in several different types of syntactic forms, both on the macro- and the micro-level. Even though there were some tendencies for a certain form to connect with a certain function, such as single lexemes with euphemistic expressions, the different forms were used variously for several different types of functions. It was also argued that the syntactic structures of the switches could provide useful comparative material for future studies, since the structure of the studied languages is very different from many other languages that have been studied in connection with code-switching. Finally, the distinction between borrowing and switching proved to be fuzzy, and it was concluded that they are part of the same continuum, as has already been stated by several researchers. However, it was also shown that by consulting studies that were conducted long before the rise of multilingualism studies, it is possible to find explanatory apparatuses that are applicable even today.

Concerning the pragmatic meanings or functions of code-switching, the findings showed that some of the most typical of these were solidarity, self-promotion, impoliteness, stylistic effect, facilitating the discourse, and euphemistic expressions. When applicable, Brown and Levinson's theory was employed in order to distinguish the functions from each other – a system that proved to be very useful. In analysing the functions it was also shown that in many cases several different functions overlap with each other. This was especially true of cases where the switches had a different

function for the characters of the play and for the communication between the audience and the actors. When I evaluated the methodology chosen for this thesis, it was argued that the framework chosen for the analysis was sound and flexible, and that it allowed for the classification of the functions in a systematic manner.

As for future studies, there are several possible directions in which to move. If we consider first the material, it is of essence that a similar study be conducted with a more extensive selection of material. Furthermore, since I had to be selective due to the limits of length (as was mentioned in chapter 4), there were several instances of code-switching that were left out of the analysis, and they should of course be accounted for in further studies. An optimal way to proceed would be to compare a selection of different types of plays with the Christmas plays in order to find out how the genre affects the linguistic choices of the authors and the characters. Moreover, since the methodology is applicable to other discourse strategies besides code-switching, the next step could be to compare other strategies such as the use of address forms or intertextuality with the findings presented in this study.

As regards historical multilingualism, it is clear that the field is still in its infancy, even though the number of different studies has been on the growth lately. Most of the studies are, however, independent and hard to compare with each other, which means that it would be advisable to conduct a number of studies on different materials with a single framework in order to both test the methods and to provide results that are readily comparable with the results from other studies. The methodology employed in this thesis is, of course, not perfect, but with further applications it could be adjusted in order to provide a clear and simple set of tools for the researchers in this field, and the field of pragmaphilology or historical pragmatics in general.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Manuscript and printed books

Canterbury Cathedral Library Lit. MS E41 [digital images and microfilm prints]. Canterbury Cathedral Archives.

Harvey Gabriel 1577. *Rhetor, vel duorum dierum oratio, de natura, arte, & exercitatione rhetorica*. STC 12904.5. Accessed through *Early English Books Online*. http://eebo.chadwyck.com.

Hoole Charles 1657. *Propria Quæ Maribus, Quæ Genus, and As in Præsenti, Englished and Explained for the Use of Young Grammarians*. Wing H2689B. Accessed through *Early English Books Online*. http://eebo.chadwyck.com.

Lily William 1544. *An Introduction of the Eyght Partes of Speche, and the Construction of the Same*. STC 15610.8. Accessed through *Early English Books Online*. http://eebo.chadwyck.com.

Lily William 1672. *Brevissima Institutio Seu Ratio Grammatices Cognoscendæ*. Wing L2258. Accessed through *Early English Books Online*. http://eebo.chadwyck.com.

Lily William, Haine William & Robertson Thomas 1687. *Lilies rules construed whereunto are added Tho. Robinsons Heteroclites, The Latin syntaxis and Qui mihi*. Wing L2273A. Accessed through *Early English Books Online*. http://eebo.chadwyck.com

Editions

Alton E. H., Wormell D. E. W. & Courtney E. 1985. *P. Ovidi Nasonis Fastorum Libri Sex*. 2nd ed. Leipzig: Teubner (= Ov. *Fast.*).

Anderson W. S. 1985. *P. Ovidii Nasonis Metamorphoses*. 3rd ed. Leipzig: Teubner (= Ov. *Met.*).

Clark A. C. [1918] 1970. *M. Tulli Ciceronis Orationes*. Vol. II. 2ⁿᵈ edition. Oxford: Clarendon Press (= Cic. *Mil*. & Cic. *Phil*.).

Heraeus W. 1982. *M. Valerii Martialis Epigrammaton Libri*. 3ʳᵈ ed. Leipzig: Teubner (= Mart. *Epigr*.).

Labriolle Pierre de & Villeneuve François 1951. *Juvénal: Satires*. Paris: Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres" (= Iuv.).

Leaf Walter 1960. *The Iliad*. Vol. II. 2ⁿᵈ edition. Amsterdam: Adolf. M. Hakkert (= Hom. *Il*.).

Places Édouard des [1951] 1965. *Platon Oeuvres Complètes*. Vol. XI.2: Les Lois: Livres III-VI. Paris: Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres" (= Pl. *Leg*.).

Purser L. [1901] 1968. *M. Tulli Ciceronis Epistulae*. Vol. I Epistulae ad Familiares. Oxford: Clarendon Press (= Cic. *Fam*.).

Shackleton Bailey D. R. 1985. *Q. Horati Flacci Opera*. Stuttgart: Teubner (= Hor. *Ars* & Hor. *Epist*.).

Tischer Gustav 1872. *M. Tullii Ciceronis Tusculanarum Disputationum*. 6ᵗʰ ed. Berlin: Weidemann (= Cic. *Tusc*.).

Watt W. S. [1961] 1967. *M. Tulli Ciceronis Epistulae*. Vol. II.2 Epistulae ad Atticum: Pars posterior libri IX-XVI. Oxford: Clarendon Press (= Cic. *Att*. 10.)

Watt W. S. [1965] 1969. *M. Tulli Ciceronis Epistulae*. Vol. II.1 Epistulae ad Atticum: Pars prior libri I-VIII. Oxford: Clarendon Press (= Cic. *Att*. 1.).

West M. L. [1978] 1980. *Hesiod: Works & Days*. Oxford: Clarendon Press (= Hes. *Op*.).

Winterbottom M. 1994. *M. Tulli Ciceronis de Officiis*. Oxford: Ocford University Press (= Cic. *Off*.).

Secondary Sources

Adams J. N. 2002. *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Auer Peter 1998. *Code-Switching in Conversation: Language, Interaction and Identity*. London: Routledge.

Barber Charles 1976. *Early Modern English*. London: Andre Deutsch.

Baugh Albert C. & Cable Thomas 2002. *A History of the English Language*. 5ᵗʰ ed. London: Routledge.

Brown Penelope & Levinson Stephen C. 1987. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Clark Herbert H. 1996. *Using Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cole Peter & Morgan Jerry L. (eds) 1975. *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts.* New York: Academic Press.

Coventry Thomas & Hughes Samuel 1832. *An Analytical Digested Index to the Common Law Reports from the Time of of Henry III. to the Commencement of the Reign of George III. with Tables of the Titles and Names of Cases.* Vol. II. Philadelphia: R. H. Small.

Crespo Begoña 2000. Historical background of multilingualism and its impact on English. In Trotter (ed.): 23-35.

Cruse Alan 2011. *Meaning in Language: An Introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Culpeper Jonathan 2011. *Impoliteness: Using Language to Cause Offence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Davidson Mary Catherine 2003. Code-switching and authority in late medieval England. *Neophilologus* 87: 473-486.

Diller Hans-Jürgen 1997. Code-switching in medieval English drama. *Comparative Drama* 31 (4): 506-537.

Edwards D. L. 1957. *A History of the King's School Canterbury*. London: Faber and Faber.

Gardner-Chloros Penelope 2010. Contact and code-switching. In Hickey (ed.): 188-207.

Goffman Erving [1967] 1982. *Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face-to-Face Behavior.* New York: Pantheon Books.

Grice H. P. 1975. Logic and conversation. In Cole & Morgan (eds): 41-58.

Gross Steven 2000. Intentionality and the markedness model in literary codeswitching. *Journal of Pragmatics* 32 (9): 1283-1303.

Gumperz John J. 1982. *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Herman József 2000. *Vulgar Latin*. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press.

Hickey Raymond (ed.) 2010. *The Handbook of Language Contact*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Hunt Tony 2000. Code-Switching in medical texts. In Trotter (ed.): 131-147.

Itkonen Esa 1983. *Causality in Linguistic Theory: A Critical Investigation into the Philosophical and Methodological Foundations of 'Non-autonomous' Linguistics*. London: Croom Helm.

Itkonen Esa 2003. *What is Language? A Study in the Philosophy of Linguistics*. Turku: University of Turku.

Johnson Anthony W. & Vaahtera Jyri (eds) 2012. *Five Restoration Plays from the King's School, Canterbury*. EyeCorner Press.

Kalliokoski Jyrki 1995. Koodinvaihto ja keskustelun moniäänisyys (Code-switching and the multiplicity of voices in conversation). *Virittäjä* 1/1995: 2-24.

Lagus Ernst 1890. *Studier i den klassiska språkundervisningens historie i Finland med afseende fäst vid förhållandena i Sverige och andra länder* (Studies in the History of the Teaching of Classical Languages in Finland in Relation to the Practices in Sweden and Other Countries). Helsingfors.

Lyons John [1977] 1978. *Semantics*. Vol. I. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Löfstedt Einar 1959. *Late Latin*. Oslo: H. Aschehoug & Co.

Minnis A. J. (ed.) 1989. *Latin and Vernacular*. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer.

Myers-Scotton Carol 1993. *Duelling Languages: Grammatical Structure in Codeswitching*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Myers-Scotton Carol (ed.) 1998a. *Codes and Consequences: Choosing Linguistic Varieties*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Myers-Scotton Carol 1998b. Introduction. In Myers-Scotton (ed.): 3-17.

Myers-Scotton Carol 1998c. A theoretical introduction to the Markedness Model. In Myers-Scotton (ed.): 18-38.

Nevala Minna 2004. *Address in Early English Correspondence: Its Forms and Socio-pragmatic Functions*. Helsinki: Société Néophilologique.

Nevalainen Terttu 2006. *An Introduction to Early Modern English*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Nurmi Arja & Pahta Päivi 2010. Preacher, scholar, brother, friend: Social roles and code-switching in the writings of Thomas Twining. In Pahta, Nevala, Nurmi & Palander-Collin (eds): 135-162.

Pahta Päivi, Nevala Minna, Nurmi Arja & Palander-Collin Minna (eds) 2010. *Social Roles and Language Practices in Late Modern English*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Paul Hermann 1960. *Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte* (Principles of the History of Language). 6th ed. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.

Poplack Shana 1980. Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish Y TERMINO EN ESPAÑOL: Toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics* 18 (7): 581-618.

Romaine Suzanne 1995. *Bilingualism*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell.

Schendl Herbert 2000. Linguistic aspects of code-switching in medieval English texts. In Trotter (ed.): 77-92.

Scotton Carol Myers 1983. The negotiation of identities in conversation: A theory of markedness and code choice. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 44: 115-136.

Strang Barbara 1970. *A History of English*. London: Methuen & Co.

Stroud Christopher 1992. The problem of intention and meaning in code-switching. *Text* 12 (1): 127-155.

Trotter D. A. (ed.) 2000. *Multilingualism in Later Medieval Britain*. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer.

Trubetzkoy N. S. 1958. *Grundzüge der Phonologie* (Principles of Phonology). 2nd ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Voigts Linda E. 1989. The character of the *carecter*: Ambiguous sigils in scientific and medical texts. In Minnis (ed.): 91-110.

Voigts Linda E. 1996. What's the word? Bilingualism in late-medieval England. *Speculum* 71 (4): 813-826.

Wei Li 1998. The 'why' and 'how' questions in the analysis of conversational code-switching. In Auer (ed.): 156-176.

Wenzel Siegfried 1994. *Macaronic Sermons: Bilingualism and Preaching in Late-Medieval England*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Winford Donald 2010. Contact and borrowing. In Hickey (ed.): 170-187.

Woodruff C. E. & Cape H. J. 1908. *Schola Regia Cantuariensis: A History of Canterbury School*. London: Mitchell Hughes & Clarke.

Wright Laura 2000. Bills, accounts, inventories: Everyday trilingual activities in the business world of later medieval England. In Trotter (ed.): 149-156.

Appendix 1: The Christmas plays in the *Oratiozes* manuscript

The following list includes the relative order of the plays in the manuscript along with folio numbers, probable years of performance, and titles. For information on the years and the titles cf. section 2.2.1.

Relative order	Folios	Year	Title
Year 1	4r-16r	1665	Captivi Grammaticales & Professionary Options
Year 2	37r-47r	1666	Anni Tempora & Wine, Beer, Ale
Year 3	62v-72r	1667	The Conquest of Metals
Year 4	87r-94r	1668	Certamen Doctrinale
Year 5	115r	1669	The Cheats
Year 6	144r-149v	1670/1671	Captivi
Year 7	171r-183v	1672	Ars Poetica
Year 8	197r-201v	1673	Colloquium de Rhetorica
Year 9	229v	1674	Amor in Labyrintho
Year 10	254v-255r	1675	Captivi a Plauto
Year 11	279r-294r	1676	Discipuli et Rustici
Year 12	319r-327v	1677	Grammaticae Partes I
Year 13	345v-356v	1678	A Contention for Honour and Riches
Year 14	374v-378v	1679	Orationes Hyemales
Year 15	413v	1680/1681	The Female Prelate & The Spanish Fryar
Year 16	433r-437r	1682	Grammaticae Partes II
Year 17	463-468r	1683	Quinque Sensus

Appendix 2: Transliterations of the Greek examples

(8)   Θεο[ς] ἀπὸ μηχανῆς, *Theo[s] apo mēkhanēs*

(9)   ὑμῖν ἐν γό[υ]νασι κεῖται, *hymin en go[u]nasi keitai*

(10)   Μέτρα φυλά[σσ]ε[σ]θαι. Καιρὸς δ' ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἄρισ[τ]οσ,
       Metra phyla[ss]e[s]thai. Kairos d'epi pasin aris[t]os

(11)   ὕσ[τ]ερον πρότερον, *hys[t]eron proteron*

(13)   Ἐργοδιώκτης, *Ergodiōktēs*

(20)   ὀ[υ]δε γράμματα, ὀ[υ]δε νεῖν, *o[u]de grammata, o[u]de nein*

(21)   τὸ λεγόμενον μήτε γράμματα μήτε νεῖν ἐπιστῶνται,
       to legomenon mēte grammata mēte nein epistōntai

(22)   ὀ[υ]δε γράμματα, ὀ[υ]δε νεῖν, *o[u]de grammata, o[u]de nein*

(51)   ὀ[υ]δε γράμματα, ὀ[υ]δε νεῖν, *o[u]de grammata, o[u]de nein*

Appendix 3: List of examples

(1)   Nam certamen erit hodie, Quodnam, inter tria doctrinæ fælicioris instrumenta, palmam optimè mereatur. [For there will be a battle to-day, regarding which instrument of the more felicitous discipline deserves victory the most.]

(f. 87v)

(2)   Lor: Quantum equidem ipse ex candido judicum horum nunc vultu possum augurari veniam impetrasti pro Captivis ut loquantur liberè quid passi sint in Tulliano nostro [As far as I can predict from the radiant looks of these judges, you have obtained a permission on behalf of the Captives, so that they would speak freely of what they have endured in our Tullianum]

(f. 144v)

(3)   Dan: Intermission! Intermission! Tis a word upon the wheel, and doth satisfie appetite aboue all Spring varieties, Summer's beauty, Autumne's grapes, or Winter's black-puddings. Tis a fat Ocium that my gutts wamble for.

(f. 147v)

(4)   Nay the Virtuosi, notwithstanding all their miracles, haue not yet allotted to them ten thousand pounds per Annum

(f. 148v)

(5)   [Dan:] Farwel; take heed of Latine. Cave ne titubes, mandataq[ue] frangas [Be careful that you do not stumble and break your commission].

(f. 147v)

(6)   Herb: But, Friend, remember, if you miss of your mark – Plus fati valet hora benigni Quàm si te Veneris commendet Epistola Marti. Therefore mock on. [A moment of benignant fate is of more avail to you than a letter of recommendation from Venus to Mars.]

(f. 147v)

(7)   Dan: Fool, hast thou so much learning, and yet hast forgot that scrap of Grammar Nihili, vel pro nihilo habentur literæ. Adeo ut sub palliolo plerunq[ue] sordido lateat sapientia. [Learning is considered worthless and good for nothing. It is for this reason that wisdom commonly hides under a filthy cloak.] But Scholars imagine any thing Concipiunt æthera mente [They perceive the firmament in their minds]. Imagination is their wealth: some of them would be poor else.

(f. 148v)

(8) Sensus hebetat, cerebrum lædit, ingenium obtundit, nosq[ue] ad omne opus scholasticum plane ineptos reddit. Utinam igitur Θεο[ς] ἀπὸ μηχανῆς adesset tandem qui auxiliatricem extendens manum nos jam a limbo tanti frigoris, et tenebrarum liberaret! [It dulls the senses, damages the brain, blunts talents, and renders us plainly inept for all school work. If only there was then a *god from the machine*, who extending a helping hand would now finally free us from such a cold and dark limbo!]

(f. 144v)

(9) Nec scimus nunc temporis quomodo id fiat melius quàm post studia diuturna, laxatis nunc Scholæ frænis, et solutis etiam nunc negotiorum vinculis. Hoc ut concedatur nobis, solum ὑμῖν ἐν γό[υ]νασι κεῖται, viri ornatissimi. [And we do not know how it could be better than at that time after long studies when the reins of school have been loosened and the ropes of labour opened. That we would be granted this, it only *depends on you*, most illustrious men.]

(f. 145r)

(10) Nimium certè ocij non petimus. Vetat id Hesiodus noster dum sic præcipit, Μέτρα φυλά[σσ]ε[σ]θαι. Καιρὸς δ' ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἄρισ[τ]οσ. Opportunitas igitur temporis cessationem a studiis paulisper efflagitat. [Certainly we do not ask for too much leisure. Our Hesiod forbids it, when he commands thus: *Maintain due measure. Proportion is best in everything*. An opportune moment therefore demands idleness from studies.]

(f. 146v)

(11) Præpositionibus ὕσ[τ]ερον πρότερον arseverse abutuntur. [They abuse prepositions *topsy-turvy* arsy-versy.]

(f. 144v)

(12) our teeth chatter in our head; our brains are soe frozen that wee cannot cry out with the Poet Est Deus in nobis, agitante calescimus illo [There is a god in us. When he moves, we become inflamed].

(f. 93r)

(13) I think, Iemmy, the fat's in thy head: but for the Ocium that must be obtained by our Superiours. With whom I hope Art will haue soe much power, if our Natures cannot prevail, as to grant us a relief from our hard taskmaster, or as they call him in greek Ἐργοδιώκτης [Taskmaster].

(f. 93r)

(14) To goe to school, to what purpose, to use illud Cassianum, Cui bono [that maxim of Cassius: to whose benefit]? Preferment sleeps in

Ladies \lapps/; and what canst thou get by thy long doating nights studies, unless it be a little Latine, and Greek. And what advantage wilt thou get by that? only thou art a Scholar forsooth; and canst begg in Latine, and Greek.

(f. 93v)

(15)   But if wee could haue time to play, it would be phisick for our witts, hearts, and backs too, that wee might be fit one day for our Priorums, and Posteriorums in the Academy. To which wee all aspire, but are loth to take pains to fit ourselves for soe happy a translation. To which Dick, I think thou'lt never attain, thou hast such an idle, and blockish pate For thou art altogether in As in præsenti, but knowest nothing of Propria quæ maribus.

(ff. 93r-93v)

(16)   Propria quæ maribus tribuuntur, mascula dicas. [Proper nouns denoting seas should be in the masculine gender.]

(Lily 1672: 12)

(17)   As in praesenti perfectum format in avi [Verbs with –as in the present tense form their perfect with –avi]

(Lily 1672: 53)

(18)   [D:] And therefore farwell Priscian, and all his trinketts. Ocium! Ocium! Ocium!   Intrat Monitor.
Mo: Quid vos hîc agitis, Pueri? mihi videmini garrire, et nugas agere. Tacete, vel vos docebo gnaviter quid sit Ocium canere, priusquam à Decano, et Præceptore ocium obtinuistis. [What are you doing here, boys? It seems to me that you are prating and playing the fools. Be quiet, or I will show you diligently what comes from celebrating over leisure before you have obtained it from the dean and the teacher.]
T: Quæso ne mihi succenseas. Putavi enim Oratores satis lusus a majoribus nostris impetrâsse. [Please do not be angry with me, for I thought that the speakers had managed to procure sportive joys from our superiors.]

(ff. 93v-94r)

(19)   Mo: Cur autem anglice loquimini, et non magis de studijs, rebus serijs, et honestis confabulamini? Ignoratis quorum in præsentia adestis? Nulli hîc adsunt, vel potius adesse debent, illiterati. [But why do you speak English, and why do you not instead talk about studies, of serious and respectable matters? Are you presently ignorant of such things? There is none − or better, there should be none − here lacking education.]
M: Doctissimi nonnunquam viri nugis, et indoctis stultorum sententijs, hoc præsertim tempore, gaudent. Et præterea hæc nostra garrulitas nihil mali intus habet.[Sometimes most learned men take pleasure in

trifles and the unlearned ideas of fools – especially at this time. And therefore this prating of ours does not contain anything improper.]
Mo: Hoc instar omnium mihi displicet. Et, si Præceptor audiret, væ vestris natibus. Sed quinam docti sunt illi qui vestris confabulationibus tantopere delectantur? fortasse indocti, qui nullam nisi linguam anglicanam intelligunt. [This displeases me as much as everything else. And if the teacher heard this, woe to your buttocks! But who are then those learned men who are so delighted by your chatter? They are probably uneducated, as they do not understand anything but English.]

(f. 94r)

(20)   Quisquis enim Exercitationem contemnit similis est ijs, qui, cum reptare vix possint, volare tamen aggrediuntur asbq[ue] pennis. Aut etiam similis ijs, qui cum ὀ[υ]δε γράμματα sciunt, ὀ[υ]δε νεῖν, nec summo aquam pede tetigerunt: tamen sine cortice natare moliuntur. [For anyone who does not value exercise is similar to those who scarcely know how to crawl, and yet they set out to fly without wings. Or they are similar to those who know *neither the letters nor how to swim*, and have not touched water with the tip of their foot, yet they strive to swim without any aid.]

(f. 89v)

(21)   τὸ λεγόμενον μήτε γράμματα μήτε νεῖν ἐπιστῶνται [as the saying goes, they know neither the letters nor how to swim]

(Pl. *Leg.* 3,689d)

(22)   Verum si sine Exercitatione, studio, diligentia, commentatione, instrumentis meis nihil possunt, ne hiscere quidem: sed perinde faciunt, vt ij, qui cum reptare non queunt, volare tamen aggrediu[n]tur sine pennis: aut etiam ut ij, qui cum ὀ[υ]δε γράμματα sciunt, ὀυδε νεῖν, quod est Graecis hominibus in prouerbio, nec summo aquam pede vnquam tetigerunt, tamen sine cortice natare moliuntur [Truly, if they are not able to do anything without practice, study, diligence and preparation – my instruments – they cannot even open their mouths. Instead, they do just as those who cannot crawl, and yet they set out to fly without wings. Or they are similar to those who know *neither the letters nor how to swim*, as the Greek saying goes]

(Harvey 1577: 94)

(23)   **J**: Why, Sam, all that wee, or any speak is comprehended in Grammer. **S**: Grammer? O woe is mee that ever I was sent from Hamburgh to learn either English, or Latine Grammer! There is a name of a thing that they call Noun, which would to God I had never heard, felt, or understood. One stands by itselfe. The other is held up by I know not what.

(f. 319r)

(24)   **S**: Fah! Fah! As for Number, though they call it Singular, or Plural, it hath brought upon mee innumerable troubles. And for your Cases, when I consider their signes A, The, Of, To, The, For, From, By, and Than, I am brought to a plain Delirium.

(f. 319r)

(25)   **J**: How now Sam? What all amort?
S: Ah, Jemmy, not only amort; but pene mortuus [almost dead]. For I am almost dead, and buried under the sad thoughts of my tormentor. A thing which is worser then death Grammer, Jemmy, Grammer.

(f. 319r)

(26)   **S**: O Jemmy, They have engender'd so much trouble in my soul, that ingeminating Hic hæc hoc, I haue brought upon mee such a terrible Hiccough, that I cannot rest, nor sleep in the night. And I must begg the help of some good Doctor, lest I Hic hæc hoc myselfe into worse than nothing.

(f. 319v)

(27)   **J**: But what think you of the Participle, Adverb, Conjunction, Præposition, and Interjection?
S: I think no better of them then Hui, vah, apagete [Hah! Ah! Away with you!]

(ff. 319v-320r)

(28)   **Jo**: But methinks, Sam, the Verb is very easy.
S: Easye doe you call it? Personal, Impersonal. I am sure tædet it irketh is all the comfort I haue received yet.

(f. 319v)

(29)   And suche as haue no persons, be called impersonalles, as Tedet, it yrketh, oportet, it behoueth.

(Lily 1544: 18)

(30)   **J**: But be you quiet, say nothing, whilst our Orators are pleading for our release from this our Purgatory.
S: If soe, then peace: and wee hope to catch a mouse. Retire and be gone in silence. But I am afraid of that old saying Parturiunt montes nascetur rediculus mus [The mountains are in labour, and a ridiculous mouse will be born].

(f. 320r)

(31)   **Quar**: Why? I haue worne my lipps almost thredbare in kissing my hands that they might keep a mannerly proportion with my leggs: and was fain to screw my face, and gird my neck so long till my very eyes began to piss tears. At last, after many a cringe at a lamentable acclamation of Quæso, Præceptor, da mihi veniam abeundi mictum [I

beg you Teacher, give me leave to go urinate], the honest man in black gave me a nodd, and out came Pilgarlick.

(f. 280v)

(32) **Sec**: Noe, noe. That's too easie a punishment. Take such a slave, and first hang him up; then disrobe his podex, then claw his breech with peice of Qui mihi.

(f. 280r)

(33) **Quar**: Noe matter. I'll put it to hazard. This martyrdome of books is a great device contra Omne quod exit in um seu Græcum, sive Latinum [against everything that ends in *–um*, be it either Greek or Latin].

(ff. 280v-281r)

(34) **Sec**: Oh! How your Adverbs will swear, and curse, as by Pol, Ædepol, Hercle, and Mediusfidius too.

(f. 281r)

(35) Attamen ex cunctis quæ diximus antè notandum, Omne quod exit in um, seu Græcum, sive Latinum, Esse genus neutrum [But of all of those that we have mentioned above it should be noted that everything that ends in *–um*, be it either Greek or Latin, is of neuter gender.]

(Lily 1672: 12)

(36) Some of swearing, as Pol, ædepol, hercle, medius fidius.

(Lily 1544: 41)

(37) **Ter**: Give me your fist then. My pate is bigg with an excellent politick treason.
Sec: Against whom I pray?
Ter: Marry against the burch scepter of old Mr Lilly.

(f. 280v)

(38) **Sec**: Our resolves are to make old Lilly dye like a martyr in the flames of his own Grammar.

(f. 280v)

(39) [**Eu**:] Et, ni fallor, maximè sollicita est, ne expectationibus vestris injuriam faceret. (Intrat Philaster) Quod si – [And if I am not mistaken, she is anxious about doing injustice to your expectations. (Philaster enters) But if –]
Phi: Quod si – Put on your hat my submissive peice of learned hypocrisie. I marvel what makes you soe humble this morning.
Eu: Phil, welcome.

(f. 283v)

(40)   **Eu**: Nay, if your wits grow soe tart to abuse your best friends, Adjeu.
         Præ: Sweet master, my lungs are at your perpetual service. Exit
         Eu: Mirum est, Philaster, animadvertere appetitus hominum inexplebiles. Quorum (quasi tot furiis impulsi) mores flagitioso cuivis opprobrio mancipatos prostituunt, dummodo rem faciunt sibi, et opes congerant [It is astonishing to observe the insatiable desires of men, Philaster. As if incited by so many furies they prostitute their morals, selling them to anything shameful and dishonourable, as long as they themselves make money and collect riches.]
         Ph: Eo scilicet dementiæ plerosq[ue] mortales adigit fames auri inexplebilis, ut lucro potius suo, quàm nomini, aut moribus consulant [Evidently for that reason the insatiable hunger for gold drives many mortals to madness, so that they have more regard for their profit than for their name or their morals.]

                                                                  (f. 287r)

(41)   **Cr**: And verily he is a wonderous ready scholard at it. Young gentleman, may I presume to spur you a question, or two?
         Gram: Mene, si placet, alloqueris? aut num quid me vis, obsecro? [Please, are you talking to me? Pray, what do you want from me now?]
         Cr: Immò ego vult habere aliquid res, dic latinè with you. [Nay, I want do some business, speak Latin with you.]
         Tr: Out, Mr Credulio, out, all to be out. You have forgotten those toys long since.

                                                                  (f. 285v)

(42)   **Cr**: Why truely to my knowledge I have not look'd on my Grannum these twenty good years.
         Gra: I am confident therefore in my hopes, Grave S^r, you will excuse the rudeness of my answer. Our schoole statutes confine me to noe other dialect.

                                                                  (f. 285v)

(43)   [**Philoponus**:] Numen testor, Apollo, tuum! Quænam intemperiæ nostram agunt scholam? Quid sibi velint ignoti subselliorum incolæ? Quid cathedræ barbatâ graves reverentiâ? Bone Jupiter! itane fatis comparatum est, ut, quos ego hinc abiens reliqui impuberes, tam citò maturescerent, ut jamjam a pueris illico nascerentur Senes? Philaster, quis malus Genius literariam hanc adeò turbavit familiam? [Apollo, I call your power to witness! What insanity possesses our school? What does this mean: strangers occupying the benches? And how about the teacher's chairs loaded with bearded dignity? By Jove! Have the fates so arranged that those whom I left as youths have so quickly matured that now from boys they have instantly grown into old men? Philaster, what evil spirit has so disturbed this school family of ours?
         Ph: Nobis, si placet, libris incumbentibus venerunt. [If you please, they came to us when we were devoted to our books.

Philo: Qui, malum! venerunt, impudens? [Damn it! Who came, you impudent fool?]

<div align="right">(f. 292v)</div>

(44)   **Gra**: En baculum, si placet, tibi. Et si quis interea absentem quæritet, pace tuâ te abiisse dicam. [There is your walking-stick, if you please. And if someone seeks you while you are away, I will tell them by your leave that you have gone away.]

Phi: Non ita nimis diu hinc abero. Quocirca, si per negotia liceat, expectet me domi quisquis convenire velit reversurum evestigiò. Atq[ue] audin? fac moneas Eugenium de epistola quam patri suo descriptam volui, ut ad reditum perficiatur. Satin memor es? [I shall not be away for very long. For that reason, my errand permitting, if anyone wants to meet me at home, he can expect me to return instantly. And do you hear? Remind Eugenius of the letter that I wanted to be written to his father, so that it is finished when I return. Will you remember all that?]

Gra: Dabo quidem operam ut satis. Num quid obsecro me vis præterea? [I shall certainly take care to remember it. Pray, what else do you want from me?]

<div align="right">(f. 282v)</div>

(45)   **Philo**: Compellabo, ut sciam. Senes, ipsa salus vos sospitet. Num quis è vobis colloquium expetivit meum? [I will address them, so that I will find out. Elders, may health itself protect you. Which one of you was seeking a conference with me?]

Tr: You are deceiv'd in us, godfather Black-coat. Speak to your children in latine. Wee are good old boyes in English.

Philo: Lepidi sunt, ni male conjicio, et festivi admodum Senes. Proin quo magis fruar, alloquar, ut intelligant. [If I am not mistaken, they are charming and altogether pleasant elders. Therefore I will be the more delighted to speak so that they will understand.] Gentlemen, 'tis my happiness to see you soe merry within my libertyes.

<div align="right">(f. 292v-293r)</div>

(46)   **Tr**: Mr Credulio, one of this Gentleman's scholars took the boyes examination, and thought him fitting for the Schoole

Philo: Nostin tu quis partes anticipavit meas Hujus examinando filiolum? [Do you know who took over my duties in examining the son of this man?]

Eu: Ni fallor, Grammatulus. Quocum ego non ita pridem deambulantem vidi puerulum. [If I am not mistaken, it was Grammatulus, with whom not long ago I saw the boy walk away.]

Philo: His approbation gives mee content. S^r, doth it please you to give mee my entrance for your Jacky; as a pledge of what you will pay me hereafter for his education.

<div align="right">(f. 293r)</div>

(47)   **Kn**: Imprimis for contempt of authority, You are adjudged by the Statute De scandalo Magnatum equorum [concerning slander against horse magnates] made anno domini Guilielmi imperatoris octavo, vigesimo quarto die Novembris Quadragintesimoq[ue] to sit in the Town pidgeon holes like a Stock dove until you hatch a brood of better manners − Item for being overtaken with a cup of Nimis, your pennance is to drink nothing but, fair water as long as the discretion of your Magistrate shall think fitting. Lastly for being a Swearer.

(f. 291v)

(48)   Illos spero nihil aliud prolocuturos quàm quod et multum prosit ipsis et vobis non parum placeat. Illud enim apud benevolos Auditores semper obtinuit / Non displicuisse merentur / Festinant dominis qui placuisse suis. [I expect them to say nothing but what will both greatly benefit themselves and give you pleasure in no small quantity. Surely that has always obtained benevolent listeners. / Those do not deserve to displease, / Who hasten to please their masters.]

(f. 144r)

(49)   Artifices, qui corporis tantum labores exercent, recreant se nonnunquam, et cessant à laboribus. An non æquum est igitur ut studiosi aliquando id faciant? Certè, ut mihi videtur, æquissimum. Nam, ut inquit Cicero oratorum summus, Graviora sunt illa quæ persequimur ingenio, ac ratione, quàm quæ viribus. [Artisans, who occupy themselves with so great bodily toil, refresh themselves often and cease from working. Is it not then fair that students do this some-times? Certainly, it seems to me, it is most fair. For as the most distin-guished orator Cicero says, those things that we pursue with intellect and reason are more burdensome than those that we pursue with our strength.]

(f. 146r)

(50)   D: You need not talk of my blockish pate. For I scarse know any one in the Schoole such a Rakehell [i.e. 'a rascal'], and Truant as thou art. Thou'lt doe no thing without the Clavigers come to rouze you out of your bed, and to dragg thee to school as a bear to the stake.

(f. 93v)

(51)   Aut etiam similis ijs, qui cum ὀ[υ]δε γράμματα sciunt, ὀ[υ]δε νεῖν, nec summo aquam pede tetigerunt: tamen sine cortice natare moliuntur.

(f. 89v)

Finnish summary

Nykyinen tilanne, jossa Britannia on suurimmaksi osaksi yksikielinen yhteiskunta, on verrattain tuore, sillä jo ensimmäisistä valloituksista alkaen Britanniassa on asunut usean eri kielen syntyperäisiä puhujia. Vaikka monet Britannian asukkaat ovat nykyäänkin jossain määrin kaksi- tai monikielisiä ja englanti on valtaväestön kieli, niin keskiajalla ja uuden ajan alussa englannin asema ei ollut yhtä hyvä kuin nykyään. Latina ja ranska olivat pitkään hallinnon ja yläluokkien kieliä, ja vaikka uuden ajan alun alkaessa 1500-luvulla englannin kielen asema oli vahvistunut, latina säilyi edelleen etenkin tieteiden ja oppineisuuden maailmanlaajuisena yleiskielenä. Eräs esimerkki Britannian kielitilanteesta uuden ajan alussa on *Orationes*-käsikirjoitus (Lit.Ms.E41, Canterburyn katedraalin arkisto), joka sisältää Canterburyn katedraalikoulun oppilaiden ja henkilökunnan kirjoittamia ja esittämiä puheita ja näytelmiä 1600-luvun loppupuoliskolta. Useat tämän käsikirjoituksen näytelmistä ovat monikielisiä, ja niissä esiintyy kielellistä koodinvaihtoa englannin, latinan ja kreikan välillä.

Tutkimukseni tarkoituksena on selvittää, millaisia syntaktisia ilmenemismuotoja ja pragmaattisia merkityksiä koodinvaihdolla on *Orationes*-käsikirjoituksessa. Näihin kysymyksiin vastaamalla on mahdollista luoda aikaisempaa selkeämpi kuva siitä, millä tavalla monikielisyys oli osana useiden ihmisten kielellistä repertuaaria. Koska koodinvaihto ja monikielisyys ylipäätään ovat tutkimusaiheina vielä melko tuoreita, olen valinnut teoreettiseen viitekehykseeni kattavan valikoiman erilaisia lähestymistapoja ja näkemyksiä monikielisyydestä ja etenkin koodinvaihdon funktioiden luokitteluperiaatteista. Analyysini avuksi olen valinnut myös Penelope Brownin ja Stephen Levinsonin (1987) kohteliaisuusteorian, jonka avulla on mahdollista selittää etenkin puhujien sosiaalisiin suhteisiin ja valtaeroihin liittyvää kielellistä käyttäytymistä. Varsinaisiin tutkimuskysymyksiin vastaamisen lisäksi tutkielmani toimii myös historiallisen monikielisyyden tutkimuksen metodologisena kokeena. Analyysini on tarkoitus toimia esimerkkinä siitä, miten monikielisyyttä voisi lähestyä etenkin historiallisessa kontekstissa, mutta tämän lisäksi metodini on sovellettavissa myös historialliseen pragmatiikkaan yleensä. Lisäksi tutkielmani on tärkeä lisä uuden ajan alun englanninkielisen kouludraaman tutkimukseen. Koska *Orationes*-käsikirjoitus on

edelleen melko tuntematon, tutkimukseni lisää myös tietoa tämän käsikirjoituksen tekstien erityispiirteistä.

Uuden ajan alussa englantilaisten koulujen pääkieli oli latina, mikä oli jatkoa pitkään kestäneestä latinan ja ranskan ylivallasta Britanniassa. Vaikka englantiakin opiskeltiin, sen päämääränä oli avustaa opiskelijaa latinan kieliopin omaksumisessa. Klassilliset kielet eli latina ja kreikka olivat edelleen korkean statuksen ja oppineisuuden symboli, mikä johti siihen, että vanhemmat laittoivat lapsiaan kouluun opiskelemaan latinaa ja kreikkaa, mikä mahdollistaisi pääsyn sosiaalisesti arvostettuihin virkoihin. Jotkut lähtivät koulusta opittuaan vain perusteet, mutta jotkut opiskelivat niin pitkään, että he saavuttivat erittäin korkean osaamistason klassillisissa kielissä. Tämän vuoksi on perusteltua kutsua tällaisia henkilöitä akateemisesti kaksikielisiksi. Kielen itsensä lisäksi oppilaat lukivat myös muita aineita kuten retoriikkaa. Kirjallisuutena oli suurimmaksi osaksi latinan- ja kreikankielisiä klassikkoteoksia, joiden tunteminen kuului osaltaan myös yläluokkaiseen sivistykseen.

Canterburyn katedraalikoulu on todennäköisesti melko tyypillinen esimerkki aikansa kouluista. Säilyneistä dokumenteista tiedämme, että oppilaiden lukulistaan kuuluivat muun muassa Erasmus Rotterdamilainen, Ovidius, Terentius, Cicero, Vergilius, Horatius, Isokrates, Homeros ja Hesiodos (Woodruff & Cape 1908: 133-134). Oppilaiden tuli myös tuottaa itse sekä proosaa että runoja latinaksi ja kreikaksi. Neljänä päivänä vuodessa koulu järjesti juhlatilaisuuksia, joissa oppilaat esittivät joko puheita tai näytelmiä yleisölle, johon kuului ainakin koulun ja katedraalin dekaani sekä muita kirkonmiehiä. Näillä tilaisuuksilla oli usein erityinen tarkoitus, sillä esimerkiksi kuninkaan syntymäpäivänä pidetyt puheet julistivat koulun lojaaliutta hallitsijaa kohtaan, kun taas ennen joulua esitetyillä näytelmillä ja puheilla oppilaat anoivat itselleen lyhyttä lomaa ennen joulua. Nämä puheet ja näytelmät kirjoitettiin ylös sinä aikana, kun koulun rehtorina toimi George Lovejoy. Hänen puheiden kirjansa eli *Orationes*-käsikirjoitus sisältää näytelmiä ja puheita useiden vuosien ajalta.

Koska Canterburyn katedraalikoulussa esitetyt joulunäytelmät liittyvät usein koulunkäyntiin ja opiskeluun ja koska latina oli edelleen koulunkäynnin kieli, näissä näytelmissä esiintyy erityisen paljon koodinvaihtoa. Tästä syystä olen valinnut tutkimukseni materiaaliksi neljä eri joulunäytelmää, joista kolme on genrelleen hyvin

tyypillisiä ja yksi taas melko poikkeava. Kaikissa näissä näytelmissä on periaatteessa kaksi osaa: muutaman oppilaan välinen suurimmaksi osaksi englanninkielinen dialogi koulunkäynnin raskaudesta sekä pidempi pääosa, joka sisältää latinankielisiä puheita. Se näytelmä, joka on poikkeus joulunäytelmien joukossa, ei sisällä puheita, vaan melko pitkän näytelmän, jonka tapahtumapaikkana on koulu itse. Kaikissa näissä näytelmissä esiintyy vaihtelua englannin ja latinan välillä, ja joissain niistä on myös koodinvaihtoa kreikkaan.

Koodinvaihdon tutkimus voidaan jakaa hyvin yleisellä tasolla kahteen osaan eli muotoon ja merkitykseen. Muodon osalta tutkimus on keskittynyt etenkin kolmeen aiheeseen: koodinvaihdon syntaktisiin ilmenemismuotoihin, koodinvaihdon ja lainaamisen suhteeseen sekä koodinvaihdon syntaktisiin rajoitteisiin. Ilmenemismuotojen osalta keskeisintä on jako intrasententiaaliseen ja intersententiaaliseen koodinvaihtoon. Näistä edelliseen kuuluvat lauseen sisällä tapahtuvat koodinvaihdot kuten yksittäisten lekseemien vaihdot. Jälkimmäiseen taas kuuluvat kokonaisten lauseiden tai pitempien osien välillä tapahtuvat koodinvaihdot. Koodinvaihdon ja lainaamisen välinen suhde on aihe, johon jokainen alan tutkija joutuu ottamaan kantaa, mutta johon ei kuitenkaan pystytä antamaan tyhjentävää ja yleisesti hyväksyttyä vastausta. Keskeisintä onkin huomata, että puhuttaessa monikielisten käytänteiden kuten koodinvaihdon ja lainaamisen pragmaattisista funktioista, ei ole välttämätöntä tehdä epäselvissä tapauksissa eroa koodinvaihdon ja lainaamisen välillä. Universaalien rajoitteiden osalta on todettava, että vaikka niitä on pyritty jo ensimmäisistä tutkimuksista alkaen etsimään, niiden universaalius on edelleen kyseenalaista. On kuitenkin selvää, että koodinvaihto on muun kielenkäytön tapaan normatiivista eli sääntöihin perustuvaa, vaikka näiden sääntöjen selkeä luonnehdinta ei ole tähän mennessä täysin onnistunut.

Koodinvaihdon funktioiden osalta keskityn tutkimukseni pohjustamiseksi kolmeen erilaiseen lähestymistapaan: Gumperzin, Adamsin ja Myers-Scottonin malleihin. Gumperz (1982: 60-61) esitti, että koodinvaihto voidaan alustavasti jakaa tilanteiseen ja metaforiseen koodinvaihtoon. Näistä edellinen riippuu nimensä mukaan tilanteen tai esimerkiksi genren tai puhujien asettamista rajoitteista, kun taas jälkimmäinen on pääasiassa pragmaattisia funktioita luovaa. Gumperzin (1982: 75-84) esittelemät alustavat funktiot ovat lainaukset, puhuteltavan spesifiointi, interjektiot, toisto, vies-

tin kvalifikaatio sekä persoonallisen tai objektiivisien näkökulman ottaminen. Gum-
perzin luokittelun ongelmana on se, että funktiot eivät ole millään tavalla hierarkki-
sesti samalla tasolla, ja lisäksi funktioiden määrittely jää hieman pintapuoliseksi.
Adams (2002) taas on tutkinut koodinvaihtoa Roomassa latinan ja muiden kielten
välillä. Hän esittelee seuraavat spesifit alakategoriat koodinvaihdon funktioille: sisä-
piirin kieli/solidaarisuus, koodaus/ekskluusio, etäännyttäminen/eufemismi, vakiintu-
neet sanonnat, semanttiset erot, tieteellinen terminologia ja stilistinen elävöittäminen,
mutta hän pohtii koodinvaihtoa myös esimerkiksi asymmetristen valtasuhteiden kan-
nalta (Adams 2002: 329-342, 347-382, 403-405, 383-396 ja 399-403). Vaikka
Adams tuo erityisen hyvin esiin tutkimuksessaan koodinvaihdon funktioiden moni-
puolisuuden, hänen lähestymistapansa on puhtaan aineistolähtöinen, jolloin häneltä
myös puuttuu selkeä teoreettinen viitekehys, jonka perusteella funktioita voisi luoki-
tella. Näin ollen hänen luokittelunsa on erittäin sekavaa, eikä funktioiden välinen hie-
rarkia tule esiin. Lisäksi jotkin Adamsin tulkinnat koodinvaihdon funktioille turvau-
tuvat liiaksi mahdollisiin stilistisiin tekijöihin, eikä hän ota tarpeeksi huomioon tilan-
teisen koodinvaihdon roolia. Viimeisenä mallina nostan esiin Carol Myers-Scottonin
tunnusmerkillisyysmallin (Scotton 1983; Myers-Scotton 1998c), joka on näistä kol-
mesta mallista kaikkein teoreettisin. Sen avulla pitäisi pystyä selittämään kattavasti
koodinvaihdon funktiot, mutta kuten esimerkiksi Wei (1998: 159-161) on todennut,
malli ei kykene selittämään kaikkea keskustelussa esiintyvää koodinvaihtoa. Yhtenä
tekijänä tästä mallista voidaan kuitenkin ottaa analyysiin mukaan käsite tunnusmer-
killisyydestä, joka on keskeinen etenkin strukturalisteille (ks. esim. Trubetzkoy 1958:
141). Niissä tilanteissa, joissa jokin vaihtoehto tai toimintatapa on oletusarvoinen,
sen sanotaan olevan tunnusmerkitön, kun taas odottamaton vaihtoehto on tunnus-
merkillinen. Esimerkiksi tilanteinen koodinvaihto tarkoittaa nimenomaan tietyssä
tilanteessa tunnusmerkittömän koodinvalitsemista.

Koska mikään koodinvaihdon funktioita selittävä malli ei ole täysin tyydyttävä ja
koska koodinvaihto liittyy usein sosiaalisten suhteiden ilmaisemiseen, olen ottanut
teoreettiseen viitekehykseeni mukaan Brownin ja Levinsonin kohteliaisuusteorian.
Tämän teorian ytimessä on käsite, jota Brown ja Levinson (1987: 61-62) kutsuvat
etenkin Goffmania ([1967] 1982) mukaillen kasvoiksi. Kasvot ovat eräänlainen jul-
kinen minäkuva, jonka jokainen yhteiskunnan jäsen haluaa säilyttää. Kasvot voidaan
edelleen jakaa positiivisiin kasvoihin eli muiden arvostamaan omakuvaan sekä nega-

tiivisiin kasvoihin eli haluun toimia itsenäisesti muiden estämättä. Tämän lisäksi kaikilla yhteiskunnan jäsenillä on kyky päätellä rationaalisesti, että omien kasvojen säilyttämiseksi ihannetilanteessa on edullisinta pyrkiä säilyttämään myös kaikkien muiden kasvot. Tämä on kuitenkin käytännössä mahdotonta, koska tavallinen kommunikaatio vaatii lähes jatkuvasti kasvoja uhkaavia tekoja (face-threatening act eli FTA), joiden pehmentämiseksi puhujat voivat käyttää erilaisia kohteliaisuusstrategioita. Kohteliaisuusstrategiat ja FTA:t voidaan jaotella edelleen sen mukaan, loukkaavatko ne puhujan vai kuulijan kasvoja ja kohdistuvatko ne negatiivisiin vai positiivisiin kasvoihin.

Varsinaisen käytännön mallinsa lisäksi Brown ja Levinson esittelevät teoriansa formaalit perustat, jotka ovat keskeisiä myös oman tutkimukseni kannalta. Puhujat pystyvät arvioimaan FTA:n suuruutta kolmen eri muuttujan avulla, jotka ovat sosiaalinen etäisyys D, suhteellinen valta P sekä velvoitteiden suhteellinen luokitus R jossain tietyssä kulttuurissa (Brown & Levinson 1987: 74-76). Keskeisenä ajatuksena näissä muuttujissa on se, että mikäli tiedetään kahden muuttujan arvot, on kielellisen käytöksen perusteella mahdollista myös päätellä, millaiseksi puhuja tai kuulija kokee kolmannen arvon. Nämä muuttujat ovat myös tärkeitä koodinvaihdon funktioiden luokittelussa, koska niiden avulla voidaan järjestää ja erottaa funktiot vedoten johonkin selkeään yksittäiseen tekijään.

Olen valinnut tutkielmaani varten metodin, jossa yhdistyy sekä aineisto- että teorialähtöisyys. Toisaalta ilmiöitä ei pyritä väkisin sovittamaan mihinkään yhteen teoreettiseen malliin, vaan funktiot tulkitaan alustavasti omassa kontekstissaan ottaen huomioon historialliset ja kulttuurilliset taustat. Toisaalta taas kohteliaisuusteorian avulla voidaan funktiot järjestää niin, että tuloksia voidaan vertailla muihin tutkimuksiin. Tällöin on mahdollista tutkia samalla metodilla myös muita diskurssistrategioita kuten puhuttelusanojen käyttöä. Funktioiden selittämiseksi turvaudun myös rationaalin selityksen malliin (Itkonen 1983: 49-53; 2003: 58), empatian käsitteeseen (Itkonen 2003: 58), ajatukseen toiminnan kerrostumisesta (Clark 1996: 353-384) sekä omaan tulkintaani kielellisen merkityksen tasoista.

Analyysini perusteella voidaan todeta, että yksi keskeisimpiä funktioita koodinvaihdolle *Orationes*-käsikirjoituksen joulunäytelmissä on intertekstuaalisuuden ilmaise-

minen. Tämä tapahtuu lainaamalla klassisia auktoreita sekä koulussa mahdollisesti käytettyjä oppikirjoja. Tilanteesta ja tarkastelutavasta riippuen intertekstuaalisuutta voidaan käyttää usean eri merkityksen aikaansaamiseen. Yleinen funktio onkin ilmaista koodinvaihdolla ja intertekstuaalisuudella solidaarisuutta, eli puhujan ja puhuteltavan välistä alhaista D-arvoa. Intertekstuaalisuutta voidaan käyttää myös FTA:n suorittamiseen, mutta tällaisia esimerkkejä esiintyi materiaalissa vain harvoin. Koodinvaihtoa voidaan myös käyttää FTA:na ilman intertekstuaalisuutta, ja sillä voidaan hyökätä sekä positiivisia että negatiivisia kasvoja kohtaan. Näiden tärkeimpien funktioiden lisäksi koodinvaihdon funktioina olivat myös esimerkiksi eufemismi (joka on solidaarisuuden alalaji), stilistinen keino sekä genren asettamat rajoitukset, jolloin koodinvaihto oli tilanteista.

Koodinvaihdon muodon osalta keskeisin havainto oli, että useat aiemmat tavat erotella koodinvaihtoa ja lainaamista eivät ole sovellettavissa materiaaliin kaikilta osin. Näin ollen on todettava, kuten useat ovat tehneet, että koodinvaihto ja lainaaminen kuuluvat samalle jatkumolle, eikä niiden välillä voi tehdä eroa kaikissa tilanteissa. Tämän lisäksi todettiin, että koska latina ja kreikka ovat syntaktisesti hyvin erilaisia kuin esimerkiksi englanti ja espanja, joiden välistä koodinvaihtoa on käytetty koodinvaihdon syntaktisten rajoitteiden selvittämisessä materiaalina, klassillisten kielten mukaan ottaminen tällaisiin tutkimuksiin saattaisi tuottaa hedelmällisiä lopputuloksia.

Metodin osalta todettiin, että vaikka kohteliaisuusteoriassa on tiettyjä puutteita, sen ja kasvojen soveltaminen materiaaliin toimi erittäin hyvin. Funktioiden luokittelu oli systemaattista, ja olisikin mahdollista soveltaa tätä samaa metodia muihin vastaaviin tutkimuksiin. Koska tutkielmani osuu usean eri alan ja aiheen risteämäkohtaan, olisi tästä mahdollista jatkaa useaan eri suuntaan. *Orationes*-käsikirjoituksen osalta olisi syytä tutkia seuraavaksi laajempaa otosta näytelmiä ja mahdollisesti ottaa mukaan vertailuun myös muita diskurssistrategioita kuten puhuttelusanoja. Käyttämääni metodia voisi myös soveltaa muihin historiallisiin teksteihin muissa kielitilanteissa, jolloin voitaisiin toisaalta paremmin arvioida metodin toimivuutta ja toisaalta saada aikaan vertailua erilaisissa tilanteissa tapahtuvien monikielisten käytänteiden välillä. Mikäli metodi osoittautuu myös muissa tutkimuksissa toimivaksi, sitä tulisikin soveltaa myös laajemmin historiallisen pragmatiikan piirissä.