

From historical code-switching to multilingual practices in the past

Päivi Pahta, Janne Skaffari and Laura Wright¹

Final draft version (without subsequent minor alterations) of Pahta, Päivi, Janne Skaffari & Laura Wright. 2018. From historical code-switching to multilingual practices in the past. In Pahta et al. (eds.). *Multilingual Practices in Language History: English and Beyond*. Berlin & Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 3–17. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.utu.fi/10.1515/9781501504945-001>. The final publication is available at www.degruyter.com.

1. Introduction

Multilingualism and multiculturalism are burning topics in today's societies. Peoples, languages and cultures coming into contact with each other can provoke confusion and concern. However, although the current situation in Europe, for example, tends to be viewed as alarmingly sudden, cultural and language contact and multilingualism are nothing new. Multilingualism in the past was not limited in place and time: we find evidence of it throughout medieval Europe, and in other periods and regions as well. Multilingual societies were composed of multilingual individuals who used more than one language in their daily lives, even within a single utterance. This is manifest in their writing. The surviving written evidence offers us access to code-switching and other multilingual practices of the past, the topic to which this volume – and a growing number of others – is dedicated.

A key term in discussing multilinguals and their communicative practices is code-switching, which has been defined in a number of different ways. We quote Winford (2003: 14): “the alternate use of two languages (or dialects) within the same stretch of speech, often within the same sentence” – and Poplack (1980: 583): “the alternation of two languages within a single discourse, sentence or constituent”. Both define code-switching as involving two linguistic codes, although there can be more. Moreover, Winford mentions speech, as code-switching was originally studied as a feature of spoken interaction, whilst Poplack highlights the linguistic, structural context within which the switch takes place. Since historical linguists only work with written records of language use, we have a slightly different emphasis: “the co-occurrence of two or more languages in a single communicative event” (Pahta and Nurmi 2006: 203). Broader definitions have also been made by others – consider Heller (1998: 1): “the use of more than one language in the course of a single communicative episode”. The similarities between these definitions, though, hides the variation and variability of the phenomenon at hand. Gardner-Chloros has compared it to a chameleon on the one hand (1995: 80) and to an elephant on the other (2009: vii–viii), revisiting the Indian legend of six blind men encountering this “wondrous beast” for the first time and describing completely different parts of it. Similarly, researchers have asked different questions: how are codes switched inside a clause or within a conversation; what

¹ The authors wish to thank the Academy of Finland (decision numbers 257059 and 258434) for funding the research projects during which this collection was compiled and edited.

constrains switching; when is a non-native word a switch rather than a borrowing; what do switches reveal about the communicators and the community; why does a speaker or writer choose a particular code in a particular context; and where do the boundaries between two codes lie? A very narrow definition would limit the study of code-switching to, for example, the syntax of a bilingual clause; an extremely broad one would incorporate virtually all processes and products of communication involving two or more languages. Yet other approaches take a different starting point for viewing the phenomenon and disregard the notion of codes in the sense of separate languages between which speakers switch; in such approaches, described, for example, by Blommaert (2010: 102), multilingualism

... should not be seen as a collection of ‘languages’ that the speaker controls, but rather as a complex of *specific* semiotic resources, some of which belong to a conventionally defined ‘language’, while others belong to another ‘language’. The resources are concrete accents, language varieties, registers, genres, modalities such as writing – ways of using language in particular communicative situations and spheres of life.

This book considers multilingual communication from a historical perspective. Its title reveals a broad approach: *multilingual practices* is offered as a term which allows researchers to consider a range of topics under the same umbrella, from multilingual societal practice and individual identities and linguistic repertoires to the use of different languages in structuring texts and the syntax of intrasentential code-switching. The phrase is familiar from previous research (e.g. Pahta and Nurmi 2006) although we as editors have not imposed it on the contributors to this volume nor constrained their use of technical meta-language: while differences and similarities between such terms as *code-switching*, *code-mixing*, *foreignism* and others are attended to by individual authors, the chapters in this book are essentially inclusive rather than divisive, with any and all evidence for historical multilingualism deemed to be of interest, whether one-off or conventionalised, or somewhere between these two extremes. This volume stands as an opening up of discussion about historical practices, rather than belonging to this or that camp.

The approach promoted by this volume has multilingualism as a default starting-point: one way or the other, virtually all historical texts are multilingual. They contain words, phrases and passages originating in a language other than the main language; they may be translations although not necessarily acknowledged as such; their authors may be bilingual

from childhood or have become multilingual later.² In the medieval European context, for example, practically anyone who could write would have known at least Latin (the *lingua franca* of the period) and one vernacular language (their mother tongue); and while some of the best-known and most prolific writers are known to have been polyglots (for example, Geoffrey Chaucer), this was not a characteristic of the finest authors alone. This multilingual approach challenges previous ways of looking at older texts, particularly multilingual records. In the past, many scholars have routinely dismissed non-monolingual written language use as simply incompetent (on the assumption that scribes were unable to maintain competence in monolingual Latin), or in the case of juxtaposed languages on the page, as fragmented. Thus, for example, in medieval texts from England which were composed of discrete passages of Medieval Latin, Anglo-Norman French and Middle English, the English portions of the text have been given much more attention than the Latin and French ones; the monolingual expectation has led to looking at one language at a time. Dictionaries in particular sift multilingual texts in this way, extracting words relevant to their concerns but not always mentioning the multilingual context, or, alternatively, not including words relevant to their concerns *because of* the multilingual context. More generally, the non-monolingual background or practices of the writer often go unnoticed, remaining dissociated from the linguistic features of the writer's output or the wider multilingual context of the day.

Embracing a multilingual approach to language history leads the researcher to look beyond the main language of a text and consider what a holistic overview of all the languages in it reveals, about the "grammar" of non-monolingual writing on the one hand or individual identity or societal practice on the other. Multilingual writing and code-switching reflect the linguistic competences and repertoires of individuals and are a response to the expectations of the wider community. There is inevitably an audience implication bound up in multilingual practices, which are interactional, social, varied phenomena. Consequently, the contributors to this volume refer to a variety of frameworks, theories and subdisciplines of linguistics: sociolinguistics, pragmatics, discourse analysis, semantics, lexicography, theoretical and historical linguistics, corpus linguistics, palaeography and codicology.

This volume is by no means the first book on multilingual practices of the past (consider, for example, Wenzel 1994; Trotter 2000; Adams, Janse and Swain 2002; or Hüning, Vogl and Moliner 2012). Some of our authors also contributed to *Code-Switching in Early English* (Schendl and Wright 2011c), the first collected volume on code-switching in

² For more on translation-induced language change, see Kranich, Becher and Höder (2011), and on the translation/code-switching interface, Kolehmainen and Skaffari (2016).

the history of English. Its introductory chapters (Schendl and Wright 2011a, 2011b) provide not only a survey of the field and its key issues but also its history, which started essentially in the 1990s (see also Pahta 2012 and Schendl 2012); there is little need to recapitulate it here. Schendl and Wright (2011b: 34–35) also posit some desiderata for future work on the topic, much of which relates to sources of multilingual data: inclusion of previously dismissed types of material, creating searchable corpora of various genres featuring code-switching, and tracing records of one and the same text-type diachronically. What the field also needs are better descriptions of Anglo-Norman and Anglo-Latin – as England and English have been and continue to be very prominent in historical multilingualism studies, including the present volume – while at the same time it is important to look beyond the borders and coasts of England and aim at a Europe-wide approach, as many of the same phenomena were relevant on the Continent, and elsewhere in the world. Conceptually and theoretically, the desiderata include acknowledging diachronic change and diatopic variation in multilingual practices, applying appropriately adapted theories of present-day multilingualism to mixed-language material of the past and, ultimately, contributing to the study of “the multilingual brain”. The chapters in the present volume show that progress has been made in achieving these goals.

Sections 2 to 5 of this introduction are structured so that they simultaneously discuss prominent issues and problems in the field and provide an overview of the chapters. While the grouping of the chapters highlights certain themes, it is possible to identify other important approaches and analyses in them, and some topics recur in a number of contributions. The contributors analyse evidence for multilingual practices of various types in communities in the past, be they informal and private (equating, insofar as is possible, to present-day informal spoken code-switching), or the codified use of two or more languages in high-register medieval religious or civic documents, or simply the self-conscious and joyful switching between Latin and vernacular languages found in early modern literature. It is hardly surprising that the majority of papers here touch on Latin, as it was the main European language of writing in the historical period. Apart from English and Latin, the other languages discussed include Anglo-Norman French, Irish, Polish, Portuguese, Scots, Spanish and Welsh. Finally, section 6 provides a review of how the chapters meet the desiderata cited above, some concluding remarks, and a call for more research in the field.

2. On code-switching and matrix language

Some of the recurrent concerns in code-switching research relate to terminology. *Code-switching* itself is not a simple or neutral term, despite its frequency. While its use in research

on multilingual spoken interaction was established decades ago (e.g. Haugen 1950; Blom and Gumperz 1972; Gumperz 1982), many researchers treat the multilingualism of written texts as clearly different from that of conversations. The crucial difference seems to be spontaneity or lack of planning, which characterises speech far more than writing. To overcome this problem, some have chosen to use code-switching as an umbrella term covering any range of what we call multilingual practices, while others choose to apply a different term altogether, such as *language mixing*, *code mixing*, *language alternation* and *language interaction*. These, however, are not unproblematic either, as even the broadest-looking terms may also have been used in narrower senses. Quite often, code-mixing has been used to refer to intrasentential switching only, while language mixing – which superficially looks transparent and non-technical – has been posited by Auer (1999) as a type of language alternation, intermediate on a continuum from code-switching to fused lects. In sum, there is no consensus on the name of the phenomenon itself.³

In addition to terms referring to switching, mixing, borrowing, and so on, there is variation in how the languages involved are labelled. Probably the most widely used and technical of these are *matrix language* and *embedded language*, introduced by Myers-Scotton (e.g. 1993) as part of her Matrix Language Frame model. In the present volume, those contributors who use matrix language as a term do so in its non-controversial sense, meaning *grammatical background*, *syntactic framework* or simply *main language*. An exception is Penelope Gardner-Chloros, who problematises the term and observes that code-switching is produced by individuals who use their repertoire of languages according to circumstance; that what belongs to one language and what belongs to another is not necessarily clear; and that identifying a single primary language in bilingual speech or writing may not be possible. In “Historical and modern studies of code-switching: A tale of mutual enrichment”, Gardner-Chloros further compares the work and interests of “mainstream” sociolinguists working on present-day data and those of historical sociolinguists, pointing out that the former are not very familiar with the research conducted by the latter and that they mainly focus on spontaneous oral production at the expense of other (written) sorts (although the rise of social media is changing that). Historical code-switched data can, however, provide a testbed for code-switching theory, illustrating, for example, the development from an initial code-switch to a widespread, assimilated borrowing. Despite their different challenges, historical and

³ For more on the terminology, see, for example, Gardner-Chloros (2009: 10–13) and Schendl and Wright (2011b: 23–24).

mainstream sociolinguists share a lot of common ground and can benefit from each other's work – in both directions.

Overall, the contributors to this volume tend to prefer terms other than *matrix* and *embedded language*. The majority, however, do not shy away from the term code-switching. All of them examine multilingual practices of the past.

3. Exploring borderlands

The first section of the book, “Borderlands”, is concerned with grey areas and boundaries on both a concrete and a metaphorical level – geographical border areas and temporally defined groups of texts which have been overlooked thus far, and the conceptually and practically challenging boundary between code-switching and borrowing.

A constant problem in researching short, mainly one-word switches is distinguishing them from *lexical borrowings* or *loanwords*. Both are consequences of language contact and refer to items originating in another language, but the latter are seen as more integrated into the recipient language, more established as part of its lexis and often more frequent. A considerable grey area nonetheless remains, since not all loans are morphologically or phonologically assimilated into the system of the recipient language, nor are all code-switches spontaneous or transient (a term for infrequently used loans, *nonce borrowing* [Weinreich [1953] 1963: 11], occurs seldom in this book). The switching/borrowing issue is specifically addressed in the chapters by Herbert Schendl, Rita Queiroz de Barros and Louise Sylvester, and appears elsewhere as well.

Herbert Schendl considers in “Code-switching in Anglo-Saxon England: A corpus-based approach” the multilingual material in two text-types, homilies and scientific treatises, from the earliest period in the history of written English. Languages pattern differently in the two text-types: homilies contain code-switched quotations and short intrasentential switches (some of them glossed religious terms), whereas treatises contain Latin authorial metacomments in addition to terminology and quotations. Schendl also considers the problem of distinguishing borrowing from code-switching and, after presenting an overview of previous work on the subject, proposes five principles for identifying one-word switches: (i) the author's bilingualism; (ii) lack of morphological integration (unlike loans); (iii) low frequency and restricted distribution; (iv) the stylistic or other effect the switch creates; and in some cases, (v) the explanation accompanying the foreign word. These criteria correspond to some of those proposed by Matras (2009: 110–114); however, Schendl notes that not all Latin word-forms appearing in vernacular texts are code-switches, as he demonstrates with a

selection of candidates. Essentially, each potential candidate has to be examined individually; and Schendl concludes that code-switching, leading to lexical innovation and eventually to lexical borrowing, is part of a dynamic process in which individual authors' bilingual resources play an important role.

In "Twentieth-century Romance loans: Code-switching in the *Oxford English Dictionary*?" Rita Queiroz de Barros gives a brief history of the issue of single-word switching versus lexical borrowing, including the problems it poses in lexicography. As a case-study, she analyses how over 1800 Romance-origin twentieth-century words have been treated in the *Oxford English Dictionary* and distinguishes foreignisms (or one-word switches) from borrowings on the basis of such criteria as orthography and pronunciation, the use of glosses, italics or inverted commas, and the presence of un-English morphology. She finds that according to her criteria, over a third of the words considered are foreignisms, although they are usually not labelled as such. The remaining two-thirds, not showing such features, may thus be classified as more assimilated borrowings which more clearly deserve to be included in a monolingual dictionary.

Louise Sylvester has a different approach to short switches/loans in her examination of technical vocabulary. In "A semantic field and text-type approach to late-medieval multilingualism" she considers single-word switches by focusing on whether or not they are general, superordinate terms, or more specialised hyponyms, taking as evidence data from wills, sumptuary laws, petitions and romances included in the *Medieval Dress and Textile Vocabulary in Unpublished Sources* project. Surveying dress and textile terms, she considers three terms occurring in all four text-types and their semantic nuances in various contexts. She then examines other clothing terms only occurring in one text-type. She concludes that as clothing terms are specific to text-type, they may be seen to represent a technolact, a precise and universal technical vocabulary, rather than a specific single language. This brings into question language boundaries: it may not be possible to know whether a given term formed part of the discrete word-stock of Latin, French or English, when there is evidence that it was used in all three. In such circumstances, both code-switching and lexical borrowing turn out to be inadequate terms.

Next, Simon Meecham-Jones takes us to the Welsh–English border in "Code-switching and contact influence in Middle English manuscripts from the Welsh Penumbra – Should we re-interpret the evidence from *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*?". Language contact between medieval Welsh and Middle English was frequent and lasted for centuries, but written evidence of it is very rare, and Welsh influence on English life and language has

been underinvestigated. Meecham-Jones demonstrates that Welsh linguistic features in “monolingual” English texts have been overlooked or misinterpreted, even in texts associated with the border area. He particularly focuses on *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* and its idiosyncratic vocabulary; many of its obscure words may be of Welsh origin, or potentially represent code-switching. Despite the broad range of research into literary language, there still remains uncharted territory.

The last chapter in this section similarly focuses on a border area often neglected in linguistic studies of medieval English, but a temporal rather than geographical one. In “Code-switching in the long twelfth century”, Janne Skaffari discusses the use of Latin, English and French in over a hundred broadly literary (as opposed to documentary) manuscripts currently held in various libraries in England, particularly in Oxford, Cambridge and London, dating from the last decades of the eleventh century to the thirteenth century. The multilingual practices evinced in the material, which is mostly religious, include intertextual, intersentential, intrasentential and also extrasentential or – literally – marginal switching between Latin and English, some of it visually flagged. French plays a very minor role in these manuscripts, which is partly a reflection of the criteria for selecting the material for this study. However, the relative rareness of code-switching between the vernacular languages in written texts (compared to switching between Latin and a vernacular) is a theme visible also elsewhere in this volume.

4. Locating patterns

The second section of the book, “Patterns”, draws upon large datasets and corpus linguistic methods. Corpora have thus far not been used extensively in historical multilingualism research; within English historical linguistics, the seminal paper is by Pahta and Nurmi (2006), who consider the long diachrony of code-switching in the history of English writing, using the Helsinki Corpus of English Texts as their data. The chapters in this section both utilise corpora – purpose-built and multipurpose ones – and introduce tools for exploring their multilingual features. Actual multilingual corpora are far rarer than monolingual ones, partly due to the markup problems they pose, but just like individual texts which have been summarily classified as monolingual, the so-called monolingual corpora may also display a wealth of evidence of other languages interacting with the main language (see, for example, the papers in Nurmi, Rütten and Pahta 2017).

This section starts with another chapter on religious material. In “‘Trifling Shews of Learning’? Patterns of code-switching in English sermons 1640–1740”, Jukka Tuominen

surveys ten sermons included in the Lampeter Corpus from a variationist point of view. The pattern which emerges from his study is that code-switching to Latin (mostly quotations and terminology) declined over time, with authors born before the 1640s switching more than those born in the latter half of the seventeenth century. Moreover, two nonconformist ministers in particular showed the least code-switching; education may also have played a role here as they, unlike the other authors, were not university educated. A claim by a bishop of the time that the use of foreign languages in English sermons was by 1692 a thing of the past is found to have been prescriptive rather than descriptive: code-switching in sermons continued throughout the period.

Arja Nurmi, Jukka Tyrkkö, Anna Petäjaniemi and Päivi Pahta research a much larger corpus in “The social and textual embedding of multilingual practices in Late Modern English: A corpus-based analysis”. They collect evidence of multilingual practices in 18th- and 19th-century English writings from the 34-million-word Corpus of Late Modern English Texts 3.0 and identify multilingual passages using semi-automated discovery methods, particularly *Multilingualiser*, a new tool specifically developed for locating data in multiple languages. The chapter presents a quantitative overview of foreign-language passages – rather than individual words (which are problematic, as seen above) – in written English and of the variety of languages used during this period. It also offers a refined statistical analysis of the sociolinguistic correlations between multilingual practices and the language-external social variables characterising the data, such as the authors’ gender, social status, age and education, and the probable target audience of each text. The chapter thus offers baseline evidence of the frequency and types of code-switching in the Late Modern English period and identifies patterns of multilingualism in writing.

Šime Demo similarly examines something other than switching between just two or three languages in “Mining macaronics”. He considers early modern macaronic verse, a widespread literary practice that lasted several centuries and included a number of language pairs in Europe, connecting educated literary people across cultures in a fashion resembling today’s social media. The dominant language was Neo-Latin (i.e., post-1500 Latin), as used in a self-conscious literary genre, informed by reference to classical works, and predominantly of humorous intent. Demo considers the structural properties of macaronic verse by investigating a corpus of sixty poems made up of eleven language pairs (including such languages as Dutch, Croatian and Portuguese), written between the late fifteenth century and 1969. A pattern or tendency he discovers is that on average, clusters of words from Germanic languages in the macaronic poems are shorter than those from Romance languages,

so the size of the vernacular-language cluster seems to be connected to the language family of the embedded-language items. The building of the multilingual corpus is also detailed in the chapter.

Tom ter Horst and Nike Stam, focusing on code-neutral material in two corpora of Medieval Latin/Irish religious writing, show how corpus methods can be employed to examine ambivalence at the fuzzy boundaries between languages. In “Visual diamorphs: The importance of language neutrality in code-switching from medieval Ireland”, they focus on material which is lexically and grammatically sufficient in both of the languages used and ask whether these visual diamorphs trigger a switch. In their corpora, they identify diamorphic lexical borrowings, function words, abbreviated words and also “emblems”, which are more pictorial symbols, such as the Tironian note for “and”, or abbreviation and suspension symbols, which transcended language boundaries. Personal and place names can also be language-neutral. The rather striking pattern in the medieval Irish data is that 75% of the switch-points occur in conjunction with diamorphs, so code-neutral material was indeed strongly operative in triggering or facilitating a switch.

Alpo Honkapohja is also interested in scribal practices and conventions in manuscripts. In “‘Latin in Recipes?’ A corpus approach to scribal abbreviations in 15th-century medical manuscripts”, he confronts the medieval European practice of using abbreviation and suspension symbols which serve to obscure morphemes, thereby creating code-neutral material. His data are taken from recipes in five bilingual medical manuscripts. As with Demo’s investigation of macaronic Neo-Latin verse, there is no corpus of medieval abbreviation symbol usage *per se*, so Honkapohja devised his own encoding system in order to count and log the distribution of the various types of abbreviations used in the manuscripts. He asks what kind of linguistic material was abbreviated, and which patterns can be discerned by looking at abbreviation frequencies. He finds differing ratios of abbreviated words in the English part of the corpus (9%) to those in the Latin part (35%), but conversely observes more variation in the use of English abbreviations than in that of Latin ones; regularity characterises the copying of the most technical part of the Latin vocabulary in particular.

5. Considering contexts

Finally, the third section, “Contexts”, is concerned with multilingual practices in a variety of communicative, social and historical contexts. While the other chapters do not dismiss the context which gave rise to multilingual practices in text production, the four studies in this section introduce previously overlooked contexts of multilingual language use, or relate a

particular context to much broader questions, be they conceptual concerns or issues of language use. The authors review prevailing ideas about historical code-switching and propose refinements to the terminology used in code-switching and multilingualism studies.

In “Administrative multilingualism on the page in early modern Poland: In search of a framework for written code-switching” Joanna Kopaczyk considers switching between Latin, Polish and Scots in seventeenth-century municipal administrative and legal records pertaining to Scottish immigrants working in early modern Poland/Lithuania, and discusses the context of Early Modern Cracow. She notes that editions and translations often lose or disguise characteristics of multilingual texts, such as the relationship between language and layout or other visual features. Kopaczyk discusses the nature of switch-points – at the macro-genre level, the discourse, clause, word, morpheme, and orthographic levels, with abbreviations sitting between the morphemic and orthographic levels – and builds these levels into a framework which also accounts for the visual aspect of multilingual writing. The chapter thus links historical multilingualism and code-switching studies with recent research combining the verbal content of texts with layout and material context (e.g. Peikola et al. 2017).

The last three chapters discuss multilingual practices in England. The first one contains examples from early modern England and is also concerned with conceptualisation and frameworks: Alekski Mäkilähde’s chapter “Approaching the functions of historical code-switching: The case of solidarity” contributes towards theory-formation in the field by shedding light on a term which is often used in research into the functions of or motivations behind code-switching, but which is rarely defined explicitly, namely, solidarity. He teases out the nature of the relationship between the speaker and the hearer, with particular emphasis on the power relations and distance of the two, and illustrates the potential of clearly defined and theoretically solid terms by analysing examples from late-seventeenth-century school drama. The school plays display switching between Early Modern English, Latin and Greek and reflect the linguistic practices prevalent in the school context.

Moving to a context frequently discussed in historical code-switching research, Richard Ingham asks in “Medieval bilingualism in England: On the rarity of vernacular code-switching” whether medieval trilingual writing can reveal anything about spoken usage. Elsewhere, he has shown that Anglo-Norman French continued to be spoken in England by bilinguals until the late fourteenth century. He takes as data religious prose and business texts and finds that code-switching in these two domains patterned quite differently, the clergy being proficient at discrete Latin and not mixing the two vernaculars, whereas the business-record keepers used three languages in their texts. In particular, Ingham argues that the

combination of [French article + English noun], which frequently occurs in documentary records, is evidence of “snippets of code-switching” akin to present-day spontaneous code-switched speech. Yet, it is only accounts and charters which show this practice, with encroachment into other Anglo-Norman text-types mainly occurring only towards the end of insular French usage in the fifteenth century. He concludes that the data extant provide a skewed vision of the spoken reality: although code-switching between the vernaculars must have been common in spoken communication in medieval England, written evidence of it is rare outside a few administrative text-types which arose from interaction between bilingual speakers.

Finally, Laura Wright considers the relationship between multilingual practices and standardisation in the late medieval English context in “A multilingual approach to the history of Standard English”. She asks how the history of Standard English looks if a multilingual perspective is taken, revealing a staggered swap-over from Medieval Latin to proto-Standard English as the predominant language of written record via a sustained period of mixed language writing in the late fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. She rehearses some recent work by scholars in order to show how the twentieth-century view of the development of Standard English has now been superseded. Emerging Standard English can be explained with reference to socioeconomic change, which is also reflected in the mixed-language phase of business writing between two monolingual stages – Latin first, followed by (proto-Standard) English. It is time the results of the multilingual approach to language history were introduced to textbooks and also utilised in research not primarily concerned with historical code-switching.

6. Conclusion

Together, the fourteen chapters in the three sections described above address nearly all of the desiderata set in Schendl and Wright (2011c) for future research on historical code-switching. Obviously, there are no direct answers to the question about the workings of the bilingual brain in this volume, although historical data could and should be used in researching the psycholinguistics of multilingualism, to complement evidence collected from present-day interaction. Nor do the contributors provide improved descriptions of the French and Latin of medieval England; such accounts are not within the scope of this book, but the chapters by Ingham and Wright, in particular, dissect the use of both languages alongside or mixed with English. Meecham-Jones complements our understanding of multilingual practices on the British Isles with his discussion of Welsh-English contact, while ter Horst and Stam focus on

Irish and Latin. Many if not most of the authors examine overlooked primary sources and text-types. Sylvester, for example, examines technical vocabulary collected from mostly non-literary texts, and Skaffari focuses on a prominent domain but an under-researched period; Queiroz de Barros uses a continually updated dictionary as her source of potential code-switches. Others use corpora of multiple genres or domains (Nurmi et al.) or of just one (Honkapohja). Schendl discusses material which constitutes the earliest stage of two domains whose multilingual features in later periods have already been objects of research. Short-term diachronic change is addressed by Tuominen, while there is a diatopic dimension in the chapter by Demo, who examines the same bilingual practices in different areas and different language pairs. Kopaczyk adapts theoretical approaches to code-switching, as does Mäkilähde.

In sum, the chapters in this book show that there are multiple ways of viewing concepts such as code-switching and borrowing. The contributors highlight questions of identity, and the many ways in which writers tailored their language to specific interlocutors in different communicative situations. They posit polarities and continua, from individual practices to wholesale language shift, they identify patterns characterising certain text-types, and more than one author confronts the physicality of the evidence: script-switching, use of red ink, positioning on the page, pictorial emblems. First and foremost, this collection emphasises that texts of the past were produced by people with multilingual repertoires and that the communicative practices witnessed in them reflect ongoing and earlier language contact situations. The historical individual deployed their linguistic resources according to the pragmatic constraints of the relevant community at the relevant point in time, often moving fluently from one language to another to express themselves in ways bearing a close resemblance to what today is known as translanguaging, i.e. using their multilingual repertoire as an integrated communication system (see e.g. García & Li Wei 2014). We hope that this volume will serve to stimulate interest in taking a multilingual perspective, as so much historical data extant, from the most ancient to the most recent, is composed of more than one language.

References

- Adams, J. N., Mark Janse & Simon Swain (eds.). 2002. *Bilingualism in ancient society: Language contact and the written text*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Auer, Peter. 1999. From code-switching via language mixing to fused lect: Toward a dynamic typology of bilingual speech. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 3. 309–332.

- Blom, J. P. & John J. Gumperz. 1972. Social meaning in linguistic structures: Code-switching in Norway. In John J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication*, 407–434. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Blommaert, Jan. 2010. *The sociolinguistics of globalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- García, Ofelia & Li Wei. 2014. *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gardner-Chloros, Penelope. 1995. Code-switching in community, regional and national repertoires: The myth of the discreteness of linguistic systems. In Lesley Milroy & Pieter Muysken (eds.), *One speaker, two languages: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching*, 68–89. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gardner-Chloros, Penelope. 2009. *Code-switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gumperz, John J. 1982. *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Haugen, Einar. 1950. The analysis of linguistic borrowing. *Language* 29(2). 210–231.
- Heller, Monica. 1988. Introduction. In Monica Heller (ed.), *Codeswitching: Anthropological and sociolinguistic perspectives* (Contributions to the Sociology of Language 48), 1–24. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hüning, Matthias, Ulrike Vogl & Olivier Moliner. 2012. *Standard languages and multilingualism in European history*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Kolehmainen, Leena & Janne Skaffari. 2016. Multilingual practices in contemporary and historical contexts: Interfaces between code-switching and translation. *Multilingua* 35(2). 123–135.
- Kranich Svenja, Viktor Becher & Steffen Höder. 2011. A tentative typology of translation-induced language change. In Kranich Svenja, Viktor Becher, Steffen Höder & Juliane House (eds.), *Multilingual discourse production: Diachronic and synchronic perspectives* (Hamburg Studies on Multilingualism 12), 11–43. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Machan, Tim William. 2016. The individuality of English in the multilingual Middle Ages. In Merja Kytö & Päivi Pahta, *The Cambridge handbook of English historical linguistics*, 407–423. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Matras, Yaron. 2009. *Language contact*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol. 1993. *Duelling languages: Grammatical structure in codeswitching*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

- Nurmi, Arja, Tanja Rütten & Päivi Pahta. 2017. *Challenging the myth of monolingual corpora*. Leiden & Boston: Brill Rodopi.
- Pahta, Päivi. 2012. Code-switching in English of the Middle Ages. In Terttu Nevalainen & Elizabeth Closs Traugott (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of the history of English*, 528–537. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pahta, Päivi & Arja Nurmi. 2006. Code-switching in the Helsinki Corpus: A thousand years of multilingual practices. In Ritt Nikolaus, Herbert Schendl, Christiane Dalton-Puffer & Dieter Kastovsky (eds.), *Medieval English and its heritage: Structure, meaning and mechanisms of change*, 203–220. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Peikola Matti, Aleksi Mäkilähde, Hanna Salmi, Mari-Liisa Varila & Janne Skaffari (eds.). 2017. *Verbal and visual communication in early English texts*. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Poplack, Shana. 1980. “Sometimes I’ll start a sentence in Spanish *y termino en español*”: Toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics* 18. 581–618.
- Schendl, Herbert. 2012. Multilingualism, code-switching, and language contact in historical sociolinguistics. In Juan M. Hernández-Campoy and J. Camilo Conde-Silvestre (eds.), *The handbook of historical sociolinguistics*, 520–533. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Schendl, Herbert & Laura Wright. 2011a. Introduction. In Herbert Schendl & Laura Wright (eds.), *Code-switching in early English*, 1–14. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Schendl, Herbert & Laura Wright. 2011b. Code-switching in early English: Historical background and methodological and theoretical issues. In Herbert Schendl & Laura Wright (eds.), *Code-switching in early English*, 15–45. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Schendl, Herbert & Laura Wright (eds.). 2011c. *Code-switching in early English*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Trotter, David A. (ed.). 2000. *Multilingualism in later medieval Britain*. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer.
- Weinreich, Uriel. 1963 [1953]. *Languages in contact: Findings and problems*, 2nd printing. The Hague: Mouton and Co.
- Wenzel, Siegfried. 1994. *Macaronic sermons: Bilingualism and preaching in late-medieval England*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Winford, Donald. 2003. *An introduction to contact linguistics*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.