Arja Nurmi* and Janne Skaffari

Managing Latin: support and intratextual translation as mediation strategies in the history of English

https://doi.org/10.1515/text-2019-0211
Received June 26, 2019; accepted January 13, 2021;
published online February 5, 2021

Abstract: Our study maps the practices of managing Latin in English texts from over a thousand years. Mediation is a communicative activity which involves explaining the content of a conversation or text to another person. In contexts of multilingual writing, this is typically self-mediation, which a writer may perform by complementing code-switches with intratextual translations in the text. The data for the study are drawn from corpora of English historical texts, dictionaries and manuscripts, and mediation is analyzed in terms of support, intratextual translation and flagging. The findings show that while cognitive support helps a reader understand all of the content of the text, intratextual translation may also have relational functions, where the reader is expected to understand both languages used, as when code-switching and translation are a vehicle for humor. Intratextual translation can also be used to add credibility to the writer's argument or to link it to a broader discussion on the topic. Mediation is also facilitated by flagging code-switching and intratextual translation metalinguistically or visually. Support is needed for Latin as a language which has always been part of relatively few English-speakers' repertoire, but these strategies are expected to apply to other language pairs as well.

Keywords: English; Latin; mediation; multilingualism; translation; written communication

***Corresponding author: Arja Nurmi**, Languages/English, Faculty of Information Technology and Communication Sciences, Tampere University, Tampere, 33014, Finland,
E-mail: arja.nurmi@tuni.fi. https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6446-9356
Janne Skaffari, Department of English, University of Turku, Turku 20014, Finland,
E-mail: janne.skaffari@utu.fi. https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7349-9904

1 Introduction[1]

Mediation is a way of facilitating multilingual communication. In this article, we discuss the strategies of mediating Latin expressions and passages in written texts throughout the history of English. Mediation strategies such as intratextual translation, support and flagging help alleviate the imbalance between participants of communicative acts when the parties have unequal expertise in the languages used.

The presence of Latin is apparent in today's English, but not just in *e.g.* and *vice versa*, *et cetera*; much more elaborate expressions appear in the media, as example (1) suggests:

(1) Folau's procedural unfairness points seem likely to be twofold, and both based on a breach of a key maxim of natural justice – the rule against bias (nemo iudex in causa sua – no-one should be a judge in his own case). (NOW Corpus: *LawInSport*, 2019-04-29 GB)

It is quite typical that on such occasions the Latin expression is accompanied by an 'intratextual' translation into English, be it a faithful word-for-word one or a paraphrase. Code-switching (CS) research has established that this practice is not uncommon in communicative contexts involving more than one language, as it supports participants' access to the intended meaning. Such translations are one main strategy of mediating content in multilingual communication. The phenomenon is perennial; we find examples in present-day written communication, as in (1), and in texts that date back centuries, when not everyone involved is familiar with both – or all – of the languages used in a particular situation.

In the present study, we explore ways of mediating Latin throughout the history of English, excluding translations of complete Latin texts into monolingual English texts. Although the phenomena related to mediation are in no way limited to these two languages, we have chosen to focus on Latin in this article, since it provides ample evidence of practices over centuries. We have arrived at this topic through recent research in historical CS and multilingual practices. CS is a term originally used in studies of spoken interaction; similarly, we apply concepts thus far used mainly with spoken language – mediation, flagging – to written texts. We also introduce terminology from translation studies, often underutilized in linguistics despite clear parallels and overlaps between these two fields. By

1 The research reported here has been in part supported by the Academy of Finland projects Democratization, Mediatization and Language Practices in Britain, 1700–1950 (DEMLANG) (project number 295381), Multilingualism in the Long Twelfth Century (257059) and Multilingual Practices in the History of Written English (258434), as well as the Faculty of Humanities, University of Turku.

discussing mediation as a concept and analyzing a range of examples qualitatively, we aim to uncover patterns that characterize mediation of Latin in written English. Another aim is to shed light on the multitude of terms surrounding this topic and specify the relationships between them.

While we do not seek to elaborate on CS as a concept here, it is worth noting that it has varied definitions, including "the use of more than one language in the course of a single communicative episode" (Heller 1988: 1) and "the use of several languages or dialects in the same conversation or sentence by bilingual people" (Gardner-Chloros 2009: 4). References to "bilingual people" in our view include people who have learned a language through education in addition to people who have acquired one as members of a linguistic community. The languages discussed below are English as the *matrix* (main, base) language and Latin as the *embedded* ('inserted', 'other') language; as some of these terms are rather loaded, we mostly use just 'English' and 'Latin' for ease of reference.

This article divides into five main sections. A brief discussion, in Section 2, of the role of Latin in Britain over the centuries is followed by a literature review in Section 3, in which we introduce our central concepts: mediation, support, intratextual translation and flagging. Of these, mediation is the hypernym, while intratextual translation and support can be viewed as co-hyponyms which are often applicable to the same passages in multilingual texts, but which bring to the fore different aspects of the phenomenon at hand; flagging, in its verbal or linguistic form, consists of facilitating expressions that may or may not involve translations of the code-switches. A description of our data in Section 4 is followed by our findings in Section 5, and in the conclusions we emphasize that while there is a range of patterns to be seen, these can be analyzed with the concepts introduced. The patterns themselves seem quite stable, as they are attested at multiple points in the history of English.

2 Background context

Latin can be said to have influenced English even before there was an English language, as numerous loanwords had been adopted from Latin into the West Germanic idiom before the Germanic languages we now regard as separate emerged as such. In the medieval and early modern periods, Latin played an important role as the European language of religion and learning. Its lexical influence on English in these periods is well-known, but there were also other types of influences, including grammatical and generic, as Latin sentences and texts served as models for vernacularized text production. As Latin has remained a cultured language worth learning until today, it continues to appear as quotations

and fixed phrases in English texts; consequently, code-switching between these two languages has attracted a fair amount of attention from scholars working on material from different periods (see, for example, most of the chapters in Schendl and Wright 2011 and in Pahta et al. 2018). The long diachrony of Latin in English is therefore ideal for identifying patterns of CS and mediation from century to century.

Despite its long-term contact with English, Latin has never been a language for everyone in Britain, but it has had a continuous role in education of the higher strata of society. Until 1960, Latin was an entry qualification at the universities of Oxford and Cambridge (Forrest 2003: 42), and in the primary education of boys both public schools and grammar schools provided (and in some cases continue to provide) instruction in the language. Latin was a working language in the courts up to the 17th century (Tiersma 1999: 35–36), the language of religion until the Reformation and the common European language of science even in the nineteenth century (see e.g. Burke 1991). Burke (2004: 59) identifies a "slow decline" of Latin after 1650 and a "more rapid" one after 1750. This created assumptions on the language skills of specific groups of people, which tie in with not only the use of Latin in texts but also the need for mediating Latin passages for other people.

3 Literature review: mediation and flagging

This section examines the main concepts used in this study: mediation, support and intratextual translation, and flagging. Mediation has recently been included as a described language activity in the Common Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR), alongside production, reception and interaction. This highlights translation (and interpreting) as language competences which are not simply in the realm of the translation profession: they are activities also needed and undertaken by ordinary language users in daily communication. We argue that support and intratextual translation are practices of mediation and that flagging can be used to aid mediation as well.

3.1 Mediation

As a term, mediation has been used in many different senses. We see it as a useful conceptualization of some aspects of multilingual communication and, by slightly modifying and focusing the definition presented in CEFR (Council of Europe 2001: 14), we use the term to refer to written and spoken activities that facilitate communication when direct communication is not possible. While in the context of

CEFR the task of mediating is assigned to a third person mediating between two others through, for example, translation or interpreting (Council of Europe 2018: 103–104), we include *self-mediation*, that is, including translations in one's own utterances or texts as a means of audience design, accommodating communication to the addressee (cf. Bell 1984). In written communication, at least, this seems like a relevant adjustment to the term. As we will see below, however, what appears to be self-mediation may not always be that in written material.

In spoken interaction, the need for mediation is often signaled by one of the participants (Hynninen 2011: 966–967), and Hynninen (2011: 965), following Schiffrin (1994), uses the term in the sense of "speaking for another […] by rephrasing another participant's turn that was addressed to a third party". In writing, only the writer is concretely present during text production: the reader and any intertextuality, for instance citing from other texts and the authors of those cited texts, are only there in the mind of the writer. It is solely the writer who can make the text understandable to the intended reader.

Hynninen (2011: 976) finds that in her spoken data mediation acts "as a co-operative strategy that increases communicative explicitness". Similarly, when discussing mediation in contexts of non-professional interpreting, for example with bilingual young people supporting their monolingual parents in health care or official encounters, not only translating but also managing the communication is relevant (see e.g. Green et al. 2005: 2104). Since in writing the parties, i.e. readers and cited authors or speakers, are at the mercy of the writer, managing the communication is also the responsibility of the writer alone. There is no feedback from readers as a form of co-operation, only the need to estimate the necessity, realization and effectiveness of mediation strategies. Without anyone to co-operate or negotiate with, it is the writer's experience of texts, genres and styles encountered or written previously that helps in deciding how to manage the text.

If viewed as negotiation of meaning, mediation is reminiscent of what Kolehmainen et al. (2015: 372–373) refer to as *translatorial actions* (see also Koskinen 2017). They include in the concept all actions of a speaker or writer that entail repeating something already expressed in one language in another language. The cases of translatorial activity they discuss include entire communicative situations but also microlevel events concerning individual words or expressions. Under the concept of translatorial actions, they include what we would call self-mediation as well as mediation by third parties.

Mediation as a practice has several dimensions. Coste and Cavalli (2015: 28) distinguish between *cognitive* and *relational* mediation, the first giving access to information, and the second being related to interpersonal relationships. Both dimensions can be relevant at the same time. For example, Elbers and de Haan (2005) describe forms of mediation in a multicultural classroom where students

support each other in understanding difficult words. Students are not always willing mediators, as they can ignore a request for explanation. This unwillingness on the part of interlocutors to engage their own resources to provide the necessary information for others can be seen as a lack of cognitive mediation, as information is not passed, as well as relational mediation, as interpersonal relationships are not maintained (cf. Coste and Cavalli 2015: 28). In written mediation, similar trends have been found by Canagarajah (2011: 14) in a multilingual university classroom, where students read and comment on each other's linguistic biographies: by not translating passages written in her native Arabic the writer is "excluding a wider audience", but perhaps also "challenging them to bridge that gap as readers", thus promoting critical thinking. In this context, then, the reluctance to engage in cognitive mediation seems to point more towards questions of relational mediation and the reasons for not providing it, as the author is asking the readers to take the necessary steps independently to meet her halfway. In other words, the lack of mediation is partly identity work, as code-choice – selecting a language for communication or parts thereof – in multilingual situations often is (e.g. Gumperz 1982; Nurmi and Pahta 2010; Sebba and Wootton 1998).

3.2 Mediation and CS

Mediation facilitates communication in the ways described above, but it has only rarely been mentioned as a concept in CS studies, although it is clear that bilingual conversation or text production often involves mediation. This is the case particularly when the speaker/writer and the hearer/reader are not equally competent in both of the languages used: translations are often provided, and the presence of translation – even when it is not absolutely necessary for successful communication – also highlights the importance of the matter at hand. In terms of Sebba's (2013: 107) language-content relationships, mediation typically appears as "*overlapping* language content", in which "some of the content is repeated in another language". Sebba's framework is particularly useful for analyzing signs with complex multimodal information but is relevant elsewhere as well.

We approach mediation in written texts mainly through two concepts, *support* and *intratextual translation*. While support associates mediation practices with the needs of readers and their access to foreign-language content, intratextual translation does not necessarily assume a supporting function and is therefore broader in scope. Another concept that helps triangulate the phenomenon is *flagging*. We begin by discussing support and intratextual translation and then consider the links between flagging and mediation.

3.2.1 Support and intratextual translation

What we call support and intratextual translation can be seen as a form of repetition. In studies of multilingual conversational practices, this has been called *reiteration* at least since Gumperz (1982) listed it as one of the functions of CS; it serves the purpose of clarifying or emphasis (for a recent discussion, see Harjunpää and Mäkilähde 2016).[2] As repetition may suggest a level of similarity in length and detail that in practice may not be inherent in multilingual communication, an alternative term can be adopted from Diller (1997/98), referring to the vernacular explanations accompanying Latin material in late medieval mystery plays as "English support". *Support* can be realized as short paraphrases, elaborations and direct translations, which do not carry the same level of authority as the – often abbreviated – Latin quotations in the medieval religious context. Broadening the scope of this concept somewhat, Skaffari (2016: 218) proposes "vernacular support" as an appropriate development of Diller's usage, if indeed 'support' requires a premodifier at all. An even broader term, suggested in this sense by Nurmi (2016), is *intratextual translation*; this term does not point to any facilitative function of the translation, but merely refers to its presence.[3] Support and intratextual translation, for us, typically appear in the body of the text, but it is useful to include also paratextual devices – footnotes and endnotes, marginalia and separate glossaries – for a broader view of how mediation works in written texts.

Neither support nor intratextual translation has thus far become the standard term for the practice of multilingual reiteration. The more widely used term *glossing* is defined by Hynninen et al. (2017: 103) as "providing a succinct interpretation or paraphrase of a word or phrase perceived as potentially problematic". This seems to correspond to (near-)literal translation and paraphrasing support, discussed below, but the problem with the term 'gloss(ing)' in a diachronically oriented study is that glosses can be understood more narrowly as interlinear or marginal additions on manuscript pages rather than all types of explanations of unfamiliar material within the text itself. We seek to develop terminology that is applicable in all contexts. Another term, *parallelism* (Sebba 2012), aptly highlights the simultaneous presence of similar structures, but as a term it makes no reference to an explanatory function or to translations. The term *support*, however, conveys

2 Although some of our data may also be interpreted as emphasizing instead of (or in addition to) clarifying content provided, emphasis is outside the scope of the present study.

3 The term has been used earlier in another sense by, for example, Zabalbeascoa and Voellmer (2014), who refer to all translation seen in (fictional multimodal) texts. See also Joysmith (2003: 149), Miller (2010: 140) and Svensson (2010: 10).

much of the same sense as *cushioning* (introduced by Young 1971 and discussed by Talib 2002: 128), but is perhaps less opaque.

As support involves translation from the supported language into the supporting one, it is unsurprising that it has also been discussed in translation studies. A transparent term applicable to both writers' and translators' strategies is *intratextual translation* (cf. also *in-text translation* by Meylaerts 2011), including literal translations as well as elaborating or summarizing explanations. It is important to note that translation as a term does not refer only to literal translation with maximal equivalence to the source text. The first discussion of this term, but in a broader sense, can be found in Sternberg (1981), where he considers, in the context of fiction, the problems of representing "the reality of polylingual discourse through a communicative medium which is normally unilingual". Sternberg (1981: 226–230) introduces four subtypes of intratextual translation. Of these, only selective reproduction, where both the source language and the translation are visible, is included in our definition of intratextual translation.

Our main concern is multilingual texts which include CS and intratextual translation. While these are usually produced in the process of writing, one subcategory of such texts are multilingual texts created through the process of translation, when an original expression in the source language (*Nations Unies*) is retained in the translation next to the target language expression (*United Nations*), known as *double presentation* (Pym 2010: 80).

Table 1 shows the range of terminology used in the literature to refer to very similar features. Our preferred terms, intratextual translation on the one hand and support on the other, are perhaps more broadly applicable than some of the others, as they are not tied to any specific theoretical tradition while being fairly transparent in both meaning and connotations. To a considerable extent, these two are overlapping terms, but they are not fully synonymous, as we will demonstrate below. Both are also associated with flagging. The metaphors behind these related terms – and the others introduced above – suggest different vantage points: support highlights the facilitating, access-providing function of repetition in the main language, whereas intratextual translation brings to the fore a form of translation. Writers may utilize a pre-existing, even conventionalized translation by someone else rather than translating themselves; moreover, providing support is not always the author's decision or preference, but it may be the subsequent copyist or editor who has added an intratextual translation to mediate the code-switch to a wider range of readers. Thus, what looks like self-mediation may actually have originated with someone other than the writer of the text at hand. We propose that mediation helps conceptualize this phenomenon as a whole, regardless of the origin of the intratextual translation.

Table 1: Summary of terms introduced.

Point of view	Meaning	Term
Repetition	repetition of the same content in another language	reiteration (Gumperz 1982) parallelism (Sebba 2012) double presentation (Pym 2010) selective reproduction (Sternberg 1981)
Translation	providing a translation within a text of a passage in another language	intratextual translation (Nurmi 2016) in-text translation (Meylaerts 2011) glossing (Hynninen et al. 2017)
Support	using one language to facilitate understanding another	support (Skaffari 2016) English support (Diller 1997/98) cushioning (Talib 2002; Young 1971)

3.2.2 Flagging

Flagging in communication draws attention to a feature of the written or spoken text that is important or requires more processing from the reader/hearer. Flagging accompanies CS or mediation and signals to the recipient: "this part needs special attention from you". In spoken CS, this can be achieved, for example, by repeating, slowing down or making metalinguistic comments (Poplack 2004: 593) or pausing or hesitating (e.g. Hynninen et al. 2017: 97–98), whereas in writing, not only verbal means are possible but also visual cues may be provided. Verbal flagging includes metalinguistic flags and reiteration of content. Of these, the former, metalinguistic flagging, involves naming the 'other' language, the main language, or both, specifying the source of the quotation, and/or remarking on the translatedness of the text or on the need for translation. The latter, reiteration, means intratextual translation, which counts as a flag in its own right, as it suggests that something in the text may be hard to understand. The verbal types of flagging will be discussed at length in Section 5.

In this article, we focus on verbal forms of flagging rather than the non-linguistic features of our material, as much of it is collected from corpora and dictionaries, which as a rule do not reproduce the typographical or palaeographical features of the source text. However, the visual features of CS and intratextual translation also deserve some attention, particularly as there has recently been increasing interest in the multimodality (see e.g. Stroud and Mpendukana 2010, 2012) or visual pragmatics (Machan 2011) of multilingual practices. Since the early days of the printing press, it has been possible to highlight different languages by typographical means. Today's readers of printed texts and digital media often associate italics with, *exempli gratia*,

foreign expressions, as in (2) (see e.g. Mahootian 2003: 1495; Sebba 2013: 102–103). Other methods have also been applied, such as selecting different typefaces for different languages in early modern dictionaries; in (3), cited from McConchie (2017: 212–213), the English headword is in blackletter font and the subsequent Latin in Roman type, for ease of navigation on the page and within the dictionary entry. Two more typographical conventions are shown in (4): quotation marks for Latin and (square) brackets for the intratextual translation following the foreign-language expression.

(2) [H]e finally swallows all pride and goes hat in hand to his trusted friend and colleague Y and lays the whole situation *ab initio ad mala* out before him… (David Foster Wallace, *Octet*, late 20th century) [original italics]

(3) ¶ **a Chafing dishe.** Batillus mensarius. […] Calefactorium. *Vn rechauffoir*. (John Baret, *Alvearie*, 16th century) [English in blackletter, with words in three different sizes; Latin in Roman; French in italic.]

(4) I always opine to be the more dignified and rational part of a repast – “Quod nunc ratio est, impetus ante fuit.” [That which is now reason, at first was but desire.] (CLMET: Bulwer-Lytton, *Eugene Aram*; 19th century)

Typeface-switching has a parallel in handwriting and manuscript culture: script-switching (see Kaislaniemi 2017). In addition, manuscripts also display a range of other means for highlighting CS visually, including underlining, variation in size and position, and the use of a different ink, particularly red. In medieval English manuscripts, it is not uncommon to find Latin in red ink, embedded in vernacular text written in black or brown ink (e.g. Latin names for sins in London, Lambeth Palace Library, MS 487); underlining in red is another way of picking out Latin. It is probably often the case, however, that the red ink does not so much highlight the presence of another language as emphasize the importance and authority of the quotation (e.g. Machan 2011: 314); it may also be a navigational tool. The visual element is also related to available resources and to audience design: visually impressive manuscripts were expensive to produce, and the needs of the most learned readers must have been different from those of the others.

Visual flagging is not only associated with the embedded language but can also highlight translations into the matrix language and, therefore, mediation (as in (4) above). This practice is seen in many of the examples cited in Section 5 below: intratextual translations are accompanied by quotation marks, brackets or meta-linguistic cues, or appear in footnotes.

To sum up, managing Latin elements in English texts – and, by extension, any multilingual elements in text or talk – can be discussed in different terms.

Intratextual translation is an apt, descriptive term for a typical form of mediation, and the other name for it, support, identifies its key function. In the context of Latin, mediation is relevant as a means of making classical cultural heritage and, for example, religious (Christian) content known, but more significantly for this paper and generally, it helps writers make sure that all members of their audience are able to arrive at the intended meaning. Flagging, then, directs readers' attention to where it is needed.

4 Material

It is our contention that Latin – as the foreign language with which the speakers of English have been in contact the longest – is near-ubiquitous in English texts, diachronically and to a notable extent also generically. This is also reflected in the materials used in this exploration: rather than investigating one text type or period, we demonstrate the breadth of Latin in English and its mediation to English readers by citing examples from a very heterogeneous set of sources, many of which we have utilized in earlier projects (see e.g. Nurmi et al. 2018; Pahta and Nurmi 2006; Skaffari 2016, 2018). They range from individual manuscripts to large electronic text corpora.

We make use of three corpora in particular: the Helsinki Corpus of English Texts (HC), 730–1710; the Corpus of Late Modern English Texts (CLMET 3.0), 1710–1920; and the *Dictionary of Old English* Web Corpus (DOEC), c.600–1150. Other electronic resources we draw on include the *Middle English Dictionary* (MED), c.1100–1600, and Eighteenth-Century Collections Online (ECCO), 1701–1800. Some corpora like HC use textual coding for foreign-language passages (see Pahta and Nurmi 2006), others like CLMET have been approached through a specific software tool (see Nurmi et al. 2018).

The selection of sources used gives us access to numerous genres throughout the history of English. This is not to dismiss other types of sources summarily: above, we have already referred to some medieval manuscripts consulted *in situ* rather than as editions, which tend to dilute the materiality of the artefact; and we also cite examples directly from printed sources. These examples we have collected in our recently completed research projects. Examples of similar types of multilingual practices can be found along the whole timespan covered and in numerous types of sources, including Present-Day English ones – see, again, example (1) – although we draw on pre-1900 materials here. We have not examined all the examples of CS and intratextual translation attested in these sources – which would be a formidable project – and do not aim at a quantitative analysis but instead seek to tease out

patterns in the ways that Latin has been embedded and mediated over the last thousand years or so.

5 Analysis: strategies of mediating Latin

Below we give examples of different types of mediation. We identify in them both intratextual translation and support – which typically coincide – as well as discuss the role of flagging as it relates to mediation. While the examples below demonstrate ways of making Latin more visible and easier to understand, not all Latin is mediated in these ways. Sometimes code-switching is *smooth*, that is, unmarked, with no visual or metalinguistic flagging provided (cf. Poplack et al. 1989). For example, in his *Troilus & Criseyde*, Geoffrey Chaucer does not offer a translation or a metalinguistic label for “mea culpa”, as this phrase from confession must have been familiar to the target readers of the fourteenth century. Expressions of this type can be seen as *habitualized* code-switching (Poplack 1980), repeated often and relevant to the admittedly quite large and comprehensive in-group of Christians. What is habitual and can be regarded as familiar depends on the context and the period: in the crime novel *Fox Evil* (2002), Minette Walters supports this phrase with “the blame is mine”.

5.1 Support and intratextual translation

There are several translatorial possibilities for facilitating access to the meaning of Latin passages. The most basic one is a word-for-word intratextual translation, as in (5)–(6). In these cases, the writer produces in English the same content that has been expressed in Latin.

(5) The terme of *Res publica* whiche is in Englisshe tong clepid a comyn profit… (MED: *Boke of Noblesse*; 15th century)[4]

(6) that space, or extension, is infinite; that nothing can be made out of nothing (*ex nihilo nihil fit*). (CLMET: Mill, *A system of logic*; 19th century)[5]

While in (5), as in numerous other cases, it is easy to posit that the mediating material counts as both intratextual translation and support, there are also cases in which the intratextual translation is, strictly speaking, not support. A case in point

4 In examples illustrating intratextual translation, we have disregarded any typographical cues included in the source. Latin has been italicized and the translation underlined.

5 The examples in each group are presented in a chronological order. The pre-1400 examples are accompanied by our translations into Present-Day English.

is example (6), in which the English expression precedes the Latin one: here, the code-switch adds authority or credibility to what precedes it, or indicates that the idea presented is not the author's own but has wider applicability and/or has been formulated or acknowledged before. It also provides a link to the Latin discussion on the topic, allowing expert readers familiar with that language and that discussion to make further connections.

Another typical way of mediating Latin is paraphrasing the Latin content in English: the writer's rewording still offers the same information. This can be regarded as a strategy oriented towards those readers who understand Latin, as they can avoid reading the exact same content twice. At the same time, particularly when the paraphrase is complemented by an elaboration (as in (7) and (8)), this strategy allows the writer to include information which might be unknown to a reader unfamiliar with the Latin quotation or concept presented. It also makes the writer's point of view more explicit, and contextualizes the Latin saying into its English cotext (8).

(7) þey byn *Cicerones*, þat is to say as eloquent & as gay yn speche as was þat grete Rethoryan Marcus Tullius Cicero. (MED: Osbern Bokenham, *Mappula Angliae*; 15th century)

(8) The consciousness of this danger has led to the adoption of the modified maxim, *Festina lente*, Hasten, but with steps deliberate and cautious. (CLMET: Godwin, *Thoughts on Man*; 19th century)

Elaboration may also accompany word-for-word translations, as in (9)–(10).

(9) On ðone eahtoðan dæg þæs monðes bið ðara martyra þrowung þe we nemnað on gewritum *quattuor coronatorum*, þæt is þara gesigefæstan weras feower, þara naman wæron Claudius, Castorius, Simfonianus, Nicostratus. (DOEC: Mart 5 (Kotzor) B19.5; 10th century)
'On the eighth day of that month is the feast of the martyrs whom we call in the books *quattuor coronatorum*, that is the four crowned men whose names were Claudius, Castorius, Symphorian and Nicostratus.'

(10) ah as godes spuse singeð bi hire seoluen. *Nigra sum set formosa*. Ich am blac & tah hwit ha seið. unseowlich wiðuten; schene withinnen. (*Ancrene Wisse*: Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 402; 13th century)
'But as the spouse of God sings of herself: *nigra sum sed formosa*. I am black and yet white, she says [referring to the dress of the religious order]. Unattractive on the outside, but beautiful within.'

Sometimes what looks like word-for-word translation followed by elaboration – or a long paraphrase – is really a fuller intratextual translation following a truncated Latin passage, the short switch carrying the function of pointing to a source and thus adding authority to the English text. This is well illustrated in (11) and (12), the latter containing a translation which diverges from the Vulgate more.

(11) he þus cweðe: *Et dimitte nobis debita nostra, sicut et nos dimittimus*; þæt is on Englisc: & forgyf us, Drihten, ure gyltas, swa we forgyfað þam ðe wið us agyltað. (DOEC: LawIICn B14.30.2; 11th century)
'he said thus: *Et dimitte nobis debita nostra, sicut et nos dimittimus*: that is in English: and forgive us, Lord, our sins, as we forgive those who have offended us'

(12) Herof sade ðe eadi apostel s[an]c[tu]s Iohannes. *Si cor n[ost]r[u]m non reprehenderit nos*. 3if ure hierte he sade us ne undernemeð naht ne ne wreihð of nane senne ðe godd hateð & ðe luuieð. hwat so we beseceð at gode. he us wile sone teiþin. (*Vices and Virtues*: London, BL, Stowe 34; 13th century)
'About this said the blessed apostle St. John: *Si cor nostrum non reprehenderit nos*. If our heart, said he, does not blame or accuse us for any sin that God hates and you love. Whatever we seek from God, he will soon give us.'

Apart from what we saw in (6), these techniques of reconfiguring meaning are typically forms of support. They specifically give the reader access to the Latin passages they follow, as well as the cultural references associated with them. These are also all examples of intratextual translation, as our definition of translation includes a broad range of translation techniques.

A special type of intratextual translation, which cannot be regarded as support, is the use of a translation as a source of humor. While the text ostensibly mediates the Latin quotation to the reader, the joke is only understood by those who understand both languages (13). This kind of ludic intratextual translation seems to highlight the in-group identity of those who have learned Latin, but it is not mediation in the strict sense of the word.

(13) I should lament from my soul, if this exposed me to the jealousy of their Reverences, because *a posteriori*, in Court-latin, signifies the kissing hands for preferment – or any thing else – in order to get it. (CLMET: Sterne, Tristram Shandy; 18th century)

As the examples in this section suggest, intratextual translations tend to be the same length as or longer than the respective code-switches. Evidence of the opposite is harder to locate in our datasets.

5.2 Naming languages as flagging

The intratextual translations seen above can be regarded as a type of verbal flagging: they emphasize the presence of another language, which may be problematic. Another consistent practice of flagging multilingual features is the naming of languages, which has a support function but does not involve translating, although language labels and intratextual translations often co-occur, as we saw in examples (5), (11) and (13). This metalinguistic practice takes several different forms. It is quite frequent to name the inserted language, in our case Latin. The mention of Latin can be incorporated in a longer phrase (14), it can consist of simply the prepositional phrase *in Latin* (15), or it can include a further description of the passage, as in (16), where the Latin passage is characterized as a proverb.

(14) Tatt mann iss Sponntaneuss, *O Latin spæche nemmnedd*, Þatt doþ wiþþ innwarrd herrte god & all wiþþ fulle wille; & swa wass Crist sponntaneuss Inn all hiss hallȝhe dede. (MED: Ormulum; 12th century)[6]
'That man is called *Spontaneus* in the Latin language, who does good with an earnest heart and all of it willingly; and so was Christ spontaneous in all his holy deeds.'

(15) The browes be called Supercilium *in Latin*; and vnder, is the Eye liddes, which is called Cilium, and is garnished with heyres. (HC: CESCIE1A; 16th century)

(16) … we have the *latin proverb* in our favour, "Ira furor brevis est." Anger's short madness. – The shorter the better, I think. (ECCO: Edgeworth, *The Parent's Assistant*; 18th century)

6 In the examples illustrating metalinguistic flagging, we italicize the flagging and do not highlight the Latin.

Flagging can also point directly at the intratextual translation by identifying the language of the main text as the target language. This can be as simple as *in English* (18), or another description of the language (*in our language* in (17)), but it may also contain a marker such as 'that is to say' indicating that what follows is an explanation (19); the shorter 'that is' appears in (17)–(18).

(17) Ðæt þridde bebod is Memento ut diem sabbati sanctifices; *þæt is on urum gereorde*: Beo ðu gemindig, þæt þu gehalige restendæg. (DOEC: ÆLet 3 (Wulfstan 2) B1.8.3ˊ; 11th century)
'The third command is *Memento ut diem sabbati sanctifices*; that is in our language: Be mindful that you observe the day of rest.'

(18) Omnes bestias malas canto, þat is *on englis*, besing & oforcum ealle wilde yfele deor. (MED: Herbarium Apuleii; 12th century)
'*Omnes bestias malas canto*, which is in English: enchant and overcome all harmful wild animals.'

(19) Thanne ye must remembre, obserue, and kepe in mind, the seconde article of the sayinge of the philosopher, that is to saye, Tene mensuram: *That is to saye in englysshe*, holde and kepe measure. (HC: Fitzherbert, *The book of husbandry*; 16th century)

The third subtype involves flagging both the inserted language and the supporting language, as in (20)–(22). If both languages are named, simple prepositional phrases *in Latin* and *in English* can be used, but longer formulations are also possible, as in (21).

(20) … ða ongan ic […] ða boc wendan on Englisc ðe is genemned *on Læden* Pastoralis, & *on Englisc* Hierdeboc, hwilum word be worde, hwilum andgit of andgiete… (DOEC: CPLetWærf B9.1.1; 9th century)
'Then I began […] to translate into English that book which is called *Pastoralis* in Latin and the Shepherd's Book in English, sometimes word for word, sometimes meaning for meaning.'

(21) I þe moneð þet *ure ledene, þet is ald Englis*, Efterliðe inempnet, & Iulium *o Latin*. (MED: St Margaret of Antioch; 13th century)
'In the month that is in our language – that is old English – called Afterlithe and *Iulium* in Latin.'

(22) … though he was not a great adept in *Latin*, he remembered, and well understood, the advice contained in these words: – 'Leve fit, quod bene fertur onus.' *In English*: 'A burden becomes lightest, when it is well borne.' (ECCO: Fielding, *Tom Jones*; 18th century)

Naming the language(s) promotes mediation of Latin by drawing attention to its presence in the English cotext, providing support particularly for those unable to identify the language themselves, and thus understand the intended meaning. Semantic help is then provided in the text.

6 Conclusions

The presence of more than one language in a written text – which may nonetheless be inaccurately labelled as monolingual – is not rare, but managing this requires some effort from the writer. When including Latin in an English text, the writer is likely to need some form of mediation. This need became apparent in our qualitative study: there was plenty of evidence of translatorial actions as mediation in both medieval and modern texts. As the same practices could be identified in different centuries and periods, the patterns seem to exhibit stability rather than change over time.

Mediation is a useful way of conceptualizing support and intratextual translation. Support as a concept highlights the function of facilitating particularly cognitive aspects of communication. This applies to much of intratextual translation, including the writer's self-mediation, which may, however, also serve purposes other than support: it can have relational functions which point to the in-group functions of multilingual practices rather than support the recipients cognitively. This is evident in, for example, ludic intratextual translation, where knowledge of both languages is necessary for understanding the message, and in material aimed at expert readers, linking the discussion in English to the broader Latin-based communicative culture. Whatever purpose they serve, intratextual translations seem to vary in length and closeness to the source. The related practice of metalinguistic flagging can be employed to highlight mediation and the need for mediation. Metalinguistic flags may accompany the switches or the intratextual translations, or both, drawing attention to linguistic and cognitive structures of the text and facilitating understanding. Similar supporting functions may be assumed for visual flagging in manuscripts and printed texts.

While we have explored written mediation practices of Latin only in historical English data, the need for both cognitive and relational mediation must exist in multilingual contexts in present-day societies, regardless of the language pair, and

both in written and in spoken communication, if the parties involved are not equally multilingual. The cognitive support function of intratextual translation is relevant in such communicative events, and the more relational function of intratextual translation is also a likely candidate for identity and community construction. How far the practices of mediation resemble each other in different linguistic and cultural contexts is a matter for further research.

References

Bell, Allan. 1984. Language style as audience design. *Language in Society* 13(2). 145–204.

Burke, Peter. 1991. *Heu domine, adsunt Turcae*: A sketch for a social history of post-medieval Latin. In Peter Burke & Roy Porter (eds.), *Language, self and society: A social history of language*, 23–50. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Burke, Peter. 2004. *Languages and communities in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Canagarajah, Suresh. 2011. Translanguaging in the classroom: Emerging issues for research and pedagogy. *Applied Linguistics Review* 2. 1–28.

Coste, Daniel & Marisa Cavalli. 2015. *Education, mobility, otherness: The mediation functions of schools*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe DGII – Directorate General of Democracy, Language Policy Unit.

Council of Europe. 2001. *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Council of Europe. 2018. *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment. Companion volume with new descriptors*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Available at https://rm.coe.int/cefr-companion-volume-with-new-descriptors-2018/1680787989 (accessed 19 November 2018).

Diller, Hans-Jürgen. 1997/98. Code-switching in medieval English drama. *Comparative Drama* 31(4). 506–537.

Elbers, Ed & Mariëtte de Haan. 2005. The construction of word meaning in a multicultural classroom. Mediational tools in peer collaboration during mathematics lessons. *European Journal of Psychology of Education* 20(1). 45–59.

Forrest, Martin. 2003. The abolition of compulsory Latin and its consequences. *Greece and Rome* 50. 42–66.

Gardner-Chloros, Penelope. 2009. *Code-switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Green, Judith, Caroline Free, Bhavnani Vanita & Tony Newman. 2005. Translators and mediators: Bilingual young people's accounts of their interpreting work in health care. *Social Science & Medicine* 60. 2097–2110.

Gumperz, John J. 1982. *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Harjunpää, Katariina & Aleksi Mäkilähde. 2016. Reiteration: At the intersection of code-switching and translation. *Multilingua* 35(2). 163–201.

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 & Amsterdam: Mouton de Gruyter.

Hynninen, Niina. 2011. The practice of 'mediation' in English as a lingua franca interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics* 43. 965–977.
Hynninen, Niina, Kaisa S. Pietikäinen & Svetlana Vetchinnikova. 2017. Multilingualism in English as a Lingua Franca: Flagging as an indicator of perceived acceptability and intelligibility. In Arja Nurmi, Tanja Rütten & Päivi Pahta (eds.), *Challenging the myth of monolingual corpora*, 95–126. Leiden & Boston: Brill.
Joysmith, Claire. 2003. (Re)Mapping mexicanidades: (Re)Locating Chicana writings and translation politics. In Aída Hurtado, Gabriela F. Arredondo, Patricia Zavella, Olga Najera-Ramirez & Norma Klahn (eds.), *Chicana feminisms: A critical reader*, 146–154. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
Kaislaniemi, Samuli. 2017. Code-switching, script-switching, and typeface-switching in Early Modern English manuscript letters and printed tracts. In Matti Peikola, Aleksi Mäkilähde, Hanna Salmi, Mari-Liisa Varila & Janne Skaffari (eds.), *Verbal and visual communication in Early English texts*, 165–200. Turnhout: Brepols.
Kolehmainen, Leena, Kaisa Koskinen & Helka Riionheimo. 2015. Arjen näkymätön kääntäminen. Translatorisen toiminnan jatkumot. [The invisible translating in daily life. The continua of translatorial activity.]. *Virittäjä* 3. 372–400.
Koskinen, Kaisa. 2017. Translatorial action in non-professional translation communities: The Tampere City Council in 1875. In Kristiina Taivalkoski-Shilov, Liisa Tiittula & Maarit Koponen (eds.), *Communities in translation and interpreting (Vita Traductiva 9)*, 37–61. Montréal: Éditions québécoises de l'oeuvre.
Machan, T. W. 2011. The visual pragmatics of code-switching in Late Middle English Literature. In Herbert Schendl & Laura Wright (eds.), *Code-switching in early English*, 303–333. Berlin & Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.
Mahootian, Shahrzad. 2003. Sending a message: Codeswitching and the bilingual identity. In Anxo M. Lorenzo Suárez, Fernando Ramallo & Xoán Paulo Rodríguez Yáñez (eds.), *Proceedings of the second University of Vigo International Symposium on Bilingualism*, 1493–1499. Vigo: University of Vigo.
McConchie, R. W. 2017. Seeing is reading: Typography in some early modern dictionaries. In Matti Peikola, Aleksi Mäkilähde, Hanna Salmi, Mari-Liisa Varila & Janne Skaffari (eds.), *Verbal and visual communication in Early English texts*, 201–218. Turnhout: Brepols.
Meylaerts, Reine. 2011. Multilingualism and translation. In Yves Gambier & Luc van Doorslaer (eds.), *Handbook of translation studies*, 227–230. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Miller, Joshua L. 2010. American languages. In John Carlos Rowe (ed.), *A concise companion to American Studies*, 124–150. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
Nurmi, Arja. 2016. Minority voices in literary fiction: Translating multilingual texts. *Multilingua* 35(2). 227–249.
Nurmi, Arja & Päivi Pahta. 2010. Preacher, scholar, brother, friend. Social roles and code-switching in the writings of Thomas Twining. In Päivi Pahta, Minna Nevala, Arja Nurmi & Minna Palander-Collin (eds.), *Social roles and language practices in late modern English*, 135–162. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Nurmi, Arja, Jukka Tyrkkö, Anna Petäjäniemi & Päivi Pahta. 2018. The social embedding of multilingual practices in Late Modern English. In Päivi Pahta, Janne Skaffari & Laura Wright (eds.), *Multilingual practices in language history: English and beyond*, 171–198. Berlin & Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.
Pahta, Päivi & Arja Nurmi. 2006. Code-switching in the Helsinki Corpus: A thousand years of multilingual practices. In Nikolaus Ritt, Herbert Schendl, Christiane Dalton-Puffer &

Dieter Kastovsky (eds.), *Medieval English and its heritage: Structure, meaning and mechanisms of change*, 203–220. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
Pahta, Päivi, Janne Skaffari & Laura Wright (eds.). 2018. *Multilingual practices in language history: English and beyond (Language contact and bilingualism, 15)*. Berlin & Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.
Poplack, Shana. 1980. "Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish y termino en español": Toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics* 18(7/8). 581–618.
Poplack, Shana. 2004. Code-switching. In Ulrich Ammon, Norbert Dittmar, Klaus J. Mattheier & Peter Trudgill (eds.), *Sociolinguistics/Soziolinguistik. An international handbook of the science of language and society*, 589–596. Berlin: de Gruyter.
Poplack, Shana, Susan Wheeler & Anneli Westwood. 1989. Distinguishing language contact phenomena: Evidence from Finnish-English bilingualism. *World Englishes* 8. 389–406.
Pym, Anthony. 2010. *Translation and text transfer. An essay on the principles of intercultural communication*. Revised edition. Tarragona: Intercultural Studies Group.
Schendl, Herbert & Laura Wright (eds.). 2011. *Code-switching in early English*. Berlin & Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.
Schiffrin, Deborah. 1994. *Approaches to discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell.
Sebba, Mark. 2012. Researching and theorizing multilingual texts. In Mark Sebba, Shahrzad Mahootian & Carla Jonsson (eds.), *Language mixing and code-switching in writing: Approaches to mixed-language written discourse*, 1–26. New York & London: Routledge.
Sebba, Mark. 2013. Multilingualism in written discourse: An approach to the analysis of multilingual texts. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 17(1). 97–118.
Sebba, Mark & Tony Wootton. 1998. We, they and identity. Sequential versus identity-related explanation in code-switching. In Peter Auer (ed.), *Code-switching in conversation: Language, interaction and identity*, 262–289. London: Routledge.
Skaffari, Janne. 2016. Code-switching and vernacular support: An early Middle English case study. *Multilingua* 35(2). 203–226.
Skaffari, Janne. 2018. Code-switching in the long twelfth century. In Päivi Pahta, Janne Skaffari & Laura Wright (eds.), *Multilingual practices in language history: English and beyond*, 121–142. Berlin & Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.
Sternberg, Meir. 1981. Polylingualism as reality and translation as mimesis. *Poetics Today* 2(4). 221–238.
Stroud, Christopher & Sibonile Mpendukana. 2010. Multilingual signage: A multimodal approach to discourses of consumption in a South African township. *Social Semiotics* 20(5). 469–493.
Stroud, Christopher & Sibonile Mpendukana. 2012. Material ethnographies of multilingualism: Linguistic landscapes in the town of Khayelitsha. In M. Martin-Jones & S. Gardner (eds.), *Multilingualism, discourse and ethnography*, 149–162. Abingdon: Routledge.
Svensson, Anette. 2010. *A translation of worlds: Aspects of cultural translation and Australian migration literature (Umeå studies in language and literature, 13)*. Umeå: Department of Language Studies, Umeå University.
Talib, Ismail S. 2002. *The language of postcolonial literatures: An introduction*. London: Routledge.
Tiersma, Peter M. 1999. *Legal language*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Young, Peter. 1971. Mechanism to medium: The language of West African literature in English. In Anna Rutherford (ed.), *Common wealth*, 35–46. Aarhus: Akademisk Boghandel.

Zabalbeascoa, Patrick & Elena Voellmer. 2014. Accounting for multilingual films in translation studies: Intratextual translation in dubbing. In Dror Abend-David (ed.), *Media and translation: An interdisciplinary approach*, 25–51. New York: Bloomsbury.

Bionotes

Arja Nurmi
Languages/English, Faculty of Information Technology and Communication Sciences, Tampere University, Tampere, 33014, Finland
arja.nurmi@tuni.fi
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6446-9356

Arja Nurmi received her PhD from the University of Helsinki and is currently a senior lecturer at Tampere University. Her research interests include historical sociolinguistics, corpus linguistics, multilingual practices and translating multilingual texts. She has recently co-edited volumes on *Challenging the Myth of Monolingual Corpora* (Brill, 2017) and *Exploring Future Paths for Historical Sociolinguistics* (Benjamins, 2017).

Janne Skaffari
Department of English, University of Turku, Turku 20014, Finland
janne.skaffari@utu.fi
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7349-9904

Janne Skaffari is a senior lecturer at the University of Turku, where he also earned his doctorate. His research mostly focuses on language contact phenomena, particularly lexical borrowing and code-switching in medieval England. He has recently co-edited volumes on *Multilingual Practices in Language History: English and Beyond* (de Gruyter, 2018) and *Verbal and Visual Communication in Early English Texts* (Brepols, 2017).