

PART FOUR

DISCOURSES OVER THE COURSE OF TIME



HANS SAUER

HOW THE ANGLO-SAXONS EXPRESSED THEIR EMOTIONS WITH THE HELP OF INTERJECTIONS

Abstract

The emphasis here is on two Old English texts, namely Ælfric's *Grammar* and the Old English *Soliloquies*, presumably translated by King Alfred. The *Grammar* offers a kind of theoretical discussion, whereas the *Soliloquies* show the use of interjections in a dialogue. In accordance with the tradition Ælfric has a chapter on the word-class of interjections, where he states, for example, that interjections express emotions and (translated into modern terminology) that they are phonetically and morphologically irregular. This is only partly true, however: Interjections also have several other functions: they can serve as attention getters, as greeting forms, as response forms, etc. Formally, primary and secondary interjections can be distinguished as well as morphologically simple and morphologically complex interjections. Etymologically, some were inherited from Indo-European or Germanic, whereas others (especially the complex ones) were newly formed in Old English. Altogether Ælfric mentions ca. ten Old English interjections; some occur in several variants and form interjection families. Several Old English interjections are only attested in Ælfric's *Grammar*, although they must have been common, e.g. *afæstla* and *haha / hehe*. The *Soliloquies* are a theological-philosophical dialogue. Especially one of the partners (the author) often gets very emotional and accordingly frequently uses interjections and interjectional phrases such as *gea la gea* 'yes oh yes' and in particular *nese la nese* 'no oh no'.

Key words

Emotions; interjections; Ælfric; Alfred; Grammar; Soliloquies; morphology; etymology; Old English; Latin

1. Introduction: Emotions and interjections

Emotions are strong feelings which are often difficult to control, such as love and hate, hope and fear or despair, joy and sadness, anger, etc. There does not,

however, seem to be a complete or generally accepted list of emotions. One of the problems is that emotions cannot always be easily separated from the way in which they are expressed: Laughter, for example, can be a sign of joy or mirth, and tears and lamentations can be a sign of grief.

The word *emotion* itself is a relatively recent addition to the English vocabulary: It was borrowed from French in the 16th century but developed its modern sense only in the 19th century. *Roget's Thesaurus*, for example, which was first published in 1852, still uses 'affections' and not 'emotions' as the superordinate term for feelings such as love, hate, fear, hope etc.¹ Nevertheless the Anglo-Saxons certainly also had emotions.

One word-class whose main function has been traditionally defined as that of expressing emotions is the interjection. Matters are, of course, not quite so simple, because interjections also have various other functions, e.g. as discourse markers, and conversely emotions can be expressed in various other ways, e.g. descriptively ("He answered in an angry voice"). I shall nevertheless concentrate here on Old English interjections as markers of emotion, but I shall also mention some of their other functions.

Another problem is that interjections are mainly a phenomenon of spoken language, but for Old English (and generally up to ca. 1900) we can only list and analyse those that have been recorded in written documents. It is also not always easy to distinguish interjections from other word-classes, e.g. from adverbs.

Information about the Old English interjections is stored in some places which we would probably not primarily associate with emotions. Perhaps the most important of them is Ælfric's *Grammar*, written around 1000, which is the only theoretical discussion of emotions in Old English.² Interjections occur, however, in a wide variety of textual genres. Texts which employ interjections include: the Old English version of the *Soliloquies*, commonly ascribed to King Alfred and accordingly written shortly before 900.³ Although the *Soliloquies* are a theological and philosophical text in the form of a dialogue, the speakers often get very emotional and the author (ic) especially uses a variety of interjections.

It is perhaps less surprising that many sermons contain highly emotional passages, because preachers often not only want to teach their audience, but also to move them; one well-known example is Wulfstan's *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*. The Old English version of the love and adventure story of *Apollonius of Tyre*, originally a novel from Late Antiquity which is full of pursuits and flights, storms and shipwrecks, love and hate, separations and reunions, is also full of emotions and accordingly uses a number of interjections.

In the present article, however, I shall concentrate on Ælfric's *Grammar* and on King Alfred's *Soliloquies*.

2. Research on the Old English interjections

Interjections have neither been among the main research interests of modern grammarians nor of Anglo-Saxonists.⁴ Grammars and handbooks of Old English often do not even mention them. For example, they do not seem to occur in the first volume of the *CHEL* (*Cambridge History of the English Language*).⁵ An early study, concentrating on the Alfredian corpus, is Wülfing (1901, I: 686–695). Offerberg (1967), apparently the most comprehensive study of the Old English interjections, is unfortunately unpublished and thus not available to most scholars. Bruce Mitchell in his *Old English Syntax* (1985, I: 526–528) devotes three of his ca. 1900 pages to the Old English interjections and gives a useful list of ca. 35 interjections. The *ThOE* (1995, I: 463) has a very brief section on interjections, listing only seven (09.01.03.01.).⁶ Recently, there seems to have been some revival in interest; there have been more general articles by Cassidy (1996), Hiltunen (2006), and myself (Sauer 2006 and 2008), and an article specifically devoted to *hwæt* by Stanley (2000).⁷

3. Interjections and emotions in Ælfric's *Grammar*

In accordance with the Latin grammatical tradition Ælfric has a chapter on interjections (pp. 277–280 ed. Zupitza; cf. also pp. 10–11).⁸ He defines interjections quite traditionally as the word-class that expresses emotions:

Interiectio est pars orationis significans mentis affectum voce incondita: Interiectio is an dæl ledenspræce getacnjende þæs modes gewilnunge mid ungesceapenre stemne (277–278).

The interjection is a part of speech which signifies the mind's commotion with an unformed voice/with unformed sounds.

Ælfric calls emotions *modes gewilnung* 'mind's desire' or *modes styrung* 'mind's commotion, disturbance', which seem to be alternative translations of the Latin *mentis affectus* – whether these were common Old English terms or just Ælfric's own translations is difficult to tell.⁹

His terms for L *interiectio* are *betwux-aworpennyss* and *betwux-alegednys*, lit. '[something] thrown in between' or '[something] put in between'; these are alternative loan-translations of the Latin term *inter-iectio*. They are hapax legomena and seem to have been Ælfric's coinages; probably they were not part of the general Old English vocabulary but just part of Ælfric's grammatical terminology and mainly used in the classroom for teaching grammar.

In accordance with the grammatical tradition Ælfric also mentions the main characteristics of the interjections, some of which are still re-iterated in present-day grammars (if they deal with interjections at all). Translated into modern terminology these are:¹⁰

(1) Semantic: Interjections have a meaning (*significatio – getacnung*): they express emotions (*modes gewilnung* etc.).

(2) Phonologic and morphologic: Interjections are phonologically and morphologically irregular and have no fixed shape or structure; they are pronounced *voce incondita – mid ungesceapenre stemne* ‘with an unformed voice or sound’ or with *behyddre stemne* ‘with an unclear (lit. concealed) voice/an unclear sound’. Furthermore Ælfric explains that interjections can be shortened or lengthened according to the speaker’s emotional state: “ac heora sweg byð hwilon gescyrt and hwilon gelencged be ðæs modes styrunge” (280/11–13).

(3) Syntactic: Interjections are usually not integrated into the sentence, and often they precede the sentence. Ælfric says that the interjection lies between the other words: “lið betwux wordum” (278/3), and this is, of course, also the meaning of his derived term *betwuxalegednys* (and *betwuxaworpennyss*).

(4) Interlinguistic: Ælfric adds that interjections cannot always be (easily) translated from Latin into English (279/12–280/1). However, he also says that some interjections are identical in Latin and in Old English (*haha* and *hui*; see below).

The statements made under (1) and (2) are especially only partly true, however: Interjections also have other functions besides expressing emotions; furthermore interjections were affected by regular sound-changes and many complex interjections were created from simple interjections (or from simple interjections and words belonging to other word-classes, see below). As regards (3), at least L *uae* – OE *wa* is sometimes integrated into the sentence, see below. Ælfric also states that interjections are like words: “þes dæl interiectio hæfð wordes fremminge” (279/12); this is, of course, also clear from the fact that he treats them as one of the eight word classes or parts of speech.¹¹

The emotions which Ælfric mentions, and which can be expressed by (Latin) interjections are: joy (*modes bliss*), grief and distress (*modes sarnyss*), wonder and astonishment (*wundrung*), fear (*oga*), anger (*æbylignyss*, *yrre*, *yrsung*), repentance (expressed verbally: *behreowsian*), contempt (*forsewennyss*), scorn (*bysmerung*); expressions of emotions are lamentations (*wanung*), threats (*ðeowwræc – ðeowracan*), cursing (*wyrigung*), although he does not distinguish explicitly between emotions and the way they are expressed.

Ælfric also points out that some interjections are polysemous and can express quite different emotions, e.g. L *euge*: joy and scorn (*bliss and bysmerung*). Latin *o* even has five functions (280/3–5): (1) it expresses anger (*æbilignyss*); (2) grief (*sarnyss*); (3) astonishment (*wundrung*); (4) but it also expresses the vocative (“adverbium vocandi”): “o magister” – “eala ðu lareow”; (5) and it stands for the letter <o>.

This also shows two further phenomena: (a) Not all functions of an interjection express an emotion; (b) A word can belong to several word-classes – *o* can be an

interjection and an adverb (according to Ælfric); a letter (*stæf*), of course, still has a different status. Similarly, *a* and *e* in Latin are interjections, prepositions, and letters (280/5–6), etc.

Ælfric's *Grammar* is basically a grammar of Latin, but written largely in Old English. Accordingly he lists primarily Latin interjections (*a, atat, e, ei, euge, haha / hehe, heu / heu mihi, hui(g), la, o, pape, pro, uae / uae illi / uae uobis*);¹² two interjections according to Ælfric are from Hebrew (*racha, uah*). But he also mentions several Old English interjections, partly as translations of the corresponding Latin interjections, and partly independently. In two cases he claims or implies correctly that a Latin interjection and its Old English counterpart are identical in form and meaning: *haha / hehe* for laughter; *hui / huig*.¹³ Moreover he mentions *la* in the context of Latin interjections. Its status as a Latin interjection seems doubtful, however, but it was certainly an Old English interjection (see below).¹⁴

Altogether Ælfric mentions ca. ten Old English interjections, namely:¹⁵

- (1) *afæstla* 'certainly, assuredly' (hapax legomenon);
- (2) *eala* 'alas, oh, lo' (very frequent in Old English);
- (3) *haha / hehe* 'ha! ha!' (indicating laughter) (hapax legomenon);
- (4) *hilahi* 'alas, oh' (hapax legomenon);
- (5) *hui / huig*: its meaning is difficult to ascertain – perhaps it expresses admiration or astonishment and (pleasant) surprise; cf. G *hui*. Ælfric's example, however, is (278/11): "huig, hu færst ðu" (but he gives no Latin equivalent). Here *huig* seems to be a greeting form, perhaps combined with a pleasant surprise, and perhaps to be translated as 'Hello, how are you?'; the French translators render it as 'Tiens! Comme vas-tu?';
- (6) *la* 'oh, ah, lo, indeed, verily' (ModE *lo*, the origin of which is more complex, however); OE *la* was also often used as an element in complex interjections, see below;
- (7) *wa* 'woe, alas', also used for cursing someone (ModE *woe*); as a noun 'misery, affliction'; also often used as an element in complex interjections, see (8) – (9) and 5. below;
- (8) *wa is me / wamme* (ModE *woe is me*), for L *heu mihi* and *uae mihi*.¹⁶ Ælfric gives several examples, e.g. *uae illi – wa him; uae uobis – wa eow; uae tibi sit – wa þe si* (278/13–16). These examples also show that *uae – wa* is integrated into the sentence in Latin as well as in Old English, because it governs a case-form (the dative);
- (9) *wala* 'woe, alas' (common in Old English);
- (10) *wellawell* 'woe, alas'.

Counting is, however, not as easy as I have just suggested: I have regarded the forms *haha / hehe, hui / huig, wa is me / wamme* as variant forms of basically the same interjections; if they were counted separately, the number would be still greater. This also shows that several interjections did not have a fixed form in Old

English, at least not in writing (but this applies to Latin as well). *Wala*, *wellawell* etc. can perhaps be regarded as members of an entire interjection-family with many variant forms (to which belong also *wegla*, *weglaweg* etc.; see further 5.1 below); the common elements are *w* and *la*, connected by the vowels *a* or *e*, and often by internal rhyme (*wala* etc.) and/or reduplication (*wel-la-well* etc.). I have not included in the list the word *wawa* ‘grief, woe, misery’, which is used as a noun by Ælfric (three times on p. 279 ed. Zupitza). *Hilahi* can perhaps also be regarded as a member of an interjection family (variants not mentioned by Ælfric include *hi*, *hig*, *higla*, *higlahig* and *hela*).

One useful distinction is between primary interjections, which were coined as such, and secondary interjections. The latter are words from other word-classes which are then also used as interjections. But even this distinction is not fine enough, because there were morphologically simple and morphologically complex interjections which arose from a combination of primary or of primary and secondary interjections.

From a morphological and word-formational point of view there are thus at least four groups:¹⁷

- (1) morphologically simple primary interjections: *la*, *hui(g)*;
- (2) morphologically simple secondary interjections: *wa*;
- (3) morphologically complex interjections, which can be subdivided into
 - (a) combinations consisting of primary interjections: *eala*, *haha* / *hehe*, *hilahi*, *wellawell*, and
 - (b) combinations consisting of secondary and primary interjections (*afæstla*, *wala*);
- (4) full and condensed phrases: *wa is me*; *wamme*.

La was obviously used particularly frequently in the formation of complex interjections, five times in the examples provided by Ælfric, i.e. it occurs in half of the interjections listed by him: *afæstla* (probably *afæst* / *æwfæst* ‘upright, pious etc.’ + *la*)¹⁸; *eala* (*ea* ‘alas, oh’ + *la* – *ea* is not listed separately by Ælfric, however); *hilahi*; *wala* (*wa* ‘woe’ + *la*); *wellawell*.¹⁹ For the formation of *haha* / *hehe* reduplication has been used, and in *hilahi* and *wellawell* reduplication and the use of *la* have been combined. *Wamme* is apparently a contraction of the phrase *wa is me*.

From an etymological point of view *ea* (as in *eala*), *wa*, *la*, *hui* and *haha* are old interjections, going back to Germanic and even to Indo-European.

- (a) $\bar{e}a < \text{Gmc } *au$ (cf. G *au*) < IE; cf. L *au*.
- (b) *haha* < Gmc **haha* (cf. G *haha*) < IE; cf. L *haha*.
- (c) *hui* < Gmc **hui* (cf. G *hui*) < IE; cf. L *hui*.
- (d) $\bar{l}a$: Holthausen compares it to OHG $\bar{l}e$ and to L *il-le*.
- (e) $\bar{w}a < \text{Gmc } *wai$ (cf. G *weh(e)*) < IE; cf. L *vae*.

Most of the complex interjections seem to be Old English formations, however. Although grammars often stress that interjections are natural sounds or in any case of an onomatopoeic or sound-symbolic origin and that they are phonologically and morphologically irregular, the examples show that interjections often had conventionalized forms. Many were morphologically complex. Moreover, even old and simple interjections were affected by later sound-changes; thus OE *ēa* evolved through regular sound-change from Gmc **au* (cf. G *au*), and *wā* developed from Gmc **wai*.

From their semantic and pragmatic function most of the interjections listed by Ælfric express negative emotions (sorrow, grief): *eala*, *hilahi*, *la*, *wa*, *wamme*, *wala*, *wellawell*; only *haha* / *hehe* for laughter expresses a (normally) positive emotion (sign of joy). *Hui(g)* seems to express surprise or admiration, but in the example given by Ælfric it functions rather as a greeting formula. *Afæstla* seems to be a response form. *Hui(g)* and *afæstla* thus show two of the other functions of interjections.

A final question in connection with Ælfric's *Grammar* is how far the interjections mentioned there reflect actual Old English language use, perhaps even colloquial speech. *Eala*, *la*, *wa*, *wala* are attested outside his *Grammar* and were apparently used frequently. *Eala* is the most frequent complex primary interjection in Hiltunen's data (2006: 96), and according to the *DOE* there are ca. 1250 occurrences of *eala* in Old English texts. *Haha* / *hehe*, *hilahi*, *hui(g)* on the other hand are rarely attested, at least in writing, or even hapax legomena – but probably they were more frequent in the spoken language. For *haha* this is quite likely because it apparently goes back to Indo-European, and is still used to express laughter in Modern English (as well as in German) and thus apparently has an unbroken tradition; for the others it is more difficult to tell. *Afæstla* is a hapax legomenon, attested only in Ælfric's *Grammar*. But since he specifically labels *afæstla*, together with *hilahi* and *wellawell*, as “englisce interiectiones”, as ‘English interjections’ (p. 280/14) and also does not give any Latin equivalents for them, it seems unlikely that he made them up. It seems more likely that like *haha* they also reflect actual Old English usage. Thus Ælfric's *Grammar* is one of the rare witnesses (or even the only one) of some interjections which were perhaps frequent in spoken Old English. Thus we find traces of colloquial speech in a grammar.²⁰

Ælfric lists many, but not all of the Old English interjections. Of the more frequent ones, noticeably *hwæt* is absent, but this may be due to the fact that *hwæt* is a discourse marker and does not primarily express an emotion. *Hwæt* occurs, however, in King Alfred's version of the *Soliloquies*, see the following section.

4. Emotions and interjections in the Old English Soliloquies

The Old English version of Augustine's *Soliloquies* is another text in which we might perhaps not primarily expect interjections.²¹ It is a theological and philosophical treatise, an “attempt to know God, and to affirm His and the soul's im-

mortality” (Greenfield and Calder 1986: 52). It has the form of a dialogue, an exchange between the author (St. Augustine; *ic* in the Old English version) and his Reason (OE *(ge)sceadwisnes*), although the latter is not clearly defined (see p. 3, ed. Endter).²²

The Old English version is commonly ascribed to Alfred, although the corpus of Alfred’s own translations has been shrinking continually in recent decades: the Old English *Orosius* was taken from him some time ago and shown to be an anonymous translation.²³ More recently Malcolm Godden has taken the Old English *Boethius* from Alfred, too.²⁴ Godden also doubts whether Alfred was the author or translator of the Old English version of the *Soliloquies*, but we can leave this question open for our purpose.²⁵ If the original translation was made by Alfred, it must have been composed in the 890s, but it survives only in a manuscript from the 12th century, now the first part of London, British Library, Cotton Vitellius A.xv (cf. Ker 1957, No. 215).

The *Soliloquies* are not an impassionate or detached philosophical dialogue – often the speakers, and especially the author (OE *ic*) get quite emotional and express intense feelings. The author frequently uses interjections, whereas Reason / *(ge)sceadwisness* employs interjections much more rarely. Often there is no exactly corresponding word or phrase in the Latin source; therefore the Old English version frequently seems to be emotionally more intense than the Latin original, and the intensity seems to increase as the dialogue progresses.

To achieve the emotional intensity, it is not only interjections which are used, but also a number of rhetorical figures and structures, e.g. repetition and anaphora, especially by Reason. Reason uses interjections only twice, and in both cases *hwæt*, *hwat* (25/7; 60/28–29), as a kind of indignant surprise (see further below). Reason’s favourite emotion actually is wondering about the author, who on the one hand is slow to understand what she tells him, and on the other hand is also quick to forget what she has just taught him.²⁶ Her favourite phrase therefore is ‘I wonder’, *ic wondrie*, which often has no correspondence in the Latin original, but was apparently frequently added by the Old English translator, e.g. “*ic wondrie þin*”, ‘I am surprised about you’ (15/19); “*ic wundrige hwi þu swa spece*” ‘I wonder why you speak so’ (24/1; cf. 53/8; 60/8; 63/3); and conversely “*nis þæt nan wundor*” ‘this is no wonder’ (32/22; cf. 34/17; 35/11).

The following interjections are used in the Old English *Soliloquies*, apart from *hwæt* mainly by the author (*ic*):

- (1) *gea* ‘yes’ (ModE *yea(h)*); 6x: 20/16; 21/9; 22/1; 51/5; 53/6; 66/19.
- (2) *eala*, *æala*: expressing regret, but also astonishment; 5x: 12/17; 28/1; 53/1; 55/11; 63/18.
- (3) *na*, *ne*, *nese* ‘no’: *ne*: 21/19; *nese* 17/18; 18/6 – for combinations with *nese* see below.
- (4) *hwæt*: uttered by *ic*: 12/3; uttered by Reason: 25/7; 60/29. Attention getter, but often used in a reproachful way.

- (5) *wel la*: 13/6; and *walawa* 43/10, both for ‘woe, alas’; on the latter, see below.

Thus there are fewer interjections than in Ælfric’s *Grammar* (which, of course, is the later text): *eala* is also listed there; *walawa* and *wel la* can be regarded as further members of the *wala(wa)* interjection family. Not listed by Ælfric are *hwæt*, *gea* and *nese*. The reason is perhaps that *hwæt* is an attention getter, and *gea* and *nese* are response forms.

Once more, however, counting is not so easy, because there are also five different reduplicative combinations of the shape ‘X la X’ (*gea la gea* etc.), which were obviously created to achieve a very intense and emphatic way of showing emotion and also of emphatically agreeing and disagreeing. They also show once more the importance of *la* for the formation of complex interjections and also the use of reduplication. They are not listed by the dictionaries as headwords, probably because most of them are groups rather than compounds, but their form and use is quite striking.

The word-division is, of course, at least in some cases editorial: *wa la wa* / *walawa* is spelled as three words in some editions and dictionaries, but as one word in others. The same is true of punctuation: for example the exclamation mark which is sometimes used after *eala* is editorial.

The following combinations are used in the OE *Soliloquies*:

- (6) *do la do* ‘do it oh do it’: 60/28
 (7) *gea la gea* ‘yes oh yes’: 2x: 35/1
 (8) *nese la nese*, or *nese*, *næse* ‘no oh no’: 9x: 3/15; 47/1; 50/14; 52/9; 61/5; 61/16; 62/5; 68/14; 68/22
 (9) *swuga la swuga* ‘be silent oh be silent’: 49/1
 (10) *wa la wa* ‘alas’ lit. ‘woe oh woe’: 43/10

Whereas *gea la gea*, *do la do*, *swuga la swuga* and *wa la wa* are used just once, and *nese la nese* (or *nese*, *næse*) is used nine times. I give an example in context of each of the interjections used by Alfred. As the examples show, the interjections are often used after the introductory formula “Ða cwæð ic” ‘Then I said’.

- (1) *gea*: “Ða cwæð ic: **gea**, ic hys gelife.” (18/15)
 (2a) *eala*: “Ða cwæð ic: **eala!** Ic eom myd earmlicre ofergiotolnesse ofseten ...” (63/18)
 (2b) *eala*: “**Eala**, hu þin godnes is to wundrienne, forþæm heo is ungelic æal-lum goodum!” (12/17–18)
 (3) *nese*, *na*, *ne*: “Ða cwæð ic: **nese**, **ne** do ic hi **na** ðe raðor gelice ...” (17/18)
 (4a) *hwæt* (the author): “for[ðam] ic eom fleonde fram hym. **hwæt**, hy me underfungon ær ...” (12/2–3)

- (4b) *hwæt* (Reason): “Ða cwæð heo: **hwæt!** Ic wat þæt þu hefst ðone hlaford nu ...” (60/28–29)
- (5) *wel la*: “**Wel la**, god feder, wel alyse me of ðam gedwolan ...” (13/6–7); for *walawa* see below
- (6) *do la do*: “Ða cwæð ic: **do, la do!** Gedo þæt me scamige forði.” (60/28)
- (7) *gea la gea*: “Ða cwæð ic: **gea, la gea;** gyf hyt nu færenga gewurde ... (35/1)
- (8) *nese la nese*: “Ða cwæð ic: **nese, la nese;** ne nawer neah!” (61/16) ‘Then I said: no, oh no; not nowhere/never near’
- (9) *swuga la swuga*: “Ða cwæð ic: **swuga, la swuga!**” (49/1)
- (10) *wa la wa*: “Ða cwæð ic: **Wa la wa!** Hwæt þu me forhæardne lætst!” (43/10)

As far as origin (etymology) is concerned, *gea*, *hwæt*, and perhaps also *nese* are old words, going back to Germanic or even Indo-European:

- (a) *gea* < Gmc **ja*; cf. G *ja*. ModE *yea(h)*.
- (b) *hwæt* < Gmc **xwat* (cf. G *was*) < IE **kwod*, cf. L *quod*. Like *quod*, OE *hwæt* (> ModE *what*) is also used as an interrogative pronoun as well as an interjection; but here we are only concerned with its use as an interjection.
- (c) *na*, *ne*, *nese* ‘no’: *ne* apparently goes back to Indo-European, cf. L *ne*. *Na* (> ModE *no*) is explained as from *ne* + *ā* ‘not + always’. *Nese* is explained as an originally complex form, arising from **nisi* or **ne sī* ‘be it not, it may/shall not be’, see, e.g., Holthausen.

The reduplicative combinations with *la* seem to have originated with *walawa*, which is perhaps the oldest and certainly the most frequently used formation of this type; probably this pattern was then extended to the response forms (*gea la gea* and *nese la nese*) and even to verbs in the imperative (*do la do*; *swuga la swuga*).

Functionally, *gea* and *nese* are response forms, and *hwæt* is an attention getter (see further below), but they also belong to the interjections; this is particularly clear in the *Soliloquies*, where *gea* and *nese* are combined with *la*. According to Wülfing (1901, II: 695) *gea* and *nese* become interjections through the combination with *la*.

The more frequently used interjections especially have a number of semantic shades which can vary according to context.

- (1) *Hwæt* is basically an attention getter, i.e. it “draws the listener’s attention to what is being said” (Hiltunen 2006: 103).²⁷ When it is uttered by the speaker, it implies also regret for his sins in his prayer to God (12/3). When it is uttered by Reason (*gesceadwisnys*), it seems to imply a kind

of indignant surprise (25/7; 60/28–29). For further details, see Brinton (1996); Stanley (2000).

- (2) *Eala*: From its etymology (*ea* + *la*), *eala* expresses sadness and regret, and this seems to be its function in most cases when it is used by the author (ic) in the *Soliloquies*, e.g. 28/1; 53/1; 55/11; 63/18. In some passages it seems to express admiration and praise, however (12/17–18; see example 2b above). *Eala* is also often used in Old English where the Latin has a vocative (on Ælfric’s statement about the corresponding Latin *o* see p. 170 above); this is also the case in 12/17–18: “O admiranda et singularis bonitas tua”, which in the Old English version has, however, been transformed into an exclamation of admiration and praise: “Eala, hu þin godnes is to wundrienne”. The gloss to Ælfric’s *Colloquy* also has several examples of the use of *eala* as a marker of the vocative, e.g. “magister – eala lareow”.²⁸ For further details, see the *DOE* s.v. *eala*.
- (3) *Wa la wa* and *wel la* were apparently part of a widespread interjection family with many variant forms (see above), but basically the same function, namely to express sorrow, regret etc.

This leads us to the question (which we asked above concerning Ælfric) of how far the interjections and formulae used by Alfred in the *Soliloquies* were his literary creations and how far they can be regarded as common or even colloquial spoken Old English.

According to Hiltunen (2006: 102), who refers to Offerberg (1967), *la* was idiomatic Old English and part of the spoken language – but, as we have seen, it is used much more often in combination than in isolation by both Alfred and Ælfric.

Eala (which was formed with *la* as second element and accordingly must have originated later) is very frequent in Old English. According to Hiltunen (2006: 98 & 104–105) it is mainly literary and Christian, and *hwæt* was part of the poetic diction – but as its use by Alfred in the *Soliloquies* shows, *hwæt* was also employed in prose.

Gea ‘yes’ and *nese* ‘no’ were probably common response formulae. *Wa la wa* seems to have been a common formula of sorrow and regret, belonging to an interjection family. The other formulae created according to this pattern (*gea la gea*, *nese la nese*, *do la do*, *swuga la swuga*), however, apparently were not common.²⁹ It seems that they were created by Alfred (or whoever translated the *Soliloquies*) for special emphasis. *Nese la nese* also occurs in the Old English *Boethius*; this text furthermore has the formula *gise la gise* ‘yes oh yes’; see Wülfing (1901, II: 695).³⁰

5. Summary

If we combine the evidence from Alfred's *Soliloquies* (*Solil*; before 900) and from Ælfric's *Grammar* (*Gramm*; around 1000), we get the following picture of the Old English interjections:

5.1. Corpus of Old English interjections: Altogether Old English had ca. 35–40 interjections. As explained above, it is impossible to give a precise number. The following ca. 12 interjections are attested in Ælfric's *Grammar* and in the *Soliloquies*; the number is comparatively small because several forms are here regarded as variant forms or as belonging to an interjection family or as groups formed with *la*, but most of the frequent and important Old English interjections are certainly included, and also some of the ones attested rarely, at least in written documents:

- (1) *afæstla*: 'certainly, assuredly'; *Gramm* (hapax legomenon).
- (2) *eala*: 'alas, oh, lo'; *Gramm*, *Solil* (very frequent in Old English); *æala*, *æla* mentioned by Mitchell (1985) are probably variants.
- (3) *gea*: 'yes'; *Solil* (probably common in Old English).
- (4) *haha* / *hehe*: 'ha! ha!' (indicating laughter); *Gramm* (hapax legomenon).
- (5) *hilahi*: probably 'alas, oh'; *Gramm* (hapax legomenon). Mitchell (1985) also mentions *hig*, *hig hig*, *higla*, *higlahig*: probably these formed an interjection family.
- (6) *hui* / *huig*: may have expressed admiration or surprise (or both; cf. G *hui*), but according to Mitchell (1985) 'alas!'; in Ælfric's example, however, it seems to be used as a kind of greeting formula, see p. 121 above); *Gramm* (rarely attested).
- (7) *hwæt*: attention getter; *Solil*. Very frequent in Old English; see Brinton (1996) and Stanley (2000).
- (8) *la*: 'oh, ah' (ModE *lo*);³¹ *Gramm*; frequently used for combinations: (a) *afæstla*, *eala*, *hilahi*, *wala*, *wellawell*, *walawa*, *wella* (some attested in *Gramm*, some in *Solil*, and some in both); and: (b) in *Solil*: *do la do*, *gea la gea*, *nese la nese*, *swuga la swuga* (plus *walawa*); and in the OE *Boethius* furthermore *gise la gise*. Thus altogether six formations in accordance with this pattern seem to be attested.
- (9) *na*, *ne*, *nese*: 'no'; *Solil* (probably common in Old English).
- (10) *wa*: 'woe, alas' (ModE *woe*); as a noun 'misery, affliction'; *Gramm*; for combinations with *wa* (interjection family) see (11)–(12).
- (11) *wa is me* / *wamme* etc., (ModE *woe is me*); *Gramm*.
- (12) *wala* (*Gramm*), *wellawell* (*Gramm*), *walawa* (*Solil*), *wel la* (*Solil*): 'woe, alas': probably together with *wa* an interjection family. Mitchell also mentions the forms *weg la*, *weilawei*, *wilawei* etc.

Apart from these, Mitchell (1985: I: 528) also lists (but says nothing about frequency or rarity):³² *ea* ‘alas’ (the basis of *eala*) and *æ* (perhaps a variant of *ea*); *efne* / *æfne* (*nu*) ‘behold!’; *egele* etc.; *enu* / *eono* / *ono* ‘behold!’; *eow* / *eule* etc.; *georstu* ‘o’; *gese* / *gyse* ‘yes’; *?hela*; *henu* / *heono* etc. ‘behold!’ (perhaps variants of *enu* / *eono*); *hu* (*la*) (*nu*) ‘how (now)! come!’; *huru* ‘indeed, surely’; *nic* ‘no’; *nu* (L *ecce*); *nula* (L *heia*); *sehde* etc. ‘behold!’; *tæg tæg* (L *puppup*); *?uton*.

5.2. Form (morphology): Regarding their morphologic shape the following groups can be distinguished:³³

- (1) simple primary interjections: *gea*, *la*, *hui(g)*, *ne*;
- (2) simple secondary interjections: *hwæt*, *na*, *wa*;
- (3) complex interjections:
 - (a) consisting of primary interjections, often combining *la* and another interjection, and sometimes using reduplication: *eala*, *haha* / *hehe*, *hilahi*, *wella* / *wellawell*;
 - (b) combinations of primary and secondary interjections (or words), at least originally: *afæstla*, *nese*, *wala*, *walawa*;
- (4) phrases (full and condensed phrases): *wa is me* / *wamme*; *do la do*; *gea la gea*; *nese la nese*; *swuga la swuga*.

5.3. Etymology: Several of the simple primary and secondary interjections go back to Germanic or even Indo-European, namely *ea*, *gea*, *la*, *haha*, *hui*, *hwæt*, *ne*, *wa*, and perhaps also *nese*. Most of the complex interjections, including those with *la* as an element, seem to be Old English formations, however, e.g., *afæstla*, *eala*, *hilahi*, *wala*, *wellawell*, as well as the phrases, e.g. *wa is me*, *gea la gea* etc.

5.4. Function: Just taking *Gramm* and *Solil* into account, four functions of interjections can be distinguished; some interjections can have several functions, however, i.e. they show polysemy:³⁴

- (1) interjections expressing emotions: (a) positive emotions: *haha* / *hehe* for laughter; possibly *hui(g)* for surprise and admiration; (b) negative emotions, expressing grief, regret, sorrow etc. (apparently the large majority): *eala*, *hilahi*, *la*, *wa*, *wa is me* / *wamme*, *wala*, *walawa*, *wellawell*;
- (2) attention getters: *hwæt*;
- (3) greeting forms: *hui(g)*;
- (4) response forms: *afæstla*, *gea*, *na* / *ne* / *nese*.

5.5. It is perhaps ironic that some Old English interjections which must have been common (e.g. *haha*) and colloquial are mainly or even exclusively preserved in a grammar and a philosophical-theological treatise.

5.6. Further fate: Many of the Old English interjections died out and were replaced in Middle English by interjections borrowed from French and/or Latin. Among those that survive are (although in some cases the functions have or may have changed): *yea(h)*, *haha*, *what*, *lo*, *no*, *woe*. For a survey of Middle English interjections see Mustanoja (1960: 620–640); cf. also Sauer (2008).

Notes

- 1 Here used in the revised edition by Dutch (1962). On the question of terminology, see also Sauer (2008: 389–390).
- 2 On abbot Ælfric see, e.g., Gneuss (2009), and the entry in *BEASE*, s.v. Ælfric of Eynsham. According to Gneuss, Ælfric wrote his *Grammar* shortly after 992, and probably in Cerne (2009: 22).
- 3 On King Alfred see, e.g., Frantzen (1986); the entries in *BEASE*, s.v. Alfred and s.v. Alfredian Texts, the recent edition of the Old English *Boethius* by Godden (2009), and Godden (2007).
- 4 See also Sauer (2008: 390–393).
- 5 In any case the index of *CHEL I* does not list the terms ‘interjection’, ‘exclamation’, or ‘feeling’.
- 6 *Buf, eala, efne (nu), georstu, o, hu la, hwæt la, la hu.*
- 7 For assistance with the present article, my thanks are due to Susan Bollinger, Susanne Gärtner, Elisabeth Kubaschewski, Katharina Wolff and Gaby Waxenberger.
- 8 On Ælfric’s treatment of interjections see Sauer (2006). His *Grammar* is here quoted in the edition by Zupitza. For a French translation, see Mensah and Toupin (2005).
- 9 Clark Hall lists a number of compounds with *mod*, but no **modstyrung* or **modgewilnung*.
- 10 Cf. also Sauer (2006: 43–44).
- 11 Ælfric deals with the following word-classes: noun, pronoun, verb, adverb, participle, conjunction, preposition, interjection.
- 12 Most of these are listed by Lewis & Short. *A* is treated under *ah*, and *haha* is treated under *ha*. *E*, *hehe* and *la* are not listed. On the other hand, Lewis & Short give many Latin interjections not mentioned by Ælfric, e.g. *ehem*, *eheu*, *eho*, *eia*, *hei*, *heia*, *heus* etc.
- 13 He does not give a meaning for *hui(g)*; according to the Latin dictionaries (Lewis & Short) it expresses astonishment or admiration; ClarkHall lists it as an Old English interjection, but does not give a meaning.
- 14 *La* is apparently not listed in the *Theasurus Linguae Latinae*.
- 15 ClarkHall often puts an exclamation mark behind the meanings. The treatment of these exclamations in the dictionaries (BT, ClarkHall, Holthausen) is very uneven. Not all of them are listed; some of the complex interjections are just listed under their first element; especially ClarkHall lists some of the interjections without giving a meaning.
- 16 Cf. the song by Harry Belafonte “Woe is me, shame and scandal in the family...”
- 17 Cf. also Sauer (2006: 46–47).
- 18 Or possibly *ā* ‘always’ + *fest* ‘fast, firm’ + *la*.
- 19 Unfortunately I have no explanation at present for the *weg* in *weg-la-weg* or the *wel* in *wel-la-well*; they do not seem to be identical with the noun *weg* ‘way’ and the adverb *wel* ‘well’.
- 20 Von Lindheim (1951) (in his article on traces of colloquial speech in Old English) does not mention the interjections.
- 21 The main source are St. Augustine’s *Soliloquia*, but other sources were also used for the Old English version. The text is here quoted from the edition by Endter.
- 22 4/11–14/7 (ed. Endter) form a prayer by the author to God.
- 23 Frantzen (1986) lists as Alfred’s works: (1) His OE law-code; (2) the OE *Pastoral Care*; (3)

- the OE Boethius; (4) the OE *Soliloquies*; (5) the *Paris Psalter*.
- 24 In: *The Old English Boethius*, ed. Godden et al (2009), esp. I: 140–146. In 1992, Godden had still subscribed to the traditional view, namely that Alfred was the translator of the OE *Boethius* and the OE *Soliloquies*: Godden (1992: 513 & 524–526).
- 25 In: *The Old English Boethius*, ed. Godden et al. (2009: I: 143); see also Godden (2007).
- 26 As indicated above (see p. 120), Ælfric also regards ‘wondering, being surprised’ as an emotion.
- 27 *Hwæt* is the first word of *Beowulf* and several other Old English poems.
- 28 The Latin Colloquy is by Ælfric, but the OE gloss was added by somebody else.
- 29 The *DOE* s.v. *do*, for example, does not seem to list the phrase “do la do”.
- 30 Godden in his introduction to his edition of the Old English *Boethius* notices certain affinities between this text and the Old English *Soliloquies*.
- 31 The origin of ModE *lo* ‘behold, indeed, verily’ seems to have been more complex, because it may have combined OE *lā* > *lō* and a shortened form of *look*.
- 32 For an inventory of Old English interjections, see also Sauer (2008: 394).
- 33 See also Sauer (2008: 397).
- 34 Of course interjections can have many more functions; see, e.g., Sauer (2008: 392 & 397–398).

References

Editions

- Ælfric’s *Grammar*: *Ælfrics Grammatik und Glossar*, ed. Julius Zupitza. Berlin: Weidmann, 1880; 4th ed. with a new introduction by Helmut Gneuss: Hildesheim: Weidmann, 2003.
- Ælfric’s *Grammar*; French translation: Marthe Mensah et Fabienne Toupin, *La ‘Grammaire’ d’Ælfric: Traduction et Commentaire linguistique*. Publications de l’Association des Médiévistes Anglicistes de l’Enseignement Supérieur. Paris, 2005.
- Boethius: *The Old English Boethius: An Edition of the Old English Versions of Boethius’s ‘De Consolatione Philosophiae’*, ed. Malcolm Godden, Susan Irvine et al. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2009.
- Soliloquies: König Alfreds des Großen Bearbeitung der Soliloquien des Augustinus*, ed. Wilhelm Endter. Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Prosa 11. Hamburg, 1922 [repr. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1964].

Dictionaries

- BT: Joseph Bosworth and T. Northcote Toller, *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1882–1898; *Supplement* by T.N. Toller, 1921.
- ClarkHall: J.R. Clark Hall, *A Concise Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*. 4th ed. with a supplement by Herbert D. Meritt. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1960 [many reprints].
- DOE: *The Dictionary of Old English*, ed. Angus Cameron et al., Fascicles A–F on CD-ROM, version 1.0. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 2003.
- Holthausen: F[erdinand] Holthausen, *Altenglisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. 3. Aufl. Heidelberg: Winter 1974.
- Lewis & Short: Charlton T. Lewis & Charles Short, *A Latin Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1879 [many reprints].

- Roget: *Roget's Thesaurus of English Words and Phrases*, new edition by Robert A. Dutch. London: Longman; Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1962 [many reprints].
- ThOE*: Jane Roberts & Christian Kay with Lynne Grundy, *A Thesaurus of Old English*. 2 vols. London: King's College, 1995; 2nd impression: Costerus New Series 131. Amsterdam and Atlanta, GA: Rodopi, 2000.

Studies and handbooks

- BEASE*: Lapidge, Michael, et al. (ed.) (1999) *The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Anglo-Saxon England*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Brinton, Laurel J. (1996) *Pragmatic Markers in English: Grammaticalization and Discourse Functions*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Cassidy, F.C. (1996) 'The Anglo-Saxon interjection'. In: Pollner, C. et al. (eds.) *Bright is the Ring of Words: Festschrift für Horst Weinstock*. Bonn: Romanistischer Verlag, 45–48.
- CHEL*: Hogg, Richard M. (ed.) (1992) *The Cambridge History of the English Language: Vol. 1: The Beginnings to 1066*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Frantzen, Allen J. (1986) *King Alfred*. Boston, Mass.: Twayne.
- Gneuss, Helmut (2009) *Ælfric of Eynsham: His Life, Times, and Writings*. Old English Newsletter Subsidia 34. Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, Western Michigan University.
- Godden, Malcolm (1992) 'Literary language'. In: Hogg, Richard M. (ed.) *The Cambridge History of the English Language: Vol. 1: The Beginnings to 1066*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 490–535.
- Godden, Malcolm (2007) "Did Alfred Write Anything?", *Medium Ævum* 76, 1–23.
- Greenfield, Stanley B., and Daniel G. Calder (1986) *A New Critical History of Old English Literature*. New York and London: New York UP.
- Hiltunen, Risto (2006) "'Eala, geferan and gode wyrhtan': On Interjections in Old English". In: Walmsley, John (ed.) *Inside Old English: Essays in Honour of Bruce Mitchell*. Oxford: Blackwell, 91–116.
- Ker, N. R. (1957) *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon*. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- Mitchell, Bruce (1985) *Old English Syntax*. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- Mustanoja, Tauno F. (1960) *A Middle English Syntax. Part I: Parts of Speech*. Helsinki: Société Néophilologique.
- Offerberg, I. (1967) *A Study of Old English Interjections*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Stockholm.
- Sauer, Hans (2006) 'Ælfric and emotion'. *Poetica* [Tokyo] 66, 37–52 [Special Issue: *The Expression of Emotions in English with an Emphasis on Old and Middle English*, ed. Hans Sauer and Michiko Ogura].
- Sauer, Hans (2008) 'Interjection, emotion, grammar, and literature'. In: Amano, M., M. Ogura, M. Ohkado (eds.) *Historical Englishes in Varieties of Texts and Contexts: The Global COE Program. International Conference 2007*. Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 387–403.
- Stanley, Eric Gerald (2000) 'Hwæt'. In: Roberts, J. and J. Nelson (eds.) *Essays on Anglo-Saxon and Related Themes in Memory of Lynne Grundy*. London: King's College Centre for Late Antique & Medieval Studies, 525–556.
- von Lindheim, Bogislav (1951) 'Traces of colloquial speech in OE'. *Anglia* 70, 22–42.
- Wülfig, Ernst Peter (1901) *Die Syntax in den Werken Alfreds des Großen*. 2 vols. Bonn: Hanstein.

HANS SAUER is Professor at the University of Munich (LMU), where he has the chair of English Language and Medieval English Literature; he also teaches at the Wyzsza Szkola (Gallus) in Katowice. Previous posts and assignments (some still continuing) were at Eichstätt, Würzburg, Dresden, Innsbruck, Lodz, Palermo, Columbus/Ohio, and Brno. His research interests and publications include critical editions and studies of Medieval English texts (e.g. *Theodulfi Capitula* 1978; *The Owl and the Nightingale* 1983; *Anglo-Saxon Heritage in Munich* 2005), word-formation (e.g. *Nominalkomposita im Frühmittelenglischen* 1992), glosses and glossaries (e.g. *The Épinal-Erfurt Glossary*), lexicography, plant names, *Beowulf*, especially *Beowulf* translations and films, the history of linguistics and of English studies, varieties of English (e.g. pidgins and creoles; advertising), interjections. In 2009 his introduction to English linguistics was published in a Russian version. He is a co-editor of, e.g., *Anglia* and Middle English Texts (MET).

Address: Prof. Hans Sauer, University of Munich (LMU), Department of English and American Studies, Schellingstr. 3, 80799 München, Germany [e-mail: hans.sauer@anglistik.uni-muenchen.de]



HERBERT SCHENDL

**WILLIAM HARVEY'S *PRELECTIONES ANATOMIE
UNIVERSALIS* (1616): CODE-SWITCHING
IN EARLY MODERN ENGLISH LECTURE NOTES**

Abstract

Historical code-switching has attracted increasing interest in recent years. From the Middle Ages onwards, medical texts have not only reflected the complex multilingualism of Britain, but also the increasing vernacularisation of scientific writing in general. This vernacularisation is often linked to a high incidence of code-switching throughout the medieval and well into the early modern period. The present paper analyses the frequent occurrence of code-switching from Latin into English in a medical text, namely William Harvey's *Prelectiones Anatomie Universalis* (1616). The *Prelectiones* represent Harvey's personal hand-written notes for a cycle of anatomical lectures accompanying a dissection. As such they have been claimed to be rather close to spoken language, though they often consist of incomplete and elliptical syntactic structures. The paper presents a brief analysis of structural and functional aspects of code-switching in these notes and concludes with a discussion of the relation between the written code-switches and their possible spoken realisation in the course of the anatomical lectures.

Key words

Code-switching; Early Modern English; Latin; medical texts; William Harvey; lecture notes

1. Introduction

The use of the English vernacular in medical texts has a long history in Britain, going back as far as the Anglo-Saxon period. It became particularly wide-spread in the later Middle Ages, when the increasing vernacularisation of medical texts helped to spread medical knowledge outside universities and gave more and more

people access to learning (cf. Pahta and Taavitsainen 2004: 2–12). The co-existence of Latin and English in medical writing is also reflected in the large number of late medieval multilingual manuscripts as well as in the frequent occurrence of code-switching in medical texts (see Voigts 1989: 96). The choice between Latin and English partly depended on the specific type of text, with academic treatises being more typically in Latin than, e.g. remedy books.¹ A “first phase of vernacularisation seems to have been largely complete by 1475” (Pahta and Taavitsainen 2004: 12), by which time even academic medical treatises were sometimes written in English (Voigts 1996). However, as late as 1534, Thomas Elyot felt compelled to justify the use of the vernacular in the preface to his *Castle of Health*, a book on ‘physicke’, i.e. an academic medical treatise. Quite generally, “Latin prevailed in printed scientific books until the middle of the seventeenth century”, though a number of scientists, including Francis Bacon, wrote and published works both in Latin and in English (Taavitsainen 2004: 38; 69, note 2). The long preference for Latin in specialised treatises resulted on the one hand from its still undisputed status as the language of education and institutional discourse in Britain, on the other hand on its status as the international language of science. Any author who aimed at an international readership would have used Latin as the lingua franca for his published works.

The above-mentioned frequent occurrence of code-switching is not restricted to medical texts, but is a widespread phenomenon in medieval texts in general, which reflects the complex multilingual situation of medieval Britain (see, e.g., Wright 1998, Schendl 2000, 2002, Pahta and Nurmi 2006, Schendl and Wright forthcoming). It seems partly linked to the process of language shift in specific genres and text types (see Schendl 2002: 70) and the vernacularisation of medicine and medical treatises seems to have provided a favourable background for this particular expression of bilingualism in written texts.

Code-switching in medieval medical texts has attracted the interest both of medievalists and historical linguists for some time, see in particular Voigts (1989, 1996), who provides a typology of mixed medical texts, Hunt (2000) and Pahta (2003, 2004), though there is still room for further research. These studies list quite a number of typical functions of code-switching both in Latin and in vernacular medieval medical texts, such as quoting from an authoritative source, using Latin medical terminology, or using Latin for tabooed expressions or even whole text passages; on the other hand, vernacular recipes are often inserted into Latin texts. Recent research in this field has greatly profited from the publication of the electronic *Corpus of Middle English Medical Texts* (2004), which has introduced corpus-linguistic methodology into code-switching research and has also provided the empirical basis for Pahta (2004).

On the other hand, code-switching in medical texts from the Early Modern English period has so far received hardly any attention. A preliminary study of switching in extracts from eight medical books dating from between 1552 and 1676 is provided in Pahta (2007). Her statement that the primary aim of her study is “simply to show that medical texts of the Early Modern English period, like

their medieval counterparts, do indeed contain some code-switching” (Pahta 2007: 254), clearly testifies to the general neglect of this research field. On the basis of her small data base, Pahta finds a range of forms and functions of switching, which are on the whole similar to those found in medieval medical texts, with terminology, expression of intertextuality and embedded recipes being among the central functions of code-switching in her material.

Pahta’s material is exclusively taken from printed medical books, an obvious data base for such a study. However, there is also a very different type of mixed-language texts from the early 17th century whose code-switching has so far not received any linguistic attention, namely the extensive handwritten notes of William Harvey, which were not intended for publication in this form.

2. William Harvey and his *Prelectiones Anatomie Universalis* (1616)

2.1. *General background*²

William Harvey (1578–1657) is most likely the greatest physician of early modern England, whose revolutionary insights into the circulation of the blood have secured his permanent fame. He studied medicine in Cambridge and Padua, then one of the most prestigious medical faculties of Europe. After his return to London, he began a highly successful medical career, becoming a member of the College of Physicians, a respected physician at a leading London hospital and, in 1618, physician to James I.

Harvey’s published writings were clearly aimed not only at a British, but also at an international readership. Thus it is not surprising that all his three published books were written in Latin: the first, his famous treatise on the circulation of the blood (1628), was even published abroad in Frankfurt-am-Main, while the other two appeared in England in 1649 and 1651, though his 1649 book was also published in Rotterdam in the same year. However, all three books were also available in English translations as early as 1653, showing the widespread demand for vernacular versions of his works.

Apart from these published monolingual Latin books, Harvey left a number of unpublished writings, of which three manuscripts are particularly interesting from a linguistic point of view. These are on the one hand his lecture notes *Prelectiones Anatomie Universalis* from 1616 and a series of notes on the muscles (*De Musculis*) from 1619, on the other hand an unfinished study of the movement of animals (*De Motu Locali Animalium*, 1627). Though these are also written in Latin, they all show some code-switching into English. Such switches are particularly frequent in Harvey’s lecture notes *Prelectiones*, which will be the topic of the present paper, much less so in the two other manuscripts.

2.2. *The Lumleian lectures and the Prelectiones Anatomie Universalis (1616)*³

Harvey had been elected a member of the College of Physicians in 1607 and in 1615 he was appointed ‘Lumleian’ lecturer there. In this position he had to give a cycle of public lectures on anatomy which was to be “accompanied by an anatomical demonstration and dissection” (Whitteridge 1989: 1; 1964: xxvi). The Lumleian lectures had been explicitly designed “for the improvement of the standards of surgery in the country and for the better education of surgeons” (Whitteridge 1964: lvii).⁴

The *Prelectiones Anatomie Universalis* are evidently Harvey’s notes for his Lumleian lectures, which were used over a number of years and thus show numerous later additions in the margins and on separate pages. They contain a discussion of the body parts and of ‘the three bellies’, i.e. the lower belly, the chest with heart and lungs, and finally the head and brain (Whitteridge 1964: xix, xxviii). The *Prelectiones* have survived in a single manuscript in Harvey’s own handwriting, MS Sloane 230, now in the British Library. The best available edition is that by Gweneth Whitteridge (1964), which not only provides a careful edition of the Latin text,⁵ but also an English translation with some interpretation of the often difficult text. From a medical point of view, Harvey’s lecture notes are of great importance for tracing the development of his medical views on the circulation of the blood and other questions (see Whitteridge 1989: 5). Their structure follows “[t]he rules drawn up for the Lumleian lectures [which] were in the best tradition of medical education: read the authorities, comment on the texts, expound their application” (Whitteridge 1964: xxx). Harvey used a variety of sources, but he based his lectures prominently on one particular book, Caspar Bauhin’s textbook on anatomy, *Theatrum anatomicum*, first published in Frankfurt in 1605.⁶ His notes are “in effect a commentary on Bauhin’s textbook”, whose description it follows rather closely, sometimes even quoting whole sentences, though in general mainly noting down words and phrases with his own comments (Whitteridge 1964: xxxii). As a text, Harvey’s notes cannot be classified with any of the three traditional categories of medical texts (see note 1), since they are not a treatise, not even notes for an academic anatomical lecture, but rather “notes to be used as the basis for a spoken commentary accompanying a dissection”, which becomes clear from a number of annotations in the manuscript, partly in the margin in red ink, giving directions for the actual dissection (Whitteridge 1989: 17f.; see also Whitteridge 1964: xxv). As such they can be supposed to be closer to speech than a text intended for publication, but since they are a mixture of complete as well as elliptical sentences and phrases, and of enumerations of single words, they do not really represent speech. As lecture notes, there was evidently no intended readership for the text, but its intended audience is of clear importance for the occurrence of the frequent code-switches into English. This intended audience, i.e. the people attending the dissections, was most likely a complex one, as was the institution of the Lumleian lectures as such. It is most likely that Harvey’s “audience consisted of physicians and surgeons, for from time to time he addresses

some remarks directly to them, saying that this or this is of particular interest for physicians or surgeons" (Whitteridge 1964: xxxv). This may have influenced the language used in particular lectures, as Whitteridge implies in her claim that

we cannot be certain whether he lectured either in English or Latin, for it is probable that for himself he always wrote in Latin. If the surgeons predominated in the audience, then possibly the lecture was in English, if the physicians, in Latin. For the most part the notes seem to be relevant to an actual dissection when the demonstrator was required not only to show anatomical structure but to discuss function in health and disease. Sometimes, however, they do seem to belong more nearly to the lecture room than to the anatomy theatre and these long discussions perhaps Harvey omitted or, at least, summarised. (Whitteridge 1964: xxxv)

Interestingly, Whitteridge does not mention the possibility that Harvey actually code-switched in his lectures, but rather seems to favour the use of either monolingual Latin or English, depending on the composition of the audience. We will come back to this question after the analysis of patterns and functions of switching in our concluding remarks.

2.3. Code-switching in the Prelectiones

As already briefly indicated, Harvey's lecture notes are basically a Latin text written in a mixture of full and elliptical sentences and phrases as well as enumerations consisting of nouns or adjectives. Additionally, there is a large number of switches into English, which show more or less similar structures as the Latin text, though the number of complete sentences is relatively small, while elliptical constructions and enumerations predominate, though one- and two-word switches equally occur.⁷ The overall frequency of these English switches is rather high and they are spread quite regularly through the whole text. Whitteridge's (1964) edition of the notes covers 170 pages, though of uneven length because of sometimes substantial footnotes. Of these, only 35 pages do not have any English material, while the remaining 135 pages show at least one, more frequently a number of switches into English of varying length.

2.3.1. Syntactic aspects

This section does not aim at providing a full syntactic analysis of switching points and patterns in the *Prelectiones*, but rather wants to briefly illustrate the wide range of such patterns in the text and thus Harvey's flexible use of the two languages.

As said above, there is only a relatively small number of complete English sentences, in some of which we find a switch back to Latin; both types are illustrated in the passage under (1):

- (1) Nan Gunter etc. puto callum fecisse. **The mad woman pins in her arme. Mary pin her cross-cloth begining with the *cuticula* as pueri volam manus.** (46)⁸
 ('Nan Gunter [name of a woman] etc. I think she made herself insensitive [to pain]. **The mad woman pins in her arm. Mary pin her cross-cloth beginning with the *cuticula* (skin) as boys** [stick pins into] the palm of the hand.)

Much more frequent, however, are non-finite and elliptical sentences and clauses, which is not surprising for handwritten lecture notes. In some instances, their meaning is only recoverable for the modern reader through a detailed analysis of the context. However, these reduced switched structures are linguistically quite interesting, since there is hardly any comparable historical material. A systematic analysis of these switches is not possible here, but they would deserve closer attention. A few instances should suffice to illustrate this linguistic strategy.

Under (2) examples of non-finite English switches are given, with (2.b) showing a switch back into Latin. The examples are from Harvey's introductory 'General rules for an anatomy'.

- (2) a. 2. **Demonstrare propria illius cadaveris, nova vel noviter inventa.** 3. **To supplye only by speech what cannot be shewn, on your own credit and by authority.** (16)
 ('2. Point out the peculiarities of the particular body, the new or newly discovered [things]. 3. **To supply only by speech what cannot be shown, on your own credit and by authority.**')
 b. 7. **Not to dispute, confute** alias quam argumentis ostensis, quia plus quam tres dies requiritur. (16)
 ('**Not to dispute** [or] **confute** other than by visible evidence, for [otherwise] more than three days would be required.')

Examples (3.a and b) illustrate switched elliptical sentences without a verb form, while (3.c) shows the not infrequent deletion of the copula between the Latin subject noun and the vernacular complement.

- (3) a. **SPLEN other side of the stomach towards the short rib.** (74)
 b. **Yeong ox less tallow** quia pinguescit intra carnem. (78)
 ('**Young ox less tallow**, because it grows fat within the flesh.')
- c. Homo **naked** etc. **yett Nature most sollicitous** dedit facultatem quae haec omnia **scin wooll fures** etc.
 (50) ('Man [is] **naked** etc., **yet Nature most solicitous** has given [him] the power [to use as covering] all these, such as **skin, wool, furs**, etc.')

A variety of switched English constituents is found in Latin finite, non-finite or elliptical sentences and clauses, and some of these switched constituents are equally elliptical. This will be illustrated under (4) with various types of prepositional phrases (PP). (4.a) gives an example of a fully switched PP, while in (4.b) the preposition *in* could be Latin or English and thus be seen as triggering the following switch into English; (4.c) illustrates a PP with deleted preposition. PP-internal switches, on the other hand, are rare and mainly occur before Latin or Greek medical terms, some of which can be considered as technical loans, as the two examples under (4.d) illustrate.

- (4) a. Hic sunt hinc intra tunicas progrediuntur oblique **on this ridge**. (96)
 ('They are here [and] from there they run obliquely within the membranous coats **on this ridge**.')
- b. sic **in a ratt** interstitium longum inter cerebrum et cerebellum (324)
 ('thus **in a rat**, [they are] in the long interstices between the cerebrum and the cerebellum'.)
- c. Quia homine intestina sexies longitudo corporis, septies **ginney-cuny**. (84)
 ('Because in man the guts [are] six times the length of the body, seven times [in] **ginneycuneys**.')
- d. Infra, **loos, sometime to the** oss pecten sed raro. (76)
 ('Below, [it is] **loose, sometimes** [attached] **to the** pubic bone, but rarely.')
- where** arteria et vena porta **going** iecori **ar slightly tyed to iejunum**. (76)
 ('**where** the artery and portal vein **going** to the liver **are slightly tied to the jejunum**.')

A detailed discussion of further switched constituents would go beyond the scope of this paper. Let me just illustrate some syntactic functions of single-word switches without going into further details.

- (5) a. **Splen** contra inferiore sinistra posteriore (124)
 ('[The] **spleen**, on the other hand, [is] lower down, on the left, to the back.')
- b. ilia, lumbares, **flanke** (36)
 ('[the] ilium, [that is the] lumbar regions, [and the] **flank**.')
- c. Hae partes aliquae aliquibus absunt omnia perfectissimis, **ratts**, unde potentes (178)
 ('These are the parts, some are wanting in some [animals], all [are present] in the most perfect, [as in]) **ratts**, wherefore [these have power to] engender.')

d. unde impetuose insequuntur et appetunt et agunt quod per se **loathsome**. (174)
 ('wherefore they pursue it impetuously and seek and perform what in itself [is] **loathsome**.')

2.3.2. *Some pragmatic functions of switching*

In a text like the *Prelectiones*, which are personal lecture notes intended as a guide through a live dissection, we can hardly expect clear pragmatic functions of the various switches. However, there are some noticeable functional tendencies for switching which, though in no way regular, seem to have a higher frequency than others. Again, we cannot aim at any completeness here nor discuss any existing counter-examples, but will only illustrate some of the more obvious tendencies.

Quite frequently, code-switching occurs when Harvey illustrates a point previously made with examples or compares it to something for easier understanding and illustration, i.e., these are evidently commentaries which make a previous, sometimes more theoretical statement more vivid and descriptive, as the three instances under (6) illustrate.

(6) a. Contra frigida alba livida cum flatibus absque sanguine. Humida relaxantur, **wett parchment or leather, flatulent**; exemplo **cattle going to grass**, equo **loose belly fundament swabby gutts croake and wallop**. (114)
 ('On the other hand cold [guts are] white [or] leaden, [they are filled] with flatus [but] without blood. Wet [guts] are relaxed, [like] **wet parchment or leather, flatulent**; for example **cattle going to grass**, in a horse [with a] **loose belly swabby fundament [the] guts croak and wallop**.')

b. Pulmonum divisio in partes continentes contentae. Contentae: sanguis, aer ut recenter mortuo quasi vesiculis; testudine **like a heape of blathers, porpos froth like aer and water**. ... Praeter Naturam contentae in morbis, passiones: apostema, vomicas magnas et exiguas **like hoggs measels**; calculi ex gypsea, **pile like chalke stones**; copia ichorosa materia unde astma (282)
 ('The lungs division into parts containing and parts contained. [The parts] contained: blood, air, as [may be seen] in the recently dead, [as it were] in bladders; in the tortoise [the lungs are] **like a heap of bladders, in the porpoise froth like air and water**. ... [Parts which are] contained contrary to Nature in diseases, affections [of the lungs]: abscesses, vomicae great and small **like hog's measles**, calculi of gypsum, **balls like chalk stones**, an abundance of ichorous matter whence asthma.')

c. Aqua acrimonia et salsedinis expers, tamen ... nitrosa, **slippery scowring as in butchers hands**. (248)
 ('[The] water free from bitterness and taste of salt, yet ... contains soda, **slippery, scouring as in butchers' hands**.')

Another frequent occurrence of switches are enumerations, though these are also sometimes mixed; frequent are enumerations of colour terms, though even these are not systematic, as (7.a) illustrates, where the second enumeration of colours is in Latin (see p. 48 for a similar example). These enumerations can also provide examples or illustrations, so that there is a functional overlap with the previous type, see (7.b).

(7) a. **Color: darke yeallow**, alii **black**, alii **rusty**, item **greenish blewish**. Unde diversitas bile flava, vitellosa, aeruginosa, nigra, porracea vel virida. (148)
(‘**Colour: dark yellow**, in some **black**, in others **rusty**, also **greenish blue-ish**. Thence diversity in the colour of the gall which can be saffron-yellow, egg-yolk-yellow, rust-red, black, leek-green or bright green.’)

b. Quibusdam motu voluntario, **porcupin, hedghog, turkey, coctoo, ruff bird in the ballad**. Hominibus: vigiliis, manè **lord, how you look! as gamesters; sick leane dog; begger sick**, eriguntur pili horridi. (44)
(‘In some [animals the skin can be moved] by a voluntary movement, **porcupine, hedgehog, turkey, cockatoo, ruff birds in the ballad**. In men: after long watchings, in the morning, **Lord, how you look! as gamesters; sick lean dog; beggar sick**, the dishevelled hair stands on end.’)

An obvious function of single-word switches is to provide an English translation or equivalent of a previously mentioned Latin technical term, as in the examples under (8), though this is relatively infrequent; the English term is very rarely preceded or followed by *anglice* ‘in English’, see (8.c), where the English term is set in contrast to the formally similar but different Latin term *renes* ‘kidneys’:

(8) a. PANCREAS, **sweetbread**, sub duodeno, principio omenti (90)
(‘PANCREAS, **sweetbread**, [is situated] below [the] duodenum, in the beginning of [the] omentum.’)

b. ut in piscibus; bronchiae **or larke-netts**. (242)
(‘as in fish, bronchial tubes **or lark nets**.’)

c. lumbi, **reyns** anglice, licet renes altiores; (34)
(‘[the] loins, in English **reins**, although the kidneys [‘renes’], higher.’)

Similar to the previous function of providing a translation is the use of the complex vernacular terms in (9). In this passage taken from an appendix at the end of the manuscript with the title ‘of the nerves as they appear in the course of dissection’, the English terms in the Latin context most likely were used to explicitly point at the respective muscles and sinews in the process of the dissection:

- (9) 3. Laterales, **stradling synews**, secundum alios radix ...
 4. Oris et palati, **mouth synews**, gustus etc. crassiores. ...
 5. Interiores, **close long sinews**. Falloppi quartum par; (341)
 ('Lateral [nerves], **straddling sinews**, according to others [the] root ...
 4. [Nerves] of the mouth and palate, **mouth sinews**, [nerves of] taste etc. thicker. ...
 5. [Interior [nerves], **close, long sinews**. Fallopius' fourth pair;')

A discussion of other possible pragmatic functions of switching would go beyond the scope of this brief contribution, but, like the syntactic patterns, these would deserve closer analysis. To give a fuller impression of the wide range and complex patterns of switching, a longer sample from the *Prelectiones* will be quoted under (10); this passage also illustrates the sometimes high density of English material in the Latin text. As the introductory Latin sentence makes clear, this text passage was intended to accompany the actual dissection, with the switches illustrating specific activities. We would suggest that the text may reflect Harvey's actual wording in the dissection to a high degree:

- (10) Brevitur situm et posituram horum omnium quod scio vos maxime velle, postea singulatim de unoquoque.
 Situs omnium: partim certus partim incertus, Natura **romidg as she can best stow, as in ships** propter motus agilitatem. Imposterum iecoris, **the gutts thrust att one side and two fingers beneath the navill. Full or empty the colick gutt on the line beneath the navil. Sitting or standing contra lying, cushiuns. Breathing**, moventur. WH Δ multis exactam posituram invicem nunquam servant. Gravidis, **yeong girls by lacing**, unde **cutt there laces**. Suspensa ilia, Cardinal Campeggio, **hard and yet** pulsare, hypogastrium **cleane empty**.
 Intestina aliquando subtus inflata, aliquando condantia retracta.⁹
 Signum malum imbecillitas intestinalium.
 IECUR magis dextra, X totum. Vide venam umbilicalem, vide conexum lieni. WH tumorem meum quartana. **Under the chondrium** tutele gratia **allong 7 ribb** dextra superior, unde difficultas respirationis tumore iecoris, **long the short ribbs, upon the stomach which it covereth**. Connexum semper diaphragmati duobus fortissimis ligamentis, umbelicali venae cavae ramo, spinae; aliquando costis, peritoneo, colico. Connectitur capite per nervos, cordi vasibus, ventriculo et lieni per ramum splenicum.
SPLEN other side of the stomach towards the short ribbs. Tangitur manu **under the short ribs att the end of the ultimate or penultimate. Soe under and soe behinde** quod vix sano sentitur precipuè ventre tenso vel pingui; tumense nihil facilius sentitur tactu et descendit. Connectitur omento aliquando diaphragmati, peritoneo, reni sinistro. (72f.)

('I will speak briefly of the site and position of each of these for I know that

this you chiefly want to hear, and afterwards I will deal with each in turn. As for the site of all the guts, it is partly fixed and partly variable, Nature **rummages as she can best stow, as in ships** on account of the vigour of the movement. Behind the liver **the guts thrust at one side and two fingers beneath the navel. Full or empty, the colic gut on the line beneath the navel. Sitting or standing** as opposed to **lying, cushions. Breathing**, [the guts] are moved. WH Δ in many they never keep an exact position in relation to each other. In pregnant women; **young girls by lacing**, wherefore **cut their laces**. The guts were suspended in the region of the flanks in Cardinal Campeggio, **hard and yet pulsating**; hypogastric region [was] **clean empty**.

Sometimes the intestines are blown up from below and sometimes they are pickled and taken out.

A sign of evil portent is weakness of the guts.

The LIVER is situated chiefly on the right side, X entirely. Observe the umbilical vein, observe the connection with the spleen. WH I had a tumour there when I had a quartan ague. **Under the chondrium (costal cartilages)** for the sake of protection, **along the seventh rib** on the right side lies its upper part, whence comes difficulty in breathing in cases of tumour of the liver, **along the short ribs, upon the stomach which it covers**. It is always connected to the diaphragm by two very strong ligaments, to the umbilical branch of the vena cava and to the spine; sometimes it is connected to the ribs, to the peritoneum and to the colon. It is connected with the head by means of the nerves, with the heart by the vessels, with the stomach and the spleen by means of the splenic branch.

The SPLEEN on the other side of the stomach towards the short ribs. It can be felt with the hand **under the short ribs at the end of the ultimate or penultimate. So under and so behind** that it can scarcely be felt in a healthy man, particularly if the belly be dilated or fat; but nothing is more easily perceptible to the touch when it is swollen and descends. It is connected with the omentum and sometimes with the diaphragm, the peritoneum or the left kidney.’)

3. Summary and conclusion

In this paper we have tried to show the linguistic importance of William Harvey's *Prelectiones Anatomie Universalis*, the written notes for his Lumleian lectures on anatomy and the accompanying dissection. These notes are basically written in Latin, in a mixture of finite and non-finite as well as elliptical sentences and clauses, but often only consist of elliptical phrases or enumerations of single words. Their particular interest, however, lies in the fact that they contain a large number of code-switches into English. These switches equally have the form of full and elliptical sentences or clauses, but also of switched constituents and single

words. There are some slight tendencies to use switches for a number of pragmatic functions, especially illustrating or enumerating, but also providing vernacular translations and equivalents for medical terms. We cannot be absolutely certain in which language Harvey lectured or whether he adapted his choice of language to the composition of the audience, as Whitteridge (1964) thinks, i.e. according to whether the audience predominantly consisted of university-trained physicians or of surgeons with a more practical training. On the basis of our preliminary analysis of the patterns and functions of code-switching in the manuscript, we would, however, rather advance the idea that the switches found in Harvey's handwritten notes would, at least to a certain extent, have been reflected in his actual spoken presentation. This is even more likely since the notes were not written for an academic medical lecture, but for a practical course in anatomy accompanying an actual dissection, where constant explicit reference to the ongoing activity was normal. Further support for this assumption lies in the fact that code-switching is on the whole rather rare in the two other unpublished manuscripts mentioned above, which were not conceived as lecture notes.

As so frequent in code-switching, not every single switch can be explained as serving a specific function. However, the overall function of the English switches in the *Prelectiones* would in our view have been to make the dissection more vivid and more easily accessible for his frequently mixed audience. This does not mean that Harvey's notes fully represent his spoken words nor that he followed them literally in his presentation, but they must have served as the basis for his spoken commentaries, in other words, they were 'written to be spoken'. This corresponds to the everyday experiences of every lecturer, who uses his or her notes as the basis for a course, sometimes following the notes very closely, sometimes hardly at all. When writing such notes, however, one normally has the actual situation very much in mind, a fact which clearly influences the structure of the written text. A more systematic and detailed linguistic analysis may shed more light on this question, but for the moment this seems to be the most likely explanation for this mixed-language text written by a scholar whose published works are all in monolingual Latin.

Notes

- 1 For L.E. Voigts' widely accepted tripartite classification of medical texts into academic treatises, surgical texts and remedy books see Pahta and Taavitsainen (2004: 14–15), who, however, re-label the first group as 'specialised treatises'. The use of French in medical writing will not be discussed in this paper.
- 2 This section is much indebted to Gweneth Whitteridge's 'Introduction' in Keynes (1989).
- 3 For further information see the introduction in Whitteridge (1964, especially xxviff.), as well as Whitteridge (1989: 1f., 15–19), on which this section is largely based.
- 4 In Harvey's lifetime, we still find the distinction between the university-trained physicians like Harvey himself and the surgeons, practitioners who had learnt their skills 'on the job'; furthermore, there were a number of other, less qualified members of the medical profession in the widest sense of the word.

- 5 For editorial changes in the Latin text see Whitteridge (1964: xxii).
- 6 Bauhin's textbook would thus fall into the category 'surgical texts or treatises', see above note 1, most of which "were originally compiled by university masters and used as university textbooks" (Pahta and Taavitsainen 2004: 15).
- 7 There is a small number of Greek single-word switches, mainly technical terms, and a few words from Italian, which will not be discussed here.
- 8 Switches into English are in bold, uncertain items, such as the Latin technical term *cuticula*, in bold italics. Translations of examples are based on Whitteridge's edition (1964), though sometimes modified to follow the original more closely, with square brackets indicating items which are not found in the Latin original, but facilitate understanding. Numbers in round brackets refer to pages.
- 9 'WH' is used in the manuscript "either to stress a point with which [Harvey] agrees or to introduce an original remark or comment", while the triangle "usually stands for some equivalence of 'demonstratio' or 'it can be shown', or it may simply call attention to a specific point" (Whitteridge 1964: xxii).

References

- Hunt, Tony (2000) 'Code-switching in medical texts'. In: Trotter, David A. (ed.) *Multilingualism in Later Medieval Britain*. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 131–147.
- Keynes, Geoffrey (1989[1928]) *A Bibliography of the Writings of Dr William Harvey 1578–1657*. 3rd ed., revised by Gweneth Whitteridge and Christine English. Winchester: St Paul's Bibliographies.
- Pahta, Päivi (2003) 'On structures of code-switching in medical texts from medieval England'. *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 104, 197–210.
- Pahta, Päivi (2004) 'Code-switching in medieval medical writing'. In: Taavitsainen, Irma and Päivi Pahta (eds.) *Medical and Scientific Writing in Late Medieval English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 73–99.
- Pahta, Päivi (2007) '*Flowers, cum multis aliis quae nunc praescribere longum est*: on code-switching in Early Modern English medical texts'. In: Smit, Ute, Stefan Dollinger, Julia Hüttner, Ursula Lutzky and Gunther Kaltenböck (eds.) *Tracing English Through Time: Explorations in Language Variation*. Vienna: Braumüller, 253–266.
- Pahta, Päivi and Arja Nurmi (2006) 'Code-switching in the Helsinki Corpus: a thousand years of multilingual practices'. In: Ritt, Nikolaus, Herbert Schendl, Christiane Dalton-Puffer and Dieter Kastovsky (eds.) *Medieval English and its Heritage: Structure, Meaning and Mechanisms of Change*. Frankfurt/M.: Peter Lang, 203–220.
- Pahta, Päivi and Irma Taavitsainen (2004) 'Vernacularisation of scientific and medical writing in its sociohistorical context'. In: Taavitsainen, Irma and Päivi Pahta (eds.) *Medical and Scientific Writing in Late Medieval English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1–18.
- Schendl, Herbert (2000) 'Syntactic constraints on code-switching in medieval texts'. In: Taavitsainen, Irma, Terttu Nevalainen, Päivi Pahta, and Matti Rissanen (eds.) *Placing Middle English in Context*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 67–86.
- Schendl, Herbert (2002) 'Mixed-language texts as data and evidence in English historical linguistics'. In: Minkova, Donka and Robert Stockwell (eds.) *Studies in the History of the English Language. A Millennial Perspective*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 51–78.
- Schendl, Herbert and Laura Wright (eds.) (forthcoming) *Code-switching in the History of Earlier English*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Taavitsainen, Irma (2004) 'Transferring classical discourse conventions into the vernacular'. In: Taavitsainen, Irma and Päivi Pahta (eds.) *Medical and Scientific Writing in Late Medieval English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 37–72.

- Taavitsainen, Irma and Päivi Pahta (eds.) (2004) *Medical and Scientific Writing in Late Medieval English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Voigts, Linda E. (1989) 'The character of the *carecter*: ambiguous sigils in scientific and medical texts'. In: Minnis, Alastair J. (ed.) *Latin and Vernacular: Studies in Late-Medieval Texts and Manuscripts*. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 91–109.
- Voigts, Linda E. (1996) 'What's the word? Bilingualism in late-medieval England'. *Speculum* 71, 813–826.
- Whitteridge, Gweneth (ed.) (1964) *The Anatomical Lectures of William Harvey. Prelectiones Anatomie Universalis. De musculis*. Edinburgh and London: E. & S. Livingstone (for 'The Royal College of Physicians').
- Whitteridge, Gweneth (1989) 'Introduction'. In: Keynes, Geoffrey, *A Bibliography of the Writings of Dr William Harvey 1578–1657*. 3rd ed., revised by Gweneth Whitteridge and Christine English. Winchester: St Paul's Bibliographies, 1–20.
- Wright, Laura (1998) 'Mixed-language business writing: five hundred years of codeswitching'. In: Jahr, Ernst Håkon (ed.) *Language Change: Advances in Historical Sociolinguistics*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 99–118.

HERBERT SCHENDL is retired professor of English linguistics at the University of Vienna, Austria, where he still continues to teach. His major research interests lie in the field of English historical linguistics, where he has widely published, more recently especially on historical code-switching, language contact and EModE variation. He is co-editor of the *Austrian Studies in English* and the *Vienna English Working PaperS (VIEWS)*. Book publications include *Historical Linguistics* (Oxford University Press, 2001), *Rethinking Middle English* (with Nikolaus Ritt, Peter Lang 2005); he is currently editing a volume on *Code-switching in the History of Earlier English* (with Laura Wright, Mouton de Gruyter).

Address: Prof. Dr. Herbert Schendl, Institut für Anglistik und Amerikanistik, University of Vienna, Spitalgasse 2, Hof 8, A-1090 Wien, Austria. [e-mail: herbert.schendl@univie.ac.at]



JARMILA TÁRNYIKOVÁ

ENGLISH BORROWINGS IN CZECH: HEALTH TO OUR MOUTHS?

Abstract¹

This paper is based on the assumption that linguistic borrowings, accompanying the processes of globalisation and the socially stratified plurality of the world, are multifaceted in nature, and find their way of manifestation at various levels of language representation (phonic, graphic, grammatical, lexical, textual...). While English loanwords (anglicisms) have been studied from various interdisciplinary perspectives², grammatical patterns mirroring the donor language preferences, or borrowings of discourse markers and other signals of communicatively regulative strategies (including formulaic phrases), have still remained at the periphery of researchers' priorities. The aim of this paper is to advocate the contribution of these less-emergent types of borrowings to the overall processes of a contact-induced language choice and/or a contact-induced language change, in which the principle of multicausation (Thomason and Kaufman 1988) has a relevant say.

Key words

Loanword; anglicism; language contact; principle of multicausation; adoption; adaptation; infiltration; language ecology

1. Introduction

In my brief outline, I would like to pay attention to a select number of corpus-based manifestations of contact-induced communicative strategies applied in the processes of language *adoption* and language *adaptation* (domestication) – in which the donor language is English and the recipient language is Czech; i.e. two typologically different languages (the former being prevalingly analytical, the latter mostly synthetic).

Being rooted in functional linguistics of the Prague School, I would like to advocate the idea that in order to evaluate the particular results of the process of borrowing, such as traditional topic No 1, i.e. *loanwords*, one has to take into consideration other supportive manifestations of borrowings and think of their complex interplay in the process of language contacts, in which language choice is highly symbolic and reflects the dynamism of social mobility (Woolard 1989).

Particular types of borrowings will be looked upon here as *scalar entities* ranging from *explicit*, overt language devices, such as loanwords – to *implicit* manifestations, in which what is borrowed is the underlying communicative strategy of a donor language put into the jacket of a recipient language word stock. This is, for example, the case of the Czech literal equivalent of the English politeness formula *Thank you for your time* i.e. *Děkuji Vám za Váš čas*, which is gaining ground as a more explicit version of the rather implicit strategy used in Czech, i.e. *Děkuji Vám* [Thank you], with the implicit, i.e. contextually retrievable “object” of thanks. (For more examples see 2.2.4.)

In between these polarities, there are ‘slight’ structural borrowings (cf. 2.2.1), borrowings of communicatively regulative discourse markers (*sorry, okay, all right...*), borrowings of evaluative strategies (e.g. *good* as a mark of quality is giving way to *super*) spreading from advertisements to everyday talk (cf. also 2.2.2). Similarly, the ‘be in’ and ‘be out’ evaluative polarization is rapidly spreading from fashion magazines (e.g. *Víte, v jaké barvě plavek budete v roce 2009, in’?* [do-you-know-in-which-colour-of-swimsuit-you-will-be-in-2009 ‘in’], [DNES 4.7.2009: C6], or *Sako je INN* [Jacket-is-INN], [Story 13.7.2009: 42] – to life style in general (cf. *Co je in? Proč být in? Jak být in?* – or spoken discourse statements, e.g. *Dnes jsem out* [today-I-am-out], interpreted by some Czech users not only as ‘out of fashion’ but also ‘out of order’, corresponding to ‘*mimo*’ in Czech) – not to speak about the rapid spread of the interjections *wow* and *oops* in the colloquial speech of young language users.

What is also gaining ground is a welcome and creative playing with Czech words by coating them into the forms echoing English, as in *PlumLove*, which is a multi-genre music festival taking place in the locality called Plumlov since 2006.

Though the present study is synchronic, the diachronic dimension is implicitly projected into the shared experience of the Czechs, who have been exposed to various contact-induced waves of borrowings through centuries, in which the Czech language has adopted and gradually adapted a large number of loanwords from various languages – with many of them perceived nowadays as productive components of the ‘common core’ of language potential, ranging from *A* (*abstinent*) to *Z* (*zadaptovat*) [= to adapt [perfective]]. Their forms reveal either total identity with the source language spelling (*copyright, computer, e-mail, interview, public relations, snowboard*, to name but a few) or various degrees of adaptability to spelling or grammar, reflecting various stages of phonological and morphological nativization (*brifink, beachvolejbal, komiksy, kornflejky, bukovat, zabukovat*).³

Due to the constant flow of new information, the Czech word stock has swollen with new loanwords, and the numerical impact of anglicisms together with their social-determined status in the Czech community has contributed to the perception of the English influence as an enrichment in those domains where there is no functional equivalent in Czech (for example in professional communication, information technologies, etc.).

But not all the ‘English-based’ borrowings are perceived as enrichments by language users and the reasons are rather socio-linguistic – unnecessary (indispensable) loanwords put into a jacket of the Czech paradigm are mostly frowned upon, as in *Nejsme schopni to [umanidžovat]* (We are not able to manage it.) in a TV debate (Channel 2, 2.6.2009). Similarly, there appear various borrowing-based sequences, in which English loanwords are ‘embroidered’ into the grammatical canvas of Czech, as in the following example quoted by Behún (2006: 4) (for a brief discussion see also *miscellany* in 2.2.5.):

Edukujeme benefity baby-sittingu

(sentence pattern V-O-Attr. Postmodifier)

[Educate_[indicative, present tense, 1st person pl.] –benefits-baby-sitting_[genitive sg.]]

We educate people on the benefits of baby-sitting.

1.1. Narrowing the scope

As mentioned in the introductory section, the focus will be narrowed to less obvious and hence less discussed manifestations of contact-induced language borrowings, with English as the donor language and Czech as the recipient language. This restriction, however, does not totally exclude *loanwords* from our considerations. But if discussed, the goal is not to attempt to *count* individual loanwords (i.e. *anglicisms* in this case) but rather to *account* for the reasons behind their usage and contextualize lexical borrowings into a larger framework of other language-contact induced borrowings.

1.2. Theoretical framework

Let me first introduce the theoretical background: I base my study mainly on the following theoretical sources:

- a. Halliday’s (1978) conception of *man as social man* – and the consequent interpretation of language as social semiotic. With this view in mind, borrowings are supposed to represent a contact-induced set of social markers endowed with various social functions.
- b. Thomason and Kaufman’s (1988: 74ff) *principle of multicausation* based on the idea that the linguistic outcome is a result of a combination of internal linguistic and external sociolinguistic factors with the following 5 degrees (gradations) of contact:

- (1) casual contact resulting in lexical borrowings
 - (2) slightly more intense contact > slight structural borrowings
 - (3) more intense contact > borrowings of function words
 - (4) strong cultural pressure > moderate structural borrowings
 - (5) very strong cultural pressure > anything goes
- c. Verschueren's (1987) concept of pragmatic perspective (see 1.3 below) as a necessary part of a language-contact description.

Two phases seem to be relevant for the interpretation and evaluation of the results, i.e. the phase of a *contact-induced language choice* (in which the borrowings from the donor language have the status of possible alternative choices) – and the phase of a *contact-induced language change* (in which the infiltration into the recipient language results in various degrees of adaptability leading to a change). Both will be looked upon as mutually dependent scalar notions.

1.3. *Interdisciplinary approach*

I base my analysis on the assumption that language contact as a phenomenon is in the first place a socio-cultural matter (it is the socio-cultural and socio-linguistic factors, and not the factors of a purely linguistic nature that bring communities into contact).

Language contact, however, is also a **pragmatic** matter reflecting our experience with particular communicative strategies and language means used to meet the intended goals. With cross-language comparison in mind, our approach should also be sensitive to **cross-cultural** pragmatics (cf. Wierzbicka, 1991) and the **ethnography of communication** (cf. the need advocated by Leech (1983) to make a distinction between communicatively constitutive units of language that are rule governed – and communicatively regulative units of language that are principle controlled). The distinction proposed by Leech enables us to keep apart those lexical borrowings that represent naming units from those representing contact words, discourse markers, etc. (*sorry, okay, all right*).

1.4. *Dynamism of the processes*

The processes of contact-induced language choice and contact-induced language change are treated here as **dynamic processes**, in which the cultural pressure and the relative linguistic distance can speed up or retard the infiltration, respectively (cf. the common adoptions and adaptations resulting in such hybrids as *homelesák* (a homeless person), *rockotéka*, *šoumanka*, etc., but also *patchworkový balíček* [patchwork+adj.ending + parcel] – and the obvious difficulty with the infiltration of e.g. quotational compounds of the type *glove-brush* to Czech, as in:

- (1) úžasná *rukavice-kartáč* pro péči o srst Vašich miláčků
[fantastic-glove-brush-for-care-of -fur-of-your-pets]).

Such word-formative process, however, is not productive in Czech and only rare exceptions occur, cf.:

raketa země-vzduch
 [missile surface-air]
surface-to-air missile

On the other hand, the pressure of the language of advertising can be very strong, as can be exemplified by such colloquial infiltrations as ‘vantáč’ < *one touch* used to refer to one touch deodorants, or ‘pušapky’ < push-up bras (both found on the list of products offered at the street market in my home town).

This dynamism is also seen in the status of the results of language contact, be it a lexical item, a syntactic structure or an underlying communicative strategy. The attitudes towards English infiltration vary in time and one has to be very cautious in using firm labels, since any description is rather indicative of **tendencies in use**, and hence tentative.

1.5. Two varieties of English

The discussion of English infiltration, as presented in this paper, is sensitive to the existence of two varieties of English, i.e. **institutionalised** variety (ESL, English as a second language) and **performance** variety (EFL, English as a foreign language). So, from now on, if not specified otherwise, my discussion of English will focus on the performance variety, i.e. EFL used as a **link-language** (cf. also the growing interest in English as an International Language (EIL)).

The extent to which English loanwords (*anglicisms*) are positively evaluated depends very much on the kinds of dimensions that we tap. It is fair to say that the positive attitudes to such processes are not always as visible on the surface as the negative ones, and, consequently, reported less often.

1.6. Generally shared attitudes towards English

There is no doubt that while Russian meant a language that was rigorously hammered into our heads as the only “foreign language”, English, after the “velvet revolution” has become a symbol of social and political prestige.

With average language users, however, the hunger for English has been giving way to a period of sober evaluation, criticism and calls for serious reasoning, monitored and regulated by language planning agencies (cf. the Institute of the Czech Language). Some of the language users’ attitudes reveal the purist intentions of “word-watchers”, while some of them are aimed at the functional purity of the mother tongue in those cases in which English infiltration seems to be an unwanted redundancy.

The principle of utility, on the other hand, is a powerful pragmatic argument for the infiltration of those English loanwords that fill in the lexical gap (*hard-*

ware, software), contribute to the principle of economy, and – last but not least – function as social markers of self-identity.

The role of linguists in the processes of language adoption and adaptation seems to be one of language **therapists** contributing to language ecology in an environment in which the reasons for promoting English as a language of wider communication are both pragmatic and prestigious.

Generally shared attitudes to English: English is pleasing to the ear and has a long-lasting reputation as a world language and one of the three working languages of many of EU institutions and bodies, acquiring the status of **lingua franca for Europe**, which contributes to the constant growth of Euro-anglicisms of the *Eurobank* type. Reasons for learning are instrumental (attainment of personal goals), interactive (participating in world-wide events) personal satisfaction (songs, reading books, etc.).

2. Discussion of the data

2.1. Data gathering

Three samples of data from different periods have been compared for the purposes of the present discussion (with a total of 157 borrowings, of which 85 were lexical, 31 structural, 41 occurrences represented borrowings of communicative strategies). These were extracted from four sources, i.e. newspapers, TV news, TV round-table discussions, and radio news in different periods of time (i.e. the first sample, collected over a period of three months, January to March in 1993, the second over the same period in 1996 and the last in 2009, January to July).

The results have supported my assumption that besides comparing the results there is a need to study the underlying communicative strategies leading to the results (i.e. the linguistic outputs), since, surprisingly enough, the result may be a typical Czech wording used to manifest a non-typical Czech communicative strategy (cf. the example with *Děkuji vám za váš čas. Thank you for your time* introduced in section 1.1).

2.2. Types of borrowings

Since the procedures with the infiltration of loanwords are well described in literature, I would like to focus on the contact-induced communicative strategies first and sub-categorize them into the following sub-types.

2.2.1. *Slight structural borrowings: modifications in syntactic patterns*

(Occasional, frowned-upon, typical of written ads mirroring the underlying English text.)

These were represented in our samples by

- long pre-modifying chains in NPs in Czech (imitating the donor language NPs), as in the following example:

- (2) *pokrokový, nejedovatý, čočkový materiál* [advertising sun-glasses in newspapers]
[progressive-poisonless-lens material]

There arise some difficulties with the borrowed pre-modifying chains in Czech. Being a synthetic language, Czech requires a grammatical concord of the pre-modifying adjectives with the head Noun (in gender, number and case) so that the original English secondary adjectives (i.e. N + N sequences) have to be changed into adjectives, which, in some cases are restricted in use in Czech to occur in specific collocations. This is e.g. the case of the adjective *čočkový* (based on (lens) but also used for (lentil)), which mostly collocates with *soup*, i.e. *čočková polévka* (lentil[Adj fem. ending] soup[Noun fem.]) but sounds funny in collocation with *material*, as in Ex.(2) above.

- pre-modification of long compound adjectives (rare in Czech), see Ex.3.

- (3) *V tomto mladofrontovském výboru*
[in this Mladá Fronta collection] (Mladá fronta = a publishing house)

(A more appropriate – and hence expected – solution would be a well-balanced NP in which the long pre-modifying adjective would be postponed and realized as a word group, i.e. *v tomto výboru Mladé fronty...*[in this-collection-of-Mladá Fronta].)

- the use of stative BE-predications (typical of ‘nominal’ English) instead of more dynamic V [lex] predications typical of ‘verbal’ Czech as in

- (4) *Ten pohled je prostě dech beroucí.* [Radio Prague 2, 14.4.2009, discussion on Iran] [The-view-is-simply-breath-taking]

- quotational compounds (newspaper and TV ads) – rare, since hyphenation is not typical of compounding in Czech – and hence stylistically marked; cf. Ex. (1) above.

2.2.2. *Shift in evaluative strategies*

Contact-induced language change seems to be in progress in the frequent introduction into the language of ads of evaluative communicative strategies **exaggerating positive values**. This is typical of both spoken and written advertisements. While *good* once meant a mark of quality, now, the positive degree in the process of gradation is, as it were, devalued, giving way to comparatives (less frequent) but mostly superlatives. As a result, everything is the *best*, *super*, or *the only one* (exclusive uniqueness). Similarly, *blue* must be *bright blue*, etc. Once we begin the evaluative strategy with the superlative, the way how to gradate the quality is to switch to a different evaluative scale of gradation, such as the one occurring in ads nowadays, i.e. *super* gives way to *new*, to become later *super new*.

This phenomenon, however, is not typical of English borrowings only: in present-day Czech, many absolute adjectives become subjects to gradation, resulting in such superlatives as *nejšpičkovější* [the most top], *nejhlavnější* [the most main] – very often to impress the addressee by the degree of value, reliance, etc.; unfortunately, very often in those situations in which the vagueness of the argument is compensated for by the power of words.

Similarly, the ‘double gradation’ of the type *více propracovanější řešení* [more elaborate [+ more] solution] is far from being ‘healthy to our mouths’. For more details see Svozilová 2003. A fashionable contribution to evaluative strategies is the spreading of the adjective *cool*, as in:

Pak jsem změnil školu, objevil gel na vlasy a začal být cool. [TV Max 14/09:8]

[Then-I-changed-school-discovered-gel-for-hair-and-began-to-be-cool.]

2.2.3. *English gambits (discourse markers) in Czech discourse*

Typical of young language users who have less than a survival command of English but want to sound ‘westernized’ (trying to imitate the ‘life-in-the-big-city’ atmosphere) is a trendy and fashionable preference for such gambits as *OK*, *all right* but also *sorry*, or *sure*. Less frequently, the same strategy is followed by those adults who ‘watch their self-identification’ and social role/s. The resulting *product* is a ‘macaroni’ Czech, with English discourse markers. But, since language should not be a battlefield, a clear position of tolerance is necessary, together with the hope that this is a temporary, trendy and fashionable price we pay for the lack of language contacts with the West under the last regime. Some of the discourse gambits, such as *sorry* have been hybridized, cf. *sorry* > *soráč*, which, however is too colloquial to achieve a wide-spread use (cf. also *second-hand shop* referred to as *sekáč* in colloquial Czech).

2.2.4. *English interjections in Czech discourse*

Restricted in choice but gaining ground namely in the speech of the young generation are interjections *wow* (used to express context-retrievable kinds of surprise, concern, wonder, pleasure, but also compliment, namely if accompanied by a relevant gesture), and *oops* (used to express acknowledgement of a (minor) accident, a mistake or blunder (e.g. when dropping something, causing sb. or st. to fall, etc.)). Both are linked with overt language manifestations of politeness and are used for almost the same reasons as in the donor language communicative situations. Similarly to the perception of the above-mentioned loan discourse markers, these interjections are considered trendy and cool.

2.2.5. *Language reflection of adopted communicative strategies*

This process can be described as a shift from implicit to a more explicit way of manifesting communicative strategies (primarily linked with politeness) by means of language. Thus, e.g. while in Czech, the usage of *thank you* used to mean ‘thank you for X in a given situational context’, nowadays, under the influence of mass-media, the formulaic language (imitating English pre-fabricated utterances) is gaining ground in various TV round-tables, interviews, etc. The prototypical result of such a strategy is the Czech version of the English sayings ‘*Thank you for your time*’ – *Děkuji Vám za Váš čas.*, or ‘*It was nice talking to you*’. – *Rád jsem si s Vámi popovídal.* The latter, unlike the English *polite way of closing the discussion*, tends to be understood by Czech users in its ‘primary interpretative plan’, i.e. as an expression of delight over talking to someone. Similarly *Have a nice day!* can be heard in Czech as a literal wording *Mějte pěkný den!* instead of the traditional *Pěkný den (přeji)!*

2.2.6. *Lexical borrowings (loanwords)*

The lexical borrowings will be understood here as manifestations of **lexicon-in-action** as opposed to **lexicon-qua-word list**. Their usage can be looked upon as a result of **casual contacts** and mostly include scientific and technical loanwords from English, typical of similar borrowings in other languages – but also some trendy (fashionable) and snobbish borrowings, as some of the samples below might illustrate.

A number of reasons have been put forward at various times to explain the spread of borrowings (cf. changes in morals, standards of a community, shift in the focus of interest, intensity of contacts, etc.). Below is a tentative (sample based) enumeration of possible reasons for the existence and infiltration of English loanwords in the domestic word stock of Czech:

- to fill in the lexical gap (e.g. in the language of technology and research) –

cf. the stage of **casual contact** in Thomason and Kaufman's classification introduced here in section 1.2.); as in

- (5) *keše hardverových řadičů*
[caché[pl.]-of-hardware-controllers]
- language economy (i.e. slight structural borrowing)
- (6) *převádění naší armády na západní styl* > *westernizace naší armády*
[transformation-of our-army- towards- the western style] > [westernisation of our army]
- internalisation of communication, as in
- (7) *peníze jsou alokovány parlamentem*
[money is allocated by the Parliament]
- prestige (to impress; cf. Ben Rampton's (1995) identity projection)

This is the domain of countless jokes and parodies imitating various politicians and celebrities but also TV announcers wanting to impress. Sometimes the lack of knowledge of the original meaning can result in funny collocations. One of them can be exemplified by Ex (8):

- (8) *stručný brífink* [TV news], in which the Czech adjective *stručný* means *brief*, so that the result is in fact a pleonastic collocation '*brief briefing*', but since the original meaning of the loanword does not belong to generally shared linguistic awareness, one can hear TV announcers speak about a 'longer briefing' as well.

In the following Exs. 9-10, the foremost intention of the author was to impress the TV viewers (Ex.9) as well as other participants of the TV debate, obviously with no sense of empathy towards the addressee, or to impress the local journal readers (Ex.10):

- (9) *V úvodním spotu se detekují snahy odhalit terorismus* [TV debate, 1996]
[in-the-introductory-spot-attempts-are-detected-to-disclose-terrorism]
- (10) *Novinkou byla letos druhá stage postavená v kempu Žralok*. [Olomoucký večerník, 7.7.2009: 8]
[news-was-this year-second-stage-built-in-camp Shark]
(Within the text, another collocation with the *stage* appeared, i.e. *spodní stage* [lower stage]).

- **determinologisation** – cf. e.g. a wide-spread use of the verb “to map” at various fields of human activities, such as:

(11) *mapovat situaci, problém*, etc.
[to map the situation, problem...]

- generally accepted professionalisms (see also Ex 5 above)

(12) *currentové indexy, impaktované časopisy*
[current indexes/indices], [impact journals]

(13) *zabukovat si letenku*
[to book[perfective] + reflexive pronoun + a plane ticket]
to book a flight

- a welcome wordplay in political competitions

(14) *Paroubegg/ParoubEGG/ParoubEgg* (blending the name of the Party leader ‘Paroubek’ + ‘egg’ to allude the happenings during which eggs were thrown on Paroubek, as in

ParoubEgg in Prague. 27 May 2009 – The throwing of eggs during rallies of the Czech Social Democratic Party (CSSD) culminated in Prague

- an attention getting means in mass media

(15) *Flash Floods. O to tu jde*. [LN 29.6.2009, p.13]

In the body of the text, the term is explained and translated, cf. *Mnohdy se dostavují doslova jako ‘blesk z čistého nebe’*. Ostatně to velice dobře postihuje jejich anglický název flash floods = ‘bleskové povodně’.

(Some of the translations, however, have to be taken with reservation, namely if the ‘translator’ is rather more keen than qualified and translates the text in a brick-by-brick fashion, cf.

(16) *Open Air Happening*

Otevřeně vzdušná událost, která pobaví nejen nás, ale i Vás... (a poster inviting students to participate in a musical event, Olomouc, 29. 6. 2009).

- miscellany

Appended to this section is a ‘waste basket’ of those samples in which it was not easy to identify their main communicative role as well as their impact as social markers. The unifying feature of these borrowing is that they are unnecessary innovations, in which the novelty of the expression and their

attention-getting role might be the main reason for their introduction (though the social role of self-identity seems to be omnipresent, see e.g. Ex. 22); cf.

- (17) *rozdělili si prize money* [TV sport news, 2009]
 [they have divided[reflex] prize money]
 i.e. a preference was given to a loanword, though a neutral naming unit is in existence in Czech (i.e. prize money = peněžitá odměna). Similarly in 18–22 there exist more common and ‘neutral’ Czech expressions:
- (18) *nemají cash money* [TV sports news, 2009]
 [they-do-not-have-cash-money]
cash money = *hotovost* in Czech
- (19) *kup si 4 pack koly a vyhraješ* [TV Ad, 2008]
 [buy [reflex]- 4 pack-of-Cola-and-you-will-win]
 4 pack = 4 *balení* in Czech
- (20) *linka na bázi amerického systému pure-pak*
 [line-on-the-basis-of-the-American-system-pure-pack]
 pure pack = *čisté balení* [milk factory Olma ad, 2008]
- (21) *Do práce. 50 nových jobů!* [newspaper ad, 2007]
 [To-work. 50-new-jobs] = 50 nových *pracovních míst*
- (22) *Nejsme schopni to [umanidžovat].* [TV 2, 3.6.2009]
 [we-are-not-able-to-manage-it] = Nejsme schopni to *zvládnout.*/ Neumíme si s tím *poradit.*, *Nestačíme* na to, etc.
- the negative impact of de-semantized loanwords

Closing our tentative list is a brief note about the negative effect of mispronunciation (i.e. an inaccurate/incorrect pronunciation) and the consequent de-semantization of loanwords often accompanied by incorrect spelling. The result is a foreign effect of a de-semantized chain of loanwords whose meaning is partly retrievable from the situational context. They mostly occur in TV ads, where the advertised product with a written name on it (often based on a pun in English), is accompanied by the sound track in which a simplified, or wrong pronunciation disrupts the intended communicative effect. The following samples might illustrate the situation.

- (23) *BEDAZZLER* [*bedazle:r*] < *Be dazzler* (here the recipient language spelling and the adapted donor language pronunciation seem to result in a total loss of the original communicative intention); cf. also

(24) *Busy B* – pronounced as [bizi be:], so that the pun with *busy bee* is lost [TV Ad, 2007]; similarly

(25) *AB Doer* – pronounced as [abdo:r] [TV Ad, 2008].

3. Concluding Remarks

The process of linguistic ‘anglicisation’ is a multifaceted phenomenon, dynamic in nature and diversified in the impact on the recipient language, its users and the overall socio/cultural setting of a given language community.

As a result, reality of language is not homogeneity but continuous diversity. What we have in fact is a continuum of variation, starting from the individual and gradually extending throughout the entire population of those who speak the language.

While some of the contact-induced language choices and language changes involve first of all an inquiry at the micro-level of language processes (i.e. they are perceptible within the micro-communicative context), others are perceptible only when larger corpora are taken into consideration.

Consequently, inquiries at both the micro-level language processing and macro-level contexts seem to be necessary pre-requisites for relevant research in this area in the future.

Loanwords, though more emergent from the text than other results of the processes of borrowing, represent only one of the possible language manifestations of the processes of adoption and adaptation – and in order to grasp their status in a given language, the investigator should also take into consideration other supportive types of borrowings, such as structural borrowings, borrowings of function words, discourse markers, communicative strategies, and perhaps many more.

The linguistic treatment of contact-induced foreign elements in a given language community has to be also correlated with socio-pragmatic functions of the borrowings in individual text-types, discourse topics, thematic areas in which they are mainly used, etc.

As Woolard (1989) pointed out, language choice is highly symbolic and language shift is often motivated by the dynamics of social mobility.

The universalization of English, i.e. the cross-cultural and international uses of English, demand new concepts, new types of research, new methodology, and, perhaps new teaching strategies. In these fields of innovation, linguists should act as therapists, sensitive to both cultural and social values, since, as Anderson (1974: 172) put it, ‘linguistic borrowing is not radically different from other types of cultural borrowing inasmuch as some items...are accepted and others rejected’. But, as the antique wisdom prompts, *Panta rhei...*

Notes

- 1 This contribution echoes the topic of my section paper read at the Brno Conference in 1996 but never published so far. During the discussion section, it was Ludmila Urbanová who backed my arguments by readily supplying me with samples of authentic language data. This paper is a modest contribution by which to express my sincere thanks.
- 2 Cf. Manfred Görlach, ed. (2001) *A Dictionary of European Anglicisms*, Oxford: OUP (recording the usage of anglicisms in sixteen European languages, with entries presented according to the degree of acceptance, with a five point scale ranging from 0 to 5). This was followed in 2003 by Görlach's publication *English Words Abroad*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. In 2006 an international conference was held at the Universität Regensburg under the general theme 'Anglicisms in Europe'.
- 3 Here the Czech prefix *z(a)* + and one of the typical verbal suffixes, i.e. *-ovat* sandwich, as it were, the loan verb *to book*, Czechified in spelling *into "buk"*, cf. *za-buk-ovat* (in its perfective interpretation).

References

- Anderson, James M. (1974) *Structural Aspects of Language Change*. London: Longman.
- Behún, Dalibor (2006) 'Hříchy pro šileného korektora – Quo vadis, češtino?' <<http://interval.cz/clanky/hrichy-pro-sileneho-korektora-quo-vadis-cestino/>> [accessed on 18.6.2009]
- Blommaert, Jan and Jef Verschueren (1992) 'The role of language in European nationalist ideologies'. *Pragmatics* 2(3), 355–75.
- Čmejrková, Světlá, František Daneš and Jindra Světlá (1999) *Jak napsat odborný text*. Praha: Leda.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1978) *Language as Social Semiotic*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Hudson, R.A. (1981) *Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Leech, Geoffrey N. (1983) *Principles of Pragmatics*. London and New York: Longman.
- Meeuwis, Michael (1991) 'A pragmatic perspective on contact-induced language change: Dynamics in interlinguistics'. *Pragmatics* 1(4), 481–516.
- Rampton, Ben (1995) *Crossing: Language and Ethnicity among Adolescents*. (Real language series). London and New York: Longman.
- Salzmann, Zdenek (1991) 'The morphology of anglicisms in contemporary Czech'. In: Mácha, Karel and Drews, Dieter (eds.). *Aspekte kultureller Integration. Festschrift zu Ehren von Prof. Dr. Antonín Měšťan*. München.
- Sparling, Don (1991) *English or Czenglish?: jak se vyhnout čechismům v angličtině*. Praha: SPN.
- Svozilová, Nad'a (2003) *Jak dnes píšeme/mluvíme a jak hřešíme proti dobré češtině*. Praha: H&H Vyšehradská s.r.o.
- Thomason, Sarah Gray and Terrence Kaufman (1988) *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*. Berkeley, Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Verschueren, Jef (1987) *Pragmatics as a Theory of Linguistic Adaptation. A Handbook of Pragmatics*. IprA Working Document I.
- Wierzbicka, Anna (1991) *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics. The Semantics of Human Interaction*. Trends in Linguistics. Studies and Monographs 53. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Woolard, Kathryn A. (1989) *Double talk: Bilingualism and the politics of ethnicity in Catalonia*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

JARMILA TÁRNYIKOVÁ is Professor of English linguistics in the Department of English and American Studies, Faculty of Arts, Palacký University, Olomouc. Academic diploma with honours, majoring

in English and Czech. PhD in Applied Linguistics in 1972, nominated and appointed Professor in 1997. Her main research areas embrace present-day English syntax (*Sentence Complexes in Text. Processing strategies in English and in Czech*, 2007), text/discourse analysis (*From Text to Texture. An Introduction to processing strategies*, [2002], 2010), pragmatics (Chapter 6 in *Rudiments of English Linguistics*, 2000) and the language of fiction. Her present research focuses on corpus-based analysis of vague language (vague reference to notional categories, 2009, vague non-numerical quantifiers, 2010) and a cross-language analysis of loanwords. Member of SLE, a regular participant of SLE conferences. In 2010 nominated member of the Prague Linguistic Circle. Her monograph on *Sentence Complexes in Text* received Rector's Award for the best monographs of 2007. Associate editor of *Linguistica Pragensia*, co-editor, *Anglica III Linguistica* (2009).

Address: Prof. PhDr. Jarmila Tárnyiková, CSc., Department of English and American Studies, Faculty of Arts, Palacký University, Olomouc, Křížkovského 10, 771 80 Olomouc, Czech Republic. [email: tarnyi@ffnw.upol.cz]