Typology and Spectrum of Latin-Irish and Latin-English Code-Switches in Medieval Sermon Literature

Tom ter Horst*

Over the twenty-five years since the seminal publication of Siegfried Wenzel's *Macaronic Sermons* in 1994, the application of modern code-switching theory to historical homilies has become habitual. Although many authors now make use of Myers-Scotton's *Matrix Language Frame* concepts, the present study presents the advantages of Muysken's approach, which is instead based on notions of grammatical government. The threefold typological model developed by Muysken turns out to be beneficial for the determination of difficult syntactic structures. Such difficulties include diamorphs, words which may belong to more than one language, and directionality, which denotes the language underlying the code-switching components. Computerised analysis is shown to be aided by adopting this theoretical typology model by Muysken. A sample syntactic analysis is tailored to constructions concerning subjects and objects. Using the threefold categorisation contributes to the understanding of the differences in dependency and linearity between Latin-Irish and Latin-English code-switching. Additional elements of late-medieval multilingual sermons in these two areas are indicative of other linguistic strategies within the spectrum of bilingualism which can complement or compete with code-switching. Convergence and variance are consequently characterised in several collections of insular sermons to achieve an innovative insight into the alternatives available to deal with ambiguity.

Keywords: code-switching; English; Irish; sermons; typology

Introduction

Over the twenty-five years since the seminal publication of Siegfried Wenzel's *Macaronic Sermons* (1994),[1] the application of modern code-switching theory to historical homilies has become habitual. The most commonly used model for this is Myers-Scotton's *Matrix Language Frame*, which will determine rules to which the two (or more) languages in multilingual texts such as sermons adhere.[2] According to Myers-Scotton, the *matrix language* is the dominant entity which dictates the syntactic structure of texts, while the *embedded language*

---

* Correspondence details: Tom ter Horst, unaffiliated researcher; email: t.terhorst@uu.nl.

1 Wenzel, *Macaronic Sermons.* Translations of the English sermons are derived from this publication.

2 E.g. Myers-Scotton, *Contact Linguistics.*

depends on this matrix as its grammatical framework, having little or no internal complexity of its own. This model can be valuable in describing a linguistic relationship within many of the medieval multilingual homilies where Latin dominates the vernacular language. This situation may, to some extent, have been the case in large parts of medieval continental Europe. In the Atlantic Archipelago, denoting the British Isles and Ireland, the linguistic picture is somewhat more complex. By the turn of the fifteenth century, English and Irish were both vernaculars that had sufficient prestige to be used alongside or in place of Latin for spoken or written religious sermons.[3] The parallels between the two regions are pervasive, including the vernacular preaching by itinerant friars and the influence of religious movements in advocating or abolishing different lay religious practices such as Lollardy.[4] As a result, some late fourteenth- and early fifteenth-century insular manuscripts contain such a web of intertwined languages as to lead one to doubt one's ability – or willingness – to determine a linguistic matrix.

Another approach to this complex of languages is taken by Muysken (2000), who describes the uses of code-switching not from the perspective of embedding in a matrix but through the various ways that the links between two languages can be governed. The notion of government entails two potentially conflicting aspects of code-switching: the one is dependency, covering the syntactic hierarchy of the sentence; the other is linearity, covering the surface word order of the sentence. This descriptive strategy results in a threefold typology of code-switching which will be elaborated further below.[5] One of the advantages of this theoretical framework is that it allows for a careful consideration of situations where both languages are more difficult to distinguish. Two examples will be adduced, the first of which has to do with the linguistic determination of the difficult syntactic structures of both subjects and objects, where the requirements of the two languages can clash. The second example involves the diamorph, a category of words which may belong to more than one language. Describing these situations from the perspective of Muysken's typological framework sheds new light on the different strategies that were available to combine the two codes. It is therefore useful, and possible, to place code-switching within the broader spectrum of bilingualism. Two related phenomena of convergence and variance, the first an attempt to construct a unified code and the second an instance of two similar texts with a completely different display of code-switch constructions, will be compared to code-switching proper. By broadening this theoretical approach to encompass the range of bilingualism actually employed, we discern the linguistic choices from which producers or users of sermons made a personal choice.

---

3   The differences between sermons and homilies are discussed elsewhere in this collection. Conventionally, the former is thought to reflect more closely a simple, spoken performance, while the latter is more reminiscent of theological disputation on a complex topic. In written practice, however, these differences are highly debatable.

4   E.g. Fletcher, *Late Medieval Popular Preaching.*

5   Muysken, *Bilingual Speech.*

Typology: Text and Society

A consideration of the structural elements of homiletic texts from both islands enables us to identify commonalities within the underlying grammar of code-switching. This convergence is exemplified by the triggering function of diamorphs, words which could belong to either of two codes (or both). The threefold typological model of *grammatical government* developed by Muysken turns out to be beneficial for the determination of difficult syntactic structures. Such difficulties include diamorphs, words which may belong to more than one language, and directionality, which denotes the language underlying the code-switching components. Computerised analysis is shown to be aided by adopting this theoretical typology model by Muysken. A threefold categorisation contributes to understanding of the differences in dependency and linearity between Latin-Irish and Latin-English code-switching. This three-fold typology of code-switches according to Muysken can be demonstrated with reference to the corpus of Latin-English sermons described by Wenzel (1994) or more recently Horner (2006), mainly taken from two fifteenth-century manuscripts.[6] The most important of these two witnesses is Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 649 (a. 1421), which is closely related to the second manuscript in Oxford, Laud miscellaneous 706. Bodley 649 contains two series of homilies, of which only the second will be considered here, as it contains twenty-three homilies with a significant amount of code-switching. The breadth of bilingual utterances in these texts can be gleaned from the following three examples.

- Insertion: isolated items from the second language within the syntactic structure of the first language:

(1) Primo adorabis Deum tuum debite cum fide que est *nedful*

primo	adorabis	deum	tuum	debite
first.abSG	worship.2FUT	god.aSG	your.aSG	required.abSG

cum	fide	que	est	*nedful*
with	faith.abSG	REL.nSG	be.3SG	necessary

»First, you will adore your God with the required faith which is needful.« [O-17.6]

- Alternation: interchange between the first and second language, each with their own separate syntax:

(2) *Quen my strength was most*, paciebar graues penas

quen	my	strength	was	most	paciebar	graues
when	my	strength	be.PRT	most	suffer.PRT	fierce.aPL

penas
pain.aPL

»When my strength was most, I suffered deep wounds.« [O-1.373]

---

6   Horner, *Macaronic Sermon Collection*. Below, I am using the Leipzig Glossing Rules.

● Congruent lexicalisation: shared syntactic structure where both languages can fulfil lexical items:

(3) Primo dixi quod genus ade was punitus *with a bollinge dropsy*

primo	dixi	quod	genus	ade	was	punitus
first.abSG	say.1PF	that	race	Adam.gSG	be.PRT	punish.PPP

with	a	bollinge	dropsy
with	a	swelling	dropsy

»First, I said that the race of Adam was punished with a swelling dropsy.« [O-18.94]

In example (1), the English term *nedful* »necessary« is added at the end of an entirely Latin sentence, where it is fully syntactically dependent on a preceding Latin verbal construction, *que est* »which is«. This instance of insertion is the closest to a notion of embedding within a Matrix Language Frame. Not only the start of the sentence and most of its content are Latin, but also the syntactical structure. Example (2) shows a clear delineation between two clauses, the first in English and the second in Latin. The code-switch here occurs at the exact clausal boundary, making it an interclausal switch. In the terms of Myers-Scotton, the second clause would comprise a so-called embedded language island which is syntactically independent. However, this theory does not accord equal weight to both parts. Example (3) further evidences the added value of a more descriptive approach to code-switches with complicated constructions. If Latin were the matrix language here, it would have to provide the grammatical core of the verbal predicate. Instead, both languages contribute to this structure, *was* in English and *punitus* in Latin. This type of instance indicates an advanced convergence between the two codes. The threefold typological model developed by Muysken turns out to be beneficial for the determination of difficult syntactic structures. This sensitivity to varying relationships between the two languages, reflecting the reality of medieval multilingualism, enables a consideration of the complications that the combined use of two distinct languages may have posed to producers and users within a society.

Multilingual society constitutes another application of Muysken's threefold code-switching typology. Rather than identifying individual switches between or within sentences, this theory could be linked to the overarching linguistic pattern that pervades a text, or even a body of texts and/or manuscripts. In this light, a corpus of code-switches that are mostly insertional may indicate a cultural context for which the characterisation is a fundamental inequality in social status. For instance, a manuscript in one language with some degree of glossing in another could point to the societal context of insertion in terms of a strict segregation of status and function. This fact is true of many early manuscripts in which continental Latin was glossed in the vernacular. Another option for the linguistic coexistence within a society is alternational, in which both languages have equal status but are used for different registers. This situation may apply in some measure to late-medieval England, where both Latin and English were held in high regard, but the use of English for religious learning was subject to debate. By contrast, congruent lexicalisation in a societal context could constitute true equality between two languages, in which there is an actual overlap in functionality as regards both the status and register. In medieval Ireland, such an equal status can be claimed for Latin and Irish in religious texts or manuscripts too, which are contexts where either language could be used for a range of functionalities. Such a societal significance of code-switching typology can be an addition to a purely linguistic use.

Returning to the linguistic details of Muysken's threefold typology, the conceptual basis behind this theory is the notion of government, previously put forward by Clyne.[7] In essence, this notion relates to the way in which an abstract syntactic structure can be realised with the help of lexical elements. The translation from syntax to lexis informs such intricacies as case assignment, where lexical items express syntactic relationships, or pronouns that refer back to nouns with the same grammatical gender. The way in which these two linguistic layers correlate and connect could indicate what instances of code-switching would be more or less likely to occur. In other words, code-switching may be subject to an underlying syntax in which the two languages both have independent but interconnected roles. There are two subdivisions of government to aid in the identification of a likely code-switch context. The first, linearity, stipulates that switching is facilitated by a shared word order between two codes. For instance, Latin-Irish code-switching could benefit from the fact that Irish is a VSO language and Latin is intrinsically an SOV language, which would validate switches between subjects and objects. Of course, medieval Latin included various substrate structures such as SVO, which complicate the linguistic picture. Below, the notion of government among subjects and objects will be elaborated. The second subdivision is dependency, which holds that grammatical connections between elements obstruct code-switching. One example already mentioned is case assignment, such as the selection of a nominal case by verbs. Such language-specific complementation patterns would hinder switching.

Consider the instance *credo deo* »I believe in a god«, where the Latin verb originally selects a dative. The medieval appropriation *credo in deum* indeed corresponds more closely to the English versions, as a result of which switching would be accommodated. This situation touches upon the issue of the case assignments in code-switched subjects and objects, which will now be discussed in more detail. The issues involved with code-switching between subjects and objects can be better understood with reference to the relevant theories. According to the Matrix Language Frame, such switching violates basic syntactic principles, since these items are arguments of the verb phrase and should, as a result, always be determined by its language, which is the matrix language of the whole sentence structure. In light of governance, the twin criteria of linearity and dependency produce a more precise picture. Linearity suggests the likely sites for switching between Latin (classical SOV, medieval also SVO)[8] and English (SVO) or Irish (VSO) respectively, which consequently diverge between these two sets. Dependency dictates that the deterrent from switching to subjects or objects may be determined by the strength of their connection with the verb, whether it is a transitive, intransitive or copula verb.[9] In this context, a distinction can be made among the subjects and objects between complements and what might be called »direct« subjects and objects. While the latter are direct arguments of their verb in terms of transitivity, the former are rather nominal predicates with a weaker link to a verb phrase.

---

7   Clyne, *Transference and Triggering*; Clyne, *Dynamics of Language Contact.*

8   I am grateful to Dr Šime Demo for this observation.

9   Halmari and Regetz, Syntactic aspects of code-switching, 129-130.

This differentiation between different types of verbal arguments and complements is set out in detail by Halmari and Regetz (2011). Based on Bodley 649, the same manuscript with Latin-English texts studied by Wenzel and Horner, they design the twofold classification of potentially problematic and non-problematic code-switches; in other words, whether or not they violate the syntactic constraints. Subject and object complements are placed in the non-problematic category, while subject or object arguments are called potentially problematic, as they are assigned by the main verb of the sentence. It is interesting to note that the ratio between subjects and objects differs markedly in the two types. While non-problematic subjects outnumber objects 24 to 1, this ratio is only 5 to 3 with problematic subjects and objects. As the authors assert in this respect, »It is more probable that switching takes place in syntactically peripheral positions.« While this statement conforms to Myers-Scotton as well as Muysken's theories, it would be worthwhile to investigate whether such constraints on switching relegate code-switch loci to clausal boundaries or whether phrasal boundaries can also be permeated. Another relevant question in this regard is whether, in addition to the dependency, the directionality of the switching (from or to Latin) influences the likelihood of its occurring in the light of linearity. To this end, one of the sermons from the corpus is selected to serve for further detailed investigation, what Wenzel called Sermon O-07, subsequently titled *De celo querebant* »They asked about heaven«.

Subjects and Objects

In this sermon, the different treatment of complements and arguments becomes abundantly clear. The non-problematic category contains 24 subject complements, all of them switches from Latin to English. By contrast, there is no switching of object complements in the text, whether from English to Latin or vice versa; a representative example of a subject complement switch is seen in (4) below.

(4) *was ther neuer* mons tam altus, numquam fuit in tot isto tempore mas uel femina *so holi*

was	*ther*	*neuer*	mons	tam	altus,	numquam	fuit
be.PRT	there	never	mountain	as	high	never	be.PRT

in	tot	isto	tempore	mas	uel	femina	*so holi*
in	so much	that.abSG	time.abSG	male	or	female	so holy

»There was never a mountain so high, there was never in that whole time a man or woman so holy.«

This instance starts with an English verb phrase followed by a Latin subject argument and predicate. While this initial switch is therefore not considered here, it is interesting to note that the direction of switching can be reversed in arguments (as opposed to complements), allowing both languages to act as the matrix. In fact, the two clauses in (4) are mirror images, one a switch to Latin and one to English. The pertinent part comes at the end, where the subject *mas uel femina* is specified by a predicate *so holi*. Contrary to the first clause of the sentence, the second clause comprises a switch that comes at the syntactic periphery, therefore qualifying as non-problematic according to the categorisation used by Halmari and Regetz. Again, such switching exclusively involves an English subject complement.

When we turn to the potentially problematic switches, the number of objects indeed outnumbers the number of subjects encountered. The directionality of code-switching also undergoes a slow shift. Among subject argument switches, two thirds are from Latin to English and one third from English to Latin. An example that may be contrasted with the subject complement from (4) is the following:

(5) Set bene nouistis quod *be* vitis *neuer so likinge*, rami *neuer so fair ne so lusti*

Set	bene	nouistis	quod	be	vitis	neuer	so	likinge,
But	well	know.2PL	that	be	vine	never	so	pleasing,

rami	neuer	so	fair	ne	so	lusti
branch.nPL	never	so	fair	nor	so	lusty

»But you know well that, be the vine ever so pleasant, the branches ever so fair or so cheerful (...)«

While this sentence starts in Latin, it switches to English for the main verb *be*, only to have another two switches of the subject in Latin amidst an otherwise English sentence structure. The best way to analyse this construction is that it starts with a main sentence and a conjunction in Latin, after which the full subordinate clause is in English, with the exception of the two Latin subjects *vitis* and *rami*. As a result, there is a switch from the English verb *be* to its Latin subject *vitis*, which is problematic in the categorisation of the authors and the context of the matrix language. Despite the fact that the Matrix Language Frame would not allow for such an eventuality, it is attractive to consider the two Latin subjects as insertions within the otherwise English subclause, or as a congruent lexicalisation.

Where such switches from English to Latin were still a minority with the subject argument category, they actually make up the majority of the potentially problematic category of the object arguments. Compared with 13 code-switches from Latin to English, there are 21 switches from English to Latin. The two directionalities of code-switching can even be combined within the same sentence as below:

(6) Clama in aure eius *thi mysleuynge*, *tel him* omnia tua peccata, *and take thi penaunce*.

Clama	in	aure	eius	thi	mysleuynge,
Shout.IPV	in	ear.abSG	his	your	misliving

tel	him	omnia	tua	peccata,	and	take	thi	penaunce
tell	him	all.aPL	your	sin.aPL	and	take	your	penance

»Cry into his ear your misliving, tell him all your sins, and receive your penance for them.«

This complex sentence commences with a Latin verb phrase, switching to an English object phrase. Subsequently, the second clause mirrors the first with the English verb phrase and the object switch in Latin, after which the third clause reverts back to English after the trigger of the conjunction *and*. In this context, it is clear that both Latin and English can fulfil the function of the matrix language. To appoint one of the codes as the main language leads to a problematic analysis of these code-switches. Instead, it is more meaningful to think of this sentence as being constructed by both simultaneously. The third switch type put forward by Muysken, congruent lexicalisation, can explain this example with more clarity; the syntactic structure is shared, with both codes able to fill the lexical elements.

Directionality: Computers and Diamorphs

These differences in switching directionality between an unproblematic complement and potentially problematic argument are an interesting finding that ensues from Muysken's typological categories. The factor of directionality did not feature prominently in the article by Halmari and Regetz, which adheres to the matrix language methodology. This choice is far from incomprehensible considering the dominance of Latin in the Bodley 649 corpus, where it constitutes around 90% of the content.[10] It is therefore not illogical to assume that English text in the sermons is an insertion into the Latin framework. As the authors assert, »We have not analyzed switches back to Latin and reserve this for future research.« It will now be seen whether or not this reservation against Latin is justified. When we looked at the category of potentially problematic objects, it proved that the switches from English to Latin outnumbered switches from Latin to English (21:13). However, upon inspection of the former group, 19 switches turned out rather to switch from Latin to English and back into Latin. An instance of a Latin-English-Latin switch and back switch is displayed in example (7) below:

(7) Mouetur super duos polos, fidem et spem, *arayid* septem stellis septem sacramentorum.

Mouetur	super	duos	polos,	fidem	et	spem,
Move.3SG	across	2.aPL	pole.aPL	faith.aSG	and	hope.aSG

arayid	septem	stellis	septem	sacramentorum.
arrange.PPP	7	star.dPL	7	sacrament.gPL

»He moved between two poles, faith and hope, arranged to the seven stars of the seven sacraments.«

This sentence admits of two interpretations, both of which are inadmissible in the matrix language. The first is to see the entire example as congruent lexicalisation, in which both languages make a contribution to the verbal syntax of the sentence, even though the English element is but one lexical element within a sea of Latin text. In terms of economy, this solution may be a slight overstatement. The second option is to consider the construction as a Latin frame in which the English word has been inserted. A problem with this interpretation is the grammatical dependency on the English switch of the following Latin phrase, which runs counter to the syntactic monopoly of the matrix language. Still, it seems easier to admit that an English problematic component can exist in an otherwise Latin context. The detailed elaboration of the Matrix Language Frame does account for such a possibility. In brief, the switching of verbal elements governing arguments is sanctioned in the presence of any so-called language carriers. This notion refers to markers that reflect the syntactic imprint of the matrix language, such as case marking. In this case, it would have to be argued that *arayid* demands a case marking in keeping with the Latin case of the antecedent to which it refers, so in this instance *polos*. The impracticality of proving silent case marking to uphold an idealised theory of matrix language should be contrasted with the ease of assuming a more equilibrious system of items sharing syntax. To illustrate the benefits of these nuanced notions, directionality will now be linked to this typology.

---

10   Halmari and Regetz, Syntactic aspects of code-switching, 128, 147.

The problems with back switches become especially apparent when using a computerised approach to tagging code-switches. One reason is that the notion of grammatical government can conflict with the idea of directionality, in particular in light of the computer system. When we think of syntax and a government relationship, this hierarchy needs to be translated to unambiguous input for a computer. However, the two subprinciples of government both run into trouble in this automated approach. As for linearity, it is determined whether an item in one language is followed by an item in another. An advantage of this approach is that it requires little interpretation of potential syntactic problems. Conversely, this method will require a manual and subjective sifting of back switches also counted. In the case of dependency, an item in one language grammatically governs an item in another language. As a result, the analysis will only consider syntactically relevant code-switches without extra clutter. A disadvantage is that this system will fail to pick up on switches which are nested in substructures. For example, if a copula verb has two subsequent nominative predicates in two different languages, this hierarchical approach will not detect the switch since the elements belong to the same syntactic structure or level. Without further assistance, then, the notions of government and directionality can cause conflicts of priority in the computerised analysis of code-switches. As it turns out, though, the threefold typology proposed by Muysken also proves its value in the computerised approach to CS.

By dividing code-switches into the three aforementioned categories, their computerised analysis will be considerably clarified. In the case of insertion, a syntactic structure in one language contains isolated items from another code. This type is unproblematic in light of linearity, as the one-off insertion can be considered not to trigger a back switch. Similarly, because there is no government relationship to the syntactic core, dependency does not come into play. As regards alternation, the interchange between two languages means that each segment has its own syntax. For linearity, it is evident that back switches should be included, as they involve relevant new information rather than reverting to the matrix language. Conversely, dependency is unproblematic as in insertion, as there is again a lack of grammatical relationship between elements in either language. Considering congruent lexicalisation makes clear that the assumption of a shared syntactic structure takes away any problems with either linearity or dependency. If the languages both take a share in the syntax, two linear elements cannot violate word order constraints, nor can two grammatical constructions cause dependency problems. This shared syntax of congruent lexicalisation could be construed through either of two techniques. It can be thought of as containing syntactic elements of either language without causing a conflict, or it can be imagined as the underlying syntax of one code that might be realised by both languages. However it may be, it appears that the three switch types validate the notion of switch directionality.

The advantages of computerised analysis with the aid of this typology are best noted in an example, for which we turn to another code-switched corpus, the fifteenth-century Latin-Irish *Leabhar Breac* (c.1410). This homiletic manuscript, whose title translates as the »Speckled Book«, contains a few dozen texts of formal written sermons in a combination of languages that is as highly intricate as it is intriguing. One instance of a potentially problematic code-switch aided by the above analysis is the item below:

(8) Archangeli. *intochtmad grad etarcert.* summi nuntii
Archangeli.   int=ochtmad   grad   etarcert   summi   nuntii
Archangels   the=eighth   grade   interpret.PPP   highest .nPL   legates.nPL
»Archangels, the eighth grade, called highest legates.«

This example is problematic in every sense, as it displays a linear sequence of switches that are also grammatically interdependent. As a result, the Matrix Language Frame would struggle with this item, even if only to determine the main language. The three criteria with which to decide this matter are the language of the syntax core (*archangeli*, Latin), the first word of the sentence (*idem*), and/or the majority of the sentence (fifty-fifty Latin and Irish). By contrast, the threefold typology handles this instance intuitively. In light of linearity, Irish syntax requires a verb to start the sentence, in this case the hidden copula *is* »is«. Consequently, dependency determines that the Latin *archangeli* is actually a sanctioned subject complement switch from the Irish verb. In terms of computer coding, the main language of the sentence can be stated as Irish, with two separate nominative code-switches to Latin.

Code-Mixing: Irish Homilies
Now that the relevance of Muysken's threefold typology in determining the switch directionality of insular sermons and homilies has been established, it is worthwhile to look in greater detail at some of the Irish material, as it has not generally received the same level of attention as English corpora. In addition to the instance of insertion under (8), the *Leabhar Breac* manuscript offers examples for the other two types of code-switching as well (9-10), some of these instances being ambiguous (11):

(9) *Maith gaden* tribus dedit *garg angleo.*

Maith	gaden	tribus	dedit	garg	a^n=gleo
Good	voice	three.dPL	give.PF	strong	in=battle.dSG

»A good voice gave out to the three strong in battle.«

(10) *7 dorogart* nomen meum *fothri*. dicens. *lucian*. ter.

7	dorogart	nomen	meum	fo-thri.	dicens.	lucian.	ter.
and	call.3PF	name	my	under-3	say.PPA	Lucianus	3x

»And he called my name thrice, saying ›Lucianus‹ thrice.«

Whereas the instance under (8) used insertion to avoid the constraints for linearity and dependency, example (9) clearly constitutes an alternation, for which Irish and Latin have been strictly separated. Although the meaning of the whole is somewhat obscure, the switching is seen to take place at the syntactic boundaries of nominal, verbal and adjectival phrases without constraints being violated. By contrast, the congruent lexicalisation under (10) shows an integrally, intrinsically mixed structure. The sentence starts with an ambiguous conjunction 7 which can be either Latin *et* or Irish *ocus* »and«. This so-called diamorph, a word that can function in two codes, is followed by an Irish verb phrase, governing a Latin object, and an Irish adverbial phrase.[11] The second clause is a mirror opposite of the first, with a Latin verb, an Irish object and a Latin adverb: a syntactic structure is clearly shared.

Although the threefold typology is highly applicable to such Irish items, not all fit as un-equivocally:

(11) *Otconnairc vero* bonifatiussin. *rolinet londus 7 torsi*

O\<t>connairc	vero	bonifatius=sin.	ro=linet	londus	7	torsi
When\<it>see	though	Boniface=that	PF=fill	rage	and	sorrow

»When Bonifatius saw that, rage and sorrow filled him.«

This sentence starts with an Irish verb, seemingly followed by a Latin adverb, a Latin subject and an Irish object. That analysis would likely indicate congruent lexicalisation, as the verbal phrase with its arguments is filled by both languages. In light of the aforementioned diamorphs, however, an alternative analysis is possible. The adverb *vero* in medieval Latin is a mere marker of speech style, meaning little more than »then« or »now«. An Irishman reading out the word may well have rendered it as the Irish *immorro* with the same sense. A similar argument applies to the name *Bonifatius* with the Irish particle *sin* attached to it. The visual form of this word may have functioned as a sign which would be recognised by the reader but in reality represented in vernacular language as Irish *Bonifas.* In this light, the seemingly Latin segments could be insertions into an otherwise Irish matrix frame. Such a sensitive analysis also has consequences for the tagging of these segments by the computer. Because diamorphs such as *7* or ambiguous elements such as the adverbial *vero* and nomenclature might be read out rendered in both languages, it has been found most useful to code these items as a mixed language ga-la, in addition to Irish (ga) or Latin (la) elements. Instead of being switches themselves, such constructions can be considered to trigger or facilitate code-switches by being in-between items. This designation has the added benefit of clearing the clutter of data from decidedly dubious entries.

Diamorphs and other difficult elements notwithstanding, the Latin-Irish *Leabhar Breac* constitutes a clear example of what Muysken has called *code-mixing*: »a combination of two syntactic systems to construct a single, unified code.« This new or third code, which in computerised terms is referred to as ga-la, represents a language situation in which both codes can take on an overlapping or equal role within the society. Such a system corresponds to the societal component of the threefold type of code-switching advocated by Muysken, with both languages as equals in terms of status and register. This situation conveniently applies to medieval Ireland, where Latin acquired a strong presence via the church and christening from the early sixth century. The resulting linguistic integration occurred over a period of a millennium, informing such highly intricate witnesses as the *Leabhar Breac* from the fifteenth century. This fluent state of bilingualism can be considered to be behind the appearance of manuscripts with related homiletic content, in which the linguistic realisation of the texts differed from one witness to the next, however. Such a mode of code-switching may be called »free variation«. One of the most important parallel codices to the *Leabhar Breac* in this context is a manuscript held at the same library, the so-called Stowe Missal (Dublin, Royal Irish Academy, Ms 23 P 16 and D ii 3 respectively). By analysing highly similar passages between the two manuscript witnesses described above, it will be seen to what extent code-switching or code-mixing in Ireland was indeed flexible.

Code-Mixing and Convergence: Tract on the Mass

The twice-attested text in question is entitled the Tract of the Mass (LB p.251a, Stowe Missal f.63v) and has the following Latin incipit *De figuris et spiritualibus sensibus oblationis sacrificii ordinis*.[12] This Latin opening is immediately succeeded by the Irish equivalent, *Figuir tra in chollaighthi etc.* The neatness of these intersentential alternations nevertheless soon becomes much more variegated. A number of passages from the two codices will hereafter be juxtaposed for a further investigation:

> (12) LB 251a *In cailech aifrind inna heclaise rofurmed 7 rofothaiged for ingreim 7 martra na fátha 7 tuicse ndé archena. ... Usqui isincailech artus icontemprid isin istéchta.* 7 dicis. quesso te pater. *Banna lassin.* Deprecor te filíí. *banna lassin.* Obsecro te spiritus sancte. *intres banna lassin. Figuir inpopul doroiset ineolus...* Mitet pater. *banna annsin.* Indulget filius. *banna aile andsin.* Miseretur spiritus sanctus. *intres banna andsin.*

> SM 64b *In cailech isfigor innaeclaise foruirmed 7 rofothiged foringrimmim 7 formartri innafathe* 7 aliorum • Huisque prius in calicem *7 issed canar occo* • peto te pater deprecor te filii • obsecro te spiritus sanctae *.i. figor inphopuil toresset* in aeclesia • Oblae iarum super altare .i. i*nturtur. issed canar occo* .i. ihs. xps A 7 Ω hoc est principium 7 finis • ... • Remitet pater indulget filius. misseretur spiritus sanctus.

> »The Chalice is the figure of the Church which has been set and founded on the persecution and martyrdom of the prophets et aliorum. Water, first, in calicem, and this is chanted thereat; Peto te Pater, deprecor te fili, obsecro te, Spiritus Sancte, to wit, the figure of the people that has been poured in Ecclesia. The Host, then, super altare, i.e. the turtle-dove. This is chanted thereat, to wit, Iesus Christus, Alpha et Omega, hoc est principium et finis. Remittit Pater, indulget Filius, miseretur Spiritus Sanctus.«

While there is a clear connection between both examples from the two codices, it is interesting that they do not code-switch at exactly the same sites. Whereas the instruction to put water in the chalice is in Irish in *LB*, it is in Latin in *SM*. Conversely, the subsequent instruction for spoken consecration has the opposite linguistic division. Next, *LB* has the beautiful alternation between the spoken parts in Latin and the action instructions in Irish, which pattern is not attested in *SM*. By contrast, church and altar are only mentioned in Latin in *SM*, but are absent in *LB*. In other words, while the contents and structure of this text are strongly related in both witnesses, the manner in which the language of individual segments is selected can be left to the preferences of the individual preacher or scrivener. Another noteworthy aspect of this passage is the high frequency of diamorphs introducing a change of language. The use of emblematic elements such as *7* »and« or *.i.* »that is« can serve as a convenient bridge between two codes, triggering or facilitating the interchange. A more intricate diamorph from the aforementioned alternation between speech and instruction is *intres*, which can occur in both the languages and may be a convenient connection. Two other longer elements merit further inspection. The phrase *.i. ihs. xps A 7 Ω* »that is Jesus Christ,

---

12 Meeder, Early Irish Stowe Missal's. The translations provided principally refer to the text in the Stowe Missal rather than that in Leabhar Breac.

beginning and end« is wholly in a visual diamorph, which could have been realised in either language; finally, the formulaic phrase *7 dicis* »and you say« is similar to the aforementioned adverbial vero in that it can be a visual trigger to change languages.

The second passage for further analysis is equally peculiar in the patterns of its linguistic switching. Not only does it contain shorter and longer segments that have been rendered in different languages, but it also comprises interesting code-switches within the intraphrasal context, which show that these witnesses are not merely copied or translated from exemplars, but composed to the individual taste:

(13) LB 251a *icanair infersa .i.* immola deo sacrificium laudis. *Figuir gene críst 7 ainócbala triafertaib 7 mírbulib*. Noui testamenti initium *sin. Intan tra chanair.* Accepit ihesus panem stans in medio discipulorum suorum usque in fínem. *Dotoirnet fotri nasacairt do aitrige dona pectaib doronsat 7 idprait dodia. 7 canait insalmsa uli.* Miserere mei deus. *7 nitéit guth ison leo conatairmesther insacart. uair ised istéchta conaroscara amenma fridia conid inoin* uocabulo *icon. conid desin ise ainmm nahernaigthisea .i.* periculosa oratio.

SM 64b *itír soscél 7 aillóir corrici* oblata ... quando canitur oblata *isforaithmet gene crist insin 7 aindocbale tre airde 7 firto* • Quando canitur accipit ihs panem • *Tanaurnat insacart fathri duaithrigi dia pecthaib atnopuir* deo. *7 slechtith inpopul 7 nitaet* guth isson arnatarmasca insacardd arissed athechte arnarascra [f.65a] *amenme* contra deum *cene canas inliachtso isde is*periculosa oratio *á* nomen •

»Both Gospel and Alleluia as far as Oblata ... quando canitur oblata, that is a commemoration of Christ's birth and of His glory through signs and miracles. Quando canitur: Accepit Iesus panem, the priest bows himself down thrice to repent of his sins. He offers it (the chalice) to God, and chants Miserere mei Deus and the people kneel, and here no voice cometh lest it disturb the priest, for this is the right of it, that his mind separate not from God while he chants this lesson. Hence its nomen is periculosa oratio.«

A remarkable difference is that *LB* contains far more Latin than *SM*, which only includes short items. Another point to be made is that the Irish *icanair infersa* in *LB* is rendered as Latin *quando canitur* in *SM*. Also striking is that *LB* mentions the psalm *Miserere mei deus* where *SM* omits this element, although *SM* includes the short segments *deo* and *contra deum* which are not present in the passage in *LB*. These particular choices in linguistic contents are apparently acceptable for either individual. The three most remarkable elements of this passage are nonetheless present at the intraphrasal level. First, the phrase *Noui testamenti initium sin* »The beginning of the New Testament [is] that« can only be understood if adding the initial Irish copula *is* »is«. It can consequently be analysed as a congruent lexicalisation with an Irish verb and a Latin noun phrase, or as insertion of the latter into the former. Second, the phrase *inoin uocabulo icon* »in one word only« can also be interpreted in differing ways. If spaced as *in oin uocabulo icon*, it would comprise a Latin preposition, Irish numeral, Latin noun and Irish adverb; as *i-n oin uocabulo icon*, it is rather a Latin noun inserted into an Irish preposition phrase. Third, the phrase *ispericulosa oratio á nomen* »its name is ›dangerous prayer‹« has not just a Latin subject complement depending on an Irish copula, but within that Latin noun phrase the Irish possessive pronoun *a* »his«; this level of interchange can only be considered congruent lexicalisation. As a whole, the linguistic fluency and flexibility of both codices point to a parallel status in society.

The third passage contains the same combination of longer interchanges and intraphrasal intricacy. All of the above elements resurface, from inserted adverbs which can be rendered in both languages and alternated prepositional phrases whose language depends on the function or content of the item, to fully intertwined segments of congruent lexicalisation where it is difficult to separate these codes:

> (14) LB 251a *Natri ceimend chindes infer graid forachula 7 chinnes* iterum *foagnúis. isé sin trédi tresanathnúidigther induine* iterum *codia … Figuirsin ind athcumai cusin lagin iláim longíni isind achsaill tóibe deiss ísu… Uair issiar boi aiged críst inacroich .i. frisincatraig ierusalem 7 is sair roboi aiged* longíni. … *Figuir comthinoilsin múintire nime 7 talman in oen múintir .i. múinter nime* per mensam. *múinter thalman* per calicem.

> SM 65a *ised »III« tressanaithnuigther iterum 7 trisatoscigther dochorp crist … robui aiged crist* incruce .i. contra ciuitatem 7 *issair robui aigeth longini … A •Xlll• diobli minchasc 7 fele fresgabale prius cefodailter …* inpars *ochtarach forlaim clii •* ut dictum est inclinato capite tradidit spiritum.

> »This is the triad of things by which he is renovated iterum and by which he is moved to Christ's Body … for westwards was Christ's face on the Cross, to wit, contra ciuitatem, and eastwards was the face of Longinus… thirteen of the Host of Low Sunday and the Festival of the Ascension before … and the upper part is inclined on the left hand, as was said: Inclinato capite tradidit spiritum.«

The first thing to note is the fact that the adverb *iterum* is repeated in the renditions of both codices. In light of this fixed formulaic form of the item and its placement within the otherwise Irish clauses, it can be argued that this word functions as a discursive device that helps the speaker in structuring the text. As a result, the actual realisation of this visually Latin word could readily have been Irish. The second point is the interesting sequence at the end of the segment in *LB* in which it is explained that *múinter nime* »the city of heaven« is represented during Mass *per mensam* »by the paten« whereas *múinter thalman* »the city of earth« is represented *per calicem* »by the chalice«. This situation appears similar to example (12) above, in that alternation can be used to distinguish various levels of content. The third observation is the contrast between the Irish passage *críst inacroich .i. frisincatraig* in *LB* and the equivalent Latin reading *incruce .i. contra ciuitatem* in *SM*. As seen above, it was possible to vary flexibly and freely in the linguistic rendition of religious phrases within the two manuscripts as well as between them. This variability will feature even more prominently throughout the next section. The final phenomenon concerns the constructions *iláim longini* »in the hand of Longinus« and *aiged longini* »the spear of Longinus«, which contain a Latin name in the genitive dependent on the noun in Irish. Given that the genitive case is governed by the preceding noun, these examples must be taken as congruent lexicalisation. As a result, these two text versions contain the whole range of switches.

Free Variation: Sermon on Death

In the previous section, it was shown how the same text in two different manuscripts can vary in the type of code-switching utilised. Further evidence of this free variation in the linguistic rendition of a text is available by virtue of the Latin-Irish Sermon on Death. From the wealth of recensions which this text has produced, three versions from two manuscripts will be analysed in the following space. Apart from a version in the *Leabhar Breac*, two recensions derive from a related manuscript held in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Fonds Celtique Ms 1. This fifteenth-century codex shows this text not once but twice in its contents, on ff. 12r and 72v respectively. The two renditions were created by different copyists, possibly members of the same family, and display a striking variance:

> (15) LB 251b Domine quis habitabit in tabernaculo tuo. aut quis
> requies*cat* in monte sancto tuo. Roiarfaid <didiu> *dauid* mac i*e*se .i.
> in rig 7 in *fáith amrae.*

> BNF 12r b i. Aga*ldaim in*cvirp 7 *in*anma *sic*. Domine quis habitabit
> intabernaculo tuo aut quis requ<*i*>esc*et* inmonte sancto tuo .i.
> rofiar*acht daibith* mac i*a*se in in ri 7 inprimfaid.

> BNF 72va i. Aga*llamh don* cuirp 7 *an* anma so sios. DOMINE quis
> habitabit ín tabirnaculo tuo aut quis requiecit ín monte sancto tuo .i.
> rof.iar*fet dauid* mac i*e*se ín rí 7 ínprim*f.*áid.

> »Here is the dialogue of the body and the soul. Who is it, Lord, that will make his home
> in thy tabernacle, rest on thy mountain? So said David, son of Jesse, the king and the
> first prophet.«

Rather than focusing on code-switch typology, these three witnesses attest to differences in spellings and style of composition. Apart from the fact that *LB* omits the Irish title, the two versions from *BNF* contain starkly dissimilar spellings of this title, with the first ending in Latin *sic*, the second in Irish *so sios* »here, thus«. As a result, only one of the two renditions contains an intrasentential code-switch. Further variation in orthography is pervasive in these phrases, from the Irish spelling of the name of David in the final version, to the confusion over the spelling of the Latin *requiescat* in all witnesses, or the rendition of David's epithet as first prophet, which is widely different in all three text versions. In other words, linguistic choices can differ not only between but also within manuscript codices.

Similar situations can be identified slightly later on in the text versions within the three manuscripts. One instance contains a confusion over case and an inadequately resolved situation of abbreviation, while the other example involves a large degree of flexibility in rendering a fully Irish construction. In this case, one of the *BNF* readings corresponds less to the other than to the version present in *LB*:

> (16) LB 251b O anima dura 7 arida atque sicca sicut in terra sine aqua o
> miserabilis *o*de*n*trior cunctis mortalibus es. *A animm cruaid ol in*
> *corp. A dúrda* dub *dorcha* dochinelach

> BNF 12r Oanima dura 7 arida at que sicca sicut terra sine aqua
> om*eisi*rabilis *o*det*er*ior cunctis mortalibus es. *Aainim chrvaide*
> dvib dair docheinelach

> BNF 72v O anima dura 7 arida atque sicca sicut terra sin[e a]qua
> omiserabilis *a*deterior cunctis mortalibus es *.i. criaid dub*. dáer
> docéinelac

> »O stern and barren soul, and dry as the earth without water; o miserable and worse
> than all mortals you are; o cruel soul, the body said, worse than all men.«

There are two points of interest in this passage. First, the phrase *o deterior* »o, [you are]
worse« only appears correctly in the first *BNF* item, as the second version changes the case
to ablative *a* »from« and the *LB* reading contains an apparent misinterpretation of the orig-
inal suspension stroke over the letter *t*, yielding *dentrior* instead of *deterior*. These differ-
ences are evidence of variety in text transmissions. Second, the final sentence contains a
range of variation in all three renditions, varying from the use of the speech marker ol in
corp »said the body« in *LB* to the abbreviated version *.i.* »that is« in *BNF* #2 and its absence
of *c[h]ruaid[e]* as compared to *BNF* #1. In all these matters, it appears that *BNF* #1 shows
a better state of spelling in Latin words, while *BNF* #2 has a more modern use of the Irish
language.

Linguistic Flexibility: Sermon on the Pater Noster

Another sermonic text in an additional manuscript sheds further light on this phenomenon
of a free linguistic variation between the various textual recensions. This text, a Sermon on
the Lord's Prayer, is contained not only in *LB* and *BNF* but also in a manuscript at London,
British Library, Egerton 91, closely contemporaneous with *BNF* near the end of the fifteenth
century, and by the same copyist.[13] Three shorter samples from these three witnesses will
now be adduced for an elaborate comparison. Like the Sermon on Death, the approach to
linguistic variation is concerned with orthography rather than with typology, but these ex-
amples should nonetheless be illustrative of the flexibility involved. As the title of the text
suggests, all three instances involve citations from the Lord's Prayer in Latin:

> (17) LB 248a Panem nostr*um* cotidianum da nobis hodie. Tabair dún
> *in*díu ar sássad cechla(i)*thide*.

> BNF 88va Panem nostr*em* cot*o*dianum danobis hodíe. Tabair dun
> *di*diu arsasad cechlai*the*.

> BLE 20v Panem nost*er* cotidianum da nobis hodie. Tabair duinn
> *in*diu ar sassat. cec.lai*tide sunn.*

> »Give us this day our daily bread.«

While the Irish is here a direct translation of the Latin, both languages contain various pe-
culiarities. The Latin possessive pronoun *nostrum* »our« is rendered correctly in *LB*, while
BNF uses the spelling *nostrem* incorrectly to connect with *panem* »bread«, and *BLE* has the
incongruous nominative *noster.* While the second instance may be a matter of pronunciation,

---

13   For more information on the personnel, read Ter Horst, Making of bilingual homilies.

the last item is clearly ungrammatical. The Irish is no less interesting: whereas *LB* and *BLE* translate *hodie* as *indiu* »today«, *BNF* selects the discursive adverb *didiu* »then«. In addition, the ending of *cechlathide* or *cechlaitide* »daily« in *LB* and *BLE* is simplified to *cechlaithe* in *BNF*. The latter witness clearly has the least reliable Irish version. It would be worthwhile to verify whether this pattern of Latin and Irish occurs in the other samples.

> (18) LB 249a & dimite nobis debita nostra. Ocus *log* dún arfiach*u* amal *logmaitne* darfechemn*aib*.

> BNF 88v & dimite nobis debita nostra *sicut 7 nos dimitimus debitoribus nostris.* Ocus dilgid dvin arfiach*u* amal dilgimit diarfechemn*vib*.

> BLE 21r & dímite nobis debita nostra *sicut 7 nós dímitibus debitoribus nostris*. Ocus d*li*gid duinn arfiac.*a* amal dilgimit díarfechemn*aib*.

> »And forgive us our debts as we also forgive our debtors.«

The second instance contains another sentence from the Latin Lord's prayer with its Irish rendition. Only one remarkable element of the Latin emerges, save for the fact that the second half of the line is absent in *LB*; all recensions are identical in their degemination of Latin *dimitte* »dismiss, forgive«. However, *BLE* has the unusual spelling *dimitibus* for old Latin *dimittimus* »we dismiss, we forgive«. The explanation is either confusion with the nominal ending in *-ibus,* or a phonological interference from Irish, where intervocalic *-b-* and *-m-* would both be rendered as a nearly equal voiced fricative. When we turn to the Irish proper, it is immediately obvious that *LB* has lexically innovated the word *dílgaigid* to *logaid*, both of which denote »dismiss, forgive«; again, *LB* differs from the other codices. In the remainder of the Irish, though, *LB* and *BLE* again combine to conspire against the loner *BNF*. Where both read *d[i]arfechemnaib* »our debtors«, *BNF* has a final ending of the word in *-vib* instead. In other respects, *LB* and *BNF* seem to agree against *BLE*. Both codices read *arfiachu* »our sins« rather than *arfiacha*. The latter also differ in confusing the noun *dligid* »law« for *dilgid* »to dismiss, forgive«, even if a simple scribal error cannot be discounted here. Although the above picture paints a somewhat more disparate image of the use of Latin and Irish in these three codices, it is clear that there is a great deal of linguistic variation in an otherwise similar textual tradition. It appears that the individual scribe or copyist would have had relative flexibility in his rendition of the linguistic details of a sermon, without it taking away from the fixed content.[14]

---

14   Fletcher, Written versus spoken.

This last point becomes even more evident when the same quote as in (18) above is again repeated:

(19) LB 249b Sicut 7 nos dimitimus debitoribus nostr*is*. Amal *logmaitne* diar*fhe*chemn*aib*.

BNF 89r Sicut 7 nós dimitimus debitoribus nostr*is*. Amal *dilgimid* diarfeichemn*aib*.

BLE 21r Sicut 7 nós dimitimus debitoribus nostr*i*. Amal *dlegmait* diarfeichemn*aib*.

»As we also forgive our debtors.«

There is once more little remarkable about the Latin, but the final ending of the possessive pronoun *nostris* »our« is reduced to the incorrect and incongruous *nostri* in *BLE*. The presence of the second half of the citation in this instance would indicate that *LB* had been correct in omitting it in instance (18) above. The most interesting information is again derived from the Irish rendition and translation. In comparison to the first occurrence, *LB* once again has the lexical element *logaid* whereas the others use *dílgaigid* »forgive«. Within their similarity, however, the latter two witnesses again show a divide between a stem in *dilg-* in *BNF* and a stem in *dleg-* in *BLE*, in addition to a different ending. Conversely, while both these two codices have identical spellings for *diarfeichemnaib* »our debtors«, *LB* has a slightly different rendition. In terms of Irish, *LB* thus differs from the other two in the most significant matter, while of the other two texts, *BNF* tends to be more correct in spellings than *BLE*. It is clear from the above three examples that three versions of the same text can be highly different. *LB* is clearly the best version for Latin text and spelling, while *BLE* shows a great deal of confusion. By contrast, *BNF* usually has the most aberrant spelling in terms of Irish, although *LB* also contains a number of divergences. As a result, all three of these texts are at the same time identical in content and individual in linguistic rendition. There is therefore a tendency towards free linguistic variation.

Conclusion

When we look at the three Latin-Irish religious texts in these three Latin-Irish religious manuscripts, the level of linguistic flexibility in the rendition of ostensibly identical recensions becomes obvious. Especially apparent are the differences between the two closely related codices *BLE* and *BNF*. The manuscript from London, British Library, Egerton 91 [c. 1475] has a tendency towards modernising the Latin readings, or rather corrupting them. For example, *fiat voluntas* »may thy will be done« can become *fuit uoluntas* »thy will was done«, *panem nostrum cotidianum* »our bread« is changed into the incongruous *panem noster cotidhianum*, while *dimittimus* »we forgive« turns into nominal *dimitibus*. The two latter instances betray some influence from Irish morphophonology on the Latin spelling.[15] By contrast, the manuscript from Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Fonds Celtique et Basque 1 [c. 1473] has

---

15   Harvey, Retrieving the pronunciation (1990); Harvey, Retrieving the pronunciation (1991).

either modernised or mangled the Irish. For instance, it reads *indim* and *anim* for the more regular *i nnim* and *in nim* »in heaven, the heaven«, or conversely the altered equivalent *ainú* for the original *indiu* »today«. There are, furthermore, differences between the two recensions within *BNF*. Nor are these contrasts reserved to minor instances of orthography; the two witnesses also display a different approach towards the homiletic structure. While *BLE* often omits the bilingual initial title or incipit but contains a lot of code-switching in the body of the text, *BNF* regularly retains bilingual incipits but shows a preference for Irish over Latin in the textual exposition. Variation thus abounds.

In contrast to both these codices, as well as to the Stowe Missal and its recension of the Tract on the Mass, the *Leabhar Breac* manuscript [c. 1410] comprises the most comprehensive overview of each level of linguistic mixing: from morphophonology, intrasentential switching and textual structuring to the language preferences of different scribes in one manuscript or one scribe in several codices.[16] The breadth of the education among these Irish copyists allows for comparison with the situation in England, which is where the present paper started its investigation of medieval insular bilingualism. Rather than being restricted by the boundaries of both languages, both English and Irish scribes had the ability to use the two codes not in a mode of hierarchical rules but to create a flexible third code. The English scribes of Bodley 649 and Laud Misc. 706 overcame the constrains of verbal syntax to produce sentences in sermons that could be communicatively understood in the environment of the learned religious elite who were versed in either language. The subjects and objects of their sermons and sentences were readily intelligible for the readers and the hearers, whether in Latin or in English. Similarly, the various levels at which authors from Ireland could mix Latin and their native tongues indicate a high degree of education on the part of both the producer and the audience of these texts. The freedom and flexibility which with these religious writers could exploit the linguistic repertoire of Latin and Irish available to them attests to a thoroughly interwoven culture and code of language.

On a purely linguistic level, the present paper hopes to have shown the advantages of using a more universal approach to code-switching instances. The reality of medieval bilingualism is too intricate to be reduced to binary distinctions between dominant and subordinated language, syntax or phrase. While this system of a matrix language works well for many instances in which insertion is attested, the threefold typology by Muysken makes for a more nuanced or methodological language analysis. In addition to insertion, alternational code-switching can account for the coexistence of codes, while congruent lexicalisation indicates a complete mixing of languages to the point of sharing the syntax. The benefits of this system have been clearly shown in the investigation of the subjects and objects. Supposing a shared syntax allows for the analysis of the convergence between the two languages as it actually occurs rather than ruling against real evidence on the basis of contemporary convictions. In addition, the threefold typology incorporates flexible transitions between the different categories, including the diamorphs that trigger or facilitate the code-switching

---

16   Clark, University monks.

from one language to the other.[17] Finally, the application of the typology by Muysken to historical sources can explain not only all the attestations of combined code but also the use of language within medieval society in general terms. As a result, the intimate interweaving of Latin and the vernacular in medieval sermons and homilies from Ireland and England can be characterised as the convergence of language on the societal level.

17   Hewish, Homily and hagiography.

References

Clark, James G., University monks in late medieval England, in: George Ferzoco and Carolyn Muessig (eds.), *Medieval Monastic Education* (London, 2000) 66-68.

Clyne, Michael G., *Dynamics of Language Contact: English and Immigrant Languages* (Cambridge, 2003).

Clyne, Michael G., *Transference and Triggering: Observations on the Language Assimilation of Postwar German-Speaking Migrants in Australia* (The Hague, 1967).

Fletcher, Alan J., *Late Medieval Popular Preaching in Britain and Ireland: Texts, Studies, and Interpretations* (Turnhout, 2009).

Fletcher, Alan J., Written versus spoken macaronic discourse in late medieval England: The view from a pulpit, in: Ad Putter and Judith Jefferson (eds.), *Multilingualism in Medieval Britain (c. 1066-1520): Sources and Analysis* (Turnhout, 2013) 137-152.

Halmari, Helena and Timothy Regetz, Syntactic aspects of code-switching in Oxford, MS Bodley 649, in: Herbert Schendl and Laura Wright (eds.), *Code-Switching in Early English* (Berlin, 2011) 115-154.

Harvey, Anthony, Retrieving the pronunciation of early insular Celtic scribes, *Celtica* 21 (1990) 178-190.

Harvey, Anthony, Retrieving the pronunciation of early insular Celtic scribes, *Celtica* 22 (1991) 48-63.

Hewish, Juliet, Homily and hagiography in Old English and medieval Irish: Some manuscript contexts, in: Julianne Nyhan, Carrie Griffin and Kenneth Rooney (eds.), *Proceedings of Borderlines Interdisciplinary Postgraduate Conference 2003* (2006). Retrieved on 14 October 2020: http://publish.ucc.ie/borderlines/Hewish.

Horner, Patrick J., *A Macaronic Sermon Collection from Late Medieval England: Oxford, MS Bodley 649* (Toronto, 2006).

Meeder, Sven, The early Irish Stowe Missal's destination and function, *Early Medieval Europe* 13/2 (2005) 179-194.

Muysken, Pieter, *Bilingual Speech: A Typology of Code-Mixing* (Cambridge, 2000).

Myers-Scotton, Carol, *Contact Linguistics: Bilingual Encounters and Grammatical Outcomes* (Oxford, 2002).

Ter Horst, Tom, The making of bilingual homilies in mediaeval Ireland and England, in: Mícheál Ó Flaithearta and Lars Nooij (eds.), *Code-Switching in the Medieval Classroom* (Bremen, 2018) 47-70.

Ter Horst, Tom and Nike Stam, Visual diamorphs: The importance of language neutrality in medieval Irish code-switching, in: Pähvi Pahta, Janne Skaffari and Laura Wright (eds.), *Historical Code-Switching: The Next Step* (Berlin, 2017).

Wenzel, Siegfried, *Macaronic Sermons: Bilingualism and Preaching in Late-Medieval England* (Ann Arbor, 1994).