Das literarische Leben der Mehrsprachigkeit

Methodische
Erkundungen

Herausgegeben von
TILL DEMBECK
ANNE UHRMACHER

Inhalt

Irina A. Dumitrescu

Literary Multilingualism in Everyday Life

The Case of Early Modern *Vulgaria*

Literary multilingualism is a knotty thing. Viewed from one perspective it is a tool for sophisticated experimentation by elite, highly educated writers, while from another angle it seems an organic reflection of polyglot everyday life. How do we distinguish between multiple languages used in a literary work primarily to reflect the author's lived reality and a mannered, aesthetically motivated polyphony of tongues? Or should we differentiate between these two uses of multilingualism at all? These dichotomies, like most extreme positions, tend to fall apart upon closer inspection. Indeed, with few exceptions, it is difficult to point to a case of literary multilingualism and classify it squarely as artistic construction or commonplace experience. More interesting is the hazy middle ground, where concepts blend together and pat definitions exhaust themselves. In this essay I hope to show how a particular space – the school – becomes a site where the difference between "real life" and "artistic" multilingualism collapses, and how the experience of education both causes multilingual literary production over a longer span of time, and complicates how we might understand such work.

In order to consider the relationship between schooling and literary multilingualism, we must also think differently about what it means to acquire and be proficient in a language. Scholars of Second Language Acquisition (SLA) often distinguish between people who learn another language in the classroom, so-called L2 or Foreign Language learners, and "L2 users," people who use an acquired lan-

guage for everyday purposes.[1] Some scholars only consider people to be "bilingual" or "multilingual" when they use the learned language outside of the classroom.[2] I prefer a notion of multilingualism that includes at least certain classroom environments. After all, while we imagine that an adult taking a language course at university is simply engaging in an intellectual pursuit that may or may not develop into flexible, robust bilingualism, there are educational contexts in which the use of an acquired language is extensive and comprehensive. Immersion language schools, for example, are artificial environments in which students acquire a tongue different both from that spoken at home and that used by society at large. Many French immersion schools in North America fit this model: a schoolchild in Toronto might speak English on the street, Romanian at home, and French at school.[3] At the same time, such schools are not apart from everyday life; for the children attending them, they *are* everyday life.

The focus of this essay is Tudor England, but already in the middle ages there were institutions similar to modern immersion schools.[4] In the early medieval period, the typical way for a child to

---

[1] Aneta Pavlenko, *Emotions and Multilingualism*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2005, pp. 7 f.

[2] For a compact, but more nuanced perspective on ways of measuring bilingualism, see Manfred Pienemann / Jörg-U. Keßler, "Measuring bilingualism," in: Peter Auer / Li Wei (eds.), *Handbook of Multilingualism and Multilingual Communication*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter 2007, pp. 247–275.

[3] See for example Colin Baker, "Becoming bilingual through bilingual education," in: Auer / Wei (eds.), *Handbook of Multilingualism* (fn. 2), pp. 131–152, here pp. 134 f.

[4] England had in fact many kinds of multilingualism over the Middle Ages and Early Modern period, only one type of which was the result of immersive schooling. Conquest, migration, and trade also resulted in multilingualism that was often reflected in literature. For recent work see Elizabeth M. Tyler (eds.), *Conceptualizing Multilingualism in Medieval England, c. 800–c. 1250*, Turnhout: Brepols 2011; Jonathan Hsy, *Trading Tongues: Merchants, Multilingualism, and Medieval Literature*, Columbus: Ohio State University Press 2013; Mary Catherine Davidson,

---

have an immersive experience was to be an oblate in a monastery or to attend its school as an external student; for oblates, Latin would not only have been a school subject, but the language of their adopted home, of education and literacy, and of international ecclesiastical and intellectual networks.[5] In the late middle ages and early modern period, a child was more likely to attend a grammar school; these were first connected to cathedrals, and after the Reformation, were independent foundations by kings and nobles.[6] While grammar schools were not total institutions in the same way monasteries often were, they could still offer immersire environments: their task was to teach children to read, write, and *speak* Latin, and some required pupils to speak Latin at all times so as to be truly fluent in the language. Children brought up in such environments were bilingual in a way we would recognize, even though they were unlikely to hear Latin spoken in the family or in the marketplace.[7] In order to understand this type of multilingualism, it is necessary to take into account the way lived experience of education can still be chiefly artificial. There are multiple examples of immersive schools in the premodern period and in today's world, and they offer ways of thinking about multilingualism acquired in a formal educational context that go beyond the simple divide between Foreign Language Learners and L2 Users.

Medievalism, Multilingualism, and Chaucer: Palgrave Macmillan 2010; Jocelyn Wogan-Browne et al. (eds.), *Language and Culture in Medieval Britain: The French of England c. 1100–c. 1500*, Woodbridge, UK / Rochester, NY: York Medieval 2009; Judith Jefferson / Ad Putter (eds.), *Multilingualism in Medieval Britain (c. 1066–1520): Sources and Analysis*, Turnhout: Brepols 2013.

[5] For a brief but useful survey of early medieval schooling in England, see Nicholas Orme, *Medieval Schools: From Roman Britain to Renaissance England*, New Haven / London: Yale University Press 2006, pp. 15–50.

[6] Orme, *Medieval Schools* (fn. 5), pp. 189–335.

[7] Catherine Nicholson describes Thomas Elyot's fantasy of a situation in which an English child could be brought up to speak Latin from infancy, thus rendering it a native, or home language. Catherine Nicholson, *Uncommon Tongues: Eloquence and Eccentricity in the English Renaissance*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press 2014, pp. 22–26.

My second argument is that there is a relationship between the way a language is learned and the nature of the proficiency a person later has in it. Learning a language is not like purchasing an electric screwdriver or a vacuum cleaner, where the process of acquiring the tool does not affect the experience of using it in practice. Instead, I propose that our relationships to languages we learn after infancy bear traces of how we learned them, where we learned them, whom we learned from, and even why we chose or needed to learn them. These traces might be strictly linguistic: preferred vocabulary or expressions, memories of texts read or music heard early on, recollections of particularly egregious or embarrassing mistakes. They are also, perhaps more frequently, emotional: the terrifying teacher, the summer affair, the sense of opportunity in choosing to learn a language, or the complex feelings occasioned by being forced to learn one.

That the nature and circumstances of language learning have powerful, lasting, and emotionally charged psychic effects is demonstrated by the interest multilingual authors have in depicting second language acquisition. One might think of the English lessons in William Shakespeare's *Henry V*, the Arabic tutorials in Emine Özdamar's *Mutterzunge*, the process of learning Sango in Vassilis Alexakis's *Les mots étrangers*, and perhaps most memorably, Eugène Ionesco's parody of language manuals in *La cantatrice chauve*.[8] Education, as these works of fiction reveal, is not a process that concludes when formal schooling is done. It forms an individual's psyche and shapes his or her relationship to a second language. Consider that certain types of schools are spaces where the distinction between raw experience and trained artifice breaks down. Consider also that the foreign language training they provide shapes an individual's affective relationship to that language over the long term, and that

8   Eugène Ionesco, *La cantatrice chauve; La leçon,* Paris: Gallimard 1954; Emine Sevgi Özdamar, *Mutterzunge,* Berlin: Rotbuch Verlag 1996; Vassilis Alexakis, *Les mots étrangers,* Paris: Gallimard 2002; William Shakespeare, *Love's Labour's Lost,* Oxford: Oxford University Press 1990.

authors often depict this process in literature. What follows is that much literary multilingualism must be at once *erfahren*, experienced, and *erzeugt*, produced, bearing the traces of a formal program of training in the use of language, and imbued with the memories and emotions surrounding that formal training – or as Larry Rosenwald has so aptly termed it, *erinnert*, or remembered.[9]

*****

The ambiguity between multilingualism arising from lived experience and that produced by artifice manifests itself in a number of early modern texts. As noted earlier, grammar schools of the English renaissance aimed, above all, to teach their pupils Latin. Latin was essential to further study, and it was key to certain careers and social advancement.[10] Schoolboys might go on to become clergymen, lawyers, or tradesmen.[11] While Latin was no one's mother tongue, it could be heard in certain contexts, such as the university or the church;[12] while it was not an everyday language, knowing it had substantial influence on an individual's daily experience. It was taught using various methods: with straightforward grammars of the language, by quizzing on word forms, by reading and analyzing classical authors, and through a variety of translation and composition exercises. In the late middle ages, the name given to sentences in Latin that pupils either studied or composed themselves was a "latinitas", or, Englished, a "latin." Later, such exercises came to be called "vulgaria" or, in English, "vulgars." This could refer to a collection of

9   See Rosenwald's article in this volume.
10 On Latin learning as an entrance rite to elite, masculine society, see the classic article, Walter J. Ong, "Latin Language Study as a Renaissance Puberty Rite," in: *Studies in Philology* 56.2 (1959), pp. 103–124.
11 Orme, *Medieval Schools* (fn. 5), pp. 159.
12 Nicholas Udall, for example, was admitted to Corpus Christi College, Oxford, in 1520, at which time students were only permitted to speak Greek or Latin in the college. See William L. Edgerton, *Nicholas Udall,* New York: Twayne Publishers 1965, pp. 20 f.

Latin sentences studied with the help of English translations, or even to English sentences meant to be translated into Latin.[13] Multiple collections of *vulgaria* have survived to the present day, and they offer scholars an important window into elementary language pedagogy at the end of the middle ages and in the early renaissance.

The collections of Latin and English exercises often called *vulgaria* are remarkably progressive in their pedagogy: they aim at oral proficiency, offer students functional phrases for real-life situations, and provide multiple ways of expressing needs and desires or of describing a set scene. So realistic are they that the historian of education Nicholas Orme has repeatedly argued that school exercises found in grammatical miscellanies, printed or manuscript, offer a unique window into English social history.[14] Yet in other respects these books are vastly different from what one might expect in a contemporary language classroom. Their composers blithely incorporate themes that would get a teacher fired today, including sexual situations or allusions, vivid invective, and violent imagery. Moreover, while modern language books generally depict people getting along and solving problems – train tickets and dinners are successfully ordered, international friendships are made – many of the *vulgaria* collections tend to focus on conflict and dissent.

---

[13]   *English School Exercises, 1420–1530,* ed. by Nicholas Orme, Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies 2013, pp. 10 f.

[14]   Nicholas Orme, "A Grammatical Miscellany of 1427–1465 from Bristol and Wiltshire," in: *Traditio* 38 (1982), pp. 301–326, here p. 301. Paul Sullivan, on the other hand, stresses playful, performative aspects of the *vulgaria*; see Paul Sullivan, "Playing the Lord: Tudor Vulgaria and the Rehearsal of Ambition," in: *ELH* 75.1 (2008), pp. 179–196. For other recent treatments of *vulgaria* and other materials for instruction in Latin, and the effect on the students being educated with them, see Andrew Wallace, *Virgil's Schoolboys: The Poetics of Pedagogy in Renaissance England,* Oxford: Oxford University Press 2010; Lynn Enterline, *Shakespeare's Schoolroom: Rhetoric, Discipline, Emotion,* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press 2012; Alan Stewart, *Close Readers: Humanism and Sodomy in Early Modern England,* Princeton: Princeton University Press 1997.

John Anwykyll's *Vulgaria abs Terencio Traducta* offers a case in point. Halfway through this collection of sentences in Latin with English translation, we find phrases any early modern grammar teacher or schoolboy would have been delighted to have at his disposal. "Do not so that thou be betyne"[15], one might warn, or he might mopingly accuse: "Thow canste neuyre make amendys to me in wordys that thow haste hurte me in dede."[16] Should the situation require firmer language, "I shall ley my … fyste on thy cheke anon,"[17] or "hic pugnus continue tibi in mala herebit," will do the trick. On a better day, a friendship might be sealed with, "I am ashaymyd to prayse the to thy face; vereor coram in os te laudare."[18]

The strongly affective qualities of the *vulgaria* demand interpretation. Beatrice White, editor of two of these collections, drew on the easiest reading, one that frequently appears in cursory descriptions of *vulgaria*: the sentences were fun for boys, made boring Latin lessons more interesting, and besides that, they reflect the harsh discipline of the time.[19] Another way to understand them is as *representative* of the inner world and emotional reality of the boys. As Orme put it, "Because school exercises were aimed at schoolboys, or written by them, they empathized with, or reflected, what might be called the private lives of boys: their families, thoughts, fears, and preferences."[20] There is a very strong urge in the literature on *vulgaria* to see them as a window into the lived experiences of Tudor boys, and for a few reasons: first, historical evidence for the details of everyday

---

[15]   "Non committas hodie vt vapules." *English School Exercises* (fn. 13), p. 327. #328.

[16]   "Neque tu verbis vnquam solues quod michi in re male feceris." Ibid., p. 327. #330.

[17]   Ibid., p. 327. #332.

[18]   Ibid., p. 329. #352.

[19]   Beatrice White, "Introduction", in: *The Vulgaria of John Stanbridge and the Vulgaria of Robert Whittinton,* ed. Beatrice White, London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co. and Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press 1932, pp. xi–lxi, here pp. xii, xix.

[20]   *English School Exercises* (fn. 13), p. 32.

life in the past is notoriously harder to come by than documents describing major institutions, powerful people, and important events. When a line such as, "Duo rubea alleca sunt lautum iantaculum pauperibus clericis," that is, "two red herrings are a fine meal for poor clerks",[21] appears in a school notebook, we have the thrill of insight into the humble daily ration of a scholar, albeit rendered in Latin. And yet this impression can be a mirage. For those lines of threat or friendship I quoted earlier, those with which a boy might learn to utter in English and Latin are not taken from classroom experience, but from a scene in Terence's *Adelphoe*.

Terence is, in fact, essential to the study of Tudor education. He was a standard part of early modern curricula,[22] and he is particularly important to the study of exercises for speaking Latin. Anwykyll's collection, published in 1483, is the first work to call these phrases

---

21 Ibid., p. 81.

22 For Terence in Renaissance education, see Jean R. Brink, "Literacy and Education," in: Michael Hattaway (ed.), *A New Companion to English Renaissance Literature and Culture*, Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell 2010, pp. 27–37, here p. 34, Martine van Elk, "'Thou shalt present me as an eunuch to him': Terence in Early Modern England," in: Antony Augoustakis / Ariana Traill (eds.), *A Companion to Terence*, Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell 2013, pp. 410–428, here pp. 413–417; Ursula Potter, "'No Terence phrase: his tyme and myne are twaine': Erasmus, Terence, and Censorship in the Tudor Classroom," in: Juanita Feros Ruys / John O. Ward / Melanie Heyworth (eds.), *The Classics in the Medieval and Renaissance Classroom: The Role of Ancient Texts in the Arts Curriculum as Revealed by Surviving Manuscripts and Early Printed Books*, Turnhout: Brepols 2013, pp. 365–389. Still cited are the classic works by Baldwin: Thomas Whitfield Baldwin, *Shakespere's Five-Act Structure: Shakespere's Early Plays on the Background of Renaissance Theories of Five-Act Structure from 1470*, Urbana: University of Illinois Press 1947; *William Shakspere's Small Latine & Lesse Greeke*, Urbana: University of Illinois Press 1944. For the influence of Terence on Shakespeare, see also Robert S. Miola, *Shakespeare and Classical Comedy: The Influence of Plautus and Terence*, Oxford: Clarendon Press 1994.

"vulgaria," the first such collection to be printed, and, according to Orme, the first to base its sentences on Roman pagan literature.[23] In 1534, Nicholas Udall published *Floures for Latine Spekynge*, a play-by-play selection of lines either useful for conversation or challenging to translate, along with colloquial English renderings.[24] Lines from Terence and references to his works or characters appear in a number of other print and manuscript schoolbooks. The plays of Terence were not only read, studied, and performed on their own, but they also served as a major source for educational florilegia.

Collections of school exercises are motley assemblages. They include proverbs, snatches of verse, riddles, and even humorous mistranslations of English into Latin designed to test students' knowledge of grammar. While we expect proverbs or passages of poetry to be culled from the classics, simple conversational phrases are often also borrowings from ancient literature. (Terence is not the only author studied in grammar schools, of course, but he seems particularly important for early training in Latin.) These phrases were not only exercises for Latin practice, however. Because pupils were expected to speak in Latin at school, the phrases also taught them how to express a variety of emotions, desires, commands, and observations in their second tongue. In other words, the lived experience of early modern schoolboys – its daily greetings, basic observations, and its statements of love, fear, and anger – was expressed in a type of multilingualism deeply influenced by classical texts.

Anwykyll and Udall followed a roughly similar procedure in putting together their handbooks. They each went through several Terentian plays, picking out useful or adaptable phrases, and followed them with English translations. There are differences between the two books, however. Anwykyll's collection of phrases is shorter

---

23 *English School Exercises* (fn. 13), *p.* 292. On Anwykyll, see Alexander H. Brodie, "Anwykyll's *Vulgaria*: A Pre-Erasmian Textbook," in: *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 75 (1974), pp. 416–427.

24 On Udall's use of Terence see Baldwin, *Shakespere's Five-Act Structure* (fn. 22), pp. 375–401. For a biography of Udall, along with discussion of his works, see Edgerton, *Nicholas Udall* (fn. 12).

(about sixty-four pages), he mixes in sentences that are not from Terence, and while he presents the lines roughly in the order that they appear in the original, he does not indicate which Terentian play they are from, or where one play begins and another ends. He also revises many of the sentences to be more immediately useable. A bit of dialogue that might be in a subordinate clause in the original play is rephrased into a snappy main clause. A sentence referring to a specific character is made vague. Udall's collection is much longer at 384 pages, is organized by play, act, and scene, and is so comprehensive that it could almost serve as a gloss on the three plays he mines for material. While Anwykyll chooses phrases that are relatively easy to pull out of context and apply to a generic conversation, Udall picks a greater variety of sentences. He translates them simply when possible, sometimes offering several idiomatic translations in English, and when necessary, adding longer explanations of the idiom, grammatical form, and historical context.

These are deeply multilingual texts, and as scholars of renaissance education are beginning to realise, they had multiple pedagogic functions. While it is tempting to think of them simply as handbooks for understanding Latin, or, more specifically, the Latin of Terence, they must have performed different kinds of work depending on how they were used in the classroom. Anwykyll's book, for example, with its seemingly freeform collection of generic sentences, might have been memorized in whole or part; it might also have served as a palette of phrases that could be recombined, arranged into a dialogue or a speech, perhaps filled in with original Latin. His book does not contain dialogues *per se* – he takes the drama out of Terence's plays – but it is easy to craft an exchange from them, especially since they are often dramatic and emotionally charged. Here is a sample I have composed, which might work as a miniature classroom drama between a wayward pupil and a stern teacher:

– Data michi verba sunt. Quid nunc potissimum faciendum est?
– Istuccine interminata sum tibi hinc abiens?
– Dispudet sic michi data verba esse. Vnam hanc noxiam mitte; si aliam ad-misero vnquam occidito.

– Non te dignum fecisti. Si quicquam hodie turbe hic ceperis, faciam vt huius loci, dieique, meique semper memineris.
– Lingua heret metu. Sine me expurgere huius criminis. Quoduis donum a me et premium optato; id optatum feres.
– Pro peccato magno paululum supplicij satis est patri.
– Vtinam esset michi pars equa amoris tecum.
– Vtinam hoc doleret tibi itidem vt michi dolet.

– I am disceyued. Whatt is best to be doon now?[25]
– Dyd not j warne / or threte the this when I went a-way?[26]
– I am ashamed that j am disceyued thus. Forgif me this oon faute; jf euyr j offende more, slee me.[27]
– Thow haste nott doon as thou owttist to doo. If thou begyn here ony trobyll to-day, j shall make the to remembyr the place, tyme, and me eueraftyr.[28]
– I can nott speke for feere. Late me clere my-selfe of this faute. Desyre of me what-so-euyr thou wyltt; thou shalt haue thy desyre.[29]
– A lytell punyshment for a grete defaute is j-now to a fadyr.[30]
– Wold godd thou louydist me as do j the.[31]
– Wold godd this greuyd the as it doth me.[32]

The generic form of any collection of *vulgaria*, and definitely of Anwykyll's book, offered students a range of expressions, sentiments, and ideas that they could use as the building blocks of their own playful, or even literary, creations. Since most such school notebooks included an English translation of the Latin, we should think of this pedagogy as training for both daily self-expression *and* literary invention in both languages. The result is a mise-en-abîme of daily life

---

[25] *English School Exercises* (fn. 13), pp. 312 f. #172, 171.
[26] Ibid., p. 314. #186.
[27] Ibid., p. 314. #187, 190.
[28] Ibid., pp. 313 f. #191, 181.
[29] Ibid., pp. 315, 307, 316. #199, 103, 208.
[30] Ibid., pp. 307. #104.
[31] Ibid., p. 308. #115.
[32] Ibid., p. 308. #116.

and literary artifice: Terence's comedies were prized by humanists for the excellence of their Latinity[33] – Cicero had, after all, referred to the "elegance of his style"[34] – but they were also conversational, casual, concerned with the adventures of entertaining but generally humble people. Schoolbooks made of Terentian sentences taught early modern pupils a language that was the apogee of both literacy and artifice. Yet they did so in a way that made the Latin feel familiar, homey, more like a phrase book than like a classical text to be revered and closely studied.

Terentian pedagogy would have offered another layer of interest too. At some point, renaissance pupils were likely to read Terence's plays *in toto*, at which point they would learn where the phrases Anwykyll had excerpted came from. Terence's depictions of "boys gone wild," spending their fathers' money on feasts and prostitutes, and generally misbehaving and ignoring paternal authority, were not exactly the kinds of models boys were expected to follow. Most of the phrases in the first sample colloquy above are from *Eunuchus*, the most problematic of Terence's plays due to its subject matter, and one on which Anwykyll draws extensively. Students learning this set of *vulgaria* might not have known that there were characters who originally spoke these lines, but if they stayed in school, they almost certainly would have found out. In other words, Terence could be excerpted and used purely for language pedagogy, at least for a while. At one point, perhaps as older youth, perhaps as adults, students were likely to learn that the vocabulary they had memorized had a context, and that context was a prostitute berating her servant

---

[33] For praise of Terence's style in antiquity, see Roman Müller, "Terence in Latin Literature from the Second Century BCE to the Second Century CE," in: Augoustakis / Traill (eds.), *A Companion to Terence* (fn. 22), pp. 363–379, here pp. 366–374. Erasmus particularly cherished Terence's Latinity, on which see Potter, "'No Terence phrase [...]'" (fn. 22). See also Baldwin, *Shakespere's Five-Act Structure* (fn. 22), pp. 338–339.

[34] *Letter to Atticus*, 7.3.10. Quoted from Müller, "Terence in Latin Literature" (fn. 33), p. 370.

---

for allowing their slave girl to be raped by a pretend-eunuch. We can only deduce what this might have felt like – it might have been quite pleasurable, like recognizing the melody of a well-known aria when seeing the full opera for the first time. But there would have been an interesting multilingual effect as well: the phrases that students had absorbed as general expressions, and perhaps already used to describe their own feelings and experiences, would suddenly regain their literary context and begin to feel crafted.

Nicholas Udall's book, which so closely and so explicitly follows Terence's plays, would probably have bypassed some of these interesting effects. It did, however, aim at others. Udall explicitly states that one of the goals of his book is not just to help students understand Terence's Latin, but also to guide them in translating it into their mother tongue with greater skill. John Barsby claims that Udall's concept of translation as a value in its own right, "helps to explain why Udall provides not merely a literal translation of Terence's phrases but alternative English versions, which apart from suggesting the range of meanings of the Latin also encourage students to be discriminating in their choice of English."[35] Here are some examples:

> Expecto quid velis. I wold fain know what your wyl, or pleasure is, Or I longe, or desyre to know your mynde, wyl, or pleasure.[36]
> Mulier ætate integra. A woman beinge in hir beste yeres, Or, a woman beinge in the flower of her tyme, or a woman nothinge broken with age.[37]

---

[35] John Barsby, "Terence in Translation", in: Augoustakis / Traill (eds.), *A Companion to Terence* (fn. 22), pp. 446–465, here pp. 447 f.

[36] Nicholas Udall, *Floures for Latine spekynge selected and gathered out of Terence, and the same translated in to Englysshe, together with the exposition and settynge forth as well of suche latyne wordes, as were thought nedefull to be annoted, as also of dyuers grammaticall rules, very profytable [and] necessary for the expedite knowledge in the latyne tongue*, London: In aedibus Tho. Bertheleti 1534, p. 1.

[37] Ibid., p. 2.

Manibus pedibusque obnixe omnia facit. He doeth all thinges with hande and foote, or with tothe and nayle, as moche as in hym lyeth, Or, he doeth all that ever he maye ryght busyly.[38]
Bona verba quęso. Speke fayre I pray you, or proverbially, You wol not do as you say. For those wordes be alwayes of the wryters used and spoken ironice, that is to saye in mockage or derision: As if one shuld say, I woll cause the braynes to flee out of thy heed, & the other shuld in mockage, scorne, and derisyon answere, and saye thus: You woll not I trowe: Or thus, you woll not do as you saye I trowe, he mought saye it elegantlye and properly in latyne, Bona verba quæso, Yet gyve us fayre language I beseche you hartely.[39]

Students who worked closely with Udall's book would have learned to think about the subtle nuances of their mother tongue through the filter of Terence, as annotated by Udall. They would have considered multiple possibilities of translation, equivalent idioms in English, nuances of tone in the Latin and how they might be conveyed in the vernacular. Whereas Anwykyll's book helped students absorb classical Latin as colloquial idiom, Udall's volume urged them to pay close attention even to simple phrases, in both mother tongue and acquired foreign language. Anwykyll's book transformed the literary into the everyday, while Udall taught students how to craft the everyday in a consciously literary way.

Engagement with Latin texts, ranging from the very basic activity of learning to read and speak Latin, to the more sophisticated analysis of classical works, was essential training in literary practice from the middle ages to the renaissance. Scholars of the early modern period are increasingly attentive to the ways early education influenced sophisticated literature in the vernacular. Indeed, some texts have long been considered products of the schoolroom. Shakespeare's *Love's Labours Lost* is such a work: not only is it full of jokes that rely on school learning, interlingual puns, knowledge of Latin, and ability to recognize references to Latin works, but it is, more basically, about a group of young noble men who decide to ignore wo-

---

men in order to study.[40] *Love's Labours Lost* is the quintessential educational drama, and one of its most flamboyant characters is the schoolmaster Holofernes. Here is a scene late in the play in which Holofernes, a curate named Nathaniel (who evidently also enjoyed a Latin education) and a constable named Dull (who almost certainly did not) dramatize the difference between the multilingual speech of English people who attended grammar school and the monolingualism of those who did not. In Act 4, scene 2, the characters enter after a hunt:

> NATHANIEL Very reverend sport, truly, and done in the testimony of a good conscience.
> HOLOFERNES The deer was, as you know, in blood, *sanguis*, ripe as the pomewater, who now hangeth like a jewel in the ear of *caelum*, the sky, the welkin, the heaven, and anon falleth like a crab on the face of *terra*, the soil, the land, the earth.
> NATHANIEL Truly, Master Holofernes, the epithets are sweetly varied, like a scholar at the least. But, sir, I assure ye it was a buck of the first head.
> HOLOFERNES Sir Nathaniel, *haud credo*.
> DULL 'Twas not a 'auld grey doe', 'twas a pricket.
> HOLOFERNES Most barbarous intimation! Yet a kind of insinuation, as it were, *in via*, in way, of explication, *facere*, as it were, replication, or rather *ostentare*, to show, as it were, his inclination, after his undressed, unpolished, uneducated, unpruned, untrained, or rather unlettered, or ratherest unconfirmed fashion, to insert again my *haud credo* for a deer.
> DULL I said the deer was not a 'auld grey doe', 'twas a pricket.[41]

William Nelson noted a long time ago that Holofernes' speeches, interspersed with Latin that is immediately followed up by several pos-

---

[38] Ibid., p. 3.
[39] Ibid., p. 4.

[40] *Love's Labour's Lost* is also, more broadly, about multilingual play. See Felicia Hardison Londré, "Elizabethan Views of the 'Other': French, Spanish, and Russians in *Love's Labour's Lost*", in: Felicia Hardison Londré (ed.), *Love's Labour's Lost: Critical Essays*, New York / London: Routledge 1997, pp. 325–341.
[41] Shakespeare, *Love's Labour's Lost* (fn. 8), pp. 151 f.

sible translations into English, reflects the practices of the early modern schoolroom.[42] Indeed, Holofernes' lines reflect quite closely the structure of Udall's *Floures for Latine Spekynge*. He has the schoolmaster's habit, also evident in *Floures*, of speaking pedagogically, of being a walking thesaurus. He strikes modern readers and audience members as highly artificial, and certainly Holofernes' speeches are mannered in comparison to many of Shakespeare's other characters. But this multilingual literary passage would have seemed realistic to educated contemporaries, recalling the schoolmasters of their youth.

The dialogue demonstrates the multilingual play available to authors who had been trained with books like Anwykyll's and Udall's. It reveals puns available to those who know English *and* Latin; the *haud credo*, "I don't believe it," sounds to the unlettered constable's ears like "auld grey doe." The scene also highlights modern scholars' own difficulties with multilingual play. The text I cite here is from the Oxford Shakespeare, edited by G. R. Hibbard. Hibbard systematically corrects Holofernes' Latin mistakes from the printed editions of the play, and he follows a tradition of doing so, arguing that the schoolmaster should know proper Latin. But J. W. Binns has argued that Holofernes' mistakes are deliberate, not necessarily errors introduced in the process of bringing Shakespeare's play to print.[43] Bilin-

---

[42]   William Nelson, "The Teaching of English in Tudor Grammar Schools," in: *Studies in Philology* 49.2 (1952), pp. 119–143, here pp. 137 f. On Holofernes' pedantry, see William C. Carroll, *The Great Feast of Language in Love's Labour's Lost*, Princeton: Princeton University Press 1976, pp. 40–46. On rhetorical knowledge in the play see Marion Trousdale, *Shakespeare and the Rhetoricians*, London: Scolar Press 1982, pp. 95–113. Carla Mazzio describes the "educational poetics" of *Love's Labour's Lost* in greater detail in Carla Mazzio, *The Inarticulate Renaissance: Language Trouble in an Age of Eloquence*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press 2009, pp. 142–174.

[43]   J. W. Binns, "Shakespeare's Latin Citations: The Editorial Problem," in: *Shakespeare Survey* 35 (1982). pp. 119–128. A defense of Holofernes' Latin is offered by Manfred Draudt, "Holofernes and Mantuanus: How

---

gual members of Shakespeare's audience likely enjoyed multiple pleasures when seeing this play: the delight of seeing the characters confuse each other, but also the thrill of catching Holofernes, an overweening master, speaking corrupt Latin. The scene recalled for Elizabethans the reality of the early modern schoolroom, with its impressive linguistic achievements and delightful failures.

In writing Holofernes, Shakespeare confronts us with the blended nature of multilingual writing. He makes a literary choice to present a bilingual character, but one that reflected his experience and that of many educated persons in his audience. However, the lived bilingualism Holofernes recalls is itself the result of bookish craft: his Latin is an ancient tongue revived, his English deeply Latinized, his entire speech an erudite confusion. Holofernes' deliberately messy language, with its evocation of the complex process of education, highlights how difficult it is to draw neat lines between art and reality in multilingual literature.

Stupid is the Pedant of *Love's Labour's Lost*?," in: *Anglia* 109 (1991), pp. 443–451.