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Abstract: The aim of this article is to draw parallels between classical and medieval translingual literature to modern contemporary post-colonial literature. In this regard, it explores literatures in contact, which use more than one language, a language variety or a second language. From a historical perspective, it explores the rise of the Roman Empire and the adoption of Latin in classical literature. Consequently, it examines the growth of vernacular languages into dominant languages in the Middle Ages in Europe to understand the ways in which languages have been shaped by translingual authors and texts. It makes comparisons with the rise of English as a Lingua Franca and discusses the way language varieties attempt to decentralise and challenge the notion of standardisation, creating innovative texts in contact.
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Introduction

Many of the discussions of the phenomena connected with migration, diaspora, borders, post-colonialism, transnationalism and with linguistic, ethnic and cultural practices tend explicitly or implicitly to conceive them as essentially modern, contemporary phenomena. Yet, the phenomenon of writing in different languages and cultures has persisted throughout the centuries. (cf. Kellman 2000; Zucca 2010; Hsy: 2013 Canagarajah 2013) In fact, in ancient and in medieval cultures, writing in more than one language or another language was the norm. (cf. Hsy 2013) Suresh Canagarajah suggests that it is important to recover an understanding of these ‘occluded practices, and theoriz[e] their continuities’, and their relation to the present, which could yield insights and parallels with present and future configurations. (9)

An Investigation into Key Terms

The recent development of new terminology and paradigms points to changing social, economic, political and technological advancements, which require new communicative alternatives. Thus, the recent development of the term ‘translingual’ and also, of the related terms ‘transnational’, ‘transcultural’ and ‘translanguaging’, to name a few, stem from a twentieth-century concern with relations or disciplines within the fields of contact studies, literature, migration studies, post-colonialism, border studies, diaspora, linguistic, ethnic and cultural practices. These terms also point to the inadequacies or shortcomings inherent in existing terminology. For example, Azayde Seyhan argues that concepts, such as exilic, ethnic, migrant, or diasporic are unable ‘to do justice to the nuances of writing between histories, geographies and cultural practices.’ (9) Scholars still lack the necessary language to name and describe these nuances. In fact, there is a need to investigate terms that are currently used and to take on board more recent and current developments of terms, including an understanding of the term translingualism. It becomes an imperative to understand and evaluate new terminology in the light of other related and/or similar terminology used in the field, such as bi-/and multilingual configurations.
The term multilingualism is currently used to refer to multiple modes of communication, when it can be argued, ‘it is not a universal category.’ (Pennycook & Makoni et al. 441) The idea that multilingualism signifies a similar notion in different contexts in communication practices is viewed as an ‘absurdity.’ (441) Furthermore, the term multilingualism tends to lead us directly back to comparisons with the monolingual paradigm. (cf. Yildiz 2012) Due to the lasting effects of the monolingual paradigm, development of communicative practices and the theorization of new concepts have also been hindered. Despite this, both multilingual and translingual practices are still very much alive in both the west and outside the west, although they may have been ‘unacknowledged and hidden.’ (Yildiz 3, 4, 15) The unease about new terminology is indeed inconsistent or even incoherent and this inconsistency can still be seen in the way the terms translingual and multilingual often overlap. An investigation of the key terms may help reveal important insights and failings, to establish the way certain terms are used and to highlight comparisons and contrasts, noting the often vague, overlapping and contradictory ways these terms are used. The term literary multilingualism is also used in critical literature to discuss the same or similar type of literature as literary translingualism. (cf. de Courtrivon 2003; Kramsch 2009; Foerster 2014) The two terms share much in common and many examples of literary translingualism could be regarded as multilingualism and vice-versa. Yet, the term translingualism has been invoked as a term in recent years, but to a certain extent, overlapping still occurs. (cf. Aneta Pavlenko 2006; Besemeres in Pavlenko 2006; Steinitz 2013; Won Lee 2018)

Multilingualism is generally used to refer to an individual or a community that adopts three or more languages, ‘either separately or in various degrees of code-mixing.’ (McArthur 673) Bilingualism, is generally used to refer to ‘the capacity to make alternate (and sometimes mixed) use of two languages.’ (126) Notice that the main objective of this definition is to focus on language use. Also, the terms focus on the degree of language proficiency or equal competency language usage, as has been evidenced in second language acquisition (SLA). (cf. Yaron Matras 2009; Grosjean François Grosjean and Ping Li 2013 and Suresh Canagarajah 2013) Multilingualism is open to the potential of being neutral, in that it descriptively classifies a phenomenon, rather than commenting on the functionality and generative qualities in texts where multiple languages are present.

Furthermore, an etymological study highlights that the roots of the terms ‘multi’-lingual (many) and ‘bi’-lingual (two) point to a numerical quantity. In contrast, the prefix ‘trans’ signifies movement, going through, crossing over, across and beyond. (Klein 1639) Thus, ‘trans’ places emphasis on change and transformation. Canagarajah argues that the term multilingual conceives of the relationship between languages in an additive manner. This gives the picture of whole languages added one on top of the other to form multilingual competence.4 (7) In this light, the term multilingual fails to ‘accommodate the dynamic interactions between languages.’ (7). A significant finding is that the terms bi- and/or multilingual tend to keep languages systems separate, even if they do address multiple languages. The emergent term translingual emphasises processes that go beyond discrete language systems and structures, which allow an engagement in diverse multiple meaning-making systems.

A translingual approach to languages as used in this article, focuses on how languages negotiate and interact with each other to generate new meanings, as opposed to something that we have or have access to. (cf. Zucca 2020 and Min-Zhan Lu & Horner in Canagarajah) A translingual approach and practice is a ‘transdisciplinary consequence of the re-conceptualisation of the way languages are used, in what contexts and in what manner.’ (Zucca 60) It is in this sense, that we can begin to make sense of translingual processes, practices and orientations in literary discourses in oral, written and digital texts and platforms and theatrical representations, as well as in literacy and pedagogy.5 (60)
A Historical Perspective of the Development of Languages: From The Tower of Babel to the Emergence of the Roman Empire and its Linguistic Dominance

Stories that account for the presence of multiple languages have appeared in early textual sources in mythologies and theogonies. However, the story of The Tower of Babel is not unique to the Bible. Tales with similar features can be found in oral accounts and written texts all over the world. It has been hypothesized that at one stage the Indo-European languages may have had the same origin, or are in some ways related to each other. Torres Janson believes there may very well have been what can be considered an original language, but it is difficult to reconstruct it from existent languages. Studies in language contact have shown how and why languages tend to shift, evolve, transform and change over periods of time, due to internal pattern pressures and external factors. Thomason & Kaufmann confirm that there are inclinations within a language that change ‘in certain ways as a result of structural imbalances.’ However, they also argue that the social context, and not only the structure of the language involved, determines the direction and the degree of linguistic change.

The historian Nicholas Ostler cites three types of changes that result from direct contact between communities: migration, diffusion and infiltration. In diffusion, a community comes to assimilate the language of those they come in contact with. Infiltration, on the other hand, is a mixture of migration and diffusion. Through diffusion and/or infiltration a language can become a lingua franca. In order for this to happen, a language must be taken up by a community of people whose native language is not the language they currently speak. This investigation in historical linguistics, helps to explain one of the motives that contributed to the rise of Latin during the Roman Empire.

A second important linguistic aspect to take into consideration is the rise of vernaculars during the Roman Empire, which occur when a group of speakers do not have a lot of linguistic and social involvement and contact with other people that speak the same language. In this case, a separate type of language or speech form may start to develop. Janson refers to this development as a ‘dialect.’ Linguistic variants are also considered as dialects. Philologists and dialectologists generally regard a dialect ‘as a historical subtype of a language and a language as the aggregate of its dialects.’

The Languages of the Roman Empire

With the rise of the Roman Empire, Latin became well-established in North Africa in present-day Algeria, Tunisia, and Libya, presumably as well as in Europe. The conquered territories, however, did not all abandon their original languages. Though retaining its power, the Roman Empire, did not seek to eliminate other languages in use. Normally, common people spoke vulgar Latin (lingua Latina vulgaris), which varied in each region. In all other affairs, learned Latin was preferred. Though each region pronounced Latin differently, it was written in the same way for centuries.

Literature in the Roman Empire reflected the power and authority of learned Latin over vulgar Latin and local vernaculars. In fact, many writers adopted learned Latin in place of their mother tongue. Kellman refers to these writers as ‘monolingual translinguals’. He extends this concept to embrace ‘ambilingual translinguals’; his term for those who are ‘fluent and accomplished in more than one language.’ Seneca (ca. 54 BC – ca. 35 AD), who was Hispanic wrote in Latin – in the adopted language. Augustine of Hippo (ca. 354 – ca. 430 AD), a Roman African
born in Algeria also used Latin. Andronicus Lucius Livius, (ca. 284 – ca. 204BC) was considered
the first literary writer in Latin, but he was in actual fact a Greek slave. He adapted Greek master
works of the *Odyssey* by using Latin and traditional patterns of Roman verse. (Ostler 251) Greek
culture still permeated Roman culture. This resulted in a total diffusion and infiltration of Greek
into Roman culture. Thus, well-educated Romans were bilingual in Greek and Latin over the
next five hundred years. (252)

Lucius Apuleius (c.125– c.180), a Berber native to the Roman colony of Madaura, Algeria, was
educated at Carthage and in Athens. His text *Metamorphoses*, also known as *The Golden Ass*, is his
only one to have survived in its entirety. According to Ezra Pound, Apuleius ‘writes in a style
that would have offended Tacitus and disgusted Cicero and Quintilian. (3) He adds that just like
Dante and Villon, he also uses the language of the people, but he writes in a new and eccentric
Latin, ‘at a time, when the language of the Roman court was Greek.’ (3) William Adlington (fl.
1566) who translated his work describes it as ‘such a frank and flourishing stile […] so drake and
high a stile, in so strange and absurd words and in such new invented phrases.’ (Adlington in Pound
3) Adlington’s statement, though written centuries ago, is still strikingly relevant today, in that
certain contemporary writing may reflect those of antiquity. Although Apuleius masters Latin, he
still pleads forgiveness if his writing appears unpolished, unrefined and crude: “En ecce praefamur
veniam, si quid exotici ac forensic semonis rudis looctuor offendoro”. Apuleius does not produce
similar writings to that of his Latinate classical peers. Furthermore, his text shows communalities
with modern and current translingual writers, who also attempt to do ‘unheard of things’, albeit
with a modern lingua franca, by including and incorporating their linguistic and cultural
repertoires, and in so doing, foreground new linguistic and cultural territories. (Achebe 50)

Apuleius’s text is written by an African, who has mastered Latin, while basing his text on a
Greek model. The concept of *Africitas*, is a term that is now being considered to refer to Apuleius’
African heritage, his Romano-African identity, and his links to geographical, linguistic and cultural
connections with Africa and Rome. Yet, his African heritage is often downplayed in scholarship.
(cf. Vincent Hunink 2014; Nencioni 1939) Although recent scholarship in the field have attempted
to revive this concept. (cf. Benjamin Lee et al. 2014) For example, Giovanni Nencioni suggests
that vocabulary borrowed from Northern Africa into Latin texts is not that significant with
regard to both quantity and quality due to the fact that Latin was already consolidated at such a
point as to reduce the possibility of infiltrations and innovations on behalf of other languages.”
(Nencioni 46-47) On the other side of the spectrum, scholars such as Sonia Sabnis, Daniel, L.
Seldon and Richard Fletcher are keen to bring forms of Africanism in Apuleius’ work to the
foreground. Seldon views the Apuleian world as conversing ‘in three languages, with varying
degrees of proficiency, depending on the speaker: Libyac and Punic, [and] Latin.’ (210) Silvia
Mattiacci proposes to redefine the concept of *Africitas*, to include the notion of a spoken form of
Latin with regional, African characteristics, and the notion of African schools with special features
that may have influenced literary Latin. (92-93)

Shirley Geok-lin Lim has suggested, in particular with regard to St Augustine of Hippo (AD
354 – 430) and his *Confessions*, that Latinate texts ‘continue[s] to be read outside the politics of
language and with little attention paid to the elisions produced by the totalizing dominance of
Latin in the written life.’ (Lim in de Courtrivon 46) A new reading in this respect could shed
light as to what extent these texts were and are affected and fractured by the dominance of a
lingua franca and the tensions this may have produced in their writing.

The notion of the monolingual paradigm may help to highlight the problems and pressures
that arise when writing within a dominant discourse. Yildiz argues that these pressures ‘have not
just obscured multilingual practices across history [but] they have also led to active processes of
monolingualization, which have produced more monolingual subjects […] Without, however,
fully eliminating multilingualism.’ [(Yildiz 2) my addition] It is not difficult to note commonalities
with today’s era of globalization, migration and technological advancements in which societies tend towards homogenised communities. This has had a crucial effect on issues of difference and identity. However, it is significant to highlight that although the concept of monolingualisation is dominant, many writers have found and still find ways of transcending the imposed boundaries of monolingualisation and of integrating their multiple worlds and words, even in seemingly monolingual texts, using strange words and phrases and/or writing with the backdrop of other language/s. It could be argued that these unique types of writing stretch the boundaries of aesthetics and monolingualisation, so that they may be able to work ‘outside the imperial centres of monolingual discourse, moving away from the ideal of singular Latinate lives toward stories of fractured, bilingual, and dialogical relations.’ (de Courtrivon 47)

The Demise of Latin: The Rise of Vulgar Languages

With the fall of the Roman Empire, important linguistic changes take place. In this period, western Europe did not retain any strong political power. The invading Germans did not possess the administrative abilities of the Romans and they were unable to establish their language as the dominant language in Europe. However, this still led to important consequences for Latin. Speech forms started to evolve and ‘each region developed its own speech patterns’.13 (Janson 101) Eco characterises this era as a ‘dark’ age for it ‘seemed to witness a reoccurrence of the catastrophe of Babel.’14 (17, 18) The first Europeans were illiterate and spoke different vulgar tongues. It was in Eco’s view, the age that we witness the rise of the languages we speak today. (Eco 18)

Most official documents were still written in Latin and handled by a few people. However, around 842 AD there is a record of a different written language. The Strasbourg oath is one of the first examples of the birth of a new language. (Janson 114) The first language used in this text is regarded as Old French. As early as 880 AD, the earliest surviving piece of French hagiography that appears in the vernacular is entitled \textit{Cantiléne de Sainte Eulalie, The canticle of Saint Eulalie}. In the 13th century, Jean Bodel, in his \textit{Chanson de Saisnes}, divides medieval literature into three subject areas: Matter of France, Matter of Rome and Matter of Britain. The second category, Rome, refers roughly to the vernacular. The language used in this period is sometimes referred to as ‘Roman’ and sometimes ‘Français’.15 At the time when the French language developed a written form in the north of France, another type emerged in the south of France. (Janson 114-116) In this Region, the language that was in use was Occitan16 and ‘the main dialect, on which the written language is based, is Provençal.’17 (116) Dante, Petrarch and Pound considered the troubadour Arnaut Daniel (12th century) to be the major writer of this dialect. Pound suggests that, ‘the Troubadours were melting the common tongue and fashioning it into new harmonies depending not upon the alternation of quantities but upon rhyme and accent.’ (13) His view can also support certain post-colonial and contemporary texts and writers, who also fashion the English language in particular ways to suit their aesthetic aims.

The first defence of the vernacular takes place in the seventh century, in Irish folklore prior to the Strasbourg oath. It is written by the scholar Longarad, entitled \textit{Auraicept na n-Éces, The scholars primer}. It precedes Dante’s \textit{De Vulgari Eloquentia} and Chernorizets Hrabar’s \textit{O Pismeneh}. In the text, the legendary king Fenius Farsaidh chooses the best features of all the confused languages and fuses them to create Goidelic, the Irish language. In Eco’s view, it was ‘an attempt, on the part of Irish grammarians, to defend spoken Gaelic over learned Latin.’ (Eco16) He considers Goidelic ‘the first, programmed language, constructed after the confusion of tongues.’ (16)

The birth of the Italian language in the thirteenth century also marks a significant cultural and literary turning point. It bears testimony to the way in which a new language can be shaped and crafted through a written construct. Dante Alighieri (1265-1321) is credited with having contributed to the development of the Italian language. Dante’s linguistic world consisted of medieval disglossia, with Latin, the high language of science and religion at the top, and the
vulgar (vulgus) language of the people, considered the lower language at the bottom. (Fortuna et al. 2) To explain his reasons for adopting the vernacular over Latin, Dante writes a treatise on the nature of language. It is the first treatise of its kind and the only known work of medieval literary theory to have been produced by a practising poet. According to Janson, ‘it is the first investigation of dialects ever made.’ (121) Dante has written extensively on the question of language throughout his works, in Convivio I, Vita Nova XII – XXV, Paradiso XXVI, and especially the Latin treatise De Vulgari Eloquentia, ‘On Eloquence in the Vernacular’. The latter text deals with the function of language, its origins and the diversity of languages. (Fortuna et al. 3) Dante’s aspiration was to create a new written language, which he called, ‘volgare illustre’. By this he meant a distinguished vernacular. (Eco 43) Dante aimed to establish ‘the restoration of the natural and universal forma locutionis of Eden’ through his poetical efforts. (44) His objective was to restore these original premises into a modern invention. This was the only way ‘a modern poet might heal the wound of Babel.’

Dante desired to refine, elevate and normalize a single language. It was not to promote writing in multiple languages. However, his texts are permeated with different languages from Vita Nuova to the Divina Commedia. In De Vulgari Eloquentia, Dante makes recourse to Latin, Provencal, Old French, and a wide array of Italian vernaculars. De Vulgari Eloquentia respects the hierarchy of languages with Latin at the top. Dante is keen to ensure that his work maintains a ‘continuity with the precepts of tradition’ and he is careful when challenging conventions, although even his early works show evidence of the use of different languages, beyond tradition. (Barañski in Fortuna et al. 101) This is more apparent in the Commedia, where the Florentine dialect is embellished and blended with ‘Latinisms, Gallicisms, […] regionalisms [and], other foreign words.’ (101) In an extract from Purgatorio xxvi, Dante encounters the Troubadour poet Arnaut. He writes:

«El cominciò liberamente a dire: “Tan m’abeilis vostre cortes deman, qu’ieu no me puess ni voill a vos cobrire. Ieu sui Arnaut, que plor e vau cantan; consiros vei la passada folor, e vei jausen lo joi qu’esper, denan. Ara vos prec, per aquella valor que vos guida al som de l’escalina, sovenha vos a temps de ma dolor!”.

Poi s’ascose nel foco che li affina.» 23 (XXVI 139-148)

The first line of the stanza of this extract commences in the Florentine Dialect in the Narrator’s voice. The second line is in Arnaut’s regional dialect Occitan, based on Provençal. The passage code-switches, that is, it alternates between these two dialects within the same context. (cf. Grosjean 18) The last line in the extract, code-switches back to the Florentine Dialect. Although the two languages appear to represent two distinct units and distinct linguistic systems, their mixing in this context, represents a type of crossing over. The extract mixes and merges language varieties in the same context, generating an innovative text. The extract shifts expectations, from one linguistic register to another, emphasising a movement across voices, languages and cultures. The extract conveys both a transcultural and translingual process, this is highlighted, on one hand, by the cross-over movement from one language to another, and on the other, by the ways in which the languages interact and co-create new meaning in new contexts. Significantly, the two languages highlight an instance of dialogue between languages, voices and differing cultures.

In the last line of the extract, the sequence is closed off by linking the two passages and languages together. Arnaut asks for forgiveness for his foolish ways in the past in the Occitan dialect, but Dante grants him forgiveness in the Italian Vulgar language: “Poi s’ascose nel foco che li affina (Then he hid within the purifying fire).” (148) This fire is viewed as cathartic. It helps Arnaut purge from the sin of lust. However, fire can also be viewed as the basic element of a craftsman’s tools. In this sense, Dante is also referring to Arnaut’s ability as a great craftsmanship. For Dante, Arnaut was the greatest craftsman of a vulgar language, his native language.

The process of movement from the written dominant language of Latin, to the written vernacular languages gradually took place all over Europe. The new languages were vehicles for literature, but they were also expressions of political power. (Janson 123) Dante had desired a politically,
coherent country, which a distinguished vernacular could achieve. He succeeded by producing one of the great literary masterpieces of all time, *The Divine Comedy*, which became a 'linguistic model' for the Italian language. (123) It helped to develop the Florentine dialect into one of the European languages. The names Italian, Roman, François and/or 'Occitan were only acquired after the language was written. Europe emerged from the Babel of tongues. Yet, it existed well before a name had been invented for the language. (Eco 18) Europe was forced at the very moment of its conception to confront the drama of linguistic fragmentation. (18) In this light, the very idea of a European culture arose out of a situation of linguistic and cultural contact, and due the creation and formation of multilingual societies.  

From Medieval Vernaculars to Standard English Varieties

In Canagarajah's view, the English language developed as a creole language and was originally 'a set of mobile and fragmented semiotic resources, lacking unitary identity, in its very inception.' (Canagarajah 52) It was not until around the sixteenth century that a standardised form of English starts to develop. This was due to the advent of technological developments of the printing press, but also through the political reforms of King Alfred. Yet, there were still a variety of regional dialects, which tended to disappear from written texts, making language more unified.

In the eighteenth century, the United States adopted a policy of pragmatism that favoured the dominance of the English language. But at the same time, there was still a linguistic culture formed around a multi-ethnic identity 'that emerged through the [...] mercantilism aboard ships and in port cities, in the slave castles of West Africa and on the New World plantations, and in pan-Indian resistance movements' (Trimbur in Horner 27). Among these varieties, there were also African creole varieties of English, which were parallel to the English varieties imported to the USA from England, as well as West African Englishes. (Canagarajah 54) These varieties became the plantation creoles that were spoken in the USA and also in the Caribbean, South America, and in West Africa. (54) In recent contexts of post-colonialism and postmodern globalization, English has undergone further changes in relation to the diverse multilingual repertoires and practices. These linguistic practices in contemporary lingua franca encounters have caused scholars to rethink the role of English in monolingual terms and to reconsider and define English in more global terms. (cf. Canagarajah 2013) These changes are evident in the coinage of different labels now in use, for example: World Englishes (WE), English as an International Language (EIL), and English as a Lingua Franca (ELF). These models offer insights into the ways the role of English is evolving. Yet, it is of significance to consider the dynamic relationship between languages and language varieties and their interactions in instances of contact, to understand the ways they negotiate and co-create new meanings in literary, pedagogical and every day speech contexts. (cf. Canagarajah et al. for an exploration of findings in pedagogy and literacy)

English Varieties: From Creolisation to Decreolisation in West Indian Contexts

This section explores the development of pidgin and creolised varieties and the process of decreolisation in the West Indies. There are several varieties of English in the West Indies, including Jamaican, Barbadian, Trinidadian and Guyanese variants. Each has a similar syntax, grammar structure and vocabulary that resemble, to some degree, standardized norms. There are however, also substantial differences. For example, the Barbadian variant, Barbadian (Bajan) English, shares characteristics with Hiberno–English (Irish English). (Graddol 210) Black American Vernacular English also shares many features with English based creoles in the Caribbean. (Romaine 270–271) Furthermore, British Black English, spoken by immigrants from the Caribbean and their offspring share features that are inherited from the Caribbean. (270–271) At a syntactic level, English creole has more in common with the creole of other languages than with standard English.
English creole’s vocabulary may sometimes be based on English. Grammar can also be altered by following other grammatical structures from different languages. Phonological systems may also differ significantly.

Similarities in syntactic and semantics among creoles are due to an innate ‘bio-programme’ for language. In this regard, creoles are useful in providing an ‘insight into the basic nature of human language capacity’ (Leith 208) and presenting a fundamental ‘key to understanding the original evolution of human language.’ (Romaine 270-271) Creole languages arise due to contact with speakers of different languages. This contact first produces a ‘makeshift language’, identified as a pidgin. (Romaine 270) When a pidgin develops into the language of a community, creolisation takes place. In the West Indies creolisation occurred due to contact between African and European languages, incorporating features from both languages. These inclusions consist of the appropriation, adoption and modification of linguistic patterns of the languages involved in the contact. Over time, a new variety of English may establish itself. It may have a distinct identity, ‘as having a generally understood social status with the community.’ (Leith 185) However, continued contact with standard forms can also give rise to a process called decreolisation. When this occurs, the variant tends to move and converge towards standard English. However, this process may also give rise to a post-creole continuum. This occurs when either a post-pidgin or a post-creole variety is under a period of renewed influence from the Standard language. (Romaine 270-271) In this instance, as in the case of American Black English, the process of de-creolisation can obscure the origins of a variety. (270-271)

**Dialects, the Vernacular and the Notion of Nation Language**

This section explores and compares the notion and usage of the terms, ‘dialect’, ‘vernacular’ and the concept of ‘nation language’. Language variants are usually referred to as dialects and a dialect is viewed as a ‘subtype of a language’ and a language is considered as the ‘aggregate of its dialects.’ (Romaine 290) Against the notion of dialect, Braithwaite has argued for his preference for the term ‘nation language’. (cf. Braithwaite in Maybin 1996: 269) He views the term dialect as having pejorative connotations, it is viewed as an inferior type of English. (Braithwaite in Maybin 269) On the other hand, the term nation language is the language that was spoken by those who were brought to the Caribbean, the language of slaves and labourers. (269) It is not the official language that is now spoken. This language is influenced by the African model. Yet, it may be English in terms of its lexicon, but it is not English in terms of its syntax, its rhythms and timbre, even though the words are English ‘to a greater or lesser degree.’ (266, 269) Braithwaite suggests that another characteristic of nation language is its orality, in that ‘it is based on sound and song.’ (270) Furthermore, it foregrounds the political. Paula Burnett argues that the term vernacular is preferable for it is ‘uncontaminated with pejorative connotations’, whilst the term nation language, although a worthwhile attempt is not used widely. (Burnett xxv) This article highlights the difficulty in naming certain linguistic processes due to resistance, processes of colonisation, diversity and politics.

**Writing in the Language/s of the Lost Mother Tongue: Inventing Language**

This section explores the literary and critical work by the Caribbean author Linton Kwesi Johnson and the Barbadian writer Edward Kamau Braithwaite. The literary extract below is taken from Johnson’s (1976) *Street 66*.  

‘De room woz dark-dusk howlin softly  
Six-a-clack,  
Charcoal lite defying site woz  
Moving black;
Johnson uses language in a particular way to create bridges between his linguistic and cultural repertoires. In this extract above, the linguistic interferences, such as ‘De’, ‘woz’ and ‘clack’ emphasise the complex interrelationship between languages and language varieties. These words add new textures and resonances of the Caribbean culture to texts that avail of an English variety. These nuances affect the aesthetic qualities and literariness of the poem. The supposed deficiency, which might once have been viewed as a negative deviation from standard norms, instead valorises difference and highlights the creative innovations in translilingual writing, where words create bridges between different cultures and languages. It also highlights what Vershawn Young has defined as code-meshing, that is the use of a standard code with a language variety. The forms of borrowing and code-meshing and switching in translilingual texts are highly literary: they do not always comply with the actual speech patterns of a given community. The degree and frequency of code-meshing and switching in literary texts may appear more conflated and perhaps more artificial than real life contact situations, but not for this reason less significant an unworthy of critical research.

The Barbadian author Edward Kamau Braithwaite also uses Standard English alongside a creole variety. The following extract is taken from the poem Starvation.

‘i did swim into dis worl from a was a small bwoy
an i never see harbour yet
Ship cyan spot no pilot light
a burning tru dis wall a silence
wid me dread’ (Braithwaite 19)

Creole speech forms are evident in words, such as ‘dis’, ‘cyan’, ‘wid’ and ‘tru’. Standard grammar norms are not consistent with standard English, for example, the extract avails of the present tense ‘see’ where a perfect tense would normally be used. Thus, the text uses a simplified linguistic register. In linguistic terms, this is known as a linguistic reduction, which is typical of creole languages.

The following extract from the poem Manchille, also highlights code-meshing:

‘is escape dem-a farr
musk rose blooms
the tight room w
its oils. drying clothes
stale mask of nivea cream’. (Braithwaite 24)

The first line makes use of an intrasentential switch. This signifies that the switch occurs within the clause. The switch to English in the second line, in contrast, is an intersentential switch, as it occurs at a sentence boundary or clause. The poem opens in creole and switches to standard English. The third line includes an abbreviated form of ‘with’, ‘w’ (25) The words have been altered and severed, as in ‘luminous w/flesh’ and ‘circled w/flowers’. (25) Spellings are modified to focus on the phonics, ‘wheels tearing the gravel as darkness xplodes in the engine.’ (26) The text becomes a fertile site of innovative linguistic exchanges, as well as a cross-cultural site, where languages resist and compete with each other. These exchanges highlight language in the making and in process.

Written texts in English varieties challenge notions of standardisation, established literary traditions and the canon. Underwriting creole within the authority of a literary form, changes the dynamics of power, centre and margin. Thus, the linguistic centre and the cultural capital of standard English is decentred. In these linguistic exchanges, new forms emerge that change the
nature of dominant discourse and language. English is defamiliarized and is in some instances unrecognizable, defying laws of logic, grammar and standardisation. Canagarajah suggests that creole and pidgins 'participate in the same creative meaning-making processes of translingual contact.' (Canagarajah 59)

Recolonising and Defamiliarising English

Adlington's (1566) statement with regard to Apuleius' strange writing, written centuries ago is still of striking relevance today. In his essay entitled Colonialist Criticism, the Nigerian author and critic Chinua Achebe writes, 'and let no one be fooled by the fact we may write in English for we intend to do unheard of things with it.' (Achebe 50) In the Nigerian author Saro-Wiwa's novel, entitled Sozaboy: A Novel in Rotten English, English is defamiliarised.

'So, although everyone was happy at first, after some time, everything begin to spoil small by small and they were saying that trouble have started. [...] Radio begin dey hala as ‘e never hala before. Big big grammar. Long words. Everytime. Before before, the grammar was not plenty and everybody was happy. But now grammar begin to plenty and people were not happy. As grammar plenty, na so trouble plenty. And as trouble plenty, na so plenty people were dying.' (Saro-Wiwa 3)

The text is written in a blend of pidgin English (the lingua franca of the former British colonies in West Africa,) and standard English. It incorporates the prosody and rhythms of Nigerian speakers as in the sentence, ‘small by small’ and ‘radio begin dey hala’. (3) It also highlights what linguistics refer to as aspects of ‘imperfect learning’ in second language acquisition (SLA), in the sense that the language has become entrenched and fossilised at certain points of SLA. This is also evident in the sentence ‘everything begin to spoil’. (3)

Although the text mimics speech of a certain community, it is an example of a literary construct. Saro-Wiwa's novel does not make an apology in the vein of Apuleius, who may himself have been ironic in his defence. On the contrary, Saro-Wiwa's text can be seen as an act of defiance. The English language is defamiliarized in a creative and unique way. It is written ‘with delicate and consummate skill’ (Boyd in Saro-Wiwa)31 Saro-Wiwa explains that the text has no rules and no syntax, ‘it thrives on lawlessness.’ (Saro-Wiwa) However, this claim seems slightly exaggerated. In Boyd's view, in the text, 'English has been skilfully hijacked – or perhaps 'colonized' would be a better word. (Boyd in Saro-Wiwa)

Mimicry plays a pivotal role in discussions of SLA and is often used in post-colonial settings to refer to the ambivalent relations between coloniser and the colonised subject. When the colonising authority exerts expectations upon the colonised subject to learn and adopt the colonisers cultural values and language, this representation results in an imitation that can never be a faithful representation of an original copy, but rather 'a blurred copy' (Ashcroft and Griffiths et al. 124) or an obscured replica that cannot fully represent an original version. Furthermore, this new replica can be perceived as 'quite threatening'. (124) The reason for this feeling of threat is that mimicry can become in turn a mockery of all that it attempts to emulate. This is because it appears to parody that which it mimics. (124) Furthermore, in Homi Bhabha’s view, not only does it contain a mockery but also a certain menace, ‘so that mimicry is at once resemblance and menace’. (86) Thus, this illusion of a faithful reproduction can be viewed as a failure of representation. In this sense, mimicry reveals the limitations of colonial discourse, what we have here is ‘a flawed colonial mimesis’. (87) However, this essential flaw is also what sets this writing apart, for it highlights the ways these texts engage with and within languages, in unique, oblique and creative ways. Thus, the ‘imperfect’ rendering of what is mimicked is used as a literary aesthetic mode. On the one hand, Saro-Wiwa's novel is an example of the way the text critiques the coloniser's difficult grammar and 'long words', but it does so, by parodying the colonizers' speech. (Saro-Wiwa 3) Furthermore, it includes words from Nigerian origin, such as 'Yanga', Kpuhu! and ‘Kotuma’. (3,
Thus, the relationship in the text is one of ambivalence in its form of mimicry. Saro-Wiwa uses English, but in a way that negates the very nature of the English language itself, by using language/s on his own terms. However, in terms of the translingual, the text conveys new ways of engaging with languages and cultures in contact. This engagement with and within languages produces texts that are at the interstices of languages and cultures. Furthermore, the text calls to the fore ambivalence, defiance and mockery, in that the text moves beyond the control of colonial authority, which disturbs dominant discourse. (Ashcroft and Griffiths et al. 126). Mimicry, in this sense, is a destabilising force, which produces innovative ways of writing that move beyond the colonizer's language into new terrain.

Conclusion

This article attempts to draw parallels between classical and medieval translingual literature to that of post-colonial contemporary writing, which is often overlooked. It is as if there is no priori and no beginning. Yet, the phenomenon of writing in more languages is not unique, it is as old as babel itself. This investigation strengthens the still underdeveloped understanding of what exactly is and is not new about contemporary translingual writing.

A translingual approach as used in this article offers new possibilities for exploring the ways languages in contact interact and generate different and innovative types of texts. Apuleius uses Latin in ways similar to contemporary writers, such as Achebe and Braithwaite by subverting, de-normalising and disrupting norms and codes.

Furthermore, a translingual approach to texts allows us to investigate the way languages change and develop into new linguistic varieties and languages. Achebe, Braithwaite, Johnson and Saro-Wiwa, eager like Dante and Arnaut deploy and develop new variants in their own right. They demonstrate the legitimacy of local languages by underwriting them within the authority of literary texts in dominant discourse, thus, signalling a shift in power relations as these variants become languages in their own right. In this sense, the translingual is determined to communicate beyond the monolingual paradigm, by moving into different linguistic territories and breaching linguistic contracts, but at the same time, it creates bridges between differing registers, varieties and languages.

University of Cagliari, Italy

Notes

1 Parts of this article were presented at the RIA Symposium, Trinity College Dublin. It has been revised and edited in the light of new research in the field. (Zucca 2010) (cf. Zucca 2020)
2 The term translingual was adopted by Kellman in 2000. However, the term was previously used by James, S. Holmes in Translations studies and in Medicine in 1985. It was first used in literary and cultural studies by L. Liu in 1995.
3 The prefix trans. is an umbrella term, it has been used refer to cross-dressers, trans-genderists and transsexuals. This observation highlights the transformational qualities inherent in the term translingual and the term’s ability to emphasise crossing over.
4 For Canagarajah, ‘this orientation may lead to the misleading notion that we have separate cognitive compartments for separate languages with different types of competence for each.’ (7).
5 Cf., Canagarajah 2013, for a fuller exploration of the translingual in literacy, educational settings and pedagogy.
Similar accounts can be found in the Kabbalah, the Qur’an and the Book of Jubilees.

The Greek language continued to be used during the Roman Empire in the eastern part of the Empire and in Roman schools. (Janson 95,96)

A long-term effect of language shift during the Roman Empire was that languages started to diminish. (Janson 97)

These varieties coexisted alongside vernacular languages. (McArthur 590)

The Romans, however, excelled in the ecclesiastic, legal, and military spheres, ‘the world and power and order belonged to Rome.’ (Janson 253)

‘I first crave and beg your pardon, lest I should happen to displease or offend any of you by the rude and rustic utterance of this strange and foreign language.’ (Kellman 8)

All translations are mine, unless otherwise stated.

Near the end of the fifth century, people no longer spoke Latin. They spoke ‘Gallo-Romantic, Italo-Romantic or Hispano-Romantic.’ (Eco16)

Referring to the biblical confusion of languages, Eco suggests that ‘before this confusion there was no European culture, and, hence, no Europe.’ (18) Thus, Europe became an entity, but it had ‘to wait for the fall of the Roman Empire and the birth of the Romano-Germanic Kingdoms before it could be born.’ (18)

Once texts are written in French, then we witness the appearance of the names French and Français. However, the language does not receive its name until a ‘written language exists.’ (Janson 116)

Today the written form of Occitan is rarely used. (Janson 116)

The two names, Provencal and Occitan were used interchangeably. ‘As a spoken language Occitan is now retrieving in favour of French, the official language of the state.’ (Janson 116)

According to Fortuna et al. Dante ‘is the first European thinker of linguistic diversity.’ (Fortuna et al. 2)

Other theoreticians from the Bible and Plato onwards have discussed linguistic diversity but no one has dealt with it ‘in such an elaborate way or developed such a deep understanding of the historicity and variability of language, because nobody before Dante […] has lived the problem of the plurality of languages in such a vital way as Dante.’ (2-3)

The troubadours and Dante aim ‘to refine or to ornament the common speech.’ (Pound 3)

Dante aimed at creating ‘a perfect, modern, natural language, without recourse to a dead language as a model.’ (Eco 46)

In the Commedia, Arnaut is the only troubadour to speak in Occitan. Other authors, like Bertran de Born are made to speak in Italian. This is because Dante considered Arnaut superior to all those who wrote in Provencal or what is now known as the French language. (Barański in Fortuna et al. 101)

‘With willing heart he then began to speak:/ Your courtly way of asking so pleases me/That I neither can nor will refuse you. /I am Arnaut, who weeps and walks while singing. With grief I look back on my foolish past, /With joy I watch for hopeful days to come. / Now I implore you, by the goodness/ That guides you to the top of the stairs, /Think in good time on my terrible pain. / Then he hid within the purifying fire.’ (Dante XXVI)

For a comparison study between European and Asian languages during the Middle Ages cf. Pollock 2006 and Canagarajah 2013.

In Leith’s view, ‘many grammatical patterns in Hiberno-English may derive not from contact with Irish, but from the many different regional varieties of seventeenth century English taken to Ireland by colonists which have become obsolete (or at least vary scarce).’ (Leith in Graddol et al. 210)

There is evidence that the influences of the African languages can be traced in creole languages. For example, the word adru (a medical herb) from Twi; himba form Ibo (edible wild yam) and dingki from Kongo (funeral ceremony) to name a few have all been found in Jamaican Creole. (Graddol et al. 211)

Jamaican creole also has words from Portuguese –Pikni (small child), Spanish – bobo (fool), French – leginz (‘a bunch of vegetables for a stew’) Arawki (the language of the pre-colonial population) – hicatee (‘a land turtle’, adopted via Spanish) and elements of English dialects, which are now scarcely used in England – haggler (‘a market woman’). (Romaine in McAthur et al. 211)

More recently, the term code-meshing has been used in the studies of pedagogy, in contrast to the term code-switching in SLA. (cf. Young 2004 713n8; Young 2007; Young in Canagarajah 2013; Canagarajah 2013) For Young code-meshing is the ‘blending, adjusting, playing, and dancing with standard English
and academic discourse’. [Young in Canagarajah 3284-3288 Kindle Version] He refers to this blending of codes as code-meshing, which he views as a ‘strategic, self-conscious and un-self-conscious blending of one’s own accent, dialect.’ (ibid) In this article, code-meshing focuses on the interrelationship between standard English and a language variety, to explore the ways the two codes interact. Furthermore, it attempts to understand what effects this interaction generates in instances of contact in literary contexts.

28 In the case of borrowing, lexical features are the first elements to be borrowed. Borrowed words may be treated as stems. Heath suggests that ‘these stems may really be words, including affixes, in the source language.’ (Heath in Thomason & Kaufmann 37) If the item has undergone full integration, the element that is integrated can be regarded as a borrowed item. (McArthur et al. 229) There are exceptions to these rules, which makes it difficult to distinguish between borrowing and code-switching. (cf. McArthur et al. 229)

29 Jamaican Patwa(h)/patois/parwa termed Jamaican creole by linguists is an English-lexified creole language with West African influences.

30 ‘holler, shout’ (Wiwa-Saro 183)

31 Introduction

Mimicry can also be viewed in the light of political ideologies.
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