Playing Dumb:
Diplomacy and Dramatised Multilingualism
in Thomas Heywood's
If you know not me, you know nobody, part 2

Nathalie RIVERE DE CARLES
Université Toulouse Jean-Jaurès (Cultures Anglo-Saxonnes, UR 801)

Michael Clyne defines multilingualism as the ability to speak several languages and that of using several languages, whether by an individual, an entire nation or society.[1] Defining multilingualism in terms of use and territory echoes the Humanist approach to languages and, particularly, to Latin. The Humanist philological project promoted Latin to create a neutral zone where one would reach an audience beyond their linguistic community[2] while increasingly codifying vernacular languages.[3] These two dynamics underpin the relationship of the Renaissance audience with the language of the Other: language is in turn a conflict zone and a way to diminish hostility.

Multilingualism in the Renaissance is both a matter of delocalising and re-localising languages in a less adversarial linguistic territory. It is a subtle form of linguistic diplomacy that Thomas Heywood dramatises in the literal context of two diplomatic scenes in the second part of *If you know not me, you know no bodie or The Troubles of the Queene Elizabeth*, first registered in 1605.[4] Heywood's is a rare play dramatising this form of diplomatic multilingualism blending Latin and vernacular language through the voice of an ambassador and his interpreter. Written and performed within the two years following Elizabeth I's death in 1603, Heywood's two-part play dramatises immediate-to-recent history. Part 1 chronicles Mary I's reign, ending with Elizabeth's accession. Part 2 is a hotchpotch of significant events symbolising the creativity, threats and victories of the Elizabethan era: the first three acts deal with Thomas Gresham's building of the Royal Exchange, then the action shifts from city comedy to historical play as the plot focuses on

---

[1] Michael Clyne, "Multilingualism", in *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics*, ed. Florian Coulmas, Oxford, Blackwell 2017 [1997], pp. 301–314.

[2] Peter Burke, *Language and Communities in Early Modern Europe*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2006, p. 57.

[3] Aldo Scaglione, *The Emergence of National Languages*, Ravena, Longo, 1984, pp. 9–49

[4] Thomas Heywood, *If You Know Not Me, You Know No bodie; or The Troubles of Queene Elizabeth part 2*, London, 1606.

Elizabeth and her political entourage, with Doctor William Parry's assassination attempt and the Spanish Armada's failed invasion of England.[5] The play was written and first performed at the same time as the 1604 Treaty of London ending the Anglo-Spanish war was signed. The diplomatic context is supposedly that of a temporary cooperation or at least a status quo between the two kingdoms. However, the treaty was not so favourably received in England. This ambivalent diplomatic endeavour is reflected in Heywood's play and its use of multilingualism.

In part 2, Elizabeth's linguistic skills and her diplomatic language are given a dramatic shape that raises the question of the reception of linguistic otherness beyond the political sphere. This study focuses on two scenes staging a diplomatic encounter in the newly built Royal Exchange, symbol of England's increasing international commercial weight. Scene 10 is a form of rehearsal of the diplomatic encounter featuring a Russian ambassador and Thomas Gresham, the building's founder. Scene 13 is the actual encounter between Queen Elizabeth, the Russian, French and Italian ambassadors.

In her illuminating study of European languages on the English stage, Marianne Montgomery analyses these scenes as "idealized exchanges" that show "the key cultural issues – of gender, of class, of nation, and of education that attend the staging of Europe's languages in early modern England".[6] This article extends this analysis by focusing on the diplomatic potential of these scenes and how they shed light on the English language culture at the turn of the seventeenth century. My approach combines the literary and the historical approaches, i.e. textual study and "looking at multilingualism both as a dramatic device, and as a sign of cultural, social and political shifts and tensions".[7] While studying the nature of Heywood's dramatic use of Latin, I kept in mind Marvin Carlson's warning against the excessive "formulation [of] regularizing and abstracting qualities",[8] i.e. considering "ideal speaker-listener" operating "in a completely homogeneous speech community" and "knowing its language perfectly".[9] Carlson suggests analysing dramatic texts from the perspective of "integrational linguistics", that is, to consider that "language is continuously created by the interaction of individuals in specific communication situations".[10] This study shows how Heywood dramatises diplomatic communication and what was known about it to discuss English language culture. Contrasting Heywood's diplomatic scenes with Francis Thynne's *The Perfect Ambassadour* (1578) and Jean Hotman's *The Ambassador* (1603),[11] this study considers, with Peter Burke, language culture "in terms of linguistic, cultural and social conflicts as well as of collective solidarities and identities".[12] It approaches languages in terms of communities, but not communities organised between insiders and outsiders, but as *loci* of construction and reconstruction of national and territorial identities.

---

[5] On the staging of anti-Spanish sentiment in the 1590s, see in this volume Nora Galland, "Armado or the Other speaking the Native's Language: Racialising the Spaniard in *Love's Labour's Lost*", *Arrêt sur Scène/Scene Focus* 10, 2021, *Scènes dans la langue de l'Autre/Scenes in the Other's Language*, ed. Sujata Iyengar and Nathalie Vienne-Guerrin.

[6] Marianne Montgomery, *Europe's Languages on England's Stages, 1590-1620*, Basingstoke, Ashgate, 2012, p. 19.

[7] Ton Hoenselaars, Dirk Delabastita, *Multilingualism in the Drama of Shakespeare and his Contemporaries*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 2015, p. 8.

[8] Marvin Carlson, *Speaking in Tongues: Language at Play in the Theatre*, Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press, 2009, p. 2.

[9] Noam Chomsky, *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*, Cambridge, MA, MIT Press, 1965, p. 3.

[10] Roy Harris, *The Language Myth*, New York, St Martin's Press, 1981, p. 167.

[11] Francis Thynne, *The Perfect Ambassadour treating of the antiquitie, priveledges, and behaviour of men belonging to that function*, London, 1652; Jean Hotman, *The Ambassador*, London, 1603.

[12] Burke, *Language and Communities…*, pp. 5–7.

<94>

Observing Heywood's unprecedented Latin-based diplomatic multilingualism, this article examines the process of delocalising one's language into a linguistic other and its physical re-localising on the stage. It probes how diplomatic multilingualism reflects the difficult construction of the English self at the turn of the seventeenth century in terms of absorptiveness and defiance. And it analyses how it dramatises the English ambivalence regarding the concepts of community and commonwealth.

This article's first section examines the use of foreign languages in early modern English diplomacy and posits that, after Francis Thynne's reflection on diplomatic multilingualism, Elizabeth's Latin should be construed as an object of a proto soft power. Thomas Heywood's transfer of Elizabeth's diplomatic multilingualism on the London stage welcoming both national and international audiences is a part of this cultural strategy. The second section thus shows how Heywood creates a theatrical language of otherness through the topicality of Russian embassies to England and how he paradoxically recreates diplomatic otherness as local language. This sense of familiarity is confronted, in a third section, with the humanist neutrality of the Latin language to examine the de-localising potential of a multilingual scene. The last section focuses on scene 13 and how Heywood's diplomatic multilingualism takes also non-verbal and spatial forms leading us to assess the concord provided by Elizabeth's stage multilingualism as both coercive and potentially inefficient if not handled with measure.

Language as Official and Non-Official Diplomatic Battlefield

Wicquefort criticises early modern diplomacy primers' frequent use of Greek and Latin quotations and promotes writing in vernacular language: "Nous luy permettons de s'égayer de son grec et de son latin pendant que nous parlerons un langage, que l'on puisse entendre aujourd'huy." [He is allowed to entertain himself with his Greek and his Latin, while we speak a language we can understand today].[13] Latin was the principal language of diplomacy for centuries, however, and retained its importance in international relations for most of the seventeenth century and way into the eighteenth century, in which treaties were still drafted in that language. Notwithstanding the debate regarding its increasing obscurity and the importance of reaching a wider audience through vernaculars, Latin is more than an ornamental tool or issue: it represents the relationship with linguistic otherness and the tension between the diplomatic need for both visibility and invisibility.

Multilingualism is a requirement for ambassadors[14] and many a Renaissance treaty on diplomacy reflects this by switching between languages and offering translations or glosses of non-vernacular quotations. In *The Perfect Ambassadour*, Francis Thynne lists all the qualities expected from an early modern diplomat: "that he be wise, valiant, circumspect, furnished with divers Languages, eloquent of quick capacitie, of ready deliverance".[15] Thynne quotes several examples of multilingualism in ambassadors, with a special emphasis on Greek and Latin.[16] In chapter 4, "What Lawes, and privileges were made, and allowed for and to Ambassadors", he explains that during a diplomatic audience, each

---

[13] Author's translation. Abraham de Wicquefort, *L'ambassadeur et ses fonctions*, La Haye, Maurice Georges Veneur, 1682, 1, p. 101.

[14] See also Pierre Danès, *Conseils à un ambassadeur*, Paris, 1561, and Étienne Dolet, *De officio legati*, Lyon, 1541; see Stefano Andretta, Stéphane Péquignot, Marie-Christine Schaub, Jean-Claude Waquet and Christian Windler, *Paroles de négociateurs, l'entretien dans la pratique diplomatique de la fin du Moyen Âge à la fin du XIXᵉ siècle*, Roma, EFR, 2010, pp. 71–90.

[15] Thynne, *The Perfect Ambassadour*, ff. 18v–19r.

[16] *Ibid.*, ff.14v, 18v–19r, 70v.

<95>

would have been speaking in their own language and resorted to interpreters. Speaking one's own native language is power assertion on both parts. However, quoting the example of Alexander's envoys speaking Greek to the Roman Senate (which allowed only Latin to be spoken in its premises), Thynne refines linguistic power play:

> In which is worthily to be noted, that the Romans with great reason did use to give answers to Legates in their Mother tongue, which was the Latine, and that hee which spake in the Senate should have the Latine tongue. The which observation if it were at this day used, it would judge most allowable, that what Prince soever should by his Ambassadours request any thing of us, should use our tongue, they standing in need of us. And so likewise when we are to require of them things necessary for us, wee to use their language, because the truth of the matter should better be understood thereby than otherwise, upon the ambiguitie of the word (not known of the Ambassadour ignorant of our tongue) might great contention rise.[17]

Thynne envisages language as a sign and instrument of domination in a negotiation. At first, his example seems a mere reminder of the ploy of each party retaining their own mother tongue and resorting to interpreters. Yet, a closer reading shows his view on languages takes a more systematic turn as he retargets what was an equalising power play as a sign of domination and subservience: the choice of language is determined by who needs to ask a favour from whom. Thynne's position is both pragmatic and a form of ingratiating civility. However, it could generate a potentially destabilising discrepancy between one party's self-image and their actual dignity even before any negotiation had begun. Indeed, the visitor might be of a higher rank than the receiving English party and this constraint might act as a breach of decorum or an untimely exercise of domination. Bearing in mind that there was a clear pecking order in early modern inter-state relations that impacted diplomatic communication, Thynne's excessively open equation between language and need might have been a volatile and limiting process of forced allegiance. It would either not allow any changes in the process of negotiation or mark the status of each party too strongly and sometimes degradingly.

If Thynne's linguistic tactic is debatable, it is also revealing of a historical fact and maybe of a deeper strategy of power increase through language. Thynne's narrative betrays the contentious fact of early modern English being a lesser-known language in other countries.[18] Thynne's language tactic is a means to secure that if England's help or alliance is required, English must be the language of negotiation. To do so, it requires the foreign negotiators to be taught English. Thynne published his text the same year as the unpopular marriage negotiations between Elizabeth and François, duke of Alençon. This instance of marriage diplomacy triggered xenophobic reactions taking the form of linguistic defiance, as in John Stubbe's *Discovery of a Gaping Gulf* (1579), which predicted that the marriage would result in Italianate Frenchmen "gibber[ing] in the streets half Hebrew, half Ashdod" and that Englishmen would be forced to "mumble the strange tongue of Rome."[19] In that tense context and that of European hegemons regularly switching alliances or engaging into conflicts, Thynne's view of diplomatic multilingualism might be less a question of education of future ambassadors than the elaboration of a linguistic strategy of power gain and expansion.

---

[17] Thynne, *The Perfect Ambassadour*, ff. 41r–42v.

[18] Terttu Nevalainen and Helena Raumolin-Brunberg, *Historical Sociolingusitic Changes in Tudor and Stuart England.* New York, Taylor & Francis, 2016, p. 7; Barber, Charles, et al. *The English Language: A Historical Introduction*, New York, Cambridge University Press, 2012, pp. 56–70.

[19] John Stubbs, *Discovery of a Gaping Gulf*, London, 1579.

<96>

Thynne's approach may suggest the beginning of England's linguistic soft power – the projection of one's interest through convincing and attracting to co-opt rather than relying on hard military and economic power. Joseph Nye explains that "soft power resources are slower, more diffuse" than those of hard power.[20] Uptal Vyas explains that soft power's vehicles are cultural and educational exchanges.[21] Thynne's strategy is not as clearly worded as one might expect it to be nowadays. However, imposing the use of English when England's help is sought requires widening England's linguistic implantation abroad. It is a way of compelling English-language learning on a wider scale, starting with political circles and then letting the trickle-down-effect do its work. Such linguistic dynamics would then trigger a wider diffusion of English printed culture and increase England's influence.

Elizabeth I's linguistic skills are a well-known topos of Elizabethan biography and hagiography.[22] They are evidenced in her own letters and in the letters of her tutor Roger Ascham, first published in 1576 and describing a more-than-able student. In a 1550 letter to the Strasbourg humanist Johannes Sturm, Ascham writes that Elizabeth "speaks French and Italian as well as she speaks English; her Latin is smooth, correct and thoughtful; frequently and voluntarily she has even spoken with me in Greek tolerably well". He uses also the gendered topos later to be found in Heywood's play that she has "talent without a woman's weakness".[23] Following in Louis Montrose's footsteps, Marianne Montgomery stresses that: "Since her gender barred her from heroic exploits on the battlefield, Elizabeth's languages became for her a source of authority". Montgomery adds that languages were used "as tools and even as weapons in her conduct of foreign policy".[24]

I would further this point by saying that Elizabeth's multilingualism is the substance of an epistolary soft power aiming at promoting the English monarchy. In another letter dated 1562, Ascham delivers a testimony that may have been an inspiration for Thomas Heywood's diplomatic scene in *If you know not me*, *part 2* studied hereafter:

> I was present one day when she replied at one time to three ambassadors, the Imperial, the French, and the Swedish, in three languages, one in Italian, another in French, and the third in Latin, speaking fluently without hesitation and readily without confusion about various matters as they cropped up in their conversation.[25]

Ascham describes what Montgomery names "a near-impossible scene of triple conversation".[26] However, the scene is far from chaotic and confused, and Elizabeth is represented as a cohesive linguistic hub. Her linguistic skills are weaponised to legitimise her rule and her competence as a monarch. They promoted and consolidated her image as a serious geopolitical player.

In Ascham's letter her multilingualism is the expression of her royal virtues of wisdom (her education), of constancy (she brings harmony and not chaos to the scene), and her

---

[20] Joseph S. Nye Jr., *Soft Power. The Means to Success in World Politics*, New York, Public Affairs, 2004, pp. 99–100. See also Joseph Nye Jr, *The Future of Power*, New York, Public Affairs, 2011.

[21] Uptal Vyas, *Soft Power in Japan-China Relations: State, Sub-state, Non-state Relations*, New York, Routledge, 2011, p. 39.

[22] See *Elizabeth I: Collected Works*, ed. Leah S. Marcus, William Rainey Harper, Janel Mueller, Mary Beth Rose, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 2000.

[23] Roger Ascham, *Letters of Roger Ascham*, trans. and ed. Maurice Hatch and Alvin Vos, New York, Peter Lang, 1989, p. 167.

[24] Montgomery, *Europe's Languages…*, p. 105. Louis Montrose, *The Subject of Elizabeth: Authority, Gender, and Representation*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 2006, p. 33.

[25] *Letters of Roger Ascham*, p. 216.

[26] Montgomery, *Europe's Languages…*, p. 2.

<97>

strength (she can handle not one but three ambassadors from three different countries at the same time).[27] The usual heroic portrayal of a male monarch is thus transferred on the intellectual and linguistic levels. Her fortitude is an intellectual one, as she comes to embody the *pax Christiana* (peace between all European Christian kingdoms).

Her fortitude expressed itself through more irate use of her linguistic skills, as during her meeting with the Polish ambassador, Pawel Dzialynski on 25 July 1597. Dzialynski transmitted King Sigismund III's grievances over England's interfering with Poland's shipping trade with Spain. His Latin address was met with Elizabeth's off-the-cuff reply in the same language.[28] Discussing Jean Hotman's views on the language of negotiation, Ian Atherton suggests the power game at play in diplomatic multilingualism: "It was generally held both a tactical advantage and an honour to one's master for an ambassador to be able to speak his native tongue, but, failing that, Latin was often accepted as a common diplomatic language".[29] Dzialynski's not being able to use Polish recalled the difference in geopolitical weight of both states. Yet Sigismund's choice of sending his message in Latin and not in Polish – as the ambassador noted he was quoting his master – was also a tactic to display the king's own perfect mastery of Latin, the language of Catholicism, and his opposition to Elizabeth's treatment of English Catholics. Janet M. Green studies Elizabeth's spontaneous oration and points out language as a both a local and an international battlefield historicising the constantly questioned legitimacy of Elizabethan rule.[30] Elizabeth's direct reply in Latin was meant to surprise Dzialynski and display her political readiness. It avoided the delaying effect of an interpreter, using speed to empower speech. It also made sure that a fair number of important players in the audience could understand and broadcast the incident.[31] Similarly it made the process of translation and diffusion of her oration much easier as Latin was a shared language across the continent and could be more easily translated than English. Green notes that an "unusual number of manuscript copies" and printed texts of Elizabeth's speech in Latin, English and Italian circulated. The incident was soon included in historical narratives such as John Speed's *The History of Great Britaine* (1614).[32] It was also famously recounted in the correspondence between two members of Elizabeth's privy council, Robert Cecil and Robert Devereux, Earl of Essex, in praise of their queen's strength.[33]

We may then wonder to what extent Ascham's letters, the circulated accounts of Elizabeth's Latin rebuke of Dzialynski and the exchange between Cecil and Essex partook of a proto soft power initiative aiming to promote the monarch. Ascham's letters to Johannes Sturmius fit the description of what is known today as track two diplomacy or

---

[27] Early modern monarchs were expected to display the classical cardinal virtues (wisdom, justice, fortitude, temperance) and the three main Christian virtues (hope, charity, faith).

[28] "Speech 22, Additional Documents A, B" in *Elizabeth I: Collected Works*, p. 335.

[29] Ian Atherton, *Ambition and Failure in Stuart England: The Career of John, First Viscount Scudamore*, Manchester, Manchester University Press, 1999, p. 172.

[30] Janet M. Green, "Queen Elizabeth I's Latin Reply to the Polish Ambassador", *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, 31:4, 2000, pp. 987–1008, p. 990.

[31] Dzialynski was received "publickly, in the chamber of Presence, where most of the Erles and Noblemen about the Court attended, and made it a great day." *Calendar of State Papers Domestic, Elizabeth I*, 12/264, no. 57, fol. 124, i.

[32] Green, "Queen Elizabeth I's Latin Reply to the Polish Ambassador," pp. 988; 990. John Speed, *The History of Great Britaine*, London, 1614; 1627, bk. 9, p. 899 [898].

[33] Michelle Parkinson, "La Jupe Blanche: (Ad)dressing Elizabeth I", *Prose Studies*, 28:2, 2006, pp. 168–183. See also Montgomery's analysis, *Europe's Languages…*, pp. 2–3.

<98>

"backchannel diplomacy" or the reliance on the diplomatic agency of non-stage actors.[34] His correspondence, including the letters to Sturmius, was later reproduced in his own educational book, *The Schoolmaster* (1570). It can be construed as part of a non-official proto soft power relying on a new medium: print. Of course, the readership would have been limited but the book would have reached the targeted audience of political circles at home and abroad.

Similarly, the correspondence between Cecil and Essex was not intended to be read by many readers. The possibility of interception of the letters, however, was real and known to the writers.[35] Thus, their portrait of Elizabeth's multilingualism might have not only served their own sycophantic self-aggrandising ambitions but also helped propagate beyond English borders a portrait of Elizabeth as a strong ruler who, Janus-like, blended capacities for war as well as for peace. This portrait of Elizabeth as a linguistic hub creating a coincidence of opposites re-emerges in Thomas Heywood's two-part play about her reign: *If You Know Not Me, You Know No bodie, or the Troubles of Queene Elizabeth*.

Heywood's Russian Ambassador: Diplomatic Topicality as Theatrical Language of Otherness

Two scenes featuring ambassadors[36] in *If you know not me (part 2)* testify to Heywood's reliance on topicality and verisimilitude effects in his plays, and his skills at staging circumstances most spectators would have been hardly acquainted with.[37] First, the scene is set at the Royal Exchange, a significant location in terms of language culture and diplomacy. When discussing the English population's familiarity with foreign languages, Peter Burke notes that Latin dominated in schools and universities, that the gentry and the prosperous urban classes resorted to private tutors to study modern vernaculars, and that the lower classes' exposure to foreign languages for instance in London centred on the Dutch and French churches in London and the workshops of foreign-born artisans and around the Royal Exchange. Besides its multilingual potential, the Royal Exchange was also a place of residence for two Scottish ambassadors who met with the Russian ambassador Heywood used as inspiration for his play. The setting is multilingually diplomatic and so is Heywood's script. The blend of English and Latin in the first diplomatic scene is evocative of the multilingualism of treaties on embassy. The latter is dramatised through the character of the interpreter, another element of the play's diplomatic verisimilitude.

Thomas Heywood's Russian ambassador scene is as much about the language of the Other as a scene featuring linguistic otherness. Multilingualism in this scene is primarily mediated. Heywood develops his own version of multilingualism that relies first on diplomatic topicality and then on the inclusion of a foreign language (Latin) as representation of a further linguistic and territorial foreignness (Russia). Before observing

---

[34] G. Berridge, Alan James, Lorna Lloyd, *Dictionary of Diplomacy* (third edition), London, Palgrave Macmillan, 2012, p. 368.

[35] See Noah Millstone, *Manuscript Circulation and the Invention of Politics in Early Stuart England*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015, pp. 145–146. See the diplomatic importance of interception in the early seventeenth century in Ernesto Oyarbide Magaña, "Collecting 'Toute l'Angleterre': English Books, Soft Power and Spanish Diplomacy at the Casa del Sol (1613–1622)" in *Print and Power in Early Modern Europe (1500–1800)*, ed. Nina Lamal, Jamie Cumby, and Helmer J. Helmers, Leiden, Brill, 2021, pp. 316–337.

[36] Hereafter identified as 'first' and 'second diplomatic scene'.

[37] Benedict Scott Robinson, "Thomas Heywood and the Cultural Politics of Play Collections", *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, 42:2, 2002, pp. 361–380. See also Tania Demetriou and Janice Valls-Russell (eds), *Thomas Heywood and the Classical Tradition*, Manchester, Manchester University Press, 2021.

<99>

the use of Latin in the first diplomatic scene, we should focus on how Heywood generates a language of the Other through recent diplomatic history and practice and how this results in an adversarial view of multilingualism.

By the time of the play's first performance, Anglo-Russian diplomacy was a popular subject, as shown by the print success of *Sir Thomas Smithes voyage and entertainment in Russia* (1605). The latter recounted the 1604 journey of English commercial diplomats to Boris Godunov to negotiate privileges for English merchants. However, if *The Voyage* seems the most obvious choice as Heywood's diplomatic muse, the first public audience of a Russian ambassador at the English court on 14 October 1600 and his stay in London until 1601 seems a more accurate source for Heywood's first diplomatic scene in *If you Know not me (part 2)*. Boris Godunov's Ambassador Grigory Ivanovich Mikulin seemed to have been the talk of the town in 1600–1601. Contemporary letters stressed the fascination for the many pearls on his coat: "He had a gowne of clothe of goulde [...} made close by laces of pearle, [...} a capp ... imborded very richly with greate pearles".[38] N.E. Evans's study of the visit recounts Mikulin's notorious spat in November 1600 with the French ambassador, Jean de Thumery, Sieur de Boissise, his not so secret meeting with two Scottish ambassadors, John Erskine, Earl of Mar, and Edward Bruce, abbot of Kinloss, who resided near the Royal Exchange in March 1601 and the use of an interpreter, Andrey Grot.[39] *If you know not me (part 2)* features these three significant details characterising Mikulin's visit:

> *Enter Mr Gresham leading in the Ambassador, Musicke, and a Banquet served in. The Ambassador's set. Enter Sir Thomas Ramsie, the 2. Lords, my Lady Ramsie, the Waits in Sergeants gowns with one Interpreter.*
>
> GRESHAM. Lords all at once welcome, welcome at once,
> You come to my new buildings vp-sitting,
> It hath beene long in labour, now deliver'd.
> And up, anon weele haue a health to it.
> This Russian Prince, the Emperours Ambassadour
> Doth not our Language vnderstand: Interpreter,
> Say that the wee bid him welcome.
> INTERPRETER. The Prince speakes Latine,
> And in that language we'll interpret for him:
> *Salutem tibi optat & adventum tuum grauissime*
> *iste Londinensis.*
> AMBASSADOR. *Istum libens audio, ages illi meo nomine*
> *Ex animo gratias, funde quod bibamus.*
> INT. He gladly thankes you for his royall welcome
> And drinkes to you.
> GRES. We vnderstand that signe.
> Come let our full crown'd cups ore-flow with wine,
> Wel-come againe faire Lords.
> Lord. Thankes M. Gresham. (E4ᵛ-F1ᵛ)
> [...] *Enter a Gentleman whispering to sir Thomas Ramsie.*
> GRES. The Russian with the French. What would that Gentleman sir Thomas?
> RAMSIE. He is a Marchant and a Ieweller:
> Mongst other stones, he saith he hath a Pearle
> Orient and round, weighing so many carets

---

[38] Rowland Whyte to Sir Robert Sidney, 18 oct 1600, *Sydney Papers*, vol. 2.
[39] N. E. Evans, "The Meeting of the Russian and the Scottish Ambassadors in London in 1601", *The Slavonic and East European Review*, vol. LV, 1977, pp. 516–528.

<100>

> That it can scarse be valued: the French king,
> And many other Dukes haue for the riches
> And price refused to buy it: now he comes,
> To offer it to this Ambassadour.
> Gres. Shew him the Pearle Interpreter:
> The Lord Ambassador.
> Int. *Mercator quidem & aurifex spectandum, tibi profert*
> *Gemmam domine serenissime.*
> Amb. *Et pulchra & principe digna, interroga quanti indicat?*
> Inter. He commends it to be both rich and faire,
> And desires to know how you value it.
> Merchant. My price sir, is fifteene hundred pound.
> Amb. *Quanti valet?*
> Inter. *Mille quingentis minis.*
> Amb. *Non, non nimis peceara est ista Gemma.*
> Int. He sayth it is too deare, he will not buy it.
> Gres. I will peruse your pearle, is that your price?
> Mer. I cannot bate one crowne and gaine by it.
> *Enter Mariner.* (F1^v)
> [...]
> Gres. Attendance, come, th'ambassadour, guests all,
> Your welcom's great, albeit your cheer's but small. (F3^r)

The "pearle", the surprising conversation with a Frenchman ("The Russian with the French. What would that Gentleman sir Thomas?") and the Royal Exchange ("my new building") are all historically accurate details. Heywood generates both a realistic otherness and a very local Russian otherness which is reinforced by the diplomatically accurate use of the Interpreter. The Russian linguistic otherness is surrogated by the verbal and visual language of real and stage ambassadors.

Flanked by a retinue and an interpreter, the Russian ambassador is dramatised in a conventional manner: he is named after his function, is confined to a form of silence as he does not speak English and plays the part of Catastrophe, being both a semi-silent figure and the pretext to announce Gresham's reversal of fortune in the shape of his wrecked ship.[40] The novelty here is the focus on the multiple forms of diplomatic multilingualism: Heywood reprised the actual diplomatic conventional use of Latin as *lingua franca* as full multilingualism rather than mere code-switching. He stressed the role of chirological codes related to welcome ceremonies as proved by the inner stage direction indicating a drinking gesture: "We understand that signe".

The structure of the conversation reprises that of a diplomatic audience and becomes the very substance of the language of the diplomatic Other. The scene falls roughly into three familiar phases: the initial greetings, the compliment to the Monarch who is receiving, and the actual business of the day – the commercial exchanges. However, Heywood introduced unfamiliar elements in terms of diplomatic protocol as Gresham praises his own monarch in place of the guest ambassador's paying of a compliment to the receiving monarch, and then displaces the trade diplomacy of the Muscovy Company on a rival country. The dramatised language of this diplomatic Other blends current affairs, diplomatic rhetoric and etiquette and dramatic conventions. Diplomatic speech on the

---

[40] Nathalie Rivere de Carles, "The Ambassador as Proteus: Indirect Characterisation and Diplomatic Appeasement in Catiline and *Measure for Measure*", in *Early Modern Diplomacy, Theatre and Soft Power: The Making of Peace*, London, Palgrave, 2016, pp. 116–121.

<101>

stage is as much multimodal as it is literally multilingual. The unfamiliarity of the language of the Other does not so much come from the Latin and its interpretation but from Gresham's handling of the diplomatic conventions. His hyperbolic praise of Queen Elizabeth casts some doubts on how welcome this Latinate foreignness is.

Ramsay introduces our scene as a ritual of togetherness by saying that Gresham "feasts this day the Russian ambassador" (scene 9). However, in scene 10, Gresham's praise of Elizabeth's linguistic skills challenges the symbolic impact of the communal ritual. It is here less the language *of* the Other that is problematic than the language used *with* the Other:

> For though a woman, she is a rare Linguist,
> Where other Princes vse Interpreters,
> She *propria voce*, I haue some Latin too:
> She of her selfe heares all their Embassies,
> And herselfe answers them without Interpreter,
> Both Spanish, Latine, French, and Greeke,
> Dutch, and Italian, so let him know: (F1ʳ).

Gresham redefines Elizabeth's multilingualism as adversarial: she is at odds in terms of gender and education with other monarchs. Gresham's contrastive binary rhythm opposes singular and plural forms, i.e. Elizabeth and the princely others. Even the implicit diplomatic topicality is adversarial here as Elizabeth's ability to speak directly to ambassadors was made notorious by her famous scolding of the Polish ambassador. Elisabeth's multilingualism is redefined as a warning rather than as a common ground. Besides, Elisabeth's multilingualism is dangerously downplayed here as it is mediated by Gresham: he reduces multilingualism to its simplest expression, code switching, and he then anglicises the languages of others and crams them in a list, in a case of the erasure of linguistic otherness.

The multimodal choices of performance of linguistic otherness are problematic as they seem to bring out adversity more than what Tasso considered to be the core of diplomacy i.e. generating an entente.[41] Such a choice questions Heywood's Latin speeches in terms of the relations with the Other. Does the use of Latin prolong the adversarial tendency or act as an instrument of appeasement?

Latin as De-Localising One's Language: Neutrality or Absorption?

In *Language and Diplomacy*, Joseph Brincat recalls that "Latin was a unifying fact for all high register writings, [while] the dialects were a factor of fragmentation". It testified to "the author's will to de-localise their language" to avoid the fragmenting power of competing territorialised languages.[42] Peter Burke explains that

> one of the advantages of Latin in the diplomatic domain was it was relatively well known by members of the elite, another was that it was prestigious, a third that it was neutral compared to the vernaculars that were competing for cultural hegemony at this time, notably Italian, Spanish and French.[43]

---

[41] See commentary on Tasso's *Jerusalem Delivered* and the promotion of peace in Timothy Hampton, *Fiction of Embassy: Literature and Diplomacy in Early Modern Europe*, Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 2009, p. 72.

[42] Joseph M. Brincat, "The language of the Knights. Legislation, administration and diplomacy in a multilingual State (14th–16th centuries)", *Language and Diplomacy*, ed. Jovan Kurbalija and Hannah Slavik, Msida, Diplo Projects, University of Malta, 2001, p. 261.

[43] Burke, *Language and Communities…*, p. 120.

<102>

In 1653, the Swedish chancellor, Oxenstierna, spoke Latin to Cromwell's envoy, Bulstrode Whitelocke, because he said that Latin was "more honourable", and that it was then a "language not peculiar to any people".[44] Oxenstierna emphasises the a-territoriality of the Latin language which could constitute a free zone and thus a *lingua franca*, not attached to any national authority. Yet, in certain situations, Latin's symbolic link with Rome may have raised the issue of another type, spiritual and not temporal, territoriality. The effect of the temporary de-localisation of the speaker's mother tongue in Latin in a diplomatic context is ambivalent in terms of reception. Celia Millward emphasised that Latin's "association with the Roman Catholic Church and England's continental adversaries tended to undermine its status".[45]

Albeit Latin's problematic political affiliations, however, Burke notes that it was still considered as a "neutral mode of communication".[46] This neutrality is favoured onstage by the spectators' familiarity with Latin's wording, sometimes its meaning, and at least with its contextual uses. The familiar strangeness of Latin is more reassuring for the audience than a thoroughly inaccessible language as the invented idiom in act 4 scene 1 of Shakespeare's *All's Well that Ends Well* (1608).[47] Onstage, Latin creates an aural otherness. Hence delocalising Russian into Latin generates a practical neutrality. We should then examine how this neutrality is paired with an absorptive identity and the nature of such absorption.

In *The Ambassador* (1603), the English translation of his French treaty published earlier that year, Jean Hotman went beyond the theoretical aspect of Thynne's primer and gave a practical definition of the ambassador's multilingualism:

> And in many places Ambassadors are callled Orators. But to speake wel, in good frame, and good termes, it shal be expedient that hee first write and polish that which hee hath to say in publike. *(Parato quid vnquam defecit?)* Yet without seruile tying himself, to learne by heart his owne speech, lest it befall him, as many times it dooth vnto schoole boies. If he know the language of the Countrie where he is, it will be a great furtherance vnto him, to the more perfect vnderstanding of the histories and affaires of that estate. *Cicero* saith *(Sumus surdi omnes in linguis quas non intelligimus.)*[48] It is alone to be deaf, and not to vnderstand what is saide.) Neuerthelesse many without this qualitie haue not failed to performe their charge well and worthily. And although he knew the language, I had rather that he should faine, not to vnderstand it: for so hath he the more aduantage to speake and negotiate in his owne language: or at least in Latine which is common vnto all, as they do in *Germany, Polonia,* and other countries.[49]

Hotman advises the ambassador to dissimulate his fluency in a foreign language and to adopt a reformed *lingua franca*, namely a synthetic version of Latin. Then, he puts theory into textual practice and interpolates vernacular language and Latin quotations from Cicero, quotations that he immediately glosses as he plays both ambassador and

---

[44] Bulstrode Whitelocke, *A Journal of the Swedish Embassy*, London, 1855, vol. I, p. 300.

[45] C. M. Millward, *A Biography of the English Language*, 2nd ed., Orlando, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc. 1996, p. 226.

[46] Peter Burke, "Heu domine, adsunt Turcae: A Sketch for a Social History of Post-medieval Latin", In *Language, Self, and Society: A Social History of Language*, ed. Peter Burke and Roy Porter, Cambridge, Polity Press, 1991, pp. 23–50.

[47] For a study of this scene, see in this volume Andrew Hiscock, "'speak what terrible language you will': Fooling with the Other in Shakespeare's *All's Well that Ends Well*", *Arrêt sur Scène/Scene Focus* 10, 2021, *Scènes dans la langue de l'Autre/Scenes in the Other's Language*, ed. Sujata Iyengar and Nathalie Vienne-Guerrin.

[48] Cicero, *Tusculan Disputations* (V, 40).

[49] Hotman, *The Ambassador*, C2v-C3r.

<103>

interpreter. Heywood's Latin mirrors two of Hotman's linguistic recommendations: the use of diplomatic multilingualism and brevity. Heywood's Latin indeed bears a form of directedness of address. As in Hotman's text, Heywood's Latin is Ciceronian[50] and presented alongside an English translation.

Heywood's Latin appears to have three main sources. The first is Cicero as the price genitive *quanti*, the use of *digna* with the ablative to mean "worthy of", and the words *indicat*, *interroga*, *ages* or *iste* are all used in the Ciceronian sense. The second is Plautus as the use of *illi* as an adverb indicating place was first established by Plautus. Similarly, the use of the verb *optat* to mean to wish something to someone is typical of Plautus. And finally, the influence of Roger Ascham can be supposed as the phrase "*principe Digna*" can be found in the conclusion of Ascham's letter to Johannes Sturmius evoked in section 1. This would corroborate the hypothesis that the three-way conversation of Heywood's second diplomatic scene derived from Ascham's account of Elizabeth's reply "at one time to three ambassadors, the Imperial, the French, and the Swedish, in three languages, one in Italian, another in French, and the third in Latin". In the play, she is introduced to "The Emperor's; the second is the French; / The last is the Florentine". And the stage direction indicates she "*entertains the Ambassadors, and in their several languages confers with them*".

Heywood's Ciceronian style of Latin not only anchors the scene in the humanist tradition and diplomatic primers' style, it also projects the language of the Other in a pre-Christian era or at least in an era before the religious schisms opposing England to other European powers. The Plautian intertext is a way to reassert the theatrical nature of the scene's language, but it also evokes a form of irreverent hybridity that redefines the purpose of a neutral linguistic territory. Plautus was the first to mingle genres, and to mingle linguistic levels as his chorus Mercury (the ambassador of the gods) explains it in the prologue of the first tragicomedy, *Amphitryo*. More than a mere functional space of neutrality, the Latin intertext becomes the place of a true exchange between linguistic Others and maybe of entente.

Burke emphasised "the absorption of Latin into English to fill conceptual voids".[51] In Heywood's play (as in many other plays), this absorption often takes the form of code-switching (the inclusion of foreign words in the middle of a sentence) rather than full-blown multilingualism (as in the ability to switch to another language one is proficient in). Heywood plays on both types of multilingualism and avoids the trap of inkhornism because his multilingualism articulates importation and coalescence. He does import words and phrases, but he also merges English and Latin thanks to their common grammatical and prosodic features.

The first common trait between classical Latin and early modern English lies in the use of *tu* that we found in Heywood's cues through the dative *tibi* or the verb *ages*. The use of *tu* in classical Latin was favoured as neutral ground for communication. Besides, it was a characteristic shared with the English language where biblical and legal language also featured a canonical use of "thou", itself an import from the Norman. Linguistic neutrality is thus subtly redefined as shared community. It overcomes the linguistic strangeness of the

---

[50] See Terence O. Tunberg, "Ciceronian Latin: Longolius and Others", *Journal of Neo-Latin Studies*, 46, 1997, ed. Jozef Ijsewijn, pp. 13–61.
[51] Burke, "Heu domine…", p. 23.

<104>

Russian ambassador, echoing the use of the language of trade to create diplomatic ties with an ill-known power, Russia.[52]

Heywood might even go a bit further in making his Latin an acceptable idiom to the likes of John Cheke who advocated a language "clean and pure, unmixt and unmangled with the borrowing of other tongues", by fully adapting it to the rhythm of the English pentameter.[53] Here, I would posit a tentative hypothesis regarding the prosody of the Latin cues as evidence of Heywood's absorptive approach to linguistic otherness, but an absorption as a coalescence and not an erasure.

If we compare the different editions of *If You Know not Me, part 2* published between its first performance circa 1604 and Heywood's death in 1641 (1606; 1606b; 1609; 1623; 1633), the Latin cues stabilise in their form and content by 1623. The 1633 edition, corrected by Heywood, draws mainly on the 1623 edition. There, the Latin cues are presented as prose when the Interpreter speaks and as verse (hexameters) when the Ambassador does. The particularity of the 1633 edition is to conflate four lines into two shared lines noted A and B below:

> The seuerall Ambassadors there will heare
> **[A] And them / in per / son an / swer. 2.Lord. Tis / most true.**
> *Enter a Gentleman whispering to sir Thomas Ramsie.*
> Gresh. The Russian with the French.
> What would that Gentleman sir Thomas?
> (…)
> Mer. My price sir, is fifteene hundred pound.
> **[B] Amb. Quanti /valet? Inter. Mille quin/gentis /minis**
> Amb. Non, non nimis persara est ista Gemma (F1^v)

If we scan [A] as one single shared line, it does indeed form a pentameter: "And them/ in per/son an/swer. 'Tis / most true." This could suggest the typographical presentation as shared line is not accidental, as the typesetter left other lines as stand-alone short lines and the characters speak in verse. As for what is presented now as a shared line in [B], first, we need to stress that the Merchant's line that precedes it is a fairly regular iambic pentameter. Now, if we try to scan [B], we come up with a mainly trochaic pentameter articulated around a classical Horatian dactyl (**Quan**ti /**va**let?/ **Mi**lle quin /**gen**tis /**mi**nis). The Latin metric tropes are rhythmically adapted to the English melody: both retain their specificity while being merged in a self-contained line. This process matches what Richard Rowland analyses as Heywood's habit borrowed from Plautus to "modulate between iambic pentameter, blank verse, rhyming couplets and prose, sometimes within a single speech".[54] This non-adversarial handling of the linguistic Other would turn the scene's diplomatic multilingualism into an instrument that coalesces distinct linguistic identities in fertile ways. This specific treatment of multilingualism may have reflected the hope that the 1604

---

[52] See Maria Salmon Arel, *English Trade and Adventure to Russia in the Early Modern Era: The Muscovy Company, 1603-1649*, London, Rowman and Littlefield, 2019; Daryl W. Palmer, *Writing Russia in the Age of Shakespeare*, London, Routledge, 2017.

[53] John Cheke, Letter to Thomas Hoby (1557), in Thomas Hoby, *The Book of the Courtier*, ed. Virginia Cox, London, Everyman, 1994, p. 10.

[54] Richard Rowland, *Thomas Heywood's Theatre: Locations, Translations and Conflict*, London, Routledge, 2010, p. 168.

<105>

London treaty would tone down the religious conflicts between Catholics and Protestants, thus opening an era of more active toleration.[55]

Besides, the brevity of the Latin exchange and its adaptation to the rhythm of the poetic vernacular proves dramatically and diplomatically useful. Hotman's recommendation for brevity matches theatre's requirement for continuous action and raises the question of how the diplomatic language can achieve this balance between substance and brevity, and more particularly on the stage. The interpreter as embodiment of linguistic otherness in a diplomatic context, although historically accurate, might not be entirely satisfying, dramatically speaking, as shown in Gresham's both civil and dismissive answer to the Interpreter, "We understand that sign". The presence of the stock-character of the Interpreter might expand the action to unnecessary length and erase the actual diplomatic presence, or might be confused with it.[56] Marianne Montgomery notes that the use of Latin on the English stage hesitates between persistence and erasure and offers a metatheatrical discussion of intelligibility.[57] This hesitation might explain why Heywood develops alternative performances of linguistic otherness in a diplomatic context in both scenes featuring ambassadors.

Whispering and Asides as Ambivalent Symbolic Linguistic Foreignness.

In his previously quoted definition of the ambassador's multilingualism, Hotman turns language into play-acting: "And although he [the ambassador] knew the language, I had rather that he should faine, not to vnderstand it".[58] Silencing his multilingualism and resorting to Latin or to speaking in his mother tongue through an interpreter brings out the paradox of the articulation of the said and the unsaid, the visible and invisible in diplomatic communication. Heywood's play dramatises this paradox in whispers and asides. The ambassador's linguistic otherness is transformed on the stage into a dramatised cypher, the whisper. This quasi non-verbal performance of diplomatic linguistic otherness makes the ambassador stand out amidst the other characters. While whispering, the stage-ambassador does not need to be mediated by an interpreter. However, we may question the impact of this dramatisation of diplomatic conversation in terms of the vision and the relationship of the audience's dominant linguistic community with linguistic Others.

Stage ambassadors in early modern drama were often reduced to silent figures.[59] In Heywood's scene, the ellipsis of the ambassadorial voice is reconfigured as whispering. We cannot really speak of "whispering" as a language *per se*, as it is merely a manner of communicating. However, on stage, this manner of speaking takes the form of a language as it is a conflation of words, sounds and gestures and is even linked to a territory, the aside. Whispering is a dramatic code that can be interpreted negatively as it relies on a sense of loss for the spectator, but also as the signal of further negotiation.

When Heywood introduces whispering in the scene with the Russian ambassador, it could be seen again as the sign of a threatening adversity. It is unclear whether after the

---

[55] The treaty implied that Spain officially abandoned any attempt to restore Catholicism in now Protestant England while England officially denounced the 1585 Treaty of Nonsuch which pledged them to finance the Dutch revolts in the Spanish-controlled Netherlands.

[56] For instance, in *Freewyll*, a play by Francesco de Negri, translated by Henry Cheke (1565-72), the Papal envoys are replaced by Hermes, the mythological interpreter.

[57] Montgomery, *Europe's Languages…*, pp. 127–128.

[58] See note 47 above.

[59] See Valeria Cimmieri, "The Performative Power of Diplomatic Discourse in Italian Tragedies Inspired by the Wars against the Turks", in *Early Modern Diplomacy, Theatre and Soft Power*, pp. 93–112.

<106>

Gentleman is seen "*whispering to sir Thomas Ramsie*", Gresham's cue, "The Russian with the French", can be understood as an inner stage direction or as a mere interrogation regarding the ensuing conversation. In the first case, it would place Gresham and Ramsie as observers of a dumbshow between the Russian ambassador, the Merchant and the Interpreter now whispering to each other. In the second case, it would be a mere announcement of what will follow. However, whether the whisper is extended to the ambassador and the merchant or not, it seems to be a code emphasising a form of potential tension glossed by Gresham's "The Russian with the French".

The notorious spat between the French and the Russian ambassadors over precedence during the festivities marking the anniversary of Elizabeth's coronation in November 1600 might explain why Gresham seems surprised to see "the Russian with the French". Of course, the merchant is not an ambassador (although in the Jacobean context this is debatable), but the reduction of the characters to metonymic expressions of their countries dramatises diplomatic representation and introduces again the adversarial view of otherness represented by Gresham. Yet, whispering counterweights this tension by introducing the possibility of a negotiation on two levels: whispering solves the problem of characters speaking in languages actors could not speak and spectators would not always understand, thus preserving the swift rhythm of the continuous act, it also initiates a moment of entente as the conversation between two antagonists finally happens.[60] The whisper becomes the language of a new territory where Others meet: the aside.

The convention of the aside is usually defined as a form of speech, characterised by brevity, physical separation, and its function of revelation.[61] It implies the silencing of the action centre-stage and that the audience can hear a character speaking from the symbolic margins of the main action. In a scene involving ambassadors, this configuration is reversed, yet the function of revelation remains.[62] Later on, Heywood's play features an example of such configuration as it stages Elizabeth's previously advertised multilingualism during a scene at the Royal Exchange:

> *Enter, at one dore, the Queene, Lecester, Sussex, Lords, Gresham; at the other, Cassemer, the French and Florentine Ambassadours, Sir Thomas Ramsey, &c.*
>
> QUEEN. Lester and Sussex, are those the Ambassadors?
> LEICESTER. They are, dread Soveraigne, he that foremost stands,
> The Emperours, the second is the French,
> The last is the Florentine.
> QUEEN. We will receive them.
>
> *Here the Queene entertaines the Ambassadors, and in their seuerall languages confers with them.*
>
> Sussex and Lester place the ambassadors,
> We at our Court of Greenwich will dilate
> Further of these designs. (H1ʳ)

---

[60] Besides, the displacement of the conversation onto the commercial level (even if the transaction eventually proves inconclusive), gives a concreteness to this linguistic contact between two opposed powers.

[61] Patrice Pavis, *Dictionary of the Theatre. Terms, Concepts and Analysis*, Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1998, p. 29. When applied to stage ambassadors, the aside is often redefined as a semi-silent one: the actors are seen to be conferring, but the audience can at best hear some whisper.

[62] Jeremy Lopez, *Theatrical Conventions and Audience Response in Early Modern Drama*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2003, p. 57.

<107>

The performance of the scene again creates a distancing effect that diminishes the positive aspect of the aside, as stated by Jeremy Lopez and exemplified in other diplomatic scenes in other plays. The Queen's previously advertised multilingual capacity is limited to a swift transitional moment which could be staged as a dumbshow.[63] The diplomatic conversation with the three ambassadors may happen in a semi-aside with the Queen still occupying the space centre-stage with Leicester and Sussex on the one side, and the ambassadors on the other.

The hypothesis of a quick aside is backed by the immediate pushing to the side of the ambassadors when the Queen orders "Sussex and Lester [to] place the ambassadours". The humanist substance of Elizabeth's multilingualism is reduced to a purely ceremonial function of civility where the Other is but a pretext for self-aggrandisement: the ambassadors are reified; the actual diplomatic conversation is rejected offstage and the action centred on the domestic plot. Although the script says that they are talking, we have no evidence of an actual audible performance of a multilingual conversation. This final set-up betrays a problematic distancing of the audience from the linguistic Other, as well as heralding the decline of Latin as spoken diplomatic *lingua franca*, because the Latin is eventually unheard in this scene.[64]

What emerges in this dramatisation of Ascham's account of Elizabeth's diplomatic multilingualism is the same impression of an England-led concord as well as an assertive display of power gain. In terms of the mirror offered to the newly crowned James I, the Elizabethan model aiming to balance strength and cooperation is remarkably difficult to sustain. The scene's reliance on non-verbal or barely heard yet physical performance of the diplomatic multilingual conversation emphasises the tension at the heart of diplomacy. It showcases the simultaneous need for secrecy or discretion and visual accountability, neither being the new ruler's strongest points. The various expressions of diplomatic multilingualism in both scenes emphasise the necessary measure as well as strength required for such diplomacy to generate the momentary concord achieved in scene 13. However, as the play ends on the preparation for the Spanish invasion, Heywood's staged diplomatic multilingualism is reconfigured as an anxiety over subjugation both on the domestic and international levels. Although the diplomatic representation in Heywood's play clearly avoids including the Spanish, its ending, which showcases Drake's victory over the Armada, and the play's ambivalent multilingualism shed a light on the defiant reception of the London treaty and the discordant views between the new monarch (James VI/I) and his parliament over Spain.

Conclusion

In 1612, in his *Apology for Actors*, Thomas Heywood pleaded for the political function of theatre. He recalled the classical tradition of training ambassadors to speak in character (progymnasmata) to "embolden them in the delivery of any forraine embassy".[65] It testifies to Heywood's acquaintance with the articulation of language, diplomacy and the education of ambassadors as actors, but it also suggests that the diplomatic scenes from *If you know not me, part 2* dramatise the lesser-known world of ambassadors and test the possibility of a cooperative language culture. These scenes aim to bring the diplomatic perspective to a

---

[63] There are other instances in the play referring to communication through "dumb" signs (scenes 10, 11, 12).
[64] We could compare this with the removal of Latin phrases in subsequent reprints of Jean Hotman's *The Ambassador*.
[65] Thomas Heywood, *Apology for Actors*, London, 1612, C3.

<108>

wider, sometimes multilingual, audience and lead them to experience a political form of otherness. It might also serve as a useful mirror to the foreign ambassadors who discovered thus the English language culture as vehicle for the nation's geopolitical ambitions.

Multilingualism and its direct or symbolic performance in a diplomatic context means creating a spatial and/or aural onstage third space. Multilingualism and its stage expressions are the means to coalesce different entities to invent, albeit momentarily, a new common identity. However, dramatised multilingualism also remains a verbal and spatial locus aiming to keep the other at a defiant distance. This diplomacy remains decidedly ambivalent, failing to delineate an operational articulation between the domestic and foreign, between a measured adversity and a realistic cooperation. The dramatisation of the language of the Other in scenes featuring foreign ambassadors testifies to the constant hesitation between an absorptive identity in constant flux and evolution, and a defiant territorialisation that leads to a dangerous silencing of otherness.

<109>