English Historical Linguistics

HSK 34.2

Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikations- wissenschaft

Handbooks of Linguistics
and Communication Science

Manuels de linguistique et
des sciences de communication

Mitbegründet von Gerold Ungeheuer (†)
Mitherausgegeben 1985–2001 von Hugo Steger

Herausgegeben von / Edited by / Edités par
Herbert Ernst Wiegand

Band 34.2

De Gruyter Mouton

English Historical Linguistics

An International Handbook

Edited by

Alexander Bergs
Laurel J. Brinton

Volume 2

De Gruyter Mouton

Contents

Volume 2

IX. Resources

X.   Interdisciplinarity and Historiography

XI.   History of English Historical Linguistics

XII. New Perspectives, Theories and Methods

XV.   Second-Language Varieties

Volume I

I.   Periods

II.   Linguistic Levels

III.   Old English

IV. Middle English

V. Early Modern English

VI. Late Modern English

VII. Standardization

VIII. English and the Media

Preface to the *Handbook of English Historical Linguistics*

The study of the English language has a lengthy history. The second half of the 18th century saw a phenomenal increase in the number of published grammars of the vernacular language, while the field of comparative linguistics arising in the 19th century was concerned in large part with the Germanic languages, including English. However, it is in the field of theoretical linguistics that English has played a truly central role. While there are no reliable statistics, it seems safe to say that the majority of studies in contemporary linguistics deal at least in part with English, and are also written in English.

During the 20th century, monumental works concerned with the English language, both synchronic and diachronic, were produced, following historical/comparative and more contemporary linguistic approaches. In keeping with developments in the field of general linguistics, today it is possible to find descriptions and analyses of the history and development of English from virtually any linguistic perspective: external, internal, generative, functional, sociolinguistic, pragmatic, comparative, phonological, morphological, syntactic, lexical, semantic. There are numerous "Histories of English" to cater to just about every (theoretical) taste, as well as detailed descriptions of historical periods, language levels, or theoretical frameworks of English and specialized studies of individual topics in the development of the language. Work on the history of English has culminated most recently in the six-volume *Cambridge History of the English Language*, edited by Richard M. Hogg (1992–2001).

Study of the history of any language begins with its texts. Increasingly, however, scholars are turning to dictionaries and corpora of English that are available online or electronically. The pioneer historical corpus of English, the *Helsinki Corpus of English Texts*, was first released to scholars in 1991. The third edition of the *Oxford English Dictionary* online is now fully integrated with the *Historical Thesaurus*. The searchable *Middle English Dictionary*, completed in 2003, is available online along with the *Corpus of Middle English Prose and Verse*. The *Dictionary of Old English Web Corpus* is also searchable online. ARCHER, *A Representative Corpus of Historical English Registers 1650–1990*, accessible at a number of universities, provides a balanced selection of historical texts in electronic form. COHA, a 400-million-word, balanced *Corpus of Historical American English 1810–2009*, was launched online in 2010. Smaller corpora, such as the *Corpus of English Dialogues 1560–1760*, the *Lampeter Corpus of Early Modern English Tracts*, the *Corpus of Early English Correspondence,* the *Corpus of Early English Medical Writing*, and the *Old Bailey Corpus*, have made more specialized corpora available to scholars. Archives of historical newspapers online, including the *Zurich English Newspaper Corpus*, provide another source of electronic data. Finally, syntactically annotated corpora for historical stages of English are being produced, including the *The York-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Poetry*, *The York-Toronto-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Prose*, *The Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Middle English*, and *The Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Early Modern English.*

Taking into account the important developments in the study of English effected by the availability of electronic corpora, this *Handbook of English Historical Linguistics* offers a comprehensive, interdisciplinary, and theory-neutral synopsis of the field. It is meant to facilitate research by offering overviews of all the relevant aspects of the historical linguistics of English and by referring scholars and students to more in-depth coverage. The handbook is intended primarily for researchers in the field of (historical) linguistics generally, as well as for researchers in allied fields (such as history, literature, and culture). The handbook comprises two volumes, each volume consisting of approximately 70 articles written by a wide variety of authors from a number of different countries world-wide, representing a variety of theoretical approaches, and including both younger scholars as well as more established experts.

Volumes 1 and 2

The sequencing of material in the two volumes of the *Handbook of English Historical Linguistics* is bottom-up, beginning with detailed studies of the periods, levels, and linguistic components of each period. The second volume moves to a higher level, with a focus on general underlying concepts, theories, and methods as well as new and hitherto rather neglected approaches to the history of English. While the two volumes form a set, with cross-reference as far as possible in order to facilitate reader-guidance, they are also capable of standing alone.

Following this essentially inductive approach, then, the first volume (edited by Laurel J. Brinton) is focused on the details of English language history. After overviews of the recognized periods of English (Section I), the volume then treats the linguistic levels. These are broadly understood to include newer components such as prosody, pragmatics, phraseology, discourse, styles, registers, and text types as well as more traditional areas such as orthography and onomastics in addition to the fully acknowledged areas of phonology, morphology, syntax, and semantics (Section II). These summaries will be useful both to students and to those not working directly in the field of English historical linguistics, such as typologists. Sections III–VI contain detailed descriptions of the different periods – Old English, Middle English, Early Modern English, and Late Modern English – in respect to the range of linguistic levels; discussions of language contact, standardization, sociolinguistics, and literary language are included for most periods. Moreover, for each period, selected important phenomena (such as the development of *do*-periphrasis, the Great Vowel Shift, pronoun usage, or relativization) have been chosen for more detailed study. Following the treatment of the different periods, the volume addresses a variety of questions of standardization (Section VII), such as the effects that dictionaries, the Bible, language attitudes, and codifiers have on normalizing the language. The last section (VIII) brings the handbook into the 21st century by treating the effects of new media (radio, television, computer) on forms of the language, as well as the longer established effects of newspapers.

The second volume (edited by Alexander Bergs) then abstracts away from these details and moves outward to address theoretical concerns raised by the topics covered in Volume 1. Volume 2 first surveys resources for the studying and teaching of English (Section IX). Section X on interdisciplinarity (in particular literature and music) and historiography explores some of the debates involved in writing a history of English, questioning, for example, how the continuum of history is divided into accepted

"periods", how oral and written forms of the language are accommodated in a history of English, and how new and perhaps "alternative histories" relate to the more established stories. This is followed by a history of the discipline of English historical linguistics itself, as it has developed in different parts of the world (Section XI). A significant part of Volume 2 covers changes in the English language as they have been theorized in various linguistic fields in the 20th century (Section XII). As Neogrammarian and Structuralist approaches are, to a great extent, embodied in the treatment of topics in Volume 1, this volume begins with later 20th century theories, including Generative Grammar, Construction Grammar, Lexical Functional Grammar, Rates of Change, Frequency, Lexical Diffusion, Grammaticalization, Lexicalization, and Language Acquisition. Related to the theoretical perspectives are new approaches which have been developed in the analysis of the history of English, including Historical Dialectology, Historical Sociolinguistics, Historical Pragmatics, Corpus Linguistics, Information Structuring, and Actuation/Change from Below. Another important aspect of Volume 2 is its focus on the effects of language contact and the often neglected history of different varieties of English. It offers a section on language contact in the history of English, organized by contact languages, and supplemented by discussions of pidginization and creolization in the history of English and its varieties (Section XIII). Section XIV comprises historical sketches of more than ten varieties of English, and complementary theoretical discussions of dialect contact, diffusion, and supra-regionalization. The history of several second-language varieties is treated in Section XV, ending with a discussion of Global English.

The beginning of a new millennium seems the right time for taking stock of the long span of scholarship in English historical linguistics and for surveying the field as a whole. Furthermore, the availability of electronic resources has changed the study of the history of English in fundamental ways, and it is important that a new handbook recognize this turning point in the study of English.

Laurel J. Brinton, Vancouver (Canada)
Alexander Bergs, Osnabrück (Germany)

Acknowledgments

Foremost, the editors wish to thank the nearly 150 experts in English historical linguistics worldwide who contributed chapters, without whom these volumes would not exist. We are particularly grateful to those who wrote two chapters or who stepped in to fill gaps that arose late in the process of assembling the contributions.

We would also like to thank our Advisory Board – Cynthia Allen, Merja Kytö, Donka Minkova, and Elizabeth Closs Traugott – who gave us invaluable advice in the initial stages of this project. Thanks too to Anne Curzan, who helped in the planning stages.

Our student assistants provided invaluable assistance in the editing stage: Slade Stolar and Martin McCarvill of the University of British Columbia; Jens Bonk, Lisa Gratzke, Barbara Hagenbrock, Claudia Kömmelt, Mona Matzke, Meike Pentrel, and Lena Probst of the University of Osnabrück.

At De Gruyter Mouton, we are grateful to former Publishing Director Anke Beck for inviting us to develop this project and to Uri Tadmor to seeing it to completions, to Barbara Karlson for her encouragement, patience, gentle prodding, and expert guidance, and to Ulrike Swientek for her production expertise. For her keen eye and soft touch in copy-editing, we are most appreciative of Catherine Every (of EveryWord), and for her meticulous indexing, we thank Vicki Low (of Scholar's Cap).

We extend our gratitude to all of the following scholars, who generously contributed their time and expertise in serving as referees for the articles contained in these volumes. Some went well beyond the call of duty and reviewed more than one article or both wrote and reviewed an article:

Sylvia Adamson
John Algeo
Ulrike Altendorf
Leslie K. Arnovick
Richard Bailey
Jóhanna Barðdal
Joan Bresnan
Derek Britton
Ulrich Busse
Joan Bybee
Deborah Cameron
Ruth Carroll
Jack Chambers
Claudia Claridge
Eve Clark
Sandra Clarke
Richard Coates
Juan Camilo Conde-Silvestre
John Considine
Nikolas Coupland

Jonathan Culpeper
Hubert Cuyckens
Mary Catherine Davidson
Hendrik De Smet
Dagmar Deuber
Hans-Jürgen Diller
Stefan Dollinger
Bridget Drinka
Edwin Duncan
Stefan Evert
Edward Finegan
Olga Fischer
Susan Fitzmaurice
Robert Fulk
Heinz Giegerich
Eugene Green
Peter Grund
Trinidad Guzmán González
Martina Häcker
Antonette diPaolo Healey

In memoriam

We commemorate those friends and colleagues who passed away since this project came into being. Without them, English historical linguistics will not be the same: Richard Bailey, Derek Britton, and Richard Hogg.

General abbreviations

ACC	accusative case
ACT	active
ADJ	adjective
ADV	adverb
AN	Anglo-Norman
Angl.	Anglian
AUX	auxiliary
AP	adjective phrase
C	consonant
C	complementizer
COMPR	comparative
DAT	dative case
CP	complementizer phrase
DEM	demonstrative
DM	discourse marker
DU	dual
EModE	Early Modern English
EWSax.	Early West Saxon
FEM	feminine
Fr.	French
GEN	genitive case
Ger.	German
Gk.	Greek
Go.	Gothic
Grmc.	Germanic
IE	Indo-European
IMP	imperative
IND	indicative
INF	infinitive
INFL	inflected
INSTR	instrumental case
IP	inflection phrase
Kent.	Kentish
Lt.	Latin
LModE	Late Modern English
LWSax.	Late West Saxon
MASC	masculine
ME	Middle English
MED	*Middle English Dictionary*
ModE	Modern English
NEG	negative
NEUT	neuter

N	noun
NOM	nominative case
NP	noun phrase
O	object
OBJ	objective case
OE	Old English
OED	*Oxford English Dictionary*
OFr.	Old French
OFris.	Old Frisian
OHG	Old High German
ON	Old Norse
OSax.	Old Saxon
OV	object-verb word order
P	person
PASS	passive
PAST	past
PDE	Present-day English
PGrmc.	Proto-Germanic
PIE	Proto-Indo-European
PL	plural
PP	prepositional phrase
PREP	preposition
PRON	pronoun
PRTC	participle
PRES	present
PRET	preterit
S	subject
SG	singular
SUBJ	subjunctive mood
SUP	superlative
SOV	subject-object-verb word order
SV	subject-verb word order
SVO	subject-verb-object word order
SVX	subject-verb-other parts of sentence word order
T	tense
THM	thematic vowel
TMA	tense-modality-aspect
TVX	topic-verb-other parts of sentence word order
V	verb
V2	verb second
V	vowel
VO	verb-object word order
VP	verb phrase
WGrmc.	West Germanic
WSax.	West Saxon
XP	variable phrase
XSV	others parts of sentence-subject-verb word order

XVS   other parts of sentence-verb-subject word order
\>   changes to, becomes
\<   derives from
Ø   no ending
*   reconstructed form, ungrammatical form
< >   spelling

IX. Resources

71. Resources: Early textual resources

Abstract

This introduction to the resources available for the history of English focuses on the nature of the evidence and the difficulties associated with individual text types. The chapter focuses on the Old and Middle English periods which perhaps pose the greatest challenge to those who are not specialists in these areas. An overview of the resources available for the early periods highlights general problems in terms of uneven diatopic and diachronic coverage, the uncertainties of dating and localization, together with broader issues relating to manuscript production and scribal practice. Topics surveyed include (for the Anglo-Saxon period) runic and non-runic inscriptions, place- and personal-names, glosses and glossaries, charters, and literary texts. Sections include a discussion of each text type with relevant bibliography, together with consideration of the principles underpinning their study. Texts surviving from the early Middle English period are similarly assessed in terms of their value for the historical study of English, as are selected resources for later Middle English. There is emphasis throughout on methodology and the importance of primary research.

1 The corpus

The corpus of Old English is comparatively small (under 3,000,000 word tokens). This manageable size permits full concordancing, and a fully searchable version has been available online (http://www.doe.utoronto.ca/index.html) from 1997 as part of the *Dictionary of Old English* project (DOE) (Cameron et al. [eds.] 1986–) essentially replacing the microfiche versions of 1980 and 1985 (high-frequency words). The importance of this resource to the study of Old English cannot be overestimated. The historical linguist working with the corpus, however, needs to be aware of certain issues relating to its production.

A potential problem concerns the treatment of variant texts. As Koopman (1992: 607) observes, there is some inconsistency in the inclusion of texts that appear in more than one version: thus only one version of Bede, but two of the Alfredian translation of Gregory the Great's *Dialogues*. Lexical variants are generally supplied, but only occasionally syntactic, morphological or phonological variants; this is unsurprising

given the origins of this resource as a by-product of the Dictionary project, but does mean that the concordance, while comprehensive, is incomplete. A futher concern of relevance here, noted by Jenkyns (1991: 385) is the DOE policy of expanding abbreviations silently. Other issues relate to the varying quality of the editions used as base texts: it turned out not to be practical to undertake the level of checking of editions against manuscripts initially proposed; reviewers have also noted some lapses in recording editorial emendations. However, the DOE policy of checking dictionary citations against editions means that the Corpus undergoes continual refinement as the Dictionary itself progresses.

The corpus of Old English may not be extensive, but there exists a considerable variety of text types. The range is well summarized by DOE's editor, Antonette diPaolo Healey:

> The body of surviving Old English texts encompasses a rich diversity of records written on parchment, carved in stone and inscribed in jewelry. These texts fall into several categories: prose, poetry, glosses to Latin texts and inscriptions. In the prose in particular, there is a wide range of texts: saints' lives, sermons, biblical translations, penitential writings, laws, charters and wills, records (of manumissions, land grants, land sales, land surveys), chronicles, a set of tables for computing the moveable feasts of the Church calendar and for astrological calculations, medical texts, prognostics (the Anglo-Saxon equivalent of the horoscope), charms (such as those for a toothache or for an easy labour), and even cryptograms. (http://www.doe.utoronto.ca/about.html [last accessed 17 May 2011])

Some historical linguists appear to assume that one text is broadly equivalent to another in terms of the evidence it supplies; texts are too frequently mined for individual forms generally without discussion of their status, value or circumstances relating to their production; the tendency to take such shortcuts is no doubt exacerbated by the way in which online search engines present their results. Further sections in this chapter elaborate on some of the issues relating to individual text types and their study.

2 Dialect materials and methodology

Old English dialectology as a discipline is compromised by the fact that diatopic investigation is hampered by the patchy survival of texts and their diachronic diversity. Crowley's summary of the situation makes for depressing reading in this regard:

> There is no evidence for Northumbrian of the ninth century and the early tenth; for Mercian before c.750, or of the later two thirds of the eleventh century; for Kentish before c.800 and after c.1000; and for West Saxon before c.850. Relatively few witnesses date before 950. Those that do are quite important, because texts after 950 are usually affected by the standard Late West Saxon literary language. (Crowley 1986: 103)

Crowley here references the four traditionally-assigned distinct dialect areas for which linguistic materials survive: Northumbrian, Mercian, West Saxon, and Kentish. Such divisions stem from political structures deriving ultimately from the Anglo-Saxon heptarchy. This approach is conceptually flawed because, as Hogg (1988; 1992: 4) has importantly observed, the texts that survive are to be associated not with such political but rather ecclesiastical structures. He proposes (Hogg 1992: 4) instead an alternate

classification based on dioceses, although does not adopt this taxonomy in his own work. There is much, however, to commend such an approach (or one broadly similar to it) not least because it coheres better with modern dialectological theory such as that which informs *The Linguistic Atlas of Late Mediaeval English* (LALME) (McIntosh et al. 1986) and *The Linguistic Atlas of Early Middle English* (LAEME) (Laing and Lass 2007) – see Williamson, Chapter 91.

The study of Old English dialectology has developed in an altogether strange way: as a whole and in general, Old English has a limited, defined, and accessible corpus, but the basic groundwork required to establish dialectal witnesses appears not to have been undertaken or at least is nowhere set out adequately or in full. This has hampered not just phonology but also word-geographical studies (see Kastovsky 1992: 338). There is nothing, therefore, that corresponds either to volume 1 of LALME (McIntosh et al. 1986) or Laing 1993, despite the fundamental nature of these works.

For example, no consensus exists as to what constitutes even the basic witnesses of non West-Saxon dialects, in particular Kentish and Mercian. The texts highlighted by Crowley (1986: 102) as "substantial, fairly well dated and localized, and linguistically consistent" (a phrase replete with difficulties) for these dialect areas are, for Mercian, two charters and, for Kentish, nothing. This statement is at variance with the source material identified by both Campbell (1959) and Hogg (1992), although they are not in full agreement either. Behind these discrepancies lie serious issues relating to matters of transmission, status, and localization which are of great consequence to, but too often overlooked by, the linguistic historian. In consequence, historical linguists working in this period tend endlessly to redeploy examples derived from Campbell and Hogg, or, at best, use only a small subset of source material potentially available to them.

3 Kentish: a case study

The case study of Kentish demonstrates some of the difficulties with preliminary assessment of the material. In terms of charters, the small number of differences between Hogg's (1992) and Campbell's (1959) lists is largely due to the inclusion or omission of early (pre 9th-century) charters, written in Latin, and which therefore only include names. Hogg does not formally list such texts, although does adduce onomastic evidence in his grammar. For Crowley (1986: 101), such evidence is "non-textual" and therefore not considered primary. Both Hogg and Campbell list the later (10th-century) material surviving in MS BL Cotton Vespasian D. vi (comprising the texts short-titled as KtHy, KtPs and CollGl 13). Only Campbell makes it clear that these three texts appear in the same manuscript, but does not explain that only the two poetic texts (KtHy, KtPs) are in the same hand. Both Hogg and Campbell note that the language of the texts is mixed which accounts for their omission from Crowley.

In fact, neither Hogg nor Campbell has done justice to the charter material surviving from Kent. Lowe (2001) lists a series of ten single-sheet charters from Kentish charters written in English, 14 Latin diplomas with some significant element of English (generally in the shape of boundary clauses) and 42 Latin diplomas. Most of these contain only place- or personal names, but a few additionally feature some contemporary (or near-contemporary) vernacular endorsements. As a whole, the material amounts to well in excess of four thousand words, and should form the basis of serious future study into the dialect. Similar work needs to be undertaken for other varieties of Old English.

4 Charters

Campbell, working in 1959, assembled his corpus of pre-10th-century charters from Sweet (1885), and it seems as though Hogg (1992) essentially followed suit, despite the publication in the meantime of Sawyer (1968), which has revolutionized charter study. Now available in revised and updated form online, the "electronic Sawyer" (eSawyer, see http://www.esawyer.org.uk/) lists each charter, together with information about the manuscript(s) in which it is preserved, the monastic archive it belongs to, and a summary of scholarly opinion. The bibliography is strong on historical and palaeographical information, rather less so on linguistic work. The most recent items currently date to 2007; more up-to-date bibliography may be found by consulting the relevant sections in the journal *Anglo-Saxon England*. Most vernacular charters have been reliably edited by Harmer (1914; [1952] 1989), Whitelock (1930) and Robertson ([1939] 1956). The ongoing British Academy/Royal Society Anglo-Saxon Charters project (since 1968) seeks to reedit the entire corpus (which numbers over 1,500 complete texts) of charters on an archive-by-archive basis with full commentary. To date, 14 volumes have appeared. For the others, one is still obliged to rely on the 19th-century scholarship of Thorpe (1865), Earle (1888), Kemble (1839–48) and Birch (1885–99). These texts (particularly those of the first three) need to be used with caution; Kemble, for example, sporadically normalized texts which do not survive in contemporary form.

A trawl through eSawyer reveals that under a fifth of charters survive in anything like their original form; the rest are preserved in cartularies (mostly dating from the 13th through to the 15th centuries) or in antiquarian transcripts. Although many of the single sheets are of known date and provenance and therefore seem to offer the tempting prospect of supplying a matrix of anchor texts, there is a limit to their value as evidence for several reasons. The first echoes the problem with the chronological and geographical spread observed in the Old English corpus at large. Very few charters survive from northern archives, for example, and the majority of pre-10th-century charters are from Kent making comparison between varieties problematic. Palaeography is an inexact science which can at best add only general support to external evidence for dating. Thus a palaeographer can only confirm whether the script of a particular charter is in her or his opinion broadly consonant with its given date or dating range (see further Lowe 2005) and in general there is insufficient material to permit the dating of a particular script more closely than to within around three decades. This precludes attempts to identify phonological trends and developments on a timescale shorter than this.

4.1 Charter boundary clauses

It seems to have been normal practice to include vernacular bounds in diplomas from the beginning of the 10th century (Lowe 1998: 74); before then some single-sheet (i.e. those existing in contemporary or near-contemporary form) charters contain topographical terms in English housed within Latin prose. Boundary clauses offer considerable scope for linguistic research particularly from an onomastic, lexicological, and word-geographical approach, and important work has been undertaken in this area by Peter Kitson (1995, 2004). The phonological value of these texts is, however, likely compromised by the centralization of diploma production from the 930s, after which such

clauses, originally compiled locally, were recopied into the diploma by the main text scribe (Lowe 1998: 64–65). The helpful LangScape database (http://www.langscape.org.uk/index.html [last accessed 17 May 2011]) has recently opened this area to non-specialists. It presents fully-searchable transcriptions of boundary clauses (with variant texts) together with a variety of other search options (including indices of topographical terms, archive and manuscripts) with associated mapping.

4.2 Onomastics

Place- and personal name materials represent some of the most extensive evidence for periods where little else survives. Names in Bede are important witnesses to 8th-century Northumbrian, whereas the Domesday and Little Domesday surveys (the latter comprising circuit summaries of Essex, Norfolk, and Suffolk) represent aspects of the language (albeit viewed through the filter of foreign scribes using Latin spelling conventions) at the end of the 11th century. The value of names for the study of phonological development has often been questioned in vague and rather unhelpful terms (for example, "[t]here are difficulties in using the evidence of names too freely" [Hogg 1992: 5]). The clearest statement of their limitation as evidence is supplied by Clark:

> Once semantically emptied, names draw partly aloof from language at large. Although the phonological tendencies that affect them cannot be alien to those bearing on common vocabulary, the loss of denotation allows development to be freer, with compounds obscured and elements blurred and merged earlier and more thoroughly than in analogous "meaningful" forms. Sound-developments seen in names may therefore antedate or exceed in scope those operating elsewhere in the language; and this makes any use of name-material for study of general or dialectal phonology an exercise requiring caution. (Clark 1992: 453)

Important, however, is the point Clark makes here that names will not operate under a set of phonological rules entirely different from that which affects other vocabulary. It is clear that the value of names as evidence will depend entirely on their context, on the conditions and circumstances that gave rise to their transmission, and a case needs to be made for their use on a source-by-source basis; no shortcuts or easy generalizations can be made.

Place-name elements offer us insights into the lexis of the quotidian as a necessary corollary to the specialized poetic vocabulary of better-studied Old English texts. Personal names also, importantly, allow us to compare naming practices across the social scale, from those of kings and ealdormen, through thegns and reeves to lesser farm workers and slaves.

4.3 Editions and manuscripts

Editions naturally vary considerably in terms of the level of detail they preserve from the manuscripts; it is always worth paying attention to the section on editorial conventions in any given edition and, if it is unclear or none exists, drawing appropriate conclusions. Certain series draw up guidelines for their editors to ensure that similar methods are employed throughout. It is surprisingly rare, even in scholarly editions, for the expansion of abbreviations to be signalled, and the majority of Old English

texts are punctuated in accordance with modern conventions. It is also worth attempt-ing to establish the principal audience of a given edition; certain editorial decisions (for example, the inclusion or exclusion of variant readings, emendations and so on) that seem surprising to linguists and render the result unserviceable will be entirely accept-able, even welcomed, in other disciplines. By way of (extreme) example, the crowning glory of the series *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. A Collaborative Edition*, containing meticulously-edited texts of the separate manuscripts of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, will be, if we are to believe one of the general editors, "reconstructed texts of the several text-historically defined stages of development of the Chronicle" (Dumville 1994: 48). It seems that these composite texts will be presented in the language of one of the main manuscript witnesses: quite how this will be accomplished for those passages which do not appear in the selected base text is not revealed. This reveals the gulf that exists between the needs and requirements of two separate academic constituencies who nevertheless share many of the same texts.

Manuscripts written mostly or entirely in Old English before c.1200 are catalogued in Ker (1957 with additions 1977 incorporated as an appendix to the reissue of 1990). This seminal work is now supplemented by Gneuss (2001; additions 2003).

4.4 Glosses, glossaries, and texts derived from Latin

Glossed material is perhaps the most under-utilized source of linguistic evidence in pre-Conquest England. Some, of course, is well known to and heavily exploited by linguists: in particular, glosses in the *Vespasian Psalter*, the *Durham Ritual*, *Rushworth* and *Lindisfarne Gospels* provide much of our evidence for Mercian and Northumbrian. There are celebrated glossaries, too, which are mined in much the same way: the *Épinal,* the *Erfurt* and the *Corpus Glossary*, again for Mercian. Lexical glosses have been collected and many published; it is of course important to signal words which appear only in glosses as the *Thesaurus of Old English* (Roberts and Kay 2000) and DOE (Cameron et al. [eds.] 1986–) do. It is important to investigate the transmission and interdependence of manuscripts when assessing and attempting to explain this material, and no justice can be done in print to the complexities of a typical glossed page, as Page (1992) effectively demonstrates.

Far less well explored than the lexical glosses are the syntactical glosses, a topic best treated by Robinson (1973) who argues persuasively for their importance:

> Syntactical glossing offers a source of evidence about Old English word-order quite differ-ent from any of the evidence used by syntacticians up to now, and it is possible that further study will show this glossing to be a uniquely valuable witness to functional word-order in Old English. Unlike the prose texts, which invariably have at least some literary preten-sions, the sequential syntactical marks would seem to be designed to signal straightforward Old English word-order uncomplicated by any distortions or irregularities for the sake of stylistic effect… It has been observed that when an Old English translator is confronted by a complicated Latin sentence with interlocking clauses he will often take the easy way of breaking the thought down into two or more simple Old English sentences, even though the vernacular is known to have been capable of hypotactic as well as paratactic construc-tions. The conditions of syntactical glossing do not permit such evasions, and so they offer a richer variety of sentence types and sentence lengths than do some of the more pedestrian prose translations in Old English. (Robinson 1973: 471–472)

This statement is reproduced at length here because it makes the important and under-acknowledged point that much Old English literature is derived directly or indirectly from Latin sources. As Mitchell (1985: i. lxi) wisely says "[w]e therefore have to study Latin loan syntax". In his conclusion, Mitchell (1985: ii. 1006–1007) identifies Latin influence on Old English syntax and syntactical glossing as two of several topics particularly worth investigation. Over twenty years on, little progress has been made in these areas.

It is remarkable that Mitchell (1985: i. lxiv) produced his monumental work without access to the DOE microfiche concordance, the first volume of which was issued only when his work was in its final draft. More recent work in this area has undoubtedly profited from the online corpus, despite the reservations expressed by Koopman (1992). Relevant bibliography is collected and annotated by Mitchell (1990; Mitchell and Irvine 1992) and then at intervals (Mitchell and Irvine 1996, 2002, 2006).

4.5 Runes, coins, and inscriptions

Crowley considers the evidence supplied by coins, inscriptions, and names in general as "supplementary" (with the apparent exception of the inscriptions on the Ruthwell Cross and Auzon (Franks) Casket), and this option seems largely to be shared, although perhaps less baldly stated, by the grammarians. The value of coinage to Old English phonology has been highlighted by scholars such as Fran Colman (1991, 1996) and Jayne Carroll (2010; Carroll and Parsons 2007). Here the ongoing *Sylloge of Coins of the British Isles* (since 1958) is of the utmost importance, separate volumes of which may be consulted in conjunction with the searchable SCBI electronic database (http://www-cm.fitzmuseum.cam.ac.uk/coins/emc/emc_search.php, last accessed 29 January 2012). Non-runic inscriptions have been collected and edited by Elisabeth Okasha (1971 with three supplements 1982, 1992, 2004).

A corpus of Anglo-Saxon runes remains a desideratum, although a project is ongoing at the University of Eichstätt to present the material in both paper and database form (see http://www1.ku-eichstaett.de/SLF/EngluVglSW/AeRunen.htm and http://www.runenprojekt.uni-kiel.de/, both last accessed 29 January 2012). Meanwhile, scholars will find the bibliographical listing of individual English runic inscriptions in Page ([1973] 1999) invaluable, supplemented by more recent volumes of *Anglo-Saxon England*: fresh finds are not uncommon.

Even more so than with manuscripts, matters concerning layout must be considered by the historical linguist and there is no substitute for looking at the inscription itself instead of simply its transcription or transliteration; peculiarities in orthography may well result from consideration of space or aesthetics. As inscriptions and runes can easily become abraded over time, antiquarian drawings of material, used with due caution, can be of considerable value.

5 Middle English

5.1 Early Middle English

The early Middle English period shares many of the same problems as the Old English period in terms of the comparative scarcity of sources. The materials available in

manuscripts dating from 1150 to 1350 are conveniently assembled in Laing (1993) with an admirably clear introduction as to method and selection criteria. This work, an essential research tool in its own right, was a necessary precursor to *A Linguistic Atlas of Early Medieval English 1150–1325* (Laing and Lass 2007), and should be read in conjunction with the online introduction to the project. There Laing makes the important point that, without the Second Continuation of the *Peterborough Chronicle*, the *terminus a quo* for the project would be c.1200 (Laing and Lass 2007: 1:4). Before then survive a few charters from the reigns of William I (now re-edited by Bates 1998), William II, Henry I and Stephen catalogued in Pelteret (1990), the *Peterborough Chronicle* with its First and Second Continuations (Irvine 2004; Clark [1958] 1970), some post-Conquest memoranda of uncertain date, and Domesday Book.

5.2   *A Linguistic Atlas of Early Medieval English* (LAEME)

Laing (1993: 3) distinguishes in her Catalogue between texts created during the period and those that are copies of Old English texts; research shows that, with a few notable exceptions, post-Conquest scribes are timid when faced with Old English material and tend in the main (especially as the period progresses) to duplicate what they see (or think they see) in front of them (see Laing 1991; Lowe 2008). This makes the use of these charters as "anchor" texts difficult, and the paucity of freshly-composed documentary materials exacerbates the problem. Careful manuscript study has allowed Laing to ascribe an small additional number of literary texts to specific areas with varying degrees of certainty; her work emphasizes the importance of paying attention to the broader manuscript context in which an individual text appears.

LAEME (Laing and Lass 2007) rejects the questionnaire method of analyzing texts employed for LALME (McIntosh et al. 1986); instead the texts are lexico-grammatically tagged. Particular care has been taken to disentangle distinct scribal contributions. The decision as to whether to tag a text in its entirety was not made purely on the basis of its length, but rather on a number of factors including significance, the nature of the scribal language and other "interpretative complexities" (Laing and Lass 2007: 2.1 3:6). Time constraints led to more restrictive sampling than originally intended: it is important to recognize that the corpus is not, and is not intended to be, fully comprehensive. Nevertheless, it consists of 650,000 fully tagged words which are searchable in a variety of ways: as a research tool for the study of orthography, phonology and morphology of the period it is therefore unparalleled. A specific advantage is that the texts were transcribed diplomatically from the manuscript witnesses themselves importantly retaining consistency of practice across the corpus and a level of faithfulness to scribal usage (such as the retention of *wynn*, <v> and <u>) rarely encountered elsewhere.

A sister project of LAEME is the *Linguistic Atlas of Older Scots* project (Williamson 2007), LAOS, which uses the same tagging system for Older Scots texts. At present the database (version 1.1 at http://www.lel.ed.ac.uk/ihd/laos1/laos1.html [last accessed 17 May 2011]) covers mainly anchor texts dating 1380–1500, but will eventually extend across the entire period (1150–1700) considerably expanding the coverage in LALME.

5.3 Late Middle English: *A Linguistic Atlas of Late Mediaeval English* (LALME)

Over twenty years, LALME (McIntosh et al. 1986) continues to define and dominate the field of medieval dialectology, with many new projects built upon its achievements. Its usefulness is not restricted to dialectology: its list of sources justifiably claimed in 1986 to be the "largest and most comprehensive list of manuscripts containing Middle English yet published" (i. 39) and its localized texts form the basis of the ongoing Middle English Grammar Project which eventually aims to produce a reference grammar to replace Jordan's of 1925 (http://www.uis.no/research/culture/the_middle_english_grammar_project/ [last accessed 29 January 2012]). Thirty-five years in the making without benefit of electronic aids, with analysis of over a thousand manuscripts, and principally the work of just two scholars, LALME is bound to contain errors. What follows is derived from Benskin's (1991) response to Burton's (1991) review of LALME. Some inaccuracies exist in the southern (essentially south of the Wash area) survey, largely as a result of perceived time pressures and resultant scanning. The questionnaire required refinement and supplementation as the project progressed, producing unevenness in the early analyses in the southern survey and omission of some relevant features. These and other issues are addressed in the project funded by the Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC) for eLALME (2007–10) which will make the materials freely available online with the exciting addition of powerful interactive mapping functionality.

There are wider methodological issues. LALME's authors were well aware themselves of the deficiencies of the questionnaire approach to interrogation of the data, quoting Gilliéron's (1915: 45) trenchant observation that "L'établissement du questionnaire […] pour être sensiblement meilleur, aurait dû être fait après l'enquête". As Laing and Lass (2007: 1:8) additionally observe, different types of text may well not include examples of particular items: "For instance, a past tense narrative may not have examples of items that elicit present tense verb morphology, while instruction manuals may not have examples of those that elicit past tenses". Short texts are less likely to exhibit the full range of forms, and specific genres (such as the all-important documentary texts) may have a limited range of vocabulary items of those identified as displaying dialectally-conditioned variation. In consequence, some Linguistic Profiles are at best sketchy, but the number of texts analyzed and the strength of diatopic coverage compensates for this. LALME's 280-item checklist is still routinely used by scholars from all disciplines to reach preliminary conclusions about the dialect of a particular text.

5.4 The *Middle English Dictionary* (MED) and Compendium

The first fascicle of the print MED was published in 1952, and the last in 1991. Its achievement is extraordinary, but its long genesis inevitably resulted in some changes in editorial focus and inconsistencies. These are discussed by Blake (2002) whose article should be read alongside the *MED's Plan and Bibliography* (Kurath 1954) and *Supplement I* (Kurath et al. 1985). Blake draws attention in particular to a rather ill-tempered exchange between MED editor Kurath and reviewer Visser concerning the omission of words (many from Barbour's *Bruce*) from the MED; this apparently was a deliberate decision because of the coterminous production of *Dictionary of the Older Scottish*

Tongue, but not one reported in the *Plan*, nor indeed it seems, implemented consistently in the dictionary itself.

For the majority of users, the print MED has been superseded by the rich textual resources of the online *Middle English Compendium* (McSparran 2002) with its searchable database, hyper-bibliography and a full-text corpus of Middle English prose and verse at present containing some fifty works. As its chief editor, Frances McSparran (2002: 130), notes, "[e]lectronic search mechanisms open up the whole of the dictionary and its 54,000-odd entries for complex searches, restricted by user-specified criteria such as date, manuscript, author, language of etymon, language associated with a field like law or medicine, etc.". The incorporation of LALME references to manuscript information allowing searches restricted by county is particularly useful. Such a powerful search engine is, however, not necessarily easy or intuitive to use, and the scholar new to the resource is advised to spend time working through the online help pages in order to make the most from it. It is important to remember that the MED itself has not been updated: although bibliographic references have been standardized, and revised datings implemented in order to facilitate searches, no attempt has been made to (for example) replace quotations from editions superseded during the course of the print publication.

6 Summary

The discussion above has sought to emphasize the recent developments in resources for this early period that together have the potential to revolutionize work in historical linguistics; this is an exciting time to be working in the field. It has also endeavored to demonstrate that what lies behind all of these corpora, grammars and dictionaries is a series of individual texts. We forget at our peril that (to adapt a phrase) *chaque texte a son histoire*. Each (and this goes as much for colloborative scholarly projects as for a runic inscription) must be interrogated in a way that is sensitive to the individual mechanics and manifold complexities of its production and history. Without this requisite spadework, we build our house on sand.

7 References

Bates, David. 1998. *Regesta Regum Anglo-Normannorum: The Acta of William I (1066–1087)*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Benskin, Michael. 1991. In reply to Dr Burton. *Leeds Studies in English* 22: 209–262.

Birch, Walter de Gray (ed.). 1885–99. *Cartularium Saxonicum: A Collection of Charters Relating to Anglo-Saxon History*, 3 vols. London: Whiting & Co.

Blake, Norman F. 2002. The early history of, and its impact upon, the Middle English Dictionary. *Dictionaries: Journal of the Dictionary Society of North America* 23: 48–75.

Burton, Thomas L. 1991. On the current state of Middle English dialectology. *Leeds Studies in English* 22: 167–208.

Cameron, Angus, Ashley Crandall Amos, Antonette diPaolo Healey et al. (eds.) 1986–. *Dictionary of Old English (DOE)*. University of Toronto. http://www.doe.utoronto.ca/about.html (last accessed 29 January 2012).

Campbell, Alistair. 1959. *Old English Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Carroll, Jayne and David N. Parsons. 2007. *Anglo-Saxon Mint-Names, I. Axbridge–Hythe*. Nottingham: English Place-Name Society.

Carroll, Jayne. 2010. Coins and the Chronicle: mint-signatures, history, and language. In: Alice Jorgensen (ed.), *Reading The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: Literature, History, Language*, 243–273. Turnhout: Brepols.

Clark, Cecily (ed.) [1958] 1970. *The Peterborough Chronicle 1070–1154*. 2nd edn. Oxford: Clarendon.

Clark, Cecily. 1992. Onomastics. In: Richard M. Hogg (ed.), *The Cambridge History of the English Language*. Vol. I. *The Beginnings to 1066*, 452–488. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Colman, Fran. 1991. *Money Talks: Reconstructing Old English*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Colman, Fran. 1996. Names will never hurt me. In: M. J. Toswell and E. M. Tyler (eds.), *'Doubt Wisely': Papers in Honour of E. G. Stanley*, 13–28. London: Routledge.

Crowley, Joseph P. 1986. The study of Old English dialects. *English Studies* 67: 97–112.

Dumville, David N. 1994. Editing Old English texts for historians and other troublemakers. In: Donald G. Scragg and Paul E. Szarmach (eds.), *The Editing of Old English: Papers from the 1990 Manchester Conference*, 45–52. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer.

Earle, John (ed.). 1888. *A Hand-Book to the Land-Charters, and Other Saxonic Documents*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Gilliéron, Jules. 1915. *Pathologie et thérapeutique verbales*. Bern: Beerstecher.

Gneuss, Helmut. 2001. *Handlist of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts: A List of Manuscripts and Manuscript Fragments Written or Owned in England up to 1100*. Tempe: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies.

Gneuss, Helmut. 2003. Addenda and corrigenda to the *Handlist of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts*. *Anglo-Saxon England* 32: 293–305.

Harmer, Florence E. (ed.). 1914. *Select English Historical Documents of the Ninth and Tenth Centuries*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Harmer, Florence E. (ed.) [1952] 1989. *Anglo-Saxon Writs*. 2nd edn. Paul Watkins: Stamford.

Hogg, Richard M. 1988. On the impossibility of Old English dialectology. In: Dieter Kastovsky and Gero Bauer (eds.), *Luick revisited: Papers read at the Luick-Symposium at Schloß Liechtenstein, 15–18 September 1985*, 183–203. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

Hogg, Richard M. 1992. *A Grammar of Old English*. Vol. 1: *Phonology*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Irvine, Susan (ed.). 2004. *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: A Collaborative Edition*. Vol. 7, MS. E. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer.

Jenkyns, Joy. 1991. The *Toronto Dictionary of Old English resources*: a user's view. *The Review of English Studies* 42: 380–416.

Kastovsky, Dieter. 1992. Semantics and vocabulary. In: Richard M. Hogg (ed.), *The Cambridge History of the English Language*. Vol. I. *The Beginnings to 1066*, 290–408. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kemble, John M (ed.). 1839–48. *Codex Diplomaticus Ævi Saxonici*. 6 vols. London: Sumptibus Societatis.

Ker, Neil R. 1957. *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. Reissued in 1990 with Ker. 1977 appended.

Ker, Neil R. 1977. Supplement to *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon*. *Anglo-Saxon England* 5: 121–131.

Kitson, Peter R. 1995. The nature of Old English dialect distributions, mainly as exhibited in charter boundaries. In: Jacek Fisiak (ed.), *Medieval Dialectology*, 43–135. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Kitson, Peter R. 2004. On margins of error in placing Old English literary dialects. In: Marina Dossena and Roger Lass (eds.), *Methods and Data in English Historical Dialectology*, 219–239. Bern: Peter Lang.

Koopman, Willem F. 1992. The study of Old English syntax and the Toronto Dictionary of Old English. *Neophilologus* 76: 605–615.

Kurath, Hans. 1954. *Middle English Dictionary: Plan and Bibliography*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Kurath, Hans et al. 1985. *Middle English Dictionary: Plan and Bibliography. Supplement I*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Laing, Margaret. 1991. Anchor texts and literary manuscripts in Early Middle English. In: Felicity Riddy (ed.), *Regionalism in Late Medieval Manuscripts and Texts*, 27–52. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer.

Laing, Margaret. 1993. *Catalogue of Sources for a Linguistic Atlas of Early Medieval English*. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer.

Laing, Margaret and Roger Lass. 2007. *A Linguistic Atlas of Early Middle English, 1150–1325* Edinburgh: The University of Edinburgh. http://www.lel.ed.ac.uk/ihd/laeme1/laeme1.html (last accessed 17 May 2011).

Lowe, Kathryn A. 1998. The development of the Anglo Saxon boundary clause. *Nomina* 21: 63–100.

Lowe, Kathryn A. 2001. On the plausibility of Old English dialectology: The ninth-century Kentish charter material. *Folia Linguistica Historica* 22: 136–170.

Lowe, Kathryn A. 2005. Paleography, Greek and Latin. In: Keith Brown (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*. 2nd edn. 14 vols. ix. 134–141. Oxford: Elsevier.

Lowe, Kathryn A. 2008. The Exchequer, the Chancery, and the Abbey of Bury St Edmunds: *Inspeximus* charters and their enrolments. *English Manuscript Studies* 14: 1–26.

McIntosh, Angus, Michael L. Samuels and Michael Benskin. 1986. *A Linguistic Atlas of Late Mediaeval English*. 4 vols. Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press.

McSparran, Frances. 2002. *The Middle English Compendium*: past, present, future. *Dictionaries: Journal of the Dictionary Society of North America* 23: 126–141.

Mitchell, Bruce. 1985. *Old English Syntax*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Mitchell, Bruce. 1990. *A Critical Bibliography of Old English Syntax to the End of 1984 Including Addenda and Corrigenda to* Old English Syntax. Oxford: Blackwell.

Mitchell, Bruce and Susan Irvine. 1992. A Critical Bibliography of Old English Syntax: supplement 1985–1988. *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 93: 1–53

Mitchell, Bruce and Susan Irvine. 1996. A Critical Bibliography of Old English Syntax: supplement 1989–1992. *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 97: 1–28.

Mitchell, Bruce and Susan Irvine. 2002. A Critical Bibliography of Old English Syntax: supplement 1993–1996. *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 103: 3–32.

Mitchell, Bruce and Susan Irvine. 2006. A Critical Bibliography of Old English Syntax: supplement 1997–2000. *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 107: 91–116.

Okasha, Elisabeth. 1971. *Hand-List of Anglo-Saxon Non-Runic Inscriptions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Okasha, Elisabeth. 1982. A supplement to *Hand-List of Anglo-Saxon Non-Runic Inscriptions*. *Anglo-Saxon England* 11: 83–118.

Okasha, Elisabeth. 1992. A second supplement to *Hand-List of Anglo-Saxon Non-Runic Inscriptions. Anglo-Saxon England* 21: 37–85.

Okasha, Elisabeth. 2004. A third supplement to *Hand-List of Anglo-Saxon Non-Runic Inscriptions. Anglo-Saxon England* 33: 225–281.

Page, Raymond I. 1992. On the feasibility of a corpus of Anglo-Saxon glosses: the view from the library. In: René Derolez (ed.), *Anglo-Saxon Glossography: Papers Read at the International Conference Brussels, 8 and 9 September 1986*, 77–95. Brussels: Paleis der Academien.

Page, Raymond I. [1973] 1999. *An Introduction to English Runes*. 2nd edn. Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer.

Pelteret, David A. E. 1990. *Catalogue of English Post-Conquest Vernacular Documents*. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press.

Roberts, Jane and Christian Kay. 2000. *A Thesaurus of Old English*. 2nd edn. 2 vols. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Robertson, Agnes J. (ed.) [1939] 1956. *Anglo-Saxon Charters*. 2nd edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Robinson, Fred C. 1973. Syntactical glosses in Latin manuscripts of Anglo-Saxon provenance. *Speculum* 48: 443–475.

Sawyer, Peter H. 1968. *Anglo-Saxon Charters: An Annotated List and Bibliography*. London: Offices of the Royal Historical Society. Revised and updated version: http://www.esawyer.org.uk/ (last accessed 17 May 2011).

Sweet, Henry (ed.). 1885. *The Oldest English Texts*. London: Oxford University Press.

Thorpe, Bernard (ed.). 1865. *Diplomatarium Anglicum Ævi Saxonici*. London: MacMillan & Co.

Whitelock, Dorothy (ed.). 1930. *Anglo-Saxon Wills*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Williamson, Keith. 2007. *A Linguistic Atlas of Older Scots, Phase 1: 1380-1500* (LAOS). http://www.lel.ed.ac.uk/ihd/laos1/laos1.html (last accessed 17 May 2011).

Kathryn A. Lowe, Glasgow (UK)

72. Resources: Electronic/online resources

Abstract

This chapter provides a brief survey of currently available and forthcoming electronic/ online resources that may be used for research in English language history. The focus of this compilation is on those electronic projects and resources that may be of particular interest to historical linguists; it omits those relating primarily to other disciplines, such as literary criticism or source study. It attempts to give mention to as many resources as possible, especially with regard to the most prominent historical dictionaries, thesauri, and corpora. A number of further projects and resources is presented and briefly characterized in order to give an impression of the wide range of material that is currently available. These include select projects dealing with specific aspects from various time periods, primary sources in the form of digitized manuscripts and electronic editions, and digital bibliographies, publications and discussion groups. Web addresses valid on 1 September 2010 are provided for all resources; references are given to representative and complementing printed publications. Some problems involving electronic material are also addressed.

1 Introduction

This chapter provides a brief survey of currently available and forthcoming electronic/ online resources that may be used for research in English language history; for a study of such resources intended for teaching purposes, see Busse, Chapter 76. For each

project, a web address is given which was valid on 1 September 2010. References to printed works on electronic material have been restricted both for reasons of space and since these become outdated rather quickly. Only some important and representative publications are mentioned which supplement the information found on the respective sites. The focus of this compilation is on those electronic projects and resources that may be of particular interest to historical linguists; it omits those relating primarily to other disciplines, such as literary criticism or source study. It has been attempted to give mention to as many resources as possible, especially with regard to the most prominent historical dictionaries, thesauri and corpora. However, not all of these could be included for reasons of space, in particular concerning the immense number of further projects and resources currently available on the World Wide Web. Whenever an online resource can be accessed without subscription this is indicated in the survey. All other websites as well as the CD-ROMs require a licence. For some corpora, mostly those hosted at the *Oxford Text Archive* (OTA) (http://ota.ahds.ac.uk/), this licence may be obtained free of charge. The representation of digital texts generally conforms to the standard of the *Text Encoding Initiative* (TEI) (http://www.tei-c.org/). Non-academic sites are usually excluded unless they make extensive use of scholarly material.

2 Surveys

Surveys on electronic resources become outdated rather quickly as new projects are started, ongoing projects are completed or abandoned, and even finished projects may be revised. For example, work on the Old English projects listed in Howe (2001: 501) and the historical corpora listed in Rissanen (2000: 14–16) has progressed significantly since. Moreover, internet resources do not necessarily remain on the same server. For this reason, printed studies such as Arista (1999) may contain a significant number of obsolete web addresses. The same problem may occur with regard to online link collections, which are usually freely accessible. For example, on 11 February 2009, Dan Mosser's *History of the English Language* page hosted at Virginia Tech (http://ebbs.english. vt.edu/hel/hel.html) stated that the last update occurred on 23 May 2005; out of the seventy links provided, no less than nineteen were no longer valid. Significantly, the site itself has been taken down since. It is therefore useful to check whether such collections are regularly maintained, as currently seen, for example, in the *Electronic Canterbury Tales* (http://www.kankedort.net/). There are also periodically updated and annotated lists, such as *Circolwyrde* (http://www.oenewsletter.org/OEN/links.php), a feature of the *Old English Newsletter*, which has provided the latest information on electronic resources for Anglo-Saxon studies on a yearly basis since 2004. With any luck, obsolete web addresses may still be accessible at the *Internet Archive: Wayback Machine* (http:// archive.org/web/web.php), which contains copies of more than 150 billion pages stored since 1996.

3 Dictionaries

The largest electronic dictionary project is concerned with the *Oxford English Dictionary* (OED) (http://www.oed.com/). The latest print version of this dictionary is the second edition (Murray et al. 1989–97); it has been digitized and can be searched on CD-ROM, currently in its version 4.0 (http://www.oup.co.uk/ep/cdroms/), which also

incorporates 7,000 additional entries not listed in printed form. There is no print version of the ongoing third edition, which is confined to web access. On 14 March 2000, the first batch of entries, ranging from *M* to *mahurat*, was published online; the remaining entries were taken from the second edition. Since then the subsequent entries have been updated and revised in alphabetical order on a quarterly basis. On 11 December 2008 these ranged until *reamy*, which resulted in the overall documentation of 263,917 entries at the time. Every regular quarterly update has also included additional entries from across the alphabet as well as revised entries replacing the respective earlier versions. Coinciding with the release of each update, commentaries on the respective changes are put online, which among other extensive background information can be accessed even without subscription. The nature of the revisions is manifold (Simpson et al. 2004). For example, besides providing a consistent terminology throughout OED, entries may be predated if earlier attestations have been found, and Old English quotations are no longer attributed to a particular year, but may be characterized as early, late or general Old English. Queries can be performed in various categories, for example, with regard to "etymologies", "first cited date" or "quotation work", which can also be combined in "advanced" searches. In December 2010, after the completion of this chapter, OED was scheduled to undergo a major relaunch including the integration of the *Historical Thesaurus of the Oxford English Dictionary* (HTOED) (Kay et al. 2009) (cf. below, Section 4) (http://www.oed.com/news/relaunch.html). OED has been used for a large number of academic studies and has even been studied itself, as seen by Charlotte Brewer's project *Examining the OED*, which primarily investigates the role of quotations in this resource (http://oed.hertford.ox.ac.uk/main/, Brewer 2007).

In 2003, the *Dictionary of Old English* (DOE) project at the University of Toronto (http://www.doe.utoronto.ca/), which had until then only issued microfiches of letters *A–E* between 1986 and 1996, published the first electronic version on a CD-ROM containing letters *A–F* (Healey 2005). The second, latest version has extended this range to letter *G*, resulting in currently 12,633 entries. Microfiches of letters *F* and *G* were issued shortly after their electronic publication. It has been possible to search letters *A–G* online since 2007; this web version is also continuously updated and complemented (http://tapor.library.utoronto.ca/doe/). Each entry contains information in several categories, such as "attested spellings", "occurrences and usage" or "Latin equivalents in manuscript", if available. The field "secondary references" points to corresponding or etymologically related entries in other dictionaries; if OED is mentioned, a direct link to this resource is provided. Regrettably, DOE contains no etymological information. A list of both Old English and Latin texts cited in DOE including the consulted editions is freely accessible, thereby providing a useful bibliographical resource. Yearly progress reports are available both at the site and in the *Old English Newsletter*. The corpus used by DOE (OEC) is available both online (http://tapor.library.utoronto.ca/doecorpus/) and on CD-ROM, the latest version of which was released in 2004. The search engine allows queries for single words, or parts of these, as well as up to three combinations or co-occurrences of whole or fragmentary words, which can also be confined to specific works or major genres. The results are listed according to their Cameron number (Cameron 1973), and page and line numbers are taken from the indicated editions. The output of OEC searches is strictly homographic; length-marks are not included, and þ and ð are distinguished. An additional tool is a "word wheel

interface" for both English and Latin, which provides alphabetical lists of all types with links to the respective tokens.

Bosworth et al.'s (1882–1972) *Anglo-Saxon Dictionary* including its supplements have been digitized in various ways. Sean Crist's freely accessible *Germanic Lexicon Project* (GLP) (http://lexicon.ff.cuni.cz/) offers several different formats: besides scanned pictures in tiff- and png-format as well as a single "weekly updated" txt-file and html-files of the individual pages achieved by Optical Character Recognition (OCR) (http://lexicon.ff.cuni.cz/texts/oe_bosworthtoller_about.html), there is also a specifically designed downloadable application (http://lexicon.ff.cuni.cz/app/). This particular program, currently in its version 0.2c, allows searches for individual entries as well as a full text search; image-files in jpg-format can be downloaded separately for optional inclusion. There is also an online version (http://bosworth.ff.cuni.cz/). GLP hosts a number of other dictionaries, grammars, and readers, two of which concern the Old English period. Comparable to the digitization of Bosworth et al. (1882–1972), the second edition of Hall's (1916) *Concise Anglo-Saxon Dictionary* is available in tiff-, png- and html-format (http://lexicon.ff.cuni.cz/texts/oe_clarkhall_about.html). However, due to currently incomplete OCR, only 257 of the 373 pages are available as html-files, and there is no downloadable txt-file; moreover, there is no application. Another Old English resource at GLP is the third edition of Bright's (1912) *Anglo-Saxon Reader* (http://lexicon.ff.cuni.cz/texts/oe_bright_about.html). Besides individual pages of the entire book in tiff-, png- and html-format, the glossary can be downloaded as a separate file in html-, xml- and pdf-format.

There are several other freely accessible resources that use material from Bosworth et al. (1882–1972), but generally without the second supplement, which is the only volume still in copyright. Kevin Kiernan's freely accessible site at the University of Kentucky provides scanned images in jpg-format of both the main volume (http://beowulf.engl.uky.edu/~kiernan/BT/Bosworth-Toller.htm) and the first supplement (http://beowulf.engl.uky.edu/~kiernan/BT2/Toller-Supplement.htm). Two searchable electronic versions have been created by David Finucane: a free one for Macintosh OS X (http://www.davidfinucane.com/bt/index.html), and an iPhone application (http://www.davidfinucane.com/Old_English/). James Jonson's Old English dictionary page at his *Old English Made Easy* site draws on a variety of sources, but only acknowledges Bosworth and Toller (http://home.comcast.net/~modean52/oeme_dictionaries.htm). Alphabetical lists are provided not only for Old English headwords, but also for Modern English equivalents. There is no search function, but each beginning letter has a separate htm-address. Based on this resource is Stephen Forrest's online tool *Englisc Onstigende Wordboc* (EOW) (http://wandership.ca/projects/eow/about.php), which translates more than 5,000 words from Old English into Modern English and vice versa. The digitization of Bosworth et al. (1882–1972) as part of Bekie Marett's *Anglo-Saxon Dictionary Project*, which is still listed on some web pages, seems to have been discontinued and the site (http://dontgohere.nu/oe/as-bt/) has been taken offline.

The *Middle English Dictionary* (MED, Kurath et al. 1954–2001) was transferred into electronic form in the year of its printed completion (http://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/med/). It is part of the *Middle English Compendium* (MEC) (http://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/mec/) (McSparran 2002), a freely accessible resource which besides MED includes also an associated hyperbibliography (http://quod.lib.umich.edu/h/hyperbib/) as well as the *Corpus of Middle English Prose and Verse* (CME) (http://quod.lib.umich.edu/c/cme/).

The 54,081 entries of MED as well as the quotations can be searched in various ways. Besides simple searches for headwords and variant forms, Boolean and proximity searches within both entries and quotations are also permitted. Full regular expression searches involving wildcard characters are also possible. As in OED, up to three fields can be combined, such as "definition", "manuscript" or "date", though date ranges are not allowed. Each "stencil", which precedes each quotation and contains information on date, text and manuscript, is linked to the hyperbibliography, which provides information on further manuscripts containing the text as well as editions and other resources. Entries can be displayed without quotations or with quotations in either compact or open display. No revisions and updates to MED have occurred since 18 December 2001, though CME was expanded on 22 February 2006, as stated on the respective websites. Also of interest to scholars of Middle English is the freely accessible *Anglo-Norman Online Hub* (ANH) (http://www.anglo-norman.net/), which features a revised version of the *Anglo-Norman Dictionary* (AND) (Stone and Rothwell 1977–92) containing c.24,800 entries. It also includes a searchable database of c.125,000 citations, which are used as the basis for an integrated concordance application.

Unlike for Old and Middle English, there is as yet no period dictionary of Early Modern English. However, one online lexicographical resource dealing with this era deserves to be mentioned: Ian Lancashire's *Lexicons of Early Modern English* (LEME) at the University of Toronto (http://leme.library.utoronto.ca/), the follow-up project to the discontinued *Early Modern English Dictionaries Database* (EMEDD) (http://www.chass.utoronto.ca/~ian/emedd.html), does not merely list words attested during this period, but is dedicated to the digitization of early English dictionaries themselves (Lancashire 2006). It currently features electronic versions of 166 monolingual, bilingual and polyglot dictionaries as well as various other lexical works dated 1480–1702 containing more than 575,000 word entries. The entries of 112 fully analyzed lexicons have been lemmatized according to their modern spellings and have been given permanent URLs. Two versions of the database are available. The freely accessible public version does not permit all search features, but allows restrictions to date range, author and text; however, the output is generally limited to 100 results. The full version displays all results and also allows further restrictive searches, such as "language", "genre", and "subject". Additional features include browsable wordlists as well as a searchable index with information on more than 1,200 lexical works. There is also a period database containing more than 10,000 Early Modern English texts, access to which, however, requires an additional external subscription.

Not many etymological dictionaries of English are available in electronic form. The freely accessible ongoing *Indo-European Etymological Dictionary* project (IEED) (http://www.indo-european.nl/) at the University of Leiden currently contains no information on the English language. The fullest and most up-to-date resource in this respect is the aforementioned third edition of OED. There are many electronic dictionaries which also have etymological information, such as the CD-ROM of the *Shorter Oxford English Dictionary* (SOED), currently in version 3.0 of the sixth printed edition (http://www.oup.co.uk/ep/cdroms/), or the freely accessible dictionary at *Merriam-Webster Online* (http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/). One independent project focusing primarily on English etymology is Douglas Harper's freely accessible *Online Etymological Dictionary* (http://www.etymonline.com/). This has been compiled from several printed sources, which are listed at the site. Its search engine allows both headword

and full text searches. Another electronic resource is Eugene Cotter's *Roots of English* (http://ablemedia.com/ctcweb/showcase/roots.html), a freely downloadable application, version 4.0 of which has not been updated since 1999. An unusual feature of its search engine is that queries for entries provide an output of etymologically or semantically related Greek or Latin roots as well as English words containing these. However, no sources are given.

Electronic dictionaries are also available for historical varieties of English. The largest of these is the freely accessible *Dictionary of the Scots Language* (DSL) (http://www.dsl.ac.uk/), which combines two major printed sources, namely the *Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue* (DOST), dedicated to entries attested between the 12th and the 17th century (Craigie et al. 1931–2001), and the *Scottish National Dictionary* (SND), which lists words in Scots used since the 18th century (Grant et al. 1931–2005). Besides full text and headword searches, some other fields are also available, such as "etymologies", "senses" or "date", though, as in MED, no date range can be specified. Boolean searches within a single category are also permitted. Queries can be restricted to DOST, SND or any of their supplements. One entry is displayed immediately, while a full list of results is indicated within a separate frame, in either alphabetical order in the case of headword searches, or their order of relevance in any other case. Bibliographic information can also be searched separately. The site is complemented with additional background information taken from the printed versions. The digitization of another variety dictionary, namely the *English Dialect Dictionary* (EDD, Wright 1898–1905), which is dedicated to the 18th and 19th centuries, is currently in development at the University of Innsbruck (Markus and Heuberger 2007). A beta version can be accessed after requesting a free password (http://www.uibk.ac.at/anglistik/projects/speed/index.html).

Finally, another specialized dictionary needs to be mentioned: the Institute for Name-Studies at the University of Nottingham is currently developing an onomastic resource, namely the *Vocabulary of English Place-Names* (VEPN) (http://www.nottingham.ac.uk/english/ins/vepn/). Its ultimate aim is to list all elements of place-names attested before c.1750. It thereby revises and extends an earlier dictionary (Smith 1956). Of the three volumes published so far as fascicles (Parsons et al. 1997–), the latest one comprising 157 entries ranging from *ceafor* to *cock-pit* can also be accessed freely at the site, though only headword searches are possible. Besides listing examples containing the element in question, an entry provides also etymological information and gives references to corresponding or related entries in other dictionaries, most notably OED, DOE, MED and EDD.

4 Thesauri

An online version of the second edition of the *Thesaurus of Old English* (TOE) (Roberts et al. 2000) can be accessed freely at the University of Glasgow (http://libra.englang.arts.gla.ac.uk/oethesaurus/). Improvements to the printed version include the occasional display of additional information in a "comments" field and the indication of word classes as "parts of speech". In contrast to the aforementioned electronic dictionaries, it is possible to refine searches according to length-marks; moreover, all occurrences of *ð* have been replaced by *þ*. Queries are allowed for both Old and Modern English words. The sections containing the respective results are then indicated and can

be browsed, though currently no alphabetical list is given. The 18 major sections of TOE and their respective sub-sections can also be displayed separately, either in full or confined to "flagged" words which are restricted to glosses, poetry, or single occurrences. Revisions and updates have not occurred since its release in 2005, however, the website states that these are planned. The database of TOE also forms the basis of a derived didactic project called *Learning with the Online TOE* (http://libra.englang. arts.gla.ac.uk/oeteach/oeteach.html). This consists of fourteen "units" intended for use in class or self-study, most of which contain questions that can be answered with the help of TOE, as well as bibliographies and further links.

TOE has also been regarded as a pilot project for the much larger *Historical Thesaurus of English* (HTE), which was completed in 2009 and published in print as *Historical Thesaurus of the Oxford English Dictionary* (HTOED) (Kay et al. 2009) (http://libra. englang.arts.gla.ac.uk/WebThesHTML/homepage.html). In December 2010, after the completion of this chapter, it was scheduled to be electronically incorporated into OED online (cf. above, Section 3). A freely accessible version of some areas in HTE is available online (http://libra.englang.arts.gla.ac.uk/historicalthesaurus/). HTE contains c.650,000 word meanings ranging from the Old English period until today. These are grouped into three major parts ("The External World", "The Mind" and "Society"), which are subdivided into sections and further sub-sections. As in TOE, it is possible to search for categories in which a word occurs. In fact, the engine of HTE allows more: besides a general query for synonyms, it is possible to search for specific labels, affixes, parts of speech, and dates or date ranges within currently 333 categories. The results of the searched categories are displayed according to sub-section, entry, part of speech, date or date range of occurrence, and label if applicable. If the meaning of an entry occurs both in Old English and later then two spellings are given. Generally, spellings and further data are taken from OED or unspecified "dictionaries of Old English". HTE contains no information on etymologies or quotations, but with regard to its chronological range it supersedes all dictionaries of English, even OED, which does not include words attested only before 1150. In its organisation of data on semantic rather than alphabetical principles, HTE represents a unique resource for the study of lexical change.

There were initial plans for a third historical thesaurus dedicated to the English language, namely the *Thesaurus of Middle English* (TME, Sylvester and Roberts 2002), but the project seems to have been abandoned or incorporated into HTE as the original web address can no longer be accessed (http://www.arts.gla.ac.uk/sesll/ EngLang/thesaur/mideng.htm). An even larger range than HTE is envisaged in the *European Historical Thesaurus* (EuroHiT), currently in its early development stages at the University of Eichstätt (http://www1.ku-eichstaett.de/SLF/EngluVglSW/OnOn-EuroHiT.htm), which aims at providing historical onomasiological data for several European languages for comparative purposes by means of a publicly accessible wiki.

5 Corpora

A large amount of textual corpora representing various time periods are available in electronic form; for more detailed surveys and discussions of their use, see Claridge (2008), and Kytö, Chapter 96. Descriptions of currently 51 corpora, many of which are mentioned in this section, are available at the University of Helsinki (http://www.

helsinki.fi/varieng/CoRD/corpora/index.html). Corpora usually indicate their size according to the number of words, though the term "token" would be more precise. The dictionary corpora of OEC and CME have already been mentioned above in Section 3. These are hosted by the University of Michigan, which also provides another historical corpus, namely *Michigan Early Modern English Materials* (MEMEM) (http://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/memem/), which is a collection of c.50,000 citations dated 1475–1700, originally compiled to illustrate occurrences of mostly modal verbs in an as yet unrealized dictionary of Early Modern English (Bailey et al. 1975). Both MEMEM, which has not been updated since 1996, and another electronic resource at this location, namely the *Michigan Corpus of Academic Spoken English* (MICASE) (http://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/micase/), which represents a specific register of Present-Day English and currently contains more than 1.8 million words, can be accessed freely. With regard to dictionaries, it has also been suggested that the quotation database of OED may be used as a corpus though one needs to take into account the uneven representation and particular selection principles of the first two editions (Hoffmann 2004).

No less than six historical corpora are contained on a CD-ROM produced by the *International Computer Archive of Modern and Medieval English* (ICAME), the latest, second version of which was released in 1999 (http://icame.uib.no/newcd.htm): the *Helsinki Corpus of English Texts: Diachronic and Dialectal* (HC); the *Helsinki Corpus of Older Scots* (HCOS); the *Corpus of Early English Correspondence Sampler* (CEECS); the *Newdigate Newsletters*; the *Lampeter Corpus of Early Modern English Tracts* (*Lampeter Corpus*); the *Innsbruck Computer-Archive of Machine-Readable English Texts* (ICAMET). These corpora can also be obtained from OTA. HC and HCOS as well as some pilot studies based on these corpora are described in Rissanen et al. (1993). The historical part of HC contains c.1.5 million words from representative texts dating from the three major periods of Old, Middle, and Early Modern English, which are subdivided into three or four chronological phases each. The modern dialectal part contains another c.400,000 words. The current version of HCOS contains c.830,000 words from Scots texts dated 1450–1700. CEECS is merely a sample version of about the sixth of the size of the *Corpus of Early English Correspondence* (CEEC), which features c.2.7 million words from letters dated 1417–1681 (http://www.helsinki.fi/varieng/domains/CEEC.html). *Newdigate Newsletters* contains 2,100 letters from the Secretary of State's office dated 1673–1692. The *Lampeter Corpus* consists of c.1.2 million words from 120 non-literary prose texts dated 1640–1740 (http://www.tu-chemnitz.de/phil/english/chairs/linguist/real/independent/lampeter/lamphome.htm). ICAMET features c.4 million words of Middle English prose; a fuller version of 6 million words is also available (http://www.uibk.ac.at/anglistik/projects/icamet/). Besides these historical six corpora, the ICAME CD-ROM contains also several modern ones, namely eight corpora of "written English", which include the "Brown Family" of corpora, five corpora of "spoken English" and two "parsed" corpora, manuals of which can be consulted freely (http://khnt.aksis.uib.no/icame/manuals/index.htm). Registered users of the CD-ROM can access all corpora also online (http://torvald.aksis.uib.no/icame/cwb/).

Information on HC, HCOS, *Lampeter Corpus* and ICAMET is also contained in the conference monograph by Kytö et al. (1994). This volume provides descriptions of many more historical corpora as well as dictionaries, thesauri and software. Among these is *A Representative Corpus of Historical English Registers* (ARCHER), which contains c.1.7 million words of British and American English dated 1650–1990. Initially devised

at Northern Arizona University and the University of Southern California, it is now an international collaboration of a number of universities, where it is currently being revised for its third version. ARCHER can only be accessed at those universities involved in the project, for example, at Flagstaff or Freiburg (http://portal.uni-freiburg. de/angl/Englisches_Seminar/Lehrstuehle/LS_Mair/research/projects/archer/). Two corpora compiled by David Denison at the University of Manchester are available at OTA. The *Corpus of Late Modern English Prose* (CLMEP) (http://www.llc.manchester.ac.uk/ subjects/lel/staff/david-denison/lmode-prose/) contains c.100,000 words from English letters written between 1861 and 1919. The associated *Corpus of Late Eighteenth-Century Prose* (CLECP) (http://www.llc.manchester.ac.uk/subjects/lel/staff/david-denison/corpus-late-18th-century-prose/) contains c.300,000 words from letters written in the northwest of England between 1761 and 1790. The *Zurich English Newspaper Corpus* (ZEN) (http://es-zen.unizh.ch/) consists of c.1.6 million words collected from newspaper issues published between 1661 and 1791; licensed owners of the CD-ROM can also access this corpus online. Besides HCOS another historical corpus of a regional variety of English is presented in the monograph: the *Corpus of Irish English* (CIE) (http://www.uni-due. de/CP/CIE.htm) at the University of Duisburg-Essen, which is available on CD-ROM (Hickey 2003), contains over seventy texts dating from the early 14th century to the present day. These include both English texts by Irish writers and the representation of Irish English in texts written outside Ireland.

There are several more well-known corpora and electronic text collections that need to be mentioned. The *Chadwyck-Healey Literature Collections* currently comprise no less than 28 corpora and bibliographies from various time periods and genres (http:// collections.chadwyck.com/marketing/list_of_all.jsp). The widest diachronic range is represented by the archive of *English Poetry*, which in its second edition contains more than 183,000 poems dating from the 8th to the early 20th century. The *Electronic Text Center* at the University of Virginia, a frequently consulted resource for digitized text collections in the past, was transferred to the *Scholar's Lab* in 2007 (http://www2. lib.virginia.edu/etext/). Some electronic texts are still freely accessible. The *Corpus of Early English Medical Writing* (CEEM) is subdivided into three parts, the first of which, namely *Middle English Medical Texts* (MEMT), was issued on CD-ROM in 2005 (http://www.helsinki.fi/varieng/CoRD/corpora/CEEM/MEMTindex.html). The upcoming parts will focus on Early Modern English and Late Modern English respectively. The *Corpus of English Dialogues* (CED) (http://www.engelska.uu.se/corpus. html), a project devised at the Universities of Lancaster and Uppsala, contains c.1.2 million words from speech-related texts dated 1560–1760. The freely accessible *Old Bailey Proceedings Online* project (http://www.oldbaileyonline.org/) hosts the texts of more than 197,000 London trials from the Old Bailey Proceedings conducted between 1674 and 1913, and more than 2,500 biographical details from the Ordinary of Newgate's Accounts recorded between 1676 and 1772. Three large corpora of Late Modern English can be downloaded after requesting a free password from Hendrik De Smet at the University of Leuven (https://perswww.kuleuven.be/~u0044428/): the *Corpus of Late Modern English Texts* (CLMET) with 10 million words; the *Corpus of Late Modern English Texts Extended Version* (CLMETEV) with 15 million words; the *Corpus of English Novels* (CEN) with 25 million words.

In addition to corpora which do not contain any further data besides the text itself as well as bibliographical information, there are a number of annotated or "parsed"

corpora which permit searches for specific syntactic structures. The principles of annotation with regard to three specific corpora are outlined in the respective manuals (http://www.ling.upenn.edu/hist-corpora/annotation/). Currently, there are seven parsed corpora which are based on HC or CEEC: the *Brooklyn-Geneva-Amsterdam-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English* (*Brooklyn Corpus*); the *York-Toronto-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Prose* (YCOE); the *York-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Poetry* (*York Poetry Corpus*); the *Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Middle English, 2nd edn.* (PPCME2); the *Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Early Modern English* (PPCEME); the *York-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Early English Correspondence* (PCEEC); the *Penn Parsed Corpus of Modern British English* (PPCMBE). The *Brooklyn Corpus* has been superseded by YCOE, but can still be consulted by requesting access from Susan Pintzuk at the University of York (http://www-users.york.ac.uk/~sp20/corpus.html). YCOE, the *York Poetry Corpus* and PCEEC can be obtained from OTA. PPCME2, PPCEME and PPCMBE are distributed on CD-ROM by the University of Pennsylvania (http://www.ling.upenn.edu/hist-corpora/). There are various programs aimed at constructing, annotating and searching electronic corpora. Among the most widely used ones are *CorpusSearch 2* (http://corpussearch.sourceforge.net/), which is also issued alongside PPCME2, PPCEME and PPCMBE, and *Corpus Presenter*, which is included on the CD-ROMs of CIE and MEMT, and is also freely available in a restricted "lite" version (http://www.uni-due.de/CP/).

Besides the aforementioned MICASE and those included on the ICAME CD-ROM there are several more electronic corpora of Modern and Present-Day English. The largest of these is the freely accessible *British National Corpus* (BNC) (http://www.natcorp.ox.ac.uk/), which contains over 100 million words of both written and transcribed spoken English from different registers and varieties from the later part of the 20th century. BNC is also hosted by Mark Davies at Brigham Young University (http://davies-linguistics.byu.edu/personal/), who besides historical corpora of Spanish and Portuguese has also compiled three corpora of American English, all of which have a specifically devised search interface and can be accessed freely, namely the *Corpus of Contemporary American English* (COCA), which contains more than 410 million words recorded since 1990, the *Corpus of Historical American English* (COHA), which contains more than 400 million words recorded since the 1810s, and the TIME *Corpus*, which contains more than 100 million words recorded since 1923. Present-Day English corpora may also be parsed, most notably the *International Corpus of English* (ICE) (http://ice-corpora.net/ice/), which is dedicated to world-wide varieties of English. This project combines various corpora of English from around the globe with each one containing c.1 million words of written or transcribed spoken English dated later than 1989 (Greenbaum 1996). Currently, seven corpora can be accessed at the website after requesting a free licence (Canada, East Africa, Hong Kong, India, Jamaica, Philippines, Singapore), three corpora can be obtained on CD-ROM (Great Britain, Ireland, New Zealand), and several more are being developed. The Linguistic Data Consortium (http://www.ldc.upenn.edu/) also hosts a large collection of corpora, such as the *New York Times Annotated Corpus*, which is available on DVD and contains more than 1.8 million articles published in this newspaper between 1987 and 2007.

Work on many more corpora of historical English is in progress. One particularly large example is the *Diachronic Internet Corpus of English* (DICE) (http://dice-corpus.pbworks.com/), which currently contains c.19 million words from 500 non-fiction

texts dating from the 16th century to the present day; it is announced to be "open-ended" and continuously incorporating additions. The envisaged web based application will be freely accessible online at the University of Tampere. Another announced corpus is *The Corpus of Early American English* (CEAE) (http://www.anst.uu.se/merjkyto/Early_Am_Eng.htm), a project conducted at the University of Uppsala and associated with HC which focuses mostly on the New England area from around 1600 to 1800 and currently contains c.700,000 words. A unique interdisciplinary project in development at the University of Helsinki is *Digital Editions for Corpus Linguistics* (DECL) (http://www.helsinki.fi/varieng/domains/DECL.html), which is aimed at providing a model that also takes into account the importance of manuscript evidence for electronic corpora (Honkapohja et al. 2009).

6 Further projects

Besides electronic dictionaries, thesauri, and corpora, a large amount of other academic projects dealing with various aspects of language history are available or in development. In order to give an impression of their range, some prominent examples dealing with particular time periods as well as resources providing access to primary sources are briefly mentioned in this section.

Projects may be based on the corpus of one particular text, writer, or period, but use it for more or different purposes than the aforementioned electronic corpora. An example for the Old English period is *An Inventory of Script and Spellings in Eleventh-Century English* at the University of Manchester, which is concerned with written evidence dated to the 11th century, including copies of earlier texts and different scribal versions of one and the same text (Powell 2004). The project has produced the freely accessible *MANCASS C11 Database* (http://www.arts.manchester.ac.uk/mancass/C11database/), which contains the text of 1,884 items identified by Cameron number (Cameron 1973) and manuscript shelfmark. Various searches within the database are permitted. A query for a particular word or stem provides a list of attested spellings occurring within a larger lexical group as well as their type frequencies; their occurrences within a wider context can also be indicated. Spelling variants involving the doubling of certain letters or the substitution of one particular letter within a stem can be searched separately. It is therefore possible to establish which variant spellings of a specific word exist, and which of these are preferred in particular texts or manuscripts. Besides storing orthographic information, the database features also illustrations of handwriting, most notably a palaeographic catalogue of certain letter-shapes and links to their occurrences in specific scribal sequences. Information on these sequences, which frequently include palaeographic images, can also be found by searching for particular manuscripts. Typical letter-shapes used by "scriptors", who are responsible for writing more than one sequence, may also be displayed. By making these features available the database combines the disciplines of orthography and palaeography, and thereby covers two fields relevant to questions of textual transmission.

Various linguistic categories are examined in the *Middle English Grammar Project* (MEG) (http://www.uis.no/research/culture/the_middle_english_grammar_project/), currently in development at the Universities of Stavanger and Glasgow (Stenroos 2007). Based on a specifically devised corpus, version 1.0 of which is freely accessible at the

site, this project intends to provide a comprehensive reference grammar of Middle English which is to include a full description of variation and change during this period. There are also three projects which are specifically concerned with regional variation in Middle English and Scots; these are being developed at the Institute of Historical Dialectology at the University of Edinburgh. The freely accessible *Linguistic Atlas of Early Middle English* (LAEME) (http://www.lel.ed.ac.uk/ihd/laeme1/laeme1.html), currently in its version 2.1, covers the period from around 1150 to 1325. Version 1.1 of the freely accessible *Linguistic Atlas of Older Scots* (LAOS) (http://www.lel.ed.ac.uk/ihd/laos1/laos1.html) contains mainly documents written in Scots between 1380 and 1500. The digitization of literary documents from this period as well as an extension up to the year 1700 are in progress. Both LAEME and LAOS have been called "daughter projects" of the *Linguistic Atlas of Late Middle English* (LALME) (McIntosh et al. 1986), a printed resource which is currently being revised for online publication (http://www.ling.ed.ac.uk/research/ihd/projectsX.shtml). In their final form, all projects will allow various searches for specific linguistic features including displays of their regional distribution on specifically created maps.

With regard to the Early Modern English period, the *Shakespeare Database Project* (SDB) (http://www.shkspr.uni-muenster.de/) (Neuhaus 1989, 1990), currently in its publication phase at the University of Münster, needs to be mentioned. It uses the "copy text" printings of Shakespeare's works as a foundation for a relational database. All original spelling texts are lemmatized, all lemmata are morphologically analyzed and classified according to etymology and date of first occurrence with access to all Shakespearean coinages and contemporary innovations. Variation in usage and later editorial emendations are systematically linked. Spevack (1993) is a printed thesaurus listing based on a previous version of the database using the modern spelling Riverside edition (Evans 1974).

Besides projects concerned with specific linguistic categories, the accessibility of primary sources is also of particular interest to historical linguists. The importance of manuscripts and early printed books is stressed in various projects. Whereas mere scans of manuscript folios may be available on the websites of various libraries, such as some belonging to the University of Oxford (http://image.ox.ac.uk/), there are also specific projects which use images as a basis for editions and applications; these usually also include a search engine as well as additional material. The Institute for Textual Scholarship and Electronic Editing at the University of Birmingham hosts the *Canterbury Tales Project* (CTP) (http://www.canterburytalesproject.org/) (Robinson 2003), which has so far issued four CD-ROMs of individual tales as well as two CD-ROMs of the manuscript Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales, Peniarth 392 D/Hengwrt 154, also known as the "Hengwrt Chaucer", and a CD-ROM containing two versions of the *Canterbury Tales* printed by William Caxton. Both early books can also be accessed freely at the British Library (http://www.bl.uk/treasures/caxton/homepage.html) and De Montfort University (http://www.cts.dmu.ac.uk/Caxtons/). Several more medieval manuscripts have been digitized in order to provide easy access to primary evidence as well as electronic tools and material for further study. The *Society for Early English and Norse Electronic Texts* (SEENET) (http://www.iath.virginia.edu/seenet/) has so far released CD-ROMs of various manuscript versions of *Piers Plowman*, as well as *William of Palerne, The Destruction of Troy*, and *Cædmon's Hymn*, which is also accompanied by a printed study of the poem (O'Donnell 2005). The

CD-ROM of Kevin Kiernan's *Electronic Beowulf* (http://ebeowulf.uky.edu/), version 3.0 of which was released in 2011, contains images of all texts in London, British Library, Cotton Vitellius A.xv as well as the Thorkelin transcripts and early collations. A new transcript and edition of *Beowulf* is also included. Another image-based edition of an Old English text by the same scholar, namely the *Electronic Boethius* from the heavily damaged manuscript London, British Library, Cotton Otho A.vi with additional evidence from Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 180, and Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 12, is currently in development (http://beowulf.engl.uky. edu/~kiernan/eBoethius/inlad.htm). Bernard J. Muir's software for *Digitising the Middle Ages* (http://www.evellum.com/) includes complete scans and editions of two other Old English poetic codices, namely Exeter, Cathedral Library, 3501, issued on DVD as *The Exeter Anthology of Old English Poetry*, and Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 11, which is available on CD-ROM. Additional features, such as bibliographies and audio material, are also provided.

Electronic versions of originally printed editions may also be available online, though these do not usually include scans of the original manuscripts. Many digitized editions of Middle English texts have been made available by the *Consortium for the Teaching of the Middle Ages* (TEAMS) (http://www.lib.rochester.edu/camelot/teams/tmsmenu.htm), which grants free access to these for individual use. There are also online editions specifically devoted to particular texts, such as Melissa Bernstein Ser's freely accessible *Electronic Sermo Lupi ad Anglos* (http://english3.fsu.edu/~wulfstan/). These may be intended as teaching aids, such as the freely accessible nine Old English texts and text extracts that form part of a hypertext course pack hosted at the University of Oxford (http://www.english.ox.ac.uk/oecoursepack/). Such electronic editions often contain hyperlinks to additional information, which may be displayed on the same screen in the form of frames for ease of reference. The already available editions of the freely accessible *Online Corpus of Old English Poetry* (OCOEP) (http://www.oepoetry.ca/), which is currently being compiled at the University of Calgary, contain three frames displaying the main text, a glossary and textual notes respectively. Those Old English poems not yet edited are provided in merely textual form, taken from the Old English section of the *Labyrinth Library* at the University of Georgetown (http://www.georgetown.edu/departments/medieval/labyrinth/library/oe/oe.html), which hosts a digitized version of the *Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records* (ASPR) (Krapp and Dobbie 1931–53) in html-format. Despite its title, the freely accessible site *Renascence Editions* (http://www.luminarium.org/renascence-editions/ren.htm) does not provide online editions as such, but merely the electronic text of works printed in English between 1477 and 1799; it may therefore be regarded rather as a corpus.

7 Further resources

Besides particular research projects, a whole range of electronic material is available which is useful for historical linguists. One frequently encountered issue is the need for specific letters or other graphs that are not generally included in the standard fonts employed in word processing. Several fonts are freely available for this purpose. The latest version 6.0 of the Unicode Standard, which contains over 100,000 characters, also includes a large number of medieval ones (http://www.unicode.org). *Junicode*, a

Unicode font developed by Peter Baker at the University of Virginia (http://junicode.
sourceforge.net/), is aimed at medievalists and in its version 0.6.17 contains 3,096
characters. The *Titus Cyberbit Font*, another Unicode font for historical linguists, can
be downloaded at the University of Frankfurt (http://titus.fkidg1.uni-frankfurt.de/
unicode/tituut.asp). The *Medieval Unicode Font Initiative* (MUFI) (http://www.mufi.
info/) both gathers additional characters to be suggested for inclusion in future Unicode
versions and coordinates the allocation of characters in the Private Use Area. A similar
purpose is intended by the *Script Encoding Initiative* (SEI) at the University of Berkeley
(http://linguistics.berkeley.edu/~dwanders/).

   Bibliographies of printed works can easily be searched in electronic format. Generally,
academic libraries hold information on most if not all of their stock within databases that
can be consulted by their users. Library catalogues may also be linked with one another.
The largest central search engine is hosted by *WorldCat* (http://www.worldcat.org/), which
provides free access to the bibliographic databases of more than 10,000 libraries world-
wide. One of the most frequently consulted bibliographies with regard to language and
literature is the *Modern Language Association International Bibliography* (MLAIB)
(http://www.mla.org/publications/bibliography/). The electronic online version contains
all entries from the annually updated printed version since 1926 and is expanded ten
times a year. Another regularly updated electronic bibliography is provided by the *Old
English Newsletter* (http://www.oenewsletter.org/OENDB/index.php), which is freely
accessible after registration and incorporates the bibliographies of the printed version
on a yearly basis. Bibliographies may also be connected to projects, as seen, for example,
in the aforementioned MEC, which contains a searchable hyperbibliography of the
works cited in MED; with 5,522 entries it is currently the largest electronic database
focusing on publications dealing with Middle English (http://quod.lib.umich.edu/h/
hyperbib/). A particularly valuable resource with regard to the Early Modern English
period and slightly beyond is the freely accessible *English Short Title Catalogue* (ESTC)
(http://estc.bl.uk/), which contains bibliographic information on more than 460,000 printed
works published between 1473 and 1800.

   A large amount of digitized publications are in the public domain due to their expired
copyright. The freely accessible *Ebook and Texts Archive* (http://www.archive.org/details/
texts/) is a particularly rich resource; it features more than 1 million items that can be
browsed by a search engine. The obtained results are available in various formats: besides
pdf-, txt- and djvu-files there is also a "flip book"-application based on jpg-files. Among
those books included are also the main volume and the first supplement of Bosworth
et al. (1882–1972) as well as Hall (1916). Another notable free e-book site is *Project
Gutenberg* (http://www.gutenberg.org/), which currently contains over 33,000 items in
html- and txt-format. Works in the public domain can also be downloaded in pdf-format
at the freely accessible *Google Book Search* (http://books.google.com/). Moreover, this
resource also provides selective preview pages to books that are still in copyright,
many of which are of an academic nature; currently, more than 7 million items can be
accessed in this way. There is also a purely historical e-book site, namely *Early English
Books Online* (EEBO) (http://eebo.chadwyck.com/home/). It contains bibliographical
information on more than 125,000 searchable items printed between 1473 and 1700.
More than 110,000 of these are available in digitized form; these can be displayed as
gif-images on screen or be downloaded in tiff- or pdf-format. An additional subscription

to the *Text Creation Partnership* (TCP) (http://www.lib.umich.edu/tcp/) allows access to the machine-readable converted text of more than 25,000 items in ASCII.

The electronic availability of many academic journals has facilitated access to these significantly. The archive of *Journal Storage* (JSTOR) (http://www.jstor.org/) currently contains digitized versions of over 1,300 titles and is continually being expanded. Journals may date as far back as 1665 in the case of *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society*, but issues from the most recent years are usually not included. In addition to journals JSTOR features also other collections, such as letters, pamphlets or conference proceedings. Journals may have a freely accessible online archive of past articles, such as the *Old English Newsletter* (http://www.oenewsletter.org/). Besides digitized versions of printed publications, there are also journals or series that are available exclusively online; these are usually peer-reviewed and freely accessible. They may be concerned with various aspects of historical linguistics, such as *Studies in Variation, Contacts and Change in English* at the University of Helsinki (http://www.helsinki.fi/varieng/journal/index.html), or focus on a specific area of language change, such as *Historical Sociolinguistics and Sociohistorical Linguistics* at the University of Leiden (http://www.let.leidenuniv.nl/hsl_shl/). There are also interdisciplinary journals of interest to historical linguists, such as the one published by the web-based community *Digital Medievalist*, which has offered articles on bibliographies and editions of medieval texts (http://www.digitalmedievalist.org/journal/), and *The Heroic Age*, which even has an entire issue dedicated to early medieval languages and linguistics (http://www.heroicage.org/).

Online discussion groups are generally used to ask questions and exchange ideas that fall within a specific subject area and may take the form of free mailing lists. Usually, archives of past postings can also be accessed by subscribers. The most prominent academically oriented ones for the purpose of this survey are the *History of the English Language List* (HEL-L) (http://wiz.cath.vt.edu/mailman/listinfo/hel-l/), and the *Historical Linguistics List* (*Histling-L*) (https://mailman.rice.edu/mailman/listinfo/histling-l/). Other relevant lists include ANSAX-L (http://www.mun.ca/Ansaxdat/index.html) for Anglo-Saxon studies, and *Chaucernet* (http://pages.towson.edu/duncan/chaucnet.html) for Chaucer and Middle English. There are also several rather specific lists in which academics may be involved, such as ENGLISC (http://www.rochester.edu/englisc/), which is dedicated to composing texts in Old English (Schipper and Higley 1996). Besides mailing lists, there are also online forums, which can be browsed according to topics; postings are permitted after free registration. Currently active forums are hosted, for example, by *Ða Engliscan Gesiðas*, a society dedicated to Old English language and Anglo-Saxon culture (http://www.tha-engliscan-gesithas.org.uk/gegaderung/), or by David Wilton's etymology site (http://www.wordorigins.org/index.php/forums/). However, though academics may participate in such forums, they are mostly frequented by the general public.

Finally, audio versions of past texts recorded by scholars need to be mentioned. These are available in both digital and analogue format. With the exception of most of *Beowulf*, the entire ASPR, as read by Michael Drout of Wheaton College, is freely accessible in mp3-format (http://fred.wheatonma.edu/wordpressmu/mdrout/), whereas *Beowulf* and a selection of other Old English poems with Modern English translations and commentaries are available on CD. The *Chaucer Studio* at Brigham Young

University has issued a number of readings in Old and Middle English as well as other medieval languages on CD and audiocassette (http://creativeworks.byu.edu/chaucer/). Visual material that attempts to provide authentic pronunciation is found less frequently. Besides some performances available from the *Chaucer Studio* on DVD and VHS, a well-known example is Benjamin Bagby's presentation of *Beowulf* with accompanying music, which is available on DVD with optional Modern English subtitles (http://www.bagbybeowulf.com/). Performances of Early Modern English plays, on the other hand, are usually pronounced in Present-Day English, as seen in the innumerable examples of modern Shakespeare productions.

8 Summary

This chapter has shown that a vast number of electronic/online resources in English historical linguistics is currently available or in development. Though these make research in various fields generally easier, it must not be forgotten that there are also several problematic issues attached to the ever-growing amount of material. Besides the already mentioned possible outdatedness of web addresses, online resources may also be subject to continuous changes and revisions, which may mean that results obtained in earlier versions can no longer be verified. The output given by some queries conducted in OED can even change every three months; more recent searches usually provide more precise results though it is also possible for updates to introduce errors. For this reason, the date of access to online resources and the version number of CD-ROM releases should always be noted. Moreover, any search within electronic/online resources is restricted to the possibilities offered by the respective engines, which may not offer all features required by their users, for example, complex wildcard searches or the resorting of results. Another difficulty is that any particular software is not necessarily compatible with the computer system used by the researcher. Programs developed for Windows may not run on Linux systems, and software intended for Windows XP may have problems under Windows Vista or Windows 7. CD-ROMs may also become unreadable, either through damage or simply due to the aging process, which varies, however, considerably. Though back-up copies for personal use are normally permitted, any further distribution will result in legal issues. Generally, electronic data is lost much more easily than printed or analogue material. Nevertheless, if one is aware of the problems relating to electronic/online resources when consulting these, they can facilitate research to an extent not possible before.

9 References

Arista, Javier Martín. 1999. English historical linguistics online. *Estudios Ingleses de la Universidad Complutense* 7: 299–306.

Bailey, Richard W., Jay L. Robinson, James W. Downer, and Patricia V. Lehman. 1975. *Michigan Early Modern English Materials*. Ann Arbor, MI: Xerox University Microfilms in cooperation with University of Michigan Press.

Bosworth, Joseph, Thomas N. Toller, and Alistair Campbell (eds.). 1882–1972. *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary Based on the Manuscript Collections of the Late Joseph Bosworth*. 1 vol. and 2 suppls. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Brewer, Charlotte. 2007. *Treasure-House of the Language: The Living OED*. London and New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Bright, James W. 1912. *An Anglo-Saxon Reader, Edited with Notes, a Complete Glossary, a Chapter on Versification, and an Outline of Anglo-Saxon Grammar*. 3rd edn. New York: Henry Holt and Company.

Cameron, Angus. 1973. A list of Old English texts. In: Roberta Frank and Angus Cameron (eds.), *A Plan for the Dictionary of Old English*, 25–306. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Claridge, Claudia. 2008. Historical corpora. In: Anke Lüdeling and Merja Kytö (eds.), *Corpus Linguistics: An International Handbook*. Vol. 1, 242–259. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Craigie, William Alexander, Adam J. Aitken, Margaret G. Dareau, and James A.C. Stevenson (eds.). 1931–2001. *A Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue from the Twelfth Century to the End of the Seventeenth*. 12 vols. Chicago, IL: Chicago University Press. Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Evans, G. Blakemore (ed.). 1974. *The Riverside Shakespeare*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Grant, William, David Murison, and Iseabail Macleod (eds.). 1931–2005. *Scottish National Dictionary*. 10 vols. and 2 suppls. Edinburgh: Scottish National Dictionary Association.

Greenbaum, Sidney (ed.). 1996. *Comparing English Worldwide: The International Corpus of English*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Healey, Antonette diPaolo. 2005. The Dictionary of Old English: The next generation(s). In: Tom Trabasso, John Sabatini, Dominic W. Massaro, and Robert C. Calfee (eds.), *From Orthography to Pedagogy: Essays in Honor of Richard L. Venezky*, 289–307. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Hall, John R. Clark (ed.). 1916. *A Concise Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*. 2nd edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hickey, Raymond. 2003. *Corpus Presenter: Software for Language Analysis with a Manual and A Corpus of Irish English as Sample Data*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Hoffmann, Sebastian. 2004. Using the OED quotations database as a corpus: A linguistic appraisal. *ICAME Journal* 28: 17–30.

Honkapohja, Alpo, Samuli Kaislaniemi, and Ville Marttila. 2009. Digital Editions for Corpus Linguistics: Representing manuscript reality in electronic corpora. In: Andreas H. Jucker, Daniel Schreier, and Marianne Hundt (eds.), *Corpora: Pragmatics and Discourse. Papers from the 29th International Conference on English Language Research on Computerized Corpora (ICAME 29). Ascona, Switzerland, 14–18 May 2008*, 451–476. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Howe, Nicholas. 2001. The new millenium. In: Phillip Pulsiano and Elaine Treharne (eds.), *A Companion to Anglo-Saxon Literature*, 496–505. Oxford: Blackwell.

Kay, Christian, Jane Roberts, Michael Samuels, and Irené Wotherspoon (eds.). 2009. *Historical Thesaurus of the Oxford English Dictionary*. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Krapp, George P. and Elliott Van Kirk Dobbie (eds.). 1931–53. *The Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records: A Collective Edition*. 6 vols. New York: Columbia University Press.

Kurath, Hans, Sherman M. Kuhn, and John Reidy (eds.). 1954–2001. *Middle English Dictionary*. 13 vols. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Kytö, Merja, Matti Rissanen, and Susan Wright (eds.). 1994. *Corpora across the Centuries. Proceedings of the First International Colloquium on English Diachronic Corpora. St Catherine's College Cambridge, 25–27 March 1993*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Lancashire, Ian. 2006. Computing the Lexicons of Early Modern English. In: Antoinette Renouf and Andrew Kehoe (eds.), *The Changing Face of Corpus Linguistics*, 45–62. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Markus, Manfred and Reinhard Heuberger. 2007. The architecture of Joseph Wright's English Dialect Dictionary: Preparing the computerised version. *International Journal of Lexicography* 20(4): 355–368.

McIntosh, Angus, M. L. Samuels, and Michael Benskin. 1986. *A Linguistic Atlas of Late Medieval English*. 4 vols. Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press.

McSparran, Frances. 2002. The Middle English Compendium: Past, present, future. *Dictionaries* 23: 126–141.

Murray, James A. H., John A. Simpson, and Edmund S. C. Weiner (eds.). 1989–97. *The Oxford English Dictionary*. 2nd edn. 20 vols. and 3 suppls. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Neuhaus, H. Joachim 1989. Shakespeare's Wordforms: A Database View. In: Heinz-Joachim Müllenbrock and Renate Noll-Wiemann (eds.), *Anglistentag 1988 Göttingen: Vorträge*, 264–279. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Neuhaus, H. Joachim. 1990. Die Architektur eines Shakespeare Hypertext-Systems. In: Hans-Jürgen Friemel (ed.), *Forum '90 Wissenschaft und Technik. Neue Anwendungen mit Hilfe aktueller Computer-Technologien*, 308–316. Berlin: Springer.

O'Donnell, Daniel P. 2005. *Cædmon's Hymn: A Multi-Media Study, Edition and Archive with CD-ROM*. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer.

Parsons, David N., Tania Styles, and Carole Hough (eds.). 1997–. *The Vocabulary of English Place-Names*. Nottingham: Center for English Name Studies.

Powell, Kathryn. 2004. The MANCASS C11 database: A tool for studying script and spelling in the eleventh century. *Old English Newsletter* 38(1): 29–34.

Rissanen, Matti. 2000. The world of English historical corpora: From Cædmon to the computer age. *Journal of English Linguistics* 28(1): 7–20.

Rissanen, Matti, Merja Kytö, and Minna Pallander-Collin (eds.). 1993. *Early English in the Computer Age: Explorations through the Helsinki Corpus*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Roberts, Jane, Christian J. Kay, and Lynne Grundy (eds.). 2000. *A Thesaurus of Old English*. 2nd edn, 2 vols. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Robinson, Peter. 2003. The history, discoveries and aims of the Canterbury Tales Project. *The Chaucer Review* 38(2): 126–139.

Schipper, William and Sarah Higley. 1996. ENGLISC: a new listserv discussion group. *Old English Newsletter* 30(1): 16.

Schonfeld, Roger C. 2003. *JSTOR: A History*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Simpson, John, Edmund Weiner, and Philip Durkin. 2004. The Oxford English Dictionary today. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 102(3): 335–385.

Smith, Albert H. (ed.). 1956. *English Place-Name Elements*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Spevack, Marvin. 1993. *A Shakespeare Thesaurus*. Hildesheim: Olms.

Stenroos, Merja. 2007. Sampling and annotation in the Middle English Grammar Project. In: Anneli Meurman-Solin and Arja Nurmi (eds.), *Annotating Variation and Change*. Helsinki: University of Helsinki. Available at http://www.helsinki.fi/varieng/journal/volumes/01/stenroos/ (last accessed 6 June 2011).

Stone, Louise W. and William Rothwell (eds.). 1977–92. *Anglo-Norman Dictionary*. 7 fascs. London: Modern Humanities Research Association.

Sylvester, Louise and Jane Roberts. 2002. Word studies on Early English: Contexts for a Thesaurus of Middle English. In: Javier E. Díaz Vera (ed.), *A Changing World of Words: Studies in English Historical Lexicography, Lexicology and Semantics*, 136–159. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Wright, Joseph (ed.). 1898–1905. *The English Dialect Dictionary*. 6 vols. London: Frowde.

Oliver M. Traxel, Münster (Germany)

73. Resources: Lexicographic resources

Abstract

This chapter offers a brief overview of the main dictionaries of English which have a historical perspective, or which are likely to be of particular use to historians of English. This is followed by a very short survey of current work in English etymology. Throughout I have aimed firstly to list the main relevant work, and give ample bibliographical references so that it can be located simply and easily; and secondly to alert the reader to some of the most distinctive qualities of each resource, particularly those which might confuse a reader new to a particular dictionary or other resource.

1 Historical dictionaries

The period dictionaries all came into being in a sense as children of the first edition of *The Oxford English Dictionary* (OED, Murray at al. 1884–), as part of a series of initiatives by Sir William Craigie in the 1920s (see Aitken 1987). The first edition of the OED sought to cover all but the rarest words found in English from 1150 onwards, but normally only included Old English words if they survived into Middle English or later. The period dictionaries have all sought partly to fill perceived gaps in OED's coverage, and partly to allow a sharper focus on a particular period, or, in the case of *Dictionary of Older Scottish Tongue* (DOST, Craigie et al. [eds.] 1931–2002), on a particular variety in a particular period. On the history of all of the dictionaries discussed here, the various contributions in Cowie (2008) provide an invaluable starting point, as on the history of English lexicography in general.

The OED is now in the middle of its first ever comprehensive revision, in the course of which data and perspectives from the various period dictionaries play a major part. I will therefore look first at the period dictionaries, before turning to look at the OED in its early 21st century incarnation.

1.1 *The Dictionary of Old English* (DOE) and other resources for Old English

Since the late 19th century the vocabulary of Old English has been served by *Bosworth-Toller* (Bosworth and Toller 1882–98), a dictionary edited by T. Northcote Toller on the basis of the collections of Joseph Bosworth (which were in part made use of in earlier much shorter dictionaries by Bosworth). A substantial *Supplement* by Toller, a little over half the length of the original dictionary, was added in 1921, and a much smaller *Enlarged Addenda and Corrigenda* was added by Alistair Campbell in 1972.

A serviceable hand dictionary for students is provided by Clark Hall (1960). For the letters A to G Old English is now served much better by 20th- and 21st-century scholarship in the *Dictionary of Old English* (DOE, Cameron et al. [eds.] 1986–). The DOE was one of the period dictionaries which emerged from Craigie's initiative when the first edition of the OED was nearing completion, but in fact the OED has only ever covered that portion of the vocabulary of Old English which survived beyond 1150, omitting most words and senses which were obsolete before that date, and hence DOE is more truly the successor to *Bosworth-Toller* than to OED.

One distinguishing feature of DOE is its tight and symbiotic relationship with its corpus. The body of surviving Old English is obviously relatively small in comparison with the data available for later periods. DOE has the huge advantage of being based on a comprehensive database of the surviving writings in Old English. Electronic publication of DOE makes it possible to exploit this relationship to the full: the dictionary and the database can be used in conjunction, so that quotations can be viewed in their fuller context, and so that the dictionary's detailed digest of information on spelling variation or grammatical forms can immediately be explored in greater depth using the database. Thus key questions can be carried further along whichever parameters are of interest to the researcher.

One thing that *Bosworth-Toller*, DOE, and even Clark Hall have in common is that dates are not given for quoted sources within the body of the dictionary entry. The dating of nearly all Old English sources is approximate and presents difficulties of one sort or another, and for the specialist readership of an Old English dictionary the information on dating and regional provenance given in the bibliography of a dictionary will be only the starting point for the exploration of numerous difficulties and controversies. The first edition of the OED tempted fate by assigning dates to its Old English quotations, thus in very many cases appearing hopelessly out of step with modern scholarship from an early 21st-century perspective. Old English material in the new edition of the OED instead follows a tripartite division into early Old English (for significantly early material up to 950, such as the early glossaries or the texts traditionally associated with Alfred the Great), Old English (for the vast bulk of Old English material, beginning roughly from the date of the Benedictine reforms), and late Old English (for material from 1100 to 1150).

1.2 *The Middle English Dictionary* (MED)

The MED (Kurath et al. [eds.] 1952–2001) takes advantage of its position as a dictionary of a single fairly coherent period in the history of English in order to reflect medieval society in unusual detail. This has led to criticism from some that MED is a dictionary which (to state the case very crudely) is overly keen to distinguish different senses for each different context of use. However, this very tendency (and it is certainly no more than that) makes MED an unusually rich source for social and cultural historians keen to explore the contexts in which Middle English words were used. In contrast to this very detailed analysis of meanings and contexts of use, there is only very limited labeling of the regional provenance of particular linguistic forms in the body of each entry in MED. In many ways this reflects the limited state of knowledge in the period when MED's editorial principles were established, as well as the very cautious approach of its early editors. It is now somewhat offset by the much richer documentation on

regional provenances provided by MED's bibliography, especially where this can draw on the documentation of the *Linguistic Atlas of Later Middle English* (McIntosh et al. 1986). A related characteristic of MED entries is that there is relatively little separation of material into different sections according to particular form types: to an unusual degree among the historical dictionaries of English, semantics is the main structural criterion within entries in the MED.

One particularly innovative area is the treatment of words when they appear as, or as part of, proper names. Such uses are treated in separate sections at the end of the relevant entries, thus avoiding difficult or sometimes impossible decisions about which sense to assign particular examples to. By this structural device uses as names are also identified clearly as being different in kind from other uses of words, while not being neglected entirely. In the light of this, the treatment in MED of vernacular words which occur in multilingual documents is often surprising: these are routinely assigned to the paragraphs of English examples, presumably because the meaning of the word is not in doubt, but in many cases it is very doubtful which language the word should be interpreted as belonging to. In many cases it would be at least as plausible to regard a vernacular word occurring in a Latin or mixed-language document as being Anglo-French rather than Middle English, but in MED such examples are treated as showing English words without comment (see discussion in Durkin 2009: 173–177). A similar treatment is even accorded to English words occurring as code switches in Cornish documents. If MED's editorial policy were re-thought in the light of modern work on the complexity of language contact situations it is unlikely that precisely this approach would be adopted.

The etymologies presented in MED are extremely short, identifying only the immediate antecedent or donor of a Middle English word, and giving little or no documentation of its range of spelling variation or of its meanings. However, one innovative area is in the treatment of mixed Latin and French etymologies, on which see further Section 6.2 below.

A truly revolutionary aspect of the editorial policy of MED is the use of a system of double dating, giving as primary date the date of the witness cited (i.e. a particular manuscript, or in some cases an early printed book), followed in parentheses by the putative date of composition of the text (where this differs). This has the huge advantage that the primary dates, used for ordering quotations and seen first by the reader, are those of the firm documentary evidence. The question of whether or not a particular reading may reflect the authorial text is then raised by the presence of the composition date, with additional evidence being brought to bear on this question when alternative readings are cited from other witnesses. It is important to be aware, however, that many of the editions used by MED are critical editions, giving a base text which is typically based on the readings of a particular witness but with numerous editorial normalizations, emendations, and corrections, which may or may not be based on the readings of other witnesses or on what the editor takes to be the more usual practice elsewhere in the same witness. In such editions an apparatus recording deviations from the base text and the readings is normally given, but very often many changes to the text are not listed in the apparatus, on the grounds that they are not taken by the editor to make a substantive difference to the text. For a linguist the implications of such editorial policies in the editions used by dictionaries can be very significant. To a large extent this is a general problem of any linguistic work based on editions which are not entirely

faithful diplomatic transcripts of a particular witness. However, in the presentation of data in a dictionary it can be easy to lose sight of these issues, since the user is at a remove from the edition, and it is important that MED's quotations are approached with due caution, and that recourse is made to the edition (and if possible the underlying witnesses) in all cases of doubt. Fortunately, as noted above, the MED is provided with a very comprehensive bibliography (especially in its expanded electronic version) which permits ready identification of the editions used, with dating information (and often also localization) for each witness.

For insightful accounts of the history of MED, in addition to its own prefatory materials, see Blake (2002), Adams (2002), Kretzschmar (2002), which all arose from celebrations for the completion of the dictionary.

1.3 *A Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue* (DOST)

DOST (Craigie et al. [eds.] 1931–2002) has been placed here among the period dictionaries because it covers a period which is entirely in the past, with a cut-off date of 1700. However, since it also describes only English as used in a particular place, Scotland, it could equally be placed in the following section on dictionaries of particular varieties or geographical areas. It covers a fascinating time span, documenting a variety of English with an emergent standard independent of that of the south of England, followed in the 17th century by the beginnings of the decline of that independent standard in the face of pressures from the English of England. The nature of this material shaped the inclusion policy of DOST: DOST is a hybrid – "comprehensive" down to 1600, "supplementary" from 1600 to 1700, when it records only the specially Scottish (Aitken 1987: 105). Throughout its history DOST has striven to define itself as a resource distinctively different from the OED, although in some ways the differences of lexicographical approach can detract from the comparison of the lexis of England and Scotland which should be one of the key innovations made possible by DOST. The methodology of DOST has also changed to an unusual degree during the course of its editorial history. One innovation found already in the entries edited by Craigie and continued by his successors Aitken and Stevenson is the tendency to devote separate entries to different form variants of a single (etymologically defined) word. Such an approach is not unknown in OED or other historical dictionaries, but in DOST it became commonplace and something of a hallmark of the dictionary. In latter years (from approximately the letter R onwards) under Dareau's editorship a different approach again was adopted to the same question, with for instance *to* and *till* being combined under a single entry, on the grounds that the meaning and function of the two words are the same. In this particular instance the theoretical underpinning for such an approach is hard to see: the two words are of different etymology (*to* being from Old English and *till* from Old Norse), and are very distinct in form, sharing only the same initial consonant. However, a suggestion is made that the two function as distributional variants in early Scots, although the argument is not pursued very far: "In early use the rule of *till* coming before vowels or *h* tends to be observed, later the variation seems to be simply a matter of style." (DOST s.v. *til* prep.) Such conflation, which goes much further than would normally be countenanced in most other historical dictionaries, is all the more surprising in the latter stages of a dictionary which in its middle period was marked particularly by its tendency to split material into separate entries which most other historical dictionaries

would tend to treat in a single entry. Sadly, it appears that limitations on time and re-
sources played a considerable part in such decisions (on this particular example and on
criticism of DOST's earlier policy compare Dareau 2002; for further examples of both
the early and later policies see the introductory matter to the last volume of DOST). So
far as the dating of quoted sources is concerned, DOST largely follows the policy of the
first edition of the OED in generally using putative dates of composition.

Scottish National Dictionary (SND, Grant and Murison [eds.] 1931–1976) could be
considered here among the period dictionaries, since it follows on chronologically
immediately from DOST. Both dictionaries can now be consulted online together as
part of the website *Dictionary of the Scots Language* (http://www.dsl.ac.uk/dsl/, last ac-
cessed 24 November 2010). However, particularly since SND deals with a period in
which the functions of written Scots have been severely curtailed, it will be considered
below in the company of other regional dictionaries such as *English Dialect Dictionary*
(EDD, Wright 1898–1905).

1.4 An abandoned dictionary of Early Modern English

Another of the projects envisaged by Craigie was a dictionary of Early Modern English.
A good deal of preparatory work was undertaken at the University of Michigan, but
ultimately support could not be found for the full dictionary project. Reservations
rested largely on the fact that the samples prepared were perceived not to be suffi-
ciently distinct from the OED's coverage of the same period to justify the considerable
investment which would have been involved. On the history of this project see Bailey
(1985) and Aitken (1987). Today the materials which were compiled for the early mod-
ern dictionary are being used to help supplement the coverage of this period for the
new edition of the OED, providing the sort of high quality results from targeted reading
programs which searching of electronic corpora still cannot match (see further Durkin
2002b).

1.5 *The Oxford English Dictionary* (OED)

In 1989 the first edition of the OED (Murray et al. 1884–1928) and its supplements
(Murray et al. 1933; Burchfield 1972–86) were brought together in a single alphabetical
sequence, forming the second edition of the dictionary (Simpson and Weiner 1989). At
time of writing in 2010 a quarter of the new, third edition of the dictionary has been
published online (Simpson 2000–). This is the first ever top to bottom revision of the
OED. At the same time as new words and senses are being added to the dictionary,
all of the existing content is being revised. Extensive searches are being made for ante-
datings, postdatings, and other examples which make a significant difference to the ex-
isting documentation; approximately 50% of all existing lemmas and senses are being
antedated. Such examples come from a variety of sources: the OED's traditional tar-
geted reading of historical and contemporary texts, today making extensive use of
non-literary as well as literary sources; other historical and regional dictionaries, includ-
ing all of those mentioned in this chapter; text corpora and other electronic collections;
and direct contributions from dictionary users. Especially for the modern period, the
focus remains on published, printed material. All definitions and labels are being reas-
sessed. Pronunciations are being updated, using British and U.S. pronunciation models

established in Upton et al. (2001). All etymologies are being comprehensively revised in the light of a century of scholarship and the new approaches made possible by modern research tools (see further Section 6.2).

The availability of databases of historical texts is changing all the time, and is having a truly transforming effect on the OED's historical lexicography. There remain some areas of difficulty and of controversy. Notoriously, the coverage of 18th-century vocabulary in the first and second editions of the OED is not so comprehensive as its coverage of other periods (see e.g. Brewer 2007); however, availability of the majority of surviving printed 18th-century material in electronically searchable form (especially through *Eighteenth-Century Collections Online* [ECCO], Gage Cengage Learning 2009) suggests that there is genuinely a dip in lexical productivity in the 18th century, at least in those varieties and registers which are reflected by surviving printed sources. In many instances where the documentation of the OED presented a gap in the 18th century, it remains impossible to fill this gap, even with the help of such resources as ECCO. Exploring and explaining this further will be a major task for English historical lexicology.

The first edition of the OED normally gave the presumed date of composition as the date for its quoted sources. The new policy of dating Old English quotations with the broad periodization eOE/OE/lOE has already been discussed in Section 2.1. For Middle English material OED3 broadly follows MED (see Section 2.2), using documentary dates as the primary dates for ordering material, but also paying close attention to composition dates in selecting examples. This creates some areas of difficulty, e.g. with Middle English works which survive only in 16th- or even 17th-century copies, and which thus appear alongside genuinely 16th- or 17th-century uses if cited. In many cases use of such sources can be avoided without any significant loss to the historical picture presented (it should be remembered that typically only a representative selection of Middle English examples are given in OED anyway). Sometimes, use of such sources is unavoidable, e.g. where the composition date would be the earliest date for a word or meaning: in such cases a note is normally supplied drawing attention to the anomaly. Early modern material (and, where relevant, later material) is also dated by date of publication in OED3, hence examples from Shakespeare are now generally dated rather later than the (sometimes speculative) dates of first performance which were normally used in the first edition; significantly, quotations also follow the text of the witness used, not that of a modern critical edition (see further Durkin 2002b on changes in this period). A similar approach is also applied to Older Scots material, with the result that dates are often much later than those found for the same source in DOST.

Another innovation is in the ordering of senses within entries. In the first edition this is generally chronological, i.e. following the earliest date of attestation for each sense, but in some instances senses are placed in what seemed to editors their likely order of historical development from one another, even if this ran counter to the actual dates of attestation. This could be termed a "logical" arrangement of material, but it should be noted that the approach remained diachronically motivated: the intention was to reflect what seemed likeliest to have been the historical development of the senses, rather than the synchronic relationships between the various senses of a word. In OED3 material is ordered on a strictly chronological basis, even where this places e.g. a figurative sense earlier than the literal sense from which it appears to have developed. In some cases this may well reflect historical reality, e.g. where in a borrowing

situation a figurative meaning may have been borrowed earlier than a literal one (e.g. *pregnant*, recorded earliest in a figurative meaning, which may have been the first to be borrowed from Latin or French). In others it seems likely that the discrepancy is an accident of the historical record (e.g. *milksop*, which is recorded earlier in figurative use than in the literal sense 'sop of bread', and which is recorded earlier still as a surname). On this issue see Considine (1996), Lundbladh (1997), Considine (1997), Allan (2012).

The secondary literature on the OED is huge. On the first edition see especially Mugglestone (2000). On the new edition see Simpson (2004), Simpson et al. (2004), and further references given there.

2 Dictionaries of particular varieties or geographical areas

Most of the dictionaries discussed in this section are also, in a sense, historical dictionaries, since they deal with a particular variety or geographical area over a particular time span, and at least some of the documentation is in the form of dated quotations arranged chronologically. However, in most of them this is accompanied by (largely synchronic) data from fieldwork, and the resulting dictionaries are thus somewhat hybrid in character.

Joseph Wright's *The English Dialect Dictionary* (EDD, Wright 1898–1905) was a worthy sister (or at least a close relative) of the first edition of the OED, and continues to be of inestimable value to anyone with an interest in historical dialectology. Its continuing importance is reflected by the considerable time and resources which have recently been devoted to the development of an electronic version at the University of Innsbruck. EDD was a pioneering venture in historical dialect lexicography, and the elegance and familiarity of the result makes it easy to overlook how seamlessly various different types of data are brought together. Most obviously, fieldworker reports are drawn upon alongside the results of reading of print (and some manuscript) sources of the type undertaken by OED. The print sources include many secondary sources (especially dialect glossaries and similar studies), as well as primary sources, drawn from literary publications, journals, newspaper columns, and a wide variety of other types of publication. Modern work on sources of this type has shown significant differences between the features which are salient and hence indicated by spellings in dialect writings by and for native speakers of a particular variety, and those intended for people who are not native speakers of that variety (see Trudgill 2002). EDD presents material drawn from all of these diverse sources side by side, with the result that its listing of form variation at the head of each dictionary entry must be used with care, and with constant reference to the supporting documentation given in these form listings and in the quotation evidence which forms the main body of each entry (on this topic see further Durkin 2010a, Durkin 2010b).

For more recent coverage of English regional usage, in addition to (sadly too few) glossaries of individual regional varieties in the 20th century and beyond, EDD is complemented by the record of the speech of mostly elderly speakers of traditional regional dialects in the mid 20th century presented in Upton et al. (1994), based on the material of the *Survey of English Dialects*.

A fundamentally similar framework is followed in *The Scottish National Dictionary* (SND), which presents similar data for Scotland, over a broadly similar historical

timeframe. Standard, non-regionally-marked English as used in Scotland is largely out-side SND's remit, although "Scotticisms", i.e. words or senses found only or chiefly in Scottish English, are included, even when they belong mainly or entirely to the standard language as used in Scotland. In this aspect of its coverage SND thus resembles diction-aries such as *A Dictionary of South African English on Historical Principles* (DSAE, Penny 1996), *The Australian National Dictionary* (AND, Ramson 1988), or *The Dictionary of New Zealand English* (DNZE, Orsman 1997) (see below) rather than EDD.

Modern U.S. regional usage is wonderfully covered by *A Dictionary of American Regional English* (DARE, Cassidy and Hall 1985–2002; see von Schneidemesser, Chapter 118). Like EDD and SND, DARE combines the results of fieldwork with quotations from various types of literary sources (the latter especially for earlier per-iods). Its fieldwork methodology is informed by modern work on dialectology, espe-cially the techniques involved in the editing of dialect atlases. This is reflected most obviously in the splendid maps which accompany many of the entries, but is also re-flected more fundamentally in the nature of the data on which information on regional distributions is based. The dictionary's founder editor comments thus on its inclusion policy, which is rather narrower than for instance SND's: "DARE's treated lexicon ex-cludes standard words, words of artificial formation, cant or secret vocabularies, highly technical usages, and popular slang. The borderlines of some of these are very difficult to determine" (Cassidy 1987: 126).

The material excluded by DARE is part of the core target vocabulary for numerous dictionaries of regionally defined varieties of English. For US English there are *A Dic-tionary of American English* (Craigie and Hulbert 1938–44) and its successor *A Dictio-nary of Americanisms* (Mitford 1951–), which both ultimately emerged from Craigie's scheme for the period dictionaries (see Aitken 1987: 102). Both are now somewhat elderly. A new dictionary of distinctively U.S. English would be an enormous undertak-ing, and hard to delimit. Similar considerations have thus far stood in the way of a dic-tionary of distinctively English (or British) English. Other dictionaries of what is distinctive in the vocabulary of various regionally defined varieties of English have fared much better. Each takes as its remit to cover broadly that component of the vocabulary which is distinctive to the regional variety in question, or which originated in it or is strongly associated with it. South African English, Australian English, and New Zealand English are served admirably by *A Dictionary of South African English on Historical Principles* (DSAE), *The Australian National Dictionary* (AND), and *The Dictionary of New Zealand English* (DNZE). For Canadian English *A Dictionary of Canadianisms on Historical Principles* (Avis 1967) is available, and a new edition cur-rently in preparation (see http://faculty.arts.ubc.ca/sdollinger/dchp2.htm, last accessed 29 January 2012; see Dollinger, Chapter 119) is eagerly awaited; *Dictionary of New-foundland English* (Story et al. 1982) is also a valuable resource for the distinctive lexis of Newfoundland. *The Dictionary of Jamaican English* (Cassidy and Le Page 1980) sets an example for one variety of Caribbean English, followed by *Dictionary of Bahamian English* (Holm 1982); for general coverage of Caribbean English *A Dic-tionary of Caribbean English Usage* (Allsopp 1996) is invaluable, but a more detailed treatment with more of a diachronic perspective would be warmly welcomed.

If we turn to gaps in coverage, these certainly exist even for the English of the British Isles. Irish English is particularly poorly represented (although *A Concise Ulster Dictio-nary* (Macafee 1986) is invaluable for a very concise treatment of Ulster English).

Contemporary Indian English awaits a full treatment (in place of which Yule et al. 1903 remains invaluable; compare also Hawkins 1984, among others). The English of for example Singapore or Hong Kong also presents inviting prospects for lexicographical research.

3 Slang dictionaries

Few of the dictionaries so far listed exclude slang, but the specialist slang dictionary can provide many useful perspectives. This said, most slang dictionaries with a diachronic perspective show deficiencies in the historical documentation they offer; it thus often is difficult for the reader to tell factually based statements from educated guesswork when assessing suggested dates of first occurrence, and definitions and etymologies. The great exception to this is *A Historical Dictionary of American Slang* (HDAS, Lighter 1994–2008), offering (for those parts of the alphabet so far published) a historical dictionary treatment of American slang, with dated illustrative quotations, and definitions and etymologies based on these (and also drawing on the secondary literature where appropriate). Slang in British English has been less well served, although there is a great deal of useful documentation in resources such as Partridge (1984), Dalzell and Victor (2006), or Green (2008). For the early modern period Williams (1994) gives very useful documentation on sexual slang. Jonathon Green's historical dictionary of slang (Green 2010), which has appeared while this chapter has been in press, is a major new contribution to the field. Regional dictionaries such as AND or DNZE can be useful on slang in local varieties. Contemporary slang dictionaries from earlier periods are an invaluable resource, in most cases long since mined for information in OED and elsewhere, but there doubtless remain discoveries to be made: for an overview see Coleman (2004–08).

4 A historical thesaurus

In all of the dictionaries listed in this chapter it is possible to trace linguistic history through word forms. Electronic versions of dictionaries also enable users to make searches on meanings, since it is possible to search the wording of definitions. However, this can be a laborious process, and it is always very difficult to be certain that something has not been missed because a difference of wording in a definition was not anticipated. The *Historical Thesaurus of the Oxford English Dictionary* (HTOED, Kay et al. 2009), in preparation for 40 years at the University of Glasgow, now makes it possible to explore all of the documentation of the OED through word meanings, arranged in a thesaurus structure. The OED's data is supplemented by a comprehensive Old English wordlist, enabling the HTOED to portray the semantic history of English from the earliest times to the present day. Within each semantic category the time period for which each word has been current in a particular meaning can be seen at a glance, enabling readers to analyze the diachronic development of semantic fields and of meaning relations more broadly. Any given item can then be explored more fully in the OED (or beyond in other dictionaries, or in corpora, etc.). Through the HTOED whole new areas of research in English historical lexicology have now become viable. On the history and development of HTOED see Kay et al. (2009).

5 Dictionaries and other resources for English etymology

This brief section will give an overview of the main sources of information on the etymologies of English words, and will note some major trends in recent work. For introductions specifically to English etymology see Bammesberger (1984) and Lockwood (1995); on more general methodological questions see Durkin (2006b, 2009).

5.1 Etymologies of Old English words

For reasons of time and resources, DOE does not cover etymologies. *Bosworth-Toller* (Bosworth and Toller 1882–98) gives only occasional listings of cognates and parallels in other Germanic languages. OED provides much fuller etymologies, but only for those words which fall within its inclusion policy; the same applies to *The Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology* (ODEE, Onions et al. 1966). For words which are not included in OED, recourse can be made (by those who read German) to Holthausen (1963), but this is not a full etymological dictionary, and for many words it serves as little more than an index to the relevant sections of Pokorny (1959–69); a very few words are covered in much more detail in Bammesberger (1979). For fuller discussion of Old English words of Germanic descent, it is usually necessary to turn to the etymological dictionaries of other Germanic languages, especially Kluge (2002) and the dictionaries of inherited Germanic strong verbs and primary adjectives edited by Seebold (1970) and Heidermanns (1993) respectively; for inherited nouns Wodtko et al. (2008) is extremely useful.

5.2 Middle English and modern English

The fullest accounts of the etymologies of most English words are given in OED, although those not yet revised for the new edition are on average many decades old, and many are badly in need of revision. ODEE is a single-volume etymological dictionary, mostly based on OED's data, but with some supplementary data and reconsideration of some etymologies, especially those in the earlier parts of the alphabet, which are generally in most need of review in OED. There is some further updating in *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology* (Hoad 1986). The period dictionaries (except DOE) all offer etymologies, although these are generally very brief (those in SND tend to be somewhat fuller, and often have useful insights). Among the regional dictionaries DARE is particularly strong in this area.

  The etymologies in MED are very brief, but do show at least one important innovation: dual etymologies are often considered for words which could, on formal and semantic grounds, be from either Latin or French or both (see Coleman 1995, Durkin 2002a). This lead has been taken up in the new edition of the OED, where the availability of much better documentation on medieval Latin and French (both continental and insular), and more generous editorial resources, make it possible to make detailed comparisons of the semantic and formal histories of words in Latin, French, and English. This work opens up further new perspectives on processes of continuing semantic and/or formal borrowing from one or more donor languages over an extended period of time, as an English word acquires further meanings and/or shows continuing formal influence. In so far as the available documentation allows, a similar methodology can be

applied in examining borrowings from other languages (see Durkin 2004, 2006a, 2008, 2009). In many cases improved documentation, for English and for donor languages, can help resolve questions about the route of transmission of a borrowed word; e.g. *marmalade* can be shown probably to be an early, 14th-century, borrowing directly from Portuguese, rather than via French as previously thought (see Durkin 1999).

Outside the dictionaries, but interconnecting with them, work on language contact has brought many new theoretical perspectives to the study of borrowing in English in recent decades. Thomason and Kaufman (1988) and Townend (2002) both consider various situations in which the introduction of words into English may have resulted from transfer when speakers switched from another language to English (i.e. a language shift situation), rather than showing borrowing by speakers of English from another language (i.e. a language maintenance situation); this theoretical perspective has shown most potential when applied to the introduction of words from Norse during the Middle English period. In work which overlaps to some extent, Dance (2003) offers a very valuable detailed consideration of intralinguistic spread of borrowed vocabulary. Such processes are generally not reflected well by even the most detailed historical dictionaries, and accommodating such perspectives is likely to be one of the future challenges for English etymology.

Work, of course, also continues on English words of unknown or problematic etymology. A detailed investigation of past suggestions combined with often very daring new hypotheses (frequently involving sound symbolism) is shown by the etymologies showcased in Liberman (2008). There is a good deal of very useful bibliographical material in Liberman (2010). A search for previously unconsidered sources for very early Old English borrowings is shown by the work of Theo Vennemann (e.g. 2002).

6 References

Adams, Michael. 2002. Phantom Dictionaries: The Middle English Dictionary before Kurath. *Dictionaries* 23: 95–114.

Aitken, Adam Jack. 1987. The Period Dictionaries. In: Robert Burchfield (ed.), *Studies in Lexicography*, 94–116. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Allan, Kathryn. 2012. Using OED data as evidence. In: Kathryn Allan and Justyna Robinson (eds.), *Current Methods in Historical Semantics*, 11–39. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Allsopp, Richard (ed.) and Jeanette Allsopp (contributor) 1996. *A Dictionary of Caribbean English Usage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Avis, Walter S (ed.). 1967. *A Dictionary of Canadianisms on Historical Principles*. Toronto: W. J. Gage.

Bailey, Richard W. 1985. Charles C. Fries and the *Early Modern English Dictionary*. In: Peter H. and Nancy M. Fries (eds.), *Towards an Understanding of Language: Charles C. Fries in Perspective*, 171–204. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Bammesberger, Alfred. 1979. *Beiträge zu einem etymologischen Wörterbuch des Altenglischen*. Heidelberg: Winter.

Bammesberger, Alfred. 1984. *English Etymology*. Heidelberg: Winter.

Blake, Norman F. 2002. On the Completion of the Middle English Dictionary. *Dictionaries* 23: 48–75.

Bosworth, Joseph and Thomas N. Toller. 1882–98. *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary; Supplement*, ed. T. Northcote Toller, 1921; *Enlarged Addenda and Corrigenda*, ed. Alistair Campbell, 1972. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Brewer, Charlotte. 2007. Reporting eighteenth-century vocabulary in the Oxford English Dictionary. In: John Considine and Giovanni Iammartino (eds.), *Words and Dictionaries from the British Isles in Historical Perspective*, 109–135. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Cameron, Angus, Ashley Crandell Amos, and Antonette diPaolo Healey (eds.). 1986–. *The Dictionary of Old English*. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, http://www.doe.utoronto.ca/ (last accessed 24 November 2010).

Cassidy, Frederic G. and Robert B. Le Page. 1980. *The Dictionary of Jamaican English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cassidy, Frederic G. and Joan Houston Hall. 1985–2002. *A Dictionary of American Regional English*. Cambridge: Belknap Press.

Cassidy, Frederic G. 1987. The Dictionary of American Regional English as a resource for language study. In: Robert Burchfield (ed.), *Studies in Lexicography 1987*, 117–135. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Clark Hall, John R. 1960. *A Concise Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*, 4th edn., with a supplement by Herbert D. Meritt. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Coleman, Julie. 1995. The chronology of French and Latin loan words in English. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 93: 95–124.

Coleman, Julie. 2004–08. *A History of Cant and Slang Dictionaries*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Considine, John. 1996. The Meanings, deduced logically from the Etymology. In: Martin Gellerstam, Jerker Järberg, Sven-Göran Malmgren, Kerstin Norén, Lena Rogström and Catarina Röjder Papmehl (eds.), *Euralex '96: proceedings I–II: papers submitted to the seventh EURALEX International Congress on Lexicography in Göteborg, Sweden I., 1996*. 365–371. Göteborg: Göteborg University.

Considine, John. 1997. Etymology and the Oxford English Dictionary: a response. *International Journal of Lexicography* 10: 234–236.

Cowie, Anthony P. 2008. *The Oxford History of English Lexicography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Craigie, William A. and James R. Hulbert (eds.). 1938–44. *A Dictionary of American English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Craigie, William A., Adam Jack Aitken, James A. C. Stevenson, and Marace Dareau (eds.). 1931–2002. *A Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. http://www.dsl.ac.uk/dsl/ (last accessed 24 November 2010).

Dalzell, Tom and Terry Victor. 2006. *The New Partridge Dictionary of Slang and Unconventional English*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Dance, Richard. 2003. *Words Derived from Old Norse in Early Middle English: Studies in the Vocabulary of the South-West Midland texts*. Tempe, Arizona: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies.

Dareau, Marace. 2002. DOST: Its history and completion. *Dictionaries* 23: 208–231.

Durkin, Philip. 1999. Root and branch: revising the etymological component of the OED. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 97: 1–49.

Durkin, Philip. 2002a. "Mixed" etymologies of Middle English items in OED3: Some questions of methodology and policy. *Dictionaries* 23: 142–155.

Durkin, Philip. 2002b. Changing documentation in the third edition of the Oxford English Dictionary: sixteenth-century vocabulary as a test case. In: Teresa Fanego, Belén Méndez-Naya, and Elena Seoane (eds.), *Sounds, Words, Texts and Change*, 65–81. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Durkin, Philip. 2004. Loanword etymologies in the third edition of the OED: Some questions of classification. In: Christian Kay, Carole Hough, and Irené Wotherspoon (eds.), *New Perspectives on English Historical Linguistics*. Vol. II: *Lexis and Transmission*, 79–90. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Durkin, Philip. 2006a. Loanword etymologies in the third edition of the OED: The benefits of a consistent methodology for the scholarly user. In: Nikolaus Ritt, Herbert Schendl, Christiane Dalton-Puffer, and Dieter Kastovsky (eds.), *Medieval English and its Heritage*, 61–75. Frankfurt am Main: Lang.

Durkin, Philip. 2006b. Etymology. In: Keith Brown (ed.), *Encyclopaedia of Language and Linguistics*, 2nd edn., 260–267. Oxford: Elsevier.

Durkin, Philip. 2008. Latin loanwords of the early modern period: How often did French act as an intermediary? In: Richard Dury, Maurizio Gotti, and Marina Dossena (eds.), *Selected Papers from the Fourteenth International Conference on English Historical Linguistics (ICEHL 14), Bergamo, 21–25 August 2006*, 185–202. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Durkin, Philip. 2009. *The Oxford Guide to Etymology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Durkin, Philip. 2010a. Assessing non-standard writing in lexicography. In: Raymond Hickey (ed.), *Varieties in Writing: the Written Word as Linguistic Evidence*, 43–60. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Durkin, Philip. 2010b. The English Dialect Dictionary and the Oxford English Dictionary: A continuing relationship between two dictionaries. In: Manfred Markus, Clive Upton, and Reinhard Heuberger (eds.), *Wright's English Dialect Dictionary and Beyond. Proceedings of the 15th ICEHL in Munich, August 2008*, 199–216. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.

Gage Cengage Learning. 2009. *Eighteenth Century Collections Online (ECCO)*. Gale Digital Collections. http://mlr.com/DigitalCollections/products/ecco/

Grant, William and David D. Murison (eds.). 1931–76. *The Scottish National Dictionary: designed partly on regional lines and partly on historical principles, and containing all the Scottish words known to be in use or to have been in use since c. 1700; Supplement* 2005. Edinburgh: Scottish National Dictionary Association. Available online as part of *Dictionary of the Scots Language*: http://www.dsl.ac.uk/dsl/ (last accessed 24 November 2010).

Green, Jonathon. 2008. *Chambers Slang Dictionary*. London: Chambers Harrap.

Green, Jonathon. 2010. *Green's Dictionary of Slang*. Edinburgh: Chambers.

Hawkins, R. E. 1984. *Common Indian Words in English*. Delhi/New York: Oxford University Press.

Heidermanns, Frank. 1993. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der Germanischen Primäradjektive*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Hoad, Terry F. (ed.). 1986. *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Holm, John A. (ed.). 1982. *Dictionary of Bahamian English*. Cold Spring, New York: Lexik House.

Holthausen, Ferdinand. 1963. *Altenglisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 2nd edn. Heidelberg: Winter.

Kay, Christian, Jane Roberts, Michael Samuels, and Irené Wotherspoon (eds.). 2009. *Historical Thesaurus of the Oxford English Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kay, Christian, Jane Roberts, Michael Samuels, and Irené Wotherspoon. 2009. Unlocking the OED: The story of the Historical Thesaurus of the OED. In: Kay et al. (eds.), Vol. I., xiii–xx.

Kluge, Friedrich. 2002. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der Deutschen Sprache*. 24th edn., ed. by Elmar Seebold. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Kretzschmar, William A. Jr. 2002. Following Kurath: an appreciation. *Dictionaries* 23: 115–125.

Kurath, Hans, Sherman Kuhn, and Robert Lewis (eds.). 1952–2001. *The Middle English Dictionary*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. http://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/med/ (last accessed 24 November 2010).

Liberman, Anatoly. 2008. *An Analytic Dictionary of English Etymology: An Introduction*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Liberman, Anatoly. 2010. *A Bibliography of English Etymology*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Lighter, Jonathan E. (ed.). 1994–2008. *A Historical Dictionary of American Slang, 1994–97* (Vol. II *H-O* 1997) Vols. I and II first published as: *Historical Dictionary of American Slang*. New York: Random House. (From Vol. III New York: Oxford University Press).

Lockwood, William B. 1995. *An Informal Introduction to English Etymology*. London: Minerva Press.

Lundbladh, Carl-Erik. 1997. Etymology and the historical principles of the OED. *International Journal of Lexicography* 10: 231–233.

Macafee, Caroline A. (ed.). 1986. *A Concise Ulster Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

McIntosh, Angus, Michael Samuels and Michael Benskin, with the assistance of Margaret Laing and Keith Williamson. 1986. *A Linguistic Atlas of Late Middle English*. Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press.

Mitford, Mathews M. (ed.). 1951–. *A Dictionary of Americanisms*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mugglestone, Lynda (ed.). 2000. *Lexicography and the OED: Pioneers in the Untrodden Forest*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Murray, James A. H., Henry Bradley, Sir William A. Craigie, and Charles T. Onions. 1884–1928. *The Oxford English Dictionary. Supplement and Bibliography*, 1933. *Supplement*, 1972–86 ed. Robert W. Burchfield. 2nd edn., 1989 ed. John A. Simpson and Edmund S. C. Weiner. *Additions Series*, 1993–97 ed. John A. Simpson, Edmund S. C. Weiner, and Michael Proffitt. 3rd edn. (in progress) *OED Online*, 2000– ed. John A. Simpson, www.oed.com (last accessed 24 November 2010).

Onions, Charles T, with the assistance of G. W. S. Friedrichsen and Robert W. Burchfield (eds.). 1966. *The Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Orsman, Harry (ed.). 1997. *The Dictionary of New Zealand English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Partridge, Eric. 1984. *A Dictionary of Slang and Unconventional English*, 8th edn., ed. by Paul Beale. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Penny, Silva, (ed.) 1996. *A Dictionary of South African English on Historical Principles*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pokorny, Julius. 1959–69. *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bern: Franke.

Ritt, Nikolaus, Herbert Schender Christiane Dalton-Puffer, and Dieter Kastovsky (eds.). 2006. *Medieval English and its Heritage*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Seebold, Elmar. 1970. *Vergleichendes und etymologisches Wörterbuch der germanischen Starken Verben*. The Hague: Mouton.

Ramson, William S. (ed.). 1988. *The Australian National Dictionary: a Dictionary of Australianisms on Historical Principles*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Simpson, John. 2004. The OED and collaborative research into the history of English. *Anglia* 122: 185–208.

Simpson, John, Edmund Weiner, and Philip Durkin. 2004. The Oxford English Dictionary Today. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 102: 335–374.

Story, George M., William J. Kirwin, and John D. A. Widdowson. 1982. *Dictionary of Newfoundland English*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Thomason, Sarah G. and Terrence Kaufman. 1988. *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Townend, Matthew. 2002. *Language and history in Viking age England: linguistic relations between speakers of Old Norse and Old English*. Turnhout: Brepols.

Trudgill, Peter. 2002. Dedialectalisation and Norfolk dialect orthography. In: Irma Taavitsainen, Gunnel Melchers, and Päivi Pahta (eds.), *Writing in Nonstandard English*, 323–329. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Upton, Clive, William A. Kretzschmar Jr., and Rafal Konopka. 2001. *The Oxford Dictionary of Pronunciation for Current English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Upton, Clive, David Parry, and John D. A. Widdowson. 1994. *Survey of English Dialects: The Dictionary and Grammar*. London: Routledge.

Vennemann, Theo. 2002. Key issues in English etymology. In: Teresa Fanego, Belen Méndez-Naya, and Elena Seoane (eds.), *Sounds, Words, Texts and Change. Selected papers from 11 ICEHL, Santiago de Compostela, 7–11 September 2000*, 227–252. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Williams, Gordon. 1994. *A Dictionary of Sexual Language and Imagery in Shakespearean and Stuart Literature*. London: Athlone Press.

Wodtko, Dagmar S., Britta Irslinger, and Carolin Schneider. 2008. *Nomina im Indogermanischen Lexikon*. Heidelberg: Winter.

Wright, Joseph A. (ed.). 1898–1905. *The English Dialect Dictionary*. London: Henry Frowde (at the expense of Joseph Wright); subsequently: Oxford: Oxford University Press. Electronic version in preparation at University of Innsbruck: http://www.uibk.ac.at/anglistik/projects/speed/ (last accessed 24 November 2010).

Yule, Henry, Arthur C. Burnell, and William Crooke. 1903. *Hobson-Jobson: A Glossary of Colloquial Anglo-Indian Words and Phrases, and of Kindred Terms, Etymological, Historical, Geographical and Discursive*, new edn., ed. by William Crooke. London: Murray.

Philip Durkin, Oxford (UK)

74. Resources: Teaching perspectives

1. Introduction
2. Linguistics and philology
3. The textbook
4. Common objectives
5. From HEL to HOTEL
6. Unorthodoxies
7. Summary
8. References

Abstract

The typical university survey course on the history of English problematically combines linguistics and history. Conceiving such a course is a challenge for many teachers because combining the two subjects is not easy, partly due to recent relations between philology and linguistics. While choosing a textbook is important to overcoming this impasse, the key to a successful course is determining the appropriate objectives, both fundamentals and otherwise essential aspects of the subject, both historical and linguistic. While students often anticipate the History of English (HEL) as a punishing course, it is possible to make History of the English Language (HOTEL) hospitable, instead. Various instructors cited do so by demonstrating the relevance of the material, engaging students as fully as possible, and capitalizing on the familiarity of certain aspects of language, especially lexis. Surveys are not the only courses appropriate to the subject, and teachers should consider unorthodox approaches and unorthodox sites within the curriculum.

1 Introduction

The typical university survey course on the history of English language (HEL) combines linguistics and something called "history", though what "history" means in this case is not obvious. The course is usually part of the English curriculum, usually fits into a single academic term, and usually covers a millennium or more of language

history. For several centuries, the language and the history were helpfully restricted to England and southern Scotland (see Watts, Chapter 80); subsequently, though, they spread over the globe in abundant variety. The course depends on literary and other texts as sources of linguistic data, especially in pre-Modern periods, but the degree to which students encounter English in literary contexts is variable. Sometimes the course is taught by a credentialed linguist who teaches in an English department; sometimes it is taught by a literary scholar, often one who studies Old and Middle English literature and culture, but who may have minimal philological training or interest; occasionally it is taught by someone we might call a philologist, though explicitly philological training in English doctoral programs has been on the wane for decades, especially in the United States.

Usually, too, a history of English course focuses on language change, though "change" is not the only historical category potentially valuable in language study. The change model focuses attention on what is often called the "inner history" of English. Celia Millward, in *A Biography of the English Language*, a leading textbook conceived on the change model, describes inner history as "the changes that occur within the language itself, changes that cannot be attributed to external forces", whereas the "outer history is the events that have happened to speakers of the language leading to changes in the language" (Millward 1989: 10). This is a very narrow sense of language history, albeit a defensible one. Anyway, how can a course probably taught by a linguist untrained in the histories of Anglophone peoples plausibly account for the history of a language like English, given its age and its many varieties, unless it takes a similarly narrow approach?

In fact, there are significant areas of agreement among teachers of the history of English about what to teach in a survey and how to teach it; there are, of course, also significant areas of disagreement about both linguistic and historical content of such a course. This chapter begins with the origins of disagreement, and proceeds to illustrate both agreement and disagreement – first in the array of textbooks available to support the course, subsequently in the practice of individual professors as they identify objectives and subjects essential to the course, as well as an effective pedagogical rhetoric for a subject that unnerves many students – and particularize them in course design and student course work. Surveys are not the only curricular means to teach the history of English, however, and, towards the end of the chapter, I consider ways in which to locate the subject at various curricular sites, representing various ways of approaching it linguistically, historically, and textually. The history of English is a naturally interdisciplinary subject, one in which many elements of a liberal education converge – if professors and students (and administrators) keep that in mind, it can be the most significant intellectual experience of an undergraduate's career.

2 Linguistics and philology

Teaching the history of English language hasn't been problematic for long, because teaching it at all is a relatively new enterprise. Francis A. March (1825–1911) was the first in America or Europe to occupy a professorship dedicated to English Language and Comparative Philology (from 1855, at Lafayette College, in Easton, Pennsylvania); his *Method of the Philological Study of the English Language* (March 1865) was the first textbook of the subject. March reported, in an address to the Modern Language Association, "In 1875 the United States Commissioner of Education sent out a circular to

our colleges inquiring about their study of Anglo-Saxon. Twenty-three colleges then claimed to be reading some of it" (March 1892: xx), and concluded that "Anglo-Saxon study, delightful and important in itself to specialists, seems also to be necessary for a solid and learned support to the study of Modern English in college" (March 1892: xxi), thus anticipating survey courses designed to demonstrate the connection by charting the history of the language in between. English, which had been overlooked as obvious before, could now be taught by the principles of classical philology: "The early professors had no recondite learning applicable to English", March said, "and did not know what to do with classes in it. They can now make English as hard as Greek" (March 1892: xxi).

By the mid-20th century, many universities and colleges offered courses on the history of English, some of them focused on "periods" of the language (Old English, Middle English, Early Modern English, Modern English), others spanning the chronological whole. The legitimacy of such courses was questioned, however, during the advent of American structural linguistics. The philological tradition was on the verge of becoming outmoded, even though nearly every intellectual impulse in it was absorbed into what we call linguistics today (see Joseph 2002: 46–47). But Leonard Bloomfield intruded dissonance into what had been an academic harmony, when he put "normal" speech ahead of textual speech, and warned students against the wasted effort of a philological "detour" (Bloomfield 1984 [1933]: 22). In a brilliant rhetorical maneuver, Bloomfield addressed the competition he was constructing between modes of language research – in a footnote: "The term *philology*, in British and in older American usage, is applied not only to the study of culture (especially through literary documents), but also to linguistics. It is important to distinguish between *philology* […] and *linguistics* […], since the two studies have little in common" (Bloomfield 1984 [1933]: 512). Bloomfield spoke of a "detour", but he really meant "wrong turn". And what started out as a disagreement about methods and aims quickly gathered ideological force.

Since Saussure, linguistics has not been a primarily historical discipline, so "the history of English" is, from a linguistic point of view, problematic, and teaching it unfamiliar territory for the average linguist. Yet Werner Hamacher (2010: 996) suggests in his apothegmatic *From "95 Theses on Philology"*, "The inner law of language is history. Philology is the guardian of this law and of this one alone". How can both Saussure and Hamacher be right? Today, we generally consider language to be natural, partly a matter of the brain, and partly a matter of ordered social activity, the sort on which we collect data which we then analyze in the social sciences (see Joseph 2002: 46). But "there is nothing natural about a sense of history" (Frank 1997: 500). How does a course on the history of English reconcile these conceptual tensions in practice, and is that practice historical or linguistic, or in some measure both, or more?

At least some of the practice must be historical, and not just an account of English's internal history, but a reconciliation of linguistic features, the language in which they figure, and other historical phenomena. Even if it is somewhat uncomfortable for them, linguists teaching the history of English must pay some attention to philology. Thus, as Cecily Clark argued,

> The history of language is part of 'history' in the wider sense, and can therefore be tapped for evidence of past socio-cultural patterns. The resultant discipline – already well-established – might be called 'Applied Historical Socio-Linguistics' or, […] more

> succinctly, […] 'Linguistic Archaeology', this latter formulation having the merit of indicating that linguistic phenomena can be to socio-cultural historians much as artefacts are to archaeologists. (Clark 1990: 55)

Even in a course taught by someone who identifies as a linguist, focused primarily on linguistic phenomena, students should engage some historical questions by examining artifacts of language in their context.

Of course, philology and linguistics are not mutually exclusive. Donka Minkova recently mounted "a renewed defense of the inseparability of philology and linguistics" (Minkova 2004: 7), between which "the breach was noticed early, and many outstanding scholars on both sides of the Atlantic set out to 'heal' it […] and argued against the absurdity of philology without theory or theory without data" (Minkova 2004: 9). As Edgar Sturtevant and Roland Kent (1928: 9) pointed out, just about when the breach opened, "In fact, the only justification for a separation between linguistics and philology is the necessity for a division of labor – *non omnia possumus omnes*". The terms of this division are at issue whether one ponders them from a meta-pedagogical apex or operates them on the ground, in the classroom: how does one divide the labor in a course on the history of English?

Clark, though, has more than data for linguistics or theory for philology in mind when she talks about philology as "linguistic archaeology"; she has in mind an independently justified practice that in the synthesis of linguistics and history and more serves broader purposes of liberal education. She wrote:

> If one sees life as a continuum, synchronically as well as diachronically, as a seamless fabric in which language is woven together with politics, religion, economic developments and socio-cultural relationships, then all linguistic manifestations are – if rightly understood – capable of illuminating these other spheres, in the same measure as language is enriched, impoverished, reshaped by the contexts in which it is used. (Clark 1990: 65)

Research on the history of English and courses that introduce students to that research are the only sites in which Clark's insight can be realized. To ignore that is to miss an intellectual opportunity of some significance. As Clark (1990: 65) suggests, "In order to reveal these cross-illuminations, all that is needed is appropriate technique". Our purpose here is to consider that technique, from a pedagogical vantage.

3 The textbook

Since nearly all who teach the history of English will need support in areas of the subject where they are less well prepared, and since no textbook is likely to resolve disciplinary tensions or to cover all relevant linguistics as well as all relevant history (it is difficult to imagine the textbook that would satisfy Clark), the choice of a textbook is vexed but, most teachers of the subject would agree, essential. "The issue is the extent to which a course in the history of the English language can also incorporate an introduction to linguistics" (Cable 2007: 18), and the extent to which it does depends in part on a very practical matter, the choice of a text.

Were one to choose Manfred Görlach's (1997) *The Linguistic History of English*, for instance, one would either teach a wholly linguistic course or supplement the book

considerably. In Görlach's book, "there is hardly any consideration of the external (social, political, cultural) background", for though, "with due caution", it can "be assumed to have caused, or influenced linguistic change […], the fusion of the two aspects in many handbooks has tended to lead to a certain degree of unexplained selectiveness of the data, fuzziness of terms and methods, or even chattiness of style" (Görlach 1997: xvi). No one will accuse Görlach of chattiness, but his clinical approach may not animate the subject for many students. Linguistics is not a naturally narrative discipline, but history is, and there may be a pedagogical advantage to use of a less linguistically oriented, more historically expansive text, such as Charles Barber's *The English Language: A Historical Introduction* recently revised by Joan C. Beal and Philip A. Shaw, because "first-year undergraduates", for instance, "need and appreciate a narrative which 'tells a story' simply and clearly without 'dumbing down' or glossing over difficulties" (Barber et al. 2009: ix). The course that balances linguistics and history would require that students read both books.

Some of the best available textbooks attempt such a balance. The classic (and generally admired) attempt is Millward's (1989), whose commonly accepted distinction between a language's outer and inner histories informs many textbooks besides hers, notably Brinton and Arnovick's (2006) and van Gelderen's (2006). Millward's longest account of external history, however, is no more than five pages long, and there is inevitably then neither sufficient historical material to please the philologist, nor any very continual integration of linguistic and historical events. The outer history of English may have a profound effect on the inner, but many textbook treatments of their relationship are neither profound nor sustained (cf. Blockley, Chapter 75). If social, political, cultural, or literary histories are not among a teacher's strengths, the available textbooks will not fill those gaps for either instructor or students.

Haruko Momma and Michael Matto believe that

> today, the usefulness of 'internal' and 'external' as defining conceptions within HEL may have run its course. Above we referred to a 'feedback loop' running between language and its 'environment'; these terms seem salient to us because they acknowledge that a language makes up part of the environment it inhabits. Language is recognized simultaneously as an agent of history and as a product. (Momma and Matto 2008: 8)

Though some textbooks (notably Smith 1996; Leith 1997; Crystal 2004; and Mugglestone 2006) resist the binary construction of inner and outer, it is not clear that there is a trend away from it, partly because those books that resist it (and often conventional periodization, as well) represent different paradigms altogether.

How does one choose a text, then? As Thomas Cable, living co-author with the late Albert C. Baugh of America's leading textbook, *A History of the English Language* (5th edition 2001), remembers,

> The cliché had it that the Baugh text was strong on the 'external' history but weak on the 'internal' history. […] The problem for me was that Baugh's text presented much more about the external history than I had ever learned, leaving me little opportunity to expand on the text in lecture and discussion. On matters that I did know something about and that my graduate education had prepared me to teach – changes in the phonological system between Old and Middle English, for example – the text did not seem to invite elaboration and complication of its succinct story. (Cable 2007: 17)

Cable seems to argue for teaching to one's strengths: if you are a linguist, choose a linguistically oriented book of which you can make the most; if you are a philologist, rely on a text focused on external history, and situate language history within larger histories. Alternatively, one might choose a textbook that does best what one does not do – perhaps text and teacher should complement each other.

My purpose here is not to assess the available textbooks; that is the subject of another chapter in this volume (see Blockley, Chapter 75). But choosing a textbook is a significant pedagogical consideration: it defines the sort of course an instructor intends to teach. There is a good argument for teaching what one knows best exceptionally well, and so promoting student enthusiasm for the subject. Courses that balance historical and linguistic materials and methods, however, can be very dynamic, with both teacher and students relying on the textbook when they can, but supplementing it continuously from what they know of various disciplines and enacting the study of English language in that exchange.

4 Common objectives

There is a very high level of agreement among those who teach the history of English about the fundamental principles any student receiving credit for a course should take away from it. There is considerably less agreement on which topics are essential to conveying those principles, as well as the fullest possible range of historical linguistic knowledge about English.

4.1 Fundamentals

In the broadest terms, nearly all courses on the history of English advance three basic linguistic concepts. Glenn Davis (2007: 27–34), in "Introducing HEL: Three Linguistic Concepts for the First Day of Class", articulates the concepts as follows: (1) "Languages are Systematic and Rule-Governed"; (2) "Spoken Languages are Constantly Changing"; and (3) "The Primary Goal of Language is Communication". It may not be necessary to introduce all three concepts on the first day of class, and not all teachers will agree that the concepts are equally important to the course, yet they are all addressed, sometimes only indirectly, in nearly every textbook and every course syllabus I have read.

Primary among the three concepts is that about "change", and it is always introduced early in a course that relies on a textbook, if the course follows the book's presentation of the subject. As already noted, Millward (more or less) begins with change and invests a great deal in setting the terms on which we should understand it (Millward 1989: 5–13), but it comes up quite early in Brinton and Arnovick (2006: 9–18 and 20–22), van Gelderen (2006: 7–10), and Görlach (1997: 9–24). Emphasis on "change" is natural to a conventional linguistically-oriented course, which measures it in terms of the "rules" and "system" identified in Concept (1).

If one mounted a critique (within linguistics) of the paradigm represented by Concept (1), thus also a critique of Concept (2), notions of "system", "change", and "history" would be problematic. Imagining such an unconventional approach is not idle speculation; it is entailed, for instance by William A. Kretzschmar's *The Linguistics of Speech* (2009, esp. 263–271). An advanced course might interrogate assumptions

about language change after considering Kretzschmar's argument, as it might historicize the history of English with Giancarlo (2001) as a case study. But textbooks, by their nature, march to the conventional wisdom – orthodoxy sells, and textbooks are made by textbook publishers with profit in mind. Even more historically-minded textbooks discuss language change in conventionally linguistic terms early in the courses they outline (see Baugh and Cable 2001: 16–17; Barber et al. 2009: 32–48).

After the Studies in the History of the English Language (SHEL)-3 conference, participants in the conference's pedagogy workshop produced a collection of *Teaching Materials: The History of the English Language* (hereafter TM) (Participants in the HEL Pedagogy Workshop at SHEL-3 2004). Some syllabi and assignments in TM focus on change, while others assume its central role without treating it explicitly. For instance, Anne Curzan (University of Michigan) contributes a syllabus which focuses on "Language Change and Attitudes toward Language Change" in the second meeting, supplementing Millward with chapters from Jean Aitchison's (2001) *Language Change: Progress or Decay?* Jeannette M. Denton (Baylor University) describes a final course project that "involves documentation of how a line or two of Old English text changes in phonetics, phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics, and lexis over time through to the present day". (Unfortunately, TM is unpaginated, so no page numbers are provided here.) In a homework assignment, Betty S. Phillips (Indiana State University) asks students to investigate the relationship of "word-formation & semantic change". In "A Random Introduction to the Uses of Dictionaries: Seeing what we can learn from a romp in the reference room", Susanmarie Harrington (currently of the University of Vermont) asks that students investigate issues raised by chronologically various versions of the Lord's Prayer: she doesn't use the word *change* in the assignment, but questions like "What is the Old English source for Modern English *loaf*?" and "In general, does the ME appear to be more similar to the OE or the later version?" implicitly identify change as the exercise's central motif.

As suggested earlier, conventional notions of language change assume some version of Davis's Concept (1): they depend on systems and rules. Nevertheless, this is a less obvious emphasis of textbooks and course materials. When it is an explicit, organizing proposition, Concept (1) appropriately appears before Concept (2), for instance in Millward (1989: 1), who observes that "All Languages Are Systematic", Brinton and Arnovick (2006: 4), and Barber et al. (2009: 12–14). Baugh and Cable, the most philological of texts, begins with a section revealingly titled "The History of English Language a Cultural Subject" (Baugh and Cable 2001: 1–2). Still, rules are a subject throughout the book, from discussion of Grimm's and Verner's Laws to discussion of dialectically salient features of contemporary American English. In TM, engagement with system and rules is also often implicit, as when Curzan asks within an exercise that introduces corpora, "How many times does the form *digged* 'dug' appear in the King James [Bible]?", which is really an invitation to consider historical change of the distribution of strong and weak verbs in English. Sometimes, though, recourse to rules is explicit, as when Denton, in the final project mentioned earlier requires that students "Apply the phonological changes to each word [in the passage of Old English selected] using the IPA to represent both the stage to which the rules apply and the output of those changes".

Davis's Concept (3), "The Primary Goal of Language is Communication" is much less frequently an explicit subject of textbooks and course materials. It is the subject

of van Gelderen's (2006: 1) opening sentence, and Millward (1989: 4) addresses it cursorily under the heading "All Languages are Conventional and Arbitrary". Still, it operates in almost all courses because textbooks (not Görlach, though) and supplementary materials usually turn to texts and textual production as an external motive for linguistic change, and so ground language in communicative behavior. When teachers focus student attention on the Lord's Prayer, as they do more than once in TM, they are joining linguistic system and language change to social contexts in which communication is a central (but not always the only) goal – a more careful formulation of the concept might reconcile "reflection", "expression", and "communication".

This underserved concept, however, is potentially the most important in teaching the history of English – it underpins Clark's "linguistic archaeology", and makes the history of English a hub of multidisciplinary inquiry rather than a narrowly specialized course in historical linguistics. To reiterate: no textbook, indeed, no course, can encompass all of the history or all of the linguistics relevant to English. For this reason, the manner in which a teacher supplements a text with "linguistic archaeology" in order to serve Davis's Concept (3), the degree to which students are invited to go on a dig among the human social behavior packed into "communication", is an important measure of any course's success. Uncovering historical artifacts and reconstructing the culture to which linguistic structure and change correspond are intellectual adventures for teacher and students alike.

4.2 Essentials

While those teaching the history of English language tend to agree on fundamentals, they do not always agree on what is otherwise "essential". The vastness of the data and the brevity of the academic term require that teachers choose examples that capture, one might say, more than their fair share of linguistics and history but are thus unusually helpful in focusing the course, as well as providing students with memorable access to the subject – one would satisfy the demands of subject and students at the same time, which is, after all, the pedagogical ideal. Anyone teaching a course on the history of English, and everyone committed to the subject, should ask, as Tara Williams has recently, "What does it mean to know English as a language?" (Williams 2010: 165).

The assignments, activities, exercises, and resources in TM suggest (usually obliquely) some of what those teaching the history of English consider important and instructionally useful. For instance, Robert Fulk (Indiana University) has students compare various forms and uses of the Old English subjunctive to the narrower repertoire of Modern English use, so that they can examine the effect of the shift from synthetic to analytic structure on a grammatical category like MOOD, for instance, in the decoupling of mood and inflection. Phillips expects students to understand the operations of Grimm's Law, as an example of systematic historical sound change that connects Modern English to its Old English, Germanic, and Proto-Indo-European roots. Curzan asks students to conduct a "Historical Investigation of a Grammatical Rule or Point of Usage", partly to expose the distinction between descriptive and prescriptive rules, partly to historicize usage, and thus to open it to linguistically and historically informed criticism.

In another exercise, Curzan asks questions like "What happened during Middle English to make the spelling of these words diverge from the phonology? *lamb,*

comb; sword, two (but *swim, swallow); which, what*" and "How did the verb *go* acquire the past tense *went*?" From questions like these, we can infer that Curzan thinks of changes in relations among inflected and uninflected forms, the rise of consistent spelling in a rising standard variety of English, processes like conversion (functional shifting) and suppletion, as something like essential to an undergraduate grasp of the history of English. Curzan's approach is oblique because students aren't given answers but are expected to construct them from evidence they've learned to muster. But it also very effectively integrates linguistic and historical issues – or more precisely, the best student answers do so.

Mary Blockley (University of Texas at Austin) argues that a specific "minimal" set of issues is

> 'essential' not so much in representing core concepts of linguistics as a science, but rather in the paramedic sense of indispensible – whether or not these perceived units and processes turn out to be central to the history of English, you cannot describe the set of language changes that encompass English without knowledge of and reference to them. (Blockley 2008: 18)

Her ten essential topics are palatalization, allophones, regularized *do*, stress shift, grammaticalization, phonemic length, complementation, diphthongization, the putative ungrammaticality of *you was*, and raising and fronting. As Blockley (2008: 23) remarks, they "surface in any phase of description that goes above the level of the lexical word or plunges below the surface of standardized spelling's imperfect record of sound".

These topics enable any number of reinforcing lectures, discussions, and assignments to plumb them; they are linguistic, of course, but even Blockley's brief descriptions of them draw on textual and cultural history. Blockley generously admits that some other set of ten topics might do as well as hers, but the topics are less important than the pedagogical example Blockley sets in attempting to catch the most history and linguistics possible in the fewest topics. A short list of essentials won't keep Blockley or any other teacher from engaging a long list of subjects, but serious teachers of the history of English should attempt to derive a similar short list, as a heuristic – as a model, Blockley's article is required reading. If one's imagination fails, one can always fall back on Blockley's list.

5 From HEL to HOTEL

The difference between HEL and HOTEL is the difference between punishment and hospitality. Unless one believes that students learn best when they think their homework is torture, one should promote the best learning attitude by using the latter acronym, the modern rather than the medieval one, and conceiving the course to justify it. According to those who teach it, the history of English has a bad reputation. K. Aaron Smith (2007: 71) (Illinois State University) believes that students "often walk away simply with the idea that Old English [...] is hard and scary", and, of course, Old English sets the tone for a chronologically organized course. Felicia Jean Steele (The College of New Jersey) revised her approach to the course because her students felt an unusually high "level of anxiety" and were "discomfited by the unfamiliar material" (Steele

2007: 35–36). Jo Tyler (2005: 465) (University of Mary Washington) "is confronted each semester with these 'apprehensive and resentful' students". Jeremy Smith (1996: x) (University of Glasgow) notes that "the subject retains a reputation for difficulty and dryness which has tended to deter students from taking it up". One suspects that teachers are at fault, because, as March (1982: xxi) put it, "they can now make English as hard as Greek". What strategies and practices can ameliorate students' experience, so that, even if the history of English is hard, students understand its value and perhaps even enjoy it?

5.1 Relevance

Many teachers of the history of English strive to make the subject relevant to the professional lives of students who take the course so "make[s] explicit connections between linguistic analysis and issues of concern to English majors and language arts teachers" (Tyler 2005: 465). The work for her course includes reflective essays and a "teaching portfolio" meant to project learning from the course into future teaching situations. There are pitfalls to teaching in this mode: even if one gauges students' future needs correctly, it is unlikely that the school curriculum is as adventurous or challenging as higher education is supposed to be, so students may be shortchanged. This caveat considered, Tyler supplements her centrally linguistic materials with Leith (1997) and Geoffrey Hughes's (2000) *A History of English Words*, and she also deals lightly with stylistics in a unit on literary devices, so averts the potential danger.

Relevance, however, need not be understood as professional utility. Curzan's TM syllabus, for instance, asserts

> Throughout the course, we will work to establish the connections between the historical events and features that we are studying and the state/status of Modern English […] On most days, we will also begin the class with questions about Modern English language and literature that we will be able to answer by the end of class through examining the day's material.

Students know their own language; they want to know more about it. The history of English perhaps matters most to students when it helps to explain the way we talk now or our attitudes about that talk.

5.2 Engagement

Students learn most when they do the work, and one way of reassuring them of the value of HOTEL is to keep them elbow deep in the language. Throughout TM, teachers send students into the library, into corpora, out into the community in order to investigate the language. Sometimes they answer questions posed by instructors; sometimes they are encouraged to come up with their own questions. Of course, such exercises introduce students to language resources, and to some protocols of actual research, but, as opposed to reading a textbook, they are effective because they focus student attention and reward that attention with knowledge about English, all the while assuring students that they have the ability to ask and answer serious questions about the

language and its history. While the subject requires a certain amount of rote learning (terminology for processes, which vowels are low or back, etc.), the anxiety some students feel is alleviated when what they've learned the hard way is reinforced in the course of figuring something out.

5.3 Familiarity: the argument for words

Students are familiar with words and relatively comfortable with them – more comfortable than they are with phonology, for instance. While we should not ignore other linguistic levels in HOTEL, words can illustrate a lot of what we hope students will learn, including, for instance, most of the processes and features among Blockley's essentials. Lexis is also the least systematic of linguistic categories, the most culturally bound, and so the easiest to talk about historically. As C. S. Lewis (1960) demonstrated in *Studies in Words*, one can uncover a great deal about a culture by examining the etymologies and semantic development of just a few words exhaustively, though to constitute an effective history the words must be chosen carefully.

Generally, HOTEL has not been designed to imitate Lewis's approach, but many iterations of the course emphasize words. Eugene Green (Boston University) provides a syllabus in TM that addresses meaning in language broadly, but subjects listed for most weeks are focused on words: "Putting words together and English in historical contexts", "Words in context and American conversational tendencies", "Word meanings and concepts and creativity", "Synonymy and word choice in dialects", etc. In most cases, the word focus is less insistent, but Curzan requires that students write a word history, Phillips has them explore historical word-formation and semantic change, and, in the assignment described earlier, Denton's students are required to take every word of their short Old English text through every stage of development to the present day, at least those that have lasted until the present day. Even Tyler's assignments turn occasionally from questions of "change and stability […] rules of grammatical usage [… and] what language changes have prompted difficulties for English teachers and students" to words, idioms, and proverbs.

There are many excellent resources for word study, notably the *Oxford English Dictionary* (Simpson [ed.] 2000–), an introduction to which is an essential ingredient of any history of English course. *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language* (Pickett et al. 2000; henceforth AHD4) is, among general dictionaries, especially historically oriented: etymologies go back to PIE, and there is an appendix dictionary of PIE roots by Calvert Watkins with copious examples of modern reflexes. (Those who want to pursue the ancient roots of English more thoroughly could supplement a history of English text with Watkins's 2000 *The American Heritage Dictionary of Indo-European Roots*). Throughout AHD4, there is a generous selection of "Word History Notes", which are the model for entries in *Word Histories and Mysteries: From* Abracadabra *to* Zeus (American Heritage Dictionaries 2004) and *More Word Histories and Mysteries: From* Aardvark *to* Zombie (American Heritage Dictionaries 2006). These and the word history notes in AHD4 illustrate all sorts of historical and linguistic processes and can be assigned prior to a class meeting to set up discussion, used as the basis for any number of assignments, or presented as a model for a word history assignment like Curzan's in TM. One could easily design a wonderful exercise for advanced classes from material in Anatoly Liberman's (2010) *A Bibliography of English*

Etymology: Sources and Word List: a teacher could set a student on the trail of any of the words in Liberman's word list; the student could check material among Liberman's sources and consult other references and, on the basis of all of it, write a fairly sophisticated etymology (for more about Liberman's pedagogical uses, see Adams 2011).

6 Unorthodoxies

Rather than organizing HOTEL according to periods or linguistic categories, one might instead focus insistently on texts, as Russom (2007) suggests is appropriate because it best integrates the language and literary interests within a Department of English Language and Literature. David Crystal, in *The Stories of English*, is also more often focused on texts and literary figures than the conventional textbook, and his mode is incurably narrative, though he admits that "telling several stories simultaneously is not something which suits the linear expository method of a book" (Crystal 2004: 2), nor, one might argue, does it suit the linearity of traditional survey courses. Crystal's book is especially good for graduate courses and an excellent resource for teachers who want to pause in the linear presentation of English, weaving something philological from the warp of inner with the woof of outer history.

But one can also change the subject from historical change in the structure of English itself, to representing language attitudes, both enacted and reflected. Lynda Mugglestone (2006: 2) explains of her *A History of the English Language* that "the wider emphasis throughout is […] placed on the twin images of pluralism and diversity, and on the complex patterns of usage which have served to make up English". This requires an approach to any history of English course captured by Richard W. Bailey's (2002: 466) question, "In our histories of English, where are those people who spoke the language?". Bailey and Mugglestone argue for particularity in a discipline that has tended to generalize; while no one denies that the generalization is necessary, one might argue so is the particularization. In a sense, they are working in precisely the opposite direction from Blockley, since, as Mugglestone (2006: 3) writes, "Any history of the language is, in this respect, enacted through innumerable voices". Yet anyone listening to voices may invite them to speak on Blockley's essentials, and Blockley's essentials are undoubtedly illustrated by innumerable voices, so the two tendencies construct a useful tension – in the best courses, they are by no means mutually exclusive, and might best be seen as mutually dependent.

Or one can abjure the need for periods or chronology, structural essentials, or the interpenetration of inner and outer histories and frame the course theoretically. Jeremy Smith attempts a historiographical approach to the history of English, concerned with "how the discipline of linguistic history may be pursued […] using selected phenomena in the history of English to exemplify the dynamic processes of change involved" (Smith 1996: 3). This opens up the history of English course to all sorts of sociolinguistic and historical methodologies, such as those of Kretzschmar and Giancarlo, mentioned earlier, though in a course designed on Smith's example, one would draw on vast and eminently flexible archives of historical and theoretical texts. Or one can turn expectations inside out, into a new configuration, in a sort of intellectual cat's cradle, as Michael Matto (Adelphi University) does: the "tendency towards" teaching the "'social history'" of English

> challenges the scientific model, but the challenge has not to date been brought with much gusto […] I am wondering what happens if we complete a radical move towards history and as not 'how do social forces account for language change?' but, instead, 'how does language affect historical, social, or cultural change?' (Matto 2007: 63)

In any event, the survey, however well supported by textbooks, traditional approaches, and institutional assumptions, is by no means the only legitimate course in the history of English.

7 Summary

Like Minkova, Richard W. Bailey (2002: 449): "argue[s] for a renewed philology, one far more comprehensive than any definition of this inquiry usually offered in the twentieth century". Courses in the history of English can be as ambitious and as instrumental as other forms of scholarship in this renewed philology, and there are many opportunities to teach the history of English beyond the traditional survey. For instance, several universities offer at least occasional courses on English etymology, sometimes conceived as specialist courses for select students, but sometimes conceived more inclusively for large enrollments (examples of the latter include courses by John Considine at the University of Alberta and Gerald Cohen at the University of Missouri – Rolla). Following Bailey's and Mugglestone's advice, a course could focus on recovering historical language attitudes, with students quite active in finding the speakers and listening to their voices.

In TM, Brad Benz (Fort Lewis College) describes a "Place Name(s) Project" in which students select a cluster of geographically connected names and then,

> for each name, examine the following: 1) the period when it was named, by whom, what it means & so on; 2) other names it has gone by and differences in meaning …; 3) the etymology of the name itself …; 4) the kind of element involved (e.g., personal name, description of landscape or vegetation, commemoration, etc.); 5) the form of the place name …; 6) an *extended* consideration of what the name tells us about the external – a maybe internal – history of the language, the people, and the area.

This project is only a small part of a survey, but it reminds us that the history of English can be examined usefully from a primarily philological vantage. Why not offer a full course in English historical onomastics, one that captured most (not all) of Blockley's essentials, examined a familiar aspect of language, at least on the surface, all the while promoting student engagement through assignments like Benz's? It would be exactly the invitation to linguistic archaeology Clark had in mind.

Such a course cannot accomplish what a survey course accomplishes, but it can come close and do things survey courses can't do. One of these is to enable the interest of students who won't commit to a survey but who are attracted by topics such as names and naming, slang, language attitudes, usage, and others that come up in survey courses. At the end of such a course, invariably a student will say to me, "What really interested me was X". Perhaps the student wouldn't have known that without a survey to introduce the interest. But if it was a pre-existing interest, a survey can do little to cultivate it. It may be of pedagogical advantage to indulge in niche marketing, on the

principle that "one size does not fit all". If we offer more non-survey courses in the history of English, if we develop more opportunities to incorporate the history of English within a degree, we may better communicate the value and pleasure of linguistic archaeology or English historical linguistics, whichever we choose to emphasize. Further, we need not teach the history of English in whole courses devoted to language study. Instead, it can constitute part of any course on a literary subject: students can compile a historical gazetteer while studying Dickens, or explore language attitudes among Jane Austen's characters and contemporaries, just to mention two rather obvious examples. As many of the exercises in TM suggest, the history of English is in every English text.

While anyone can benefit from HOTEL, students in the humanities and social sciences (especially linguistics and anthropology) find it immediately relevant to their broad curricular concerns. Primary among these are students of English literature and culture. Recently, the Modern Language Association, with support from the Teagle Foundation, studied undergraduate majors in language and literature, finally issuing a report that noted, "As readers become cognizant of the complexities of the linguistic system – its codes, structures, and articulations – they become mindful of language and of languages as evolving, changing historical artifacts and institutions, intricately bound up with the cultures expressed through them" (MLA Teagle Foundation Working Group 2009: 289), a sentiment that converges with Cecily Clark's "linguistic archaeology". At its most radical, Tara Williams (2010: 169) (Oregon State University) suggests, HOTEL "not only gives students the necessary historical and linguistic foundation for their reading but also makes them aware of the contingent nature of that foundation".

Ever optimistic, Thomas Jefferson (as quoted in Bailey 2002: 466) declared, "We want an elaborate history of the English language". Scholars tend to respond to his appeal with more books and articles, and there's nothing wrong with that, of course, unless we forget that college and university courses, indeed our very classrooms, are excellent sites for that elaboration.

8 References

Adams, Michael. 2011. Review of Anatoly Liberman, *A Bibliography of English Etymology: Sources and Word List*. *NOWELE* 60/61: 231–244.

Aitchison, Jean. 2001. *Language Change: Progress or Decay?* 3rd edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

American Heritage Dictionaries. 2004. *Word Histories and Mysteries: From* Abracadabra *to* Zeus. Boston*:* Houghton Mifflin.

American Heritage Dictionaries. 2006. *More Word Histories and Mysteries: From* Aardvark *to* Zombie. Boston*:* Houghton Mifflin.

Bailey, Richard W. 2002. A Thousand Years of the History of English. In: Donka Minkova and Robert Stockwell (eds.), *Studies in the History of the English Language: A Millennial Perspective*, 449–471. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Barber, Charles, Joan C. Beal, and Philip A Shaw. 2009. *The English Language: A Historical Introduction*. 2nd edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Baugh, Albert C. and Thomas Cable. 2001. *A History of the English Language*. 5th edn. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Blockley, Mary. 2008. Essential Linguistics. In: Haruko Momma and Michael Matto (eds.), *A Companion to the History of the English Language*, 18–24. Malden, Massachusetts: Wiley-Blackwell.

Bloomfield, Leonard. 1984 [1933] *Language*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Brinton, Laurel J., and Leslie K. Arnovick. 2006. *The English Language: A Linguistic History*. Don Mills, Ontario: Oxford University Press.

Cable, Thomas. 2007. A History of the English Language. *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Teaching* 14(1): 17–25.

Clark, Cecily. 1990. Historical Linguistics – Linguistic Archaeology. In: Sylvia Adamson, Vivien Law, Nigel Vincent, and Susan Wright (eds.), *Papers from the 5th International Conference on English Historical Linguistics*, 55–68. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Crystal, David. 2004. *The Stories of English*. Woodstock and New York: The Overlook Press.

Davis, Glenn. 2007. Introducing HEL: Three Linguistic Concepts for the First Day of Class. *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Teaching* 14(1): 27–34.

Frank, Roberta. 1997. The Unbearable Lightness of Being a Philologist. *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 96(4): 486–513.

van Gelderen, Elly. 2006. *A History of the English Language*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Giancarlo, Matthew. 2001. The Rise and Fall of the Great Vowel Shift? The Changing Ideological Intersections of Philology, Historical Linguistics, and Literary History. *Representations* 76: 27–60.

Görlach, Manfred. 1997. *The Linguistic History of English: An Introduction*. London: Macmillan.

Hamacher, Werner. 2010. From "95 Theses on Philology". *PMLA* 125(4): 994–1001.

Hughes, Geoffrey. 2000. *A History of English Words*. Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell.

Joseph, John E. 2002. *From Whitney to Chomsky: Essays in the History of American Linguistics*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Kretzschmar, William A. 2009. *The Linguistics of Speech*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Leith, Dick. 1997. *A Social History of English*. 2nd edn. London: Routledge.

Lewis, C. S. 1967. *Studies in Words*. 2nd edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Liberman, Anatoly. 2010. *A Bibliography of English Etymology: Sources and Word List*. Minneapolis/London: University of Minnesota Press.

March, Francis A. 1892. Recollections of Language Teaching. *PMLA* 7: xix–xxii.

March, Francis A. 1865. *Method of the Philological Study of the English Language*. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Millward, Celia M. 1989. *A Biography of the English Language*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Minkova, Donka. 2004. Philology, Linguistics, and the History of [hw] ~ [w]. In: Anne Curzan and Kimberly Emmons (eds.), *Studies in the History of the English Language II: Unfolding Conversations*, 7–46. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Matto, Michael. 2007. The English Language in History. *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Teaching* 14(1): 63–70.

MLA Teagle Foundation Working Group. 2009. Report to the Teagle Foundation on the Undergraduate Major in Language and Literature. *Profession*: 285–312.

Momma, Haruko and Michael Matto. 2008. History, English, Language: Studying HEL Today. In: Haruko Momma and Michael Matto (eds.), *A Companion to the History of the English Language*, 3–10. London: Blackwell.

Mugglestone, Lynda (ed.). 2006. *The Oxford History of English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pickett, Joseph P. et al. (eds.) 2000. *American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language*, 4th edn. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Russom, Geoffrey. 2007. Literary Form as an Independent Domain of Validation in HEL Pedagogy. *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Teaching* 14(1): 47–54.

Simpson, John (ed.). 2000–. *The Oxford English Dictionary*. 3rd edn. online. Oxford University Press. (www.oed.com/).

Smith, Jeremy. 1996. *An Historical Study of English: Function, Form and Usage*. London/New York: Routledge.

Smith, K. Aaron. 2007. The Development of the English Progressive: A Felicitous Problem for the Teaching of HEL. *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Teaching* 14(1): 71–88.

Steele, Felicia Jean. 2007. Studying like a Scientist: Adapting Successful Pedagogies from the Sciences to HEL. *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Teaching* 14(1): 35–46.

Sturtevant, Edgar H., and Roland G. Kent. 1928. Linguistic Science and Classical Philology. *The Classical Weekly* 22.2 [No. 586]: 9–13.

Participants in the HEL Pedagogy Workshop at SHEL-3. 2004. *Teaching Materials: The History of the English Language.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.

Tyler, Jo. 2005. Transforming a Syllabus from HEL. *Pedagogy* 5(3): 464–471 and 479–481.

Watkins, Calvert. 2000. *The American Heritage Dictionary of Indo-European Roots.* 2nd edn. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Williams, Tara. 2010. The Value of the History of English Course for the Twenty-First Century. *Profession*: 165–176.

Michael Adams, Bloomington/Indiana (USA)

75. Resources: Textbooks

1. Introduction
2. Internal and external histories of textbooks
3. The "voice" of textbooks
4. Textbooks in the 21st century
5. Summary
6. References

Abstract

The disparaged yet subtly influential medium of the textbook seems poised for great changes under the complementary pressures of continual updating made possible by website-based information technology and the totalizing effect of the globalization of English. The variety and quantitative sophistication of research on contemporary varieties of the language should inspire more rigorous approaches to the analysis of historical evidence, and new answers to the questions of how and why the language has changed, though the daunting linguistic paucity of the merely written record has tended to enforce conservatism. While 19th-century exercises in linguistic periodization directed at a popular audience reveal at a first reading only the embarrassing disparity between their assumptions about the forces shaping linguistic change and ours, there now can be a historiography of English that seeks to remedy its own limitations through exploiting connections with disciplines such as archeology and language acquisition.

1 Introduction

The history of English in university level departments of American, British, and European universities amounts to a truncated and circumscribed introduction to historical linguistics. Wherever taught, to students for whom it is a first language or not, forks in the road quickly present themselves, and different books make different maps of

the material. A history of the English language has at a minimum to describe sequential change in sounds, inflections, and syntax, or what is usually called internal history, which is the default assumption in current textbooks. Lining up these changes with not exclusively linguistic events is the role of external history, the role of which has lately been correspondingly minimal.

The implications of this bifurcation and the effects on assumptions and methodology are there from the beginning, and become particularly acute as a textbook moves structurally above the level of the word into the sentence and its functions (Traugott 1972). The traditional support role of external history comes somewhat less in the form of referencing literarily ambitious (and legible) authors of texts and, increasingly, in timelines of events, preferably with a highly *localizable* place and time if not always a finite number of language-affecting agents: vernacularly literate or credibly Anglophonic kings, Chanceries, plagues, playwrights, punctuational innovations, proclamations, inoculations, immigrations, integrations, identifications, standardizations, and a host of definitions. The other academic discipline also called "English", English literature, only occasionally gets mentioned, though for many students coursework in English literature precedes study of the history of English. While certain literary innovations such as the rise of vernacular iambic pentameter and the varieties of rhyme can feature in language histories, literary sources are more often apologized for as a necessary evil.

And indeed the more that the external history surfaces in a textbook, the more we have to contend with the assumptions of the very axioms of linguistic description being at odds with some of the assumptions, predilections, and constructed objects of history.

2 Internal and external histories of textbooks

History approaches language only in its *diachronic* aspect, the Saussurean distinction that places historical linguistics as only half of linguistics, and perhaps the lesser half of it. Additionally, the individual and communal vicissitudes that history traces pose an implicit challenge to the axiom of linguistic adequacy, the assumption that language always (physical deficit aside) meets the needs of its community. While adequacy in coexistence with change has inspired the study of the role of linguistic variation, there is less discussion of whether changes in the wider culture ever can be shown to affect language directly or even, as in a version of the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, whether particular features of language affect the perceptions of a speech community.

A fundamental linguistic axiom is that of universalism, the idea of an underlying (and synchronic) unity in the diversity of language forms, not just in English, but everywhere. Comparison with other languages is therefore crucial for analysis. The necessarily multilingual context is a matter that textbooks engage in a variety of ways. American textbooks must assume students bring little or no knowledge of other languages, even contact languages, to their study of English, and little knowledge of the cartography of the United Kingdom. Particular European histories of English naturally devote some space at a minimum to phonetic points of contrast and comparison with the student's first language of instruction (Görlach 1997 [1974]; Nielsen 1998, 2005). It remains to be seen if the Bologna process will significantly standardize language instruction in Europe to a degree that will affect the study of language history.

The matter of earlier standard languages, and the extent to which early texts imply or embody one or more standard languages raises the question of how much social and political content necessarily accompanies an outline of the linguistic history of English. In a recent 20-page account, James Milroy (2007: 20) claims that "a standardised language has multiple origins – both linguistic and social". For earlier stages of English, the record of the linguistic variation that contributes to that standard is partial, and the analysis of social structure is beset by anachronism as well.

Linguistics itself has taken a congenially historical turn in continued developments in the analysis of change, such as the theory of unidirectionality in grammaticalization, the name that Meillet gave to the trajectory that converts syntax into morphology and more generally lexical material into grammatical material (cf. Brems and Hoffmann, Chapter 99). For history of any type, the collection and analysis of evidence is crucial, and yet history differs from sociology and psychology in being humanistic and not an experimental science. Psychologists of language have recourse to human subjects for testing their ideas, and while sound-recordings from across the world are approaching their century, the kind of variation most intensively studied still inclines to the near and now. In connecting this research with the earlier states of the language of course, the evidence is far more elusive, and, once located, complex; evidence that must be accumulated in libraries and archives.

In particular, the grammatical phrase "History of X" in all its narrative and material and political associations and consequent ambiguities about what we mean by English may not seem as apt a modifier as *historical* or even *diachronic* for the internal history of English language or linguistics. Is the history of English the description of a Germanic language with interdental fricatives, the language of Shakespeare, or the lexemes and idioms in the online *urbandictionary* (http://www.urbandictionary.com), an open-source dictionary managed by a California college student? Like the word "grammar", the term "history" can be taken as description or analysis, as establishing both generalizations about and prescriptive judgments of the success or utility of particular developments.

3 The "voice" of textbooks

History and the English Language got linked fairly early on, almost certainly in the English-speaking world with a third party (literature) playing the role of matchmaker. The mid-19th century state of the textbook documents the curious intertwining of the three disciplines.

An investigation rarely is encapsulated by the title that it has in its first publication, rather, the title speaks both to its predecessors and to the new audience that its author and publisher seek to provide with its new perspective. Ten years ago Hans Nielsen memorably romped through a number of earlier textbook titles in the preface to his own book and adds an allusion to Laurence Sterne in his three-volume history, *A Journey through the History of the English Language in England and America*, thus far published as *The Continental Backgrounds of English and its Insular Development until 1154* (Nielsen 1998) and *From Dialect to Standard: English in England 1154–1776* (Nielsen 2005).

Such a title as Nielsen's has what Andrew Scheil (2007), in a survey of Old English textbooks, has termed "a voice", a foregrounded, allusive, self-conscious written presence of the interests of a particular author in his or her rehearsal of more or less generally-agreed-upon information:

> The difference between Moore and Knott and *Reading Old English* is one of voice – that instructional narrator emanating from the pages of the text. In an Old English course the "voice" of the textbook must stand as a proxy for the instructor's voice: there is so much to cover in class periods (particularly the time-consuming process of individual student translations) that one must expect that a certain burden of the teaching will be carried by the voice of the textbook itself, as the student reads and re-reads, e.g., the section on strong verbs, trying to decode what is going on and what is the point of it all, and how important it is anyway, relative to the potential time invested. (Scheil 2007)

Some history textbooks have a lot of voice; some have a lot of bullet points. The voice of historical language textbooks is heard not only in the tone of the narrative and the extent to which it addresses a particular kind of reader, but even in chronological endpoints and other seeming matters of fact. For example, Norman F. Blake (1996) in his *History of the English Language* confidently adduces 1873 as the beginning of the subject, with its major periods as defined by Henry Sweet even though these divisions conform too narrowly, in his view, to political events like the Norman Conquest. However, the American lawyer, Germanist, judge, ambassador, and proto-environmentalist George Marsh (1885 [1862]) wrote a series of lectures under the same title some decades before Sweet's periodization, and with quite different endpoints.

Marsh (1885 [1862]) is potentially illuminating because so much has changed since his time, beginning with his conservatism about change in what is, admittedly, a history of the language embodying a literature. Though Marsh knew that a standard language, like society itself, and paleography, recruits from below, his tone of mild condescension to earlier states of the language sometime recalls that of other writers who highlight the idea of history as the unfortunate eddies and riffles in an otherwise laminar flow of time taking.

It is almost as if a truly successful language would have no history, if by history we mean irretrievable losses or the emergence of wholly new possibilities for meaning and expression. Yet such resistance to the idea of irreversible change can be the first step to the fractal microsociology of idiolect, and even the dot maps for dialect features as in *A Linguistic Atlas of Late Mediaeval* English (LALME, McIntosh et al. 1986) rather than the reified heavy-line isoglosses of linguistic boundaries in many books.

In the study of any Western language comparisons with Latin are inevitable in assessing the penetration and stability of the standard. With the minority status (perhaps 5%) that Leith (1997 [1983]) claims for Received Pronunciation since its recognition can be compared Graham Robb's more recent claim, in *The Discovery of France* (Robb 2007), that at the height of the prestige of French as the international language of culture and diplomacy in the 1790s only 11% of those resident within the boundaries of the country were considered by those in charge to be speaking French – in other words, the government judged not only speakers of Basque but those of Breton and Provençal as beyond the linguistic pale. While one may wonder how Roger Wright, the historian of how Romance emerged from Vulgar Latin, would respond to this characterization, the controversy shows the potential for re-thinking what distinguishes a language from a dialect.

Marsh recognized both literary and linguistic models of 19th-century academic industry as influences on his project. One was the, to him unattractive (Marsh 1885 [1862]: 14), model of Thomas Warton's 1840 *History of English Poetry*, from the end of the 11th to the 18th century. The other was the new philology of Bopp, and particularly of Grimm's *Geschichte der deutschen Sprache* (History of the German Language, 2 volumes, 1848, 2nd ed. [1852]). Yet surprisingly given the esteem in which Marsh held philology, his early American History of English is not solely concerned with chasing a syllable through time and space. As the tale of his long title suggests, March assumes a mutual influence of language and literature.

Marsh more or less follows Craik in a pre-Sweet division of the language. English to his mind is, by its vocabulary, distinct from Anglo-Saxon, an approach reminiscent of that taken by Angelika Lutz (2002), and begins only in 1250. A second period, of more than two hundred years duration from 1350 to 1575, treats as one what now is usually separated into Middle English and Early Modern English. Marsh's third period is the century that begins with the youth of Shakespeare and ends with the death of Milton in 1674. He describes this culminating period as the maturity of the language in a desperately Homeric simile that is a portrait of English as a not-so-young man, yet ever strong, yet supple, that would not do today. Alzheimer's disease and the near-extinction within the past century of Gaelic, aboriginal American languages, and many others show there is as yet no analogue of Human Growth Hormone that can prevent the metaphor of ontogeny recapitulating phylogeny from completion in decay: the sequential acquisition of morphology, prepositions and syncope, in a life or a language, will be followed by loss in the other direction.

> I am far from maintaining that the language of England has at any time become a fixed and inflexible thing. In the adult man, physiological processes, not properly constitutional changes, go on for years before decay can fairly said to have commenced. His organs, indeed, when he passes from youth to manhood, are already fully developed, but under favorable circumstances, and with proper training, they continue for some time longer to acquire additional strength, power of action, and of resistance, flexibility, and one might almost say, dexterity, in the performance of their appropriate functions. New organic material is absorbed and assimilated, and effete and superfluous particles are thrown off; but in all this there are no revolutions analogous to those by which the nursling becomes a child, the child a man. So in languages employed as the medium of varied literary effort, here is, as subjects of intellectual discourse, practical applications of scientific principle and new conditions of social and material life multiply, an increasing pliancy and adaptability of speech, a constant appropriation and formation of new vocables, rejection of old and worn-out phrases, and revivifications of asphyxiated words, a rhetorical, in short, not a grammatical change, which, to the superficial observer, may give to the language a new aspect, while it yet remains substantially the same. (Marsh 1885 [1862]: 33; see also p. 392)

An even more extraordinary metaphor, reprised in the conclusion of the lectures, supposes a nonhuman force in the passage of the centuries developing and propelling the language into relative completeness:

> I do not purpose to carry down my sketches later than the age of Shakespeare, when I consider the language as having reached what in the geography of great rivers is called the *lower course**, and as having become a flowing sea capable of bearing to the ocean of

time the mightiest argosies, a mirror clear enough to reflect the changeful hues of every sky and give body and outline to the grandest forms which the human imagination has ever conceived. (Marsh 1885 [1862]: 144)

He glosses in a footnote the *lower course* as follows:

In German, *Unterlauf*, or with some writers, *Strom,* is that lowest and usually navigable part of the course of a river, where its motion is due less to the inclination of its bed than to the momentum acquired by previous rapidity of flow, and to the hydrostatic pressure of the swifter currents from higher parts of its valley. (Marsh 1885 [1862]: 144)

In other words, to unpack this figure, Marsh saw the pre-Shakespearian history of still-read English as causing the success of the distant stages, and presumably he offered this idea to justify his inclusion of material on the earlier stages of the language, claiming for it a sort of action at a distance. There may also be an implicit comparison with the development through change detectable in other literary traditions of other European vernaculars. Marsh seems to have picked his endpoints to establish the achieved stability of his own standard language as having existed for the statutory period of more than two centuries. March's segmentation is noteworthy therefore for where it ends as well as where it begins. Not only does he cut off Old English altogether (presumably as insufficiently English for his American audience), but he declares that the history of the language, in its essentials, ended some two hundred years before his writing. This ukase saves him the trouble of characterizations and descriptions of the near past that will date quickly, a difficulty that modern mass market and textbooks seldom avoid.

Extravagant ideas about the life and death of languages had been in the air. Silly as Marsh's segmentation of the field may look, he was familiar with the work of Rasmus Rask and there is the melancholy possibility that early 21st century statements of consensus may look at least as peculiar from the far-off perspective of our own linguistic sesquicentennial when so much more of the detail of language will be recorded, inventoried, parsed and searched. Current axioms of linguistic practice include the adequacy of each stage of every language to its community and the constant of the s-curve in the variable rate of change of an item as it becomes part of the standard.

Why were Histories of English written first just from the 19th century on, and why do the first ones end as they do, so much earlier than their own moment of composition than do those of the 20th century and after? Changing notions of literacy, of reconstruction, and, I think, of language death attend these choices. Perversely, given the variation in any language, it is easier to speak confidently of its nature when, like Latin, it is on Vatican life support, as can be seen in a flurry of recent books, such as Janson (2004), written for a popular audience.

The impulse to write the history of a living language begins in the discovery that it too is dead in some respects, as can be seen in Fichte's *Reden an die deutsche Nation* (1807–08):

Looking upon modern European civilization as a product of the Latin and Germanic peoples, all of them formed by the migration of German tribes after the downfall of the Roman empire, Fichte found that among them all the Germans alone had preserved

their original language, while the others had adopted an alien tongue and slowly trans-
formed it according to their needs. Only the Germans had a language rooted in nature
and therefore fully alive, while French or Italian, English or Spanish tongues were dead
in their roots and therefore could only sustain a superficial life. (Kohn 1949: 334)

On morphological grounds, then, Lithuanian speakers might be said to have a still bet-
ter case for deep and living roots. Still, the next best thing to relative isolation for mak-
ing a language emerge in workable clarity as a subject is for it to be partially dead,
which puts it not beyond all change but at least safely out of the journalistic first
draft stage, and limits the scope with a manageable corpus of material declared worthy
by time, and even more worthy by its economic clout.

English triumphed, if we are to believe Richard Foster Jones, in 1588 (Jones 1953). In
a move noticeable in 16th-century translators' prefaces that is not much accredited by
linguists but welcome to historians, writers in English began to look back on its modest
past and retroactively "ennoble" the vernacular. As with many European languages, the
bursting of its national borders played a part in leading first-language speakers to con-
sider extra-national developments and gave a new impetus to standardization. The lan-
guage of the colonies became worthy of notice only after they not only created wealth
for the empire but found a measure of political independence for themselves, so that
their innovations were perceptible as something other than disfluencies.

The role of the present day, when English regards itself in a textbook and is not man-
ifested solely in the facts most congenial with its own assumptions, has been the defining
character of comprehensive textbooks since Albert Baugh's first American textbook in
the thirties (Baugh 1935).

Marsh's now-embarrassing exposed assumptions contrast with later, more social, and
less literary treatments of the history of English, such as Ishtla Singh's 2005 outline,
which gives equal space to the first and last segments, beginning with Proto-Indo-
European and ending with English after 1700, so that the emergence of an insular
English, let alone its literary tradition, is less emphasized. Singh does quote from the
literary criticism surrounding some Old English poems and gives a page each of titles
of Middle English and Early Modern English writings. But these references seem a con-
cession to literature students seeking paper topics. Görlach had already illustrated his
Linguistic History with Biblical translations that "make no claim to literary excitement"
(Görlach 1997 [1974]: preface xvii), reminiscent of Sweet's "Preface" to his edition of
the Alfredian *Pastoral Care* and its "exclusively philological interest" (Görlach 1997
[1974]: ix).

The advent of quantificational studies has reduced the extravagances of interpreta-
tion of the past. Discoveries worthy of the ages, or at least of the textbooks that purport
to give the facts, remain to be made in describing as neutrally as possible the first or last
appearance of distinctive forms or registers. For example, a recent study argues that the
20th century textbook writers projected their contemporary characterization of phrasal
verbs as more informal alternatives to simplex verbs, native or borrowed, back into the
Early Modern English period in which they emerge in numbers. Stefan Thim's (2006)
contention that the to-be-stigmatized phrasal verbs register was originally neutral re-
quires subtlety; how are we to know from silence that such verbs enjoyed prescriptive
acceptance?

4 Textbooks in the 21st century

A look at books published in the 21st century suggests that three trends are currently emerging. The trajectory from the integrating narrative has been taken up by a number of mass-marketed books with more footnotes than photographs or exercises appealing to an audience without a classroom or research libraries (Crystal 2004; Bragg 2002; Lerer 2005; McWhorter 2008). This market does not mean that the academic textbook's day is over, but rather that it increasingly shares space with accounts that frequently but not always simplify the descriptive detail and that often add an explicit point of view, a voice that not only instructs but entertains or corrects.

Second, there is a movement within the newer textbooks towards contextualizing "facts" by several means. A ubiquitous feature is the timeline of events familiar in US literary anthologies, such as the Norton series, but also now given prominence in textbooks such as van Gelderen (2006), Curzan and Adams (2005), Momma and Matto (2008), and Millward and Hayes (2010). Lists of dateable political and cultural events appear sometimes in the absence of any other external history, and the links to be made to internal change are left open. The function of some timelines is hard to see, save as a peg for memory and the danger offered for correlation as causation is great for the naïve student. Other schemas are more linguistically relevant and potentially powerful. Though Brook (1957) self-described his summary of changes from Germanic through Modern English as "indigestible" schemas of sound change taking the form of charts and graphs (for example, Görlach's (1991: 70) schematic reduction of the Early Modern English work of Dobson), they are an attractive model, particularly with visual and aural illustrations.

One such contextualization is by foregrounding a plurality of approaches, a move especially important for a student audience potentially interested in taking the conversation further, particularly in the intermediate periods of the past six centuries, for which literary works frequently provide the impetus for linguistic study. This approach has antecedents in Bloomfield's curious pattern, seen again in different ways in Fennell (2001), of matching each traditional historical period with a mode of theoretical inquiry developed to account for it. Several books (e.g. Cusack 1998; Graddol et al. 1996; Sacks 2003) address the material culture that affected the conditions of writing in the medieval and early modern period. Another is the foregrounding of themes within subtypes of academic textbooks, such as Blake (1996) on standardization, or the compact linguistic introductions to single periods, e.g. Smith (1999), Nevalainen (2006), and Beal (2004). In a time of change the material in textbooks has several functions that reflect differences in audiences, in preparation, theoretical orientations and in the time they can allot to whatever historical segments they teach.

The new textbooks seem to present somewhat less in the way of data, and more attention to generalizations about change, as well as a focus on describing the final stage of standardization. For example, even one of the most comprehensive new textbooks (Brinton and Arnovick 2011), with a remarkably full treatment of Proto Indo-European vowels, presents a more limited selection of the Old English noun paradigms than do some books of 50 years ago whose authors could presume a certain study of and interest in the morphology of Old English for itself. Labov's refusal to accept a sidebar status for his approach ("I have resisted the term *sociolinguistics* for many years, since it implies that there can be a successful linguistic theory or practice which is not social"

[Labov 1972: xiii]) has been followed by decades of historical sociolinguistic inquiry that is only now finding its way into mainstream accounts. As literary scholarship in the United States continues to address matters of race, social class, and gender, the full integration of sociolinguistics with earlier forms of historical linguistics will remain an issue for introductory textbooks.

Thirdly, while current textbooks treat a wealth of topics, none to my knowledge have yet taken the opportunity to explore long-standing points of contact with research in the neighboring disciplines of language acquisition and loss, archaeology, and anthropology. I hope future work will come to assess both the impact of synchronic work on diachronic material and the implications of diachronic data for current issues in linguistic research, particularly in the continuing global spread of English. Here are a couple of points of potential interest.

The early acquisition of verbal -ing by children has been confirmed for several generations. In particular, the psychologist Roger Brown's work on politeness theory is well-known in linguistic circles, so the apparent absence of reference by history of language surveys to his introduction to child language acquisition (Brown 1973: 259–260; 271–293) or its successors is a little puzzling. The acquisition of verbal –ing contrasts with the historical introduction of the periphrastic progressive tense into Standard English well after the perfect and passive in a reverse of the expected ontogeny recapitulating phylogeny.

There is even less cause for neglect in considering the implications of Philip Lieberman's work on the role of the supervowel [i] in supralaryngeal vocal tract (SVT) normalization (Liebermann 1984: 111), particularly in the acquisitional tuning of formants so that the variety of formant frequencies made by small and large people are nonetheless perceived as belonging to distinct shared phonemes. What was the impact of the late medieval diphthongization stage of the Great Vowel Shift on the perception of the "carrier" [i] (Liebermann 2006: 164–165) that enables this scaling?

The anthropology of the past quarter-century is underrepresented in accounts of the early medieval external history in current textbooks, though here the contentiousness of studies in Celtic-Germanic contact may impede producing a well-balanced summary account. The description of the *adventus Saxonum* is generally accompanied by a prudent silence about the possibility of any Celtic influence on the early deviation of Old English from Continental Germanic in even recent core vocabulary studies (Polzin et al. [2006]; popularly in Ostler [2006; 2007] and McWhorter [2008]), leaving aside syntax, with its difficulties of reconstruction from slim early records.

Updating of the first textbooks continues, in some cases through many editions (Baugh and Cable 2012; Pyles and Algeo 2004). Whether preserving the original section or paragraph order of books that are segmented permits intercalation that will consistently reflect the best or most useful order of information is an open question, and may be moot if electronic media replace paper pages, but parallelism does facilitate cross-reference between sections. Whether the next generation of textbooks will continue to have a national curriculum model, like Wikipedia, or whether a designedly global or at least transatlantic textbook will establish itself remains to be seen.

Since the Early Modern period there is evidence for L2 users of English, but language contact outside the British Isles has generally merited diachronic textbook discussion only in chapters on (contemporary) World English. The 1988 Braj Kachru diagram representing global English as three overlapping inner, outer and expanding

circles is ubiquitous in synchronic treatments (McArthur 1988: 97–100 for discussion). Svartvik's 2006 revision in collaboration with Leech has a three-dimensional version of Kachru's expanded circle combined with a peak: an apparently single World Standard English rising out of the supra-national regional standards, in order to show an affinity with standardization and the creation of acrolect (Svartik 2006: 226). But is the age of national standards indeed over?

The effect of technology on the size and currency of textbooks is certainly a work in progress. The three-year cycle of Samuelson's *Economics* is famous among American textbooks. Dictionaries were once said to have a ten-year lifespan, but as of this writing the unabridged *Oxford English Dictionary* (OED) will not come out again in paper, continually updateable as it now is online.

At what point in the scholarly volleying does its bibliographic representation in a textbook cease to be useful, and do the potentially infinite resources for storing data urge inclusiveness? A case in point is the growth of borrowed vocabulary in Middle English. Otto Jespersen's 1909–49 study found a place in the first edition of Baugh (1935); in the 4th edition (1993) the co-author added a 1986 reference to Xavier Dekeyser from the Fisiak Festschrift, but nothing in the 5th edition (Baugh and Cable 2002), even omitting mention of Dalton-Puffer's 1996 discussion of Dekeyser. In a climate of globalization it should at least become desirable as well as possible to acknowledge and facilitate reference between books written for different audiences, as in Kortmann's (2005: 60) conversion chart of British and American transcription systems, to which could be added the charts in Bronstein (1988).

5 Summary

The ideal text will describe the various levels of linguistic organization efficiently as well as provide a survey of current theories for causes and mechanisms of change internal and external. At present, introductory textbook coverage is generally richest for phonological and, to a lesser extent, semantic change, and until very recently virtually non-existent on pragmatics. Whatever number of paradigms of inflection are provided, basic help needs to be provided for many students on morphological and syntactic fundamentals, such as the role of analogy, grammaticalization, or conservative and innovative change. An order of presentation matters and a strong cross-referencing system of links leading back as well as forward aids with connecting the necessarily discontinuous discussions of the building blocks of the language at different stages. Another desideratum that would help instructors customize the focus appropriate to their students and curricula would be more and more kinds of sections, arranged by form or by function, somewhat along the lines of several texts, including even the present-to-past order of description in Strang (1970). The best textbook view may be one that while acknowledgedly partial, reflects the scholarly work of centuries and yet can still serve, as often it must, as the introduction to many aspects of the study of language.

6 References

Algeo, John and Thomas Pyles. 2004. *The Origins and Development of the English Language*. 5th edn. Boston: Wadsworth Publishing.
Baugh, Albert. 1935. *A History of the English Language*. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company.

Baugh, Albert C. and Thomas Cable. 2012. *A History of the English Language*. 6th edn. London: Longman.

Beal, Joan C. 2004. *English in Modern Times. 1700–1945*. London: Hodder.

Blake, Norman F. 1996. *A History of the English Language*. London: Macmillan.

Brinton, Laurel J. and Leslie K. Arnovick. 2011. *The English Language: A Linguistic Introduction*. 2nd edn. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Britain, David (ed.). 2007. *Language in the British Isles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bronstein, Arthur J. (ed.). 1988. *Conference Papers on American English and the International Phonetic Alphabet*. Tuscaloosa, Alabama/London: University of Alabama Press.

Brook, George L. 1957. *English Sound-Changes*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Crystal, David. 2004. *The Stories of English*. London: Overlook.

Bragg, Melvyn. 2002. *Adventure of English. The Biography of Language*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

Brown, Roger. 1973. *A First Language: The Early Stages*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Culpeper, Jonathan. 2005. *History of English*, 2nd edn. London: Routledge.

Curzan, Anne and Michael Adams. 2005. *How English Works: A Linguistic Introduction*. 2nd edn. New York: Longman.

Cusack, Bridget. 1998. *Everyday English, 1500–1700*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Dalton-Puffer, Christiane. 1996. *The French Influence on Middle English Morphology. A Corpus-Based Study of Derivation*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Fennell, Barbara. 2001. *A history of English. A sociolinguistic approach*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Fischer, Olga, Ans van Kemenade, Willem Koopman, and Wim van der Wurff. 2000. *The Syntax of Early English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fisiak, Jacek. 2005. *An Outline History of English*. 4th edn. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Poznańskie.

van Gelderen, Elly. 2006. *A History of the English Language*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

van Kemenade, Ans and Bettelou Los. 2006. *Handbook of the History of English*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Görlach, Manfred . 1991. *Introduction to Early Modern English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Görlach, Manfred. 1997 [1974] *Linguistic History of English: An Introduction*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Graddol, David, Dick Leith, and Joan Swann. 1996. *English. History, Diversity and Change*. London: Routledge.

Hogg, Richard. M. and David Denison (eds.). 2006. *A History of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Huddleston, Rodney and Geoffrey Pullum. 2002. *Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Janson, Tore. 2004. *A Natural History of Latin*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jespersen, Otto. 1909–49. *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles*. 7 vols. Heidelberg: Carl Winter (later vols. by Copenhagen: Ejnar Munksgard, and London: George Allen & Unwin).

Jones, Richard Foster. 1953. *Triumph of the English Language*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Knowles, Gerry. 1997. *A Cultural History of the English Language*. London: Arnold.

Kohn, Hans. 1949. The Paradox of Fichte's Nationalism. *Journal of the History of Ideas* 10(3): 319–343.

Kortmann, Bernd. 2005. *English Linguistics: Essentials*. Berlin: Cornelsen.

Labov, William. 1972. *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Leith, Richard. 1997 [1983] *Social History of English*. London: Routledge.

Lerer, Seth. 2005. *Inventing English: A Portable History of English*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Lieberman, Philip. 1984. *The Biology and Evolution of Language*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Lieberman, Philip. 2006. *Toward an Evolutionary Biology of Language*. Cambridge: Belknap Press.

Lutz, Angelika. 2002. When Did English Begin? In: Teresa Fanego, Belen Mendez-Naya, and Elena Seoane (eds.), *Sounds, Words Texts and Change Selected Papers of 11 ICEHL Santiago*, 145–172. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Marsh, George. 1885 [1862]. *The Origin and History of the English Language and of the Early Literature It Embodies*. New York: C. Scribner's Sons.

McArthur, Tom. 1998. *The English Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McIntosh, Angus, M. L. Samuels and Michael Benskin. 1986. *A Linguistic Atlas of Late Medieval English*. 4 vols. Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press.

McWhorter, John. 2008. *Our Magnificent Bastard Tongue*. New York: Gotham.

Millward, Celia M. and Mary Hayes. 2010. *A Biography of the English Language*, 3rd edn. Boston: Wadsworth Publishing.

Milroy, James 2007. The History of English in the British Isles. In: David Britain (ed.), *Language in the British Isles*, 5–32. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Moessner, Lilo. 2003. *Diachronic English Linguistics: An Introduction*. Tübingen: Narr.

Momma, Haruko and Matthew Matto (eds.). 2008. *A Companion to the History of the English Language*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Moretti, Franco. 2005. *Graphs, Maps, Trees. Abstract Models for a Literary History*. London: Verso.

Mugglestone, Linda (ed.). 2006. *The Oxford History of English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nevalainen, Terttu. 2006. *An Introduction to Early Modern English*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Nielsen, Hans Frede. 1998. *A Journey through the History of the English Language: The Continental Backgrounds of English and its Insular Development until 1154*. 2 vols. Odense: Odense University Press.

Nielsen, Hans Frede. 2005. *From Dialect to Standard: English in England 1154–1776: A Journey Through the History of the English Language in England and America,* Vol. II. Odense: University Press of Southern Denmark.

Nunberg, Geoffrey. 2000. The Persistence of English. Introduction to: M. H Abrams and Stephen Greenblatt (eds.), *The Norton Anthology of English Literature*. 7th edn. 2 vols. New York: Norton.

Ostler, Nicholas. 2006. *Empires of the World. A Language History of the World*. London: Harper Perennial.

Ostler, Nicholas. 2007. *Ad Infinitum: A Biography of Latin*. London: Harper Collins.

Polzin, Peter, Tobias Forster, and Arne Röhl. 2006. Evolution of English Basic Vocabulary within the Network of Germanic Languages. In: Peter Forster and Colin Renfrew (eds.), *Phylogenetic methods and the prehistory of languages*, 131–138. Cambridge: McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research.

Rastorgueva, Tatiana Andrapova. 1983. *Istoriya Anglijskogo Yazika*.

Robb, Graham. 2007. *The Discovery of France: A Historical Geography*. New York: Norton.

Sacks, David. 2003. *Letter Perfect. The Marvelous History of Our Alphabet From A to Z*. (originally published in hardback as *Language Visible*). New York: Broadway Books.

Schaefer, Ursula (ed.). 2006. *The Beginnings of Standardization: Language and Culture in Fourteenth Century England*. Frankfurt am Main: Lang.

Scheil, Andrew. 2007. Old English Textbooks and the 21st Century: A Review of Recent Publications. *Old English Newsletter* 40.3. http://www.oenewsletter.org/OEN/archive.php/essays/scheil40_3/ (last accessed 17 May 2011).

Schlauch, Margaret. 1964. *The English Language in Modern Times*. London: Oxford University Press.

Singh, Ishtla. 2005. *The History of English: A Student's Guide*. London: Arnold.

Smith, Jeremy J. 1999. *Essentials of Early English*. London and New York: Routledge.

Strang, Barbara. 1970. *A History of English*. London: Routledge.

Svartvik, Jan and Geoffrey Leech. 2006. *English: One Tongue Many Voices*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Thim, Stefan. 2006. Phrasal Verbs in Everyday English 1500–1700. In: Andrew James Johnston, Ferdinand von Mengden, and Stefan Thim (eds.), *Language and Text: Current Perspectives in English and Germanic Historical Linguistics and Philology*, 292–306. Heidelberg: Winter.

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 1972. *A History of English Syntax*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Mary Blockley, Austin, TX (USA)

76. Resources: Online resources for teaching

Abstract

This chapter describes a selected number of web-based resources for teaching and studying the history of English and English historical linguistics. The chapter begins with an overview of criteria that need to be observed when developing and implementing a web-based environment for teaching the history of English. Online dictionaries and corpora of English are seen as important sources of and tools for (blended) learning environments that focus on the history of English and English historical linguistics. Drawing on a number of representative examples of web-based introductions to the history of English, this chapter also describes the potential of web-based and especially blended learning frameworks.

1 Introduction

This chapter focuses on available web-based resources for teaching and studying the history of English and English historical linguistics. It will show that the concept of e-learning and English historical linguistics and the history of English needs to be seen on a continuum with the mere use of electronic materials in class or in blended learning environments at the one end and the implementation of virtual classrooms at the other end.

There is a vast number of online historical resources ranging from surveys, dictionaries, thesauruses, corpora, digitized manuscripts and so on (see Traxel, Chapter 72) which can also be used for studying and teaching English historical linguistics and

the history of English. However, the number of real web-based classrooms that focus on the history of English is much smaller; possible reasons being the time, effort, and money it takes to develop and encourage an incentive for creating a web-based course. And yet, the scarcity of web-based virtual classrooms is also somewhat surprising because an affiliation between linguistics and e-learning environments has often been claimed (Barbereau and Lamb 2005). (Perhaps this is also one reason why we find a number of web-based environments which introduce to general linguistics, Modern English language teaching and/or grammar courses or which are designed for distance education and language teaching programs; see Chemnitz Internet Grammar at http://www.tu-chemnitz.de/phil/english/InternetGrammar/shared/, or MiLCA Lehrmodule at the department of computational linguistics at http://milca.sfs.uni-tuebingen.de/module.html, both pages last accessed 29 January 2012). Also, e-learning has long been seen as a didactic panacea for improving teaching and learning and for meeting with the shortage of staff at universities. Interestingly, there are a number of recent textbooks which introduce to the history of English (van Gelderen 2010; McIntyre 2008).

The efficient utilization and functions of e-learning in general have been rather extensively researched and various national and international communities have been set up. See, for example, The European Association of Distance Teaching Universities (EADTU) at http://www.eadtu.nl/; see also http://www.e-learning.org. There are also various handbooks, such as the *Sage Handbook of E-Learning Research* (Haythornthwaite and Andrews 2007) and *The AMA Handbook of E-Learning* (Piskurich 2003). But the possible interplay between e-learning and English historical linguistics/the history of English has been neglected. Therefore, in this overview, a number of didactic, technical, and content-related issues are stressed. These should be taken into consideration when developing web-based courses, when drawing on web-based teaching methods (including technical aspects as well as functional and didactic aspects) or when simply using online material. Also, this chapter shows some representative examples of electronic and e-learning resources, which can be creatively used when teaching and studying English historical linguistics and the history of English.

2 From using web-based material to designing a virtual online environment – points to remember

The continuum of using web-based material, on the one hand, and the implementation of a virtual classroom, on the other, as well as the decision about the extent to which web-based learning should be integrated into teaching the history of the English and English historical linguistics embrace some important considerations:

- Intended use: decisions have to be made as to when, where, why, and how to use an online environment.
- Format: studies (e.g. Short et al. 2006) have shown that a blended learning format – a combination of web-based learning and face-to-face teaching and learning – is most efficient.
- Mode of learning: it has been claimed that an emphasis on collaborative learning and constructivist learning (Bremer 2002: 18) is most efficient. Students engage in a

continual process of constructing their own views and analyses, and they compare their results with those of the instructor and other students.

- The students: the students' pre-experience with web-based learning environments needs to be taken into account as well as the different types of learners and their styles of learning. Different models have been used to describe these types of learners. For example, one model that is especially relevant when constructing a web-based environment is that which differentiates between the various perception channels a learner may use to acquire knowledge. There are auditive, visual, and tactile types of learners, who prefer one or the other sensual mode when learning (Bremer 2002: 18). In view of these different models, it is important to stress that each learner works individually when studying. In turn, this implies that the student should also be aware of his/her learning situation (for example, the time to spend on the course) as well as his/her technological prerequisites. It is necessary to advise students on how to proceed and on how to organize their cooperative work in a web-based environment.
- The creator of the course and the instructor(s): there is a definite increase in workload, in managing the students' learning experience and in applying this to the modules and units of historical English linguistics under construction. Knowledge of the social, didactic, technical, financial, and thematic contexts and parameters is needed for the creation of a web-based environment.
- The team: in case a virtual classroom is aimed at an enthusiastic and multi-disciplinary team is needed. This group should at least include technologists, designers and academics teaching English linguistics and the history of English.
- Good practice and sustainability: due to the amount of time and money needed when creating a web-based course creators need to be realistic about whether the course will be continuously used.
- Variety of formats: the content of the course should be presented in a variety of formats (audio-files, visual representations and text files etc.) so that the individual types of learners are equally addressed. Photographs, illustrations, and other visual effects promote understanding and lighten up the learning process. The outline of the content and individual sessions should be presented as audio-files.
- Breaking up the text: the texts should be broken up in meaningful chunks – not only because it is more difficult for a reader to read on the screen but also in order to create coherent learning units. This aspect of coherence could be enhanced by links to other pages within and outside the online environments, so that the navigation gives a sense of movement to the learning process.
- Teaching methods: a variety of teaching methods, e.g. problem-oriented or cognitivist learning methods, should be used.
- Navigation: the site navigation, or what Pajares Tosca (2000) calls the "pragmatics of links," needs to be carefully planned and should include a coherent design of the pages to be navigated so that the user is able to reconstruct the passages and their structure. Color coding is a good strategy to connect thematic sections. It is also helpful to install permanently visible as well as fast links to constant content pages (e.g. to a glossary, the table of contents page, etc.). Frequently, courses can take their students to the next page by means of a link to follow the sequences recommended by the course designer. A "menu" (often found at the left hand side of each

session page) indicates the sub-sections worked on and the suggested arrangement for exploring topics.
- "Printer-friendly" notes: they ease the download of the content material and are especially useful for students with passive learning styles.
- Exercises: these should be created in an interactive way (e.g. cloze-procedures, or test where students can move chunks themselves). Means of self-evaluation (e.g. self-tests, self-assessment mechanisms) are indispensable to guarantee interactivity and a guided learning process.
- Handbook: a detailed course reader or workbook should be provided in which the instructor informs the student about aims, workload, assessment, deadlines etc., and in which additional material is presented. The instructor should plan carefully and well ahead when to provide the students with course exercises, essay questions, and term-paper topics.
- Communication: a web-based course should also allow online synchronous (chat, wikis) and asynchronous modes of communication (e.g. e-mail) among students and instructors, because the social element of teaching face-to-face will be lost when teaching and studying online. This situation necessitates the careful choice of a suitable system for synchronous communication (often provided by the local university).

The advantages and disadvantages of web-based learning depend on the institutional and web-based contexts as well as on the instructor and the student. Therefore, in certain institutional settings, a generally perceived advantage may become a disadvantage and vice versa. Nevertheless, in order to raise awareness it is useful to discuss some of the arguments that are traditionally listed in favor of and against web-based learning. As regards disadvantages of web-based learning, students often only read what is actually presented in the online environment. Instead of consulting additional books, some of them are inclined to assume that all knowledge is simply available online. What is called the "serendipity effect" is reinforced, and often students complain about a cognitive overload. As to the advantages of web-based learning it is a clear gain that students have access to the course from anywhere and at any time and can revisit the materials in a multi-modal way. To spread knowledge worldwide and to follow a global pedagogy that would help to reduce costs, human assistance and marking could be seen as a laudable development.

There is still not enough research on how learners respond to e-learning and its various manifestations. New technologies may partly exceed our understanding and visualization of how best to use them in order to achieve high quality learning, and often the focus of designers is on technology to the detriment of content and pedagogy (Barbereau and Lamb 2005: 101–114). Evaluation should take account of cultural diversity as well as to the students' and instructors' pre-experience with and responses to web-based learning. It should also include different practices within subject disciplines and varying institutional policies. That is, global differences and local circumstances play an important role in whether and how online courses are produced and used pedagogically effectively. Questionnaires as well as focus-group interviews are suitable means of evaluation (Short et al. 2006).

3 Taking stock – useful tools

3.1 Online dictionaries and corpora

The number of useful tools to be incorporated in teaching and studying the history of the English language and English historical linguistics grows rapidly, and they range from surveys and dictionaries, over thesauruses and corpora to digitized manuscripts. Due to digitization initiatives, on the one hand, and corpus research, on the other, e-texts of older books, historical corpora and databases of English historical dictionaries are now electronically accessible. In addition, many English historical dictionaries can now also be accessed online. It comes as no surprise that their potential for studying and teaching word-meaning is not the only way of exploring the history of English and that it is through various electronic search interfaces that study questions in, for example, lexicology and morphology or even the history of speech acts can be more elaborate and efficient than the use of book versions of the respective dictionaries. In electronic dictionaries, like, for example, the *Oxford English Dictionary* (OED) at www.oed.com or the *Middle English Dictionary* (MED) (see http://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/med; see also *The Dictionary of Old English* at http://www.doe.utoronto.ca) so-called "advanced searches", which may go beyond the Boolean search once one has acquired more than basic knowledge of how to use these interfaces, allow users to investigate, among others, a number of lexicological enquiries. For example, it is possible to search for new lexemes that have been taken up in the OED from the 1970s onwards or blends that have been compiled in the OED since whatever period one is interested in (see also van Gelderen 2010). Jucker and Taavitsainen (2007), for example, have used the OED to collect "speech act verbs" and Mair (2007) uses the OED quotation database on CD-ROM to investigate lexical change of English in the 20th century. The OED (www.oed.com) also provides a "quiz" site which shows users the various functionalities of lexicological and lexicographical research possible with the OED. The "help" website, which elaborates on the range of (historical) searches that can be made, is equally fruitful.

The online edition of the *Historical Thesaurus of the Oxford English Dictionary* (HTOED) (Kay et al. 2009) is an equally fruitful source for the historical study of English. The HTOED arranges the English found in the second edition of the *OED* into a network of semantic categories *and* incorporates the diachronic development of words and concepts. With the OED we can trace the meaning of a word. With the HTOED we can now see how a meaning came about and which meanings were among the first to express a particular concept. This is extremely useful because the lexical history of a concept is usually supressed by the alphabetical structure of a dictionary and one needs a certain amount of expertise to extract this kind of information from dictionaries.

The *Lexicons of Early Modern English* (see http://leme.library.utoronto.ca/public/intro.cfm, last accessed 29 January 2012) is a "historical database of monolingual, bilingual, and polyglot dictionaries, lexical encyclopedias, hard-word glossaries, spelling lists, and lexically-valuable treatises surviving in print or manuscript from the Tudor, Stuart, Caroline, Commonwealth, and Restoration periods" (Lancashire 2008). It serves as one example of how a compiled historical database of Early Modern dictionaries provides not only an impressive overview of the character of

dictionaries in Early Modern England, but also the opportunity to acquire a variety of lexical and pragmatic information. A look at the entry *welcome* in the database, for example, reveals a rather long list of occurrences of *welcome* and its collocations – in the main entries of the respective dictionaries or in the definitions. The dictionaries in which *welcome* occurs range from 1530 to 1702 and among them are Palsgrave's (1530) *Lesclarcissement de la langue francoyse* and Florio's (1598) *Worlde of Wordes*. In a sub-entry of *welcome*, Palsgrave (1530) even elaborates on how the speech act of a welcome is paralinguistically supported by opening one's arms in:

> I Welcome I take one vp or receyue hym with myn armes |{yt}| maketh courtesye to me/ as the frenche men vse to do/ Ie accueuls, iay accueilly, accueyllir, c|_o|iugate lyke his symple ie cueulx, I gather/ and ie recueulx, c|_o|iugate lyke his symple ie cueuls, I gather. Let hym come whan Fo.CCCC.vii. whan he wyll he shall be welcomed on the best facyon: Viengne quant il vouldra il sera recueilly, or accueilly de la meilleure sorte. (Palsgrave 1530)

This quotation also illustrates the potential in historical dictionaries for what Trudgill and Watts (2002) call "alternative histories of English" and the need for an emphasis on the pragmatic aspects of the history of English.

As regards historical corpora, access to *ARCHER: A Representative Corpus of Historical English Registers* (Biber and Finegan 1990–93/2002/2007/2010; Biber et al. 1994), for example, the *Corpus of English Dialogues 1560–1760* (Kytö and Culpeper 2006), or the *Helsinki Corpus* (Rissanen et al. 1991) and knowledge of tools that help search them and explain how to interpret the respective results are necessary prerequisites (see Kytö 2010, and chapter 96) for a complete overview of historical corpora). In recent studies of English historical pragmatics, these play a crucial role and they may also be used for web-based teaching purposes. Jucker and Taavitsainen (2000) and Kohnen (2006) have pointed to the methodological caveats involved in applying speech act theory diachronically. Taavitsainen and Fitzmaurice (2007) elaborate on the general caveats of historical pragmatics. The *Corpus of Contemporary American English* (Davies 2009) and its historical clone the *Corpus of Historical American English* (Davies 2010) allow for diachronic search to draw conclusions about language change.

3.2 Web-based courses of the history of English and other databases – a selection

Web-based courses of English historical linguistic or the history of English introduce to or teach aspects of the history of English, language change, or English historical linguistics. The following list of references is a selection of notable courses or relevant sources which can be used to enhance historical linguistic teaching. Visual documentation of the respective features described in the following courses will not, for reasons of space, be given. However, the reader will be referred to the respective URL; all web links were accessed on 29 January 2012. It is beyond the scope of this chapter to present a comprehensive list of all available courses.

Old English Online (http://www.utexas.edu/cola/centers/lrc/eieol/engol-0-X.html), developed at the Linguistics Research Center in Austin, Texas, by Jonathan Slocum and Winfred P. Lehmann, gives an overview of the most important differences between

Old English and Present-day English focusing on syntax and phonology. It also contains pointers to Proto-Indo-European roots identified by Julius Pokorny. The site is remarkable for its valuable form-index dictionary, in which, for each English word, base forms containing that word in their general meaning are shown, along with a link to everyday usage. In a user-friendly way, general meanings correlate with links to each usage in the numbered lesson. The suggested study of various OE texts is divided up into two to three sentences, which are then translated literally.

Words in English Website (http://www.ruf.rice.edu/~kemmer/Words04/), developed at Rice University, Houston, Texas, by Suzanne Kemmer, focuses on language change in general and the change of word meanings in particular. Through a modern user-friendly interface, the general developments of the history of English are explained alongside the meaning change of words.

The module "History of English" of *The Virtual Linguistic Campus* (http://linguistics.online.uni-marburg.de) developed at the University of Marburg, Germany, by Jürgen Handke and collaborators is categorized according to the classic periodization of the history of the English language and focuses on the core linguistic areas of phonology, morphology and syntax. It also contains modules about "The Evolution of Language", "Proto Languages", "The Classification of Languages", "Principles of Language Change", and a section on "Varieties of English". The main linguistic developments of each of the respective stages of the English language are described. Although there is a bias on phonology, the sessions on the phonology of the respective stages of the English language contain, for example, well-researched audio-files of each spoken phoneme, which are easily clickable. In addition, suitable exercises guarantee that students are able to control the learning process. Although it is doubtful whether the aim of an online environment should be to reduce textual information to a minimum and to do entirely without external links, the highly sophisticated design and the general teaching philosophy behind this and other modules are fruitful. Each session adheres to a common corporate design structure, which enhances the reader-friendly structure and the coherence of what is presented. There is also a general overview of the topics to be discussed in the session. A permanent bar contains links to "Glossary", "Language Index", and "Important Linguists". Each unit within a module contains a worksheet (including the solutions on a separate page). It is also possible to send (via e-mail) feedback to the Marburg team (a pre-created form can be used). There are even audio-versions of the respective sessions, including music. Also, animations are successfully inserted. Each unit is accompanied by a workbook which focuses on the reading and analysis of texts from the respective periods. It informs the users again about the unit they have been studying online, and explains various symbols, before moving on to exercises and sequential print-offs of the content in the online environment. Thus, having to print the hypertexts is avoided. It is therefore a useful supplement to the e-learning environment, which focuses on interactivity and visual information.

Knut Hanneman's EHL Project (English Historical Linguistics) developed at the University of Düsseldorf (http://www.phil-fak.uni-duesseldorf.de/anglistik1/e-learning/ehl/) enables BA students to broaden their knowledge of English historical linguistics by using specifically devised web-based modules which include interactive elements, such as self-tests, podcasts, and flash animations.

Raymond Hickey (http://www.uni-due.de/SHE/) offers a comprehensive website which covers the main findings about language change in general and about the history of the English language. Despite the fact that this website is text-centered, it offers a wealth of material which can be used for blended learning environments or as reference tools.

Another outstanding project are eHistLing web pages "English Historical Linguistics" of the University of Basel at http://www.ehistling-pub.meotod.de/. The project is based on a blended learning approach. It promotes online communication and cooperation and supports cognitive and social network processes by including lecture scripts, online tutorials, a key word section, an extensive bibliography, illustrative images, diagrams, and well-chosen hyperlinks. The course gives a systematic overview of the phonological, morphological, and semantic development of the history of English and situates it within the socio-historical contexts. The website focuses on the acquisition of historical linguistic knowledge and analytical techniques. It is based on behaviorist and cognitivist learning theory. Classroom lectures on the history of English and corresponding web-based tutorials are provided to supplement the web-based sessions. Constructivist learning theory guides the second part of this course in which the students are asked to write a research paper on a historical linguistic research question. Students have to form research groups and they act as authors and reviewers at the same time. Furthermore, the publication process is simulated because the papers are discussed in a classroom conference and uploaded to be accessible for all students. Students are also provided with tutorials on, for example, James Murray, one of the first editors of the *Oxford English Dictionary*.

Elly van Gelderen's classic website History of English at http://www.historyofenglish.net/ is a companion to her textbook *History of English*. Next to chapters explaining the history of the English language and the varieties of English and their development, this website contains useful links which, for example, guide the user towards relevant historical corpora, towards other web-based introductions to the history of English, towards websites that represent the classic "Elizabethan accent", or towards historical textual editions, early printed pages and manuscripts. The website also contains a glossary and illustrated time-line of the development of the history of English as well as a manual of how to do searches in the *Oxford English Dictionary* online. Furthermore, excerpts from classic texts important for or representative of each period of the history of the English language are listed electronically.

Basic tenets of historical sociolinguistics and historical pragmatics have not frequently been incorporated in an interactive web-based environment. The module "Historical pragmatics, language change and historical linguistics" of my own web-based course IELO ("Introduction to English linguistics online") contains an introduction to theoretical frameworks such as historical pragmatics, grammaticalization and pragmaticalization. The general concept of *welcome* is used to show how the interplay between lexis, grammar, discourse, and context, that is, the patterns of human interaction within the social conditions of earlier periods, is meaning-making. As an exemplary case, the first session focuses on students' general knowledge of *welcome*. Students are asked to write down their initial impressions after watching a video-sequence of the musical *Cabaret*, in which the conferencier greets the visitors with the famous song "Willkommen, bienvenue, welcome!" Following this first introduction to the concept of *welcome*, the French, German and English

etymological interconnections between these concepts are explored with the help of the OED. There is also a separate unit which aims at studying the uses and functions of *welcome* through time. Text passages from Chaucer, Shakespeare, and other historical sources are given to highlight the attributive, adjectival, and nominal usage of *welcome*, as well was the *to*-construction and respective speech-act realizations. Following the guidelines for web-based learning, students are given continuous feedback, the course is interactive and addresses the different types of learners.

Despite the fact that *Language and Style* (http://www.lancs.ac.uk/fass/projects/stylistics/, last accessed 29 January 2012), developed by Mick Short at Lancaster University, UK, does not explicitly focus on the teaching of "The History of English", but touches on stylistic analyses of literary texts from older stages of the English language only in passing, the website illustrates how complex linguistic concepts can be successfully transferred to an online environment. In its focus on the stylistics' tool-box and its application to the three main literary genres, the course consists of 13 topics relevant to stylistic analyses. The topics are color-coded for each literary genre. Other navigation links, such as a permanent bar at the top right side and initial guidance as to how to go through the course, help create coherence. Printer-friendly notes, graphics, audio-material, and self-assessments activate and enhance the learning process in a variety of ways. In the poetry sub-sections, poems from various centuries introduce the stylistician's tool-box for a stylistic study of poems. Also, the section on the analysis of drama introduces how pragmatic approaches to language study, such as turn-taking management, speech acts and politeness theory, help readers to understand a play-text. For the study of the history of English, the analysis of an excerpt from G. B. Shaw's *Major Barbara* (1905) is used to introduce the interplay between turn-taking mechanisms and power structures in a highly rank-conscious society. Grice's (1975) Cooperative principle and Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness theory are introduced through C. Churchill's modern play *Top Girls* (1982).

4 Summary

As illustrated, the interplay between English historical linguistics and web-based learning is far from being extensively studied. This is partly due to the fact that, on the one hand, there is a wealth of online material which can be used in a variety of teaching environments. On the other hand, the implementation of virtual classrooms is part of this continuum, but not as frequently realized within English historical linguistics and the study as well as teaching of the history of English. There can be no doubt that the advantages and disadvantages of any kind of web-based learning need to be carefully weighed, taking account of pedagogical requirements and users' needs.

5 References

Barbereau, Danielle and Terry Lamb. 2005. *Re-thinking Pedagogical Models for Elearning*. Sheffield: Modern Languages Teaching Center, University of Sheffield.
Benson, Philip. 2001. *Teaching and Researching Autonomy in Language Learning*. London: Longman.

Biber, Douglas and Edward Finegan. 1990–93/2002/2007/2010. *A Representative Corpus of Historical English Registers (ARCHER)*. Version 3.1. Consortium of fourteen universities, see http://www.llc.manchester.ac.uk/research/projects/archer/ (last accessed 7 February 2012).

Biber, Douglas, Edward Finegan, Dwight Atkinson, Ann Beck, Dennis Burges, and Jena Burges. 1994. The Design and Analysis of the ARCHER Corpus: A Progress Report. In: Merja Kytö, Matti Rissanen, and Susan Wright (eds.), *Corpora across the Centuries*, 3–6. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Bremer, Claudia. 2002. Online Lehren Leicht Gemacht! Leitfaden für die Planung und Gestaltung von virtuellen Hochschulveranstaltungen. In: Brigitte Berendt, Hans-Peter Voss, and Johannes Wildt (eds.), *Neues Handbuch Hochschullehre: Lehren und Lernen effizient Gestalten*, 1–40, D 3.1. Berlin: Raabe.

Brown, Penelope and Stephen C. Levinson. 1987. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Busse, Beatrix and Patricia Plummer. 2005. More Teaching Power than Anything that Could Ever be Printed on Paper?: (E-)Teaching in a Hypertext network. In: Lilo Moessner (ed.), *Anglistentag 2004 Aachen Proceedings*, 359–379. Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier.

Davies, Mark. 2008–. *The Corpus of Contemporary American English: 425 million words, 1990–present* (COCA). http://corpus.edu/coca (last accessed 7 February 2012).

Davies, Mark. 2010. *Corpus of Historical American English (1810–2000)* (COHA). http://corpus.byu.edu/coha/ (last accessed 7 February 2012).

van Gelderen, Elly. 2010. *A History of the English Language*. 2nd edn. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Grice, Herbert Paul. 1975. Logic and conversation. In: Peter Cole and Jerry L. Morgan (eds.), *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts*. 41–58. New York: Academic Press.

Handke, Jürgen. 2003. *Multimedia im Internet: Konzeption und Implementierung*. München: R. Oldenbourg Verlag.

Haythornthwaite, Caroline and Richards Andrews (eds.). 2007. *The Sage Handbook of E-Learning Research*. London: Sage.

Jucker, Andreas H. and Irma Taavitsainen. 2000. Diachronic Speech Act Analysis: Insults from Flyting to Flaming. *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 1: 67–95.

Kay, Christian, Jane Roberts, Michael Samuels, and Irene Wotherspoon (eds.). 2009. *Historical Thesaurus of the Oxford English Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kohnen, Thomas. 2006. Variability of Form as a Methodological Problem in Historical Corpus Analysis: the Case of Modal Expressions in Directive Speech Acts. In: Christian Mair and Reinhard Heuberger (eds.), *Corpora and the History of English: Papers Dedicated to Manfred Markus on the Occasion of His Sixty-fifth Birthday*, 221–233. Heidelberg: Winter.

Kytö, Merja. 2010. Data in Historical Pragmatics. In: Andreas H. Jucker and Irma Taavitsainen (eds.), *Historical Pragmatics*, 33–68. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter Mouton.

Kytö, Merja and Jonathan Culpeper. 2006. *A Corpus of English Dialogues 1560–1760*. With the assistance of Terry Walker and Dawn Archer. Uppsala University and Lancaster University. http://www.engelska.uu.se/Research/English_Language/Research_Areas/Electronic_Resource_Projects/A_Corpus_of_English_Dialogues/ (last accessed 7 February 2012).

Lancashire, Ian. 2008. *Lexicons of Early Modern English*. http://leme.library.utoronto.ca (last accessed 30 September 2011).

Mair, Christian. 2007. *Twentieth-Century English: History, Variation and Standardization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McIntyre, Dan. 2008. *History of English. A Resource Book for Students*. London: Routledge.

Pajares Tosca, Susana. 2000. Pragmatics of Links. *Journal of Digital Information* 1.6. http://jodi.ecs.soton.ac.uk/Articles/v01/i06/Pajares/ (last accessed 24 June 2010).

Piskurich, George M. 2003. *The AMA Handbook of E-Learning*. Columbus: McGraw-Hill Publishing Company.

Plummer, Patricia and Beatrix Busse. 2006. E-learning and "Language and Style" in Mainz and Münster. *Language and Style* 15(3): 257–276.

Rissanen, Matti, Merja Kytö, Leena Kahlas-Tarkka, Matti Kilpiö, Saara Nevanlinna, Irma Taavitsainen, Terttu Nevalainen, and Helena Raumolin-Brunberg. 1991. *The Helsinki Corpus of English Texts*. In: *ICAME Collection of English Language Corpora (CD-ROM)*, 2nd edn., Knut Hofland, Anne Lindebjerg, Jørn Thunestvedt (eds.), The HIT Center, University of Bergen, Norway. For manual, see http://khnt.hit.uib.no/icame/manuals/hc/index.htm (last accessed 7 February 2012).

Short, Mick, Beatrix Busse, and Patricia Plummer. 2006. Preface: The Web-based "Language and Style" course, e-learning and stylistics. *Language and Literature* 15(3): 219–233.

Taavitsainen, Irma, and Andreas H. Jucker. 2007. Speech act verbs and speech acts in the history of English. In: Susan M. Fitzmaurice and Irma Taavitsainen (eds.), *Methods in Historical Pragmatics*, 107–138. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Taavitsainen, Irma and Susan M. Fitzmaurice. 2007. Historical Pragmatics: What It Is and How To Do It. In: Susan M. Fitzmaurice and Irma Taavitsainen (eds.), *Methods in Historical Pragmatics*, 11–36. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Trudgill, Peter and Richard Watts. 2002. Introduction. 'In the Year 2525' In: Peter Trudgill and Richard Watts (eds.), *Alternative Histories of English*, 1–3. London/New York: Routledge.

Beatrix Busse, Heidelberg (Germany)

X. Interdisciplinarity and Historiography

77. Interdisciplinarity and Historiography: Literature

Abstract

This chapter discusses some of the central problems readers – both historical linguists and literary scholars – encounter when dealing with the literature of the past, especially with that of the very distant past such as the Middle Ages or the Early Modern Period. It focuses on the key issues of (1) periodization, (2) geography and language, (3) notions of the literary, (4) method and theory, (5) canon formation, and (6) authorship and subjectivity, since these are the problems typically invoked when it comes to defining what makes the literature of the past so different from our own (post)modern notions of the literary. The chapter invites readers, first, to develop a methodological awareness of the alterity of the literature from the past; second, to avoid defining that alterity as the mere Other of the (post)modern; and, third, to make use of (post)modern theory and methodology in the service of better understanding that alterity.

1 Introduction

The relationship between historical linguistics and literary studies is fraught with problems. Although the two fields go back to the same disciplinary roots – both are (grand) children of 19th-century philology – they have developed in ways so different as to make a dialogue between them dauntingly complicated.

This chapter will sketch some of the theoretical and methodological issues which render that dialogue difficult. The perspective chosen here is, however, a decidedly literary one. The situation may look very different if approached from a historical linguist's point of view. Moreover, I do not claim any kind of objective stance on literary history or theory. Indeed, this chapter is based on the unoriginal premise that such an approach is impossible. Hence, this text is not meant to equip historical linguists with a toolkit enabling them to overcome whatever literary obstructions they might encounter in the course of their research. Yet I do hope that the issues raised here will increase their awareness of some of the methodological problems involved when dealing with literature and that this awareness may help to generate new forms of co-operation between the disciplines.

The principal focus is on a set of specific methodological issues whose common denominator is the alterity of the literary text composed in the distant past. When historical linguists come across literary texts they face a twofold problem: first, they are confronted by literary artefacts whose very literariness precludes a straightforward appropriation as linguistic data, and second, they encounter notions of the literary

which may differ considerably from those prevailing nowadays. Because historical alterity must always be seen as the central obstacle for the understanding of literature from the past (Jauss 1979), the issues highlighted in this chapter are illustrated mainly by examples from medieval and early modern literature and culture, i.e. from periods whose alterity is most plainly visible. These examples have, however, been chosen such that they throw light on questions relevant to all who study the relationship between literature and historical linguistics, not merely those interested in medieval or early modern English phenomena.

Six principal problems will be discussed: (1) periodization, (2) geography and language, (3) notions of the literary, (4) method and theory, (5) canon formation, and (6) authorship and subjectivity. These problems are especially relevant because of the basic role they play in shaping our understanding of the literature of the past. This list could easily be extended and there are sure to be overlaps with other chapters in this volume, such as Curzan (Chapter 79) on periodization, Williamson (Chapter 91) on historical dialectology, and Britain (Chapter 129) on diffusion. Other questions relevant to a discussion of literature from the past, e.g. orality and literacy, are dealt with by other contributors (see, e.g., Schaefer, Chapter 81, on orality and literacy). None of the six topics is treated exhaustively. Instead, each of the chapters draws attention to a few poignant features exemplifying specific aspects of alterity.

2 Literature of the past: basic methodological problems

2.1 Periodization

Time and space are two of the most important categories that historians of any aspect of human culture grapple with. Neither can be seen as a given. Each must be viewed as a construct reflecting the specific interests of those who operate with the category. Even though history evolves under conditions imposed by time and space it is history that gives shape to these notions in the first place. This may sound like a truism, a well-worn cliché of poststructuralist cultural analysis, but it is nevertheless worth remembering, if only because the major periods of English literary history have remained surprisingly stable. Our basic ideas on the beginning and the end of the literary Middle Ages, for instance, have not changed within the last century and a half. Indeed, the very fact that we still employ the term "Middle Ages" when we deal with literature written between c.500 and c.1500 is remarkable. After all, the term was invented in the Renaissance in the context of a very specific, ideologically driven cultural polemic (Starn 1994: 132–133).

Our period boundaries' relative stability appears even more impressive if seen in the face of the massive paradigm shifts that have taken place both in cultural history and in literary studies. Many of these conceptual shifts were accompanied by sweeping iconoclastic claims to methodological innovation. Yet the major schools of literary interpretation succeeding one another after World War II have left the periodization of English literature virtually untouched.

One reason for this is literary history's precarious status in the academy. "Literary History" is a body of knowledge implicitly taken for granted and usually relegated to introductory courses or lecture series for undergraduates. But it is something few critics are actively involved in since even scholars dealing with the literature of the past display

a strong tendency to approach their object in a synchronic fashion. Truly diachronic studies which seek to cover long-term change and development in literature are few and far between and usually focus on rather narrow problems. Besides, they are frequently pursued by students of Comparative Literature rather than by scholars who concentrate on a single national literature.

This is all the more surprising since the traditional period boundaries in literary studies are anything but innocent. They are ideologically charged and ought, therefore, to be especially sensitive to methodological debate. Precisely because the Middle Ages as a concept is a Renaissance invention do they still tend to play the role of the Other of all that is complex and valuable about modern literature and culture. Not surprisingly, attempts to transgress the well-policed boundaries between the periods are predominantly undertaken by medievalists moving forward in time rather than by early modernists moving backwards. Helen Cooper's (2004) recent book on romance in English literature, for example, clearly shows how that genre extends far beyond the temporal demarcations that traditionally mark the end of the Middle Ages. But such a line of inquiry is not adopted very frequently. Hence, it is one of the more tragic ironies of literary historiography that the tendency to identify revolutionary breaks in the development of literature is most pronounced amongst scholars whose expertise is limited to only one fairly narrowly defined literary period, i.e. scholars who know very little of the past they are ostensibly using as a backdrop for the revolutionary changes they claim to be identifying.

The disconcerting durability of period boundaries has many causes – not least the exigencies of the academic job market and the general drive towards specialization to be witnessed particularly but not only in the English-speaking countries. The huge and ever-widening divide between Anglo-Saxonists and students of Middle English literature is a case in point. It is interesting to note in this context that the barriers segregating students of Old English literature from Chaucerians are not mirrored in the field of historical linguistics where the divide separating Old English from Middle English is transgressed much more easily.

Thus, the drive towards ever more narrowly defined fields of research has adverse consequences for literary history. However much individual schools of thought might proclaim a focus on ruptures or shifts – as does the New Historicism with its Foucauldian roots – they are prone happily to reproduce the traditional chronological patterns of literary historiography that have been accepted all too long.

Literary scholars are not the only ones to blame, however. After all, the periodization of literary history tends to follow fundamental patterns and basic assumptions developed in neighboring fields such as political, social, or cultural history or even historical linguistics. To be sure, there is a certain logic to this. If we see literature as one cultural phenomenon amongst others then it is obvious that it should be influenced by the pressures of the political, social, economic, and cultural world it is produced and read in. But at the same time, there is something rather uncanny about the odd parallels we discover when we realize that the beginning of the Tudor monarchy in 1485, the introduction of the printing press into England, the transition from Middle English to Early Modern English and the end of medieval literature are all supposed to have happened within a space of ten years.

Not all literary scholars have accepted this happy fit of paradigm shifts and ruptures. C. S. Lewis (1954: 55–56), for instance, writing his history of 16th-century English

literature in the mid-20th did not think that these changes mattered all that much. In fact, Lewis called into question the very validity of the concept of the Renaissance for English literature. For him there was nothing really new about the Renaissance, except perhaps the introduction of Greek learning – and that supposedly affected only a small and select band of humanists. I mention this not because I think Lewis was right, nor because I wish to argue that he was mistaken (which, by and large, he was), but to point out that the problem of literary periodization always rests on a choice of criteria, many of which are quite arbitrary, and more importantly, most of which are derived from human activities whose links to the literary are more or less indirect. Furthermore, the way we describe these external factors' impact on literature depends entirely on the theoretical framework we employ. New Historicists, for instance, have for the last three decades or so been engaged in breaking down the barriers between text and context. Ostensibly, for them the principal issue is not that of determining literary period boundaries on the basis of extra-literary phenomena. But this has not led them to redefine or even to question traditional period boundaries.

2.2 Geography and language

The relationship between literary history and linguistic geography is just as problematic as that between literature and its temporal boundaries. Since our concept of "literature" as an object of academic research originated in the 19th century it tends somehow to be linked to a national language. In the 19th century a nation's literature gained its particular importance as the highest expression of a national culture and, therefore, as an expression of a national identity which was linked to a national language. Literature as an institution, as an object valued and protected by official authority, is thus a product of the 19th-century nation state – as is the philological origin of historical linguistics, one of whose prime purposes, originally, was to make accessible the treasures of medieval literature as the supposedly undiluted expression of a nation's spirit.

A closer look at the English Middle Ages teaches us how problematic such an assumption is. At the end of the 12th century, when the great works of early French literature were being composed, Angevin England was part of the French literary landscape (Symes 2007: 10–18). Chrétien de Troyes spent some time in England, Marie de France composed all her works there, and the earliest manuscripts of the *Chanson de Roland* were also written in England. French, like Latin, was a literary language of England and a huge body of macaronic verse and of multi-lingual manuscripts testifies to how difficult it is from a literary point of view to draw clear distinctions between the cultural spheres of these languages. More often than not they seem to have shared common audiences. And as late as the end of the 14th century we find John Gower composing works in all three of England's literary languages, i.e. in Latin, Anglo-French, and English. Besides, not only did medieval literary culture not adhere to the geographic, political, and even linguistic boundaries we take for granted at the beginning of the 21st century, but the very role of those geographic boundaries was different. In an age when transport and travel over land was arduous and time-consuming, a topographical feature such as the English Channel was more likely to bring people together than to keep them apart. In the absence of powerful navies and coastal defences the sea was the easiest access for invaders and the many invasions that the

British Isles were subjected to from the migration period down to the end of the Middle Ages illustrate this fact.

One of the well-known results of these many invasions and conquests is that English linguistic history has a strong Scandinavian component (see Dance, Chapter 110). And yet, while the powerful Scandinavian impact on the English language is easily identifiable today through the presence of such basic words as *they* or *till* in the English lexicon, the literary influence exerted by the Danes is much less tangible. *Beowulf*, a poem which like no other epitomizes Anglo-Saxon literature for modern readers (especially for readers who are not professional Anglo-Saxonists) serves as a perfect example. The poem is set in early 6th-century Scandinavia and events at the Danish court play a central role. Consequently, when the epic was first subjected to rigorous academic scrutiny in the early 19th century, Danish scholars actually claimed it as a monument of their own national history and culture. Yet a closer look at the Danes in the poem suggests that the text seems to know hardly anything of Scandinavian culture – contemporary or otherwise. Whatever the *Beowulf*-poet was trying to do, he was evidently not attempting to give his Danes any recognizable contemporary coloring. This is an important observation because in their eagerness to identify the contexts of historical poems even literary scholars often underestimate the powerful role of fictionality. The *Beowulf*-poet may have refrained from making his Danes look more authentically Scandinavian because he simply lacked the cultural expertise to do so. At the same time he may not have been particularly interested in any kind of historical specificity at all but rather in using his Danes for fictional purposes of his own. Since the New Critics (Wellek and Warren 1956: 147–150) have taught us that the quest for authorial intent is not only futile but risky, we need not pursue the question any further. What matters is the literary effect. And as far as *Beowulf* is concerned, that effect results in a fictional universe that manages to be both intensely historical and oddly ahistorical at the same time. It conveys a deep sense of multilayered history since it affords us a glimpse of a past that is distant even from the narrator's point of view. Yet it also presents us with a legendary landscape that remains ultimately vague and unspecific. In other words, we have no reason to believe that the Denmark in *Beowulf* is any more realistic than the one that Shakespeare depicts in *Hamlet*. And this is the case even though the ties between 10th-century England and Danish culture were much stronger than those between England and Denmark in the early 17th century. As John D. Niles (1997: 225–226) states, despite all the Scandinavian places and peoples *Beowulf* mentions, we never really get a clear idea of how those different places or peoples are supposed to be related to each other geographically, ethnically or linguistically. The fact that many of the names in the poem can actually be identified historically does not automatically mean that the *Beowulf*-poet and his audience would have interpreted them in the same way as we do. At the end of the day, there is no doubt that in some sense *Beowulf* is a witness to historical relations between Anglo-Saxon and Scandinavian cultures, but because of its brilliant exploitation of fictionality and its general aesthetic complexity, the poem defies any attempts to use it as a source that might help us understand the cultural relations between Englishmen and Danes at the time the poem's manuscript was produced.

Given the complex forms of cultural hybridity that obtain in medieval England especially after 1066, it is not surprising that the situation of Middle English literature has been described as essentially post-colonial (Bowers 2000: 53–66). Helpful as

postcolonial terminology may be for an understanding of how different the Middle Ages were from what we have come to accept as the standard cultural situation of the modern West, postcolonial associations also threaten to obscure medieval and early modern cultural and literary specificity. This is because postcolonial concepts imply notions about identity formation, about the relationship between the center and the margins and about the role of literature in society and within the educational system that are largely useless when it comes to describing the medieval or early modern experience. More importantly, postcolonial criticism's very focus on a world shaped by the European conquest of a vast expanse of overseas territories tends to reify the period boundaries which, according to postcolonial theory's own theoretical claims, it should be seeking to deconstruct. As Jeffrey Jerome Cohen (2003: 19) has argued persuasively, postcolonial theory "has neglected the study of the distant past, positing instead of interrogating the anteriority against which modern regimes of power have supposedly arisen".

2.3 Notions of the literary

One of the central difficulties all students of the literature of the past – including historical linguists – have to grapple with is that the very idea of "literature" is a fairly recent one, one that is changing and shifting even as I write. Ever since Romanticism at the latest, the study of literature has revolved around the privileging of literature as an aesthetic object easily accessible in the form of printed books and largely enjoyed through practices of private reading. This has resulted in a special emphasis on self-conscious formal experimentation, on the one hand, and on fictionality, on the other, as typical markers of "literariness". To be sure, literary works have shown an awareness of these aspects from the earliest times, but there have always been other criteria, too, which have served to distinguish the "literary" from the "non-literary", such as the use of an elevated style or that of specific topoi. Many types of texts which had still been considered of high literary value right up to the 18th century – letters, historiographical works, speeches or sermons – were considerably demoted in status and it is only in recent times that they have begun again to receive increasing attention. John Donne's contemporaries valued him as a preacher just as much, or perhaps even more than, as a poet. Similarly, our (post)modern reading habits are ill-attuned to the strong presence of the didactic or even encyclopaedic in literature from the earliest times down to the 18th century.

    In the same vein, the romantic and post-romantic cult of originality saw a reduced artistic relevance of translation. While the Middle Ages possessed a sophisticated relationship to the question of translation, encapsulated, for instance, in Eustache Deschamps' famous praise of Chaucer as a "grand translateur" (Pearsall 1992: 81), for a long time modern critics tended to see translation as derivative and paid little attention to the complex theoretical questions medieval and early modern authors debated in the context of scriptural translation, but not only there. It is only within the last two decades that medieval ideas on and practices of translation have received growing attention, a development that has taken place within the larger translational turn which we witness in the humanities and which is to a certain extent driven by increasingly complex notions of intertextuality. Translation is now seen as a highly creative and self-conscious activity that cannot be reduced to the mere act of finding equivalents

in one language for the words and phrases of another. In the Middle Ages and the early modern period, when cultural boundaries were much more fluid and the relationships between the European vernaculars on the one hand and Latin on the other, but also between the vernaculars themselves, were constantly being readjusted, translation was the site of complex ideological and aesthetic negotiation.

Some scholars have called into question the applicability *per se* of the modern notion of "literature" to the medieval and early modern periods. I shall single out one especially brilliant and also very radical example illustrative of this approach. Christopher Cannon (2004) has recently suggested that modern notions of literature ignore the cultural specificity of medieval texts, especially of those problematic medieval texts written in English during the 12th and 13th centuries, i.e. at the very beginning of the linguistic period we call "Middle English". Cannon argues that we ought to see these works not as representative of some over-arching literary tradition, according to whose standards they are fairly unsophisticated products, but rather as highly individual textual entities meriting individualized critical responses. According to Cannon, the subsequent rise of romance – supposedly the first genre in English literary history to actually identify itself as such – dealt the death blow to that prelapsarian world of individualized textuality. I refer to Cannon's theory not because I agree with him – I don't – but because his fascinating Hegelian interpretation of one of the most crucial and yet least studied phases of English literary history represents a challenging attempt to come to terms with the fundamental problem of medieval literature's alterity: how can we study the literature of the past if we cannot even be sure that the object of our study is what we think it is? Important as his contribution is, Cannon's theory has at least two fundamental weaknesses. One is that it disregards the multilingual situation of the literary field of medieval England. Latin literature – and to some extent French – was capable of providing a powerful, well-developed and highly – if often implicitly – theorized notion of the literary to the authors who produced works like the *Orrmulum* or *The Owl and the Nightingale*. Precisely because medieval English literature did not exist in the comparative isolation of a 19th-century national culture can its notions of textuality and literariness be studied only if seen in conjunction with contemporary developments in Latin or French. The other reason why Cannon's valiant attempt to rewrite medieval English literary history has to be approached with care is that for all its Hegelian terminology it actually shares in a Foucauldian tradition of romanticizing a state of lost innocence. Just as Foucault (1990: 42–43) proclaimed the absence of homosexual identities for the periods preceding the 19th century, positing instead that there had before been merely individual male-male sexual acts, so does Cannon proclaim the absence of a concept of literature in favor of individual texts. Foucault and many other theorists and historians of culture thus apply what one might arguably call the oldest model of periodization available to Western culture, that of the Fall. But as Jacques Derrida (1974) famously pointed out in his critique of Claude Lévi-Strauss's (1973 [1955]: 294–304) equally famous *Writing Lesson*, there is no point of origin in cultural history, no moment of absolute beginning and, therefore, no state of innocence nostalgically to be invoked. Obsessed with radical breaks and revolutionary ruptures, modern and postmodern historians of culture and literature are too prone to confuse difference with absence. In other words, when studying the literature of the past we must be careful not to cast our notion of alterity in terms of binary oppositions and thus simply define the "medieval" as all we think the modern is not.

2.4 Method and theory

The problem just sketched leads us to another of the basic issues that makes literary history so complex: to what degree are literary critics permitted to employ (post)modern critical tools on literary texts from the past? How anachronistic do we allow ourselves to become?

In the early 1960s, an influential American scholar of medieval literature, Durant W. Robertson Jr. (1962), flatly denied the applicability of any kind of modern theory to medieval texts, suggesting instead that all medieval texts had to be read according to a hermeneutical key provided by the Middle Ages itself, namely biblical exegesis. Robertson and his followers argued that all medieval literature had to be read for allegorical Christian messages to be uncovered with the help of the fourfold sense of scripture. In effect, all medieval literature thus meant the same, it was an expression of the Christian religion. For obvious reasons, Robertsonian criticism never spread beyond the confines of medieval studies and was more popular in North America than elsewhere in the world – though it did in a way parallel the conservative, history-of-ideas style of approach expressed, for instance, in E. M. W. Tillyard's (1959) *The Elizabethan World Picture*. Today Robertsonian forms of critique have either vanished or been absorbed into the more philologically rigorous types of contemporary medievalist historicism. The reason why Robertson is nevertheless worth mentioning is because he has become something close to the whipping boy of enlightened medieval studies, a spectre invoked when one wishes to attack one or another form of historicism as being too conservative. The ghost of Robertson still haunts Anglo-American medieval studies – he is virtually unknown in Germany – because, erroneous as his totalizing system of hermeneutics was, it did at least attempt to address the question of affording the literature of the past an interpretative system of its own, one not dominated by (post)modern notions of textuality and hermeneutics (Patterson 1987: 26–39).

The fundamental question of alterity and anachronism thus addressed cannot be answered here. Much of the history of post-romantic literary theory and criticism can, to a certain extent at least, be read as a continuous engagement with or conscious rejection of this issue. If I nevertheless adopt a provisional stance in this matter, it is in order to remind historical linguists of the slipperiness of the texts they so often deal with as mere sources for their research into the earlier stages of the English language. These sources were not written with a view to becoming sources for historical linguists. Consequently, they will yield evidence – including the most basic forms of linguistic evidence – only to readers prepared to engage with them at their level of cultural complexity, even though it is ultimately impossible to reconstruct that level with any claim to accuracy. This is why literary medievalists will often sniff at the notion of corpus linguistics with its practice of prizing linguistic utterances out of their textual environment and thus divorcing them from a cultural and historical context without which they cannot be understood.

Looking back on two decades of New Historicist literary studies, Catherine Gallagher and Stephen Greenblatt (2000) attempted a pragmatic statement on how to view literature from the past, one that derives much of its persuasiveness from the fact that it is not overly theorized. According to Gallagher and Greenblatt, the relationship between a historical work of literature and the discourses of a given time must always be seen in the light of a *relative* aesthetic autonomy of the literary text. The term "relative aesthetic autonomy" is one they would probably not use themselves,

but it does seem to express the general current of their argument. This "relative aesthetic autonomy" matters not because it inoculates the text against the vicissitudes of history or because it removes the work of art onto some kind of timeless, universal plane, as the New Critics would have had it. On the contrary, – and this is very much my interpretation of Gallagher's and Greenblatt's statement – the text's specific aesthetic qualities make it possible for it to express more than it would be capable of saying if it were wholly reducible to a period's stated ideological concepts or even its discursive framework as explicitly or implicitly expressed in so many different non-literary texts. As Gallagher and Greenblatt (2000: 17) explain, a historical work of literature is, therefore, "at once immersed in its time and place and yet somehow pulling out and away". Modern readers "feel at once pulled out of our own world and plunged back with redoubled force into it" (Gallagher and Greenblatt 2000: 17). The fact that modern readers are capable of this exhilarating experience when they encounter the strange aesthetic object from the past, the two authors stress, suggests that similar feelings might actually have been generated in the past itself: "It seems arrogant to claim such an experience for ourselves as readers and not to grant something similar to the readers and the authors of the past" (Gallagher and Greenblatt 2000: 17). To speak of a "relative" autonomy of the aesthetic, as I did in rephrasing Gallagher and Greenblatt can, therefore, sound misleading. What is important here is precisely the literary text's ability to give expression to ideas, concepts, and notions in an indirect or even performative way by employing specific aesthetic strategies and devices. And though these aesthetic devices need not be the exclusive property of literary texts, they do enable a literary text to expand and critique the conceptual frameworks of its period in ways not as readily available to text-types from fields where the ideological premises and norms of a given age are more directly and explicitly phrased, e.g. learned treatises, academic textbooks or legal compendia. And this helps us to understand why interpretations relying on (post)modern methods and theories, or interpretations that seem to contradict overwhelming evidence about the ideological structures of a given period cannot automatically be called anachronistic. If literature is capable of expressing through aesthetic means messages and ideas that would (have) be(en) inexpressible in any other form within a specific historical period, then the critic is justified in using every conceivable means of decoding the aesthetic structures which convey these particular meanings and that includes the complete panoply of (post)modern theory and linguistic methodology. By doing so, the critic is not disregarding or erasing historical specificity but rather bringing it into a fuller and more comprehensive view.

My reading of Gallagher and Greenblatt is not entirely orthodox since, by and large, the New Historicists have not been too eager to stress the literariness of literary texts. Affirming the general textuality of culture, New Historicist critics have sought to treat supposedly non-literary texts very much like literary ones and vice versa. Thus, works of literature are frequently read in conjunction with e.g. contemporary medical, legal, or theological texts. Inspiring as this critical work has often been it has also permitted critics to let the literary work "rest easy within a contemporaneous sign system" (Strohm 2000: 150). Erasing the text-context-dichotomy has proved, therefore, to be much less of a liberating move than is often claimed. In many New Historicist readings, contemporary discourse has become the text's new prison, confining its potential meanings in just as rigid a fashion as some of the dominant contexts from the so-called "Old Historicism" had done.

2.5 Canon formation

The anonymous romantic comedy *Mucedorus*, first printed as a quarto in 1598 and reprinted in 16 quarto editions by 1668, was five times more popular with Shakespeare's audience than *Hamlet* (Gurr 2004: 88). This can mean two things – and they are not mutually exclusive. First, it draws attention to the fact that an Elizabethan audience's tastes differed from ours and that what we consider canonical might not have been seen as important by contemporaries. Second, the observation highlights the issue of popularity versus canonicity, i.e. the problem that even in Elizabethan times there was a clearly felt difference between literary works with a high degree of cultural prestige and texts addressing a less sophisticated audience. In other words, both is true: namely that Shakespeare's canonical status amongst contemporaries was not what it is today and also that the Elizabethan literary field already distinguished between high-brow and low-brow forms of literary production.

Canon formation is thus one of the central and one of the trickiest questions in literary studies, but it is also of interest to historical linguists because it helps them to assess the status of their sources. I do not have the space to expound in detail on how within the last three decades or so not only the canon as such but the very notion of the canon has become the target of harsh, often politically inspired criticism. The traditional canon is seen to contain almost exclusively the works of male writers belonging to the cultural heritage of the great imperialist powers of the 19th century while authors representing ethnic or racial minorities within the great metropolitan centers of the West, authors from outside these metropolitan centers and women were afforded no more than a marginal status. These debates are driven by the legitimate desire to introduce into the canon works previously excluded, yet the discussions thus raised alert us to the complexity and contingency of canon-formation in general and this is just as relevant for our perspective on the literature of the past as it is for the question of what to teach modern high school students and undergraduates.

That a poem like *Beowulf* should be considered the most canonical of Old English texts is an entirely modern phenomenon that disregards both the poem's manuscript context and, perhaps even more importantly, our huge lack of knowledge with respect to the literary field of Anglo-Saxon England. Because so much medieval literature is irretrievably lost, we can never be quite sure whether the surviving texts were considered of high quality by contemporaries or not, or whether their survival is due to sheer coincidence. For the later Middle Ages, popularity and, to a certain extent, canonicity can often be gauged through the survival rate of manuscripts. But even here we have to be careful: one of the most canonical works of late Middle English literature (in modern eyes), *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*, survives in only a single manuscript together with the anonymous poet's other extant works. Does this mean that the poem was unpopular in its time, or even uncanonical? Is it possible at all to employ the notion of the canonical for the time period in question? Our canon of medieval English literature obviously looks different from what medieval audiences would have considered important. And the same is true of Renaissance literature. The privileged status we accord to the Elizabethan and the Jacobean stage would have seemed decidedly odd to contemporaries who would have assigned a much higher status to narrative verse than to drama.

That some notion of a canon did actually exist even in the early Middle Ages is beyond question. When Alfred the Great instigated his great translation project he

obviously considered a certain body of texts more important than others. But those were Latin texts. It is far more difficult to assess whether there was a sense of vernacular canonicity and if so, when it came into being. Chaucer's work definitely betrays a strong sense of the canonical and imitates Dante in attempting to elevate vernacular poetry to a status comparable to that of classical literature.

Changes in the literary canon have been brought about not merely by attempts to include women or representatives of racial and ethnic groups previously marginalized. Fluctuating tastes and interests often lead to a retrospective reshuffle even of the traditional canon. One of the most prominent cases of such a change in appreciation is the fate of the Metaphysical Poets of the early 17th century. Within a few decades their reputation had become tarnished since their dark and complicated metaphors did not conform to the neoclassical taste that dominated the end of the 17th century and much of the 18th. It was only high modernism as embodied by T. S. Eliot that brought the Metaphysicals back into view and elevated them to an illustrious literary status (Eagleton 1983: 37–40). A more recent example of such shifting sensibilities is the case of the late romantic poet Thomas Lovell Beddoes. Beddoes spent most of his life working on the sprawling and intricately crafted drama *Death's Jest Book*, which until recently was largely considered an unstageable and chaotic failure. Now, however, the play is in the process of being completely re-evaluated and raised to the status of an undisputed masterpiece (Berns and Bradshaw 2007: 10–24). Hence the process of restructuring the canon proves to be a complex one. As newly developing aesthetic sensibilities seek hitherto unexposed aesthetic principles in historical texts, new vistas are opened on aesthetic structures previously unrecognized. Natural as this may sound it is actually quite a dramatic and often even painful process.

2.6 Authorship and subjectivity

Despite these shifts in the canon, many traditions of 19th- and early 20th-century criticism linger on and still inform much of our thinking about the canon. Until fairly recently, for instance, the vast body of anonymous Middle English lyrics was deemed to be "popular", i.e. written by simple people for simple people. Only within the last decade or so have scholars begun to understand the full implications of the fact that anonymity is not necessarily a witness to social or aesthetic irrelevance but may simply be due to different notions of authorship (O'Donoghue 2005: 212–222). And these notions of authorship might actually vary from genre to genre more considerably than they do from period to period. But if anonymity can be linked to genre, then anonymity must also be seen as an aesthetic device producing, for instance, the effect of a disembodied voice. And disembodied voices may make very specific demands on a text's pragmatics.

Anonymity plays such an important role in discussions of medieval and early modern authorship because it has been seen as evidence for the supposed absence of subjectivity in the Middle Ages and, to some degree, in the early modern period. This is a view that goes back to the 19th century and was famously expressed by Jacob Burckhardt (1990: 98). He argued that medieval human beings possessed only collective identities determined by their families, tribes, or cities and that they were incapable of seeing themselves as (individual) subjects. Even though Burckhardt's theoretical premises have become obsolete his basic ideas linger on. Poststructuralists, New Historicists

and Cultural Materialists all have voiced similar views within their own theoretical frameworks.

Critics who deny the existence of subjectivity to the Middle Ages subscribe to a notion of subjectivity shaped by the rise of 18th- and 19th-century bourgeois individualism. They adhere to a model that posits a linear development of subjectivity as a kind of unbroken vector rising in one direction only. That such a view is teleological is obvious; again difference is primarily conceived of in terms of absence and not in terms of an alterity that may, in fact, defy the very categories we bring to bear on it. One possibility these critics do not usually entertain is that of a subjectivity not linked to individuality (Spearing 2005: 1–34), or of a subjectivity that does not express itself through a self-conscious celebration of the individual but, for instance, through a troubled meditation on the conflicted experience of the collective. Nor do they realize that subjectivity and the degree to which it is discussed in literature might vary even within such time periods as the Middle Ages, the Renaissance or the Enlightenment instead of moving forward in an unbroken continuity (Aers 1992: 177–202). Finally, and this is by far the worst problem from a literary point of view, they do not grant the literary text of the past the ability to stage and construct forms of subjectivity rather than merely to mirror them. To argue that a notion or idea did not exist in the past because it is supposedly absent from the texts of a given period, means falling prey to a whole set of fallacies. First, such a view confuses literary fictions with extra-textual reality. Second, such an approach overlooks the fact that something may actually be hidden under the surface level and, third, it neglects the possibility that a text from the past may be using a form of conspicuous absence as a form of highlighting the very phenomenon it apparently lacks. This, for instance, is what Lee Patterson (1991: 165–230) argues in his classic discussion of Chaucer's *Knight's Tale*.

This brings me to the end of my discussion. Ultimately, what makes our understanding of the literature of the past so complicated is not only the alterity of that literature but also the fact that many of the features we are prone to consider as straightforward evidence of that alterity may, in fact, be the products of self-conscious aesthetic strategies. In other words, when studying literature from the past we must be aware not merely of the possibility of fundamental cultural difference, but also of highly sophisticated forms of artistic expression which actually produce some of those effects we like to associate with the pastness of the past. And this would mean that the past already creates its own fictions of alterity (Johnston 2008: 1–16).

3 References

Aers, David. 1992. A Whisper in the Ear of Early Modernists; or, Reflections on Literary Critics Writing the "History of the Subject". In: David Aers (ed.), *Culture and History 1350–1600: Essays on English Communities, Identities and Writing*, 177–202. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Berns, Ute and Michael Bradshaw. 2007. Introduction. In: Ute Berns and Michael Bradshaw (eds.), *The Ashgate Research Companion to Thomas Lovell Beddoes*, 1–31. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Bowers, John M. 2000. Chaucer after Smithfield: From Postcolonial Writer to Imperialist Author. In: Jeffrey Jerome Cohen (ed.), *The Postcolonial Middle Ages*, 53–66. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Burckhardt, Jacob. 1990 [1860]. *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*. London: Penguin.

Cannon, Christopher. 2004. *The Grounds of English Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cohen, Jeffrey Jerome. 2003. *Medieval Identity Machines*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Cooper, Helen. 2004. *The English Romance in Time: Transforming Motifs from Geoffrey of Monmouth to the Death of Shakespeare*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Derrida, Jacques. 1974 [1967]. *Of Grammatology*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press. [*De la Grammatologie*. Paris: Les Editions de Minuit]

Eagleton, Terry. 1983. *Literary Theory: An Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Foucault, Michel. 1990. *The History of Sexuality:* Vol. I: *An Introduction*. New York: Vintage Books.

Gallagher, Catherine and Stephen Greenblatt. 2000. *Practicing New Historicism*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Gurr, Andrew. 2004. *The Shakespeare Company, 1594–1642*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jauss, Hans Robert. 1979. The Alterity and Modernity of Medieval Literature. *New Literary History* 10: 181–229.

Johnston, Andrew James. 2008. *Performing the Middle Ages from* Beowulf *to* Othello. Turnhout: Brepols.

Lévi-Strauss, Claude. 1973 [1955]. *Tristes Tropiques*. Harmondsworth: Penguin. [*Tristes Tropiques*. Paris: Librairie Plon.]

Lewis, Clive Staples. 1954. *English Literature in the Sixteenth Century: Excluding Drama*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Niles, John D. 1997. Myth and History. In: Robert E. Bjork and John D. Niles (eds.), *The Beowulf Handbook*, 213–233. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

O'Donoghue, Bernard. 2005. "Cuius Contrarium": Middle English Popular Lyrics. In: Thomas G. Duncan (ed.), *A Companion to the Middle English Lyric*, 210–226. Cambridge: Brewer.

Patterson, Lee. 1987. *Negotiating the Past: The Historical Understanding of Medieval Literature*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press.

Patterson, Lee. 1991. *Chaucer and the Subject of History*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press.

Pearsall, Derek. 1992. *The Life of Geoffrey Chaucer*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Robertson, Durant W, Jr. 1962. *A Preface to Chaucer: Studies in Medieval Perspectives*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Spearing, Anthony Colin. 2005. *Textual Subjectivity: The Encoding of Subjectivity in Medieval Narratives and Lyrics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Starn, Randolph. 1994. Who's Afraid of the Renaissance. In: John Van Engen (ed.), *The Past and Future of Medieval Studies*, 129–147. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.

Strohm, Paul. 2000. *Theory and the Premodern Text*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Symes, Carol. 2007. Manuscript Matrix, Modern Canon. In: Paul Strohm (ed.), *Middle English*, 7–22. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tillyard, Eustace M. W. 1959. *The Elizabethan World Picture*. London: Vintage.

Wellek, René and Austin Warren. 1962. *A Theory of Literature*. 3rd edn. San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Andrew James Johnston, Berlin (Germany)