Book Section:

Seiler, A. and Wallis, C. orcid.org/0000-0002-8373-0134 (2023) Philological approaches. In: Condorelli, M. and Rutkowska, H., (eds.) The Cambridge Handbook of Historical Orthography. Cambridge Handbooks in Language and Linguistics . Cambridge University Press , Cambridge , pp. 338-359. ISBN 9781108487313

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108766463.017

Philological Approaches

Annina Seiler and Christine Wallis

1 Introduction

As a mode of study, philology has a long history, yet the way the term has been used, and the attitude of scholars to both the study of orthography and the meaning of orthographic variation has changed substantially over time. This chapter outlines the origins and history of philology, from its roots in the Classical period to the present day, and discusses how far philological approaches pertain to the study of historical orthography. Philology's focus on material, historical and manuscript context make it an especially fruitful way of interrogating historical texts, and philological methods have long been viewed as a particularly apt way of dealing with (among other features) the wide orthographic variation naturally present in medieval works. To illustrate the concerns and approaches of present-day philologists to the study of historical orthography, the chapter presents two case studies: the first focuses on scribal practices in Old English and provides an example of a manuscript-centred analysis of historical orthography. The second focuses on the scripting of Old English and Old High German and illustrates how historical orthographies can be analysed by mapping spelling onto an etymological sound reference system. The final section discusses the future of the approach and highlights areas for further research.

The term philology ultimately derives from Greek φιλολογία 'love of reasoning, love of learning and literature', which is a derivative of the compound adjective φιλόλογος 'fond of words'. It enters the modern European languages via Latin *philologia* in the later Middle Ages; cf. French *philologie*, Spanish *filología*, Italian, Portuguese, Polish *filologia*; Czech *filologie*, Russian филология. The English and German words (*philology, Philologie*) are coined on the basis of the French form.[1] Philology involves a wide range of practices that are generally linked to the study of texts and languages. Initially tied to the task of editing works from classical antiquity, philology has split into separate branches, including classical philology, comparative philology (or historical linguistics), manuscript studies, *Altertumskunde*, as well as literary criticism.[2] As a result of the differentiation of philology, the notion as to what philological approaches entail has changed considerably and also differs from discipline to discipline. Nevertheless, all philological practices are characterized by an orientation towards the material sources in which the languages and literatures of the past are attested.

Not only the notion of what philological approaches entail but also their appreciation has changed. Jacob Grimm (1785-1863) placed a very high value on philology when he famously claimed that, 'none among the sciences is prouder, more noble, more pugnacious than

---

[1] Cf. *OED*, *FEW*, *DWB*, svv.

[2] On the differentiation of philology into separate fields see, for example, Harpham (2009), Wolf & Blauth-Henke (2011), Turner (2014).

philology and more implacable against mistakes.'[3] On the other hand, in the first half of the twentieth century, *Buchstabenphilologie* (i.e. philology of letters) came to be used as a derogatory term assigned to research that was held to rely too strongly on the written word. In the past decades, philology has been rehabilitated, as it were, in particular in the context of historical sociolinguistics and pragmatics with a strong focus on the manuscript evidence. The different uses of philology have impacted philological approaches to orthography. First and foremost, whether orthography was considered worthy of study has waxed and waned with the fortunes of philology itself.

2 Philology in Classical Antiquity and the Middle Ages

In Classical Antiquity and the Middle Ages, philology included all branches of learning, as illustrated by Martianus Capella's fifth century allegorical encyclopaedia *De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii* (ed. Willis, 1983).[4] This work gives an account of the seven maidens which Philology, a personification of learning, receives as a wedding gift from her husband Mercury. The maidens embody the seven liberal arts, i.e., grammar, dialectic, rhetoric (the *trivium* of medieval education); geometry, arithmetic, astronomy and music (the *quadrivium*).[5] The study of orthography lies at the very foundation of this curriculum as it represents the initial step of the *Ars grammatica*, the first discipline of the *trivium*. Classical and medieval discussions of orthography centre on the concept of the *littera*, which combines *nomen* 'name', *figura* 'shape' and *vox* 'voice' (or *potestas* 'might', i.e. the sound value of a letter).[6] Thus, *littera* not only refers to the character as a visual unit of a writing system, it also relates to the sound a character represents, as well as to the name by which it is identified. Consequently, medieval discussions of orthography focus not only on the correct spelling of Latin words but also on their pronunciation. Regional differences of Latin are addressed by Abbo of Fleury in the tenth century: in his *Quaestiones Grammaticales* (ed. Guerrau-Jalabert, 1982), he criticizes the way his

---

[3] German original: 'keine unter allen wissenschaften ist hochmütiger, vornehmer, streitsüchtiger als die philologie und gegen fehler unbarmherziger' (Grimm, 1864: I, 235). All translations are by the authors unless otherwise stated.

[4] The earliest attestation of the term in English is also a reference to the 'personification of linguistic and literary knowledge' in Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales* (*MED*, s.v. philoloğī(e n.; OED s.v.).

[5] For more details on *De nuptiis*, see Hicks (2012); on the *trivium* and *quadrivium* see, for example, Kintzinger (2016a and b).

[6] As, for example, stated by the fourth-century Roman grammarian Donatus (*Ars Grammatica*, I.2. 'De littera'; ed. Keil 1864, *GL* 4, 368.14). The tripartite differentiation goes back to Stoic language theory; the Greek equivalents (as attested by Diogenes of Babylon in the second century BC) for the different aspects of γράμμα are στοιχεῖον, χᾰρακτήρ and ὄνομα (cf. Vogt-Spira, 1991: 301-2, 308). For an in-depth account, see Vogt-Spira (1991); cf. also Desbordes (1990: 123-5).

students at Ramsay Abbey apparently pronounced words like *civis*, using the spelling <qui> to represent what must have been the sound [k].[7]

Medieval accounts of orthography do not normally focus on the vernacular languages. One notable exception is the twelfth-century *First Grammatical Treatise* (ed. and transl. Benediktsson, 1972), which devises an orthographic system for Old Icelandic in which each speech sound is represented by a single character (cf. Huth, 2003: 444-457). While the First Grammarian's use of minimal pairs to establish differences between sounds is highly innovative and reminiscent of twentieth-century linguistic methodology, his terminology is firmly grounded in medieval grammatical theory; a *stafr*, for example, like its Latin counterpart *littera*, combines shape, sound and name (Benediktsson, 1972: 44-5). Sharing the fate of many orthographic reforms, few of the Grammarian's suggestions became part of Old Icelandic spelling practice.

3 Orthography, renaissance philology and beyond

In the Renaissance, philology evolved as the set of methods necessary to edit classical Greek and Latin texts.[8] The antiquarian interest of scholars in the sixteenth and seventeenth century also extended to the vernacular languages, which resulted in the establishment of 'modern' philology. Textual criticism necessitated the collation of different manuscripts and, thus, resulted in fine-grained analyses of orthographic differences and their implications (cf. Zanobini 2016: 5). The method culminated in the nineteenth century in Lachmann's scientific approach to the reconstruction of the archetype of a text – still one of the tenets of classical and medieval philology.[9]

On a theoretical level, Renaissance scholars started to rethink the classical concept of *littera*. Julius Caesar Scaliger (1484-1558), is among the first to criticise the *Ars grammatica* and to argue that *littera* only refers to the written letter (Vogt-Spira, 1991: 311-13). Scaliger adduces (spurious) etymological 'evidence' to support his view: he explains that *litera* – to be spelled with a single <t> – derives from *lineaturae*, which is, the lines drawn on the page. Vogt-Spira suggests a connection between this new conceptualisation of writing and the practice of silent reading, which certainly became the norm with the spread of printed books, though it must have started some centuries earlier (313-4).[10] Printing, in any case, did result in a wider debate on orthography, which manifested itself in suggestions for orthographic reforms for the modern languages across Western Europe in the sixteenth and seventeenth century (Neis, 2011:

---

[7] Ironically, Abbo imposes a pronunciation resulting from Romance assibilation of /k/ > /ts/ and criticizes what must have been the Classical sound value. For a detailed discussion of Abbo's *Quaestiones*, see Wright (2011).

[8] On the philological endeavours of the Renaissance, see Zanobini (2016).

[9] For a detailed discussion of Lachmann's method, see Trovato (2014).

[10] On the origins of silent reading, see Saenger (1997); for silent reading in the 17th and 18th centuries, see Jajdelska (2007).

174). The aim of such propositions was to bring the spelling in line with contemporary pronunciation, so for example, by Louis Meigret (1500-1558) for French, John Hart (d. 1574) for English, and Gonzalo de Correas (1571-1631) for Spanish (cf. Neis, 2011; Salmon, 2000: 15-21; Lucas, 2000). Reform attempts were often informed by philological work on medieval texts. Some of the characters proposed by Sir Thomas Smith (1513-1577) for English, for example, were adopted from Anglo-Saxon scripts, e.g. the use of <ð> and <þ> for the voiced and voiceless dental fricatives, respectively, or of <ꝼ> for /v/ and <ȝ> for /ʤ/ (Lucas, 2000: 6).

The use of these characters was closely linked to type design (on the print types for Anglo-Saxon texts, see Lucas 1999, cited in 2000: 6). Such spelling reforms were generally unsuccessful (cf. Liuzza 1996: 25); however, their influence is still visible in the IPA script.[11] The eighteenth-century saw a boom in the publication of pronouncing dictionaries. Elocutionists employed a variety of methods for conveying their preferred pronunciation, using such features as italic and Gothic fonts (Johnston 1764), accents and macrons (Jones 1798), numeric (Kenrick 1773), and alphanumeric notation (Walker 1791; Sheridan 1780), or devising their own systems (Spence, 1775) to reconcile spelling and pronunciation.[12] However, spelling reform itself was not a concern of the eighteenth century orthoepists.

4 Orthography and comparative philology

Philology took a new turn in the late 18th century with the identification of Sanskrit as an Indo-European language by Sir William Jones in 1786. This discovery resulted in a focus on the relationship and history of the Indo-European languages (Sonderegger, 2000a: 417; 2000b: 443), as in the work undertaken by the Danish philologist Rasmus Rask (1787-1832) and the Germans Franz Bopp (1791-1867), and Jacob (1785-1863) and Wilhelm Grimm (1786-1859). Jacob Grimm, the more linguistically minded of the two Grimm brothers, discusses orthography in a lecture addressed to the Prussian Academy of Sciences in 1847. His starting point is contemporary German orthography, which he considers to be 'barbaric' in contrast with earlier spelling:

> vor mehr als 800 jahren, zu Notkers zeiten in Sanct Gallen, war es besser um die deutsche schreibung bestellt und auf das genaue bezeichnen unsrer laute wurde damals grosze sorgfalt gewendet; noch von der schrift des 12. und 13. jh. läszt sich rühmliches melden, erst seit dem 14. begann sie zu verwildern. (Grimm, 1864: I, 349)[13]

---

[11] On orthography and phonetics in the 16th and 17th century, see MacMahon (2013: 112-4).

[12] On 18th-century pronouncing dictionaries and the relationship between their notation and contemporary phonology, see Sen, Beal, Yáñez-Bouza, & Wallis (eds.) (2020), and references therein.

[13] 'More than 800 years ago, in St Gall during the time of Notker, German orthography was in a better state, and great care was applied to the exact designation of our sounds; good things can still be said about the writings of the 12th and 13th century; only since the 14th century has it started to deteriorate.'

Grimm specifically criticises words in which the spelling deviates from the spoken language, for example, 'superfluous' letters in compounds like *Schifffahrt*, *Eichhorn*,[14] etymological or hypercorrect spellings, as well as the different ways of representing vowel length (330, 349-50). Interestingly enough, Grimm also takes issue with features of written language that have no counterpart in the spoken language, such as hyphens or apostrophes, as well as word-initial capitals. His remarks illustrate that, in his view, an ideal writing system is closely aligned with the spoken language and has a one-to-one relationship between letters (or graphs) and sounds. This attitude is coupled with the belief that earlier orthographies represented this ideal state.[15]

Grimm has been accused by later scholars of not being able to distinguish between letters and sounds (cf. Haas, 1990: 10-13). While he may not have been an astute phonetician, part of this criticism arises from Grimm's *Deutsche Grammatik* (1822), whose Book 1 is entitled 'Von den buchstaben'. Yet, Grimm's use of *buchstabe* stands in the classical *littera* tradition: he clearly separates *zeichen* (sign) and *laut* (sound), and he is very aware of the fact that the sounds of historical stages of languages can only partially be recovered from writing. Fowkes goes one step further in his defence of Grimm and argues 'that his use of the term *Buchstabe* was tantamount to "phoneme"' (1964: 60).[16] On the other hand, as Haas reminds us, as a philologist Grimm primarily dealt with letters and not with sounds (1990: 13).

The Neogrammarians (*Junggrammatiker*) in the second half of the 19th century took the natural sciences, primarily anatomy and biology, as a model for their linguistic work.[17] On the one hand, this resulted in the application of empirical methods to the study of articulatory phonetics, or 'sound physiology'. On the other hand, based on the wide-reaching impact of Charles Darwin's *On the Origin of Species* (1859), it led to the adoption of the tree model for historical linguistics and resulted in the reconstruction of Proto-Indo-European. Orthography is largely ignored in comparative philology, despite the fact that an understanding of the letter-sound correlations of the earliest attested stages of languages is a prerequisite for any reconstruction. The attitude of historical linguistics towards writing is reflected in the handbooks on the earlier stages of languages; they traditionally start with a section on spelling and pronunciation before they move on to a more detailed discussion of the phonology and morphology (and rarely the syntax). However, in-depth discussions of the writing system itself are usually absent.[18] Only a few 19th-century studies focus specifically on orthography: there are,

---

[14] Recent debates on German orthography still focus on the same issues; the prescribed spelling for *Schiff(f)ahrt*, to use one example, changed from two to three <f> in the *Rechtschreibreform* in 1996.

[15] For a critical discussion of this notion, see Stanley (1988).

[16] Fowkes also draws attention to Grimm's use of minimal pairs and speculates that he may have known the *First Grammatical Treatise* (1964: 61, n. 19).

[17] On the Neogrammarians, see Putschke (1998), Burridge (2013: 157-165).

[18] Cf. for example, the grammars of the early Germanic languages, e.g. Wilhelm Braune's *Gotische Grammatik* (1880), his *Althochdeutsche Grammatik* (1886), or Eduard Sievers' *Angelsächsische Grammatik* (1882). Haas (1990: 13) points out that the *Althochdeutsche Grammatik* only distinguishes letters and sounds since its 13th edition (Braune & Eggers, 1975), and only in the 15th edition (Braune &

for example, Friedrich Wilkens' *Zum hochalemannischen Konsonantismus der althochdeutschen Zeit* (1891) and Friedrich Kauffmann's 'Über althochdeutsche Orthographie' (1892), both on Old High German spelling, or Karl D. Bülbring 'Was lässt sich aus dem gebrauch der buchstaben *k* und *c* im Matthäus-Evangelium des Rushworth-Manuscripts folgern?' (1899) on Old English orthography.

A theoretical discussion of writing is provided by Hermann Paul (1846-1921) in *Principien der Sprachgeschichte* (1880). In Chapter 13 on 'Language and Writing' ('Sprache und Schrift'), Paul stresses the fact that any linguistic information from the past is only accessible through 'the medium of writing' ('das medium der schrift' (245)). However, he holds that it is impossible to fully reconvert writing into speech – even in the case of writing systems that are close to spoken language. To illustrate the relationship of spoken and written language, Paul uses two similes: first, spoken language and writing are as a line is to a number (246), since speech sounds blend into each other whereas writing is discontinuous. Second, they are as a painting to a rough sketch, which means that writing can never express all the nuances of speech and that only someone who is familiar with the language will be able to recover details such as quantity or stress.[19]

5 Saussure and the structuralists

Starting with Ferdinand de Saussure's (1857-1913) ground-breaking publications, philology, referring to a diachronic analysis of language, came to be contrasted with synchronic linguistics. Saussure explicitly criticises philology for 'attaching itself too slavishly to the written language and forgetting the living language' ('elle s'attache trop servilement à la langue écrite et oublie la langue vivante'; 1916: 14). In his view, the only function of writing is to represent (spoken) language; for those who study writing rather than language Saussure uses a comparison similar to the one presented by Hermann Paul: 'C'est comme si l'on croyait que, pour connaître quelqu'un, il vaut mieux regarder sa photographie que son visage' (1916: 45).[20] Therefore, the sole object of linguistics is spoken language. The only reason for studying writing is that linguists need to understand its 'functionality, defects and perils' ('l'utilité, les défauts et les dangers'; 44) in order to recover language from written sources.

This view dominated the structuralists' approach to language, which culminates in Leonard Bloomfield's famous statement in the introduction to his book *Language* that, '[w]riting is not language, but merely a way of recording language by means of visible marks' (1933: 21). While Bloomfield considers writing a 'handicap', whose study is only needed in

---

Reiffenstein, 2004) do we get a separate section on 'Schreibsysteme und Paläographie' (§7-8), though some details are already included in §8 on 'Schriftsysteme' of the 13th and 14th edition.

[19] 'Die schrift verhält sich zur sprache etwa wie ein grobe skizze zu einem mit der grössten sorgfalt in farben ausgeführtem gemälde.' (Paul, 1880 249-250)

[20] 'It is as if one believed that, in order to know someone, one should rather look at his photo rather than at his face.'

order to 'get [...] information about the speech of past times' (20-21), he nevertheless devotes one chapter to 'Written Records' (297-313), in which he discusses the properties and history of different writing systems. Bloomfield also uses a simile to illustrate the relationship of writing to language: 'writing is [...] merely an external device, like the use of the phonography, which happens to preserve for our observation some features of the speech of past times' (299). The generally negative attitude towards writing meant that, as Venezky puts it, 'orthography was relegated to the backporch of the new linguistic science' (1970: 10).

In the Prague linguistic circle, Josef Vachek (1909-1996) began to rethink the structuralist stance on writing, identifying written language as a separate norm alongside spoken language. Vachek saw the two norms as independent but coordinated representations of a universal linguistic norm, or *langue*. Yet, he accorded independent status only to established writing systems and considered the earliest attempts at writing by a linguistic community as 'a mere transposition of the spoken norm' ('eine bloße Transposition der Sprechnorm' (1939: 102)) or as 'a kind of quasi-transcription' (1945-49: 91) and, thus, as a secondary system of representation. Vachek's work heralded the development of grapholinguistics as a separate linguistic discipline. This field has been dominated by a debate on the relationship between writing and spoken language and the consequent methodological question whether to use an autonomous or a relational approach for graphemic analysis. Proponents of an autonomous approach call for an analysis of written language without making recourse to the spoken language.[21]

6 Philology in the twentieth century

Philological approaches to orthography have largely eschewed autonomous methods. Instead, they are characterized by a careful assessment of spelling evidence in combination with other philological methods. Particular significance has been attached to the letter-sound correlations of the Latin alphabet in different regions and time periods. An early study urging a reconsideration of the evidence of orthographic variation was Marjorie Daunt's (1939) examination of the Old English spellings which were traditionally viewed as representing short diphthongs arising from a number of sound changes.[22] Under one such change (palatal diphthongisation), monophthongs which were preceded by the newly-palatalised sounds /tʃ/ and /j/ became diphthongs, for example *gær > gear*, *cæster > ceaster*. Daunt reinterpreted the digraphs <ea> and <eo>, not as evidence of short diphthongs, but as allophones of the short vowels /æ/ and /e/, the second vowel indicating the quality of the following consonant.

---

[21] For a summary and discussion of the different positions, see Glaser (1988); see further [cross-reference to the chapter on grapholinguistics?].

[22] For example, palatal diphthongisation (Campbell, 1959: §§170-189), breaking (§§ 139-56), and back mutation (§§ 205-21).

According to Daunt this was due to Irish influence on Old English orthography, where consonant quality was phonemic.[23]

Important work on Old High German orthography and phonology was undertaken by Herbert Penzl (1910-1995). His numerous publications provided new impulses, in particular, by making explicit some of the methodological issues at stake (e.g. Penzl 1950, 1959, 1971, 1982, 1987).[24] For example, in his 1971 article 'Scribal practice, phonological change, and biuniqueness', Penzl proposes a method for establishing the phonological systems of early Germanic languages, which combines an 'internal graphemic analysis' with a 'diagraphic comparison'. The first takes into consideration the 'choice and distribution of graphemes' within a single text while the latter entails an analysis of the spelling attested in earlier or later periods as well as in different dialects (305). Penzl illustrates the application of this method with an example from the St Gall *Paternoster & Creed* (c. 790). This text uses <o>, <oo> in words like *losi*, *prooth*, *sonen*, *erstoont*. Comparing this material with the same words in Notker's works (11th c.), it becomes clear that in this text there is a graphic contrast between <ô> (*lôse*, *brôt*) and <uô> (*[be]suônet*, *irstuônt*). In early St Gall charter material (before 762), on the other hand, Notker's <ô> corresponds to <au> or, later <ao> (e.g. *Autmarus*, *Gaozberto*); this is not the case for Notker's <uô>, which corresponds to <o> in the charters. This evidence makes clear that in the *Paternoster & Creed* 'the two *o oo* must have been different, even if lack of symbols led to their graphic merger in the writing system of [St] G[all] Pat[ernoster]'s scribe' (306). Penzl's method also takes other types of evidence into consideration, which include comparative data from the wider language family, meter and rhyme, loanwords, typological aspects, as well as metalinguistic comments. On a theoretical level, Penzl identifies the 'phonemic fit of the orthography' as 'a major consideration' of any analysis of written texts. He questions the structuralist assumption of biuniqueness, i.e. a one-to-one relation of graphemes and phonemes, which resulted either in misconceptions of the phonology represented by early orthographies, or in a rejection of writing as an object worthy of study. In Penzl's work, on the other hand, a careful consideration of the 'complex orthographic solutions' leads to a deeper understanding of writing systems and their evolution (307).

In another work arguing for a more nuanced relationship between orthography and sound-values, Cecily Clark (1992) worked at the intersection of history and onomastics. She carefully considered the spellings of personal and place names in the *Domesday Book*, which routinely render /θ/ and /ð/ with <t> or <d>, for example. Clark disputed the traditional view that these unetymological spellings represented the effects of French speakers' pronunciation of insular names, and concluded that the Domesday scribes were 'not consciously representing current pronunciations used either by scribes or by informants' (1992: 320); rather, they were

---

[23] Cf. Stockwell & Barritt (1951; 1955), and White (2000) for a further development of this argument. For a different opinion, see Kuhn & Quirk (1953; 1955); for a phonemic interpretation of Old English spelling, generally, see Kuhn (1961; 1970).

[24] For a selected bibliography of Penzl, see Rauch & Carr (1979: 11-18).

deliberately rendering insular names according to Latin (or, when that failed, French) orthographic norms, in the context of what was a Latin-language administrative text.

Similar considerations involving detailed discussions of the pronunciation of medieval Latin, the letter-sound correlations and of vernacular phonology resulted, for example, in Anthony Harvey's reassessment of the origins of Celtic orthography (2011 and publications cited there), or Klaus Dietz's analysis of digraphs in the transition from Old to Middle English (2006). These studies demonstrate philology's continuing applicability to a number of related disciplines.

7 'New Philology' and Pragmaphilology

In the second half of the twentieth century, a renewed emphasis on the value of the manuscript sources of medieval texts lay at the heart of 'New Philology'. This approach arose from concerns among literary scholars that medieval studies – long seen as a bastion of the philological method – had become marginalised and widely perceived as irrelevant in the face of newer methodologies and advances, particularly in literary criticism. In a special volume of *Speculum*, Stephen Nichols (1990) describes New Philology in terms of a renewal, with a strong desire among its adherents to return to its origins in manuscript culture. This entailed a concentration on the materiality of the text, in contrast with earlier focuses on text stemmata and the reconstruction of an idealised, 'original' text as envisaged by its author. The new approach presented itself as a fundamental shift; whereas earlier efforts had had the effect of narrowing the variation (orthographic, morphological, or lexical) naturally present in multiple-witness texts in an attempt to retrieve 'the author's original text', New Philologists emphasised the importance of this variety inherent in the different manuscripts.[25] Variety and variation were seen as fundamental aspects of the condition of medieval texts:

> If we accept the multiple forms in which our artifacts have been transmitted, we may recognize that medieval culture did not simply live with diversity, it cultivated it. The 'new' philology of the last decade or more reminds us that, as medievalists, we need to embrace the consequences of that diversity, not simply live with it, but to situate it squarely within our methodology. (Nichols, 1990: 8-9)

New Philology's emphasis on the original manuscript text aligned literary studies more closely with some of the more language-orientated approaches to manuscript texts, although some questioned whether New Philology offered anything that was not already being done.[26]

---

[25] For an overview of New Philology and critical responses to the movement, see Yager (2010).

[26] See Baisch (2018) for German reactions to Nichols (1990). Breier's (1910) study of *The Owl and the Nightingale* established that the C and J manuscripts had been copied from an exemplar which had been written by two scribes, each using his own dialect. His work showing that the C scribe was a literatim

More recent work has again returned to the question of manuscript transmission and how this can be elucidated by the evidence offered by orthographic variation.[27] Scholars in historical linguistics have also sought a return to the manuscript text; such a plea was at the heart of Roger Lass's (2004) article which, in focusing on the processes of textual selection in corpus building, makes a strong case for the inclusion only of texts as they occur in their manuscript form. He advocates the faithful recording of features such as spelling, capitalisation and punctuation, and rejects edited texts which normalise or modernise in any way; building a corpus from edited texts runs the risk of incorporating the distortions of editorial choices into the evidence we are able to gain from corpus enquiry. Jeremy Smith (1996: 14) also emphasises the necessity of bringing together philological and linguistic approaches when studying Old or Middle English, as advocated in historical pragmatics and historical sociolinguistics. He points out that as our earliest records of the language are mediated to us through writing, an understanding of writing systems (in terms of both handwriting and spelling) is essential if we are to undertake effective historical language research (56).[28]

The emergence of pragmaphilology as a discipline also reflects the increasing preoccupation of scholars with the written text in its context. In a seminal publication heralding the arrival of the new discipline, Andreas Jacobs and Andreas Jucker stated that 'adequate (i.e. pragmatic) analysis of historical texts must study these texts in their entirety including socio-historical context, their production process and – crucially – a faithful account not only of the syntactic/lexical level but also the physical and orthographic level' (1995: 11–12). Among the more recent studies in the field are those which combine small details (for example punctuation or palaeography) with morpho-syntactic features and wider concerns such as the social contexts of a text's production, in order to produce a more nuanced and rounded picture of the text and its communicative function.[29] At heart, pragmaphilology, in common with New Philology and other recent fields in linguistics such as historical sociolinguistics,

---

copier who preserved the original spellings, in contrast with the J scribe's translating behaviour, predates some of the methods and concerns of later work in the area.

[27] See Lapidge (2000) for an approach which deduces the likely palaeographic forms underlying spelling variations and scribal errors in the only existing manuscript of *Beowulf*, in an attempt to provide further dating evidence for the poem's archetype. Neidorf (2013) analyses the errors made by *Beowulf's* scribes in rendering proper names and discusses the implications this has for the scribes' understanding of their exemplar, and thus of the likely date of the original poem. Fulk (2010; 2012) analyses non-West-Saxon spellings that occur throughout a body of anonymous Old English homiletic texts, concluding that they provide evidence for a more widespread Mercian literary production than previously anticipated, the majority of which has not survived.

[28] See also Labov (1994: 11) on the 'bad data problem'.

[29] See for example, Williams (2014), who includes orthographic variation as part of a range of features in a pragmaphilological study of the letters of the sixteenth-century Thynne sisters; Evans (2013) considers spelling evidence alongside morpho-syntactic features in her historical sociolinguistic study of Elizabeth I's letters.

maintains a focus on original texts. As Irma Taavitsainen and Susan Fitzmaurice noted, 'a prerequisite for the conduct of historical pragmatics is the acceptance of written texts as legitimate data' (2004: 18). The increasing availability of high-quality facsimiles, and online scans of manuscripts has been fundamental in enabling a more manuscript-centred approach which is able to account for factors such as palaeographical data alongside areas which fall more traditionally under the domain of linguistics. Martin Baisch notes that the increasing availability of digital editions 'has begun to open up new possibilities which reflect central preoccupations of the New Philology' (2018: 183).

8 The *Linguistic Atlas of Late Mediaeval English*

While not always a mainstream approach, the philological focus on manuscript text and context repeatedly surfaces as a primary concern among scholars working on medieval language and literature. This holistic approach is exemplified by the substantial body of work undertaken in compiling the *Linguistic Atlas of Late Mediaeval English* (*LALME*) and its subsequent counterpart, the *Linguistics Atlas of Early Middle English* (*LAEME*). The seeds of *LALME* were sown by Angus McIntosh in a 1956 article, in which he advocated the study of Middle English orthography in its own right, and not just as a way to devise or understand the correspondence between written and spoken Middle English. His confidence in the value of the evidence of written language in its own right was not widely shared at the time, and put him at odds with the structuralist stance: 'there is beyond doubt at present a fairly prevalent feeling that the approach to spoken manifestations of language is in some fundamental sense a more rewarding – not to say reputable – pursuit than that to written texts' (1956: 37). This approach was informed by McIntosh's earlier work as a dialectologist in present-day Scots, and his observations that orthographic patterns were apparent in surviving Middle English manuscripts which enabled him to make geographical or dialectal correspondences.

McIntosh's methodology was novel in that it treated each manuscript witness as a linguistic informant, the equivalent of a living speaker in a dialect survey. From each witness he collected counts of a wide range of variants akin to a dialect questionnaire to construct profiles for each scribe (1974: 602-3). These features included what he termed 'S-features' (reflective of spoken language differences, such as *hem/þem*), 'W-features' (orthographical features, reflective of written language and which have no bearing on the pronunciation of a word, such as *sche/she*), and 'G-features' (palaeographical features such as the shape of a particular graph). Throughout, McIntosh emphasises the value of working across disciplines to view the problem in the round, because 'it is sometimes the case that that a scribe fails to impose his own S-features on texts but does impose upon them various *scribal* characteristics of his own' (1974: 603). That is to say, palaeographical variants are used alongside evidence from spellings which

encode spoken variation, as well as those spellings which do not. This complementary evidence is used as part of the 'fit technique' to place writers geographically.[30]

This build-up of small details culled directly from the manuscripts themselves enabled *LALME* researchers to categorise scribal behaviour into different types; for example, a scribe may choose to copy his exemplar text literatim, reproducing a near-identical text, or he may 'translate' the exemplar into his own linguistic norms, substituting his favoured spellings for those he finds in his exemplar. Or he may choose to do something in-between, perhaps beginning as a more literatim scribe before moving to translating behaviour as he becomes more familiar with the exemplar's forms. Michael Benskin and Margaret Laing (1981) also described the behaviour of a *Mischsprache* scribe; one who produces both forms from the exemplar and those from his own preferred usage, but who, importantly, maintains this behaviour throughout his copy. Altogether, this methodology tells us, not only about the way the scribe of the surviving manuscript went about his task, but it can also allow us to build, through the collection of relict forms, an idea of the nature of the underlying exemplar. As Laing (1988: 83) notes, 'dialectal analysis often provides the means to do far more than place a scribe on the map'. More recent research has focused on what can be discovered about the writing systems employed by different scribes; careful and painstaking analysis has revealed the use by some writers of 'literal substitution sets' (where one sound is represented by several *litterae*), and by others of 'potestatic substitution sets' (where one symbol represents several sounds).[31] Laing (1999) details, for example, how changes in the written forms of <þ>, <ƿ> and <y> during the Middle English period led to the interchangeable use of these graphs by some scribes to map a range of pronunciations including [ð], [θ], [w] and [j]. Margaret Laing and Roger Lass (2009) see scribal variation as overlapping function and formal equivalence, as systematic, and not a result of 'mental failure' or 'scribal error'.[32] This emphasis on the value of the input of the scribe

---

[30] The 'fit technique' is a method used by McIntosh, adapted from modern dialectology, whereby 'unlocalizable texts are assigned a geographical position by triangulation on the basis of features shared with texts of known provenance' (Fulk, 2016: 100); texts whose provenance could be ascertained on external grounds were plotted on a map, and these points used to provide comparative data in order to position texts of unknown origin. Notably, McIntosh was able to successfully employ the technique due to his inclusion of features reflective of both written and spoken variation: 'we must seek to detect significant variations within the written-language system as such, and not just those variations which seem to reflect differences within the spoken-language system' (1974: 602).

[31] Laing, following Benskin (1997: 1, fn.1) deliberately employs the medieval doctrine of *littera*, referring to the concepts *figura* (the letter-symbol), *nomen* (the letter-name) and *potestates* (the sound-value): 'When one wishes to 'get inside the head' of a medieval copyist, reference to graphemes and allographs seems neither appropriate nor useful.' (Laing 1999: 255). See also section 2 above.

[32] 'We use the terms 'confusion' and 'confused' without pejorative intent. We do not mean to imply any necessary mental failure on the part of the scribe(s). The terms refer to a formal equivalence and/or an overlap in function, which is normally systematic. They rarely denote intellectual confusion, or even inadvertence. Formal equivalence and functional overlap may sometimes lead to genuine intellectual

(as a 'native speaker'), rather than trying to correct something that is perceived as an inferior version of the author's original, links the *LALME/LAEME* project's attitude to historical texts with that of new philologists, historical sociolinguists and pragmaphilologists: '[i]t is recognised that a 'corrupt' text may reflect the activity of a contemporary editor, critic, or adaptor rather than that of a merely careless copyist.' (Laing 1988: 83)

9 Case Study 1: The Scribes of the Tanner Bede

The methods outlined by the compilers of *LALME/LAEME* are not only of use for the study of Middle English but can also be applied to Old English material, although the language situation is rather different; in general later writers of Old English appear to have used a focused variety (late-West-Saxon), whereas Middle English was '*par excellence*, the dialectal phase of English' (Strang, 1970: 224), when writing routinely reflected local usage.[33] The important thing to bear in mind is that many surviving Old English texts are copies, rather than autograph writings, meaning that what we see on the page is not the result (as in case study II) of a considered scripting choice, but the outcome of the copying behaviour of the latest scribe. Thus, in line with McIntosh's observations, we may detect orthographical features as well as morpho-syntactic ones, which may have been transmitted from the exemplar text, or else translated into the scribe's own preferred usage. The difference between looking at late-Old English and Middle English is that Old English literacy was probably far less wide-spread socially, being more or less restricted to the ecclesiastical elite. In addition, the destruction of Northumbrian and Mercian monasteries and their libraries during the Viking attacks of the ninth and tenth centuries means that a substantial part of our data for Old English comes from eleventh-century Wessex and the dialect written there.

This case study examines the performance of two scribes from Oxford, Bodleian Library Tanner 10 (T), a late-tenth-century copy of the Old English translation of Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica*, and is based on the methodology developed in Wallis (2013) and adapted from that of the *LALME* project. An examination of T alongside the other Old English *Bede* manuscripts reveals that the original translation, which no longer exists, was written in a Mercian dialect, and the text was progressively West-Saxonised as a succession of scribes recopied it during the late 10th and 11th centuries (Miller, 1890; Wallis, 2013). In total five scribes contributed to T, and the two under examination will be referred to as T2 and T4.[34] A questionnaire was used to

---

confusions; but in our experience they are unusual. 'Confusions' are more often than not systematically explicable in terms of the writing praxis of the exemplar and/or of the copyist. Simple scribal error, whose existence in individual cases we of course do not deny, is comparatively uncommon' (Laing & Lass 2009: 3).

[33] Smith (1996: 66) defines a focused variety as 'a centripetal norm to which speakers tend, rather than a fixed collection of prescribed rules from which any deviation at all is forbidden.'

[34] T2 writes sections of text between ff. 103r-117v (Miller 1890: 352-90), and provides a total of 1540 graphic units across four short stints which alternate with those by T1, before the copying task is taken over by T4 part way through f. 117v. T4's contribution falls into two stints, the first of which is

collect the variant spellings, from which five features will be examined.[35] These are all conservative features indicative of the *Bede's* original Mercian dialect: *ah* is a form of *ac* ('but') commonly found in Anglian dialects, rather than West-Saxon ones (Hogg, 1992: §7.52), while *ec* is a spelling of *eac* ('also') which shows Anglian smoothing (Campbell, 1959: §225). Spellings retaining <oe> represent the rounding of *ō*, found in non-West-Saxon dialects (Campbell 1959: §196-7, 319), while double-vowel combinations (e.g. *tiid* for *tid* ('time')) are found in older texts representing long vowels (Campbell, 1959: §26). *Cuom-* and *cwom-* represent early spellings of *com-* the past tense of *cuman* ('to come'), before the loss of *-w-* (Ringe & Taylor, 2014: 339). These features are summarised in the table below:

Relict Feature	Newer variant
ah	ac
ec	eac
oe	e
double vowels: aa, ee, ii, oo, uu	a, e, i, o, u
cuom-, cwom-	com-

Table 1: Spelling variation in T2 and T4.

These features appear sporadically as relicts in other *Bede* manuscripts, as well as in T. It is important not only to ascertain the form(s) of each feature present, but also where each instance occurs, by folio. It that way we can detect whether a scribe's behaviour is consistent throughout his stint, or whether it changes as he writes. Two main trends are noticeable about T2's performance: firstly, he has a strong tendency to use the more conservative spellings, for example he only ever uses *ah*, and never *ac*, while he transmits six <oe> spellings, including *roeðnis* 'storminess', *woedelnisse* 'poverty', *woen* 'hope'. Another relict feature transmitted throughout his stint is the use of double vowels, rendering both proper and common nouns; his twenty-three examples include *tiidum* 'time', *cwoom* 'came', and the personal name *eedgils*. Finally, T2 only uses older spellings of the past tense of the verb *cuman*; while he vacillates between the older <u> for *w* and the newer *wynn*, it is notable that he never writes *com* (see

---

considered here, and which consists of 3561 graphic units between ff. 117v-126r. Scribal stints are measured in graphic units rather than in words, as spacing and word division can be rather irregular in the manuscript and words are frequently split over lines.

[35] A questionnaire with a greater number of features will allow a more nuanced picture, and may well include morphological and palaeographical, as well as orthographic variants (McIntosh 1974: 610-11). For the sake of brevity only a limited number of features are considered here.

case study 2 on variation between <u> and *wynn* in Old English).[36] One place where T2 may introduce a form of his own is on a single occasion right at the beginning of his stint, where he writes *eac* (f. 103r). However, following this he always writes *ec* (three times), apparently following his exemplar. It would appear then that T2's copying behaviour falls towards the literatim end of the spectrum; there is little evidence on the basis of the features discussed here to suggest that he brings many of his own preferred spellings to his copy, and he maintains conservative spellings throughout.

When T2 reached the end of his stint, the copying task was taken up by T4, whose approach over the next eighteen folios is rather different. T4 begins by reproducing a number of forms from his exemplar, and on the first two folios (f. 117v-118r) we find *ah*, *ec*, *cuom*, *cwom*, and *forðfoered* 'to depart, die' with an <oe> spelling. It is quite clear that as he continues, T4 gradually abandons these inherited spellings for ones which reflect his own training and preferences. What is notable, however, is that he does not change all these spellings at the same point in his copy; while *ec* is soon changed to *eac* on f. 118r, *com* makes its appearance a little later, on f. 119r. Rather later still is the change from *ah* to *ac* (f. 121v), suggesting that these changes happen perhaps at a lexical level, rather than at a systematic, orthographical level; previous exposure to a spelling does not seem to be a factor, as *ec* is written only once before the spelling is changed, while *ah* appears four times before it is replaced. It is rather more difficult to say whether the lack of <oe> forms in the later folios represents a conscious change by T4, or whether it was simply the case that no such forms existed in this part of the exemplar.

A different pattern is shown, however, by the four double-vowel spellings, which appear, rather sporadically, throughout T4's stint in words such as *aa* 'always' and *riim* 'reckoning'. Although the contributions of both scribes are short, it appears that T2 is rather more likely to transmit a double-vowel spelling than T4 (twenty-three times in 1540 graphic units, against T4's four times in 3651 graphic units). It is possible that fewer double-vowel spellings occurred in T4's exemplar than in T2's, although the fact that such spellings are also transmitted by scribes T1 and T5 suggests that this is unlikely. That double-vowels occur in each scribe's stint, though to differing degrees, might suggest that they were not felt by the scribes to be too incongruous a spelling, or that they were part of the T scribes' passive repertoire (Benskin & Laing, 1981: 58-9).

T4, then, acts as a translator scribe, albeit one who starts out more literatim, before 'writing in' to his own preferred norms and style. Of course, without the original exemplar, we cannot be entirely sure to what extent either scribe made alterations in their text, and it should be stressed that this is not an exhaustive survey. Nevertheless, comparison of T2 and T4 with each other, and with other scribes of the *Bede* manuscripts, allows us to build a picture of the sorts of features we would expect to have been in the archetype, and which therefore may well

---

[36] By contrast, a study of the manuscript's main scribe (T1) shows that in his copy of Book 3 of the *Bede* he never writes *cuom*, however he does write *cwom* (57x in Book 3), and occasionally *com* (5x).

have occurred in T's exemplar. Building up a scribal profile, which aims to analyse both the features used as well as their distribution, enables us to map the internal consistency of each scribe, in addition to their differences from one another.

10 Quantification in philological approaches to orthography

Beyond the research on early English triggered by the *LALME/LAEME* project, a number of philological approaches to orthography from the early decades of the 21st century have tackled written language by mapping spelling onto a linguistic reference system. This method was initially developed by Arend Mihm and Michael Elmentaler in the context of a project entitled 'Niederrheinische Sprachgeschichte' at the University of Duisburg, which focused on administrative writing in Duisburg from the 14th to the 17th century (cf. Elmentaler, 2003: 49-51). While rejecting an autonomous analysis of written language as impractical, Elmentaler takes great pains to avoid circular reasoning. This is achieved by analysing graphs (*Graphien*) according to their correspondence to *Lautpositionen* ('sound positions'), which are units defined by sound etymology and context. Elmentaler's research also relies on the strict separation of scribes and exact quantification (60-63). Graphs and sound positions are correlated, which makes it possible to establish the grapheme systems of individual scribes and to assess the overlap in the representation of different sound positions. On a wider level, Elmentaler's research confirms that early written languages are fully functional, that the letter-sound correlations of Latin are persistent, and that change in written language is often discontinuous (51-3).

Subsequent studies have applied Mihm and Elmentaler's approach to other types of material: Niels-Erik Larsen has adopted it for a study on Middle Dutch statutes of the Flemish town of Ghent (2001, 2004), Yasushi Kawasaki for a graphemic analysis of the Old Saxon *Heliand* (2004), and Annina Seiler in the context of research on the earliest Old English, Old High German and Old Saxon sources (2014). These studies address different research questions and, consequently, adapt the relational method to suit their own purpose: Larsen aims at establishing the entire grapheme systems represented in the material from Ghent; Kawasaki systematically compares the spellings for the dentals þ, *d*, *đ* and *t* across the five extant manuscripts of *Heliand*; and Seiler investigates, on the one hand, how a number of consonant phonemes are represented and, on the other hand, how 'superfluous' letters of the alphabet like <k>, <q>, <x> and <z> are employed. These differences aside, the studies share a cautious stance when it comes to attributing exact sound values to the orthographic features under investigation and they all aim at elucidating the workings of non-standardised writing systems.

11 Case Study II: The scripting of /w/ in Old English and Old High German

This case study focuses on the spellings for one sound, the continuant of Proto-Germanic *w* in Old English and Old High German. This sound was phonologically stable, yet it is represented in various ways since Latin had no corresponding sound and, therefore, the alphabet provided

no suitable character.[37] The case study provides insights into the scripting of Old English and Old High German, which is the process by which those languages were put into writing. The details presented here are based on a comparative analysis of early orthography (Seiler 2014), which relies on quantitative data to identify the factors determining graphemic choices. The methodology is adapted from Elmentaler (2003; cf. above), mapping spellings onto an etymological reference system. The results show that while, overall, the spellings for Old English and Old High German *w* are variable, there are clear-cut diatopic and diachronic patterns. Furthermore, different orthographic solutions tend to be used for specific sound positions. Once these factors are taken into consideration, Old English and Old High German orthographies turn out to be surprisingly consistent.

When scribes in England and in Frankia started to write their vernacular languages with the Latin alphabet, three typologically distinct spellings for the representation of *w* were available to them: The first option was to use single <u>, though this graph stood for labiodental [v] in Latin; the second spelling consisted of the digraph <uu>, and a third option was to adopt the character <ƿ>, named *wynn* 'joy', from the runic script. All three spellings (as well as some others) are attested in Old English and Old High German sources, yet, the patterns of distribution are very different. Wynn is the standard spelling in Old English from the ninth century onwards and remains in use well beyond the end of the Anglo-Saxon period.[38] Early Old English sources, going back to the late seventh and eighth century, generally use <u> or <uu> instead, though rare instances of wynn occur. Single <u> dominates in the eighth-century versions of Cædmon's Hymn transmitted as part of Bede's *Ecclesiastical History* (cf. the extract from the Moore manuscript under (1) below) and is found in names attested in the earliest Anglo-Saxon charters. Even in texts that use <ƿ> or <uu> elsewhere, <u> is often retained as a spelling for *w* in the consonant clusters *kw*, *hw sw*, etc. – as for example in the Alfredian translation of the *Pastoral Care*, which normally employs <ƿ> but uses <cu>, <su>, etc. for these clusters (2).[39] These spellings are clearly modelled on Latin words, like *suauis* 'sweet', which contain a bilabial semivowel (Stotz, 1996: 142). Double <uu> occurs only occasionally – mostly in early Mercian sources as exemplified by examples from the Epinal Glossary (3). However, the digraph spelling continues to be used in Old English personal names in Anglo-Latin texts as in the *Vita St. Æthelwoldi* (4) (cf. Lapidge & Winterbottom, 1991: clxxxviii). Again, there is a restriction: <uu> is rarely used before the vowel *u* (e.g. **uu**lfgar

---

[37] Old English and Old High German *w* must have been a bilabial approximant [w]; Latin <u>, when used as a consonant, represented a labiovelar fricative [v] probably by the first century AD (Stotz, 1996: §108.2, 113.1). Cf. the difference between early (i.e. pre-650) borrowings from Latin into Old English, like *wine*, *wall* and later ones, such as *verse*, *vulture* (examples from Durkin, 2014: 102-19).

[38] On early Old English spelling, see Scragg (1974: 1-14), and Blomfield (1935). The disappearance of wynn in the course of the Middle English period has not been investigated in detail, though Laing (1999) discusses its confusion with <þ> and <y> in later Middle English (cf. section 8 above).

[39] Cf. also the use of <cu> in the Tanner Bede in case study I above.

and not **<**uu**ulfgar>). The following text samples illustrate the range of spellings found in different Anglo-Saxon sources:

(1) *Nu scylun hergan hefaenricaes* **u***ard, metudæs maecti end his modgidanc,* **u***erc* **u***uldurfadur, sue he* **u***undra gihuaes, eci dryctin, or astelidæ.* (Cædmon's Hymn from the Moore MS, c. 737, ed. Dobbie, 1942: 105)[40]

(2) *Ne cuæð he ðæt forðyðe he ænegum men ðæs* **p***yscte oððe pilnode, ac he* **p***itgode sua sua hit gepeorðan sceolde.* (OE *Pastoral Care*, Hatton MS, late 9th c., ed. Sweet 1871: I, 29.10)[41]

(3) [232] *ca[ta]ractis* **uu***aeterthruch* 'water-pipe', [1026] *telum:* **uu***eb* 'web', [1040] *taberna:* **uu***inaern* 'tavern', [1045] *talpa:* **uu***andae***uu***iorpae* 'mole', [1062] *uitelli: suehoras* 'fathers-in-law', [1088] *uirecta: quicae* 'green place' (Epinal glossary, c. 700, ed. Pheifer 1974)

(4) *Est enim ciuitas quaedam modica, commerciis abunde referta, quae solito* <u>**uu***ealinga ford*</u> *appellatur, in qua uir strenuus quidam morabatur, cui nomen erat* <u>*Ælfhelmus*</u>*, qui casu lumen amittens oculorum cecitatem multis perpessus est annis. Huic in somnis tempore gallicinii sanctus* <u>*AÐEL***VV***OLDUS*</u> *antistes adstitit eumque ut maturius* <u>**uu***intoniam*</u> *pergeret et ad eius tumbam gratia recipiendi uisus accederet ammonuit […].*[42] (*Vita St. Æthelwoldi*, ed. Lapidge & Winterbottom, 1991: 42)

In Old High German, the digraph <uu> is already the regular spelling for *w* in the earliest sources in the eighth century. Its use is doubtless modelled on West Frankish spelling practice, where <uu> is attested in personal names on coins and charters from the late sixth century onwards (e.g. *UUaldemarus, UUandeberctus*; cf. Wells, 1972; Felder, 2003). From Merovingian Frankia the digraph presumably also spread to Anglo-Saxon England (Seiler, 2015). Eventually, <uu> or <vv> were combined into a single character with touching or overlapping strokes, which resulted in the establishment of a new letter <w>.[43] The runic

---

[40] 'Now we shall praise the guardian of heaven, the lord's might and his purpose, the work of the father of glory, as he, the eternal lord, established the beginning of all wonders.'

[41] 'He did not say this because he wished or desired it to befall any man, but he prophesied how it was to happen' (transl. Sweet, 1871: 28).

[42] 'For in a small but busy market town commonly known as Wallingford there dwelt and industrious man called Ælfhelm, who had chanced to lose the sight of his eyes and had endured blindness for many a year. To this man the holy Æthelwold appeared in his sleep at cock-crow; he told him to hurry to Winchester and go to his tomb to receive back his sight' (transl. Lapidge & Winterbottom, 1991: 64-5). The text printed above follows the spelling of MS Cotton Caligula A VIII (1st quarter of the 12th c.), f. 127v (available online at
http://www.bl.uk/manuscripts/Viewer.aspx?ref=cotton_ms_caligula_a_viii_f121r [accessed 23 January 2020]).

[43] According to Bischoff (1986: 122), the composite form appears in the eleventh century, though '[i]t is almost attained in the tenth [...]' (n. 83). Sporadic attestations, however, already occur in Merovingian sources (Seiler 2014: 114 an n. 91).

character wynn, on the other hand, is restricted to a small number of texts and is rarely used consistently (Braune & Reiffenstein, 2004: 14, § 7, A.1). The presence of wynn in Old High German is generally attributed to Anglo-Saxon influence. One text in which it is found is in the *Hildebrandslied*, an alliterative heroic poem (5). The mixture of <uu> and <ƿ> spellings suggests that wynn occurred in the exemplar from which the extant version was copied but was not normally used by the two scribes (cf. Lühr, 1982: 32-4). The *Hildebrandslied* was copied in Fulda, one of the centres of the Anglo-Saxon mission on the Continent, which explains the presence of Insular influence in the scriptorium.

The restrictions on <uu> found in Old English also apply to Old High German orthography: in consonant clusters and before the vowel *u* many scribes prefer single <u> as a spelling for *w* (5, 6, 7). One exception to this rule is Otfrid of Weissenburg, who explicitly speaks out in favour of 'triple-u' for the sequence *wu-* in one of the prefaces to his *Evangelienbuch*: 'Sometimes, as I believe, three u are necessary for the sound; the first two as consonants, as it seems to me, but the third keeping its vocalic sound.'[44] Otfrid also insisted on this spelling being used in the *Evangelienbuch* (cf. Seiler, 2010: 92-5, 99). For the representation of the cluster *kw*, many Old High German sources resort to <qu> or similar spellings, as in the Old High German translation of Tatian's *Diatessaron* (6). This spelling is clearly modelled on the large number of Latin words containing a labiovelar (*quia*, *quod* etc.). Incidentally, the same spelling occurs in some Old English sources (cf. *quicae* in (3) above).

Overall Old High German orthography is highly idiosyncratic and more prone to intricate di- and trigraph spellings than Old English. The scribe of part Ka of the *Abrogans* glossary, for example, uses <ouu> to represent Proto-Germanic **w* in clusters with *s* or *z*, single <u> in other clusters and double <uu> elsewhere (7). It is possible that the trigraph owes its composition to the insertion of a parasitic vowel after the sibilant (Braune & Reiffenstein 2004: §69 A.5); however, many intricate spelling rules are graphic in nature and unconnected to the sound level. The following examples illustrate the range of Old High German spellings for *w*:

(5) *[…] gurtun sih iro suert ana, helidos, ubar [h]ringa. do sie to dero hiltiu ritun. hiltibraht gimahalta, heribrantes sunu – her **uu**as heroro man, ferahes frotoro –; her fragen gistuont fohem **uu**ortum, [h]ƿer sin fater ƿari […].* (*Hildebrandslied* 5b-9, c. 830, ed. Lühr, 1982, I, 2).[45]

---

[44] *Nam interdum tria* u u u, *ut puto, quaerit in sono, priores duo consonantes, ut mihi videtur, tertium vocali sono manente* (ed. Magoun, 1943: 880).

[45] 'The heroes girded their swords over the ring-mail, as they rode to the fight. Hilitbrant spoke, Heribrant's son. He was the older man, wiser of life. He began to ask with few words who his father might be.' In the extract printed here, <ƿ> is substituted for <w> used in Lühr's edition. For a facsimile see, for example, Lühr (1982, II, 799-800).

(6) *Inti quad Zacharias zi themo engile:* **uu**anan **uu**eiz ih thaz? ih bim alt, inti mīn quena fram ist gigangan in ira tagun. (OHG *Tatian*, c. 830; ed. Braune & Ebbinghaus, 1994: 47)[46]

(7) [12.19] *ambiguus : undar z**ouu**aim* 'going two ways', [12.20] *dubius : z**ouu**iual* 'doubt', [28.20] *natare : s**ouu**imman* 'to swim', [29.02] *natabat: s**ouu**am* 'swam'; [13.11] *ambitus : cadh**u**ing* 'region', [23.06] *ego inquid : ih qhuad* 'I said', [30.16] *adfligit : th**u**ingit* 'he throws down'; [10.21] *almum :* **uu**ih 'holy', [25.16] *crescit :* **uu**ahsit 'it grows' (*Abrogans*, Cod. Sang. 911, c. 790, ed. Bischoff, Duft & Sonderegger 1977)

A comparison of the spellings for *w* in Old English and Old High German suggests that similar factors were at work. Orthographic solutions are influenced by two opposing principles: firstly, a desire for an unambiguous representation of vernacular sounds and, secondly, the rules of Latin grammar. This leads to compromises such as single <u> in clusters and before the vowel *u*, while <uu> is used elsewhere. The dominance of Latin spelling practice and orthographic rules results in similarities between individual writing systems but also across the traditions of the West Germanic languages. Such similarities are owing to a shared background rather than to direct influence from one spelling system to another. Individual scribes define their own, sometimes intricate spelling rules, though Old English spelling coalesces towards a relatively uniform representation of the vernacular in the course of the Anglo-Saxon period. Old High German orthography, on the other hand, remains more fragmented. Finally, scribal choices are also affected by the text type. In non-standardised writing systems, spellings often carry associations beyond the sounds that they represent: The runic character <ƿ>, for example, is clearly a 'vernacular' graph. Single <u> but also the digraph <uu>, on the other hand, stand for (Merovingian) Latinity and are thus more suitable for the representation of vernacular elements in Latin texts.[47]

12 Outlook

The popularity of philology has waxed and waned among scholars of historical texts, however it has never been entirely eclipsed by other methods. It has frequently been noted that 'philology' is difficult to define (e.g. Nichols, 1990: 2; Fulk, 2016: 95), encompassing a wide range of methods and involving competence in a number of (sub)disciplines.[48] Nevertheless, it is because it is a fundamental part of textual scholarship that philology remains a relevant and valid approach to the study of historical texts on a variety of levels; while the concerns of philologists may have moved away from the tasks of textual editing and the recovery of the original authorial text, the methodology and expertise developed by philologists now finds its use in 'mediating between the demands of linguistic methodology and the limitations that beset the

---

[46] 'And Zachary spoke to the angel: how do I know this? I am old and my wife is well along in years.'

[47] For more details on this last aspect, see Seiler (forthcoming).

[48] See, for instance, the wide range of methods and topics covered in Neidorf, Pascual and Shippey (eds.) (2016).

records of prior states of the language available for linguistic analysis' (Fulk, 2016: 96). It is precisely this mediating role which is most valuable; philology is easily absorbed by and combined with newer theoretical linguistic approaches, providing scholars with a deeper understanding of the 'extralinguistic contexts of linguistic data' (Fulk, 2016: 95). Thus, a range of scholarship has developed that combines philological sensitivities with the theoretical underpinning of, for example, variationist linguistics in historical sociolinguistics, or politeness theory in historical pragmatics. It is arguably in these fields that we see the most fruitful combinations of many of the strands laid down by twentieth-century work (e.g. New Philology, pragmaphilology, *LALME*), much of which involves the study of historical orthographies, alongside several other features.

A further boost for philological methods has undoubtedly come from advances in digital humanities. In one such advance, it is becoming increasingly feasible to obtain and view high-quality images of individual manuscripts, many of which are available online.[49] Such ready availability of the originals means that it is a straightforward matter to verify orthographical variation, without the mediation of an edited text. It is also much easier to take into account details such as palaeographical variation, abbreviations and punctuation, or mis-en-page, for example, with the result that a researcher can gain a more rounded view of the text in its physical context. Electronic editions are also able to combine traditional editions with facsimiles, and make use of annotation tools such as the TEI framework to tag texts and encode relevant features. Moreover, researchers are not the only academics making use of these tools; university teachers are increasingly utilising them to bring students into contact with real language data, and to train students in research methods.[50]

Another advance in linguistic methodology which can be usefully combined with philological approaches is corpus linguistics. Although the usefulness of any given corpus for orthographical research depends very much on the way in which it has been compiled (cf. Lass, 2004), corpora can enable the researcher to handle a far greater amount of data than is possible manually, and allow for quantitative methods to be used in addition to qualitative ones.[51]

Finally, there is an emphasis in newer fields such as historical pragmatics and historical sociolinguistics on finding new texts to study, often from the kinds of writers who have been overlooked by traditional scholarship (for example, using documents from lower class writers in 'language history from below' (Elspaß, 2012)). This means that the supply of historical

---

[49] See, for example, the online images available for manuscripts from the British Library (https://www.bl.uk/manuscripts/), Cambridge's Parker Library (https://parker.stanford.edu/parker/), or the Virtual Manuscript Library of Switzerland (https://www.e-codices.unifr.ch).

[50] See Wallis (2020) as an example of this approach. Further discussion of the place of digital resources in teaching the history of the English language can be found in the essays contained in Hayes & Burkette (eds.) (2017) and Moore & Palmer (eds.) (2019).

[51] Cf. Lass (2004). Cain (2016: 235) notes that while the *Dictionary of Old English Corpus* is a powerful research tool, the fact that it is based on edited texts necessitates careful checking against the actual manuscript forms if it is to be a reliable source for orthographic studies.

documents is by no means exhausted, and there remains much work for philologists to do using such combined methods, both on existing documents, and on those yet to be discovered.