CHAPTER 27

Teaching Original Pronunciation

DAVID CRYSTAL

27.1. INTRODUCTION

Serious interest in reconstructing the phonologies of earlier periods of literary English dates from the mid-nineteenth century, within the evolving study of comparative philology. The earliest reference I know to Shakespearean exploration is an essay by the American literary critic and lawyer Richard Grant White, whose many works on Shakespeare included two editions of the plays. He was also a music critic, and it was perhaps this joint interest which led him to pay special attention to pronunciation. In a "Memorandum on English Pronunciation in the Elizabethan Era" he analyses rhymes, puns, and spellings as evidence and anticipates the reaction of readers.[1] In Britain, at around the same time, Alexander Ellis was completing his thousand-page study, *On Early English Pronunciation* (1869–74), in which Chaucer and Shakespeare receive special attention. And soon after, in Europe, further interest was fostered by such scholars as Paul Passy, Wilhelm Viëtor, Henry Sweet, and Daniel Jones.[2]

The interest was purely scholarly. The academic tradition focused on the compilation and evaluation of the evidence, the listing of pronunciation variants, and (especially after the publication of the International Phonetic Alphabet, or IPA, in 1888) the choices now available for transcription. A great deal of teaching must have taken place through university lecture courses and in preparing readings and performances, but none of those involved give us information about how they worked in rehearsal or the problems they encountered. That there were problems is evident from the reviews of the (rare) performances in the first half of the twentieth century, both on stage and on the BBC, where critics mentioned uncertainties and inconsistencies in some actors' pronunciations, suggestive of under-rehearsal. British phonetician John Trim attended a production of *Macbeth*, starring Bernard Miles, at the Mermaid Theatre in 1952, and commented: "Miles himself was very enthusiastic and followed the reconstruction quite accurately, but I gained the impression (confirmed

by the performance I attended) that others did not wish to spend time on detailed phonetic accuracy as opposed to giving a general impression."[3]

There was no further interest in stage performance in original pronunciation (OP) during the second half of the century. I put this down to several factors: the mixed critical reactions to the early experiments; the scholarly caution of the academics, who spent a great deal of time debating phonetic details but little time presenting the issues to a potentially interested general (and theatre-going) public; and, above all, to the total dominance of the classical stage by Received Pronunciation (RP). This was a period when RP was the dominant voice of British theatre, given resonant articulation by Laurence Olivier, John Gielgud, and other great Shakespearean actors. It was also the voice of the BBC, where broadcasts of Shakespeare and other early authors were always in RP. In the United States, actors struggled to acquire an RP accent for their Shakespeare performances. Putting on the plays in a regional accent was unimaginable; so a production which was perceived to be a mixture of regional accents—critics commented on the echoes of Irish, West Country, and other accents they heard in OP—was never likely to be well received.

Everything changed in 2004, when Shakespeare's Globe in London decided to mount an OP production of *Romeo and Juliet* as part of a commitment to introduce "original practices" into its reconstructed theatre. The experiment was sufficiently successful, in terms of audience reaction, to motivate the Globe to mount a second production the following year of *Troilus and Cressida*—this time with the whole run being presented in OP. American visitors to these events enthusiastically took the idea home with them, and the next decade saw several OP productions: *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (Kansas University, 2010), *Hamlet* (University of Nevada, Reno, 2011), *Cymbeline* (Portland Center Stage, Oregon, 2012), *Julius Caesar* (University of Houston, 2013), *Twelfth Night* (Classical Actors Ensemble, Minneapolis, 2014), *The Merchant of Venice* and *A Winter's Tale* (Shakespeare Factory, Baltimore, 2015–16), and *King Lear* (Indiana University, 2016). Europe saw productions of *As You Like It* (Bangor University, 2013), *Macbeth* (Shakespeare's Globe, 2014), *Henry V* (Shakespeare's Globe, 2015), and *Pericles* (Passion in Practice, Stockholm, 2015). In 2016, other writers began to receive an OP treatment, beginning with Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus* and an event based on Henslowe's Diary, both performed at the Globe. At the same time, interest was being shown in the expressive individuality of OP by other groups interested in the period, notably those involved in early vocal music, both secular and religious, as well as people working at heritage sites reconstructing life in the early seventeenth century, such as those at Stratford-upon-Avon (UK) and Plimouth Plantation (United States).

In all these cases, those involved had to be taught OP. Most had little or no general awareness of the history of English, and usually no training in phonetics. On the other hand, actors and singers have a good ear, are used to working with varying articulations, and—once they realize what is involved in OP—become hugely enthusiastic, willing to spend a great deal of time to get it right. The next section describes a teaching methodology that can be used for any OP project, based on my experience as consultant or dialect coach in almost all of the earlier mentioned productions.[4]

27.2. TEACHING OP: GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

Although the concept of OP has an immediate intuitive appeal, it is essential to provide practitioners with some theoretical background about what they are about to learn, before going into the accent in detail. When the news breaks that there is to be an OP performance—whatever the period and genre, speech, or song—those involved will certainly be asked about it by family, friends, and colleagues, and they need to know how to respond. Two questions always arise. Everyone hears echoes of modern regional accents in OP ("We speak like that where I come from") and they want to know why. And everyone (other than historians of English) is intrigued by the process of reconstruction ("How do you know?"). I therefore always give a short introductory talk to the participants, putting OP into its historical setting, describing the evidence from rhymes, puns, spellings, and contemporary writers, and illustrating the impact of OP on performers and audience, based on the now substantial accumulation of events. The points would differ, according to the OP period being explored. For Old English, the focus would be entirely on the way missionaries first wrote English down and on the surviving dialect evidence. For Chaucer, more attention would be paid to the evidence of metre and rhyme. For Shakespeare, the writings of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century orthoepists would loom large.

The introductory talk also gives an account of what OP is, in order to dispel some of the myths and preconceptions that most practitioners will have. It is important to eliminate the idea that this is an individual accent: it is not "Shakespeare's pronunciation," about which we know nothing. Nor is OP a single accent, any more than present-day English is a single accent. Shakespearean OP is, technically, the phonological system of Early Modern English (as manifested around the year 1600). It is a phonology—the reconstruction of a sound system—and there is thus as much phonetic variability in the realisation of the abstract units (phonemes) as there would be in any modern accent. I like to point out the accent variations that would have been heard on the Globe stage in the early 1600s, given that we know a little about the regional backgrounds of several of the actors—such as Robert Armin from Norfolk, John Heminges from Worcestershire—and stress that present-day actors are no different, and need not be concerned about losing their accent identity. In the 2004 *Romeo*, for example, there was a Scots-tinged Juliet, a Cockney-tinged Nurse, an RP-tinged Romeo, and a Northern Irish-tinged Peter. In the U.S. productions of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and *Hamlet* the OP was heard filtered through a range of American accents. Regional differences in intonation accounted for some of the effects, but vowels were affected too, with slight variations in tongue position causing slight variations of vowel quality that can signal regional or personal differences. Putting this in traditional linguistic terms: there can be several phonetic realizations of a vowel phoneme while preserving the status of that vowel within the sound system as a whole. With or without the terminology, the point needs to be appreciated that OP would have contained as much variation as any modern system.

In some ways, an introduction to OP is an introduction to basic linguistics. Not only do we need to draw attention to the existence of language variation, we also need to point out the nature of language change. With Shakespeare, writing over a

period of twenty or so years, at a time when there was rapid linguistic change taking place in England, the co-existence of different pronunciation preferences needs to be recognized and taken into account in any production—just as it would today. I always remind people of the many variations in pronunciation that characterize present-day English as a result of language change and social variation (*schedule* vs. *skedule*, *often* pronounced with or without the /t/, *re*search vs. re*search*, etc.). There would have been many more in Early Modern English, which lacked the standardizing influence of dictionaries, and where there was no prestige accent, as in present-day RP. Shakespeare himself (in *Romeo and Juliet*) has a character referring to "the new tuners of accent" in society, and accent variation is mentioned several times in the plays. It was possible to rise to the top of the kingdom with a strong regional accent, as the Devonshire speech of Raleigh and Drake illustrate. And after 1603, when James I came to the throne, many in the court spoke with Scottish accents. British people without a knowledge of the history of English are usually surprised that there was ever a time when there was no RP, but that accent didn't evolve until the end of the eighteenth century. The actor playing the Prince in the *Romeo* company was especially confused when he discovered this: "'How can I play a Prince if I can't use a posh accent?' he asked the director, Tim Carroll. He received a one-word reply: 'Act.'"

All of this needs to be explained before beginning the training of the individual vowels, consonants, and syllabic features that make up OP. And the relevance of this for dramaturgical decisionmaking also has to be thought through; otherwise, a great deal of time will be wasted during rehearsal. For example, one of the important decisions affecting OP in performance is what to do with initial /h/ in such words as *house* and *hundred*. *H*-dropping has been a feature of the language since Middle English, and in Shakespeare's time it would have come and gone without notice, in much the same way as people today sometimes vary their pronunciations of *again*, *says*, and *often*. So it would be perfectly possible for an educated person to pronounce a word beginning with *h* in a stressed syllable either with or without the sound. If you were literate, and so knew that there was an *h* in the spelling, you might well pronounce it (Holofernes in *Love's Labour's Lost* certainly would), so *h*-retention would presumably have been available as a sign of an educated background, then as now. A directorial decision has thus to be made in relation to characters of different kinds. In the OP *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, for example, the decision was made to keep *h* for Theseus, Hippolyta, and the lovers, and to omit it for the mechanicals. But what do we do with the fairies? Do Oberon and Titania drop their *h*'s, as down-to-earth beings might do, or do they keep them, as might befit a well-brought-up Fairy King and Queen? And what about Puck, whose naughtiness might have a linguistic reflex in *h*-dropping? If he is an *h*-dropper, then he has an extra option, when mimicking the voices of Lysander and Demetrius in the forest, to add *h*'s as required.

Time has to be allowed early on in a production for a thorough discussion of questions of this kind, especially in cases (such as *h*) where people have been brought up to believe that a particular pronunciation is "wrong." The issues can be quite complex, as in *Henry V*, where decisions have to be made not only about educated English accents (and whether a king like Henry would have used one) but also about the

regional accents of the Welsh, Scottish, and Irish captains, the accents of the French nobility speaking both English and French, and the accents of those characters who find themselves in language-learning situations (Katharine and Pistol). There are many OP variants here. The issues, moreover, go beyond plays, also affecting the voicing of poems and lyrics that are to be read aloud. Should the Sonnets be read in a colloquial or a formal style? Should *h*'s be dropped in a Dowland song? Would John Donne have dropped his *h*'s in a sermon? Directors, actors, and singers all need to "take a view," when they encounter variation, just as they do today.

It's not essential for practitioners to have the arguments at their fingertips, but their teachers should have some good examples to hand—which is partly why I compiled my *Dictionary of Original Shakespearean Pronunciation*.[5] Here is an illustration of the kind of issue we encounter in individual words. In *A Midsummer Night's Dream* we find that *gone* rhymes with *alone, anon, moan, none, on, Oberon*, and *upon*. We can divide these into three types. The rhymes with *on* and *upon*, which have always had short vowels in the history of English, along with *Oberon*, indicate the pronunciation that we still have today. The rhymes with *alone* and *moan* clearly indicate a long vowel. The rhymes with *anon* and *none* provide ambiguous evidence, as those words also had variant forms. This means that in any dictionary of Shakespearean pronunciation, both /gɒn/ and /go:n/ need to be represented. It also means that a choice is available when we encounter this word in a non-rhyming context. When Lucrece says, "O that is gone for which I sought to live" (line 1051), there is no way of knowing whether Elizabethans would have read this as /gɒn/ or /go:n/, or whether they would even have noticed the difference. We have a similar situation today with the vowel in *says*, which can be pronounced either short as /sez/ or long as /seɪz/. People switch from one to the other without a second thought, depending on such factors as euphony, emphasis, and speed of speaking—or singing. Early Modern English phonology will have been no different.

27.3. TEACHING OP: SPECIFIC CONSIDERATIONS

It would be perfectly possible to teach someone OP on a purely imitative basis: say what I say. No analysis, no transcription. Some actors prefer to work like that, in learning a character, and if they have a good ear their OP renditions can be excellent. Hilton McRae, for example, about to perform an extract from *King Lear* for a recording, listened to me saying his lines through once in OP and then repeated them with hardly an error. After two or three goes, he was perfect. The downside is that actors who have this ability are unable to transfer their OP skill to new parts without going through the same process. They have a brilliant ear, but no sense of the phonological system, so they do not generalize their learning.

At the opposite extreme there are those—the majority, in my experience—who learn best by working through the OP system, phoneme by phoneme, and who do end up being able to generalize. For this kind of workshop, it's useful to provide a handout with several examples of the distinctive vowels, diphthongs, consonants, and syllables, relating these to modern English. The focus of the examples will vary

somewhat according to the properties of the learners' accents. If the learners are RP-speakers, for example, they will need to focus on the importance of post-vocalic /r/ in such words as *heart* and *car*, whereas most speakers of American English will not. If they come from some of the Celtic-speaking areas of Britain, they will automatically pronounce such words as *whales* with a voiceless *wh*, which is a feature of OP; if they normally make no difference between *whales* and *Wales*, as is the case in RP, then they will have to learn to make it. A similar listing, with copious examples, can also be provided online, as in Paul Meier's OP tutorials.[6] In face-to-face settings, the evidence that the system is being internalized comes when the participants begin to "play" with the accent, using it in non-literary contexts—wishing each other *good morning* with a postvocalic /r/ or saying *good night* with a centralized /əɪ/ diphthong in *night*. Having the teacher shout out a series of words in OP and the class repeat them in unison is also a useful technique: it boosts personal confidence and also introduces an element of accommodation within a group whose home accents might be very different from each other.

In providing examples, attention needs to be paid to the frequency of the sounds in OP. As with modern English, some vowels are much more common than others. Words like *day* and *way* are much more common than words like *boy* and *oil*, for instance. It is therefore important to spend a little more time ensuring that the *day* word-set is pronounced really well, with an open /ɛ:/, as it will be heard many times in a Shakespeare speech, and provides an important element in the overall impression or "colour" of the accent. Similarly, resonant open long vowels, such as the /ɑ:/ of *all* or *war*, with no lip-rounding, are going to be more noticeable, simply because of their sonority, than words with close short vowels, such as *cup* and *set*, and need a special focus. Inconsistency in such prominent vowels is one of the things that listeners do notice and conveys the impression of sloppiness that John Trim, among others, commented upon.

Because Shakespearean OP is the ancestor of many modern accents, there will be similarities, which of course fuels the impression that "we speak like that where I come from." It helps to draw attention to these points, as occasion arises. If participants know Canadian English, they will notice the centralized quality of the diphthong in words like *house* /həʊs/. Those who know Australian, New Zealand, or South African English will notice the /ɪ/ quality in words like *yet*. The /ɛ:/ quality of such words as *day* will ring bells with anyone who is familiar with the accents of Lancashire and Yorkshire. The /ɐ:ɹ/ quality in words like *mercy* will remind people of many parts of the United States and Britain ("marcy me!"). The value of these associations is that they convey to the learner that OP is a "real" accent and not simply an arcane reconstruction by academic linguists.

It's important not to spend too long on the phoneme-by-phoneme stage. Actors in particular are impatient to hear their lines spoken in OP and to interact using it. It's impossible to listen to everyone saying all their lines in a group session, of course, so some element of one-to-one tuition is essential. I do this in two stages. First, I provide everyone with an audio version of the play in OP, read in what I call a "flat" recording—saying the lines as accurately as I can, respecting the metre and the

sense, but avoiding emotion or idiosyncrasy of character. This can be made scene by scene or character by character.

If such a recording is made, we need to bear in mind that the director is likely to have cut the play, for a variety of reasons, and only wants to hear the lines that remain. In the case of Tim Carroll's *Romeo and Juliet*, some 600 lines were cut. If someone wants to bring *Hamlet* in within "two hours traffic on the stage," a third of the play will have to go. However, recording only the lines required by director A presents a long-term problem. The next time the same play is produced, director B will make a raft of different decisions. To avoid repeated recordings, it's therefore wise to record the whole of a play first, later providing the director with the required selection (or allowing others to edit it). This is easy enough to do if whole scenes or speeches have to be cut. It's trickier to edit when individual lines or half-lines have gone. If there are lots of these, it's quicker to record a scene twice: one version for the director; the other for posterity!

But even this is only a partial solution, as different directors may use different textual sources. There are often significant differences between the text of a play in the First Folio and one of the routinely available modern English versions. Choices also need to be made about the individual cruxes that have exercised editors over the years—whether it is *sullied* or *solid flesh* at *Hamlet 1.2.129*, for example. Because it's impossible to deal with all options, teachers need to note the decisions they make, so that a recording can be passed on to future users with appropriate commentary. I usually write a set of notes to accompany a recording so that people can see the choices made. For example, a text might be recorded in a colloquial reading with all the initial *h*'s and the final *g*'s (in verbs like *running*) dropped and unstressed pronouns shortened (such as *my* becoming /mɪ/), reflecting Hamlet's requirement that speech should come "trippingly upon the tongue." This would not suit a director who insisted on a more formal declamation.

An open question is whether it is helpful to accompany this recording with some sort of transcription. I learned early on that few actors and directors are able to interpret a full IPA transcription, so decided on a semi-phonetic system, in which only the phonemes that have realisations which differ from modern English are shown in a phonetic script. Everything else is in modern spelling. For example, the *Romeo* line "It is my lady. O it is my love. O that she knew she were" would look like this:

it is mɪ lɛ:dəɪ. o: it is mɪ lɤve. o: that shɪ knew shɪ wɐ:ɹe

Having made such transcriptions[7] now of several plays, I remain in two minds about their usefulness. Some actors find them very helpful; others ignore them. Certainly they are extremely time-consuming to prepare, because each symbol has to be painstakingly added. Whereas a play might be audio-recorded in a day or so, a transcription of this kind can take several weeks to complete. From a linguistic point of view the exercise is valuable, as it forces the analyst to pay attention to the tiny points of detail that might be missed in a solely auditory version. Subtle alternatives in metrical phrasing become apparent, when one has to decide whether to transcribe a word with a short or a long vowel. Previously unnoticed puns and word nuances

suggest themselves as one slowly transcribes. But these are bonuses. For the most part, I suspect, the bulk of a transcription remains unread by the actors it is intended to assist. Most tell me that they listen to the flat recording while reading their script in whatever modern edition has been chosen. These days I work far more with audio recordings than with transcripts.

The recordings are always greatly appreciated. Because the audio-files are large, I usually make them available to individuals using a file-transfer medium, such as Dropbox or WeTransfer. They are always accompanied by a health warning: actors should not be slavish in following my choices. Even though I am trying my best to avoid dramatic interpretations, these can't be completely avoided. A word that I emphasize might conflict with the way an actor or director sees the line. The recording, I stress, is an aid-memoire, not a template. I wouldn't advise listening to it more than once or twice, to avoid the risk of a particular reading getting stuck in someone's mind. Repeated listening can lead to nightmares (as the actor playing Romeo found, after falling asleep with his headphones still on, and my voice ringing in his dreams).

I ask individuals to practise their parts on their own, in their own time, before arranging to hear them one by one. Making academic and theatrical schedules coincide, to allow face-to-face interaction, is often impossible—it certainly was in 2004. If there is an in-house dialect coach (as there was for *Romeo*), this takes the pressure off the linguist, assuming the coach has taken the OP thoroughly on board; but the luxury of such expertise is often absent. As a result, these days I find online interactions, using such a medium as Skype, to be the best solution. A company of a dozen or so actors can be timetabled to call in for a session of fifteen minutes or so, at times to suit both actor and linguist.

As with all line-learning, the process of acquiring OP goes through three stages. An accurate enunciation can be achieved while "on-book," but as soon as the actor goes "off-book," performance deteriorates. It then takes time to build up to the previous level of accuracy. Actors need to be warned that this will happen. But that isn't the end of the story, for when they are on stage and beginning to move around, accuracy deteriorates again, and it takes yet more time to build up to the previous norm. If there is vigorous interaction, such as a Macbeth/Macduff fight, the energy devoted to the action can be at the expense of the articulation. Perhaps nobody (except a passing linguist) would notice, at such times. But I'm always impressed by the way the actors themselves, after getting their breath back, are the first to worry about the way their accent fluency dropped.

This is the point where it is essential to emphasize the most important principle of all: the play's the thing. Macbeth and Macduff need to have a convincing fight, however they speak. And if I heard members of the audience, after an OP production, talk only about the pronunciation, then in my view the exercise has failed. Anyone leaving a Shakespeare play should be on an emotional high as a result of what they have experienced, whether it was tragedy, comedy, or history. They should be bubbling about the drama, the acting, the production generally; they should be reflecting on what the play has "said" to them. And then, almost as an afterthought, they should be recalling how the OP added a new vitality to their experience. OP is a

means to an end; it should never be thought of as an end in itself. The point needs to be emphasized, over and over, in rehearsal.

The OP adds to the theatrical experience in several ways. "Trippingly upon the tongue" means that lines are spoken faster than in many a traditional production. In the 2004 Romeo, which was presented both in OP and in modern English—the only time such a parallel process has happened—the OP performances were ten minutes shorter. The effect of using OP also immediately transfers to body posture and movement. As Glynn MacDonald, the master of movement at the Globe, commented the first time she saw her *Romeo* actors in rehearsal on stage: "They're holding themselves differently; they're moving differently." It was true: the centralized vowels seem to be giving the actors a different centre of gravity. Those who try to describe the feeling talk about the sounds coming from the gut rather than the head. And there are consequences for the way they interpret their characters. The actress playing Juliet found herself able to stand up to the nurse and her parents more in OP than in RP. The actor playing Mercutio found he could say his Queen Mab speech, with its allusions to the natural insect world, much more effectively in what he called the "earthiness" of OP. We have yet to explore all the interactions between OP and these other features of a production. As of 2016, only a third of Shakespeare's plays have been performed in this medium, and hardly any of other writers. We have yet to experience how OP would affect our appreciation of a Falstaff, a Coriolanus, or an Othello, or how the actors' characterisations would be influenced by it.

The OP movement, then, notwithstanding its origins in the nineteenth century, is still in its infancy. The conclusions I have arrived at, as a result of working almost exclusively with Shakespeare, need to be tested against a much larger corpus of contemporary material. The choices I have made about individual sounds and line-readings need to be compared with the views of other linguists interested in the relationship between historical phonology and theatre. We need more teaching experiences, to complement those outlined previously. We need more OP versions, from linguists with different backgrounds, to determine the maximum degree of plausibility we can achieve in reconstructing earlier sound systems. This to me is the supreme attraction, in working on such well-known texts as Shakespeare plays. It is sometimes said, after over two centuries of studies, that there is nothing more to be learned about Shakespeare. OP shows that this is not the case: any teacher who explores an old text for the first time will find something original to say about it, whatever the period and genre.

But at least historical phonology is now centre stage—a huge change from a generation ago. When I was first learning Old English, my tutor refused point-blank to read the texts aloud, on the grounds that all reconstructions are hypothetical and the best we can do is describe them in linguistic terms. So, for example, I was told that the first vowel in *cyning* ("king") was high, front, and rounded, but because we do not know just how much height, frontness, or rounding there would have been there was no justification for trying to articulate it, so rather than be given an inaccurate rendition I was given no rendition at all. As a result, Old English remained, for me, firmly on the page. For so many children today, their first encounters with Shakespeare have also remained on the page.

OP is one way of drawing attention to the way plays can be made to come alive, and in ways that are refreshing. Although there have been many wonderful performances of plays in RP, it is a fact that the majority of audiences around the world, who do not speak RP, find this accent introduces an auditory distance between what they hear on stage and what they hear in their everyday lives. OP helps to bridge that gap. As one inner-city London teenager told me, in a strong east London accent during the *Romeo* interval at the Globe: "Normally, when we go to the theatre, they speak all posh. But this lot, they're speakin' like us." It wasn't an accurate observation, as only a few features heard in present-day East London are found in OP, but that wasn't the point. From the teenager's point of view, the OP was reaching out to him in a way that RP had never been able to do. It is an experience I have since found to be widely shared—and not least in the United States, where actors are now realizing that in order to "own" Shakespeare, they no longer need to present him in a mock-British accent but can give him full rein in an accent that is actually much closer to the way they themselves speak.

It is this greater sense of ownership of a text that OP can provide, whether the listeners have English as a first or foreign language. And for teachers of historical phonology, it can be a revelation, for they learn that not only is their subject intrinsically fascinating—something they already knew—it also turns out to be popular and useful—something they never expected. No linguist teacher could ask for more.

27.4. RESOURCES FOR TEACHING

www.originalpronunciation.com. The site that provides information about past and future OP events around the world, as well as recordings of OP practice and further background on the OP movement.

David Crystal, *The Oxford Dictionary of Original Shakespearean Pronunciation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), with an associated website containing a complete audio file and additional pages of rhyming and other data.

David and Ben Crystal, *The Oxford Illustrated Shakespeare Dictionary* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015). A dictionary aimed specifically at young people, but with a broader student appeal, that includes all the words in the twelve most studied Shakespeare plays that display some difference of meaning with present-day vocabulary, with appendices on grammar and pronunciation.

Paul Meier, *Shakespeare and Original Pronunciation*, http://paulmeier.com/shakespeare.html. A website that includes a tutorial on learning OP and links to Meier's transcription and production of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*.

John Wall, "Virtual Paul's Cross Project," *Virtual St. Paul's Cathedral Project*, http://vpcp.chass.ncsu.edu. A virtual reconstruction of St Paul's Cathedral, used as a perspective for a John Donne sermon, read in OP.