Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Language prescriptivism : attitudes to usage vs. actual language use in American English

Kostadinova, V.

Citation
Kostadinova, V. (2018, December 18). *Language prescriptivism : attitudes to usage vs. actual language use in American English*. Retrieved from https://hdl.handle.net/1887/68226

Version:	Not Applicable (or Unknown)
License:	Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden
Downloaded from:	https://hdl.handle.net/1887/68226

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page

Universiteit Leiden

The handle http://hdl.handle.net/1887/68226 holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

Author: Kostadinova, V.
Title: Language prescriptivism : attitudes to usage vs. actual language use in American English
Issue Date: 2018-12-18

Appendix A: Usage problems in the HUGE database

List of usage problems in the HUGE database

The following is a list of all usage problems included in the HUGE database, which I mention in Chapters 1, 3, and 4. The table contains the usage feature, the definition as included in the database, and the number of guides which treat that particular feature. The definitions have not been changed in any way, which accounts for some inconsistencies in punctuation. A shorter version of this table, excluding the definitions, can be found in Chapter 3.

usage feature	**definition**	**no. guides**
shall / *will*	use of *will* / *would* or *shall* / *should* to indicate futurity / intention / promise / threat	65
different to / *than* / *from*	variability in the choice of the particle after *different*(*ly*) (*to* or *than vs. from*)	63
who / *whom*	use of interrogative *who* or *whom* in initial position	63
lay / *lie*	use of the verbs *to lay* and *to lie*	63
only	the occurrence of only elsewhere than immediately next to the word/words it modifies (cf. Mittins et al. 1970:58)	62
split infinitive	anything inserted between the infinitive-marker *to* and the verb-form itself (Mittins et al. 1970:69)	62
I for *me*	use of subject pronouns where grammar is thought to demand the objective forms (Mittins et al. 1970:89)	61

singular *they*	use of *they* or *their* as a common-sex singular pronoun	59
less / *fewer*	use of *less* or *fewer* when referring to a number	58
none in plural context	the occurrence of *none* with plural verb where a singular is thought to be more appropriate	55
data is / *are*	use of etymologically plural subject form with a singular or plural verb. Forms: *data*, *media*, *phenomena*, *stigmata*, etc.	54
disinterested / *uninterested*	use of *disinterested* or *uninterested* to mean not interested	53
neither ... nor ... are / *is*	use of singular or plural verb with coordinated singular subjects (in negative context)	53
try and / *to*	use of *try and* or *try to*	53
like / *as*	use of *like* or *as* to introduce a clause of comparison	52
nouns of multitude	interpretation of nouns of multitude as singular or plural	52
very unique	use of *very* as an intensifier with an adjective of absolute rather than gradable meaning	52
apostrophe	apostrophes improperly used for plurals *vs.* possessives	52
a / *an*	choice of indefinite article form before words starting with *u-* or *h-*	52
both ... and	proper use of correlative conjunctions	52
between / *among*	use of *between* or *among* when referring to more than two parties	51
slow / *slowly*	use of *slow* or *slowly* as the adverbial form of the adjective *slow*; the use of flat adverbs	51
who(m) / *which* / *that*	choice of relative pronoun *who(m)* or *that*/*which* referring to a human antecedent	51
preposition at end of sentence	the occurrence of a preposition at the end of the sentence rather than before the noun phrase it modifies	50
aggravate	use in sense of to annoy, to irritate	50
snuck and *dove*	choice between weak or strong forms for the past tense or the past participle	50
dangling participle	placement of participle away from the subject of its root verb, or elision of that subject	49
was / *were*	use of indicative form *was* rather than subjunctive form *were* in subjunctive contexts	49
me for *I*	use of objective pronouns in subject position	49

foreign plurals	Anglicised and native singular and plural forms of foreign words	49
due to / *owing to*	use of *due to* or *owing to* as a preposition / adverb in contexts of causality	48
effect / *affect*	use of the verbs *effect* and *affect*	48
infer / *imply*	use of *infer* with meaning *imply* and vice versa	47
literally	use of *literally* as an intensifier in non-literal context	47
alright / *all right*	use of *alright* or *all right* as one word or two	46
this / *these sort of*	use of a plural demonstrative with a singular noun phrase that has a collective plural sense	46
compound subject	choice of compound subjects joined by a coordinator as singular or plural	45
double negatives	use of more than one negative particle to negate the same clause	44
that / *which*	choice between relative pronouns *that* or *which* in relative clauses	44
mutual	use of *mutual* (= reciprocal) and *common* (= shared)	43
can / *may*	choice between *can* and *may* as deontic auxiliary in requests	43
farther / *further*	choice between *further* and *farther* as the comparative of *far*	43
-ic / *-ical*	use of *-ic* or *-ical* to form adjectives from nouns	42
lend / *loan*	use of *loan* as a verb with the meaning of *lend*	42
me / *myself*	use of a reflexive pronoun in a non-reflexive context	42
each other / one another	use of *each other* or *one another* when referring to more than two parties	41
it is I / *it is me*	use of objective or subjective pronoun after *be* in copulative clause	41
reason is because	use of *the reason is because* for *the reason is that*	41
if / *whether*	choice between *if* and *whether* to express a condition or an alternative	41
your / *you're*	confusion of possessive pronoun with personal pronoun-verb contraction	41
one of those who	agreement with subject *one of those who*	40
one ... one / *he*	use of specific pronoun *he* to refer to antecedent unspecific pronoun *one*	39

them / *their* + V-*ing*	use of objective or possessive pronoun in gerundive construction	39
ain't	use of *ain't* to mean *isn't* or *aren't*	39
compare with	choice between the prepositions *with* or *to* with the verb *compare*	39
hopefully	use of *hopefully* as sentence modifier with the sense of *it is to be hoped that ...*	38
than I / *me*	use of *than* as a conjunction – combining with *I* – or as a preposition – combining with *me*	38
former / *latter*	use of *former* and *latter* in the sense *first and last* of three or more things rather than *first and second* of two things	38
equally as	use of *equally as* + Adj for *equally* + Adj	38
decimate	use in the sense of to destroy large proportion of or even obliterate, rather than destroy one tenth of	36
alternative	use of *alternative* to indicate more than two options	36
flaunt / *flout*	use of the verbs *to flaunt* and *to flout*	35
off of	use of *off of* for *of*	35
false attraction	subject-verb agreement when there is an intervening NP.	35
on to / *onto*	use of *on to* or *onto* as two words or one	34
either is / *are*	single or plural verbs with *either*	34
most perfect	comparative or superlative with absolute adjective	34
whose / *of which*	choice between *whose* or *of which* as possessive pronoun with non-human antecedents	34
(not) as / *so far as*	variation between *so ... as* and *as ... as* depending on whether or not it is preceded by a negative particle	33
may / *might*	choice between *may* and *might* as epistemic auxiliary	33
from thence	use of deictic preposition with deictic adverbs *thence* / *hence* / *whence*	32
like / *as if*	use of *like* with the sense of *as if*	31
either of them / *each of them*	choice between *either* or *each* referring to two or more; *either* meaning each of two or both	31
But / *And*	begin sentence with *But* or *And*	31
have to / *have got to*	use of *get* in a sense apart from *obtain* or *acquire*, in expressing necessity or obligation	30
comma splice	using a comma rather than semicolon to connect two main clauses	30

subject-complement	subject-subject complement agreement (in a copular construction)	30
averse to / from	use of *to* or *from* with *averse* and *adverse*	29
in / *into*	choice of preposition for position / movement	29
spoonsful	plural formation of the type N-ful	29
either ... or ... (*or ...*)	use of the construction *either ... or (... or)* to refer to more than two entities.	28
providing / *provided*	use of *providing* and *provided* with the same sense	28
family is / *are*	use of plural or singular verb with nouns that can be interpreted as both mass or count nouns	27
very / *much amused*	use of *very* or *much* to qualify an adjective or past participle. For the purist, *very* is an intensifier; only qualities – and not actions – may be intensified, and therefore *very* can qualify an adjective but not a past participle	26
superlative comparison	use of the superlative to compare two things	26
-lily adverbs	formation of adverbs from adjectives ending in *-ly*	26
hoi polloi	inclusion of definite article in hoi polloi (= 'the many')	25
contemporary	use of *contemporary* in the sense of present day, up-to-date, or referring to a previously established time frame	24
likely	adverbial use of *likely*	24
could of	use of *could / would / should / must of* for *could / would / should / must have*	24
dare	*dare* as marginal modal verb	23
more warmer	the use of double comparatives or double superlatives	23
in / *under circumstances*	use of the preposition *in* or *under* with the word *circumstances*	21
'd rather	choice of auxiliary *have* or *will*, and meaning of contracted form	21
there's	using a plural subject with a singular verb form in case of is a dummy subject with contracted verb form, there's	21
corporeal / *corporal*	use of *corporeal* and *corporal*	20
learn / *teach*	use of *learn* and *teach*	20

as well (as) ... or better than	elision of *as* in coordination of the phrase *as well as* with *better than*	19
pretty	use of *pretty* as a degree adverb	19
the two first	choice between *the two first / last* and *the first / last two*	19
upon	choice between *upon* and *on*	16
double passive	use of constructions with multiple passives	16
thusly	use of *thusly* instead of *thus*	16
like / the way	use of *(in) the way* or *like* in expressions of analogy	15
have went	use of the past participle form for simple past tense or vice versa	15
split auxiliaries	insertion of element between auxiliaries or auxiliary and main verb (split compound verbs)	15
off / from	use of *off* or *from*	14
quicker / more quickly than	use of *quicker* or *more quickly* as the comparative form of *quick*	14
omission of relative pronoun	omission of the relative pronouns *who*, *that*, *which* in non-restrictive relative clauses	14
gay	use of *gay* to mean 'homosexual'	14
thankfully	use in the sense 'in a thankful way' not 'let us be thankful that'	14
demonstrative *them*	use of personal pronoun *them* as a demonstrative pronoun	14
meet with / meet up with	inclusion of preposition *up* in the phrasal verb *meet with*	13
all that / so easy	use of *all that* or *so* to modify an adjective / adverb	12
hisself	use of *hisself* for *himself*	12
at / in	choice of *at* rather than *in* or *on* with *university*, *school* and similar nouns	11
less / least	choice of *less* and *least* when referring to two or more things	9
when	*when* or *where* used in defining as in *X is when/where Y*	8
get thither	use of deictic verb that also indicate location with deictic adverbs that do the same	6
evenings and Sundays	coordination of prepositional phrases with different elided prepositional heads	4
at (the) university	omission of *the* before *university* and some similar nouns	4

momentarily	the use of *momentarily* to mean 'for a moment or short time'/ 'in an instant' / 'from moment to moment' / 'at any moment'	1

Appendix B: Usage guides in American English

Anderson, Charles. 1931. *Common Errors in English Corrected*. New York: Van Nostrand Co.

Anonymous. 1886. *Many Mistakes Mended: Containing Two Thousand Five Hundred Corrections in Speaking, Pronouncing, and Writing the English language*. New York: N. Tibbals & Sons.

Anonymous. 1953. *The Associated Press Stylebook*. New York: Associated Press.

Anonymous. 1996. *The American Heritage Book of English Usage*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

Bailie, John and Moyna Kitchin. 1979. *The Newnes Guide to English Usage*. Feltham, Middlesex: Newnes Books.

Baker, Josephine Turck. 1909. *Correct English in the Home*. Chicago: Correct English Publishing Company.

Baker, Sheridan. 1962. *The Practical Stylist*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co.

Baker, Sheridan. 1984. *The Complete Stylist and Handbook*. New York: Harper & Row.

Ball, Francis K. 1923. *Constructive English*. Boston: Ginn.

Barnard, Ellsworth. 1979. *English for Everybody*. Amherst, Mass.: Dinosaur Press.

Barnes, Duane C. 1948. *Wordlore*. New York: E.P. Dutton & Co.

Barzun, Jacques. 1985. *Simple & Direct*. New York: Harper & Row.

Barzun, Jacques. 1986. *A Word or Two Before You Go*. Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press.

Bawer, Bruce. 1987. *The Contemporary Stylist*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Belanoff, Pat, Betsy Rorschach, and Mia Oberlink. 1986. *The Right Handbook*. Upper Montclair, N.J.: Boynton/Cook.

Bell, James K. and Adrian A. Cohn. 1972. *Bell & Cohn's Handbook of Grammar, Style, and Usage*. Beverly Hills: Glencoe Press.

Bell, Janis. 2008. *Clean, Well-lighted Sentences: A Guide to Avoiding the Most Common Errors of Grammar and Punctuation*. New York: W. W. Norton & Co.

Bell, Ralcy H. 1902. *The Worth of Words*. New York: Grafton Press.

Bernstein, Theodore M. 1958. *Watch Your Language*. Manhasset, N.Y.: Channel Press.

Bernstein, Theodore M. 1962. *More Language That Needs Watching*. Manhasset, N.Y.: Channel Press.

Bernstein, Theodore M. 1965. *The Careful Writer*. New York: Atheneum.

Bernstein, Theodore M. 1971. *Miss Thistlebottom's Hobgoblins: The Careful Writer's Guide to the Taboos, Bugbears, and Outmoded Rules of English Usage*. New York: Simon & Schuster, Inc.

Bernstein, Theodore M. 1977. *Dos, Don'ts and Maybes of English Usage*. New York: Time Books.

Berry, Thomas E. 1971. *The Most Common Mistakes in English Usage*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.

Blount, Alma and Clark S. Northup. 1931. *Grammar and Usage*. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Boyle, Joe. 1982. *The Federal Way with Words*. Washington, D.C.: Twain Pub.

Boyle, Toni and K. D. Sullivan. 2005. *The Gremlins of Grammar: A Guide to Conquering the Mischievous Myths that Plague American English*. Chicago: McGraw-Hill.

Bremner, John B. 1980. *Words on Words*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Brown, Ivor. 1945. *A Word in Your Ear and Just Another Word*. New York: E.P. Dutton & Co.

Brown, Ivor. 1948. *I Give You My Word and Say the Word*. New York: E.P. Dutton & Co.

Brown, Ivor. 1951. *No Idle Words and Having the Last Word*. New York: E.P. Dutton & Co.

Bryant, Margaret M. 1962. *Current American Usage*. New York: Funk & Wagnalls Co.

Bryant, William C. 1877. *Index Expurgatorius*. Originally unpublished, but reprinted in Bernstein (1971).

Buckley, William F. 1996. *Buckley: The Right Word*. New York: Random House.

Butt, Margot and Linda Lane. 1973. *Collins Gem Dictionary of American Usage*. London: Collins.

Campbell, Cathy. 2008. *The Giggly Guide to Grammar*. Shoreham, Vt.: Discover writing press.

Carew, Paul T. 1923. *The Art of Phrasing in Composition*. Boston: Stratford Co.

Carter, Ronald and Michael McCarthy. 2006. *Cambridge Grammar of English: A Comprehensive Guide*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Casagrande, June. 2006. *Grammar Snobs are Great Big Meanies: A Guide to Language for Fun and Spite*. New York: Penguin Books.

Cazort, Douglas. 1997. *Under the Grammar Hammer*. Los Angeles: Lowell House.

Cioffi, Frank L. 2015. *One Day in the Life of the English Language: A Microcosmic Usage Handbook*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Claiborne, Robert. 1986. *Saying What You Mean: A Commonsense Guide to American Usage*. New York: Ballantine Books.

Clark, Stewart and Graham E. Pointon. 2016. *The Routledge Student Guide to English Usage*. London and New York: Routledge.

Cody, Sherwin. 1903. *The New Art of Writing & Speaking the English Language*. New York: SunDial Press, Inc.

Cody, Sherwin. 1905. *Dictionary of Errors*. New York: Funk & Wagnalls.

Colby, Frank. 1944. *The Practical Handbook of Better English*. New York: Grosset & Dunlap.

Cook, Claire K. 1985. *Line by Line: How to Improve Your Own Writing*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.

Copperud, Roy H. 1960. *Words on Paper: A Manual of Prose Style for Professional Writers, Reporters, Authors, Editors, Publishers, and Teachers*. New York: Hawthorn Books, Inc.

Copperud, Roy H. 1964. *Webster's Dictionary of Usage and Style*. New York: E.P. Dutton, Inc.

Copperud, Roy H. 1970. *American Usage: The Consensus*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

Corder, Jim W. 1981. *Handbook of Current English*. Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman.

Dahlskog, Helen, ed. 1972. *A Dictionary of Contemporary and Colloquial Usage.* New York: Avenel Books.

Davidson, Mark. 2006. *Right, Wrong and Risky: A Dictionary of Today's American English Usage*. New York and London: W.W. Norton & Co.

Davis, C. Rexford. 1936. *Toward Correct English*. New York: Appleton Century Crofts, Inc.

Dorey, J. Milnor. 1949. *Good English Made Easy*. New York: Permabooks.

Dumond, Val. 1990. *The Elements of Nonsexist Usage: A Guide to Inclusive Spoken and Written English*. New York: Prentice Hall Press.

Eggenschwiler, Jean. 1997. *Writing: Grammar, Usage, and Style*. Lincoln, Nebr.: Cliffs Notes.

Ehrlich, Eugene and Daniel Murphy. 1991. *The HarperCollins Concise Dictionary of English Usage*. New York: HarperCollins.

Eichler, Lillian. 1928. *Well-Bred English*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, Doran & Co.

Einstein, Charles. 1985. *How to Communicate: The Manning Selvage & Lee Guide to Clear Writing and Speech*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Elsbree, Langdon and Frederick Bracher. 1968. *Brief Handbook of Usage*. Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath & Co.

Erskine, John and Helen Erskine. 1910. *Written English: A Guide to the Rules of Composition*. New York: Century Co.

Evans, Bergen. 1962. *Comfortable Words*. New York: Random House.

Fennell, Francis L. 1980. *Writing Now: A College Handbook*. Chicago: Science Research Associates, Inc.

Ferguson, Don K. 1995. *Grammar Gremlins*. Lakewood, Colo.: Glenbridge Publishing Ltd.

Fernald, James. 1904. *Connectives of English Speech: The Correct Usage of*

Conjunctions, Relative Pronouns and Adverbs Explained and Illustrated. New York: Funk & Wagnalls Co.

Fernald, James C. 1911. *Helpful Hints in English.* New York: Funk & Wagnalls Co.

Fischer, James A. 1999. *Talking Correctly for Success: A Practical Guide to Sounding 'Right' for Business, Professional and Social Success*. Blue Ridge Summit, Pa.: Avant Publishing Co., revised edn.

Flesch, Rudolf. 1962. *How to Be Brief: An Index to Simple Writing*. New York: Harper & Row.

Flesch, Rudolf. 1964. *The ABC of Style: A Guide to Plain English*. New York: Harper & Row.

Flesch, Rudolf. 1983. *Lite English: Popular Words That Are OK to Use*. New York: Crown Pubs., Inc.

Foulke, Adrienne. 1964. *English for Everyone*. New York: Pocket Books.

Freeman, Morton S. 1983. *A Treasury for Word Lovers*. Philadelphia: ISI Press.

Freeman, Morton S. 1998. *The Wordwatchers Guide to Good Grammar & Word Usage: Authoritative Answers to Today's Grammar and Usage Questions*. Medford, N.J.: Plexus Publications.

Garner, Bryan A. 1987. *A Dictionary of Modern Legal Usage*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Garner, Bryan A. 2016. *The Chicago Guide to Grammar, Usage, and Punctuation*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Goodman, Roger. 1962. *A Concise Handbook of Better English*. New York: Bantam Books.

Gordon, Karen E. 1993. *The New Well-Tempered Sentence: A Punctuation Handbook for the Innocent, the Eager and the Doomed*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

Gordon, Karen Elizabeth. 1997. *Torn Wings and Faux Pas*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Greenwood, Joseph A. 1969. *Find It in Fowler: An Alphabetical Index*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton Univ. Press.

Greer, Garland and Easley S. Jones. 1924. *The Century Collegiate Handbook*. New York: Century.

Griswold, William M. 1882. *A Manual for Misused Words*. Bangor, Maine: Q.P. Index Publishers.

Grossman, Ellie. 1997. *The Grammatically Correct Handbook*. New York: Hyperion.

Gummere, John F. 1989. *Words & C.* Haverford, Pa.: Bolchazy-Carducci Publishers.

Guth, Hans. 1985. *New English Handbook*. Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth.

Gutierrez, Lucy. 2015. *English is Not Easy: A Visual Guide to the Language*. New York: Gotham Books.

Haber, Tom B. 1942. *A Writer's Handbook of American Usage*. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

Haberstroh, Emil F. 1931. *How to Speak Good English*. Racine, Wis: Whitman Publishing Co.

Hale, Constance and Jessie Scanlon. 1999. *Wired Style: Principles of English Usage in the Digital Age*. New York: Broadway Books.

Hennesy, James A. 1917. *The Dictionary of Grammar*. New York: Funk & Wagnalls.

Herbert, A.P. 1935. *What a Word!* Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, Doran & Co.

Hodgson, John C. and Mary E. Whitten. 1984. *The Harbrace College Handbook*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Hook, J.N. 1962. *Hook's Guide to Good Writing*. New York: Ronald Press Co.

Hook, J.N. and E.G. Mathews. 1956. *Modern American Grammar and Usage*. New York: Ronald Press Co.

Hopper, Vincent F., Cedric Gale, and Ronald C. Foote. 1984. *A Pocket Guide to Correct Grammar*. New York: Barron's Educational Series, Inc.

Hotchkiss, George B. and Edward J. Kilduff. 1914. *Handbook of Business English*. New York: New York University Book Store.

Howard, Philip. 1977. *New Words for Old*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Hudson, Randolph H. 1966. *A Modern Handbook of American English*. Chicaco: Science Research Associates, Inc.

Hyck, Wynford. 2009. *The Basics of English Usage*. London and New York: Routledge.

Irmscher, William F. 1976. *The Holt Guide to English*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Ivers, Mitchell. 1991. *The Random House Guide to Good Writing*. New York: Ballantine Books.

Janis, J. Harold. 1984. *Modern Business Language and Usage in Dictionary Form*. Garden City, N.Y: Doubleday.

Jenkins, Evan. 2007. *That or Which, and Why: A Usage Guide for Thoughtful Writers and Editors*. New York: Routledge.

Jones, George A. 1967. *English for Adventurers*. New York: Pageant Press, Inc.

Kilduff, Edward J. 1941. *Words and Human Nature: How to Choose and Use Effective Words*. New York: Harper & Bros.

Kilpatrick, James J. 1984. *The Writer's Art*. Kansas City: Andrews, McMeel & Parker.

Kilpatrick, James J. 1985. *The Ear Is Human: A Handbook of Homophones and Other Confusions*. Kansas City: Andrews, McMeel & Parker.

Kirtland, Elizabeth. 1968. *Write It Right: A Handbook of Homonyms*. New York: Golden Press.

Langan, John and Janet M. Goldstein. 1997. *English Brushup*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Larsen, Karen. 1994. *The Miss Grammar Guidebook*. Lake Oswego: Oregon State Bar.

Lederer, Richard. 1987. *Anguished English: An Anthology of Accidental Assaults upon Our Language*. Charleston, S.C.: Wyrick & Co.

Leggett, Glenn H., Carl D. Mead, and Melinda G. Kramer. 1954. *Prentice Hall Handbook for Writers*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.

LePan, Don. 1988. *The Broadview Book of Common Errors in English: A Guide to Righting Wrongs*. Peterborough, Ontario/Orchard Park, N.Y: Broadview.

LePan, Don. 1992. *The Broadview Book of Common Errors in English*. Peterborough, Ontario: Broadview Press.

Lewis, Norman. 1948. *Better English*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell & Co.

Lieberman, Leo. 1962. *Dictionary of Correct English Usage*. Paterson, N.J.: Littlefield Adams & Co.

Lodwig, Richard R. and Eugene F. Barrett. 1967. *The Dictionary and the Language*. New York: Hayden Book Co.

Long, J.H. 1888. *Slips of Tongue and Pen*. New York: D. Appleton & Co.

Lurie, Charles. 1927. *How to Say It*. New York: G.P. Putnam's.

Lynch, Jack. 2008. *The English Language: A User's Guide*. Newburyport, Mass.: Focus Publishing/R Pullins Co.

MacCracken, Henry N. and Helen E. Sandison. 1917. *Manual of Good English*. New York: Macmillan & Co.

Maggio, Rosalie. 2001. *How to Say it: Style Guide*. Paramus: Prentice Hall Press.

Magio, Rosalie. 1987. *The Nonsexist Wordfinder*. Phoenix: Oryx.

Manly, John M. and John A. Powell. 1913. *A Manual for Writers*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Manly, John M. and Edith Rickert. 1923. *The Writer's Index of Good Form and Good English*. New York: Henry Holt & Co.

Martin, Phyllis. 1977. *Word Watcher's Handbook*. New York: David McKay.

Mathews, William. 1876. *Words: Their Use and Abuse*. Chicago: S.C. Griggs & Co.

McElfresh, G.E. and E.C. Ingalls. 1940. *Everyday English*. New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons.

McMahan, Elizabeth and Susan Day. 1980. *The Writer's Rhetoric and Handbook*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

McMahan, Elizabeth and Susan Day. 1984. *The Writer's Rhetoric and Handbook*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 2nd edn.

Miller, Casey and Kate Swift. 1980. *The Handbook of Nonsexist Writing*. New York: Lippincott.

Montgomery, Michael and John Stratton. 1981. *The Writer's Hotline Handbook*. New York: New American Library.

Nickles, Harry G. 1974. *Dictionary of Do's and Don'ts for Writers and Speakers.* New York: Greenwich House.

Nurnberg, Maxwell. 1972. *Questions You Always Wanted to Ask About English ... but Were Afraid to Raise Your Hand*. New York: Washington Square Books.

O'Connor, Patricia and Tom Stiglich. 2007. *Woe Is I Jr: The Younger Grammarphobe's Guide to Better English in Plain English*. New York: Penguin.

O'London, John. 1925. *Is It Good English?* New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons.

Opdycke, John B. 1941. *Get It Right! A Cyclopedia of Correct English Usage*. New York: Funk & Wagnalls Co.

Opdycke, John B. 1944. *Say What You Mean: Everyman's Guide to Diction and Grammar*. New York: Funk & Wagnalls Co.

Opdycke, John B. 1949. *Mark My Words: A Guide to Modern Usage and Expression*. New York: Harper & Bros.

Opdycke, John B. 1950. *The Opdycke Lexicon of Word Selection*. New York: Funk & Wagnalls Co.

Orcutt, William D. 1912. *The Writer's Desk Book*. Norwood, Mass.: Frederick A. Stokes Co.

Orcutt, William D. 1926. *The Desk Reference Book*. New York: Frederick A. Stokes Co.

Partridge, Eric. 1942. *Usage and Abusage: A Guide to Good English*. New York: Harper & Bros.

Paxson, William C. 1990. *The New American Dictionary of Confusing Words*. New York: Signet.

Pence, Raymond W. 1944. *Style Book in English*. New York: Odyssey Press.

Phythian, B.A. 1990. *A Concise Dictionary of Confusables*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Pocock, Guy N. 1936. *Brush Up Your Own Language*. Philadelphia: David McKay Co.

Postman, Neil, Charles Weingartner, and Terence P. Moran, eds. 1969. *Language in America*. New York: Pegasus.

Ransom, Robert W. 1911. *Hints & "Don'ts" for Writers and Copyreaders*. Chicago: Chicago Record Herald.

Rattray, David, ed. 1983. *Success with Words: A Guide to the American Language*. Pleasantville, N.Y: Reader's Digest.

Raub, Albert N. 1889. *Hints and Helps of English Grammar*. Cleveland: J.R. Holcomb & Co.

Raub, Albert N. 1897. *Helps in the Use of Good English*. Philadelphia: Albert N. Raub & Co.

Rine, George W. 1902. *The Essentials of Our Language: A Guide to Accuracy in the Use of the English Language*. Oakland: Pacific Press Publishing Co.

Rothwell, Kenneth S. 1971. *Questions of Rhetoric and Usage*. Boston: Little, Brown & Co.

Rovin, Jeff. 1994. *What's the Difference? A Compendium of Commonly Confused and Misused Words*. New York: Ballantine Books.

Runkel, Philip and Margaret Runkel. 1984. *A Guide to Usage for Writers and Students in the Social Sciences*. Totawa, N.J.: Rowman & Allanheld.

Safire, William. 1980. *On Language*. New York: Times Books.

Safire, William. 1982. *What's the Good Word?* New York: Times Books.

Safire, William. 1984. *I Stand Corrected*. New York: Times Books.

Safire, William. 1986. *Take My Word for It*. New York: Times Books.

Safire, William. 1990. *Fumblerules: A Lighthearted Guide to Grammar and Good Usage*. New York: Doubleday.

Safire, William. 1991. *Coming to Terms*. New York: Doubleday.

Safire, William. 1994. *In Love with Norma Loquendi*. New York: Random House.

Safire, William. 1997. *Watching My Language*. New York: Random House.

Schumaker, Florence. 1948. *The Student's Guide*. Cleveland, Tenn.: Church of God Publishing House.

Semmelmeyer, Madeline and Donald O. Bolander. 1955. *The Instant English Handbook*. Mundelein, Ill.: Career Institute.

Sessions, Keith W. 2013. *A Sometimes Snarky Guide to English Usage, Grammar & Punctuation*. Charleston, S.C.: CreateSpace.

Shaw, Harry. 1962. *Errors in English and Ways to Correct Them*. New York: Barnes & Noble.

Shostak, Jerome. 1968. *Concise Dictionary of Current American Usage*. New York: Washington Square Press, Inc.

Siegal, Allan M. and William G. Connolly. 1999. *The New York Times Manual of Style and Usage*. New York: Times Books.

Spector, Stephen. 2015. *May I Quote You on That?: A Guide to Grammar and Usage*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Stratton, Clarence. 1940. *Handbook of English*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.

Terputac, Thomas J. 1989. *A Handbook of English Usage*. Lawrenceville, Va.: Brunswick Publishing Corp.

Thomas, Charles S. 1941. *Your Mastery of English*. New York: P.F. Collier & Son.

Thomas, Henry. 1954. *Better English Made Easy*. New York: Greystone Press.

Thomas, Lewis. 1990. *Et Cetera, Et Cetera: Notes of a Word-Watcher*. Boston: Little, Brown & Co.

Thompson, Newton. 1947. *A Handy Guide for Writers*. St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co.

Timmons, Christine and Frank Gibney, eds. 1980. *Britannica Book of English Usage*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday/Britannica Books.

Tracz, Richard F. 1991. *Dr. Grammar's Writes from Wrongs*. New York: Vintage Books.

Trask, Robert L. 2005. *Say What you Mean!: A Troubleshooter's Guide to English Style and Usage*. Boston: David R. Godine.

Trimmer, Joseph F. and James M. McCrimmon. 1988. *Writing with a Purpose*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Urdang, Laurence. 1988. *The Dictionary of Confusable Words*. New York: Ballantine Books.

Utter, Robert P. 1914. *A Guide to Good English*. New York: Harper & Bros.

Venolia, Jan. 1982. *Write Right! A Desk Drawer Digest of Punctuation, Grammar and Style*. Berkeley: Ten Speed Press.

Vizetelly, Frank H. 1933. *How to Use English: A Guide to Correct Speech and Writing*. New York: Funk & Wagnalls Co.

Wagnalls, Funk. 1917. *Faulty Diction as Corrected by the Funk & Wagnalls New Standard Dictionary of the English Language*. New York: Funk & Wagnalls Co.

Wallwork, Adrian. 2013. *English for Research Usage, Style, and Grammar*. New York: Springer.

Watt, William. 1967. *A Short Guide to English Usage*. Cleveland: World.

Weekley, Ernest. 1931. *Cruelty to Words, or First Aid for the Best-Seller*. New York: E.P. Dutton & Co.

Weseen, Maurice H. 1922. *Everyday Uses of English*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell.

Weseen, Maurice H. 1928. *Crowell's Dictionary of English Grammar and Handbook of American Usage*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co.

Weseen, Maurice H. 1932. *Words Confused and Misused*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company.

Whitford, Robert C. and James R. Foster. 1955. *Concise Dictionary of American Usage and Grammar*. New York: Philosophical Library.

Williams, Deborah K. 1995. *NTC's Dictionary of Easily Confused Words*. Lincolnwood, Ill.: National Textbook Co.

Williams, Joseph M. 1981. *Style: Ten Lessons in Clarity and Grace*. Glenview: Scott, Foresman & Co.

Willis, Hulon. 1964. *Structure, Style, and Usage: A Guide to Expository Writing*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Wilson, Robert F., ed. 1982. *The Macmillan Handbook of English*. New York: Macmillan.

Witherspoon, Alexander M. 1943. *Common Errors in English and How to Avoid Them*. New York: New Home Library.

Wood, Clement. 1944. *More Power to Your Words!* New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Appendix C: Corpus data extraction

Extraction of corpus occurrences of features

In this appendix I explain how I extracted, or identified, all occurrences of each of the features analysed from corpus data used for the analyses presented in Chapter 6. I used the full-text data from the Corpus of Contemporary American English and the Corpus of Historical American English, and searched the two corpora and extracted all relevant cases of the features with the programming language Python,[2] and the command shell Jupyter Notebooks.[3] In addition to the main features investigated in this thesis, an additional number of features were used for the analysis of prescriptive influence on the occurrence of the split infinitive. The occurrences of all of these features were searched for in the corpora, and the relevant data extracted from the corpora in a similar way.

The first part of this appendix provides the details for the extraction of the occurrences of variants of the main features analysed, i.e. *ain't*, discourse particle *like*, *literally*, negative concord, object *I*/subject *me*, and the split infinitive. The second part of the appendix provides the details for the extraction of the additional language features, i.e. *and/but* at the beginning of the sentence, singular *data*, *hopefully*, *less* with plural nouns, *these kind/sort of*, *try and*, plural *none*, passives, *shall*, and *whom*.

The general procedure for each of the features described below was first to search for and extract each relevant lemma (e.g. *data*) from the

[2] See https://www.python.org.
[3] See https://jupyter.org.

word/lemma/part-of-speech-tagged files from the full-text corpus data.[4] After all occurrences of that particular lemma were extracted from the corpus files, the concordance lines were split into individual tokens. Each token has an accompanying part-of-speech tag, on the basis of which each occurrence could be further classified, and relevant occurrences could be identified. This appendix outlines how specific features were identified and extracted from the corpus texts, i.e. how this process was conducted.

Extraction of the main features used in the analysis

Ain't – All occurrences of *ain't* were extracted from the corpus files using an appropriate regular expression (essentially the string `ai n't`, as it appears in the corpus files). The occurrences of *ain't* were extracted along with the immediate preceding and following context, creating a concordance for all the uses of *ain't*. Each of these occurrences was then classified into two groups: *ain't* for *be not*, if *ain't* was followed by an *-ing* form or a noun phrase; and *ain't* for *have not*, if *ain't* was followed by a past participle. In addition to these, all occurrences of present *be not* forms and present *have not* forms were also extracted, in order to establish the total number of potential environments in which *ain't* could have occurred. In these cases, all forms of the respective verbs were taken into consideration, i.e. full forms, copula-contracted forms, and *not*-contracted forms (see Section 3.3 for more on these distinctions).

Like – First, all occurrences of *like* were extracted from the corpus data using a regular expression; the immediate preceding and following context was also extracted. Occurrences of discourse particle *like* were identified on the basis of punctuation in the corpus, i.e. commas preceding and following *like*, and further selected from the initial dataset. This was done because the initial attempt to extract these occurrences on the basis of their part-of-speech tags revealed that tags tended to be quite messy, which would have resulted in a high level of inaccuracy in the analysed data. However, as most of the occurrences of discourse particle *like* were preceded and followed by a comma, this was then used as a more practical way of extracting these occurrences.

Literally – The initial extraction of *literally* from the corpus files was the same as that for all the other features: all occurrences of *literally* were extracted using regular expressions, and the immediate preceding and following context was also included in the concordances thus produced. Further disambiguation of these cases of *literally* was done on the basis of a tripartite distinction of uses. The first one refers to the primary

[4] See https://www.corpusdata.org for more information on the full-text data.

use of *literally*, referring to what a word or a phrase means, how something is to be understood, or interpreted, pointing out that something should be taken literally, and not figuratively, or saying that something is literally true. The second use of *literally* included cases of dual use, where *literally* is used with idiomatic or figurative expressions to force a literal meaning of a conventionally non-literal expression. Finally, the third use of *literally*, the so-called non-literal use, refers to cases where *literally* is used with non-literal expressions, hyperbolic or figurative, in which it is obvious from the context that a literal meaning is not possible. As I explain in Section 4.4, the disambiguation of these uses of *literally* consisted of two parts. For the first part of the analysis, concordance lines in which *literally* is preceded or followed by words indicating that the use of *literally* is the primary use were identified. Such words included any form of *mean*, *interpret*, *read*, *say*, *write*, *translate*, and similar forms. Some manual check-up was used to identify these forms, but the disambiguation itself was done automatically in Python (this involved using 'if-functions'). On the basis of these forms, concordance lines in which *literally* was preceded or followed by these forms were classified as primary, while all the other ones were classified as secondary, here including both dual and non-literal cases. The second part of the analysis involved manually disambiguating cases in a systematic random sample of the entire dataset for *literally*; the sample was drawn by selecting every fifth occurrence from the overall set of occurrences of *literally*. These cases were then manually classified into the three categories mentioned above.

Negative concord – For the extraction of cases of negative concord, I identified occurrences of negated verbs used with indefinites in post-verbal position. I selected the indefinites *anything/nothing*, *anyone/no one*, and *anybody/nobody*. This was done by extracting all occurrences of these six words from the corpora separately, and subsequently checking whether they were preceded by a negated verbs. The part-of-speech tags of the five preceding words were checked. If one of them was identified as *not/n't* or *never*, the instance in question was identified as a case of negation with a post-verbal indefinite. The concordance lines for *anything*, *anyone*, and *anybody* in which a negative element was identified at one of the five preceding slots were classified as single negation cases, e.g. *I haven't seen anybody*, while the concordances for *nothing*, *no one*, and *nobody* in which a negative elements was identified at one of the five preceding slots were classified as double negation cases, e.g. *I haven't seen nobody*. The remaining cases in the concordances for *nothing*, *no one*, and *nobody* in which a negative element was not identified were then checked for verbs. If a non-negated verb was identified in one of the five preceding slots, those

cases were classified as cases of single negation with *nothing*, *no one* and *nobody*, e.g. *I saw nobody*.

Pronouns: object *I* and subject *me* – In order to extract occurrences of object *I*, the first step was to identify coordinated phrases functioning as objects, in which one of the coordinated phrase-constituents is realised with *I*. Taking into account all such cases proved difficult for two reasons. The first reason was that the syntactic function of a coordinated phrase is not always straightforwardly determined automatically on the basis of a part-of-speech-tagged corpus; some kind of manual disambiguation subsequent to the automatic extraction of cases was therefore necessary. Secondly, cases in which the coordinated phrase involves two pronouns can reasonably be expected to behave differently with respect to the realisation of *I*/*me* than cases in which the first element is a noun. For example, in a sentence such as *He brought a present for him and me*, the realisation of *me* is likely to be affected by the realisation of *him*, while in a sentence such as *He brought a present for Anne and me*, this constraint is not present. In order to minimise such additional constraints on the realisation of *I*/*me* in object coordinated phrases, I limited my search to object coordinated phrases in which one of the constituents is a proper noun, which was done on the basis of identifying all cases in which *I* or *me* are coordinated with a proper noun, as tagged in the part-of-speech-tagged corpus data. This was done by first extracting occurrences of the strings 'and I' and 'and me'. The function of these strings was then determined automatically on the basis of preceding and following elements. For instance, cases where the phrase NP-proper + *and* + *I* is both immediately preceded by a preposition or a verb and immediately followed by an element other than a verb were identified as cases of coordinated phrases functioning as objects in the sentence. The analysis also did not take into account cases where the coordinated phrase is a complement to *to be*, or where they are part of subordinated clauses with *for... to...*, because such cases introduce additional constraints to the choice of form.

Split infinitive – All occurrences of the infinitive marker *to* were extracted from the corpus files and were subsequently disambiguated to distinguish between cases where *to* is immediately followed by a verb, and cases where *to* is followed by another part of speech and then by a verb, in other words, *to* + V, and *to* + [WORD] + V. This was done in order to first examine the types of elements that can come between the *to* and the verb, so that those same elements could then be checked in pre-verbal and post-verbal positions. After examining the most common 'splitters', i.e. elements that can modify an infinitive, and that can vary between pre-verbal (*really to know*), post-verbal (*to know really*), or medial position (*to really know*), only those cases which the adverb

can be placed pre-verbally or post-verbally were taken into account for the analysis. Since these elements included most lexical adverbs ending in *-ly*, these cases were used for the variationist analysis of patterns of use of the split infinitive (see Sections 4.4 and 6.7). Infinitives split by the negator *not* were not taken into account, because they follow different patterns of variation, in that *not* can only take a pre-verbal (*he decided not to join*) or a split (*he decided to not join*) position; this is different from adverbial splitters, as explained above. Finally, the variable context was established as infinitives modified by one element only; thus, infinitives split by two elements, or modified by two adverbs, were not included in the analysis.

For the multifactorial analysis discussed in Section 6.8, a subset of all occurrences of modified infinitives was selected on the basis of the length of the corpus texts in which these infinitives occurred. Modified infinitives found in texts between 5,000 and 9,999 words were selected, in order to avoid a dataset with a large number of zeros, as the features extracted are not always highly frequent, and many short texts in the corpus contain no instances of these features. A random sample of a third of these instances was selected and manually classified to exclude all false positives (i.e. cases where the pre-verbal or post-verbal adverbs do not modify the infinitive, such as *to advance entirely different arguments*, as well as cases where there are two or more pre-verbal and post-verbal adverbs). Finally, the manually checked cases of split and non-split modified infinitives were further cleaned up in order to ensure that there were no two cases from the same text, because independent observations are required for the application of the binomial logistic regression analysis. The resulting dataset contained 4,926 cases of infinitives modified by a single *-ly* adverb.

Extraction of other prescriptively targeted features

The features below were used as prescriptivism-related predictors in the analysis of prescriptive influence on the use of split infinitives presented in Section 6.8. For all of these features, only the typically proscribed variant was identified, and the corpus texts were searched only for those variants, i.e. the frequencies of occurrence per 1,000 words for each text were calculated, but not the proportion of these variants in relation to their prescribed counterparts. For instance, only the frequency of singular *data* was established for each text in the corpus, and not its proportion in relation to plural *data*. The same goes for all other features.

Sentence-initial *and/but* – Each text in the corpus was searched for sentence-initial *and/but*, using regular expressions and punctuation to identify these occurrences. The

number of occurrences of these two words taken together was calculated for each text in the corpus, and was subsequently normalised per 1,000 words.

Data – Occurrences of singular *data* were identified on the basis of other elements in the sentence overtly marked for number. Thus, instances of *data* preceded by a singular determiner (e.g. *this data*) or followed by a singular verb (e.g. *the data shows*) were identified as singular *data*, while occurrences where *data* was preceded by a plural determiner or followed by a plural verb were identified as plural *data*. Instances where no overt number marking were identified (e.g. *The data showed an increase in frequency*), as well as instances where *data* was part of a noun phrase and the main verb of the clause is later in the clause, such as *The data obtained through this analysis shows that...*, were not included in the analysis (see the note at the end of this appendix). The occurrence of the singular *data* was operationalised as the normalised frequency per 1,000 words of singular *data* for each text in the corpus data.

Hopefully – All occurrences of *hopefully* were extracted from each text of the corpus with a regular expression, and no further classification was conducted, due to the difficulty of automatically disambiguating cases where *hopefully* was used as a sentence adverbial, from those where it was used as an adverb of manner. However, the frequency of this feature was still included, in view of the fact that we know from previous studies that *hopefully* as a manner adverb occurs very infrequently (Busse and Schröder 2010: 94), so we could assume that changes in the frequency of *hopefully* are indeed indicative of changes in the usage patterns of the sentence adverb *hopefully*. Thus, for each text in the corpus, the number of times *hopefully* was used was established, and the raw frequency for each text in the corpus was normalised per 1,000 words.

***Less* + PL** – All occurrences of *less* were extracted from the corpus files, using a regular expression. For each occurrence, only cases where *less* was immediately followed by a noun were used to calculate the frequency of occurrence of this feature. As in the case with *data*, cases where *less* referred to a plural noun that did not immediately follow *less* were not included in the analysis (see note at the end of this appendix). The raw frequencies per text were normalised per 1,000 words.

***None* + PL** – All occurrences of the word *none* were extracted from the corpus data, using a regular expression. The resulting concordances were then analysed using Python. Cases in which a plural verb was identified at any of the four positions following *none* were counted as *none* + PL. This means that both cases such as *none is* and cases such as *none of these is* were taken into account.

Passives – Passive constructions were identified by extracting all occurrences of the

verb *to be* followed by a past participle. For each text in the corpus, the number of such occurrences was counted, and normalised per 1,000 words.

Shall – All occurrences of *shall*, regardless of person, were extracted from each text of the corpus, using a regular expression. The total number of occurrences of *shall* in each text was normalised per 1,000 words.

These kind of/sort of – All occurrences of *kind* and *sort* were extracted from the corpus files, followed by counting the number of occurrences of the phrases: *these/those kind of* and *these/those sort of*. The total number of occurrences of these phrases was counted for each text in the corpus, and the frequency was subsequently normalised per 1,000 words.

Try and – All occurrences of *try* were extracted, using a regular expression, and cases where *try* is followed by *and* were counted for each text in the corpus. The total number of occurrences of *try and* in each text was normalised per 1,000 words.

Whom – All occurrences of *whom* were extracted from each text of the corpus, using a regular expression. The total number of occurrences of *whom* in each text was normalised per 1,000 words.

Note – In many cases described above, certain occurrences of the features were not taken into account. This was partly due to the difficulty of automatically identifying these cases. The other reason for this exclusion is that I focus on cases where a prescription is very conspicuously violated, while making sure that these cases are all quite similar. In other words, if we were to include cases where *less* refers to a plural noun that does not immediately follow *less*, the additional constraint here would be the distance between *less* and the noun, which may be expected to influence the likelihood of using *less* with a plural noun. Given that such details are hard to include in this kind of analysis, these cases were excluded. Thus, the figures for the occurrences are on the one hand conservative – in that there may be more occurrences of the proscribed variants than are included in the analysis – while on the other hand the cases which are included are very straightforward and conspicuous violations of a prescription: their occurrence in a particular text may reasonably be interpreted as an indication of weaker prescriptive influence in the text.

Raw data for the analyses presented in Chapter 6

In Section 6.2 I discussed the register effects on the increasing frequency of use of *ain't* and, on the basis of the data, argued that these are not indicative of actual changes in use, but are the by-product of the make-up of the corpus. The table below contains the raw figures on the basis of which this conclusion was reached.

Decade	**% drama texts**	**% drama texts with *ain't***
1810	16.28	0.00
1820	10.00	0.00
1830	7.18	0.00
1840	3.63	0.00
1850	0.00	0.00
1860	4.74	4.46
1870	0.47	0.97
1880	2.62	1.50
1890	0.38	0.00
1900	20.52	17.69
1910	33.90	27.01
1920	33.10	28.48
1930	7.32	8.05
1940	14.29	15.20
1950	8.92	11.38
1960	16.34	19.48
1970	18.75	20.95
1980	24.12	23.44
1990	4.79	11.52
2000	1.38	7.26

Table C.1: Percentage of drama texts in the fiction section of COHA per decade and percentage of drama texts which contain *ain't*

Appendix D: Annotations in usage guide entries

Attitudes to usage in usage guides

The tables below contain the annotations of usage guides entries for each feature, and the classification of attitude expressions into POSITIVE and NEGATIVE. These annotations formed the basis for the discussion of the attitudes to usage in usage guides in Section 5.4. The tables are given for each feature in alphabetical order. The phrases included in the tables are expressions of attitudes annotated in the usage guide entries. Following these tables, this appendix also contains the annotations for references to dimensions of usage identified in the entries, for each of the features analysed. In the tables, semi-colons separate different annotations, and, where necessary, minor changes have been made to the original text to allow for easier understanding out of context, as well as for consistency. These modifications were made only in the formatting of the text, in order to make the tables uniform. The tables contain only the years for each of the entry, as the goal is to represent how the attitudes and references to usage have changed over time. Adding the authors' names was avoided, as for some years the tables contain annotations from multiple entries and multiple usage guides. However, the corpus of entries annotated in 'brat' is available for consultation upon request.

Expressions of attitudes to usage in entries on *ain't*

Year	POSITIVE expressions
1950	could be an economical single form for *am not*, *is not*, *are not*, *has not*, *have not*

1957	*ain't* for *am not* is a natural contraction; the language needs an expression of this sort; supplies a real want
1963	appropriate; [*ain't*] would be a useful addition to informal English
1977	appropriate
1978	a deliberate attempt to suggest informality; down-to-earth common sense
1980	accepted in speech; on its way to full acceptance
1988	many English speakers go beyond defending *ain't*; handy contraction; natural; proper
1989	a few hardy souls approve the locution; approved by some; at times you will probably find *ain't* a very useful; desired by others; grammatically sound; in widespread use but usually in particular circumscribed ways that tend to remove the stigma from its use; logical; what is the matter with *ain't I?* for *am not I?*? Nothing whatever, save that a number of minor grammarians object to it
1993	acceptable; accepted; it is a word
2002	may be suitable
2003	to convey a down-to-earth quality
2005	*ain't* continues to appear in the speech of ordinary folks, leads a vibrant life in song lyrics, should be a contraction like any other
2006	little risk of censure
2014	a crisp and euphonious substitute for the strident and bisyllabic *isn't*, *hasn't*, and *doesn't*; today the word is going strong

Year	**NEGATIVE expressions**
1847	vulgarism of discourse
1901	inelegant; it will be a blessing to the English speaking people when the descendant shall sleep with his father; misleading
1907	always inelegant; atrocious
1910	always incorrect; vulgarism
1911	can not be called a contraction; vulgarism
1916	no defense possible for the vulgar use of *ain't* for *hasn't* and *haven't*; shows no signs of coming into good use; universally condemned; usually the construction can be avoided; we must get along as best we can without it
1920	inelegant; ought not to need criticism; the safe rule respecting contractions is never to use them; ungrammatical; vulgar; vulgarism
1927	careless; wrong
1934	illiterate expressions; never to be used; not in good use; vulgarism; vulgarisms
1937	vulgar
1947	error; I blush to record it; illiterate ($\times 2$)
1948	illiterate; too vulgar

1949	vulgarism; you should avoid it
1950	vulgate (×2)
1955	a vulgate contraction; never good English; should always be avoided; wrong
1957	illiterate; is an uneducated blunder; not considered standard; serves no useful purpose; unacceptable forms; unrecognised
1975	denounced; illiterate; illiterate and ungrammatical; inelegant; regarded as substandard; stigmatised; uneducated blunder; ungrammatical
1977	chiefly to record uneducated speech; leaves the writer open to the risk of having his or her intention misunderstood
1980	best avoided; illiterate; non-standard; not acceptable; the hallmark of the uneducated
1987	has not been accepted; illiterate; is cautioned against
1988	a mark of illiteracy
1989	absolutely vulgar; bugbear; incorrect; inelegant; its present disesteem; much vilified word; stigma; stigmatised word in general use; tends to mark the speaker and writer as socially or educationally inferior; the widely disparaged status; ungrammatical; utterly intolerable; vulgar; vulgarism
1993	firm rejection of *ain't*; not accepted; shibboleth; substandard; ungrammatical; vulgar
1998	a shibboleth of poor usage; it never will be OK; it's still misbehavin'; nonword; not OK
1999	affectation; stigma attached to it; social disapproval is so strong; controversial words in current English; regarded as the clearest single token of illiteracy
2002	appearance of ignorance; beyond rehabilitation; illiterate
2003	condemned; the classic 'mistake' in English; uneducated
2005	a mark of ignorance; a vulgarism; inelegant; low-class
2006	bugbear
2014	*ain't* is frowned upon

Table D.1: Expressions of attitudes to usage in entries on *ain't*

Expressions of attitudes to usage in entries on *like*

Year	NEGATIVE expressions
1975	a throwaway word; filler; ignorance; misuse; nervousness; overuse
1991	a vague qualifier; a verbal tic; apologetic overtones it gives sentences; indecisive; infests every sentence; poor
1998	it shows arrested development; juvenile colloquialism; space-filler; verbal tic; vogue word
2000	faddish; [shows] limited grasp of [...] language; maltreatment; verbal crutch

2002	filler word; flibbertigibbet; [*like* has] no more meaning than a belch
2003	habit; irritating; meaningless verbal hiccup
2004	a big indicator of unpolished; informal speaking; habit

Table D.2: Expressions of attitudes to usage in entries on discourse particle *like*

Expressions of attitudes to usage in entries on *literally*

Year	POSITIVE expressions
1989	it is neither; neither a misuse nor a mistake
1999	a little linguistic reflection will reveal a logical rigour behind a much derided use
2006	adds a hyperbolic edge to clichés; invites readers to savour the aptness of the writer's terms of reference; lends impact to quantitative statements

Year	NEGATIVE expressions
1910	intolerable
1918	incorrectly used
1927	incorrectly
1947	colloquialism, slovenly
1957	*literally* is used to mean the exact opposite of what it properly means; such false coin makes honest traffic in words impossible; the word should be avoided; we ought to be at pains to repudiate; [used] with no regard whatever to any meaning of *literally*
1977	misuse
1978	literal-minded readers find such locutions absurd
1980	a habit of heedless writers; do not recognize it; excess baggage; authorities criticise it; misuses; the consensus, however, is heavily against this sense; the sentence is more forceful without it; unnecessary emphasis
1984	a kind of disclaimer; if you don't wish to be taken literally, don't use *literally*; the result [of using *literally*] is generally painful
1988	erroneous; exasperating; loose; superfluous
1989	improperly; mistake; misuse
1991	has no meaning at all beyond a vague and unnecessary intensification; in careless writing and speech it often has the opposite meaning; misuse; misuses; often *literally* actually weakens an expression
1993	almost always overkill; bad intensifier
1994	disclaimer; enhancer; misguidedly; overused; [using *literally*] would raise some rather unpleasant images
1998	distorted beyond recognition; often confused; slipshod extension

1999	much derided use
2003	has been so overused; in danger of losing its literal meaning; should not be used as a synonym for *actually* or *really*; vague
2004	bold bluff of an intensifier; incorrect
2005	incoherence
2006	not acceptable
2008	avoid using *literally* to add extra emphasis; there are a lot of people whose blood pressure literally rises as they imagine putting lit firecrackers in your ears to make your sentence correct
2010	I think the use of *literal* as a general intensifier has become a distraction, something that tears me away from the message and makes me doubt the messenger; word confusion
2014	can evoke ludicrous imagery; it drives careful readers crazy; it screams, "I don't think about what my words mean"; problematic; superfluous

Table D.3: Expressions of attitudes to usage in entries on *literally*

Expressions of attitudes to usage in entries on negative concord

Year	POSITIVE expressions
1917	good English; natural; natural; natural to human language; springs from the desire for emphasis
1942	such a double negative is not a backsliding from the idiom of more formal English
1947	psychologically defensible
1957	normal way of strengthening a negative
1978	not a backsliding from the current idiom of standard English
1980	[two negatives] ordinarily reinforce each other and this is clearly felt by the reader
1989	it does have its uses; normal; you certainly don't need to eradicate it
1993	simply powerful
2005	alive and well; remains an effective construction in writing dialogue or striking a folksy note
2006	helps to underscore the force and/or defiance of the utterance

Year	NEGATIVE expressions
1856	mistake
1872	errors; should not be used
1884	incorrect
1895	inelegant

1895	should be avoided
1910	incorrect
1917	long banished from polite society and from literature
1920	do not say, used for ‘any’ by the illiterate
1927	wrong (×2)
1934	wrong (×2)
1938	*nothing* should not follow a negative expression in place of *anything*; wrong
1942	vulgate way
1947	contrary to the present idiom of the educated
1949	error; ignorant; of the lowest level
1955	should be avoided, vulgate idioms
1957	a shocking vulgarism; no one who values public opinion can afford to say; put a man beyond the pale
1980	are to be avoided; avoided by all except the unlettered; conspicuous; they place on the reader the burden of sorting out the meaning
1981	avoid; poor; poor English
1984	you shouldn’t say
1988	let people who write street graffiti, like this one in Kingston, Jamaica, believe that two negatives make a forcefully negative statement: “The poor can’t take no more.”; non-standard; unsuitable as prestige constructions
1989	not a prestige form; rustic; uneducated; you are not likely to impress
1990	incorrect; redundant
1991	an immediate indication that the speaker’s or writer’s diction is substandard; errors; wrong
1992	do not use more than one negative within the same clause; incorrect (×2); no exceptions about this taboo; taboo
1993	inappropriate; incorrect; mark speakers of vulgar English; shibboleths
1998	condemn the phrase; not standard English; stay away from the most flagrant examples
1999	self evidently wrong
2000	causing hundreds of English teachers to grimace in pain; error; illiterate; improper; mistake; ungrammatical; vulgar
2005	incorrect; it is not acceptable to say; violates the double-negative rule
2006	illogical; incurs more censure; target of common criticism; very conspicuous

Table D.4: Expressions of attitudes to usage in entries on negative concord

Expressions of attitudes to usage in entries on object *I*

Year	POSITIVE expressions
1947	a sense construction
1957	cannot be classed as a mistaken attempt to speak elegant English; has such a long and honourable history; used by so many great writers
1989	treated as a polite fixed unit; you are probably safe in retaining *between you and I* in your casual speech

Year	NEGATIVE expressions
1856	as that of the vulgarian who says "Him and me are going to the play," and with less excuse; erroneous; errors of the ill-bred and those of the well-bred man; fault; faults; genteel error; gross violation of a rule which ought to be familiar to everybody; heinous; manifest improprieties; not very generous; woeful confusion
1868	error; mistake
1884	carelessly used
1911	error; gross errors; insidious errors; mistakes
1916	grossly incorrect
1920	careless; error (×2); incorrect; often confused
1927	certainly not the best English; ungrammatical; wrong
1937	fault
1947	indefensible grammatically; misused
1949	always wrong
1957	a piece of false grammar; illiterate; lapses; not sanctioned even by colloquial usage
1975	even from otherwise literate speakers
1977	error (×2); genteelism; misguided
1978	half-educated
1980	blunder; deviations; erroneously; questionable; wrong (×3)
1981	poor
1984	a grammatical error of unsurpassable grossness; always wrong; gaffe
1988	error; irritating
1989	blunder; illiterate; wrong
1990	incorrect
1991	wrong
1992	incorrect; major relapse; mistake
1993	mistake; never say or write; shibboleth
1994	incorrect; misguided; most common error; ungrammatical
1996	error (×2)); grammatical errors; mistake

1998	debilitated grammar; gross linguistic gaffes; mistake; problem
1999	hypercorrection
2000	a form of overrefinement; error (×2)); mistake
2001	never acceptable; problem
2002	no exceptions
2003	misuse
2004	incorrect
2005	blunder; sign of ignorance
2006	shibboleth
2008	wrong
2010	error (×2)
2014	avoid *between you and I*; despised; error (×3); excruciating grammatical blunder; it makes many readers bristle

Table D.5: Expressions of attitudes to usage in entries on object *I*

Expressions of attitudes to usage in entries on subject *me*

Year	NEGATIVE expressions
1868	gross error; mistake
1916	vulgar
1920	vulgar; error; one should not say
1927	wrong
1977	incorrect
1984	lapses
1988	mistake
1989	disputed; problematical; likely to be unfavourably noticed in the speech and writing of adults; characteristic of less educated English
1993	never say or write
1996	error (×2); incorrectly using object pronouns in subject positions; mistake
2003	not elegant; not correct

Table D.6: Expressions of attitudes to usage in entries on subject *me*

Expressions of attitudes to usage in entries on the split infinitive

Year	POSITIVE expressions
1898	it sometimes helps the writer over the difficulty; not a violation of any rule of grammar
1911	seems to be growing in favour
1917	admirable; cannot so easily be proved to be a corruption; contributes decidedly to clearness; has a right to a trial in the language; has the distinct advantage of bringing an adverb into an emphatic position; natural; neither an innovation nor a vulgarism; not really an error in grammar; the use of a split infinitive does not necessarily put us among illiterates, ignoramuses, and violators of English undefiled; very clear; very convenient
1927	clearness and emphasis
1938	the meaning is more clearly expressed by inserting the adverb between the preposition and the infinitive
1949	a single adverb may not do violence to the statement of an idea
1957	the rule against splitting an infinitive contradicts the principles of English grammar and the practice of our best writers; natural
1963	good writers, in fact, prefer using split infinitives in sentences where not doing so would result in ambiguity or awkwardness; there is no point in revising a sentence just to avoid splitting an infinitive
1966	expressive; has its place in good composition; [the split infinitive] should be used; sometimes splitting is called for
1975	feel free to split the infinitive; perfectly good English
1978	sentences can be improved by splitting the infinitives; some [infinitives] should be [split]; smoothly and clearly
1980	infinitives may be split when splitting makes the sentence read more smoothly
1981	keeps your meaning clear; sometimes necessary; clear
1984	if it is the clearest and most natural construction, use it boldly; the split infinitive is [not] a grammatical error
1988	a construction that is fully established in the language
1989	nothing grammatically wrong; the objection to the split infinitive has never had a rational basis; you can split [infinitives] when you need to
1991	better [split]
1992	adds emphasis; excusable with good reason
1993	an adverb may split an infinitive if required by natural position
1994	a sentence that would read more smoothly with the infinitive split
1997	in this case, splitting the infinitive is the most accurate way of expressing what happened; it is better to split an infinitive

1998	[the English language gives us] the inestimable advantage of being able to put adverbs where they will be most effective; the rule against split infinitives contradicts the principles of English grammar and the practice of our best writers; correct and acceptable English; in full accord with the spirit of modern English; no harm in separating them; perfectly proper; the universal adoption of this usage is as certain as anything in the future well can be; there is no point in rearranging a sentence just to avoid splitting an infinitive unless it is an awkward one
1999	it is acceptable; it is usually better (and sometimes necessary) to place [the adverb] between *to* and the verb; neither a major error, nor a grammatical blunder
2000	an improvement of English expression; you need not avoid splitting an infinitive if you have good reason to split it; can also be helpful; expresses your meaning more clearly; sounds more natural
2001	often the most natural position to place an adverb
2003	not strictly speaking an error; often more expressive and graceful
2004	more often than not, in my opinion, infinitives are better split; natural
2005	has a strong rhythm that reinforces the meaning; hard to see what exactly is wrong; meaning is clear
2008	there's no reason to go out of your way to avoid it; don't let anyone tell you that it's forbidden; it is OK to split infinitives; it's fine to split infinitives
2010	do not be afraid to split infinitives

Year	**NEGATIVE expressions**
1856	an adverb should not be placed immediately after *to*; the rule is violated
1867	another of the blunders; preposterous
1868	mistake
1884	do not put an adverb between *to* and its infinitive; never separate *to* from the infinitive with which it belongs
1895	errors; fault
1901	intolerable; no author who uses English with propriety and regard for established correct usage, ever separates the particle from the verbal word
1910	condemnation of the split infinitive is now pretty general
1911	awkward; mistake
1916	has long been frowned on
1917	an offence against philology; barbarous practice; aesthetically ugly; intolerably awkward; objected to only when it produces clumsiness; vulgarism ($\times$2)
1920	blunder; condemned; finds no place in such expressions as...; reprehensible; should not [be used]; [infinitives are] strictly inseparable
1927	contrary to the history of the construction; suspended syntax; wrong
1934	wrong

1937	indefensible
1942	awkward
1949	error
1955	avoid split infinitives that are obviously awkward
1957	a grammatical mistake; deafening; lapse; the heinousness of this offense
1966	fault
1975	pedantic bogey
1978	awkward; should not be split
1980	believe they will not go to heaven if they split the infinitive
1981	infinitive should be kept intact
1984	avoid the split infinitive wherever possible; grammatical error
1988	the notion that only the illiterate and ill-bred split an infinitive
1989	avoid split infinitives; anyone who aspires to be a bad writer should split as many infinitives as possible; condemned (×2); would produce bad writing
1990	awkward constructions; in general, you should avoid splitting infinitives
1991	implication of ignorance; sloppiness
1992	questionable; unnecessary; unnecessary split
1993	eliminates all possibility of ambiguity; sometimes can cause very clumsy sentences
1994	incorrect
1997	interrupt the flow; may be taken as ignorance; separating its parts can weaken it
1998	displays carelessness; generally to be avoided
1999	error; has sufficient weight of opinion against it
2000	can be awkward; somewhat discomforting
2003	better to avoid; people are offended by split infinitives
2006	can make awkward reading; inelegant; ungrammatical

Table D.7: Expressions of attitudes to usage in entries on the split infinitive

Dimensions of usage in entries on *ain't*

Year	**References to FREQUENCY**
1901	frequently heard
1911	however much it may be employed
1927	it is true nevertheless that many educated persons permit themselves this habit; used as a contracted form of *am not*, *is not*, and *are not*
1948	in spite of its use

1950	fairly common among educated speakers; the commonest and most easily identifiable vulgate words
1957	it is heard; insist on using; used for *isn't*
1963	used in non-standard English
1975	used
1978	regularly use *ain't*; it is never used in formal writing
1980	sometimes boldly used; relatively rare
1987	occasionally used
1988	even more restricted; occasionally, however, those who are certain of their status as cultivated speakers of standard English dare to use it
1989	word in general use; in widespread use; common among the less educated and among children; most common in fiction; common in fiction; this use pops up unsurprisingly in advertising and in political slogans; often heard; *ain't* occurs frequently in inverted expressions, such as questions; use of *ain't* that many handbooks agree is common is facetious or jocular or humorous use
1998	used; *ain't* is used
2002	common; appears
2003	still commonly used; everyone uses it occasionally
2005	*ain't* continues to appear; leads a vibrant life
2014	not that *ain't* is used as a standard contraction

Year	**References to MODE**
1901	speech
1920	never to use them in public speech
1937	not yet been promoted to writing; speech
1948	in written or spoken
1950	conversation
1955	rarely needed in writing
1975	orally; in speech; writing; *ain't* in writing
1978	in speech; writing ($\times$2)
1980	in writing ($\times$2); in speech
1987	speech and writing
1988	speech or writing
1998	orally
2002	speech; in writing; in speech; used orally; may be suitable for writing
2005	in the speech; in speech; writing
2006	distinction between spoken and written usage; spoken as well as written; appearances in print; used orally

Year	References to REGISTER
1847	in the pulpit or at the bar
1901	colloquial speech
1920	never to use them in public speech
1927	on the low colloquial level; cultivated colloquial; literary use; low colloquial
1934	not in good use in either colloquial or formal
1950	colloquial; in actual conversation
1955	in dialogue
1963	informal English; colloquial; in formal English
1975	in fictional dialogue
1977	to deliberately informal usage; a device for providing humor, shock, or other special effect
1978	formal writing; ordinary expository prose; in general writing
1980	quoted speech; jocular
1987	colloquial; informally
1988	informal; mainly limited to dialogue and humorous contexts; formal; in clichés; to lighten the tone of their remarks
1989	in ordinary speaking and writing; usually in particular circumscribed ways; educated persons whose regular vocabulary still includes *ain't* use the term in talking to relatives and to peers with whom they are both friendly and on a first-name basis; the use of *ain't* in a letter marks a close and warm relationship; spoken, as in an interview or even in a talk; written, as in an article; to emphasize their informality; most common in fiction; can also be found in other forms of writing; can also be used for characterizing purposes; common in fiction; the characterizing *ain't* can be used in reportage; in advertising; in political slogans; in otherwise rather straightforward prose for purposes of contrast; *ain't* occurs frequently in inverted expressions, such as questions; in popular music; catch phrases and variations on them make up a goodly portion of the word's use, both orally and in writing; when the tag is necessary, *ain't* will probably occur in it in some people's speech; use of *ain't* that many handbooks agree is common is facetious or jocular or humorous use; many educated people, when they use *ain't*, try to use it in such a way as to show that it is not part of their serious day-to-day vocabulary; accomplished by the use of the familiar fixed phrases; from speech
1993	when used unconsciously or unintentionally; jocular uses; using *ain't* in circumstances that do not suggest deliberate choice
1998	show that you have the common touch; to be tongue-in-cheek
1999	in catchphrases; as an affectation
2002	in the most casual of colloquial speech; spoken slang; in many songs
2003	part of a joking phrase

2005	in song lyrics; *ain't* has no substitute in fixed expressions; informal writing
2006	informal conversation; signal of congruent informality; associated with casual and dialectal speech; embedded in quoted speech; quasi-proverbial sayings; appearing freely in utterances quoted in newspapers; in proverbial sayings; gets into print in reference to songs
2014	but it does have some widely established places; in the lyrics of popular songs; even in relatively formal settings; to emphasize that some fact is so obvious as to be beyond further debate

Year	**References to SPEAKERS**
1847	some persons of education and character
1927	students of English; critical speakers; many educated persons
1950	educated speakers; educated people
1955	some modern users of English
1957	a few bold spirits; most people
1963	some authorities; most users of standard English
1975	America's schoolteachers; by many cultivated speakers
1977	the writer
1978	millions of Americans
1980	by those who are sure of themselves; most readers; cultivated speakers prefer *am I not*
1987	by educated persons
1988	some authorities; many English-speakers; educated speakers; those who are certain of their status as cultivated speakers of standard English
1989	among the less educated; among children; educated persons whose regular vocabulary still includes *ain't* use the term in talking to relatives and to peers with whom they are both friendly and on a first-name basis; many educated people, when they use *ain't*, try to use it in such a way as to show that it is not part of their serious day-to-day vocabulary
1993	by some authorities; Americans ($\times$2)
1998	by cultivated speakers; for most people
2002	by many cultivated speakers
2003	everyone
2005	by upper-class speakers; the lower classes; of ordinary folks; educated and upperclass speakers; educated speakers
2006	American school teachers; between American speakers; writers; by many cultivated speakers

Year	**References to VALUE**
1927	they reprehend it as careless

1950	if the social objection could be relaxed; prejudice against it among educated people has been almost unanimous for the last century or so
1957	shamefaced reluctance with which these full forms are often brought out; as used for *isn't* is an uneducated blunder and serves no useful purpose; he (or still more she) fears will convict him of low
1963	strong social and educational pressure against *ain't*
1975	cultivated
1980	most readers are likely to consider it the hallmark of the uneducated
1988	to many people, *ain't* doesn't bear discussion: it is simply a mark of illiteracy; the risk of criticism or ridicule is too high a price to pay for using this handy contraction
1989	in ordinary speaking and writing it tends to mark the speaker and writer as socially or educationally inferior; often meant to mark the speaker as belonging to a lower class or being poorly educated or being black or being countrified; but it may also be a code word, used in a sly way to tip off the reader to the fact that the person being quoted is poor, illiterate, or black; most common public uses of *ain't* makes use of the word's ability to attract attention; it's not really an attempt at jocularity or humor, it's an attempt at distancing; the verbal equivalent of a wink or nudge intended to show that you are not so ill-bred as to really use *ain't*
1993	may brand you as a speaker of vulgar English
1998	(1) to be tongue-in-cheek; and (2) to flaunt their reverse snobbery; if you're tempted to use it to show that you have the common touch, make clear that you know better
2003	if you always use it instead of the more proper contractions you're sure to be branded as uneducated
2005	low-class; upper-class; a term used by the lower classes; has come to be regarded as a mark of ignorance.
2006	stigma attached to it in the U.S.; a signal of congruent informality

Year	**References to VARIETY**
1957	in the United States; standard; modern English
1963	non-standard English; standard English
1975	in most parts of the United States; substandard
1980	British; American; non-standard; non-standard
1987	dialectal; standard speech and writing
1988	dialectal; peculiar to a certain region, community, social group, or the like; non-standard; the language variety of educated speakers
1989	non-standard
1993	Americans; standard English; substandard; standard use; standard American English; vulgar and some Common use; vulgar English
1998	in most parts of the country

1999	current English; Cockney speech; unlikely that *ain't* will be admitted to standard English in the foreseeable future
2002	in most parts of the U.S.
2005	in English
2006	American English; British; dialectal; standard English; in most parts of the U.S.; stigma attached to it in the U.S.; American speakers; more significantly embedded in American English than in British
2014	regional and lower-class English; as a standard contraction

Table D.8: References to dimensions of usage in entries on *ain't*

Dimensions of usage in entries on *like*

Year	References to FREQUENCY
1975	used constantly in the speech of many persons
1991	sometimes used
1998	ubiquitous
2003	common in speech; this habit has spread throughout American society
2005	used frequently

Year	References to MODE
1975	in the speech of many persons
2003	speech
2004	speaking
2005	speech; spoken
2005	writing

Year	References to REGISTER
1993	casual
1998	colloquialism
2004	informal
2005	informal ($\times$2); limited chiefly to dialogue

Year	References to SPEAKERS
1975	especially young people
1975	many persons
1988	some speakers
1991	adolescents
1993	adolescent

1998	in teenagers; in adults
2002	teenage
2003	hipsters; people of all ages; young people
2005	younger people

Year	**References to VALUE**
1988	with the approval of almost no one outside their own group
1991	using it amounts to an admission by the speaker that his or her expression is poor
1998	in adults, it shows arrested development
2000	faddish
2003	to be reacted to as a grown-up, avoid this pattern
2004	because a few of these likes in a sentence send all the wrong signals

Year	**References to VARIETY**
1993	substandard
1998	California

Table D.9: References to dimensions of usage in entries on discourse particle *like*

Dimensions of usage in entries on *literally*

Year	**References to FREQUENCY**
1918	often incorrectly used
1927	sometimes used
1947	when used, as it often is
1957	we have come to such a pass with this emphasizer; we do not hesitate to insert the very word
1966	*literally* continues to be seen as a mere intensive that means practically, almost, all but
1975	too often used to intensify a statement which is actually a figure of speech
1977	common misuse
1978	it is so often used to support metaphors that its literal meaning may be reversed
1980	seldom is the word employed in its exact sense
1984	all too often used as a kind of disclaimer
1989	seldom is the word employed in its exact sense, which is to the letter, precisely as stated; often used hyperbolically; often improperly used; furthermore, these uses as monitored by our readers outnumber the hyperbolic use by a substantial margin

1991	careless writing and speech it often has the opposite meaning
1994	but many writers use it
2006	yet sensational examples like this don't outnumber those of a more measured kind in the BNC; it has also been used to underscore figures of speech or turns of phrase which could never be taken at face value
2010	how often writers and speakers confuse the antonyms literal and figurative
2014	common

Year	**References to MODE**
1927	in colloquial speech
1991	writing and speech
2006	both written and spoken
2008	writing

Year	**References to REGISTER**
1927	in colloquial speech
2006	not in the most formal prose; but in interactive discourse; media discourse

Year	**References to SPEAKERS**
1966	writers; rhetoricians; writers
1977	writers of such sentences
1978	literal-minded readers
1980	heedless writers
1984	writers
1988	some people use both words, but particularly the adverb, merely as intensives
1994	many writers use it misguidedly
2006	skilled writers; writers/speakers
2010	writers and speakers

Year	**References to VARIETY**
2006	in standard English

Table D.10: References to dimensions of usage in entries on *literally*

Dimensions of usage in entries on negative concord

Year	References to FREQUENCY
1856	a very common mistake
1872	not uncommon
1917	it sometimes crops out at inopportune times in the speech of self-taught men and women
1920	often used for 'any' by the illiterate
1937	dropped out of use
1942	not used in formal and informal English; probably not so common in vulgate English as comic writers suggest; two negatives are very often used to make an emphatic negative; survives in vulgate usage
1963	often used; not used by educated people
1978	very often used in non-standard English; two negative words in the same construction are not used in standard English; no longer used
1980	the more sophisticated are often unwittingly guilty of it
1989	is indeed common; the range of use of the double negative has shrunk considerably in the past 400 years; but it has not disappeared; it still occurs in the casual speech and writing of more sophisticated and better educated people
1993	many speakers still use these constructions today
1999	can easily be found
2006	it has a long history of use; used in many non-standard dialects; survives in casual conversation

Year	References to MODE
1917	speech
1917	speech
1942	lost to written English
1955	writers
1989	speech of the unlettered
1989	speech
1989	speech
1989	writing
1989	speech
1993	spoken and written standard English
2003	speech
2005	spoken English
2005	speech
2006	conversation

2006	strongly associated with speech

Year	References to REGISTER
1917	popular speech
1927	in your conversation
1942	in many speech situations; formal; informal; formal; informal
1963	except in joking mood; in formal and informal English
1989	seem to have gone out of literary favour; restricted to familiar use; conversation; letters; the speech of similar characters in fiction; discursive prose; when talking to your family and friends; casual speech and writing
1993	except in jocular use
2001	standard English; vernacular English
2003	informal
2005	writing dialogue; folksy note; spoken English
2006	survives in casual conversation

Year	References to SPEAKERS
1895	writers
1917	teachers; self-taught men and women
1920	the illiterate
1942	educated people; comic writers
1947	contrary to the present idiom of the educated
1955	writers
1963	educated people
1978	educated people
1980	the unlettered; the more sophisticated
1984	most people know that you shouldn't say; some writers
1988	schoolteachers; people who write street graffiti, like this one in Kingston, Jamaica
1989	grammarians; among the least educated; unlettered; less educated people; more sophisticated and better educated people; the boss; the teacher; the job interviewer; many other grammarians
1991	the speaker's or writer's
1993	eighteenth-century grammarians; many speakers
1998	traditionalists; descriptive linguists
2000	an investigative correspondent; English teachers
2001	vernacular speakers
2003	people

2005	grammarians; readers (×2)
2006	sociolinguists; contemporary grammarians; writers

Year	**References to VALUE**
1942	not now in fashion among educated people
1957	no one who values public opinion can afford to say; when used with a negative verb put a man beyond the pale
1963	they are out of fashion now in the standard language
1978	not now in fashion among educated people
1989	associated with the speech of the unlettered; you are not likely to impress the boss, the teacher, or the job interviewer
1991	it is nevertheless an immediate indication that the speaker's or writer's diction is substandard
1993	mark speakers of vulgar English
1999	poorly educated
2000	double negative is vulgar and improper
2006	socially stigmatized; they incur more censure than the others through their social connotations − the fact that they're used in many non-standard dialects

Year	**References to VARIETY**
1937	Modern English
1942	survives in vulgate usage; vulgate English; vulgate way; contrary to the present idiom of the educated
1955	non-standard; vulgate idioms
1957	in all Teutonic languages
1963	non-standard English; non-standard; the standard language; standard
1978	standard English; non-standard English; in standard English
1991	substandard
1993	standard English; not out of the language, but out of standard use
1998	standard English
1999	in all varieties of English used throughout the world; East London English; Black English spoken in the U.S.
2005	dialect or non-standard speech; standard English; standard usage
2006	American and British English; non-standard dialects

Table D.11: References to dimensions of usage in entries on negative concord

Dimensions of usage in entries on object *I*

Year	References to FREQUENCY
1856	frequently heard; how often do we hear even well-educated people say
1868	common
1884	often carelessly used
1911	we sometimes meet with gross errors of this kind; common
1920	common
1927	occurs occasionally; sometimes used; current
1937	common faults
1942	frequently heard
1947	often used
1957	is often said
1975	is often heard
1977	a very common error
1978	frequently heard and has a long history in written English
1980	here are many (bad) examples of the expression; often erroneously used
1984	very common
1988	instead we often hear the subjective forms; more often in speech than in print; why is it so common
1989	it occurred in the past and it occurs now; examples in print, especially recent ones, are hard to find
1991	is heard
1992	common
1994	most common error
1996	commonly occur; so common
1998	it is perennially surprising how many otherwise educated speakers commit them; ubiquitous
2001	common though this form may be in spoken English
2005	phrase occurs quite often in speech
2006	certainly used; unlikely to occur
2010	common
2014	commonly heard phrase

Year	References to MODE
1927	speech
1988	in speech than in print
1989	chiefly spoken; in print; mostly in speech; in print
1993	speech; writing

1996	speech
2001	in spoken English; in careful writing
2005	in speech
2005	writing
2006	in writing
2006	it's to be avoided in writing

Year	**References to REGISTER**
1911	we sometimes meet with gross errors of this kind in the writings of authors of repute; in conversation
1927	colloquial speech; colloquial; low colloquial
1957	not sanctioned even by colloquial usage
1975	in casual speech
1980	in literary classics; colloquial
1989	in your casual speech; in essays; works of a discursive nature; modern edited prose
2005	formal writing
2006	a formal document

Year	**References to SPEAKERS**
1856	well-educated people
1911	authors of repute
1947	often used by those who would never dream of saying *between he and I*
1988	even from people who probably know better; editors; proofreaders; editors; authors; schoolteachers; writers of books on grammar and usage; speakers and writers
1989	the ignorant or timid
1991	the well-educated
1993	standard English users
1994	misguided speakers and writers
1996	sophisticated people such as news broadcasters and educators
1998	educated speakers
2003	educated people; people
2006	for some people
2014	speakers; careful writers and speakers ($\times 2$); many speakers; writers

Year	References to VALUE
1977	sometimes a genteelism resorted to by those who think that *I* is somehow a finer or 'more correct' word than *me*
1977	attempt at refinement is misguided
1978	anyone who uses it now is apt to be thought only half-educated
1988	probably no construction is more irritating to those who don't use it than between you and I
1989	in rather more educated varieties of English; if you use it, someone is sure to notice and disparage your character, background, or education.
1994	who think I sounds more formal than me
1998	most people who make this mistake do so out of habit, without thinking, and not because they don't know the difference between I and me
2000	a form of overrefinement
2003	the misuse of 'I' and 'myself' for 'me' is caused by nervousness about 'me'
2005	widely regarded as a sign of ignorance

Year	References to VARIETY
1927	in dialectal speech
1957	not standard English
1989	occurs in rather more educated varieties of English; early modern English
1993	standard English
2003	standard English
2014	contemporary English

Table D.12: References to dimensions of usage in entries on object *I*

Dimensions of usage in entries on subject *me*

Year	References to FREQUENCY
1868	we sometimes hear
1984	not as uncommon as we might hope them to be
1988	sometimes
1989	in actual practice we also find me and someone and someone and me
1996	quite rare
2005	widespread tendency
2006	*me* is sometimes used for *I* when it's the first coordinate of the subject

Year	References to MODE
1988	in print
1989	speech forms
1989	speech and writing
2003	speech
2005	writing
2005	in speech
2006	speech
2006	in writing

Year	References to REGISTER
1989	when used facetiously
2005	formal writing
2006	in conversation; informal; easy-going conversation; casual speech

Year	References to SPEAKERS
1988	editors
1988	proofreaders
1989	children; adults
1991	child's speech; parents; teachers
2003	educated people
2006	some speakers

Year	References to VALUE
1989	associated with the speech of children

Year	References to VARIETY
1989	less educated English
1989	non-mainstream varieties of English
1991	standard English
2006	world Englishes

Table D.13: References to dimensions of usage in entries on subject *me*

Dimensions of usage in entries on the split infinitive

Year	References to FREQUENCY
1867	it is even more common
1869	the liberty is frequently taken
1895	the most common fault
1917	is used by a great many careful writers; the split infinitive is very rare as compared with the other; more and more common among good writers; widely used in colloquial and literary English; used without hesitation by many writers of repute; it is becoming more and more common among good writers; it crops up frequently in scientific journals, daily papers, reports of mercantile societies, and such places; it is used pretty frequently by well educated men not especially careful of their English; the split infinitive is rare; very rare in standard literature; it is spreading in the daily and weekly papers, and in the colloquial English of the intelligent classes; while a good many reputable authors use the split infinitive, they use it rarely
1920	despite the hundreds of uses of this method of expression
1927	in practice; some good writers permit themselves the liberty of placing an adverbial modifier between to and the infinitive
1957	the split infinitive first came into general use
1966	extremely rare
1989	there has always been a question about how frequently the split infinitive construction occurs; only occasionally; the construction is common; frequent in Mark Twain, Thomas Hardy, and Rudyard Kipling as well as Browning; the frequency of the split infinitive is that it noticeably increased in the 19th century; the increase in split infinitives
1993	during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries great numbers of split infinitives appeared in print; for the popularity of the split infinitive; split infinitives continue to appear often
1998	frequently; has steadily increased during the last hundred years, and goes on increasing still
1999	occasionally
2004	common
2005	people have been splitting infinitives since the 14th century; split infinitives all the time without giving it a thought

Year	References to MODE
1911	everyday speech
1966	spoken; in written work
1978	formal writing; writing
1989	spoken; on the printed page; in the speech of the less educated
1993	in print; in writing; speech

1998	bad writing
1999	best avoided in normal writing and speech

Year	References to REGISTER
1869	in print
1911	in most cases of everyday speech
1917	colloquial; literary English; in scientific journals; daily papers; reports of mercantile societies; in the daily and weekly papers; the colloquial English of the intelligent classes
1966	in good composition
1978	formal writing; in unquestionably reputable general writing; in general English; in formal
1984	a question of style
1989	unless it is in the slangy construction in which an expletive is infixed between the syllables of a word; to literary contexts
1993	edited English; planned, oratorical, and formal levels

Year	References to SPEAKERS
1898	good writers
1917	careful writers; good writers; writers of repute; good writers; well educated men not especially careful of their English; the intelligent classes; good many reputable authors
1957	readers
1963	good writers
1980	many writers
1988	English-speakers who are at home with the language; anyone who has ever spoken or written the language
1989	native speakers; the less educated; users of standard English; many authors
1991	fewer and fewer writers, and few grammarians; sophisticated users; less sophisticated users; writers
1994	many people
1998	writers of English
2001	a minority of people
2005	people have been splitting infinitives since the 14th century

Year	References to VALUE
1957	deplorable breach of etiquette
1966	the one fault that everybody has heard about and makes a great virtue of avoiding and reproving in others

1989	common in the speech of the less educated
1991	occasionally writers seem to go out of their way to put the modifier in an unnatural place, perhaps as a kind of showing off they want their readers to notice that they know enough not to split infinitives.
1998	bad writing

Year	**References to VARIETY**
1955	standard usage
1966	spoken English
1989	spoken English
1993	in standard speech
1998	both in England and America

Table D.14: References to dimensions of usage in entries on the split infinitive

Primary Sources

Allen, Edward Frank. 1955. *How to Write and Speak Effective English*. New York: Fawcett Publications, Inc. First published in 1938.

Allen, Robert, ed. 1999. *Pocket Fowler's Modern English Usage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Anonymous. 1856a. *Five Hundred Mistakes of Daily Occurrence in Speaking, Pronouncing and Writing the English Language, Corrected*. New York: Daniel Burgess & Co.

Anonymous. 1856b. *Live and Learn: A Guide for All, Who Wish to Speak and Write Correctly*. New York: Garrett & Company.

Ayres, Alfred. 1911. *The Verbalist*. New York and London: D. Appleton and Company, revised edn. First published in 1881.

Bache, Richard. 1868. *Vulgarisms and Other Errors of Speech*. Philadelphia: Claxton, Remsen & Haffelfinger.

Ballard, Harlan H. 1884. *Handbook of Blunders Designed to Prevent 1,000 Common Blunders in Writing and Speaking*. Boston: Lothrop, Lee & Shepard Co.

Bardeen, C.W. 1883. *Verbal Pitfalls: A Manual of 1500 Words Commonly Misused*. Syracuse, N.Y.: C.W. Bardeen, Publisher.

Batko, Ann. 2004. *When Bad Grammar Happens to Good People: How to Avoid Common Errors in English*. Franklin Lakes, NJ: Career Press.

Beason, Larry and Mark Lester. 1996. *Now I get it: A Commonsense Guide to Grammar and Usage*. Boston and New York: Bedford/St. Martin's.

Bechtel, John H. 1901. *Slips of Speech: A Helpful Book for Everyone Who Aspires*

to Correct the Everyday Errors of Speaking and Writing. Philadelphia: The Penn Publishing Company. First published in 1895.

Bierce, Ambrose. 1909. *Write It Right: A Little Blacklist of Literary Faults*. New York: Walker Publishing Company, Inc.

Booher, Dianna. 1992. *Good Grief, Good Grammar*. New York: Ballantine. First published in 1988.

Brians, Paul. 2003. *Common Errors in English Usage*. Wilsonville, Oreg.: William, James & Co.

Bryson, Bill. 1984. *The Penguin Dictionary of Troublesome Words*. London: Guild Publishing.

Carter, Bonnie, Craig Skates, and Ted Buchholz. 1990. *The Rinehart Guide to Grammar and Usage*. Fort Worth: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 2nd edn. First published in 1988.

Clark, Roy Peter. 2010. *The Glamour of Grammar: A Guide to the Magic and Mystery of Practical English*. New York: Little, Brown and Company.

Compton, Alfred G. 1898. *Some Common Errors of Speech*. New York and London: G.P. Putnam's Sons.

Copperud, Roy H. 1980. *American Usage and Style: The Consensus*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, revised edn.

Corbin, Richard K. and Porter G. Perrin. 1963. *Guide to Modern English*. Chicago: Scott, Foresman, and Company. First published in 1955.

de Mello Vianna, Fernando, Anne D. Steinhardt, and Carole La Mond, eds. 1977. *The Written Word*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

De Vries, Mary. 1991. *The Complete Word Book*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, Simon & Schuster.

Ebbitt, Wilma and David Ebbitt. 1978. *Writer's Guide and Index to English*. Glenview, Cook County, Ill.: Scott, Foresman and Company, 6th edn. First published in 1939.

Evans, Bergen and Cornelia Evans. 1957. *A Dictionary of Contemporary American Usage*. New York: Random House.

Fernald, James C. 1907. *Better Say – A Book of Helpful Suggestions for the Correct Use of English Words and Phrases*. New York: Funk & Wagnalls Company.

Fitzgerald, Joseph. 1901. *Word and Phrase: True and False Use in English*. Chicago: C. McClurg & Co.

Fogarty, Mignon. 2008. *Grammar Girl's Quick and Dirty Tips For Better Writing*. New York: St. Martin's Griffins.

Follett, Wilson. 1966. *Modern American Usage: A Guide*. New York: Hill & Wang.

Garner, Bryan. 1998. *A Dictionary of Modern American Usage*. New York: Oxford.

Gilman, E. Ward, ed. 1989. *Webster's Dictionary of English Usage*. Springfield, Mass.: Merriam-Webster.

Gould, Edward. 1867. *Good English, or Popular Errors in Language*. New York: W.J. Widdleton.

Hadida, Sophie. 1927. *Pitfalls in English and How to Avoid Them*. New York and London: G.P. Putnam's Sons.

Hall, John Leslie. 1917. *English Usage: Studies in the History and Uses of English Words and Phrases*. Chicago: Scott, Foresman, and Company.

Horwill, Herbert W. 1935. *A Dictionary of Modern American Usage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hurd, Seth T. 1847. *A Grammatical Corrector; or, Vocabulary of the Common Errors of Speech*. Philadelphia: E.H. Butler & Co.

Johnson, Edward D. 1991. *The Handbook of Good English: A Comprehensive, Easy-to-use Guide to Modern Grammar, Punctuation, Usage, and Style*. New York: Pocket Books, revised edn. First published in 1982.

Krapp, George Philip. 1927. *A Comprehensive Guide to Good English*. New York: Rand McNally.

Lounsbury, Thomas R. 1908. *The Standard of Usage in English*. New York and London: Harper & Brothers Publishers.

Lovinger, Paul W. 2000. *The Penguin Dictionary of American English Usage and Style*. New York: Penguin.

Mager, Nathan H., Sylvia K. Mager, and John Domini. 1993. *Prentice Hall Encyclopedic Dictionary of English Usage*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 2nd edn.

Meredith, L.P. 1872. *Every-day Errors of Speech*. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott & Co.

Morris, William and Mary Morris. 1975. *Harper Dictionary of Contemporary Usage*. London: Harper & Row.

Nicholson, Margaret. 1957. *A Dictionary of American-English Usage: Based on Fowler's Modern English Usage*. New York: Oxford University Press.

O'Conner, Patricia. 1998. *Woe is I*. New York: Riverhead Books. First published in 1996.

Parrish, Thomas. 2002. *The Grouchy Grammarian: A How-Not-To Guide to the 47 Most Common Mistakes in English Made by Journalists, Broadcasters, and Others Who Should Know Better*. Hoboken, N.J.: Wiley.

Partridge, Eric. 1947. *Usage and Abusage in English*. London: Hamilton. First published in 1942.

Payne, Gertrude. 1911. *Everyday Errors in Pronunciation, Spelling, and Spoken English*. San Francisco: Ricardo J. Orozco.

Perrin, Porter G. 1950. *A Writer's Guide and Index to English*. Chicago: Scott, Foresman, and Company, revised edn.

Perrin, Porter G. and George H. Smith. 1955. *The Perrin-Smith Handbook of Current English*. Chicago: Scott, Foresman, and Company.

Peters, Pam. 2004. *The Cambridge Guide to English Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pickett, Joseph P., Steven Kleinedler, and Susan Spitz, eds. 2005. *The American Heritage Guide to Contemporary Usage and Style*. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin.

Pinker, Steven. 2014. *The Sense of Style*. London and New York: Allan Lane.

Randall, Bernice. 1988. *Webster's New World Guide to Current American Usage*. New York: Prentice Hall, Simon & Schuster.

Shaw, Harry. 1975. *Dictionary of Problem Words and Expressions*. New York: McGraw-Hill. First published in 1975.

Stilman, Anne. 1997. *Grammatically Correct: The Writer's Essential Guide to Punctuation, Spelling, Style, Usage and Grammar*. Cincinnati, Ohio: Writer's Digest.

Stratton, Clarence. 1949. *Guide to Correct English*. New York and Toronto: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc.

Straus, Jane. 2008. *The Blue Book of Grammar*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Strunk, William. 1918. *The Elements of Style*. Geneva, N.Y.: Privately printed at the Press of W.F. Humphrey.

Sutcliffe, Andrea J. 1994. *The New York Public Library Writer's Guide to Style and Usage*. New York: Harper Collins Publishers.

Trask, Robert Lawrence. 2001. *Mind the Gaffe: The Penguin Guide to Common Errors in English*. London and New York: Penguin Books.

Treble, H.A. and G.H. Vallins. 1937. *An A.B.C. of English Usage*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Turck Baker, Josephine. 1910. *The Correct Word: How to Use It*. Chicago: The Correct English Publications.

Utter, Robert P. 1916. *Every-day Words and Their Uses: A Guide to Correct Diction*. Harper & Brothers.

Vermes, Jean C. 1981. *Secretary's Modern Guide to English Usage*. New York: Parker Publishing Company, Inc.

Vizetelly, Frank H. 1920. *A Desk-Book of Errors in English*. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, revised edn. First published in 1906.

Walsh, Bill. 2004. *The Elephants of Style: A Trunkload of Tips on the Big Issues and Gray Areas of Contemporary American English*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

White, Richard Grant. 1870. *Words and Their Uses, Past and Present: A Study of the English Language*. New York: Sheldon & Company.

Wilson, Kenneth G. 1993. *The Columbia Guide to Standard American English*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Witherspoon, Alexander M. 1948. *Common Errors in English and How to Avoid Them*. New York: Permabooks. First published in 1943.

Wood, George B. and Clarence Stratton. 1934. *The Blue Book of Good English*. Garden City, N.Y.: Nelson Doubleday, Inc. First published in 1926.

Secondary Sources

Aarts, Flor. 1994. Relative *who* and *whom*: prescriptive rules and linguistic reality. *American Speech*, 69(1):71–79.

Agheyisi, Rebecca N. and Joshua A. Fishman. 1970. Language attitude studies: a brief survey of methodological approaches. *Anthropological Linguistics*, 12(5):137–157.

Albakry, Mohammed. 2007. Usage prescriptive rules in newspaper language. *Southern Journal of Linguistics*, 30(2):28–56.

Albanyan, Ahmed and Dennis R. Preston. 1998. What is standard American English? *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia*, 34:29–46.

Algeo, John. 1991a. The best of the genre. *English Today*, 7(2):52–57.

Algeo, John. 1991b. Sweet are the usages of diversity. *Word*, 42(1):1–17.

Algeo, John. 1994. Pan-atlantic usage guidance. In Greta D. Little and Michael Montgomery, eds., *Centennial Usage Studies (Publication of the American Dialect Society, No. 78)*, pp. 101–107. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.

Allen, Harold B. 1935. The standard of usage in freshman textbooks. *English Journal*, 24:564–571.

Allen, Robert E. 2009. Dictionaries of usage. In A.P. Cowie, ed., *The Oxford History of English Lexicography, Vol. II: Specialized Dictionaries*, pp. 340–360. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Anderwald, Lieselotte. 2002. *Negation in Non-standard British English: Gaps, Regularizations, and Asymmetries*. London and New York: Routledge.

Anderwald, Lieselotte. 2004. The varieties of English spoken in the southeast

of England. In Bernd Kortmann, Kate Burridge, Rajend Mesthrie, Edgar W. Schneider, and Clive Upton, eds., *A Handbook of Varieties of English, Volume 2*, pp. 175–195. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Anderwald, Lieselotte. 2012. Clumsy, awkward or having a peculiar propriety? Prescriptive judgements and language change in the 19th century. *Language Sciences*, 34(1):28–53.

Anderwald, Lieselotte. 2014. Measuring the success of prescriptivism: quantitative grammaticography, corpus linguistics and the progressive passive. *English Language and Linguistics*, 18(1):1–21.

Anderwald, Lieselotte. 2016. *Language Between Description and Prescription: Verbs and Verb Categories in Nineteenth-Century Grammars of English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Anderwald, Liselotte. 2005. Negative concord in British English dialects. In Yoko Iyeiri, ed., *Aspects of English Negation*, pp. 113–137. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Arnovick, Leslie K. 1997. Proscribed collocations with *shall* and *will*: the eighteenth-century non-standard reassessed. In Jenny Cheshire and Dieter Stein, eds., *Taming the Vernacular: From Dialect to Written Standard Language*. Longman.

Auer, Anita. 2006. Precept and practice: the influence of prescriptivism on the English subjunctive. In Christiane Dalton-Puffer, Dieter Kastovsky, Nikolaus Ritt, and Herbert Schendl, eds., *Syntax, Style and Grammatical Norms: English from 1500–2000*, pp. 33–53. Bern: Peter Lang.

Auer, Anita. 2009. *The Subjunctive in the Age of Prescriptivism*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Auer, Anita and Victorina González-Díaz. 2005. Eighteenth-century prescriptivism in English: a re-evaluation of its effects on actual language usage. *Multilingua*, 24(4):317–341.

Austin, Frances. 1994. The effect of exposure to standard English: the language of William Clift. In Dieter Stein and Ingrid Tieken-Boon van Ostade, eds., *Towards a Standard English, 1600–1800*, pp. 285–313. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Baayen, R. Harald. 2008. *Analyzing Linguistic Data: A Practical Introduction to Statistics Using R*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bailey, Richard W. 1992. *Images of English: A Cultural History of the Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (first published by the University of Michigan Press in 1991).

Baker, Anne and Kees Hengeveld, eds. 2012. *Linguistics*. Malden, Mass.: John Wiley & Sons.

Baker, C.L. 1970. Double negatives. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 1(2):169–186.

Baker, Robert. 1770. *Reflections on the English Language, In the Nature of Vaugelas's Reflections on the French*. London.

Baron, Dennis E. 1982. *Grammar and Good Taste: Reforming the American Language*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Beal, Joan C. 2009. Three hundred years of prescriptivism (and counting). In Ingrid Tieken-Boon van Ostade and Wim van der Wurff, eds., *Current Issues in Late Modern English*, pp. 35–55. Bern: Peter Lang.

Berk, Lynne M. 1994. Prescriptive versus descriptive: the role of reference books. In Greta D. Little and Michael Montgomery, eds., *Centennial Usage Studies (Publication of the American Dialect Society, No. 78)*, pp. 108–114. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.

Biber, Douglas. 1988. *Variation across Speech and Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Biber, Douglas, Jesse Egbert, Bethany Gray, Rahel Oppliger, and Benedikt Szmrecsanyi. 2016. Variationist versus text-linguistic approaches to grammatical change in English: nominal modifiers of head nouns. In Merja Kytö and Päivi Pahta, eds., *Handbook of English Historical Linguistics*, pp. 351–375. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Biber, Douglas, Stig Johansson, Geoffrey Leech, Susan Conrad, and Edward Finegan. 1999. *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Harlow: Longman.

Bloomfield, Leonard. 1927. Literate and illiterate speech. *American Speech*, 2(10):432–439.

Bloomfield, Leonard. 1944. Secondary and tertiary responses to language. *Language*, 20(2):45–55.

Blyth, Carl, Sigrid Recktenwald, and Jenny Wang. 1990. I'm like, "Say what?!": a new quotative in American oral narrative. *American Speech*, 65(3):215.

Bodine, Ann. 1975. Androcentrism in prescriptive grammar: singular 'they', sex-indefinite 'he', and 'he or she'. *Language in Society*, 4(2):129–146.

Boyland, Joyce Tang. 2001. Hypercorrect pronoun case in English? Cognitive processes that account for pronoun usage. In Joan Bybee and Paul J. Hopper, eds., *Frequency and the Emergence of Linguistic Structure*, pp. 383–404. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Breheny, Patrick and Woodrow Burchett. 2017. Visualization of regression models using visreg. *The R Journal*, 9(2):56–71.

Brugman, Claudia. 1984. The very idea: a case study in polysemy and cross-lexical generalizations. *Papers from the Parasession on Lexical Semantics*, pp. 21–38.

Bryant, M.M. 1946. The split infinitive. *College English*, 8(1):39–40.

Bryer, Jason and Kimberly Speerschneider. 2017. *likert: Analysis and Visualization Likert Items*. http://jason.bryer.org/likert.

Buchstaller, Isabelle and Karen Corrigan. 2011. How to make intuitions succeed: testing methods for analysing syntactic microvariation. In Warren Maguire and April McMahon, eds., *Analysing Variation in English*, pp. 30–48. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Burchfield, Robert. 1991. The Fowler brothers and the tradition of usage handbooks. In Gerhard Leither, ed., *English Traditional Grammars: An International Perspective*, pp. 93–111. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Busse, Ulrich. 2015. Transatlantic perspectives on late nineteenth-century english usage: Alford (1864) compared to White (1871). In Marina Dossena, ed., *Transatlantic Perspectives on Late Modern English*, pp. 73–98. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Busse, Ulrich and Anne Schröder. 2009. Fowler's *Modern English Usage* at the interface of lexis and grammar. In Ute Römer and Rainer Schulze, eds., *Exploring the Lexis-Grammar Interface*, pp. 69–87. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Busse, Ulrich and Anne Schröder. 2010. Problem areas of English grammar between usage, norm, and variation. In Alexandra N. Lenz and Albert Plewnia, eds., *Grammar Between Norm and Variation*, pp. 87–102. Peter Lang.

Calhoun, Kendra. 2015. "It is the worst of our time": youth language, language attitudes, and arguments about literally. *Texas Linguistics Forum*, 58:1–10.

Calle-Martín, Javier and Antonio Miranda-García. 2009. On the use of split infinitives in English. In Andrew Kehoe and Antoinette Renouf, eds., *Corpus*

Linguistics: Refinements and Reassessments, pp. 347–364. Amsterdam: Brill Academic Publishers.

Cameron, Deborah. 1995. *Verbal Hygiene*. London and New York: Routledge.

Cameron, Deborah. 2012. The commodification of language: English as a global commodity. In Terttu Nevalainen and Elizabeth Closs Traugott, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of the History of English*, pp. 352–362. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Campbell-Kibler, Kathryn. 2006. *Listener Perceptions of Sociolinguistic Variables*. Stanford University: PhD Dissertation.

Campbell-Kibler, Kathryn. 2010. The sociolinguistic variant as a carrier of social meaning. *Language Variation and Change*, 22(3):423–441.

Card, William, Raven I. McDavid, and Virginia McDavid. 1984. Dimensions of usage and dictionary labeling. *Journal of English Linguistics*, 17(1):57–74.

Chafe, Wallace. 1984. Speaking, writing, and prescriptivism. In Deborah Schiffrin, ed., *Meaning, Form, and Use in Context: Linguistic Applications*, pp. 95–103. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Chambers, Jack K. 2004. Dynamic typology and vernacular universals. In Bernd Kortmann, ed., *Dialectology Meets Typology*, pp. 127–145. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Chambers, Jack K. and Peter Trudgill. 1980. *Dialectology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chapman, Don. 2017. Stalwarts, SNOOTS and some readers: How 'Traditional Rules' are traditional. In Ingrid Tieken-Boon van Ostade and Carol Percy, eds., *Prescription and Tradition in Language: Establishing Standards across Time and Space*, pp. 238–252. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Cheshire, Jenny. 1981. Variation in the use of *ain't* in an urban British English dialect. *Language in Society*, 10(3):365–381.

Cheshire, Jenny. 1982. *Variation in an English Dialect: A Sociolinguistic Study*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Claridge, Claudia. 2010. *Hyperbole in English: A Corpus-based Study of Exaggeration*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cohen, Jacob. 1988. *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*. New York: Academic Press.

Connors, Robert J. 1983. Handbooks: history of a genre. *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, 13(2):87–98.

Corder, Gregory W. and Dale I. Foreman. 2009. *Nonparametric Statistics for Non-Statisticians: A Step-by-Step Approach*. Hoboken: Wiley.

Creswell, Tomas J. 1975. *Usage in Dictionaries and Dictionaries of Usage*. Alabama: University of Alabama Press.

Crisp, Raymond. 1971. *Change in Attitudes toward English Usage*. University of Illinois: PhD Dissertation.

Croissant, Yves. 2013. *mlogit: multinomial logit model*. R package version 0.2-4.

Crystal, David. 2006. *The Fight for English: How Language Pundits Ate, Shot, and Left*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Curme, George O. 1927. The split infinitive. *American Speech*, 2(8):341.

Curme, George O. 1935. *A Grammar of the English Language, in Three Volumes. Vol. II: Parts of Speech and Accidence*. Boston: D.C. Heath and Company.

Curzan, Anne. 2014. *Fixing English: Prescriptivism and Language History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dailey-O'Cain, Jennifer. 2000. The sociolinguistic distribution of and attitudes toward focuser *like* and quotative *like*. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 4(1):60–80.

D'Arcy, Alexandra. 2006. Lexical replacement and the like(s). *American Speech*, 81(4):339–357.

D'Arcy, Alexandra. 2007. *Like* and language ideology: disentangling fact from fiction. *American Speech*, 82(4):386–419.

Davies, Mark. 2008–present. *The Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA): 560 million words, 1990–present*. Available online at https://corpus.byu.edu/coca/.

Davies, Mark. 2009. The 385+ million word *Corpus of Contemporary American English* (1990–2008+): design, architecture, and linguistic insights. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 14(2):159–190.

Davies, Mark. 2010a. The Corpus of Contemporary American English as the first reliable monitor corpus of English. *Literary and Linguistic Computing*, 25(4):447–464.

Davies, Mark. 2010b. *The Corpus of Historical American English (COHA): 400 million words, 1810–2009*. Available online at https://corpus.byu.edu/coha/.

Davies, Mark. 2012. Expanding horizons in historical linguistics with the 400 million word Corpus of Historical American English. *Corpora*, 7:121–157.

Dekeyser, Xavier. 1975. *Number and Case Relations in 19th Century British English: A Comparative Study of Grammar and Usage*. Antwerp: De Nederlandsche Boekhandel.

Denison, David. 1998. Syntax. In Suzanne Romaine, ed., *The Cambridge History of the English Language, Volume 4*, pp. 92–329. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dobbins, Austin C. 1956. The language of the cultivated. *College English*, 18(1):46–47.

Dragojevic, Marko, Howard Giles, and Bernadette M. Watson. 2013. Language ideologies and language attitudes: a foundational framework. In Howard Giles and Bernadette Watson, eds., *The Social Meanings of Language, Dialect and Accent: International Perspectives on Speech Styles*, pp. 1–25. New York: Peter Lang.

Drake, Glendon F. 1977a. American linguistic prescriptivism: its decline and revival in the 19th century. *Language in Society*, 6(3):323–340.

Drake, Glendon F. 1977b. *The Role of Prescriptivism in American Linguistics, 1820–1970*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Ebner, Carmen. 2016. Language guardian BBC? investigating the BBC's language advice in its 2003 news styleguide. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 37(3):308–320.

Ebner, Carmen. 2017. *Proper English Usage: A Sociolinguistic Investigation of Attitudes towards Usage Problems in British English*. University of Leiden: PhD Dissertation.

Facchinetti, Roberta. 2000. The modal verb *shall* between grammar and usage in the nineteenth century. In Arthur Mettinger and Dieter Kastovsky, eds., *The History of English in a Social Context: A Contribution to Historical Sociolinguistics*, pp. 115–133. Berlin and New York: De Gruyter Mouton.

Feagin, Crawford. 1979. *Variation and Change in Alabama English: A Sociolinguistic Study of the White Community*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Finegan, Edward. 1980. *Attitudes Toward English Usage: The History of a War of Words*. New York and London: Columbia University Teachers College Press.

Finegan, Edward. 1985. Unconscious attitudes toward linguistic variation. In Sidney

Greenbaum, ed., *The English Language Today*, pp. 92–98. Oxford: Pergamon Institute of English.

Fischer, Olga. 2000. Grammaticalisation: unidirectional, non-reversable? The case of *to* before the infinitive in English. In Olga Fischer, Anette Rosenbach, and Dieter Stein, eds., *Pathways of Change: Grammaticalization in English*, pp. 149–169. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Fischer, Roswitha. 2007. To boldly split the infinitive – or not? Prescriptive traditions and current English usage. In Stephan Elspaß, Nils Langer, Joachim Scharloth, and Wim Vandenbussche, eds., *Germanic Language Histories 'From Below' (1700–2000)*, pp. 259–274. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Fitzmaurice, Susan M. 1998. The commerce of language in the pursuit of politeness in eighteenth-century England. *English Studies*, 79(4):309–328.

Fitzmaurice, Susan M. 2000a. The great leveler: the role of the spoken media in stylistic shift from the colloquial to the conventional. *American Speech*, 75(1):54–68.

Fitzmaurice, Susan M. 2000b. Remarks on the de-grammaticalisation of infinitival *to* in present-day American English. In Olga Fischer, Anette Rosenbach, and Dieter Stein, eds., *Pathways of Change: Grammaticalization in English*, pp. 171–186. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Fries, Charles C. 1925. The periphrastic future with *shall* and *will* in Modern English. *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, 40(4):963–1024.

Fries, Charles C. 1940. *American English Grammar*. New York and London: D. Appleton-Century.

Fromkin, Victoria A., ed. 2000. *Linguistics: An Introduction to Linguistic Theory*. Malden, Mass.: Wiley.

Fuller, Janet M. 2003. Use of the discourse marker *like* in interviews. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 7(3):365–377.

Garrett, Peter. 2001. Language attitudes and sociolinguistics. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 5(4):626–631.

Garrett, Peter. 2010. *Attitudes to Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Giles, Howard and Tamara Rakic. 2014. Language attitudes: social determinants and consequences of language variation. In Thomas M. Holtgraves, ed., *The Oxford Handbook of Language and Social Psychology*, pp. 11–26. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Goatly, Andrew. 1997. *The Language of Metaphors*. London and New York: Routledge.

Gramley, Stephan and Kurt-Michael Pätzold. 1992. *A Survey of Modern English*. London: Routledge.

Greenbaum, Sidney and Janet Whitcut. 1988. *Longman Guide to English Usage*. Harlow: Longman.

Gustafsson, Larisa Oldireva. 2002. *Preterite and Past Participle Forms in English 1680–1790: Standardisation Processes in Public and Private Writing*. Uppsala: Uppsala University.

Harrell, Frank E. 2018. *rms: Regression Modeling Strategies*. R package version 5.1-2.

Hinrichs, Lars, Benedikt Szmrecsanyi, and Axel Bohmann. 2015. *Which*-hunting and the Standard English relative clause. *Language*, 91(4):806–836.

Hock, Hans Henrich and Brian D. Joseph. 2009. *Language History, Language Change, and Language Relationship: An Introduction to Historical and Comparative Linguistics*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Hodson, Jane. 2006. The problem of Joseph Priestley's (1733–1804) descriptivism. *Historiographia Linguistica*, 33(1):57–84.

Howe, Darin M. 1997. Negation and the history of African American English. *Language Variation and Change*, 9(2):267–294.

Howe, Darin M. and James A. Walker. 2000. Negation and the creole-origins hypothesis: evidence from early African American English. In Shana Poplack, ed., *The English History of African American English*, pp. 109–140. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell.

Huddleston, Rodney and Geoffrey K. Pullum. 2002. *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge.

Ilson, Robert. 1985. Usage problems in British and American English. In Sidney Greenbaum, ed., *The English Language Today*, pp. 166–182. Oxford: Pergamon Institute of English.

Irvine, Judith. 1989. When talk isn't cheap: language and political economy. *American Ethnologist*, 16(2):248–267.

Israel, Michael. 2002. *Literally* speaking. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 34(4):423–432.

Iyeiri, Yoko. 2001. *Negative Constructions in Middle English*. Fukuoka: Kyushu University Press.

Jespersen, Otto. 1940. *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles, Part V: Syntax (Fourth Volume)*. London and Copenhagen: George Allen & Unwin Ltd./Ejnar Munskgaard.

Kachru, Braj B. 1992. Models for non-native Englishes. In Braj B. Kachru, ed., *The Other Tongue. English Across Cultures*, pp. 48–74. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press.

Kato, Kazuo. 2001. *Not to be* or *to not be*: more on split negative infinitives. *American Speech*, 76(3):312–315.

Kjellmer, Goran. 1997. On contraction in modern English. *Studia Neophilologica*, 69(2):155–186.

Klima, Edward S. 1964. Relatedness between grammatical systems. *Language*, 40:1–20.

Konopka, Marek. 1996. *Strittige Erscheinungen der Deutschen Syntax im 18. Jahrhundert*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.

Kostadinova, Viktorija. 2015. Literally, too big a fuss about nothing. *English Today*, 31(2):3–4.

Kostadinova, Viktorija. 2018a. Correcting English: Josephine Turck Baker (1873–1942) and the early American usage guide tradition. In Linda Pillière, Wilfrid Andrieu, Valérie Kerfelec, and Diana Lewis, eds., *Standardising English: Norms and Margins in the History of the English Language*, pp. 171–190. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kostadinova, Viktorija. 2018b. Usage problems in American English. In Ingrid Tieken-Boon van Ostade, ed., *English Usage Guides: History, Advice, Attitudes*, pp. 155–175. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kostadinova, Viktorija. forthcoming. Prescriptivism as a constraint in language variation and change: moving beyond binary oppositions. In Don Chapman and Jacob D. Rawlins, eds., *Values and Multiplicity: Identity and Fluidity in Prescriptivism and Descriptivism*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Kostadinova, Viktorija. in press. Attitudes to usage vs. actual language use: the case of *literally* in American English. *English Today*.

Kroch, Anthony and Cathy Small. 1978. Grammatical ideology and its effect on speech. In David Sankoff, ed., *Linguistics Variation: Models and Methods*, pp. 45–55. New York: Academic Press.

Kroskrity, Paul. 2004. Language ideologies. In Alessandro Duranti, ed., *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology*, pp. 496–517. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell.

Labov, William. 1972a. Negative attraction and negative concord in English grammar. *Language*, 48(4):773–818.

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

Labov, William, Paul Cohen, Clarence Robins, and John Lewis. 1968. *A Study of the Non-standard English of Negro and Puerto Rican Speakers in New York City*. New York: Columbia University.

Laitinen, Mikko. 2009. Singular YOU WAS/WERE variation and English normative grammars in the eighteenth century. In Minna Palander-Collin, Minna Nevala, and Arja Nurmi, eds., *The Language of Daily Life in England (1400–1800)*, pp. 199–217.

Landau, Sidney I. 2001. *Dictionaries: The Art and Craft of Lexicography*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lavandera, Beatriz R. 1978. Where does the sociolinguistic variable stop? *Language in Society*, 7(2):171–182.

Leech, Geoffrey, Marianne Hundt, Christian Mair, and Nicholas Smith. 2009. *Change in Contemporary English: A Grammatical Study*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Leech, Geoffrey and Nicholas Smith. 2009. Change and constancy in linguistic change: how grammatical usage in written English evolved in the period 1931–1991. In Andrew Kehoe and Antoinette Renouf, eds., *Corpus Linguistics: Refinements and Reassessments*, pp. 173–200. Amsterdam: Brill Academic Publishers.

Leonard, Sterling A. 1929. *The Doctrine of Correctness in English Usage, 1700–1800*. New York: Columbia University.

Leonard, Sterling A. 1932. *Current English Usage*. Chicago: The Inland Press.

Levshina, Natalia. 2015. *How to Do Linguistics with R: Data Exploration and Statistical Analysis*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Lippi-Green, Rosina. 1997. *English with an Accent: Language, Ideology, and Discrimination in the United States*. London and New York: Routledge.

Long, Daniel and Dennis R. Preston. 2002. *Handbook of Perceptual Dialectology, Volume 2*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Lukač, Morana. 2018. *Grassroots Prescriptivism*. University of Leiden: PhD Dissertation.

Macaulay, Ronald. 2001. You're like 'why not?' The quotative expressions of Glasgow adolescents. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 5(1):3–21.

MacKay, Donald G. 1980. On the goals, principles, and procedures for prescriptive grammar: singular *they*. *Language in Society*, 9(3):349–367.

Mair, Christian. 2006. *Twentieth-Century English: History, Variation, and Standardization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mair, Christian and Geoffrey Leech. 2006. Current changes in English syntax. In Bas Aarts and April M.S. McMahon, eds., *The Handbook of English Linguistics*, pp. 318–342. Malden, Mass. and Oxford: Blackwell.

Malmstrom, Jean. 1964[1958]. Linguistic atlas findings vs texbooks pronouncements on current American usage. In Harold B. Allen, ed., *Readings in Applied English Linguistics*, pp. 316–323. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Malone, Kemp. 1941. The split infinitive and a system of clauses. *American Speech*, 16(1):52–54.

Marckwardt, Albert H. 1968. Language standards and attitudes. In Albert H. Marckwardt, ed., *Language and Language Learning*, pp. 1–22. Champaign, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English.

Marckwardt, Albert H. and Fred G. Walcott. 1938. *Facts About Current English Usage*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

McArthur, Tom. 1986. The usage industry. *English Today*, 2(3):8.

McCarthy, Michael and Ronald Carter. 2004. "There's millions of them": hyperbole in everyday conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 36(2):149–184.

McDavid, Raven I. 1941. *Ain't I* and *aren't I*. *Language*, 17(1):57–59.

McDavid, Virginia G. 1973. Variations in dictionary labeling practices. In Raven I. McDavid and Audrey R. Duckert, eds., *Lexicography in English*, pp. 187–207. New York: New York Academy of Sciences.

McKenzie, Robert M. 2010. *The Social Psychology of English as a Global Language*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Meyers, Walter E. 1991. Usage glossaries in current college handbooks. *American Speech*, 66(4):341–358.

Meyers, Walter E. 1995. Linguistics in textbooks: a forty-year comparison. *American Speech*, 70(1):30–68.

Milroy, James. 2001. Language ideologies and the consequences of standardization. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 5(4):530–555.

Milroy, James and Lesley Milroy. 1985. *Authority in Language: Investigating Language Prescription and Standardisation*. London and New York: Routledge.

Milroy, James and Lesley Milroy. 2012. *Authority in Language: Investigating Standard English*. London and New York: Taylor & Francis, 4th edn.

Mittins, W.H., Mary Salu, Mary Edminson, and Sheila Coyne. 1970. *Attitudes to English Usage*. London: Oxford University Press.

Molencki, Rafał. 2003. Proscriptive prescriptivists: on the loss of the 'pleonastic' perfect infinitive in counterfactual constructions in Late Modern English. In Marina Dossena and Charles Jones, eds., *Insights into Late Modern English*, pp. 175–196. Bern: Peter Lang.

Nerlich, Brigitte and Pedro J. Chamizo Domínguez. 2003. The use of *literally*: Vice or virtue? *Annual Review of Cognitive Linguistics*, 1(1):193–206.

Nevalainen, Terttu. 1997. The processes of adverb derivation in Late Middle and Early Modern English. In Matti Rissanen, Merja Kytö, and Kirsi Heikkonen, eds., *Grammaticalization at Work*, pp. 145–190. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Nevalainen, Terttu. 2000. Gender differences in the evolution of standard English: evidence from the corpus of early English correspondence. *Journal of English Linguistics*, 28(1):38–59.

Nevalainen, Terttu. 2006a. Historical linguistics and language change. In Ans van Kemenade and Bettelou Los, eds., *The Handbook of the History of English*, pp. 558–588. Oxford: Blackwell.

Nevalainen, Terttu. 2006b. Negative concord as an English "vernacular universal": social history and linguistic typology. *Journal of English Linguistics*, 34(3):257–278.

Nevalainen, Terttu and Helena Raumolin-Bunberg. 2003. *Sociohistorical linguistics: Language Change in Tudor and Stuart England*. London and New York: Routledge.

Pateman, Trevor. 1982. MacKay on singular *they*. (discussion). *Language in Society*, 11(3):437–438.

Perales-Escudero, Moisés D. 2011. To split or to not split: the split infinitive past and present. *Journal of English Linguistics*, 39(4):313–334.

Percy, Carol. 2009. Periodical reviews and the rise of prescriptivism: the *Monthly* (1749–1844) and *Critical Review* (1756–1817) in the eighteenth century. In Ingrid Tieken-Boon van Ostade and Wim van der Wurff, eds., *Current Issues in Late Modern English*, pp. 117–150. Bern: Peter Lang.

Peters, Pam. 2006. English usage: prescription and description. In Bas Aarts and April M.S. McMahon, eds., *The Handbook of English Linguistics*, pp. 759–780. Malden, Mass. and Oxford: Blackwell.

Peters, Pam. 2012. Usage guides and Australian English: prescription and description. In Anne Schröder, Ulrich Busse, and Ralf Schneider, eds., *Codification, Canons and Curricula: Description and Prescription in Language and Literature*, pp. 247–264. Bielefeld: Aisthesis Verlag.

Peters, Pam. 2014. Usage guides and usage trends in Australian and British English. *Australian Journal of Linguistics*, 34(4):581–598.

Peters, Pam and Wendy Young. 1997. English grammar and the lexicography of usage. *Journal of English Linguistics*, 25(4):315–331.

Poplack, Shana. 2006. How English became African American English. In Ans van Kemenade and Bettelou Los, eds., *The Handbook of the History of English*, pp. 452–479. Oxford: Blackwell.

Poplack, Shana and Nathalie Dion. 2009. Prescription vs. praxis: the evolution of future temporal reference in French. *Language*, 85(3):357–387.

Powell, Mava Jo. 1992. Folk theories of meaning and principles of conventionality: encoding literal attitude via stance adverb. In Adrienne Lehrer and Eva Feder Kitay, eds., *Frames, Fields, and Contrasts: New Essays in Semantic and Lexical Organization*, pp. 333–353. New York and London: Routledge.

Preston, Dennis R. 1991. Sorting out the variables in sociolinguistic theory. *American Speech*, 66(1):33–56.

Preston, Dennis R. 1999a. *Handbook of Perceptual Dialectology, Volume 1*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Preston, Dennis R. 1999b. A language attitude analysis of regional US speech: is northern US English not friendly enough? *Cuadernos de Filologia Inglesa*, 8:129–146.

Pullum, Geoffrey K. 2010a. The land of the free and *The Elements of Style*. *English Today*, 26(2):34–44.

Pullum, Geoffrey K. 2010b. These 'rules' are already broken. *Times Higher Education*, p. 56.

Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, and Jan Svartvik. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.

R Core Team. 2013. *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.

Roberts, Sam. 2009. 'The Elements of Style' turns 50. *The New York Times*, p. C3.

Romaine, Suzanne and Deborah Lange. 1991. The use of *like* as a marker of reported speech and thought: a case of grammaticalization in progress. *American Speech*, 66(3):227–279.

Sankoff, Gillian. 1972. Above and beyond phonology in variable rules. In Charles-James N. Bailey and Roger W. Shuy, eds., *New Ways of Analyzing Variation in English*, pp. 44–61. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Schourup, Lawrence. 1983. Common discourse particles in English conversation. *Ohio State Working Papers in Linguistics*, 28.

Schweiger, Beth Barton. 2010. A social history of English grammar in the early United States. *Journal of the Early Republic*, 30(4):533–555.

Seright, Orin Dale. 1966. Double negatives in Standard Modern English. *American Speech*, 41(2):123.

Silverstein, Michael. 1976. Shifters, linguistic categories, and cultural description. In Keith H. Basso and Henry A. Selby, eds., *Meaning in Anthropology*, pp. 11–56. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Silverstein, Michael. 1979. Language structure and linguistic ideology. In Paul R. Clyne, William F. Hanks, and Carol L. Hofbauer, eds., *The Elements: a Parasession on Linguistic Units and Levels Including Papers from the Conference on Non Slavic Languages of the USSR*, pp. 193–248. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

Silverstein, Michael. 1996. Monoglot "standard" in America: standardization and metaphors of linguistic hegemony. In Donald Brenneis and Ronald H.S. Macaulay, eds., *The Matrix of Language: Contemporary Linguistic Anthropology*, pp. 284–306. Boulder: Westview Press.

Silverstein, Michael. 2003. Indexical order and the dialectics of sociolinguistic life. *Language and Communication*, 23(3):193–229.

Singh, Rajendra. 1996. *Lectures Against Sociolinguistics*. New York: Peter Lang.

Smith, Jennifer. 2001. Negative concord in the old and new world: evidence from Scotland. *Language Variation and Change*, 13(2):109–134.

Speelman, Dirk, Adriaan Spruyt, Leen Impe, and Dirk Geeraerts. 2013. Language attitudes revisited: auditory affective priming. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 52:83–92.

Stenetorp, Pontus, Sampo Pyysalo, Goran Topić, Tomoko Ohta, Sophia Ananiadou, and Jun'ichi Tsujii. 2012. brat: a web-based tool for nlp-assisted text annotation. In *Proceedings of the Demonstrations Session at EACL 2012*.

Stevens, Martin. 1954. The derivation of 'ain't'. *American Speech*, 29(3):196.

Straaijer, Robin. 2009. Deontic and epistemic modals as indicators of prescriptive and descriptive language in the grammars of Joseph Priestley and Robert Lowth. In Ingrid Tieken-Boon van Ostade and Wim van der Wurff, eds., *Current Issues in Late Modern English*, pp. 57–87. Bern: Peter Lang.

Straaijer, Robin. 2014. *Hyper Usage Guide of English*. University of Leiden: http://huge.ullet.net.

Straaijer, Robin. 2015. *The Hyper Usage Guide of English Database: User Manual*. University of Leiden. Online publication.

Straaijer, Robin. 2018. The usage guide: evolution of a genre. In Ingrid Tieken-Boon van Ostade, ed., *English Usage Guides: History, Advice, Attitudes*, pp. 11–29. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sundby, Bertil, Anne Kari Bjørge, and Kari E. Haugland. 1991. *A Dictionary of English Normative Grammar, 1700–1800*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Szmrecsanyi, Benedikt. 2016. About text frequencies in historical linguistics: disentangling environmental and grammatical change. *Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Theory*, 12(1):153–171.

Tagliamonte, Sali A. 2012. *Variationist Sociolinguistics: Change, Observation, Interpretation*. Malden, Mass.: Wiley-Blackwell.

Thomason, Sarah G. 2007. Language contact and deliberate language change. *Journal of Language Contact – THEMA*, 1:41–62.

Thomason, Sarah G. 2011. *Language Contact*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Tibbetts, A. M. 1966. Were nineteenth-century textbooks really prescriptive? *College English*, 27(4):309–315.

Tieken-Boon van Ostade, Ingrid. 1982. Double negation and eighteenth-century English grammars. *Neophilologus*, 66:278–285.

Tieken-Boon van Ostade, Ingrid. 1994. Standard and non-standard pronominal usage in English, with special reference to the eighteenth century. In Dieter Stein and Ingrid Tieken-Boon van Ostade, eds., *Towards a Standard English, 1600–1800*, pp. 217–242. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Tieken-Boon van Ostade, Ingrid. 2000. Normative studies in England. In Sylvian Auroux, E.F.K. Koerner, Hans-J. Niederehe, and Kees Versteegh, eds., *History of the Language Sciences/Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaften/Histoire des sciences du langage*, pp. 876–887. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Tieken-Boon van Ostade, Ingrid. 2002. *You was* and eighteenth-century normative grammar. In Katja Lenz and Ruth Möhlig, eds., *On Dyuersite & Chaunge of Langage: Essays Presented to Manfred Görlach on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*, pp. 88–102. Heidelberg: C. Winter Universitätsverlag.

Tieken-Boon van Ostade, Ingrid. 2006. Eighteenth-century prescriptivism and the norm of correctness. In Ans van Kemenade and Bettelou Los, eds., *The Handbook of the History of English*, pp. 539–557. Oxford: Blackwell.

Tieken-Boon van Ostade, Ingrid. 2008a. The codifiers and the history of multiple negation, or, why were 18th-century grammarians so obsessed with double negation? In Joan C. Beal, Carmela Nocera, and Massimo Sturiale, eds., *Perspectives on Prescriptivism*, pp. 197–214. Bern: Peter Lang.

Tieken-Boon van Ostade, Ingrid, ed. 2008b. *Grammars, Grammarians, and Grammar-writing in Eighteenth-century England*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Tieken-Boon van Ostade, Ingrid. 2010. The usage guide: its birth and popularity. *English Today*, 26(2):14–23.

Tieken-Boon van Ostade, Ingrid. 2011. *The Bishop's Grammar: Robert Lowth and the Rise of Prescriptivism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tieken-Boon van Ostade, Ingrid. 2012a. The codification of English in England. In Raymond Hickey, ed., *Standards of English: Codified Varieties Around the World*, pp. 34–54. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tieken-Boon van Ostade, Ingrid. 2012b. Codifying the English language. In Anne Schröder, Ulrich Busse, and Ralf Schneider, eds., *Codification, Canons and*

Curricula: Description and Prescription in Language and Literature, pp. 61–77. Bielefeld: Aisthesis Verlag.

Tieken-Boon van Ostade, Ingrid. 2012c. English at the onset of the normative tradition. In Lynda Mugglestone, ed., *The Oxford History of English*, pp. 240–273. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tieken-Boon van Ostade, Ingrid. 2015. *Five Hundred Mistakes Corrected*: an early American usage guide. In Marina Dossena, ed., *Transatlantic Perspectives on Late Modern English*, pp. 55–72. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Tieken-Boon van Ostade, Ingrid. 2016. Usage guides and the age of prescriptivism. Paper presented at the *19th International Conference on English Historical Linguistics*, University of Duisburg-Essen, Germany.

Tieken-Boon van Ostade, Ingrid. forthcoming. *Describing Prescriptivism*.

Tieken-Boon van Ostade, Ingrid and Carmen Ebner. 2017. Prescriptive attitudes to usage. In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Available online at: http://linguistics.oxfordre.com.

Tottie, Gunnel. 1997. Literacy and prescriptivism as determinants of linguistic change. In Uwe Böker and Hans Sauer, eds., *Anglistentag, Dresden 1996*, pp. 83–93. Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier.

Trudgill, Peter. 2009. Vernacular universals and the sociolinguistic typology of English dialects. In Markku Filppula, Juhani Klemola, and Heli Paulasto, eds., *Vernacular Universals and Language Contacts: Evidence from Varieties of English and Beyond*, pp. 304–322. New York and London: Routledge.

Tucker, G. Richard and Wallace E. Lambert. 1972. White and Negro listeners' reactions to various American-English dialects. In Joshua A. Fishman, ed., *Advances in the Sociology of Language*, pp. 175–184. The Hague and Paris: Mouton.

Ueda, Reed. 1987. *Avenues to Adulthood: The Origins of the High School and Social Mobility in an American Suburb*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ukaji, Masatomo. 1999. On the scope of negative concord. In Ingrid Tieken-Boon van Ostade, Gunnel Tottie, and Wim van der Wurff, eds., *Negation in the History of English*, pp. 269–294. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Underhill, Robert. 1988. *Like* is, like, focus. *American Speech*, 63(3):234.

van der Wouden, Ton. 1997. *Negative Contexts: Collocation, Polarity and Multiple Negation*. London and New York: Routledge.

Vorlat, Emma. 1979. Criteria of grammaticalness in 16th- and 17th-century English. *Leuvense Bijdragen: Tijdschrift voor Germaanse Filologie*, 68(2):129–140.

Walker, James A. 2005. The *ain't* constraint: *not*-contraction in early African American English. *Language Variation and Change*, 17(1):1–17.

Weiner, Edmund. 1988. On editing a usage guide. In E.G. Stanley and T.F. Hoad, eds., *Words: For Robert Burchfield's Sixty-fifth Birthday*, pp. 171–183. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer.

Weldon, Tracey. 1994. Variability in negation in African American Vernacular English. *Language Variation and Change*, 6(3):359–397.

Wickham, Hadley. 2009. *ggplot2: Elegant Graphics for Data Analysis*. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Wild, Catherine. 2010. *Attitudes towards English Usage in the Late Modern Period: the Case of Phrasal Verbs*. University of Glasgow: PhD Dissertation.

Wolfram, Walt. 1969. *A Sociolinguistic Description of Detroit Negro Speech*. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Wolfram, Walt. 1974. *Sociolinguistic Aspects of Assimilation: Puerto Rican English in New York City*. Arlington, Va.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Wolfram, Walt. 2004. Social varieties of American English. In Edward Finegan and John R. Rickford, eds., *Language in the U.S.A.: Themes for the 21st Century*, pp. 58–75. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wolfram, Walt and Donna Christian. 1976. *Appalachian Speech*. Arlington, Va.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Wolfram, Walt and Ralph W. Fasold. 1974. *The Study of Social Dialects in American English*. New York: Prentice-Hall.

Wolfram, Walt and Natalie Schilling. 2016. *American English: Dialects and Variation*. Malden, Mass.: Wiley Blackwell, 3rd edn.

Woolard, Kathryn A. and Bambi B. Schieffelin. 1994. Language ideology. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 23(1):55–82.

Yáñez-Bouza, Nuria. 2015. *Grammar, Rhetoric and Usage in English: Preposition Placement 1500–1900*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.