UNIVERSIDAD DE SALAMANCA

FACULTAD DE FILOLOGÍA

DEPARTAMENTO DE FILOLOGÍA INGLESA

TESIS DOCTORAL

The Enregisterment of Late Modern Derbyshire Dialect

(1850-1950)

DOCTORANDA:

Paula Schintu Martínez

DIRECTORES:

Dr. Fco. Javier Ruano García

Dra. Mª Fuencisla García-Bermejo Giner

2022

UNIVERSIDAD DE SALAMANCA

FACULTAD DE FILOLOGÍA

DEPARTAMENTO DE FILOLOGÍA INGLESA

TESIS DOCTORAL

The Enregisterment of Late Modern Derbyshire Dialect (1850-1950)

Resumen del trabajo para optar al título de doctor presentado por **Paula Schintu Martínez**, bajo la supervisión del **Dr. Fco. Javier Ruano García** y la **Dra. Mª Fuencisla García-Bermejo Giner**

Vº Bº de los Directores:

Dr. Fco. Javier Ruano García   Dra. Mª Fuencisla García-Bermejo Giner

Table of Contents

Abstract

Within the framework of third-wave sociolinguistic research, Asif Agha's (2003) theory of *enregisterment* has proved a successful approach to explore the path that leads to the indexical connection between language and ideology. As is known, the extensive and pioneering work on Pittsburghese by Johnstone (2006, 2009, 2013, among others) and Johnstone et al. (2006) has paved the way for the study of enregisterment of modern dialects, whilst Beal (2009a, 2012a, 2012b, 2016, 2020), Beal and Cooper (2015), Cooper (2013, 2016, 2020), and Ruano-García (2012, 2020a, 2021a) have investigated this phenomenon in northern varieties of British English from a diachronic perspective. Crucially, most of them examine instances of dialect writing as they reify "the idea of a dialect and [provide] models for the performance of local identity" (Beal 2009a: 3), which ultimately contributes to dialect enregisterment.

This thesis seeks to add to this field of research by looking at literary representations of Derbyshire speech (1850-1950) through the lens of enregisterment. My aims are threefold: I attempt to (1) shed light on the history and main linguistic and sociolinguistic features of the Derbyshire dialect, while (2) determining how this variety was enregistered in the Late Modern English period and the role that dialect writing and dialect commentary played in this process. In this manner, I also aim to (3) enhance our understanding not only of the sociolinguistic panorama of late modern England, but also of the mechanisms involved in socio-cultural development and linguistic variation and change more generally.

The qualitative and quantitative analysis of the data has revealed discernible patterns in the depiction of a set of seemingly enregistered transitional linguistic features which correlate with specific social values and identities. It has likewise revealed discrepancies in the degree of perceived localness of some of these features which point to indexical changes and processes of deregisterment operating not only over time, but also over type of representation. In other words, the results obtained suggest that the Derbyshire dialect was perceived and thus represented variably over the course of the centuries and by insiders and outsiders of the dialect, evincing the dynamic nature of processes of enregisterment and underscoring the agentive role of writers and audiences in (re)shaping language and identity.

Resumen

En el marco de la investigación sociolingüística de tercera ola, la teoría del *enregisterment* de Asif Agha (2003) ha demostrado ser un enfoque exitoso para explorar la conexión entre lengua e ideología. Como es sabido, el extenso y pionero trabajo de Johnstone (2006, 2009, 2013, entre otros) y Johnstone et al. (2006) sobre el Pittsburghese ha sentado las bases para estudiar los procesos de enregisterment de dialectos modernos, mientras que Beal (2009a, 2012a, 2012b, 2016, 2020), Beal y Cooper (2015), Cooper (2013, 2016, 2020) y Ruano-García (2012, 2020a, 2021a) han investigado este fenómeno en variedades norteñas del inglés británico desde una perspectiva diacrónica. En la mayoría de estos trabajos se examinan ejemplos de escritura dialectal, ya que, como explica Beal (2009a: 3), a través de este material se da forma a la imagen abstracta de un dialecto y se proporcionan modelos para la representación de una determinada identidad local, lo que en última instancia contribuye al enregisterment.

Esta tesis pretende contribuir a este campo de investigación a través del análisis de las representaciones literarias del habla de Derbyshire (1850-1950) desde la perspectiva del enregisterment. El presente estudio se propone tres objetivos principales: (1) arrojar luz sobre la historia y las principales características lingüísticas y sociolingüísticas del dialecto de Derbyshire, así como (2) examinar el enregisterment de esta variedad en el período y el papel que la escritura y comentarios dialectales desempeñaron en dicho proceso. De este modo, se pretende (3) mejorar nuestra comprensión no solo del panorama sociolingüístico de la Inglaterra moderna tardía, sino también de los mecanismos que determinan el desarrollo sociocultural y la variación y cambio lingüístico en general.

El análisis cualitativo y cuantitativo de los datos obtenidos en este estudio ha revelado claros patrones en la representación de un conjunto de rasgos lingüísticos de transición asociados con la variedad que se correlacionan con valores e identidades sociales específicos. Asimismo, se han observado discrepancias en el grado de localidad percibida de algunos de estos rasgos, lo que apunta a cambios indexicales y procesos de deregisterment que parecen depender no solo del tiempo, sino también del tipo de representación. En otras palabras, los resultados sugieren que el dialecto de Derbyshire se ha percibido y, por lo tanto, se ha representado de manera variable tanto a lo largo de los siglos como por parte de autores nativos y no nativos del dialecto, lo que evidencia la naturaleza dinámica de los procesos de enregisterment y subraya el papel agentivo de

escritores y lectores a la hora de establecer y reformular la relación entre lenguaje e identidad.

Acknowledgements

1.
Introduction

Over the past years, advances in historical sociolinguistic research have enriched and broadened our understanding of the complex phenomenon of linguistic variation in the past. They have opened new paths into the principles and rationale underlying human linguistic behaviour and, consequently, language change. The premise is straightforward: language evolves "in systematic connection to the socio-historical situation of [its] speakers" (Conde-Silvestre and Hernández-Campoy 2012: 1), which inevitably places the individual at the centre of sociolinguistic enquiry. On this basis, third-wave historical sociolinguistic studies have developed frameworks to provide more refined insight into the processes that may explain the history of languages. Such processes, Conde-Silvestre and Hernández-Campoy (2012: 3) contend, "can no longer be seen as simple shifts from one state to another, but as complex courses whose inception and spread often interact with" elaborate nets of sociolinguistic variables, which ultimately shape and determine the sociolinguistic constructs that we come to understand as discernible varieties and registers. And it is precisely the road to such a fine-drawn realisation that Asif Agha's (2003) theory of *enregisterment* tries to fathom.

1.1. Research Overview and Background

This thesis explores the concept of enregisterment from a historical perspective by considering the diachronic development of late modern Derbyshire dialect (1850-1950). Over the last two decades, enregisterment, or the "processes through which a linguistic repertoire becomes differentiable within language as a socially recognized register of forms" (Agha 2003: 231), has attracted considerable scholarly attention on account of its potential to explain what is often assumed to be the inherent connection between a specific set of linguistic features and particular socio-cultural meanings and identities. Such a connection, which ultimately distinguishes and legitimates a given linguistic variety, is not innate but rather bestowed and crafted by speakers via a range of discursive practices which exemplify and subsequently circulate the perceived relationship between language and ideology. This allows its replication over time, place, and populations, leading to the variety's enregisterment and legitimation as a unique and established register.

Such processes and the metapragmatic practices behind their development have been extensively and thoroughly investigated in relation to modern linguistic varieties, especially in the well-known works on Pittsburghese by Johnstone (2006, 2009, 2011, 2013, among others) and Johnstone et al. (2006), which have laid the foundation for the study of the enregisterment of dialect. Less attention, however, has been paid to the study of this phenomenon in historical contexts due to, among other reasons, the scarcity or even lack of availability of ready material to evaluate linguistic variation in the past. In this sense, projects like *The Salamanca Corpus* (2011-) have played a crucial role in the pursuit of empirical solidity by trying to remedy these deficiencies. Such projects, together with the developments in the field of historical sociolinguistics, have contributed to alleviate this problem by providing tools and developing methodologies that have strengthened the discipline's scientific reliability. In this framework, studies like Beal (2009), Cooper (2013, 2015, 2016, 2020), Beal and Cooper (2015), Ruano-García (2012, 2020, 2021), and Asprey (2020) have highlighted the role of historical textual material as a crucial source of both linguistic and sociolinguistic information about dialects long gone by. In fact, most of them turn to literary representations of dialect as a tool to reconstruct the form-meaning connections reflected in the performative interplay between literary characterological types and their linguistic behaviour, which is in turn mediated by the real-life experience, perceptions, and shared expectations of literary authors and their audiences.

This thesis seeks to contribute to this field of research by investigating the process of enregisterment of late modern Derbyshire dialect and examines the literary representations of this variety. While most of the research outlined above, with the exception of Asprey's (2020) study on the Black Country dialect, has concentrated on northern varieties of British English, very little has been discussed as regards the enregisterment of other historical dialects. In this sense, late modern Derbyshire speech has revealed itself as a particularly enthralling variety for three main reasons. Firstly, it was spoken in a region of remarkable interest for the sociolinguist, as the county lies in a transition area between the north of England and the Midlands, within which it also marks the borderline separating the East and the West Midlands. In fact, its dialect has often been described as "a fascinating mixture of both East Midland and West Midland forms, along with others that have crept in from the North" (Wright 1975: 3). The unique linguistic character of the dialect thus raises questions about contemporary perceptions of

its (socio)linguistic nature and how such ideas may have informed the way the variety was represented and thus enregistered. Secondly, a number of key socio-demographic and historical factors that have been singled out as prerequisites for dialect enregisterment (see Johnstone et al. 2006: 89-99) have been identified in 19th and 20th-century Derbyshire. These include social and geographical mobility and language contact, which, coupled with the county's peculiar location, idiosyncrasy, industry, and working-class mentality, gave way to a well-defined and distinctive character that ultimately shaped its societal structures, language, and identity, while it fostered awareness of sociolinguistic difference. Indeed, such an awareness was behind the emergence of a considerable body of Derbyshire dialect writing during the period, which opens windows into the county's society, dialect, and character. Last but not least, and perhaps rather surprisingly given the abovementioned premises, the Derbyshire dialect remains to date virtually unexplored, with only a few exceptions among which the works by García-Bermejo Giner (1991b, 1993) are the most remarkable.

1.2. Research Aims, Questions and Hypotheses

Within this context, the aim of this thesis is threefold. Firstly, it seeks to shed light on the history of the Derbyshire dialect by exploring its representation in literature. Besides, it attempts to determine how this variety was enregistered in the Late Modern English period, as well as to ascertain the role of dialect writing and dialect commentary, and, therefore, of the human agents involved in their production and sociolinguistic development. In this manner, this thesis also aims to contribute to and enhance our understanding not only of the sociolinguistic panorama of late modern England, but also of the mechanisms involved in socio-cultural development and linguistic variation more generally, and how the interaction between both of them ultimately determines language change in a given moment and over prolonged periods of time.

More specifically, this study addresses the following research questions:

1) What were the main linguistic and socio-cultural features associated with 19th and 20th-century Derbyshire dialect in literary representations of this variety? Do they correlate with the metacommentary available in non-literary accounts of the dialect?

2) How was the Derbyshire dialect enregistered in the period analysed? To what extent did literary representations of this variety contribute to and determine this process?

3) Have there been meaningful indexical shifts in the way the dialect has been understood over time? Do they echo evolving ideas about the linguistic location of the dialect? Do they correlate with the writers' knowledge of the variety and the expectations of the audience addressed?

In answering these questions, I propose three main hypotheses:

1) that there will be patterns in the literary representations of the dialect and that they will reveal a well-defined repertoire of phonological, morphological, and lexical features which will correlate with a clear set of socio-cultural values and identities consistently associated with Derbyshire speech and speakers in both literary and non-literary accounts of the variety;

2) that dialect writing will not only show, but will also prove to have played a pivotal role in the enregisterment of late modern Derbyshire dialect by recording and putting on display pre-existing form-meaning indexical connections, helping to circulate such links and strengthening their perceptual association with the dialect;

3) that because enregisterment is an essentially dynamic process, there will be indexical changes in the sociolinguistic evolution of the dialect not only at the linguistic level, but also as regards the variety's transitional character, reflecting the interplay between northern and (east/west) midland forms derived from the county's geographical location. Such changes will be observable not only over time, but also over type of dialect representation, putting forth the agentive role of writers in creating and shaping sociolinguistic ideas about the dialect based on both their own and their audience's perceptions and familiarity with its main features and the values they index.

In order to test these hypotheses, a corpus of 19th and 20th-century Derbyshire dialect writing extracted for the most part from *The Salamanca Corpus* will be analysed from both qualitative and quantitative perspectives. The outcomes of the analysis will be examined against contemporary and modern non-literary sources containing dialect metadiscourse in order to establish whether a correlation exists between the sociolinguistic perceptions of the variety recorded in such documents and those reconstructed in literature, and whether these perceptions have continuity over time. This approach, moreover, will serve to evaluate the validity and usefulness of literary representations of dialect as sources of information about processes of sociolinguistic variation in the past.

1.3. Study Organisation

In pursuing the aims stated above, this thesis has been organised as follows:

Chapters 2 to 6 explore Derbyshire's socio-historical and linguistic context in order to put into place both the nationwide and the county-specific events and circumstances that contributed to the gradual configuration of the Derbyshire character and dialect. Chapter 2 carefully surveys the Late Modern English historical, economic, and demographic setting derived from the Industrial Revolution so as to evaluate its effects on British society and language. The unprecedented geographical mobility prompted by industry and the advances in communication and transport fostered encounters between speakers from different geographical and linguistic backgrounds. This, together with the developments in education and the unparalleled social upheaval that characterise the period, greatly influenced the way in which people perceived their own manners of speech and the connotations they entailed in opposition to those of others from different places and social strata. Language contact, thus, increased sociolinguistic awareness and pushed processes of standardisation and dialect levelling. Paradoxically enough, such processes also led to concerns about the loss of the English linguistic diversity and the subsequent birth of the science of dialects; the onset and development of dialect studies is addressed in Chapter 3. Chapter 4, in turn, focuses on the county of Derbyshire. It discusses the region's socio-historical and demographic evolution from its very early days until the present time in an attempt to trace the steps that led to the development of the county's distinct social identity and, crucially, its language, which is investigated in Chapter 5. This chapter examines the extant non-literary records of the Derbyshire dialect in trying to reconstruct the variety and its diachronic development, while decoding how it was and is understood by both natives and non-natives. In this line, Chapter 6 further looks into the dialect by considering the remaining sources of information about its main features; it provides an overview of the available literary representations of Derbyshire speech in an attempt to complete the sociolinguistic picture painted by the sources surveyed in Chapter 5. In doing so, it addresses not only how such works portray dialect in purely linguistic terms, but also, and perhaps most importantly, the main motifs, concerns, and socio-cultural values and identities reflected in the fictional societies they depict, as literature is, after all, a mirror image of its time, writers, and audiences.

Chapters 7 and 8 describe the theoretical framework concerning the notions of indexicality and enregisterment. Chapter 7 provides an overview of the key concepts and overall development of the sociolinguistic study of linguistic variation with an emphasis on what has come to be known as the third wave of variation studies (Eckert 2012), including the theories of indexicality (Silverstein 1976) and enregisterment (Agha 2003). It also considers the fluid and dynamic nature of such mechanisms by addressing processes of deregisterment and the possibility of shifting indexicalities (Williams 2012; Cooper 2013, 2016; Ruano-García 2020). Chapter 8, in turn, explores enregisterment in historical contexts and analyses the role of dialect writing as a tool to gain insight into linguistic variation in the past. In fact, it considers the main strategies and authenticating devices employed by dialect writers (e.g. dialect respellings) in order to signal potentially salient features, thereby hinting at their social significance and links to local identity. In fact, these strategies are the main objects of analysis in Chapters 10 and 11.

Chapters 9 to 11 are the core sections of the present study as they are devoted to the analysis and discussion of the data extracted from the corpus texts. These have been selected and scrutinised following the methodology described in Chapter 9, where a detailed account of the procedures regarding the corpus design and compilation, as well as the sampling and searching methodologies, is provided. The data thus gathered are then thoroughly analysed in Chapter 10 by using both qualitative and quantitative methodologies. This chapter is divided in two main parts, namely the 19th and the 20th centuries, which are in turn further subdivided into qualitative and quantitative analyses, the latter of which include three sections: phonology and spelling, morphology, and lexis. The results of the analysis are brought together and discussed in Chapter 11, where they are also interpreted through the lens of indexicality and enregisterment, paying special attention to the indexical changes and possible processes of deregisterment that may have affected the dialect over the course of the centuries. Finally, Chapter 12 summarises the main conclusions, limitations, and key contributions of this study.

In this manner, I attempt to shed light on the Derbyshire dialect, as well as on the history of the English language more generally. Besides, in the chapters that follow, I will try to contribute to our understanding of linguistic variation and the processes which underpin the mechanisms whereby languages become "objects of value" in self-conscious social practice (Agha 2003: 232), and how our agentive usage of such intangible objects

ultimately comes to shape and reshape not only the way we speak, but also, and most importantly, our own identity.

2.
The Late Modern Period:
England and the English Language from 1700 to 1950

This chapter examines some of the factors that contributed to the major social changes that took place in the Late Modern English period in order to determine the extent to which this social upheaval had an influence on the 19th and early 20th-century English linguistic setting.

The offer and demand for labour created by the factory system of the Industrial Revolution had a momentous impact on England's economic, demographic and social structure. This new system of production turned a traditional agricultural society into an industry-based nation, which transformed the English society entirely. From the 1700s onwards, massive population movements towards the growing industrialised towns and cities started to drain rural areas. These massive movements of population towards industrial centres, which were made easier by technological advance including the expansion of the railways, resulted in the gradual depopulation of rural areas, enlarging towns and cities and turning them into melting pots in which people from different social and geographical origins could interact. Therefore, very different linguistic varieties were brought into contact, which gave way to unprecedented levels of linguistic awareness and placed language at the very centre of social life. This, together with the prospects of economic growth offered by industry, allowed for the possibility of moving up the once invariable social scale, which created a new social order that included a new element: the industrial working class. This social group was comprised by those labouring poor at the very bottom of society who, brought together by industry and precariousness, became self-conscious and developed feelings of solidarity and class pride.

Improvements in education also played a pivotal role in reshaping the late modern English society. In 1870, the Elementary Education Act came into force. It became a milestone in the British educational system since schooling was made compulsory for children under 13 years old, granting basic academic training for the late 19th-century new generation of Britons. This had far-reaching effects, including an increase in literacy,

which became central for both professional and social life, especially for the working classes. It gave them access to culture and brought them into contact with written, standard English and the attitudes surrounding it, whereby, following the prescriptive ideologies developed during the 18th century, dialect use was overtly criticised and condemned. This brought linguistic awareness to unprecedented levels as 19th-century Britons came to understand that language and the way people used it was a crucial element of socio-economic life, to the point that it could determine, facilitate or even prevent advance and success. As such, linguistic uses, perceptions and ideologies experienced a far-reaching turn which would transform the way English was understood both socially and linguistically, making speakers' decisions regarding language not only a linguistic, but also an identity matter.

Consequently, works aimed at "improving" the linguistic performance of English speakers multiplied, especially those addressing pronunciation. These documents, coupled with the increasing importance of notions of class and the ever dimmer boundaries between social strata, strengthened the already high linguistic insecurity of social climbers, especially that of those who belonged to the working class. They were aware that command of "proper" manners of pronunciation could facilitate social advance, and that by educating their accent they would acquire not only specific linguistic skills, but also a respectable identity. Standard ideologies were further fostered and spread thanks to the developments in the British educational system and the growth of public schools. They brought working class children into contact with the standard whilst rejecting and even sanctioning dialect use. Non-standard features became shibboleths of vulgarity that were overtly condemned in and out of the classroom since they were perceived as a handicap for future professional success. In 19th-century England, failure to use English as taught in public schools was an indicator of lack of formal schooling at a time when attending public schools entailed not only the acquisition of knowledge but also the membership to a highly valued, newly prestigious social group: the publicly educated. All these practices inevitably led to "the dominance of the public-school accent as the gauge of correctness, and this is responsible for the rise of what became known as Received Pronunciation" (Görlach 1999c: 60-61).

In previous centuries, "proper" English pronunciation had traditionally been ascribed to the south of the country; however, 19th-century ideas of the Standard started to surpass their former regional boundaries. Indeed, the most socially-convenient variety

was now that "in which all marks of a particular place of birth and residence [were] lost, and nothing to indicate any other habits of intercourse than with the well-bred and the well-informed" (Smart 1836: xl). The most prestigious accent was now that in which geographical origin was less apparent, "a supraregional variety (…) free of any strongly vernacular associations" (Hickey 2012: 23). This regionally unmarked variety continued to grow in importance during the 20th century thanks to the advances in communication and the media. The invention of the radio in 1895 marked a revolution in that it brought about a change in the way information was circulated among the population. Indeed, in England, it led to a critical period for the development of Standard English which started in 1922 with the foundation of the British Broadcasting Corporation, better known as the BBC. In an attempt to maintain regularity in speech and avoid criticism towards announcers, Beal (2004) explains, the BBC made the decision to solely employ newscasters who spoke uniformly and within a limited range of accents, which in actual fact meant that only RP speakers were employed (187). Linguistic uniformity was one of the requisites to achieve a stable, collective BBC personality in the airwaves, and the use of non-localised RP was by then "equated with civilization and intelligence" (Mugglestone 2008: 200). This homogenisation and the generalised use of RP by announcers contributed to broadening the influence of Standard English by increasing people's exposure to what came to be known as "BBC English". BBC authoritative voices, perceived as the epitome of respectability, success and culture, entered the homes of 20th-century Britons, who, influenced by the accent ideologies circulating in the airwaves, tried to emulate the language they used whilst concealing their own local accents. In this sense, the BBC helped to foster the already existing hierarchical perception of language, reinforcing the privileged role of the Standard to the detriment of dialects. Be it as it may, non-localised RP was (and still remains) "the accent of a minority" (Mugglestone 2008: 213), proof of which was the emergence and increasing importance of dialectological studies from the 19th century onwards.

3.
The Rise of Dialects

This chapter explores the onset and development of English dialectology, while also providing an overview of the most important British English dialectological works.

The negative attitudes towards dialectal speech and the prevalence of RP described in the previous chapter led to fears that local varieties would be lost as a result of levelling. This was because, as Beal (2012b) points out, "in the linguistic melting-pot of dialect contact, features shared by the majority of speakers are more likely to be retained, and those used by a small minority (…) [or] 'marked' in the sense of being stigmatised (…) tend to be lost" (127). The teaching of standard English in public schools was a major threat, while geographical mobility and advances in transport were equally feared. Facilities in communication had allowed that people from different parts of the country merged in the new industrial cities, prompting linguistic contact and threatening to level the once pure dialect forms that had remained virtually untouched in isolated rural communities. Warnings about the imminent loss of traditional dialects began to proliferate; in the 1870 issue of *Notes & Queries* (no. 134), William Aldis Wright, claimed that "some more systematic effort ought to be made for the collection and preservation of (…) provincial words"; he urged: "In a few years it will be too late. Railroads and certificated teachers are doing their work. Not a year passes but some words escape beyond the reach of recovery".

Far from disappearing and against all odds, though, non-standard varieties did indeed gain stature in the period. Despite the disapproving views of non-standard varieties shared by some sectors of society, "there was a great deal of interest in, and sympathy for, regional dialects" in 19th-century industrial England (Görlach 1999a: 140). Working-class consciousness had led to feelings of self-assurance and pride among the members of this social group, who came to perceive language and dialect as a tool to shape their social identities (Joyce 1991: 16). Moreover, thanks to the growing literacy rates, the production of literary works written in dialect by and for the working classes greatly increased. These works gave the working class reassurance and a place in a society ruled by the higher classes, and thus they developed at unprecedented rates in the 19th century as more and more dialect speakers acknowledged their native regional varieties as

hallmarks of identity. However, this was not the only reason behind 19th-century interest in dialectal speech. Dialects were increasingly seen as linguistic relics from earlier stages of English that deserved to be preserved, which led to the development of the systematic scientific investigation of regional variation that grew parallel to the proliferation of literary representations of dialect (García-Bermejo Giner 2008: 33). It was in this period, as Wakelin (1972: 42) points out, that the establishment of "a continuity of [dialect] scholarship" after the sporadic nature of "pre-nineteenth-century historical work in language" took place. The main reasons behind the scholarly interest in regional varieties were, however, nationalistic and historical, as dialects were perceived as "the living archive of the national language" (Penhallurick 2009: 301). The emergence of projects such as the compilation of the *New English Dictionary* (*NED*) —later known as the *Oxford English Dictionary* (*OED*)— sparked the interest in earlier stages of English. Traditional dialects became the target for those philologists who wished to investigate the history of English since they retained a linguistic pedigree the Standard did not. They were seen as a necessary step towards the understanding of Standard English. This is why, as Upton (2006) explains, given the *NED*'s diachronic focus, it was the intention of its compilers to include dialectal material in their prospective dictionary; however, "an early decision was taken that, in concert with the *OED*, an *English Dialect Dictionary* should be compiled" (306).

Calls for a dialect dictionary began early in the century. The pessimistic mood and the fears that dialects would disappear as a result of the all-pervading spread of the Standard led to the publication of a large number of dictionaries and glossaries which attempted to "rescue from oblivion the fast-fading relics of by-gone days" (Holloway 1838: subtitle). Examples are William Holloway's (1786-1870) *General Dictionary of Provincialisms* (1838), James Orchard Halliwell's (1820-1889) *Dictionary of Archaic and Provincial Words* (1847), and Thomas Wright's (1810-1877) *Dictionary of Obsolete and Provincial English* (1857). However, the zenith of dialect lexicography arrived with the foundation in 1873 of the English Dialect Society (EDS). The society's activities until its dissolution in 1896 resulted in the publication of eighty works, including glossaries (both reprinted and original), bibliographies and miscellanies (Petyt 1980: 77), yet its most important accomplishment was to promote the compilation of the six-volume *English Dialect Dictionary* (*EDD*), "the most authoritative and comprehensive dialect dictionary so far compiled" (Ruano-García 2018: 86). Published between 1896 and 1905,

and covering a period of two hundred years (1700-1900), the *EDD* was the result of a monumental collaborative work led by Joseph Wright (1855-1930), whose purpose was to "get together sufficient pure dialect material to enable anyone to give even a mere outline (…) of our dialects as they existed at the close of the nineteenth century" (1905: viii). Wright's *English Dialect Grammar* (*EDG*) was added to the sixth volume of *EDD* and published separately in 1905. It was mainly based on the material collected during the process of compilation of the *EDD*, on a questionnaire on dialect pronunciation sent to around 1200 people, as well as on some of the information previously gathered by philologist and phonetician Alexander John Ellis (1814-1890) in the fifth volume of his monumental *On Early English Pronunciation: The Existing Phonology of English Dialects Compared with that of West Saxon Speech* (1869-1889). Ellis's work chiefly focuses on regional pronunciation; indeed, it is the first systematic account of English dialectal phonology and contains an impressive amount of country-wide dialect data from 1145 localities in England, Wales, Scotland, and Ireland. One of his collaborators for this work, Thomas Hallam (1819-1895), was also one of the main English dialectologists of the 19th century. Although his work has often been overshadowed by that of well-known figures, his invaluable contribution to 19th-century dialect studies, especially as regards the West Midlands, materialised not only in Ellis's work and his numerous collaborations with the EDS, but also, and most importantly, in the copious information gathered in his vast and thorough notes, which, to my knowledge, remain virtually unexplored.

19th-century advances in dialect study greatly inspired 20th-century scholarly work on regional speech, though the insights and methods of modern linguistics had a significant impact on the way 20th-century dialect studies were carried out, especially in that they shifted the attention away from the dictionary. One of the most celebrated national-scale projects on regional varieties in the period took its first steps in 1946 at the University of Leeds. Led by Harold Orton (1898-1975) and Eugen Dieth (1893-1956), the *Survey of English Dialects* (*SED*) (1962-1971) was born with the final aim of producing a linguistic atlas of English dialects. The result of the large amount of information collected throughout the years were numerous publications including its four volumes of *Basic Material* (1969), *A Word Geography of England* (1974), *The Linguistic Atlas of England* (1978), and the well-known *Survey of English Dialects: The Dictionary and Grammar* (1994). To these and the many earlier studies described in this chapter we owe our understanding of past and present regional varieties of English; only by means

of the data they have provided us with have we been able to unveil and understand the real value of English dialects and the "ancient pedigree of much of that which modern speakers have often been trained to be apologetic about or even ashamed of" (Upton 2006: 308).

4.
Derbyshire:
Socio-historical Background

This chapter addresses Derbyshire's socio-historical background in order to determine the role the county's particular historical, demographic, and economic conditions played in the development and shaping of local identity and culture.

Over the course of its history, Derbyshire has learned to be a tough, tenacious, industrious, and resilient county. In spite of the numerous invasions it endured during its early history, the development of local industries, especially mining, remained steady. In fact, lead mining was behind the precocious industrialisation of some parts of the county in the late 17th and early 18th centuries, bringing prosperity and an early industrial socio-economic structure to the mining districts. This had profound effects on the county's demographic and social development as the high employment rates afforded by mines deemed migrations to other counties unnecessary, which translated into a remarkably static population that strengthened local identity and reinforced the county's sense of community, place and tradition. Locals' powerful feeling of localness and adherence to custom, in turn, played a pivotal role not only in the construction and shaping of the county's collective identity and culture, but also in the development of negative stereotypes and attitudes towards Derbyshire natives, especially as regards specific social groups such as the Peak miners and the moorland farmers.

The arrival of the textile industry and its factory system during the Industrial Revolution prompted advances in communication and transport that facilitated the flow of workers and the expansion of local industries, especially mining, during the late 18th and 19th centuries. They also opened the county to tourism, especially the Peak district and the Buxton and Matlock waters, where the number of visitors increased exponentially from 1825. All these factors led to a dramatic population growth and eventually transformed the economic and societal structures completely. The distribution of the population also changed during this time. The socio-economic developments of the Industrial Revolution had pushed workers towards the growing industrial towns, changing Derbyshire's traditional rural society into a predominantly urban one.

Agricultural communities, thus, entered a process of gradual depopulation, although working the land continued to be an important source of income for the people in Derbyshire, "one of the most improved Counties in England" in terms of agriculture and farming (Farey 1815: 26). The number of textile workers also declined, while the county's mineral output considerably increased during the late 1800s, as did the mining industry's workforce. As such, according to Arnold-Bemrose (1910), by the end of the century most Derbyshire men "were chiefly engaged in the mining and metal industries", followed by "agriculture [and] railways" (62).

The advent of the Industrial Revolution and the concomitant development of class society enhanced the feelings of solidarity, community and belonging among Derbyshire people. As the emerging working class gradually increased, so did class consciousness, further fueled by the fact that, as Wood (1999) remarks, Derbyshire has historically been characterised by "the absence of any significant elite presence" (3). At the same time, the number of foreigners increased with the arrival of labourers attracted by the county's industry, especially from Lancashire (Porteous 1950: 205), though not as markedly as in other industrialised regions. Population, thus, although not as static as in previous centuries, remained highly local in the 19th century and later in time, as the socio-economic and demographic trends that characterised the century show relatively little fluctuation during the 1900s.As such, Derbyshire's traditional society, tenacious character, and distinctive identity, together with the county's strong sense of community and powerful "spirit of place" (Porteous 1950: 2) remained for the most part untouched by foreign influence.

5.
The Derbyshire Dialect:
Sources for the Study of a Forgotten Transitional Variety

This chapter tries to provide a historical overview of the extant non-literary sources for the study of the Derbyshire dialect in order to reconstruct its main linguistic and extralinguistic features.

From the very first references to the dialect, Derbyshire has always been difficult to locate. Its conspicuous border nature is behind the county's traditional shifting status as either part of the North or the North, West, or East Midlands, an open debate which has of course been extrapolated to its language. Early remarks on the variety frequently subsumed Derbyshire speech within the wider North, while a gradual perceptual shift towards the Midlands started to develop from the 18th century onwards. It was not until the late 19th and 20th centuries that a more precise classification of the variety in terms of dialect areas was provided by Alexander John Ellis, Thomas Hallam, Joseph Wright and the *SED*; they included Derbyshire in the West Midlands, a classification that remained in force until the late 1900s, when the county came to be considered part of the East Midlands after the Local Government Reform (1974) (see Table 1).

In spite of its undeniable linguistic interest, little attention has been paid to the Derbyshire dialect, as references to this variety are "few and far between in the literature" (Docherty and Foulkes 1999: 48). The first extant remark on the county's speech was made by Derbyshire antiquary Philip Kinder (1597-1665) around 1663; nevertheless, it was Samuel Pegge's (1704-1796) *Two Collections of Derbicisms* (1896 [*c*.1751]) that marked a turning point in the linguistic survey of the dialect. Although it was not published until the late 19th century, it constitutes the first attempt at a general linguistic survey of the county since his wordlists gather not only lexical, but also morphological and phonological information, as well as commentary on general features of the dialect, which were overtly associated with specific social values.

	North	Midland				South
		North	West	East	South	
17th c. Ray (1674, 1691)	X					
18th c. Pegge (c.1751)			X			
Marshall (1790)			X			
19th c. Holloway (1838)	X					
Guest (1838)	X		X			
Denman (1862)		X				
Ellis (1889)			X			
Hallam (c.1873)			X	X		
Bonaparte (1875)	X		X			
20th c. *SED* (1962-1971)			X			
Wakelin (1972)			X			
Trudgill Trad. (1990)						X
Trudgill Mod. (1990)	X					
P. Wright (1975)	X		X	X		
Wells (1982)			X	X		
Docherty and Foulkes (1999)		X			X	
21st c. Scollins and Titford (2000)				X		
Braber and Flynn (2015)				X		
Braber and Robinson (2018)				X		
Braber and Jansen (2020)				X		

Table 1: Derbyshire dialect's linguistic classification across the centuries: A summary

However, the golden age of the Derbyshire dialect arrived in the 1800s. Though less notably than in other counties like Lancashire and Yorkshire, interest in the Derbyshire dialect increased in during this time within the context of the growing scholarly concerns about English dialects discussed in Chapter 3. During the first half of the century, a number of works on mining lexis like James Mander's (?-?) *The Derbyshire's Miners Glossary* (1824) were published, together with a brief glossary by William Bainbridge (?-?) sent to the editor of *The Monthly Magazine* (1815). The Derbyshire dialect also received attention in the larger contemporary dictionaries, including Boucher's (1738-1804) *Glossary of Archaic and Provincial Words* (1832), Rev. Joseph Bosworth (1788-1876) *Dictionary of the Anglo-Saxon Language* (1838),

Holloway's *General Dictionary of Provincialisms* (1838), Halliwell's *Dictionary of Archaic and Provincial Words* (1847), and Wright's *Dictionary of Obsolete and Provincial English* (1857). Despite the usefulness of the data recorded in these works, the richest Derbyshire material was produced during the second half of the 19th century in the form of antiquarian and scientific works. Amongst the former, a couple of studies published in the journal *The Reliquary* deserve attention. Lord Denman (1805-1894) wrote *A Fragment on the Dialect of the High Peak* in January 1862, including remarks not only on Derbyshire lexis, but also on its most distinctive phonological and morphological traits, as well as comments about prosody and usage which may uncover patterns of socio-pragmatic distribution. This can also be found in John Sleigh's (1827-1826) lengthy glossary (1865), which he expanded in 1871. Inspired by Sleigh's first work, Rev. Francis Jourdain (1833-1898) published "Additional Materials for a Derbyshire Glossary" in 1870, a brief glossary of around fifty local terms which he combined with spelling variants suggesting dialect sounds and non-standard morphological forms.

Revealing though the information provided by the above-mentioned works is, they paint a diffuse picture of the dialect and pale in comparison with the wealth of data of the works of Alexander John Ellis, Thomas Hallam, and Joseph Wright. Ellis (1889) offers an unrivalled phonological survey of the different varieties spoken in late modern Derbyshire, where some remarks on morphology are also provided. The data was collected from a total of sixty-seven locations (grouped within districts D21, D25, and D26). Ellis himself explained in the introductory pages of his work that he had been assisted by Thomas Hallam, whose thorough work throughout the Midlands, and especially in his native Derbyshire, resulted not only in his contribution to Ellis's work, but also in some individual publications like *Four Dialect Words: Clem, Lake, Nesh, and Oss* (1885), and numerous other collaborations. These include the edition of Pegge's *Two Collections of Derbicisms* (1896), which he co-edited with Rev. W. W. Skeat (1835-1912). Hallam carefully reviewed the first wordlist in order to determine the currency of the terms, which he transcribed according to their 19th-century pronunciation. His most important contribution to this work was, in the words of Skeat, his "exhaustive, painstaking, and masterly Introduction" (xviii), where he provides an impressive account of the "dialect and glossic phonology" of the parish of Whittington, in Scarsdale, Derbyshire's Peak district (xxiii), along with occasional references to its morphology and

lexis. Despite the extent and scope of Hallam's Derbyshire material, García-Bermejo Giner (1994) points out that Joseph Wright's *EDD* and *EDG* are the most important sources of information about the dialect in the 19th century. She claims that in these works "not only does he list extensively much of [the dialect's] characteristic vocabulary but he also provides us with a wealth of information about variant pronunciations of standard and dialectal words" (232-233).

The *SED* is the main source of information about the Derbyshire dialect in the 20th century. It provides us with abundant phonological, morphological, and lexical data about traits already documented in earlier works. Besides the account given by this work, a number of academic and non-academic works on the Derbyshire dialect were published during the 1900s, which bears witness to the continuity and enduring interest in this variety. These include Hilda M. Hulme's (1914-1938) study "Derbyshire Dialect in the Seventeenth Century" (1941) and Peter Wright's *The Derbyshire Drawl: How it is Spoke* (1975). García-Bermejo Giner's *El Dialecto en las Primeras Novelas de George Eliot: Grafía y Vocalismo* (1991) is probably the first contemporary study to look at the Staffordshire, Warwickshire, and Derbyshire dialects from a historical perspective by means of their representation in literature. In her later works "Personal Pronouns in Derbyshire as Reflected in Sheridan Le Fanu's Uncle Silas (1864)" (1991), and "Morphosyntactical Variation in Nineteenth-century Derbyshire" (1993), García-Bermejo Giner further expands on Derbyshire's morphology. Another pioneering study is that of Docherty and Foulkes, who explore modern Derbyshire phonology in *Derby and Newcastle: Instrumental Phonetics and Variationist Studies* (1999).

Interest in the dialect has continued well into the 21st century, with well-known works such as Scollins and Titford's *Ey Up Mi Duck! Dialect of Derbyshire and the East Midlands* (2000). Similarly, J. Geoffrey Dawes (1983, 2004), Philip F. Holland (2008), and Mike Smith (2013) also have taken a non-academic approach to the dialect in their works. On a more scholarly tone, the works of Braber (2014, 2015), Braber and Flynn (2015), Braber and Robinson (2018), and Braber and Jansen (2020) are the most valuable pieces of research for the study of present-day Derbyshire dialect. They examine East Midlands English by focusing on Derbyshire, Nottinghamshire and Leicestershire, and explore the counties' identity, phonology, morphology, and lexis. Finally, the contribution of the BBC *Voices* project (2005) to the study of regional linguistic variation in the UK over the last decades is also worth mentioning; in the case of Derbyshire, data

were retrieved in Belper (2004), Burton upon Trent (2005), Heanor (2005), Swadlincote (2004), and Two Dales (2005).

It should be noted that most of the limited yet valuable linguistic descriptions of the dialect testify to its undeniable hybrid and transitional nature. Although scattered over time and pages, the sparse and often vague references to the dialect allow us to build a relatively detailed picture of the features and evolution of Derbyshire speech. Taken together, they reveal phonological, morphological and lexical patterns, in which northern (e.g. unsplit [ʊ], northern [a]), west (e.g. rounding before nasals, plural marker *-en*, feminine *hoo*) and east midland (e.g. past BE *-r* forms) traits coexist with a repertoire of rather unique features such as the [a:] pronunciation of ME /u:/. Such forms constitute a fascinating and distinctive variety which appears to have remained reasonably stable over time. The sources scrutinised in this chapter not only testify to the perceptual salience of the Derbyshire dialect, but also specify the links between its purely linguistic features and a set of extralinguistic attributes such as broadness, simplicity, bluntness and conciseness, which offer a valuable picture of the characteristics of this nearly forgotten dialect.

6.
Literary Representations of the Derbyshire Dialect

This chapter provides a historical account of the available literary works representing the Derbyshire dialect, paying special attention to the 19th and 20th centuries.

Although the county's literary tradition is not as vast as that of other counties such as Yorkshire and Lancashire, Derbyshire has witnessed the publication of a fairly significant number of dialect literary works during this time. They include examples of dialect literature (DL) and literary dialect (LD). As is well known, DL comprises those "works composed wholly (sometimes partly) in a non-standard dialect, and aimed essentially, though not exclusively, at a non-standard-dialect-speaking readership", while LD refers to "the representation of non-standard speech in literature that is otherwise written in standard English (…) and aimed at a general readership" (Shorrocks 1996: 386). Derbyshire examples of DL and LD have followed a tradition that can be traced as far back as 1653 and that continues until the present day. They share a range of common themes and motifs which give insight into late modern Derbyshire life and culture: a working-class humble society where their long-standing traditions, community values, and resilience in face of socio-economic adversity were the central axes that determined their life and culture. Within this context, dialect features acted as a tool to both characterise and shape the identities of the members of this close-knit community, while establishing their relationship with the outer world and specifying their position within contemporary social hierarchies based on their linguistic performance.

19th-century Derbyshire witnessed the production and publication of a considerable number of dialect works that tried to preserve the dialect while celebrating the county and its working class. Instances of LD are the most numerous, and they represent both poetry and prose. Only three works written in verse are known, among which we may highlight Thomas Tapping's (1817-1886) 1851 edition of Edward Manlove's *The Liberties and Customs of the Lead Mines within the Wapentake of Wirksworth in the County of Derby* (1653), which is the earliest literary record of the dialect. The poem elaborates on the customs of the town and the "strange and uncoth"

(19) language of its "poor and laborious" (20) inhabitants: the miners, while extolling their identity and peculiar idiosyncrasy. Examples of LD prose, on the other hand, are the most numerous, especially as regards popular novels. Among the most relevant examples is Mary Howitt's (1799-1888) *My Uncle, the Clockmaker* (1844); the novel revolves around the daily affairs of humble working-class characters, who, matching Derbyshire's contemporary socio-demographic setting, are described as families of no "great worldly account (…); merely farmers, cottagers and labourers" (22). Contrary to this work, Joseph Sheridan Le Fanu's (1814-1873) *Uncle Silas* (1864) tells the story of the wealthy upper-class Ruthyn family, so the role of the rural is not as marked as in other cases of LD. In fact, it is the only novel that differs from the generalised working-class theme observable in most 19th-century examples of LD. Closer to this working-class focus, *The Reliquary* published in its issue of 1870-1871 Thomas Brushfield's (1828-1910) short story *A Village Sketch, at Ashford-in-the-water, in Illustration of the Derbyshire Dialect*, which revolves around the economic hardships endured by John Baggalley and his resilient sister, who seem to be a reflection of 19th-century working-class Derbeians' struggles. Frances Parthenope Verney's (1819-1890) *Stone Edge* (1868) also mirrors the concerns of her time and the generalised views about Derbyshire natives discussed in Chapter 4. Her novel tells the story of a family of poor and hardworking farmers. By means of characters such as Roland Stracey, Lady Verney depicted the lives of those who had to travel and migrate from rural Derbyshire to industrialised urban centres in search for a better future: this allowed her to recreate differences in speech not only at the regional, but also at the social level. This reality is also visible in Mrs. Humphrey Ward's (1851-1920) successful three-volume novel *The History of David Grieve* (1892). A child of its time, the novel tells David's story and it starts in a small Derbyshire farming community from which he escapes to Manchester looking for a more prosperous life. Far from celebrating country life, though, it shows the contrast between the static customs and lifestyle, rough manners, and somewhat inaccessible character of Derbyshire natives and Manchester's society. These stereotypical non-mobile and industrious farming communities are also the focus of Robert Murray Gilchrist's (1867-1917) collection of stories *A Peakland Faggot. Tales of Milton Folk* (1897), in which we can find the same tropes, identities, and motifs that permeate the vast majority of dialect writing representing Derbyshire, its people, and its dialect.

DL material is scarce in 19th-century Derbyshire. As regards poetry, only very short works can be found. An example is *Derbyshire Men* (1864), a short poem written by Walter Kirkland of Matlock (1828-1899) where he illustrates and praises both the Derbyshire dialect and character. In terms of prose, between the years 1870 and 1881, Joseph Barlow Robinson (*c*.1820-1883) wrote the only available examples of this type of representation in the 19th century.They are a series of five stories whose protagonist and narrator, Sammy Twitcher, takes readers to different events and exhibitions around the county: *Owd Sammy Twitcher's Visit tu't Gret Exibushun e Derby* (1870), *Owd Sammy Twitcher's Second Visit tu't Gret Exibishun e Darby, wi' Jim* (1870), *Owd Sammy Twitcher's Crismas Bowk for the Year 1870* (1870), *Owd Sammy Twitcher's Visit tu't Watter Cure Establishment at Matlock Bonk* (1871) and *Owd Sammy Twitcher's Visit tut Royal Aggeracultural Show e Darby, wi his son Jim* (1881). The main aim of these celebratory works was to record "the thoughts and manner of speech of one of the many old farmers yet to be met with: jolly old chaps, with more genuine fun in them than half-a-dozen of the young ones growing up round them" (1870a: 1).

As explained in previous chapters, the growing "cultural capital" of RP (Wales 2006: 145) in the early 20th century deepened the fears of those worried about the loss of regional dialects under the pressure of standardisation. Nevertheless, literary renditions of non-standard varieties, including Derbyshire, were still used by some as a tool to preserve traditional regional speech, especially in the form of LD. Robert Murray Gilchrist continued to represent the Derbyshire dialect in his 20th-century works, amongst which we may highlight the collection *Good-bye to Market* (1908). Just like in his 19th-century writings, he turns to the county's farmers and other working-class characters to develop his tales, which once more deal with the daily occupations and family values of humble, close-knit communities. Similarly, writer Thomas Moult (1893-1974) set his novel *Snow over Elden* (1920) in a farming village in the Peak District, which further underscores the cultural relevance of farmers as the epitome of Derbyshire life. His representation of dialect also bears witness to the social connotations linked to 20th-century Derbyshire speech, as most of the dialect-speaking characters alter, reduce, or even avoid their native tongue depending on the social setting. These connotations are also clearly represented in Buck Dallison's (?-?) *Still Lookin' Back* (1941), a novel that deals with the life of Buck Dallison (?-?), its author and narrator. It is the sequel of his first work, *Lookin' Back* (1939), and it continues to narrate Dallison's own story in a

small mining community. In this novel, dialect is employed as a tool to mark the differences between different social strata while illustrating the growing social mobility and upheaval which characterised the county in the 20th century. Crichton Porteous's (1901-1991) *The Farm by the Lake* (1942) and *Reet Darbyshire* (1950) also reflect this sociolinguistic setting, though dialect is here used by the local farmers and country folk in general.

Just like in the 1800s, examples of DL were not particularly abundant during the 20th century. We may refer to the works of, at least, three authors. Buck Dallison's *Lookin' Back* (1939) is probably the only extant example of DL prose. The story deals with a small Derbyshire mining community whose customs and routines are celebrated. Its dialect, though, is not particularly well regarded, especially by those in search of social improvement and by young people, who tend to favour the Standard. Interestingly, and unlike in previous centuries, most of the 20th-century DL texts published in Derbyshire are examples of drama. L. du Garde Peach (1890-1974) wrote and produced a number of plays entirely written in dialect like *Wind o' the Moors* (1925), while Crichton Porteous also used it in his play *Dickie's Skull* (?).

Although apparently decreasing, Derbyshire dialect literary tradition continued after 1950 and remains alive today. It encompasses the collections of short stories *Unexpurgated Echoes from a Derbyshire Village* (1983) and *More Crich Tales from a mid Derbyshire village mostly in the mid 20th century* (2004), by J. Geoffrey Dawes (?), and a few poetry books. Among the latter, Philip Holland's anthologies are the most remarkable. We may refer to *Words of a Derbyshire Poet* (2009), *Jigsaw* (2012), *Fragments* (2015) and *Lines of the Land* (2018).In their attempt to preserve Derbyshire's traditional dialect, most of them perpetuate the motifs and values displayed in the 19th and early 20th-century literary works. They bring rural communities to the spotlight by focusing on the lives and daily affairs of the local working class, especially of the farmers, while they extoll their long-standing values, traditions, and the worth and beauty of their native county.

7.
Indexicality and Enregisterment

This chapter is concerned with processes of indexicality and enregisterment. In the context of the speaker-centered, socio-constructivist view of sociolinguistic variation framed within what Eckert (2012) has called the third wave of variation studies, Silverstein (1976) and Agha's (2003) theories have provided frameworks for a more refined understanding of the processes via which linguistic varieties take on social meaning and come to be understood as stable repertoires by wide populations of language users. Although indexicality and enregisterment are intertwined concepts in that they are part of the same value-assignment process, it is worth noting that, as Clark (2019) points out, while indexicality describes general "stages of linguistic awareness and reflexivity", enregisterment "refers to the specific forms used in discourse" (30).

Silverstein (2003) defines *indexicality* as "the concept necessary to showing us how to relate the micro-social to the macro-social frames of analysis of any sociolinguistic phenomenon" (193). In other words, indexicality describes the processes through which the connection between sociocultural values and individuals' communicative choices becomes manifest. Echoing Labov's (1972: 178-180) concepts of *indicators*, *markers* and *stereotypes*, Silverstein developed a taxonomy which distinguishes three stages that describe the increasing levels of speaker awareness of the indexical link between language and ideology based on their social evaluation of specific linguistic features (see Johnstone et al. 2006). At the first order of indexicality, there is a correlation between a given linguistic feature and a certain socio-demographic category. However, this connection is often accounted for by an outsider (e.g. a linguist; see Silverstein 2003: 205): speakers are unaware of the indexical link that exists between their language and specific cultural values. In fact, the use of dialect features is presupposed within the social network where they are employed, and therefore they are not noticeable given that all speakers use them. It is precisely speaker awareness that marks the shift from first to second-order indexicality, when speakers come to interpret and rationalise the link between their language and certain values and start to attribute social meaning to their habits of speech. This is made possible by processes of social mobility, which Johnstone et al. (2006) identify as crucial practices that disrupt otherwise close social networks,

broadening the speakers' existing linguistic repertoire and allowing comparison, contrast, and conscious variation. Second-order indexicality thus involves style-shifting on the basis of social criteria, as speakers have become aware that the use of certain linguistic features entails a message, and this enables them to make linguistic choices in order to create or fit into specific social contexts. At the third order of indexicality, the possibility of second-order stylistic variability is not only acknowledged, but has also become noticeable enough so that speakers may deliberately turn to it to perform and (re)construct identity. Geographical mobility and language contact have been recognised as preconditions for third-order indexicality (see Johnstone et al. 2006, among others): they bring previously isolated non-mobile individuals into contact with varieties different from their own, thereby conveying the idea that language and place are essentially connected. Thus, at this stage "regional forms are (…) increasingly heard as signals of authentic local identity" (Johnstone et al. 2006: 93), and therefore the link between that feature and a specific social meaning becomes the subject of overt social comment. Such commentary materialises in what Johnstone et al. (2006) call *metapragmatic activities* or "activities that point to a feature's appropriate context of use" (80), which often involve metadiscourse or, more simply, "talk about talk" (Johnstone and Baumgardt 2004). And it is precisely talk about talk that determines enregisterment.

Agha (2003) defines *enregisterment* as the "processes through which a linguistic repertoire becomes differentiable within a language as a socially recognized register of forms" which indicate status according to particular schemes of socio-cultural values (231). This theory has become central in third-wave research seeking to explain the connection between language and social values, as well as the processes by which sets of linguistic forms come to be perceived as distinctive, legitimate social or regional varieties and registers. Indeed, Agha's approach has been adopted by a number of scholars investigating variation due to its potential to provide a more refined understanding of the meaning of linguistic varieties in social context. The height of enregisterment has been particularly notable with regard to the English language, especially in the US, where this branch of sociolinguistic research has gained greater relevance following Johnstone's pioneering and influential work on Pittsburghese (see, for instance, Johnstone 2006, 2009, 2011, 2013, 2016; Johnstone et al. 2006).Modern varieties of British English, in turn, have received comparatively little attention; we may refer to Clark's (2013, 2020) work

on the dialect spoken in the Black Country area, Honeybone and Watson's (2013) exploration of Scouse, and Snell's (2017) study of North-East England.

As is well known, registers are context-bound linguistic constructs that reflect and develop from speakers' social and linguistic performance. They are not inherently loaded with social meaning, but are rather the result of "a precipitate of sociohistorically locatable practices, including discursive practices, which imbue cultural forms with recognizable sign-values and bring these values into circulation along identifiable trajectories in social space" (Agha 2003: 232). In fact, it is precisely this connection between linguistic repertoires and particular ideological schemes that allows the contrastive evaluation of linguistic varieties, but in order for individuals to be able to trace it, and, therefore, in order for a variety to be truly enregistered, attention must be drawn to such a link. This, Agha (2003) claims, can be done explicitly (e.g. by means of direct comment or description) or implicitly (e.g. via more nuanced, indirect associations between characterological types and linguistic features) (237), but must necessarily involve "the circulation of messages typifying speech" (243) that allow for the "replication of its forms and values over changing populations" (Agha 2007: 155). In other words, enregisterment depends on the existence and dissemination of metapragmatic practices and talk about talk. These include a variety of oral and textual artefacts that contain and exemplify form-meaning connections; they range from printed material (e.g. prescriptive works such as dictionaries or grammars, metalinguistic comments in newspapers or books) to more modern sources like websites, blogs, and TV shows. Crucially, it is when metapragmatic activities and the forms and values they circulate become socially regular and accepted that varieties become enregistered and are thus linked with particular identities, so that their deliberate use becomes in itself an "act of identity" (Clark 2013: 442).

One of the most important aspects of enregisterment is that it is an essentially dynamic process in that it is determined by speakers' conscious, ever-changing indexical moves, which depend on both internal and external factors such as time, context and social change. Therefore, form-meaning connections are always subject to (re)interpretation on the part of speakers, which often results in enregistered items undergoing indexical shifts as their social meanings are negotiated by changing speaking communities. In line with the fluid nature of enregisterment processes, Williams (2012) and Cooper (2016) have put forth the notion of *deregisterment* as the progressive

replacement of an enregistered feature or repertoire of features in favour of a more salient, previously marginalised equivalent form. Cooper (2016) identifies two main sub-processes whereby formerly enregistered dialect features can undergo deregisterment. On the one hand, a given dialect feature that was previously enregistered as part of one or more regional varieties can eventually lose salience within one of the speech communities to which it was once indexically linked, maintaining or acquiring further third-order indexical connections with another variety. Deregistering processes can, on the other hand, completely erase the indexical links between a dialect form and social or regional values, thereby diminishing sociolinguistic salience to the extent that, very much in line with Labov's predictions regarding stereotypes, it becomes a fossil form: one "whose meaning has been entirely forgotten" (1972: 317). Cooper's (2016) work has provided useful insight into the processes which underpin the changes in the perceptual association between regional identity and individual forms leading to contemporary deregisterment. Ruano-García (2020a: 11-17), in turn, has addressed shifting indexicalities in relation to a complete repertoire. His findings confirm that dialect writing and historical corpora can reveal shifting indexicalities operating not only over time, but also over different literary text types (DL vs. LD), which contributes to a more detailed understanding of the dynamics underlying sociolinguistic variation.

The possibility of shifting indexicalities and deregisterment goes only to further emphasise the fluid and mutable nature of processes of indexicality and enregisterment. It stresses how individuals' perceptions of language and social life, either expressed via simple discursive practices or by means of metapragmatic commentary, greatly influence the way in which linguistic varieties are constructed, acknowledged and shared, acquiring or even losing legitimacy and status in a process that also determines the features associated with the speech community itself.

8.
Enregisterment in Historical Contexts: Insights from Dialect Writing

This chapter provides an overview of the study of enregisterment in historical contexts by means of the exploration of dialect writing. Despite traditional skepticism towards the use of historical textual material as a tool for sociolinguistic enquiry, recent interdisciplinary third-wave research has largely proved its validity and fruitfulness as a source of both linguistic and extralinguistic information concerning linguistic variation in bygone times. Its role is of special significance as regards the exploration of enregisterment from a diachronic perspective, given that it is only thanks to textual data that scholars interested in historical dialects may have some access to language uses and attitudes in the past.

Beal's (2009) work on Sheffieldish and Geordie constitutes the first study that looks at enregisterment from a diachronic perspective by examining historical texts. It evaluates a range of written documents such as dialect dictionaries, wordlists, and music-hall songs, and establishes their role in the processes of enregisterment of the varieties discussed. By explicitly foregrounding the connection of specific forms like *mooth* 'mouth' with Geordie and Geordies, for instance, these historical sources demonstrate "that the variety of English spoken in Newcastle was widely recognized as different" from others, to the extent that it could be "used in performative contexts" to evoke identity (145-146). In other words, they constitute early evidence of enregisterment. To this work we can add her later studies on Northern English, including Beal (2012a, 2012b, 2016, 2020) and Beal and Cooper (2015), among others.

Cooper (2013) has also discussed historical enregisterment as regards 19th-century Yorkshire speech by developing a methodological framework for the quantitative and qualitative study of the process in historical contexts, which he has also applied in Cooper (2015, 2016, 2020). Just like Beal (2009), he explores various sources of 19th-century metapragmatic commentary like the prefatory material of dialect dictionaries and grammars, while combining them with the analysis of dialect writing including cases of both DL and LD. By comparing the data obtained from these sources with those extracted

from modern dialect material and an online survey of contemporary Yorkshire speakers, Cooper (2013) not only discusses the enregisterment of a repertoire of features linked with the characterological figure of the Yorkshireman, but, as previously mentioned, also pinpoints and describes indexical shifts affecting specific dialect forms over time.

Ruano-García (2012, 2020b), in turn, considers the enregisterment of northern dialect features in early modern drama and ballads. Worth of mention are also his later works on the enregisterment of late modern Lancashire dialect by means of the examination of dialect writing (Ruano-García 2020a) and performance (2021). Both studies address shifting indexicalities in the perception of the Lancashire dialect throughout the Late Modern English period; crucially, the data examined on the former suggest that such changes occurred not only over time, but also over type of representation. Ruano-García (2020a), thus, demonstrates the mutability of entire enregistered repertoires and the dynamic nature of their ideological connection with locality, which may and does indeed vary depending on the type of audience addressed and their degree of familiarity with the dialect. This, in turn, has a direct impact on the way dialects are publicly construed, (re)valorised, and (re)typified (Ruano-García 2021: 124), while highlighting the agentive role of dialect writers in building and circulating ideas about linguistic varieties.

Although much more occasionally, Agha's theory of enregisterment has also been applied to the study of non-northern historical regional and social varieties of British English; we may refer to Schintu (2016, 2018a, 2018b) and Asprey (2020). Other works on historical enregisterment have also been carried out on Irish and American varieties; they include Picone (2014), Amador-Moreno and McCafferty (2015), and Paulsen (2022).

All of these studies rely then on historical textual data as a means to uncover the mechanisms leading to the enregisterment of dialect, and, crucially, most of them analyse it in light of literary discourse. Literature, they contend, not only provides windows into the exploration of the uses and perceptions of dialect in days gone by, but also cements the perceptual connection between language, place and social identities, and becomes a channel via which such a correlation is shared. As such, literary works not only show, but also actively contribute to enregisterment, as their authors draw on pre-existing ideas and repertoires and make deliberate and meaningful decisions that "constitute implicit metapragmatic commentary (…), foregrounding and making visible selected forms of

31

speech, as well as the performed demeanors which count as their effects" (Agha 2003:257). In other words, dialect writing can be understood as a conscious indexical process in which writers' linguistic choices imbue dialect items with social and regional values, thereby leading to the enregisterment of the forms they represent.

Together with the use of dialectal lexis and morphology, the orthographic representation of dialectal phonology in literary works is a case in point. Indeed, according to Honeybone (2020), the conscious respelling of particular words "is one of the most obvious signs that a text is intended to be dialect writing" (213). Ruano-García (2020a) explains that there are three main strategies via which dialectal pronunciation is depicted in literature. They include, first, eye dialect, which refers to standard sounds represented by means of non-standard spelling forms with the aim of giving the impression of dialect pronunciations (e.g. <bee> for *be*). Second, he refers to allegro forms, or non-normative spellings purporting to represent connected speech phenomena (e.g. <goin'> for *going*). Finally, he addresses dialect or pronunciation respellings (5). It is this latter type of respelling that actually signals alternative dialectal realisations of standard sounds, highlighting phonological divergences between the regional and the reference varieties. Some of these respellings have a long history of orthographic representation and have therefore been conventionalised as part of traditional dialect repertoires in literature (see Blake 1981: 17). They have become "tokens of a regional identity" (Beal 2000: 350) rather than idiosyncratic phenomena resulting from individual authors' subjective perceptions and practices (Sánchez-García 2003: 270). As such, by virtue of their opposition to their standard equivalent and the ensuing possibility of variation, pronunciation respellings are loaded with cultural meaning whereby orthography "not only depicts a representation of a sound pattern, but also links to a framework of social identity" (Clark 2020: 105).

Nevertheless, "the quality of the representation", Ruano-García (2020a) claims, "responds to the writer's knowledge of the variety represented, either as insiders or outsiders, who target respectively an in-group or out-group audience" (6). In this sense, outsiders to the speech community tend to appropriate dialect representations in LD, sometimes falling into inconsistent, often negative and more stereotypical conventions (Jaffe 2000: 509), whereas insiders rely on their first-hand knowledge of the variety and thus employ more precise local forms in DL. Crucially, as Hodson (2016: 31) highlights, the consistent use of a given set of dialect features in literary discourse, either by DL or

LD writers, does not necessarily stand up for the real-life use of such forms; rather, it bears witness to the collective ideas and perceptions about that specific variety in the popular imagination, while signaling not authenticity, but perceived salience. In this regard, as Bucholtz (2003) explains, it is not authenticity but authentication that matters in sociolinguistic work: "where authenticity presupposes that identity is primordial, authentication views it as the outcome of constantly negotiated social practices" (408). And it is precisely by means of this continuous process of (re)negotiation in social and stylistic activity that speech communities' claimed linguistic peculiarities become indexical of perceived authentic personae and come to be available for identity performance not only by insiders, but also by outsiders to the variety. Indeed, authenticity claims "feature in conventionalised accounts of what is distinctive about local speech, once a speech style has come to people's awareness through the process of enregisterment" (Coupland 2014: 28). Such "conventionalised accounts" include dialect writing, which draws upon authenticating practices such as the use of enregistered dialect respellings or lexis, for instance, capturing "linguistic evocations of localness" (Androutsopoulos 2010: 748) and putting them on display so as to achieve "authenticity effects" (Bucholtz 2003: 408) and perform identity.

9.
Methodology

The design of a corpus aimed at the representation and description of any given language depends upon the nature of the research it is compiled for. Corpora, Biber (1993) claims, "must be 'representative' in order to be appropriately used as the basis for generalizations concerning (…) language" (243), and any corpus "is best used to answer a research question which it is well composed to address" (McEnery and Hardie 2012: 2). In other words, representativeness depends on purpose, and thus, data gathering and selection need to be made in accordance with the specific aims of the study to be carried out, be they elicited from spoken material and/or taken from written texts. As shown by many of the studies which have been revised in previous chapters, when it comes to the diachronic analysis of a specific linguistic variety, the availability of spoken material is rather scant at best or completely non-existent, which hinders the retrieval of representative data. Written evidence becomes, thus, of utmost importance in order to explore language uses and perceptions in bygone times, especially in the form of literature.

Despite the traditional scepticism towards the validity of literary works for linguistic research highlighted by authors like Schneider (2013), who remarks on the perceived "limitations" of literary sources derived from their "overuse [of] stereotypical markers[,] reduce[d] variability" and questionable authenticity (68), the reliability of these works to approach dialect in the past has been largely proved (see Beal 2000; García-Bermejo Giner 1997, 1998, 2002; Hickey 2010a; Melchers 2010; Ruano-García 2010, 2020a; Sánchez-García 2003; Wales 2010, among others). These works show that, as Kytö and Walker (2003) put it, there is no "such thing as "bad" data in historical linguistics per se, but only inadequacies in how the value of the material is assessed" (242). Literature, as Sánchez-García and Ruano-García (2020) explain, not only accounts for "clear speech variability", but also provides "potential evidence of the degree of salience of specific features that writers consciously choose to represent (…), whilst the repertoires of forms documented may signal dialect enregisterment and indexicality, both of which play a remarkable role in linguistic change" (54-55). Besides, literary renditions of dialect are a source of both linguistic and sociolinguistic information about the variety

they represent since it is used in a context which reflects and attempts to recreate not only language but also the attitudes towards it. This is crucial information that can offer useful insight into dialect use in the past, while it informs both the criteria behind the selection of texts and the quantitative and qualitative nature of this study.

This chapter deals with the methodological approach taken in this study, which draws on Cooper (2013). I will first discuss the design and compilation of the corpus, followed by an explanation of the sampling and searching procedures for the quantitative analysis of linguistic data. Finally, I will describe the qualitative analysis methodology. Given the importance of this chapter in the present thesis, a more detailed account of its subsections is provided this synthesis in an attempt to facilitate the understanding of the following chapters.

9.1. Corpus Design and Compilation

As noted in Chapter 5, very few studies have been carried out that attempt to study the Derbyshire dialect in light of its literary representation (e.g. García-Bermejo Giner 1991b, 1993 are the most remarkable exceptions). This has rendered the location and compilation of texts rather difficult. The corpus has been chiefly compiled drawing on the information available at *The Salamanca Corpus*, the *EDD* bibliography, as well as the works by García-Bermejo Giner (1990) and Snell (2002). All of them include information that is chiefly related to the 19th and 20th centuries, with some isolated references pertaining to the late 17th and 18th centuries listed in the bibliography added to the *EDD*. Whenever available, the texts have been retrieved from *The Salamanca Corpus*, the *Archive.org* database and the Bodleian Libraries at the University of Oxford. They have been selected according to three main criteria based upon Hickey's (2010b: 8-11) classification criteria for non-standard texts; they are described as follows:

i. Diachronic criteria

a. Publication between 1850 and 1950:

This time period has been selected given the larger availability of texts and because evidence on dialect awareness is more commonly documented then than in any other periods (see Chapter 3). Besides, it has been my intention to study at least one hundred years covering the turn of the 19th to the mid-20th century in order to reach more

conclusive findings as to the development of the Derbyshire dialect and the socio-cultural perceptions associated with it over this crucial historical period.

b. Chronological balance:

The selection has aimed at providing a representative, well-balanced sample of the Derbyshire dialect that may confirm the continuity (or the lack of it) of the features identified in the literary representations throughout the period analysed. Thus, the corpus contains:

b.1. A similar number of texts per century and

b.2. Texts for every decade of the period analysed, when possible.

ii. Authorial criteria

a. One text per author, when possible:

Criterion ii.a. is meant to ensure representativeness and the provision of an unbiased sample that is not the result of one author's individual perceptions and stylistic choices. However, this has not been possible in all cases.

iii. Typological criteria

a. Examples of both DL and LD:

As explained in Chapter 6, there are key differences between these two types of dialect representation in terms of authorship, purpose and target audience, which may affect the information they provide about the variety under study and the associated contemporary perceptions. Thus, the decision to study both types of representation has been made in an attempt to obtain data produced and circulated within and outside the county.

b. Texts written in prose:

Criterion iii.b. can be explained on account of text availability, since prose texts were the most numerous in the period scrutinised. In addition, by including only this sort of literary discourse, possible misleading results that might be subject to, or vary as a result of rhyme and other literary conventions were avoided.

In light of these criteria, the corpus consists of thirteen texts that amount to a total of 629,386 words, as Table 2 shows:[1]

Period	DL		LD		Total	
	N texts	N words	N texts	N words	N texts	N words
19th c.	2	16,299	5	251,123	7	267,422
20th c.	1	84,132	5	277,832	6	361,964
Total	3	100,431	10	528,955	13	629,386

Table 2: Corpus data

In what follows, I will discuss the specific criteria regarding, firstly, the compilation of texts representing the 1800s and, secondly, the 20th-century material.

9.1.1. 19th-century Data

As we have seen, the corpus includes seven texts published between 1850-1900, with a total of 267,422 words. Table 3 provides details about the 19th-century works selected:

---

[1] It should be noted that the corpus comprises not only the dialectal passages within the works selected, but the complete texts. This has been done in an attempt to preserve and analyse the potential linguistic and extralinguistic metacommentary provided by narrators, as well as to explore "the deliberate contrast between the standard and the non-standard stretches" of the texts (Hickey 2010b: 9).

Dialect representation	Year	Author	Title	N words
DL	1870a	Robinson, Joseph B.	*Owd Sammy Twitcher's Visit tu't Gret Exhibishun e Derby*	7,764
DL	1870b	Robinson, Joseph B.	*Owd Sammy Twitcher's Crismas Bowk for the Year 1870*	8,535
LD	1864	Le Fanu, Joseph S.	*Uncle Silas*	54,958
LD	1868	Verney, Frances P.	*Stone Edge*	66,541
LD	1870-71	Brushfield, Thomas	*A Village Sketch, at Ashford-in-the-water, in illustration of the Derbyshire Dialect*	1,584
LD	1892	Humphrey Ward, Mrs.	*The History of David Grieve (Vol. I)*	95,893
LD	1897	Murray Gilchrist, Robert	*A Peakland Faggot*	32,147
TOTAL				267,422

Table 3: 19th-century corpus texts

The compilation of these texts has proved somewhat difficult in order to meet some of the selection criteria:

Criterion i.a.: This criterion has been easily met, as all the texts included in the 19th-century subcorpus were published in the second half of the century.

Criterion i.b.: this criterion has been partially met, as it has not been possible to find texts for every decade of the century. In particular, I have been unable to locate texts written between 1850 and 1859, nor in the 1880s. In addition, as Table 3 shows, there are two DL texts published in 1870. This is due to the impossibility to find more examples of DL (see criterion iii.a. below) and the fact that these are rather short pieces. The 19th-century material comprises another representation published between 1870 and 1871, which I have decided to include given the lack of other LD texts from this decade.

Criterion ii.a.: as shown in Table 3, the two DL texts selected were written by the same author. This is, again, due to the unavailability of material: no further DL examples could be located.

Criterion iii.a.: this criterion has been met, with two examples of DL and five instances of LD. In these cases, the data have been normalised in the analysis following Biber et al. (2006: 263).

Criterion iii.b.: this criterion has been successfully met.

9.1.2. 20th-century Data

Dialect representation	Year	Author	Title	N words
DL	1939	Dallison, Buck	*Lookin' Back*	84,132
LD	1908	Murray Gilchrist, Robert	*Good-bye to Market*	36,634
LD	1920	Moult, Thomas	*Snow over Elden*	71,419
LD	1941	Dallison, Buck	*Still Lookin' Back*	80,685
LD	1942	Porteous, Crichton	*The Farm by the Lake*	87,486
LD	1950	Porteous, Crichton	*Reet Darbysher*	1,608
TOTAL				361,964

Table 4: 20th-century corpus texts

As shown in Table 4, the corpus contains six texts (361,964 words) published between 1900-1950. The compilation of texts from this period has been more demanding due to the apparently smaller amount of available data which fitted our selection criteria.

Criterion i.a.: all the texts were published during the first half of the 1900s.

Criterion i.b.: as with the 19th-century subcorpus, there is one decade for which texts have not been found: 1910-1919. By contrast, three texts published in the 1940-1950 decade have been included (see criteria ii. and iii. below).

Criterion ii.a.: three exceptions are worth noting here. In spite of the fact that both *Reet Darbyshire* (1950) and *The Farm by the Lake* (1942) were written by the same author, the decision has been made to include the former given that, though quite smaller in size, it contains relevant linguistic and socio-cultural information for this study. By the same token, Buck Dallison's (?-?) *Still Lookin' Back* (1941) has been likewise incorporated. The fact that the same writer composed two dialect works representative of LD and DL raises the question of whether variations can be found in the way dialect was depicted given factors such as the different conventions, purposes or target audience of

both types of representation. Similarly, Robert Murray Gilchrist's *Good-bye to Market* (1908) has been included, even though another of his works has been selected for the 19th-century subcorpus. As in other cases, this has been done in an attempt to rely on a similar number of texts per century and thus provide a relatively balanced sample representative of the period studied.

Criterion iii.a.: because of the uneven distribution of texts in terms of type of representation and their number of words, the data will be normalised according to standard practice.

Criterion iii.b.: it has been successfully met.

9.2. Sampling and Searching Methodology

As already noted, the corpus texts have been retrieved from *The Salamanca Corpus*, the *Archive.org* database, and the Bodleian Libraries. All the works retrieved from the first database were available in Microsoft Word format, while those extracted from *Archive.org* were PDF files. These have been manually transcribed into Microsoft Word documents. As for the texts found in the Bodleian Libraries, only PDF and print versions of the original texts were available, and so they had to be manually transcribed too.

Once ready for analysis, the texts have been read in detail in order to extract every dialectal feature together with metalinguistic commentary that could be of use in the qualitative part of the study (see section 9.3). The data have been extracted in several stages. Firstly, the texts have been processed and analysed using *Corpus Presenter* 14.5 (Hickey 2017) for quantitative information. As shown in Figure 1, wordlists have been retrieved so that individual frequencies could be obtained, although careful inspection has been necessary to disambiguate dialectal traits that could either be potentially mistaken with standard forms —e.g. *gait* for standard English *gate*—, or could point to different dialectal features; e.g., *agen* for both standard *again* and *against*, or *t'* for *the* or *to*. Those cases have been thoroughly scrutinised by exploring concordances, as were morphological features like cases of non-standard negation with *none* (see Figure 2).

Figure 1: Alphabetised wordlist extracted from *Owd Sammy Twitcher's Crismas Bowk for the Year 1870* (1870) with *Corpus Presenter* 14.5

Figure 2: Concordances for *none* extracted from the 19th-century corpus with *Corpus Presenter* 14.5

The second stage refers to the classification of the data. The dialectal forms identified have been transferred to Microsoft Excel sheets (one per text) and arranged into three main categories: phonology and spelling (i.e. non-standard spellings which suggest dialectal sounds), lexis, and morphology. There have been cases in which the items have been found to fall into more than one category; this has been duly taken into account. An example is the noun *ninny-hommer*. According to the *EDD*, this is a variant of *ninnyhammer*, a dialect noun meaning 'a fool, simpleton; a stupid or weak-minded

41

person', which is documented in the counties of Lancashire, Cheshire, and Derbyshire. It can be thus considered an instance of Derbyshire dialect lexis, but also a phonological feature since the spelling <o> instead of <a> suggests a rounded vowel sound, most likely due to the rounding before nasals traditionally associated with the dialect, as we have seen in Chapter 5. Similarly, the form *soomwheer* 'somewhere' has been taken as an example of two phonological features as the spellings <oo> and <ee> point to two different phonological traits: the lack of FOOT/STRUT split and what appears to be an [ɪə]-diphthong or [iː] in SQUARE words.

It is worth noting that some of the items identified have fallen outside the three categories considered in the data classification. On the one hand, and as expected, the representations of the Derbyshire dialect rely on eye dialect and allegro spellings to recreate non-standard speech. Cases such as *attenshun* 'attention' and *speshel* 'special' are documented alongside *comin* 'coming' and *comp'ny* 'company'. They have been excluded from the analysis except for dubious cases in which double readings are possible. An example is the term *won* 'one', which can be understood as either [ɒ] or eye dialect for /ʌ/. On the other hand, the corpus provides evidence on terms such as *lad* or *lass*, which, as is known, were widely employed in dialect representations of numerous varieties, especially in those spoken in the North since the Early Modern English period. As such, they were not characteristic Derbyshire items, or at least words that point to some restricted Derbyshire usage over the period analysed. Such terms have also been excluded.

The filtered data have then been sorted following different procedures depending on the category they have been assigned to. With regard to the phonological and spelling forms, they have been mostly organised etymologically according to the Middle English vowel of their standard English equivalent and/or the phonological process they represent, if typified, as well as following Well's (1982) lexical sets. Examples such as spellings <oi> and <ee> for standard PRICE words *side* and *die*, respectively, have been thus grouped under ME /iː/, while the form *aw* 'all' has been considered an example of /l/ vocalisation. In this regard, the linguistic classification of the data have relied on the *OED* and standard reference works like Trudgill (1990) and Ihalainen (1994), where such processes are described and typified. By the same token, examples of non-standard morphology have been classified according to the dialectal trait represented. For instance,

shouldna or *mustna* have been described as instances of *-na* negation, while *it were* is an example of past BE *-r* forms.

As for lexis, the data have been primarily organised according to the information provided by *EDD Online* 3.0 (Markus 2019). My aim has been to ascertain whether the lexical forms found in the corpus represent instances of genuine Derbyshire lexis or were distributed rather more widely. To do so, four different cases have been identified and considered for analysis:

1. Terms labelled as part of the Derbyshire dialect (e.g. *flungs* 'the lungs');
2. Terms cited from Derbyshire and other varieties (e.g. *kestrel* 'a worthless person, a harum-scarum fellow, a runagate' documented in Derbyshire, Lancashire and Yorkshire);
3. Forms that are not lemmatised but are documented as Derbyshire dialect variants of a dialect word. An example is *scroodge*, which *EDD* (s.v. v. and sb., 1.) records as a Derbyshire variant of *scrouge* 'to squeeze, press, crush, crowd, huddle together', which is reported in widespread dialect use in Ireland, England, and the US. As already explained, such cases have been included into the categories of lexis and phonology and spelling.
4. Terms that, although lemmatised or recorded as spelling variants, are not localised to Derbyshire: *limb*, 'a mischievous child or person; an unruly, troublesome person; applied also to females', which *EDD* (s.v. *limb* sb., v. 8) documents elsewhere in Scotland and England.

In addition, the data have been compared against contemporary glossaries and monographs of the Derbyshire dialect in order to ascertain the extent to which the terms identified were localised to the region and explicitly linked to its variety in the period considered.

9.3. Qualitative Analysis

9.3.1. Qualitative Data

As indicated at the beginning of this chapter, the present study is both quantitative and qualitative in scope. Two sources of qualitative information have been explored: literary and non-literary texts. Access to this material was gained again through *The Salamanca Corpus*, the *Archive.org* database, and the Bodleian Libraries.

9.3.1.1. Literary Material

The corpus texts have also been investigated from a qualitative perspective by looking at metacommentary about the Derbyshire dialect and its users so as to gain insight into the socio-cultural perceptions associated with it. For example, in the introduction to the short story *Reet Darbyshire* (1950), Crichton Porteous states that "Derbyshire retains a good bit of dialect. To those who are used to it, naturally it is homely talk, though to strangers it may seem crude and harsh" (205). By introducing this comment, Porteous gives a hint on how the dialect was perceived by both natives and non-natives to the variety, which establishes a link between the language he is about to depict and values of familiarity for members of the community as opposed to a sense of unfriendliness for non-members. Such examples of metalinguistic discourse have been thus taken into account for the analysis.

By the same token, attention has been paid to the way dialect is displayed in the texts, that is, who uses it, how and to what purpose. The analysis of William Townend, a character of Murray Gilchrist's *A Peakland Faggot* (1897), may exemplify this. Born and bred in Derbyshire, he returns from Canada, where he had moved to become a wealthy businessman. Once he is back in his home town, and given his new social status, he refuses to use his native dialect in order to mark himself off from the rest of the characters. However, he behaves in a different way with Emma Bamber, with whom he is in love. In an attempt to get close to her, he turns to the Derbyshire dialect in her presence, "his speech losing the refinement which a broader life had given" (184). By means of the social context of the character, the conscious decisions he makes regarding language, and the narrator's comments, we can gain valuable insight into the uses, social connotations and attitudes towards the variety, namely how the Derbyshire dialect is used (or not used) as a tool to perform social and regional identities. Such extralinguistic remarks contribute to a richer understanding of the processes of enregisterment of the Derbyshire dialect.

9.3.1.2. Non-literary Material

Besides metalinguistic commentary and the use of the dialect in the corpus texts, qualitative information has also been retrieved from specialised non-literary evidence dealing with the dialect. These texts have been selected according to the following criteria:

i. Publication between 1850-1950;

ii. Discussion of the dialect's linguistic features (phonology, lexis and/or morphology). An example is: "In Derbyshire, when they say, 'I went up the *Bar*, or down it', 'tis the same as saying 'I went up or down the *hill*'" (Pegge 1896: 4. My emphasis);

iii. Discussion about the attitudes, perceptions and meanings linked with the dialect, when available. For instance, Pegge (1896: 4) notes that "Bawcross at Bakewell is a *corruption* of Bar-cross" (My emphasis).

As Table 5 shows, the study is thus based on four documents that meet the above criteria. Though very few in number, they provide useful qualitative information, as explained below.

Year	Author(s)	Title
1862	Denman, Lord	*A Fragment on the Dialect of the High Peak*
1865	Sleigh, John	*A Derbyshire Glossary*
1871	Sleigh, John	*Derbyshire Glossary*
1896	Pegge, Samuel; Hallam, Thomas	*Two Collections of Derbicisms*

Table 5: 19th-century Non-literary Qualitative Material

Lord Denman's *Fragment* in *The Reliquary* (1862), for example, remarks on the local pronunciation of words like *lone* 'lane' (115), as well as on speakers' tendency to use -*na* negatives (e.g. *wunna* 'will not') (114), among other morphological features. This work also includes comments on the many "corruptions" (115) and "incorrect words" (116) that conformed 19th-century Derbyshire dialect, whose pronunciation also differed "from what [Sleigh] considered correct" (Sleigh 1865: 157). In his glossaries (1865, 1871), Sleigh refers to *cawf* 'calf' and *kä's* 'cows' as characteristic local variants, while commenting on the currency of -*n* pronouns like *ourn* 'ours' in the county (1865: 92).

Pegge's work (1896) discusses the pronunciation of certain sounds such as the diphthong in *gooa* 'go' (ix) and remarks on Derbyshire morphological traits, as in "-en is added to verbs; *yo talken*, you talk" (xi). This work also contains metacommentary on the dialect which renders plenty of extralinguistic information as regards contemporary perceptions of the variety, as well as about the social values and identities associated with it. For example, Pegge claimed that the features therein described were "not the language of the better sort, but of the vulgar" (xix).

12.
Conclusion

In line with the calls for "a (re-) examination of historical discourse about variation in English in the light of the "third-wave" sociolinguistic concepts of indexicality and enregisterment" (Beal 2019: 20), this thesis has attempted to show the validity and usefulness of literary representations of dialect as sources of information about the sociolinguistic processes underlying linguistic variation, including indexicality and enregisterment. They not only provide valuable insight into the forms and features associated with historical linguistic repertoires, but also, and perhaps most importantly, into the values construed around and attached to such forms, as well as into their evolution over prolonged periods of time and across shifting populations of language users.

In this chapter, I summarise the main conclusions drawn from this study, while also addressing its main limitations and contributions to the wider fields of historical linguistics and sociolinguistics.

12.1. Main Conclusions and Limitations

In the Introduction to this thesis (see section 1.2.), the following research questions were posed:

1) What were the main linguistic and socio-cultural features associated with 19th and 20th-century Derbyshire dialect in literary representations of the variety? Do they correlate with the metacommentary available in non-literary accounts of the dialect?

2) How was the Derbyshire dialect enregistered in the period analysed? To what extent did literary representations of this variety contribute and determine this process?

3) Have there been meaningful indexical shifts in the way the dialect has been understood over time? Do they echo evolving ideas about the linguistic location of the dialect? Do they correlate with the writers' knowledge of the variety and the expectations of the audience addressed?

In answering research questions 1) and 2), the analysis of the 19th and 20th-century data has revealed the enregisterment of particular form-meaning connections that highlight the association of specific sets of Derbyshire phonological, morphological, and

lexical features with schemes of socio-cultural values and larger regional identity frames. These associations were not only reflected in and circulated via literature, but were also consciously built and shaped by its writers on account of their own perceptions of the Derbyshire dialect and its speakers, which were in turn largely determined by the socio-historical context in which such works were composed.

Beal (2019) claims that "metalinguistic and metapragmatic discourse which signals enregisterment tends to appear at specific points in history, when events such as migration bring users of different registers into contact" (12). As I have attempted to show in Chapters 2-6, this was certainly the case of 19th and 20th-century Derbyshire. The growing geographical and social mobility prompted by industrialisation led to an increased awareness of linguistic difference, which, coupled with the rise of class consciousness and the advances in the British educational system, fostered processes of linguistic standardisation. Such processes also led to the valorisation of dialectal speech, especially in traditionally working-class rural communities such as Derbyshire. Speakers' concern about the loss of their long-standing cultural values and linguistic identity, together with the rise of antiquarianism, translated into an emergent body of both literary and non-literary accounts of dialect. They attest to both awareness of the Derbyshire dialect as a distinct and unique variety, and to the existence of pre-established associations between specific linguistic and socio-cultural features and notions of authentic Derbyshire speech and speakers. As we have seen, they could and were in fact effectively used for conscious identity construction and performance in writing. Features like unsplit [ʊ], -na negation, and lexical forms such as *summat*, *nowt*, and *owt* were consistently and recurrently employed as authenticating devices that correlated with what was perceived to be the archetypical Derbyshire persona: the industrious Derbyshire farmer, who embodied a well-defined set of extralinguistic attributes including low social class, vulgarity, and roughness. Such socio-cultural features were transferred to the language deliberately used to craft this characterological type in a reflexive and circular process of value assignment and identity construction. These form-meaning connections would subsequently be circulated via the metadiscourse contained in the very same artefacts that helped to establish such ideological associations in the first place. In this regard, literary representations of the Derbyshire dialect bear witness to second- and third-order indexicality and are therefore valuable tools to reconstruct processes of enregisterment in late modern Derbyshire.

As discussed in Chapters 10 and 11, 19th-century Derbyshire dialect was enregistered as a repertoire of transitional linguistic features including characteristically northern traits like [ʊ]-type realisations of STRUT, [ʊə] and [u(:)] GOAT pronunciations, and [a]/[e] FACE words, to name some of them. It also featured typically west midland traits such as *-na* negatives and third person feminine pronoun *hoo*, together with forms halfway through both linguistic areas (e.g. *mun*, *nowt*, *owt*). This, together with the evidence provided by non-literary testimony and the qualitative data, indicates that Derbyshire speech was linguistically construed and thus enregistered not as a set of localised features restricted to this variety alone, but as an essentially transitional register reflecting the county's social history, demography, and geographical location by means of a unique compendium of hybrid features. The fact that most of these features were replicated in the 20th-century works emphasises the continuity not only of the linguistic and socio-cultural ideas of the dialect held by earlier dialect writers, audiences, and commentators, but also of its distinctive sensed hybridity, which is precisely what determines the dialect's uniqueness.

The data analysed has also provided answers for question 3), which are in line with the related hypotheses posed in the Introduction to this thesis. The indexical development of the Derbyshire dialect unveiled in this study has put forth the inherent mutability and multi-layered, dynamic nature of processes of enregisterment in at least two ways. Firstly, the analysis has identified indexical changes in the way the dialect was understood in the course of one hundred years. While the socio-cultural values and identities linked to the dialect seem to have remained rather stable over the period analysed, perhaps with the exception of the slightly decreased perceived linguistic associations between Derbyshire and northernmost regions, remarkable differences exist at the purely linguistic level. Although most of the features identified in the 19th-century material were likewise used by 20th-century writers, marked differences seem to have existed as regards their degree of sociolinguistic salience, especially when it comes to phonology and morphology. Following what appears to be a downward trend in the overall volume and density of dialect representation, most of the features identified seem to have become not only less salient, but also more lexically restricted and simplified. An example is STRUT. While, according to the data, it was the most prominent phonological feature in the 19th century, both in terms of the frequency and variety of items represented, its incidence notably decreased in the 20th-century works to the extent of being mostly limited to the words

summat 'something' and *un* 'one'. This, in turn, highlights the enregisterment of such individual items, which were also very frequent in the 19th-century material. Derbyshire morphology exhibits very similar patterns in terms of its indexical development, with the only exception of *th-* second person pronouns, whose association with the dialect seems to have been perceived more strongly in the 1900s. Other features like *yo* pronouns and non-standard negation, especially *-na* negatives, show markedly diminished levels of salience, suggesting that their indexical links with Derbyshire speech and speakers had perhaps entered a process of gradual deregisterment. Interestingly enough, and despite the aforementioned decrease in the quantity of dialect representation in the 1900s, Derbyshire lexis exhibits a considerable growth, which points to an increase in its degree of sociolinguistic salience and local meaning. Crucially, the trends foregrounded by the analysis of the historical literary material are confirmed by the modern data discussed in section 11.4., where features such as the lack of FOOT/STRUT split, [e] pronunciations of FACE words, *-na* negation, and *th-* pronouns are commonly understood as part of the Derbyshire repertoire today. The latter two, though, are recessive, which corroborates the deregistering trend highlighted by the corpus texts. Besides, the fact that *yo* pronouns, which, according to the texts analysed, were clearly enregistered in the 19th century but almost non-existent in the 1900s, are not discussed in modern accounts of the dialect, further adds to our estimates that they might have become completely deregistered as characteristic Derbyshire forms. In contrast, the upward trend revealed by the comparative analysis of the dialect's lexis is once more supported by present-day evidence, suggesting that the local meaning of the forms identified and the tendency signaled by the data increased over time, to the extent that items like *nowt* and *owt* are currently perceived as rather emblematic and active Derbyshire words. Taken together, these findings go only to further emphasise the essentially mutable character of processes of indexicality and enregisterment. Dynamic by nature, they draw on pre-existing, shared ideas about dialect and its speakers, which are constantly negotiated and reshaped in an ongoing process where social significance is moulded, bestowed upon, and sometimes even taken away from linguistic items at different times and by different speakers. In fact, it is not only time but such changing populations that determine the mutability of processes of sociolinguistic variation.

As we have seen, some of the indexical changes detected in this study have to do with time; there are others, however, whose explanation points to the type of dialect

writing, and therefore to the agents involved in dialect representation and their knowledge of the variety. On the one hand, the first worth noting difference refers to the accuracy of the representation. Overall, DL authors tend to rely on more restricted and consistent sets of features, especially when it comes to respellings, whereas LD displays a wider range of strategies and forms to recreate the dialect. Most of these, as we have seen, correspond to predominantly northern conventions, most likely appropriated by non-native writers on account of their more limited knowledge of the variety and the perceived linguistic links between Derbyshire and the North, which, as already explained, were more salient for outsiders than for natives, as were the negative stereotypes associated to the Derbyshire persona. Paradoxically enough, on the other hand, LD writers generally show more stable perceptions of the dialect's features over time, while greater variation has been observed in the DL material, especially as regards phonology and morphology (see section 11.3). In fact, the data point to possible processes of in-group deregisterment for most of the phonological and morphological features analysed, with the exception of specific unsplit [ʊ] words and second person pronouns, particularly *ye* forms, which are the only items besides lexis whose salience seems to have increased in the 1900s. Interestingly, remarkable text type-dependent disparities have been found regarding the local significance of such pronouns: while they are much more strongly associated with Derbyshire for 20th-century natives, they show a clear downward trend in LD. *-na* negation further exemplifies such perceptual divergences by showing similar indexical patterns, though in opposite directions: while it remained an equally distinctive Derbyshire feature for outsiders over the course of a century, it became clearly deregistered for native speakers, at least according to the material analysed. These findings underscore the pivotal and agentive role of writers and speakers in processes of enregisterment and deregisterment, which are largely determined by their conscious linguistic choices based upon their knowledge or, more critically, their fluctuating, ever-changing perception of the variety and its speakers. Such perceptions, as the data have largely demonstrated, greatly vary on account of the type of writer and audience as well as of their degree of familiarity with the dialect, to the point that certain features may present divergent or even opposing indexical developments in terms of their sociolinguistic salience.

These results, however, need to be interpreted rather cautiously in light of the main limitations of the study, which are related to the number of texts analysed, the authorship,

and the recreation of the social meaning of linguistic variation. When it comes to the number of texts, as discussed in Chapter 9, the corpus analysed is relatively small given the limited availability of accessible material. Besides, as already mentioned, there are substantial differences in the number of DL and LD texts, as the former amount to a total of three works. This is particularly notable in the 20th-century, when only one DL text has been located, perhaps hindering representativeness. In addition, although two different DL texts have been scrutinised for the 19th century, they were produced by the same author, which in actual fact implies that the results may point to writer's subjective perceptions and idiosyncratic linguistic choices. This can also be discussed in relation to the 20th-century material more generally: four out of the six works analysed were written by either Buck Dallison or Crichton Porteous. Furthermore, one of the remaining novels, *Good-bye to Market* (1908), was composed by the same author of the 19th-century text *A Peakland Faggot* (1897), which once more compromises authorial balance. Finally, it should be noted that the historical nature of the literary material scrutinised does not allow as clear and detailed an interpretation of the dialect's indexical fields as that procured by modern data and methodologies. Historical data, especially when it comes to literature, although useful in that it hints at perceptual links between given repertoires of linguistic forms and specific social meanings, does not provide us with completely transparent data, nor does it offer unequivocal interpretations of how speakers and readers understood linguistic variation in the past.

12.2. Main Contributions and Directives for Future Research

In light of previous third-wave research on processes of historical enregisterment, this thesis has attempted to make the following contributions. Firstly, following the pioneering works of Beal (2009), Cooper (2013), and Ruano-García (2012), the enregisterment of the Derbyshire dialect has been explored via the scrutiny of historical textual data, further confirming Beal's (2018) assertion that this kind of material "whether [it] be recommendations concerning appropriate linguistic choices, the association of specific variants or varieties with characters in literature, or the multimodal discourse of cartoons", is not only a fruitful source of linguistic information about dialects in the past, but also "provides evidence of $n + 1$ (+1) level indexicality and of enregisterment" (20). Indeed, the corpus-based analysis of the literary texts surveyed in this thesis has identified a repertoire of transitional features which seem to have characterised late modern Derbyshire dialect. Crucially, they coincide with those highlighted in non-literary

contemporary and modern linguistic metacommentary, shedding further light on the main forms and features of this otherwise nearly forgotten variety, while also enriching our understanding of the sociolinguistic setting in the Late Modern English period. This thesis has thus contributed to broaden the still fragmentary knowledge of the dialectal reality of English in the 19th and 20th centuries. In this regard, it adds to our comprehension of the other histories of the English language by legitimising the voices of the vast majority of speakers whose linguistic habits and identities have all too often been left behind and stigmatised on account of the all-pervading focus on standard speech.

Besides, as previously mentioned, this study has also shown that the textual material analysed can and has indeed opened windows into the processes of enregisterment of such voices, and, more precisely, how it has informed the mechanisms that underpinned the enregisterment of Derbyshire speech. Just like in the studies about Sheffield and Newcastle, Yorkshire, Lancashire, and Black Country Englishes, the data have revealed that the Derbyshire dialect was enregistered as a relatively stable repertoire of features that were widely recognised as inherently local. Nevertheless, this thesis has also shown that, unlike the aforementioned varieties, this particular dialect was enregistered not as a set of exclusive traits localised to this area only, but as a compendium of hybrid and transitional features which, taken together, constitute a unique variety which is consistent with its county and speakers' sociolinguistic history and the perceptions that both insiders and outsiders seem to have held over the course of the centuries. Thus, this study contributes to our understanding that different registers may be enregistered in different ways, always, quoting from Conde-Silvestre and Hernández-Campoy (2012), "in systematic connection to the socio-historical situation of [its] speakers" (1). This goes only to further highlight the role of the individual as the centre of linguistic variation and as the main agent of sociolinguistic change.

The combination of qualitative and quantitative methodologies adopted in this study has allowed the implementation of the aforementioned contributions, while further testifying to the usefulness of such an approach to linguistic variation that previous studies like Cooper (2013) and Ruano-García (2020a) had already evinced. Indeed, this qualitative-quantitative methodology has also enabled this thesis to corroborate Cooper (2013, 2016), Ruano-García (2020a), and Asprey's (2020) claim that "processes of enregisterment operate along a continuum" (Cooper 2013: 277), and that both indexical changes and deregisterment mechanisms may affect the way speakers perceive and thus

represent linguistic varieties, continually (re)negotiating and (re)shaping identity and language in stylistic practice and reflexive performance. The study has demonstrated that shifting indexicalities may and do indeed operate over time (Cooper 2013, 2016), but also, and perhaps most importantly, over type of dialect representation (Ruano-García 2020a). In this vein, it therefore stresses the agentive role of writers, audiences, and commentators and their knowledge and understanding of sociolinguistic repertoires. They are the ultimate architects and agents of linguistic variation and change, and, at the same time, they are determined by such a change in what constitutes an endless loop of ongoing sociolinguistic meaning making that involves "reinterpreting variables and combining and recombining them in a continual process of bricolage" (Eckert 2012: 94).

The analysis, though, has also put forth several areas for further research that may remedy the limitations of the present study. In terms of the corpus considered, more texts should be retrieved and analysed in order to reach more comprehensive findings that may offer new information and clarify the insights provided by the material scrutinised here. More specifically, further investigation on DL representations of the dialect would shed light on the perceptions that natives had about their own language; this would certainly serve to clarify the potential processes of in-group deregisterment signaled by our analysis.

Besides, the exploration of other literary and non-literary genres would likewise broaden our understanding of late modern Derbyshire dialect. The analysis of poetry, drama, or letters would reveal whether the features identified in works of prose have a correlation with those represented in other genres, thereby strengthening the sociolinguistic image of the dialect painted by such works, or rather opening new paths into the dialect by unveiling traits that may have escaped the pages of prose writers. In this line, further investigation on the features outlined in sections 11.1. and 11.2. (e.g. DAR and rounding before nasals) should be carried out. Despite being out of the scope of this thesis, they seem to have been relatively salient in late modern literary and non-literary representations of the dialect, as well as in more modern accounts of the variety, which points at possible processes of enregisterment that deserve to be looked at. Besides, although the results obtained from our analysis have been compared against present-day evidence, the elaboration of a modern dialect survey similar to that developed by Cooper (2013) would help to clarify the indexical development of the variety by providing first-

hand information about the possible processes of deregisterment foreshadowed by our data.

Finally, it should be noted that, while the present study has considered the Derbyshire dialect as a whole, this variety, just like any other dialect, is far from homogeneous. Indeed, substantial variation exists between the sub-varieties spoken across the county. This, of course, raises questions about the dialect's transitional nature: is its northern character felt more strongly in the High Peak than in the most southerly part of the Derbyshire Dales? Is the variety spoken in the latter more influenced by West Midlands English? In short, does the sensed transitional character of the Derbyshire dialect vary, or does it become less marked, depending on location? And if so, how? All these questions need to be further investigated in order to better understand not only the nature of the Derbyshire dialect, but also the rationale underlying processes of sociolinguistic variation.

Corpus Texts

Brushfield, T. (1870-71). A Village Sketch, at Ashford-in-the-water, in illustration of the Derbyshire Dialect. *The Reliquary*, XI, 163-165.

Dallison, B. (1939). *Lookin' Back*. Rich and Cowan Ltd.

---. (1941). *Still Lookin' Back*. Rich and Cowan Ltd.

Le Fanu, J. S. (1864). *Uncle Silas*. Richard Bentley.

Murray Gichrist, R. (1897). *A Peakland Faggot. Tales of Milton Folk*. Grant Richards.

---. (1908). *Good-bye to Market*. Moorland Press Leek.

Moult, T. (1920). *Snow over Elden*. William Heinemann.

Porteous, C. (1950). Reet Darbyshire. In *Derbyshire* (pp. 205-210). Robert Hale Limited.

---. (1942). *The Farm by the Lake*. Michael Joseph Ltd.

Robinson, J. B. (1870a). *Owd Sammy Twitcher's Visit tu 't Gret Exibishun e Derby*. Derby.

---. (1870b). *Owd Sammy Twitcher's Crismas Bowk for the Year 1870*. Derby.

Verney, F. P. (1868). *Stone Edge*. Smith Elder and Cy.

Ward, M. H. (1892). *The History of David Grieve, vol. I*. Smith, Elder & Co.

Secondary sources

Aaron, J. E. (2009). Coming Back to Life: From Indicator to Stereotype and a Strange Story of Frequency. *Journal of Sociolinguistics,* 13(4), 472-498.

Abercrombie, D. (1965). RP and Local Accent. In *Studies in Phonetics and Linguistics* (pp. 10-15). Oxford UP.

Adams, M. (2009). Enregisterment: A Special Issue. *American Speech,* 84(2), 115-117.

Addington, S. (1772). *An Inquiry into the Reasons for and against inclosing the Open Fields*. J. W. Piercy.

Agha, A. (2003). The Social life of cultural value. *Language & Communication*, 23, 231-273.

---. (2005). Voice, Footing, Enregisterment. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology,* 15(1), 38-59.

---. (2007). *Language and Social Relations.* Cambridge UP.

Aikin, J. (1797). *A Description of the Country from Thirty to Forty Miles Round Manchester*. Iohn Stockdale.

Alston, R. C. (1965-2008). *A Bibliography of the English Language from the Invention of Printing to the Year 1800*. Arnold.

---. (1984). The British Book Trade, 1701-1800. *Publishing History*, 16, 43-86.

Altick, R. D. (1974). *Victorian People and Ideas: A Companion for the Modern Reader of Victorian Literature*. W. W. Norton & Company.

Amador-Moreno, C. and McCafferty, K. (2015). "[B]ut sure its only a penny after all": Irish English Discourse Marker *sure*. In M. Dossena (Ed.) *Transatlantic Perspectives on Late Modern English* (pp. 179-197). John Benjamins.

Anderwald, L. (2016). *Language between Description and Prescription: Verbs and Verb Categories in Nineteenth-Century Grammars of English*. Oxford UP.

Androutsopoulos, J. (2000). Non-Standard Spellings in Media Texts: The Case of German Fanzines. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 4, 514-533.

---. (2010): The Study of Language and Space in Media Discourse. In P. Auer and J. E. Schmidt (Eds.) *Language and Space: An International Handbook of Linguistic Variation. Volume I: Theory and Methods* (pp. 740-758). De Gruyter.

Anonymous. (1870). *Mixing in Society. A Complete Manual of Manners*. George Routledge & Sons.

Arnold-Bemrose, H. H. (1910). *Cambridge County Geographies: Derbyshire*. Cambridge UP.

Asprey, E. (2008). The Sociolinguistic Stratification of a Connected Speech Process – The Case of the T to R Rule in the Black Country. *Leeds Working Papers in Linguistics and Phonetics*, 13, 109-140.

---. (2015). The West Midlands. In R. Hickey (Ed.) *Researching Northern English* (pp. 393-416). John Benjamins.

---. (2020). Black Country Dialect Literature and What it Can Tell Us about Black Country. In P. Honeybone and W. Maguire (Eds.) *Dialect writing and the North of England* (pp. 29-50). Edinburgh UP.

Axon, W. E. A. (1883). *English Dialect Words of the Eighteenth Century as Shown in the "Universal Etymological Dictionary" of Nathaniel Bailey*. Trübner & Co.

Bailey, N. (1763) [1721]. *Universal Etymological English Dictionary*. T. Osborne.

Bailey, R. (1991). *Images of English: A Cultural History of the Language.* Cambridge UP.

---. (1996). *Nineteenth-Century English*. The University of Michigan Press.

---. (2010). Variation and Change in Eighteenth-Century English. In R. Hickey (Ed.) *Eighteenth-Century English: Ideology and Change* (pp. 182-199). Cambridge UP.

Bainbridge, W. (1815). Peculiarities of the Dialect of Derbyshire. *Monthly Magazine*, 275, 297-298.

Baker, R. (1770). *Remarks on the English Language, In the Natura of Vaugelas's Reflections on the French*. J. Bell.

Bamford, S. (1854). *The Dialect of South Lancashire*. John Russell Smith.

Beal, J. C. (1999). *English Pronunciation in the Eighteenth Century: Thomas Spence's 'Grand Repository of the English Language'*. Oxford UP.

---. (2000). From Geordie Ridley to *Viz*: Popular Literature in Tyneside English. *Language and Literature*, 9(4), 343-359.

---. (2004a). *English in Modern Times*. Routledge.

---. (2004b). English Dialects in the North of England: Morphology and Syntax. In B. Kortmann et al. (Eds.). *A Handbook of Varieties of English. Vol. 2: Morphology and Syntax* (pp. 114-141). Mouton de Gruyter.

---. (2008). "Shamed by your English?" The Market Value of a Good Pronunciation. In J. C. Beal, C. Nocera, and M. Sturiale (Eds.) *Perspectives of Prescriptivism* (pp. 21-40). Peter Lang.

---. (2009a). Enregisterment, Commodification, and Historical Context: "Geordie" versus "Sheffieldish". *American Speech,* 84(2), 138- 156.

---. (2009b). Three Hundred Years of Prescriptivism (and Counting). In I. Tieken-Boon van Ostade and W. Van der Wurff (Eds.) *Current Issues in Late Modern English* (pp. 35-56). Peter Lang.

---. (2009c). Pronouncing Dictionaries—I Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Centuries. In A. P. Cowie (Ed.) *The Oxford History of English Lexicography, vol. II: Specialized Dictionaries* (pp. 150-175). Clarendon Press.

---. (2010). Prescriptivism and the Suppression of Variation. In R. Hickey (Ed.) *Eighteenth-Century English: Ideology and Change* (pp. 21-37). Cambridge UP.

---. (2012a). "By Those Provincials Mispronounced": The Strut Vowel in Eighteenth-Century Pronouncing Dictionaries. *Language and History*, 55(1), 5-17.

---. (2012b). Levelling and Enregisterment in Northern Dialects of Late Modern English. In D. Denison et al. (Eds) *Analysing Older English* (pp. 126-139). Cambridge UP.

---. (2016). Enregistering the North: The Dialect of Mendicus in William Bullein's *Dialogue Against the Fever Pestilence*. In A. Auer et al. (Eds.) *Linguistics and Literary History: In Honour of Sylvia Adamson* (pp. 13-30). Benjamins.

---. (2019). Enregisterment and Historical Sociolinguistics. In S. Jansen et al. (Eds.) *Processes of Change: Studies in Late Modern and Present-Day English* (7-24). John Benjamins Publishing Company

---. (2020). Dialect and the Construction of Identity in the Ego-documents of Thomas Bewick. In P. Honeybone and W. Maguire (Eds.) *Dialect writing and the North of England* (pp. 51-74). Edinburgh UP.

Beal, J. C., and Cooper, P. (2015). The Enregisterment of Northern English. In R. Hickey (Ed.) *Researching Northern English* (pp. 27-50). John Benjamins.

Belanger, T. (1982). Publishers and Writers in Eighteenth-Century England. In I. Rivers (Ed.) *Books and their Readers in Eighteenth-Century England* (pp. 5-25). Leicester UP.

Bell, A. (1984). Language Style as Audience Design. *Language in Society*, 13, 145-204.

Biber, D. (1993). Representativeness in Corpus Design. *Literary and Linguistic Computing*, 8(4), 243-257.

Biber, D. and Reppen, R. (2006). *Corpus Linguistics*. Cambridge UP.

Blake, N. F. (1981). *Non-Standard Language in English Literature*. Andre Deutsch.

Blommaert, J. (2007). Sociolinguistics and Discourse Analysis: Orders of Indexicality and Polycentricity. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, 2(2), 115-130.

---. (2013). Writing as a Sociolinguistic Object. *Journal of Sociolinguistics,* 17(4), 440-459.

Blount, T. (1707) [1656]. *Glossographia anglicana nova: or, A Dictionary*. D. Brown.

Braber, N. (2014). The Concept of Identity in the East Midlands. *English Today*, 30(2), 3-10.

---. (2015). Language Perception in the East Midlands. *English Today*, 31(1), 16-26.

---. (2017). Pit Talk in the East Midlands. In N. Braber and S. Jansen (Eds.) *Sociolinguistics in England* (pp. 243-274). Palgrave.

---. (2022). *Lexical Variation of an East Midlands Mining Community*. Edinburgh UP.

Braber, N. and Flynn, N. (2015). The East Midlands: Nottingham. In R. Hickey (Ed.) *Researching Northern English* (pp. 369-392). John Benjamins.

Braber, N. and Jansen, S. (2020). Foot-Fronting and Foot-Strut Splitting: Vowel Variation in the East Midlands. *English Language and Linguistics*, 1-31.

Braber, N. and Robinson, J. (2018). *East Midlands English.* De Gruyter.

Britton, D. (2007). A History of Hyper-Rhoticity in English. *English Language and Linguistics*, 11(3), 525-536.

Bonaparte, L. L. (1877) [1875]. On the Dialects of Monmouthshire, Herefordshire, Worcestershire, Gloucestershire, Berkshire, Oxfordshire, South Warwickshire, Buckinghamshire, Hertfordshire, Middlesex, and Surrey, with a New Classification of the English Dialects. *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 570-581.

Borsay, P. (2002). Urban Life and Culture. In Dickinson (Ed.) (pp. 196-208).

Bosworth, J. (1838). *Dictionary of the Anglo-Saxon Language*. Longman, Rees, Orme, Brown, Green, and Longman.

Boucher, (1832). *Glossary of Archaic and Provincial Words*. Black, Young, and Young.

Boyer, G. R., and Hatton, T. J. (1997). Migration and Labour Market Integration in Late Nineteenth-century England and Wales. *Economic History Review*, 4, 697-734.

Britten, J. (1880). *Old Country and Farming Words: Gleaned from Agricultural Books*. Trübner & Co.

Broadbent, J. (2008). T to R in West Yorkshire English. *English Language and Linguistics*, 12(1), 141-168.

Broadhead, A. (2017). The Textual History of Josiah Relph's Cumberland Poems: Inventing Dialect Literature in the Long Nineteenth Century. In J. Hodson (Ed.) *Dialect and Literature in the Long Nineteenth Century* (pp. 67-88). Routledge.

Bucholtz, M. (2003). Sociolinguistic Nostalgia and the Authentication of Identity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 7(3), 398-416.

Bucholtz, M. and Lopez, Q. (2015). Performing Blackness, Forming Whiteness: Linguistic Minstrelsy in Hollywood Film. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 15(5), 680-706.

Bulmer, T. & Co. (1895). *History, Topography, and Directory of Derbyshire*. T. Snape & Co.

Burton, T. L., and Ruthven, K. K. (Eds.) (2013). *The Complete Poems of William Barnes, vol. 1: Poems in the Broad Form of the Dorset Dialect*. Oxford Scholarly Editions Online.

Caird, J. (1852). *English Agriculture in 1850-51*. Longman, Brown, Green, and Longmans.

Campbell-Kibler, K. (2012). Contestation and Enregisterment in Ohio's Imagined Dialects. *Journal of English Linguistics*, 40(3), 281-305.

Campbell-Kibler, K. and Bauer, K. M. (2015). Competing Reflexive Models of Regional Speech in Northern Ohio. *Journal of English Linguistics*, 43(2), 95-117.

Chamberlain, E. (1882). *A Glossary of West Worcestershire Words*. Trübner & Co.

Cheshire, J. (1982). *Variation in an English Dialect*. Cambridge UP.

Chinn, C. and Thorne, S. (2002). *Proper Brummie: A Dictionary of Birmingham Words and Phrases*. Brewin Books.

Clark, U. (2004). The English West Midlands: Phonology. In B. Kortmann et al. (Eds.) *A Handbook of Varieties of English. Vol. 1: Phonology*, (pp. 134-162). Mouton de Gruyter.

---. (2013). 'Er's from off: The Indexicalization and Enregisterment of Black Country Dialect. *American Speech,* 88(4), 441-466.

---. (2019). *Staging Language: Place and Identity in the Enactment, Performance and Representation of Regional Dialects*. De Gruyter.

---. (2020). Enregistering Dialect Representation in Staffordshire Potteries' Cartoons. In P. Honeybone and W. Maguire (Eds.) *Dialect writing and the North of England* (pp. 103-125). Edinburgh UP.

Clark, U. and Asprey, E. (2013). *West Midlands English: Birmingham and the Black Country*. Edinburgh UP.

Coles, E. (1692) [1676]. *An English Dictionary*. Peter Parker.

Collins, B., and Mees, I. M. (2009). Pronouncing Dictionaries—II Mid-Nineteenth Century to the Present Day. In A. P. Cowie (Ed.) *The Oxford History of English Lexicography, vol. II: Specialized Dictionaries* (pp. 177-214). Clarendon Press.

Conde-Silvestre, J. C. (1990). *Pragmática literaria, estilística y sociolingüística. Variedades socio-dialectales e idiolectales en los primeros cuentos de D. H. Lawrence*. [Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation]. University of Murcia.

---. (2016). A 'Third-Wave' Historical Sociolinguistic Approach to Late Middle English Correspondence: Evidence from the Stonor Letters. In C. Russi (Ed.) *Current Trends in Historical Sociolinguistics* (pp. 46-66). De Gruyter.

Conde-Silvestre, J. C. and Hernández-Campoy, J. M. (2012). Introduction. In J. C. Conde-Silvestre, and J. M. Campoy (Eds.) *The Handbook of Historical Sociolinguistics* (pp. 1-8). Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Considine, J. (2017). *Small Dictionaries & Curiosity; Lexicography & Fieldwork in Post-Medieval Europe*. Oxford UP.

Cooper, P. (2013). *Enregisterment in Historical Contexts: A Framework* [Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation]. University of Sheffield.

---. (2015). Enregisterment in Historical Contexts: Nineteenth Century Yorkshire Dialect. *Dialectología*, 14, 1-16.

---. (2016). 'Deregisterment' and 'fossil forms': The Cases of *Gan* and *Mun* in 'Yorkshire' Dialect. *English Today*, 1-10.

---. (2020). Russian Dolls and Dialect Literature: The Enregisterment of Nineteenth-Century 'Yorkshire' Dialects. In P. Honeybone and W. Maguire (Eds.) *Dialect writing and the North of England* (pp. 126-146). Edinburgh UP.

Cotton, F. (1921) [1886]. Derbyshire Hunting Song. *Derbyshire Advertiser*, 2, 5-7.

Coupland, N. (1996). *Language, Situation, and the Relational Self: Theorising Dialect Style in Sociolinguistics* [Conference presentation]. Stanford Workshop on Stylistic Variation, Stanford, CA.

---. (2003). Introduction: Sociolinguistics and globalization. *Journal of Sociolinguistics,* 7(4), 465-472.

---. (2009). Dialect Style, Social Class and Metacultural Performance: The Pantomime Dame. In N. Coupland and A. Jaworski (Eds.) *The New Sociolinguistics Reader* (pp. 311-325). Palgrave.

---. (2014). Language, Society and Authenticity: Themes and Perspectives. In V. Lacoste, J. Leimgruber, and T. Breyer (Eds.) *Indexing Authenticity* (pp. 14-39). De Gruyter.

Courtney, M. A. (1880). West Cornwall. In *A Glossary of Words in Use in Cornwall* (pp. ix-68). Trübner & Co.

Cox, J. C. (1903). *Derbyshire*. Methuen & Co.

Cramer, J. (2013). Styles, Stereotypes, and the South: Constructing Identities at the Linguistic Lorder. *American Speech*, 88(2), 144-167.

Daniel. C. (1982). A Diagnosis of Derbyshire Dialect. *Derbyshire Life & Countryside*, 47, 59-60.

Dawes, G. (1983). *Crich Tales: Unexpurgated Echoes from a Derbyshire Village*. Scarthin Books.

---. (2004). *More Crich Tales from a mid Derbyshire village mostly in the mid 20th century*. Scarthin Books.

Defoe, D. (1928) [1724-1726]. *A Tour through England and Wales. Vol. II*. J. M. Dent & Sons.

Denison, D. (1998). Syntax. In S. Romaine (Ed.) *The Cambridge History of the English Language, vol. 4: 1776-1997* (pp. 92-329). Cambridge UP.

Denman, L. (1862). A Fragment on the Dialect of the High Peak. *The Reliquary*, II, 113-117.

---. (1862-3). A Second "Fragment" on the Dialect of the High Peak. *The Reliquary*, III, 13-16.

Dobson, E. J. (1957). *English Pronunciation 1500-1700*. Oxford Clarendon.

Docherty, G. J. and Foulkes, P. (1999). Derby and Newcastle: Instrumental Phonetics and Variationist Studies. In P. Foulkes and G. J. Docherty (Eds.) *Urban Voices: Accent Studies in the British Isles* (pp. 47-71). Routledge.

Dong, J. (2010). The enregisterment of Putonghua in practice. *Language & Communication*, 30, 265-275.

Dossena, M. (2015). Late Modern English Glossaries as Tools of Definition an Codification. *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses*, 71, 29-40.

Du Garde Peach, L. (1925). *Wind o' the Moors*. Shakespeare Head Press.

Durkin, P. (2015). Mackems, Geordies and ram-raiders: documenting regional variation in historical dictionaries. *English Language and Linguistics*, 19(2), 313-326.

Eckert, P. and McConnell-Ginet, S. (1992). Think Practically and Look Locally: Language and Gender as Community-Based Practice. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 21, 461-490.

Eckert, P. (2008). Variation and the Indexical Field. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 12(4), 452-476.

---. (2012). Three Waves of Variation Study: The Emergence of Meaning in the Study of Sociolinguistic Variation. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 41, 87-100.

---. (2014). The Trouble with Authenticity. In V. Lacoste, J. Leimgruber, and T. Breyer (Eds.) *Indexing Authenticity* (pp. 43-54). De Gruyter.

Edwards, K. [@KatieBEdwards]. (2020, May 11). I thought I was doing well! Who's this chuffing comedian? Anyway, I haven't got time to chat – I must return to my 'evidently difficult background.' #Barmpot [Tweet]. Twitter. https://twitter.com/KatieBEdwards/status/1259881996924436482?t=0zM906S7_9KLSomuOH8RVg&s=08

Ekwall, E. (1980) [1975]. *A History of Modern English Sounds and Morphology*. Blackwell.

Ellis, A. J. (1869-1889). *On Early English Pronunciation. Vols. 1-5*. Trübner & Co.

Elphinston, J. (1787). *Propriety Ascertained in Her Picture; or, Inglish Speech and Spelling Rendered Mutual Guides*. Jon Walter.

Elworthy, F. T. (Ed.) (1887). Tenth Report of the Committee on Devonshire Verbal Provincialisms. In *Report and Transactions of the Devonshire Association for the Advancement of Science, Literature, and Art. Vol. XIX*. W. Brendon & Son.

Fabricius, A. Twentieth-Century Received Pronunciation: Prevocalic /r/. In R. Hickey (Ed.) *Listening to the Past: Audio Records of English* (pp. 39-65). Cambridge UP.

Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and Power*. Pearson Professional Education.

Farey, J. (1815). *General View of the Agriculture of Derbyshire*. B. M. Millan.

Feather, J. (1996). *A History of British Publishing*. Routledge.

---. (2007). The British Book Market 1600-1800. In S. Eliot and J. Rose (Eds.) *A Companion to the History of the Book* (pp. 232-246). Blackwell.

Featherstone, W. P. (1978). Notes on Dialect in the Dove Valley Area. *Derbyshire Miscellany*, 8(4), 117-126.

---. (1983). Further Notes on Dialect. *Derbyshire Miscellany*, 10(2), 55-56.

Ferdinand, C. Y. (2009). Newspapers and the Sale of Books in the Provinces. In M. Suarez and M. Turner (Eds.) *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, vol. 5* (pp. 434-447). Cambridge UP.

Foulkes, P. (1997). English [r]-sandhi – A Sociolinguistic Perspective. *Histoire Épistémologie Langage*, 19(1), 73-96.

Francis, Mrs. (1876). South Warwickshire Provincialisms. In W. W. Skeat (Ed.) *English Dialect Society. Series C. Original Glossaries, and Glossaries with Fresh Additions* (pp. 122-135). Trübner & Co.

Frekko, S. E. (2009). "Normal" in Catalonia: Standard Language, Enregisterment and the Imagination of a National Public. *Language in Society*, 38(01), 71-93.

Furness, R. (1836). *Medicus Magus or the Astrologer. A Poem with a Glossary.* Whittaker and Co.

---. (1858). The Cat and the Vicar. In G. Calvert Holland *The Poetical Works of the Late Richard Furness with a Sketch of his Life* (pp. 267-269). Partridge and Co.

Fyne, J. (2005). *The Dialect of New Mills: Linguistic Change in a North-West Derbyshire Community* [Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation]. University of Sheffield.

García-Bermejo Giner, M. F. (1989). *El dialecto en las primeras novelas de George Eliot.* [Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation]. Universidad de Salamanca.

---. (1991a). *El dialecto en las primeras novelas de George Eliot: grafía y vocalismo*. Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Salamanca.

---. (1991b). Personal Pronouns in Derbyshire as Reflected in Sheridan Le Fanu's *Uncle Silas*. In S. G. Fernández-Corugedo et al. (Eds.) *Studia Patriciae Shaw Oblata* (pp. 225-239). Universidad de Oviedo.

---. (1993). Morphosyntactical Variation in Nineteenth-Century Derbyshire. In F. J. Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez et al. (Eds.) *Actas XV Congreso AEDEAN* (pp. 305-318).

---. (1994). Sources for the Linguistic Analysis of some Nineteenth-Century Midland Dialects. In W. Viereck (Ed.) *Proceedings of the International Congress of Dialectologists* (pp. 232-245). Franz Steiner.

---. (1997). Some Northern Dialect Features in Deloney's *Thomas of Reading*. *SEDERI*, VIII, 7-18.

---. (1998). The Northern/Scottish Dialect in Nathaniel Woodes' *A Conflict of Conscience (1581). SEDERI*, 9, 9-21.

---. (1999). Methods for the Linguistic Analysis of Early Modern English Literary Dialects. In P. Alonso et al. (Eds.) *Teaching and Research in English Language and Linguistics* (pp. 249-266). Celarayn.

---. (2002). *Regional Dialects in Sixteenth-century Jest-Books. SEDERI*, 12, 209-228.

---. (2008). Towards a History of English Literary Dialects and Dialect Literature in the 18th and 19th Centuries: The Salamanca Corpus. In B. Heselwood and C. Upton (Eds.) *Proceedings of Methods XIII. Papers from the Thirteenth International Conference on Methods in Dialectology* (pp. 31-41). Bamberger Beiträge zur Englischen Sprachwissenschaft.

---. (2009). Early Sixteen Century Evidence for [ia] < OE a: in the North?. In M. F. García-Bermejo Giner, P. Sánchez-García, et al. (Eds.) *Multidisciplinary Studies in Language and Literature: English, American and Canadian* (pp. 59-65). Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca.

García-Bermejo Giner, M. F., Pilar Sánchez-García, P., and Ruano-García, J. (Eds.). 2011-. *Salamanca Corpus: A Digital Archive of English Dialect Texts*. http://www.thesalamancacorpus.com

Gil, A. (1621) [1619]. *Logonomia Anglica*. Iohannes Beale.

Gilliver, P. (2011). Harvesting England's Ancient Treasure: Dialect Lexicography and the Philological Society's First Plans for a National Dictionary. *Journal of the Dictionary Society of North America*, 32, 88-92.

Gimson, A. C. (1962). *An Introduction to the Pronunciation of English*. Arnold.

Goebel, Z. (2012). Enregisterment, Communities, and Authenticity: Watching Indonesian Teledramas. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 22(2), 1-20.

Gordon, I. A. (1966). *The Movement of English Prose*. Longman.

Görlach, M. (1995). Dialect Lexis in Early Modern English Dictionaries. In M. Görlach (Ed.) *New Studies in the History of English* (pp. 82-127). Universitätsvelag C.

---. (1998). *Annotated Bibliography of Nineteenth-Century Grammars of English*. John Benjamins Publishing.

---. (1999a). Attitudes towards British English Dialects in the 19th Century. *Leeds Studies in English*, 30, 139-164.

---. (1999b). Regional and Social Variation. In R. Lass (Ed.) *The Cambridge History of the English Language* (pp. 459-538). Cambridge UP.

---. (1999c). *English in Nineteenth-Century England*. Cambridge University UP.

Grose, F. (1787). *A Provincial Glossary with a Collection of Local Proverbs, and Popular Superstitions*. S. Hooper.

Guest, E. (1838). *A History of English Rhythms*. William Pickering.

Guy, G. (2011). *Language, Social Class, and Status*. In R. Mesthrie (Ed.) The Cambridge Handbook of Sociolinguistics (pp. 159-185). Cambridge UP.

Hallam, T. (c. 1873). Bodl. MS. Eng. lan. d. 40, 41, 42.

---. (1885). *Four Dialect Words: Clem, Lake, Nesh, and Oss*. Printed for Private Circulation.

Halliwell, J. O. (1847). *Dictionary of Archaic and Provincial Words.* John Russell Smith.

Harvey, A. D. (1991). Truths, No 1 and the Industrial Revolution. *Derbyshire Miscellany*, 12, 150-153.

Hernández-Campoy, J. M. (2016). *Sociolinguistic Styles.* Wiley Blackwell.

Hernández-Campoy, J. M. and García-Vidal, T. (2018). Persona Management and Identity Projection in English Medieval Society: Evidence from John Paston II. *Journal of Historical Sociolinguistics*, 4(1), 33-64.

Heywood, T. (1861). *On the South Lancashire Dialect*. Printed for the Chetham Society.

Hickey, R. (2010a). Attitudes and Concerns in Eighteenth-Century English. In R. Hickey (Ed.) *Eighteenth-Century English: Ideology and Change* (pp. 1-20). Cambridge UP.

---. (2010b). Linguistic Evaluation of Earlier Texts. In R. Hickey (Ed.) *Varieties of English in Writing* (pp. 1-14). John Benjamins.

---. (2012). Standard English and Standards of English. In R. Hickey (Ed.) *Standards of English: Codified Varieties around the World* (pp. 1-33). Cambridge UP.

---. (2017). Areas, Areal Features and Areality. In R. Hickey (Ed.) *The Cambridge Handbook of Areal Linguistics* (pp. 1-16). Cambridge UP.

Hodson, J. (2016). Talking like a Servant: What Nineteenth-century Novels Can Tell Us about the Social History of the Language. *Journal of Historical Sociolinguistics*, 2(1), 27-46.

---. (Ed.) (2017). *Dialect and Literature in the Long Nineteenth Century*. Routledge.

Holland, P. (2008). *Words of the White Peak, the Disappearing Dialect of a Derbyshire Village*. Anecdotes Publishing.

---. (2018). *Lines of the Land*. Five-Bar-Gate Publishing.

Holloway, W. (1839) [1838]. *General Dictionary of Provincialisms*. Sussex Press, Baxter and Son.

Holmes, G., and Szechi, D. (1993). *The Age of Oligarchy: Pre-Industrial Britain 1722-1783.* Longman.

Honeybone, P. (2020). Which Phonological Features Get Represented in Dialect Writing? Answers and Questions from Three Types of Liverpool English Texts. In P. Honeybone and W. Maguire (Eds.) *Dialect writing and the North of England* (pp. 211-242). Edinburgh UP.

Honeybone, P. and Maguire, W. (2020). Introduction: What Is Dialect Writing? Where is the North of England? In P. Honeybone and W. Maguire (Eds.) *Dialect writing and the North of England* (pp. 1-28). Edinburgh University Press.

Honeybone, P. and Watson, K. (2013). Salience and the Sociolinguistics of Scouse Spelling. *English World-Wide,* 34(3), 305-340.

Hooson, W. (1979) [1747]. *The Miner's Dictionary*. Ilkley.

Houghton, T. (1681). *Rara Avis in Terris: Or the Compleat Miner*. London.

Howitt, M. (1844). *My Uncle, the Clockmaker*. D. Appleton & Company.

Hulme, H. M. (1941). Derbyshire Dialect in the Seventeenth Century. *Journal of the Derbyshire Archaelogical Society*, 1, 88-103.

Hultin, N. C. (1995). "To Shine with Borrowed Splendour": J. O. Halliwell-Phillipps, Thomas Wright, and Victorian Lexicography. *Journal of the Dictionary Society of North America*, 16, 109-150.

Ihalainen, O. (1994). The Dialects of England since 1776. In R. Burchfield (Ed.) *The Cambridge History of the English Language* (pp. 197-273). Cambridge UP.

Jackson, G. F. (1879). *Shropshire Word-Book, A Glossary of Archaic and Provincial Words, Etc., Used in the County*. Trübner & Co.

Jaffe, A. (2000). Introduction: Non-standard Orthography and Non-standard Speech. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 4(4), 497-513.

---. (2012). Transcription in Practice: Nonstandard Orthography. In A. Jaffe, J. Androutsopoulos, and M. Sebba (Eds.) *Orthography as Social Action: Scripts, Spelling, Identity and Power* (pp. 203-224). De Gruyter.

Jaspers, J. and Van Hoof, S. (2013). Hyperstandardisation in Flanders: Extreme Enregisterment and its Aftermath. *Pragmatics*, 23(2), 331-359.

Jewitt, L. (Ed.) (1867). *The Ballads and Songs of Derbyshire*. Bemrose and Sons.

Johnson, S. (1785) [1755]. *A Dictionary of the English Language*. J. F. and C. Rivington, L. Davis, T. Payne and Son, T. Longman, B. Law, J. Dodsley, C. Dilly, W. Lowndes, G. G. J. and J. Robinson, T. Cadell, Jo. Johnson, J. Robson, W. Richardson, J. Nichols, R. Baldwin, W. Goldsmith, J. Murray, W. Stuart, P.

Elmsly, W. Fox, S. Hayls, D. Ocilvie, T. and J. Egerton, J. Phillips, and M. Newbury.

Johnstone, B. (2006): How to Speak like a Pittsburgher: Exploring the Role of a Folk Dictionary in the Production of a Dialect. *Carnegie Mellon University Papers*, 1-11.

---. (2009). Pittsburghese Shirts: Commodification and the Enregisterment of an Urban Dialect. *American Speech*, 84(2), 157-175.

---. (2011). Making Pittsburghese: Communication Technology, Expertise, and the Discursive Construction of a Regional Dialect. *Language & Communication*, 31, 3-15.

---. (2013). *Speaking Pittsburghese: The Story of a Dialect*. Oxford Studies in Sociolinguistics.

---. (2016). Enregisterment: How Linguistic Items Become Linked with Ways of Speaking. *Language and Linguistic Compass,* 10, 632-643.

---. (2017). Characterological Figures and Expressive Style in the Enregisterment of Linguistic Variety. In C. Montgomery and E. Moore (Eds.) *Language and a Sense of Place: Studies in Language and Region* (pp. 283-300). Cambridge UP.

Johnstone, B., Andrus, J. and Danielson A. E. (2006). Mobility, Indexicality, and the Enregisterment of "Pittsburghese". *Journal of English Linguistics*, 34(2), 77-104.

Johnstone, B. and Baumgardt, D. (2004). "Pittsburghese" Online: Vernacular Norming in Conversation. *American Speech*, 79(2), 115-145.

Jones, C. (1989) [1939]. *A History of English Phonology*. Longman.

---. (2005). *English Pronunciation in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries*. Palgrave.

Jones, D. (1909). *The Pronunciation of English*. Cambridge UP.

---. (1946). *An English Pronouncing Dictionary, 7th edition*. E. P. Dutton.

Jourdain, F. (1870-1871). Additional Materials for a Derbyshire Glossary. *The Reliquary*, XI, 116.

Joyce, P. (1991). *Visions of the People: Industrial England and the Question of Class 1848-1914*. Cambridge UP.

Kennet, W. (1818) [1695]. *Parochial Antiquities Attempted in the History of Ambrosden, Burcester, and Other Adjacent Parts in the Counties of Oxford and Bucks.* Clarendon Press.

Kenrick, W. (1784). *A Rhetorical Grammar of the English Language wherein the elements of speech in general, and those of the English tongue in particular, are analyzed; and the rudiments of articulation, pronunciation, and prosody intelligibly displayed*. R. Cadell and W. Longman.

Kersey, J. K. (1706). *The New World of Words: Or, Universal English Dictionary*. J. Phillips.

Kerswill, P. (2018). Dialect Formation and Dialect Change in the Industrial Revolution: British Vernacular English in the Nineteenth Century. In L. Wright (Ed.) *Southern English Varieties Then and Now* (pp. 8-38). De Gruyter.

Kerswill, P. and Williams, A. (2002). "Salience" as an Explanatory Factor in Language Change: Evidence from Dialect Levelling in Urban England. In V. Herman, et al. (Eds.) *Language Change: The Interplay of Internal, External and Extra-Linguistic Factors,* (pp.81-110). De Gruyter.

Kirkland, W. (1867). Derbyshire Men. In L. Jewitt (Ed.) (1867). *The Ballads and Songs of Derbyshire* (p. 145). Bemrose and Sons.

Kortmann, B., and Wagner, S. (2010). Changes and Continuities in Dialect Grammar. In R. Hickey (Ed.) *Eighteenth-Century English: Ideology and Change* (pp. 269-292). Cambridge UP.

Kynder, P. (1883) [c.1663]. The Historie of Darbyshire. In Rev. W. G. Dimock Fletcher (Ed.) *The Reliquary*.

Kÿto, M. and Walker, T. (2003). The Linguistic Study of Early Modern English Speech-Related Texts. *Journal of English Linguistics*, 31(3), 221-248.

Labov, W. (1966). *The Social Stratification of English in New York City*. Cambridge UP.

---. (1972). *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. University of Pennsylvania Press.

Lacoste, V., Leimgruber, J., and Breyer, T. (2014). Authenticity: A View from Inside and Outside Sociolinguistics. In V. Lacoste, J. Leimgruber, and T. Breyer (Eds.) *Indexing Authenticity* (pp. 1-13). De Gruyter.

Lawton, R. (1986). Population. In J. Langton and R. J. Morris (Eds.) *Atlas of Industrializing Britain 1780-1914* (pp. 10-29). Methuen & Co.

Laycock, S. (1867). An Address to "Dickie". In L. Jewitt (Ed.) (1867). *The Ballads and Songs of Derbyshire*, (pp. 226-229). Bemrose and Sons.

Le-Baigue, M. R. (2010a). *The Accent of Chesterfield in North-East Derbyshire, "Dee-Dahs", County Boundaries and "Ey Up Mi Ducks!"*. [Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation]. University of Sheffield.

---. (2010b). *The Earl Sterndale Dialect Poems of F. Holland*. [Unpublished]. University of Sheffield: Dialect in Literature and Song.

Lucas, R. J. (1991). Parsonage Houses in the Derby Deanery during the Seventeenth to Eighteenth Centuries: Part II. *Derbyshire Miscellany*, 12, 133-149.

Macaulay, R. K. S. (1977). *Language, Social Class and Education: A Glasgow Study*. Edinburgh UP.

Maguire, W. (2012). Mapping the Existing Phonology of English Dialects. *Dialectologia et Geolinguistica*, 20(1), 84-107.

Managan, K. (2011). *Koud Zyé*: A Glimpse into Linguistic Enregisterment on Kréyòl Television in Guadalupe. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 15(3), 299-322.

Mander, J. (1824). *The Derbyshire's Miners Glossary*. Minerva Press.

Mantoux, P. (1929). *The Industrial Revolution in the Eighteenth Century: An Outline of the Beginnings of the Modern Factory System in England*. Butler and Tanner Ltd.

Markus, M. (2009). Joseph Wright's English Dialect Dictionary and its Sources. In I. Tieken-Boon van Ostade and W. van der Wurff (Eds.) *Current Issues in Late Modern English. Linguistic Insights: Studies in Language and Communication, vol. 77* (pp. 263-282). Peter Lang.

---. (Ed.). (2019). *EDD Online 3.0*. http://eddonline-proj.uibk.ac.at/edd/terms OfUse.jsp

Markus, M., Upton, C., and Heuberger R. (Eds). (2010). *Joseph Wright's English Dialect Dictionary and Beyond: Studies in Late Modern English Dialectology*. Peter Lang.

Marshall, M. (1787). *Rural Economy of Norfolk*. T. Cadell.

---. (1790). *The Rural Economy of the Midland Counties*. G. Nicol.

Massie, J. (1778). *A Plan for the Establishment of Charity Houses*. T. Payne.

McEnery, T. and Hardie, A. (2012). *Corpus Linguistics: Method, Theory and Practice*. Cambridge UP.

McIntosh, C. (1998). *The Evolution of English Prose 1700-1800: Style, Politeness, and Print Culture*. Cambridge UP.

Melchers, G. (2010). Southern English in writing. In R. Hickey (Ed.) *Varieties of English in Writing* (pp. 81-98). John Benjamins.

Michael, I. (1970). *English Grammatical Categories and the Tradition to 1800*. Cambridge UP.

---. (1987). *The Teaching of English from the Sixteenth Century to 1870*. Cambridge UP.

---. (1991). More than enough English Grammars. In G. Leitner (Ed.) *English Traditional Grammars: An International Perspective* (pp. 11-26). Benjamins.

---. (1997). The Hyperactive Production of English Grammars in the Nineteenth Century: A Speculative Bibliography. *Publishing History*, 41, 23-61.

Milroy, J. (1996). A Current Change in British English: Variation in (th) in Derby. *Newcastle and Durham Working Papers in Linguistics*, 4, 213-222.

Milroy, L. (1980). *Language and Social Networks*. Blackwell.

Milroy, L., Milroy, J., Docherty, G., Foulkes, P., and Walshaw, D. (1999). Phonological Variation and Change in Contemporary English: Evidence from Newcastle upon Tyne and Derby. *Cuadernos de Filología Inglesa*, 8, 35-46.

Mitchell, C. J. (1987). Provincial Printing in Eighteenth-Century Britain. *Publishing History*, 21, 5-24.

Møller, J. S. and Jørgensen, J. N. (2011). Enregisterment among Adolescents in Superdiverse Copenhagen In J. S. Møller and J. N. Jørgensen (Eds.) *Language Enregisterment and Attitudes: Copenhagen Studies in Bilingualism, Vol. 63* (pp. 99-121). Faculty of Humanities, University of Copenhagen.

Moncrieff, A. R. H. (1927). *Derbyshire*. A&C Black Ltd.

Montes Granado, C. (1989). *Estudio dialectal sociolingüístico en la novelística de D. H. Lawrence.* [Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation]. Universidad de Salamanca.

Montgomery, C. (2015). Borders and Boundaries in the North of England. In R. Hickey (Ed.) *Researching Northern English* (pp. 345-368). John Benjamins.

Morton, F. (1797). *The State of the Poor: Or, An History of the Labouring Classes in England, from the Conquest to the Present Period*. J. Davis.

Mugglestone, L. (2006). English in the Nineteenth Century. In L. Mugglestone (Ed.), *The Oxford History of English* (pp. 274-304). Oxford UP.

---. (2007). *Talking Proper: The Rise of Accent as a Social Symbol.* Oxford UP.

---. (2008). Spoken English and the BBC: In the Beginning. *Arbeiten aus Anglistik und Amerikanistik*, 33(2), 197-216.

---. (2010). Registering the Language – Dictionaries, Diction and the Art of Elocution. In R. Hickey (Ed.) *Eighteenth-Century English: Ideology and Change* (pp. 309-338). Cambridge UP.

O'Brien, P. K. (2010). Deconstructing the British Industrial Revolution as a Conjuncture and Paradigm for Global Economic History. In J. Horn, L. N. Rosenbald, & M. R. Smith (Eds.), *Reconceptualizing the Industrial Revolution* (pp. 21-46). Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Orton, H. and Barry, M. V. (Eds.) (1969). *The Basic Material: The West Midland Counties*. E. J. Arnold & Son Limited Leeds.

Orton, H., Sanderson, S., and Widdowson, J. (Eds.) (1978). *The Linguistic Atlas of England.* Croom Helm Ltd.

Osselton, N. (1958). *Branded Words in English Dictionaries before Johnson*. J. B. Walters.

Parker, A. (1876). A Glossary of Words used in Oxfordshire. In W. W. Skeat (Ed.) *English Dialect Society. Series C. Original Glossaries, and Glossaries with Fresh Additions* (pp. 110-121). Trübner & Co.

Paulsen, I. (2022). *The Emergence of American English as a Discursive Variety.* Language Science Press.

Pegge, S. (1789). Derbeiesseira [a] Romana. By the Rev. Mr. Pegge, in a Letter to Richard Gough, Esq. *Archaeologia*, 10, 17-36.

---. (1896). *Two Collections of Derbicisms*. Henry Frowde, Oxford UP.

Penhallurick, R. (2009). Dialect Dictionaries. In A. P. Cowie (Ed.) *The Oxford History of English Lexicography, vol. II: Specialized Dictionaries* (pp.290-313). Clarendon Press.

Percy, C. (2010). Women's Grammars. In R. Hickey (Ed.) *Eighteenth-Century English: Ideology and Change* (pp. 38-58). Cambridge UP.

---. Robert Lowth and the Critics: Literary Contexts for the "Critical Notes" in his Short Introduction to English Grammar (1762). *Historiographia Linguistica*, XXXIX(1), 9-26.

Petyt, K. M. (1980). *The Study of Dialect: An Introduction to Dialectology*. Blackwell Publishers.

Picone, M. (2014). Literary Dialect and the Linguistic Reconstruction of Nineteenth-Century Louisiana. *American Speech*, 89(2), 143-169.

Picton, J. (1865). *Notes on the South Lancashire Dialect*. D. Marples.

Podesva, R. J. (2011). The California Vowel Shift and Gay Identity. *American Speech*, 86(1), 32-51.

Poole, J. (1815). *The Village School Improved; or, the New System of Education Practically Explained, and Adapted to the Case of County Parishes*. Oxford UP.

Porteous, C. (1950). *Derbyshire*. Robert Hale Limited.

Pratt, T. and D'Onofrio, A. (2017). Jaw Setting and the Californian Vowel Shift in Parodic Performance. *Language in Society*, 46, 283-312.

Preston, D. R. (1985). The Li'l Abner Syndrome: Written Representations of Speech. *American Speech*, 60(4), 328-336.

Profitt, Michael, (Ed.) (2000). *Oxford English Dictionary Online*. https://www.oed.com/

Puttenham, G. (1589). *The Arte of English Poesie*. A. Murray & Son.

Raven, J. (2009). The Book as a Commodity. In M. Suarez and M. Turner (Eds.) *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, vol. 5* (pp. 85-117). Cambridge UP.

Ray, J. (1674, 1671). *A Collection of English Words Not Generally Used*. H. Bruges.

Remlinger, K. (2009). Everyone Up Here: Enregisterment and Identity in Michigan's Keweenaw Peninsula. *American Speech*, 84(2), 118-137.

---. (2017). *Yooper Talk: Dialect as Identity in Michigan's Upper Peninsula: Languages and Folklore of the Upper Midwest*. University of Wisconsin Press.

Remlinger, K., Salmons, J. and Von Schneidemesser, L. (2009). Revised Perceptions: Changing Dialect Perceptions in Wisconsin's and Michigan's Upper Peninsula. *American Speech*, 84(2), 176-191.

Rogers, N. (2002). The Middling Orders. In H. T. Dickinson (Ed.) *A Companion to Eighteenth-Century Britain* (pp. 172-182). Blackwell.

Rose, J. (1993). Willingly to School: The Working-Class Response to Elementary Education in Britain 1875-1918. *Journal of British Studies*, 32(2), 114-138.

Ross, T. (1998). *The Making of the English Literary Canon: From the Middle Ages to the Late Eighteenth Century*. McGill-Queen's UP.

Ruano-García, J. (2009). Looking for Regional Words in Late Seventeenth-Century England: Bishop White Kennett and his Glossary to *Parochial Antiquities* (1695). *SEDERI*, 19, 151-173.

---. (2010). *Early Modern Northern English Lexis: A Literary Corpus-Based Study*. Peter Lang.

---. (2012). On the Enregisterment of the Northern Dialect in Early Modern English: An Evaluation across Literary Text Types. In S. Martín et al. (Eds.) *At a Time of Crisis: English and American Studies in Spain* (pp. 376-383). Universidad Autònoma de Barcelona.

---. (2014). Cumbrian Lexis in the English Dialect Dictionary: William Nicolson's *Glossarium Brigantinum* (1677) in Focus. *Journal of the Dictionary Society of North America,* 35, 162-186.

---. (Ed.) (2018). *White Kennett: Etymological Collections of English Words and Provincial Expressions*. Oxford UP.

---. (2020a). On the Enregisterment of the Lancashire Dialect in Late Modern English: Spelling in Focus. *Journal of Historical Sociolinguistics*, 6(1), 1-38.

---. (2020b). Shaping the Other in the Standardization of English: The Case of the 'Northern' Dialect. *International Journal of English Studies*, 20(2), 185-205.

…. (2020c). The Contribution of Angelina Parker to the English Dialect Dictionary. *Journal of the Dictionary Society of North America*, 41(2), 1-24.

---. (2021a). Aw'm Lancashire, owd cock, and gradely hearty: Enregistered Lancashire voices in the nineteenth-century theatre. In D. Montini and I. Ranzato (Eds.) *The Dialects of British English in Fictional Texts* (pp. 108-129). Routledge.

---. (2021b). *Horae Subsecivae*, 'that remarkable glossary of west country words' (Bodl. MS En. lang. d. 66). *International Journal of Lexicography,* 34(2), 235-258.

---. (forthcoming). The Language of Dialect Writing. In M. Kÿto, and E. Smitterberg (Eds.) *The New Cambridge History of the English Language. Vol. II Documentation, Data Sources and Modelling*. Cambridge UP.

Ruano-García, J., García-Bermejo Giner, M. F., and Sánchez-García, P. (2013). Past Tense BE Forms in Late Modern Lancashire English. A Preliminary Corpus-Based Approach. In P. Bennett et al. (Eds.) *New Methods in Historical Corpora* (pp. 181-194). Narr Verlag.

Ruano-García J., Sánchez-García, P., and García-Bermejo Giner, M. F. (2015). Northern English: Historical Lexis and Spelling. In R. Hickey (Ed.) *Researching Northern English* (pp. 131-157). John Benjamins.

Russell, L. R. (2018). *Women and Dictionary Making: Gender, Genre, and English Language Lexicography*. Cambridge UP.

Sánchez, P. (1999). Spelling as an Image of Language Variety. In P. Alonso, M. F. García-Bermejo Giner, M. J. Sánchez, and C. Moran (Eds.) *Teaching and Research in English Language and Literature* (pp. 267-282). Celerayn.

---. (2003). *Acervo y tradición en la grafía del dialecto literario en la novela inglesa norteña del siglo XIX*. [Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation]. Universidad de Salamanca.

Sánchez-García, P. and Ruano-García, J. (2020). Some Challenges behind the Compilation of the Salamanca Corpus: The Wiltshire Dialect as a Case Study. *Nexus*, 2, 53-66.

Sebba, M. (2007). *Spelling and Society*. Cambridge UP.

Schilling, N. (2013). Investigating Stylistic Variation. In J. K. Chambers and N. Schilling (Eds.) *The Handbook of Language Variation and Change,* (pp. 327-349). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Schintu, P. (2016). The Vulgar on Stage: The Enregisterment of 18th-century Cant Language. In P. Ruano and G. Nieto Caballero (Eds.) *Stylistics in Use* (pp. 29-45). Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

---. (2018a). Portraying the Underworld: The Enregisterment of 17th and 18th-century English Cant. In S. Martín, D. Owen and E. Pladevall-Ballester (Eds.) *Persistence and Resistance: New Research in English Studies* (pp. 98-108). Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

---. (2018b). The Gully-hole of Literature: On the Enregisterment of Cant Language in 17th-century England. *SEDERI*, 28, 99-117.

---. (2020). *Theers gud stuff amung uz Darbysher foaks*: Dialect Enregisterment in 19th-century Derbyshire. *Token*, 10, 109–128.

Schleef, E. (2020). Identity and Indexicality in the Study of World Englishes. In D. Schreier, M. Hundt, and E. W. Schneider (Eds.) *The Cambridge Handbook of World Englishes* (pp. 609-632). Cambridge UP.

Schneider, E. (2013). Investigating Historical Variation and Change in Written Documents: New Perspectives. In J. K. Chambers and N. Schilling (Eds.) *The Handbook of Language Variation and Change* (pp. 57-82). Wiley.

Schofield, R. E. (1981). Dimensions of Illiteracy in England, 1750-1850. In H. J. Graff (Ed.) *Literacy and Social Development in the West: A Reader*. Cambridge UP.

Schreier, D. (2012). Varieties Resistant to Standardisation. In R. Hickey (Ed.) *Standards of English: Codified Varieties around the World* (pp. 354-368). Cambridge UP.

Scollins, R. and Titford, J. (2000). *Ey Up Mi Duck! Dialect of Derbyshire and the East Midlands*. Countryside Books.

Scragg, D. G. (1974). *A History of English Spelling*. Manchester UP.

Shakleton, R. G. (2007). Phonetic Variation in the Traditional English Dialects. *Journal of English Linguistics*, 35(1), 30-102.

Sheridan, T. (1761). *A Dissertation on the Causes of the Difficulties which Occur, in Learning the English Tongue*. R. and J. Dodsley.

Sheridan, T. (1968) [1762]. Course of Lectures on Elocution. Reprinted as R. C. Alston (Ed.) *English Linguistics 1500-1800*, 129. The Scolar Press.

Silverstein, M. (1976). Shifters, Linguistic Categories, and Cultural Description. In B. G. Blount (Ed.) *Language, Culture, and Society. A Book of Readings* (pp. 187-221). Waveland.

---. (1998). Contemporary transformations of local linguistic communities. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 27, 401–426.

---. (2003). Indexical Order and the Dialectics of Sociolinguistic Life. *Language & Communication*, 23, 193-229.

Shorrocks, G. (1991). A. J. Ellis as Dialectologist: A Reassessment. *Historiographia Linguistica*, 18, 321-334.

---. (1996). Non-Standard Dialect Literature and Popular Culture. In J. Klemola et al. (Eds.) *Speech Past and Present. Studies in English Dialectology in Memory of Ossi Ihalainen* (385-411). Peter Lang.

---. (1999). Working-Class Literature in Working-Class Language: The North of England. In T. Hoenselaars and M. Buning (Eds.) *English Literature and the Other Languages* (pp.87-96). Rodopi B. V.

Skeat, W. W. (Ed.) (1874). Dr. Pegge's MS. Alphabet of Kenticisms, and Collection of Proverbial Sayings Used in Kent (1735). *Archaeologia Cantiana*, 9, 50-116.

Sleigh, J. (1864). An Attempt at a Derbyshire Glossary. *The Reliquary*, V, 154-164

---. (1865). Derbyshire Glossary. *The Reliquary*, VI, 92-96; 157-171.

---. (1870-1871). Derbyshire Glossary. *The Reliquary*, XI, 226-227.

Smart, B. (1836). *Walker Remodelled. A New Critical Pronouncing Dictionary of the English Language*. T. Cadell.

Smith, M. (2013). *Derbyshire Dialect*. Blackwell.

Snell, J. (2017). Enregisterment, Indexicality and the Social Meaning of 'Howay': Dialect and Identity in North-East England. In C. Montgomery and E. Moore (Eds.) *Language and a Sense of Place: Studies in Language and Region* (pp.301-324). Cambridge UP.

Snell, K. (2002). *The Bibliography of Regional Fiction in Britain and Ireland, 1800-2000*. Ashgate.

Staehr, A. (2015). Reflexivity in Facebook Interaction – Enregisterment across Written and Spoken Language Practices. *Discourse, Context and Media*, 8, 30-45.

Strang, B. (1970). *A History of English*. Routledge.

Sturiale, M. (2016). '[Sir,] Who is the English Authority on Pronunciation?': Accent and Normative Attitude in *The Times* (1785-1922). *Language and History*, 59(1), 37-47.

Sutherland, J. (1989). *The Stanford Companion to Victorian Fiction*. Stanford UP.

Sundby, B., Bjørge, A. K., and Haugland, K. E. (1991). *A Dictionary of English Normative Grammar 1700-1800*. Benjamins.

Tagliamonte, S. A. (2015). *Making Waves*. Wiley Blackwell.

Tapping, T. *The Rhymed Chronicle of Edward Manlove Concerning The Liberties and Customs of the Lead Mines within the Wapentake of Wirksworth, Derbyshire*. Shaw and Sons.

Tieken-Boon van Ostade, I. (Ed.) (2008). *Grammars, Grammarians and Grammar-Writing in Eighteenth-Century England*. Mouton de Gruyter.

---. (2010). Lowth as an Icon of Prescriptivism. In R. Hickey (Ed.) *Eighteenth-Century English: Ideology and Change* (pp. 73-88). Cambridge UP.

---. (2012). The Codification of English in England. In R. Hickey (Ed.) *Standards of English: Codified Varieties around the World* (pp. 34-54). Cambridge UP.

Tilley, J. (1899). *The Old Halls, Manors and Families of Derbyshire*. Simpkin, Marshall, Hamilton, Kent, & Co., Ltd.

Trevisa, J. (1869) [1387]. *Polychronicon Ranulphi Higden Monachi Cestrensis; Together with the English Translation of John Trevisa and of and Unknown Writer of the Fifteenth Century*. Longmans, Green, and Co.

Trudgill, P. (1974). *The Social Differentiation of English in Norwich*. Cambridge UP.

---. (1986). *Dialects in Contact*. Blackwell.

---. (1990) *The Dialects of England.* Basil Blackwell.

---. (2020). Verner's Law, Germanic Dialects and the English Dialect 'Default Singulars'. In P. Trudgill (Ed.) *Millennia of Language Change: Sociolinguistic Studies in Deep Historical Linguistics* (pp. 67-76). Cambridge UP.

Trudgill, P. and Chambers, J. K. (1991). Pronouns and Pronominal Systems in English Dialects. In P. Trudgill and J. K. Chambers (Eds.) *Dialects of English: Studies in Grammatical Variation* (pp. 4-7). Longman.

Tudor, T. L. (1950). *Derbyshire*. Methuen & Co.

Upton, C. (2006). Modern Regional English in the British Isles. In L. Mugglestone (Ed.), *The Oxford History of English* (pp. 305-333). Oxford UP.

---. (2012). An Evolving Standard British English Pronunciation Model. In R. Hickey (Ed.) *Standards of English: Codified Varieties around the World* (pp. 55-71). Cambridge UP.

Upton, C. and Widdowson, J. D. A. (2005). *An Atlas of English Dialects.* Routledge.

Viereck, W. (1992). Prince Louis-Lucien Bonaparte and English Dialectology. *IKER*, 7, 17-30.

Vicinus, M. (1974). *The Industrial Muse: A Study of Nineteenth Century British Working-class Literature*. Croom Helm.

Vorlat, E. (1959). The Sources of Lindley Murray's "The English Grammar". *Leuvense Bijdragen*, 48, 108-125.

---. (2001). Lexical Rules in Robert Baker. *Leuvense Bijdragen*, 90(4), 391-401.

Wakelin, M. F. (1972). *English Dialects: An Introduction*. Antony Rowe Ltd.

---. (1987). The Treatment of Dialect in English Dictionaries. In R. Burchfield (Ed.) *Studies in Lexicography* (pp. 156-177). Clarendon Press.

Wales, K. (2002). North of the Watford Gap. A Cultural History of Northern English (from 1700). In R. Watts and P. Trudgill (Eds.) *Alternative Histories of English* (pp. 45-66). Routledge.

---. (2006). *Northern English. A Cultural and Social History*. Cambridge UP.

---. (2010). Northern English in Writing. In R. Hickey (Ed.) *Varieties of English in Writing* (pp. 61-80). John Benjamins.

Walker, J. (1791). *A Critical Pronouncing Dictionary and Expositor of the English Language*. G. G. J. and J. Robinson.

Wells, J. C. (1982). *Accents of English*. Cambridge UP.

Wirtz, K. (2007). Enregistered Memory and Afro-Cuban Historicity in Santería's Ritual Speech. *Language & Communication*, 27, 245-257.

Withers, P. (1822). *Aristarchus; or, the Principles of Composition*. J. Hearne, W. Gossling, and C. Brown.

Wolfram, W. (1969). *A Sociolinguistic Description of Detroit Negro Speech.* Center for Applied Linguistics.

Wolfson, D. (2008, October). *Dicky's Skull – The Peak District legend uncovered*. Explore Buxton. https://explorebuxton.co.uk/dickys-skull-peak-district/

Wood, A. (1999). *The Politics of Social Conflict: The Peak Country, 1520-1770*. Cambridge UP.

Woods, R. (2000). *The Demography of Victorian England*. Cambridge UP.

Wright, E. M. (1932). *The Life of Joseph Wright*. Oxford UP.

Wright, J. (1905). *English Dialect Grammar*. Henry Frowde.

Wright, P. (1975). *The Derbyshire Drawl: How it is Spoke*. Dalesman Books.

Wright, T. (1857). *Dictionary of Obsolete and Provincial English*. G. Bohn.

Wright, W. A. (1870). Provincial Glossary. *Notes & Queries*, 134, 271.

Williams, Q. E. (2012). The Enregisterment of English in Rap Braggadocio: A Study from English-Afrikaans Bilingualism in Cape Town. *English Today*, 28(2), 54-59.

Wyld, H. C. (1914). Class Dialect and Standard English. In O. Elton (Ed.) *A Miscellany Presented to John Macdonald Mackay, LL.D.* (pp. 283-291). Liverpool UP.

---. (1934). *The Best English: A Claim for the Superiority of Received Standard English*. Clarendon Press.

---. (1936). *A History of Modern Colloquial English*. Basil Blackwell.

Yáñez-Bouza, N. (2012). Grammar Writing and Provincial Grammar Printing in the Eighteenth-Century British Isles. *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 110(1), 34-63.

---. (2015). Senses of "Grammar" in the Eighteenth-Century English Tradition. *English Studies*, 96(8), 913-943.