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**Abstract**

This paper argues that textual data from historical periods can be evidence of indexicality (Silverstein 2003) and enregisterment (Agha 2003), and that repertoires of enregistered features can be identified in historical contexts. A repertoire of features that was enregistered as “Yorkshire” to nineteenth century audiences is identified using a corpus of nineteenth century Yorkshire dialect material. This data is compared with data from a corpus of modern Yorkshire dialect material and an online survey of current speakers’ perceptions of Yorkshire dialect. Similar patterns as those seen in the modern Yorkshire dialect data can be observed in analogous data from the nineteenth century. Therefore, features of Yorkshire dialect which occur frequently in the historical corpus and metapragmatic discourse were enregistered in the nineteenth century.
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**1. Introduction**

Enregisterment was defined by Asif Agha as ‘processes through which a linguistic repertoire becomes differentiable within a language as a socially recognized register of forms’ (2003: 231). I am following both Agha’s definition of enregisterment and also that of Johnstone et al, who state that a feature has been enregistered when it has ‘become associated with a style of speech and can be used to create a context for that style’ (2006: 82). The style in this case is “Yorkshire” dialect in the historical context of the nineteenth century. The notion that enregisterment can be studied in historical contexts is based on Agha’s statement that the cultural value associated with certain enregistered forms is ‘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’ (2003: 232). This suggests that the discursive practices involved in enregisterment are identifiable in historical periods as they are now, due to their nature as ‘sociohistorically locatable’. I argue here that the discursive practices Agha mentions can be observed in historical texts. This means that it is therefore possible to study enregisterment in historical contexts based solely on textual evidence (see also Cooper 2013, 2014).

In this paper I examine textual evidence concerning the Yorkshire dialect from the nineteenth century and discuss whether textual representations of dialect features and historical metapragmatic discourse can highlight these features’ enregisterment. I then go on to consider patterns observable in dialect material for modern Yorkshire dialect and how this, combined with metapragmatic data from an online survey of current speakers, can inform our interpretations of the historical data. Ultimately, I address the issue of historical textual data being sufficient to discuss enregisterment in historical contexts.

**2. Enregisterment in historical contexts**

Beal states in her discussion of the enregisterment of two varieties of Northern English, “Geordie” in Newcastle and “Sheffieldish” in Yorkshire, that the “Geordie” repertoire was enregistered ‘early enough for it to be used in performative contexts in the nineteenth-century music halls’ (2009: 140). This suggests that there is specific evidence to directly highlight the nineteenth-century enregisterment of this variety. Furthermore, Aaron’s study of the historical development of linguistic stereotypes in literary media also suggests evidence for the observation of enregisterment in historical periods. Using the CORDE corpus of written Spanish, she considers literary representations of non-standard Spanish dialectal forms over a period of almost 1,000 years. She also considers historical metacommentary regarding these features. Aaron states that certain patterns in the frequencies of nonstandard dialect representations in textual data can highlight that these features have become linguistic stereotypes (2009:474). She goes on to argue that there is a diachronic pattern to the development of linguistic stereotypes in literature over time, characterised by ‘a slow decline in frequency, nearly to extinction, followed by a sharp and exaggerated rise’ (ibid. p.476). She concludes that by considering both the quantitative frequencies of certain features and qualitative metadata from historical periods, we may be able to arrive at ‘tentative conclusions about the social meaning of other variants in societies long gone’ (ibid. p.492). Aaron does not specifically discuss the concept of enregisterment, though; she discusses linguistic stereotypes in relation to Labov’s paradigm for ‘indicators’, ‘markers’ and ‘stereotypes’, where stereotypes are defined as ‘socially marked forms, prominently labelled by society’ (1972: 314). However, Johnstone et al equate Labov’s notion of a linguistic stereotype with what they term third-order indexicality (2006: 82-3). This term derives from Silverstein’s concept of indexical order (2003: 199), and relates to a linguistic feature which speakers explicitly link with a particular identity, or other social value, such as geographical location (Johnstone et al 2006: 82). These third-order indexicals can also be said to be enregistered. Following Johnstone et al, we can therefore interpret Aaron’s conclusions about social meaning from textual representations and historical metadata as evidence for these variants’ enregisterment.

Finally, Ruano-García discusses the enregisterment of the northern dialect of Early Modern English as represented in literary texts. He argues that there is a set repertoire of features used in literary representations of Northern English, highlighted by quantitative corpus analysis, and concludes that ‘EModE ballads and plays show enregisterment of some linguistic features’, and that ‘a specific set of forms is fairly consistently used in both ballads and drama’ (2012: 381) when representing Northern English. He goes on to state that the wide distribution of these texts in the Early Modern Period led to these Northern forms being brought into contact with non-Northern speakers, which created ‘a collective linguistic idea about the dialect itself’ (ibid.); however, unlike Aaron above, Ruano-García does not discuss any form of qualitative metadata for Northern English in the Early Modern Period. I discuss the possibility of studying enregisterment using both quantitative and qualitative data from historical textual sources further and in more detail below.

*2.1.* *Historical context: nineteenth-century Yorkshire*

I have noted elsewhere (Cooper 2013, 2014; Beal and Cooper 2014) the suitability of the nineteenth century for the study of enregisterment in historical contexts. However, I present the following outline as historical background for this paper.

The Industrial Revolution gave rise to great cultural and social change in England. The increased ease of social mobility and the emergence of the middle class led to ‘white-collar and service based jobs’ which ‘demanded a veneer of gentility’ (Beal 2004: 179). This ‘genteel’ veneer was in part represented by ‘correct’ pronunciation, and resulted in a demand for guides detailing ‘correct’ English usage. Jones notes that certain shibboleths and ‘mis-pronunciations’ were focused on as being ‘vulgar and low-class’ (2006: 286), stating that these usage guides were not aimed at the lowest classes of society, but instead were aimed at the ‘newly socially aspirant’ (ibid. p.287), who wanted to distinguish themselves from the ‘vulgar’ and ‘low-class’ strata of society. The effect of this linguistic awareness on the part of the ‘newly socially aspirant’, however, ‘was the creation of what Labov has termed the ‘linguistic insecurity’ typically associated with the middle class’ (Beal 2004: 94).

Additionally, the Industrial Revolution was responsible for several technological advances, specifically the railways, which meant that it became much simpler and quicker to get around the country. Before the expansion of the railways in England, one of the most efficient means of transport had been the canal system. In the 1830s and 1840s, though, the railways began to expand, and it soon became apparent that rail travel could enable people to move much more freely around the country. This would ultimately lead to the creation of a new industry based on leisure time and holidays, and it was Thomas Cook who ‘was the first man – in 1859 – to see the country’s potential for ‘tourism’’ (Robbins 1989: 25). The Thomas Cook Group plc is now a major travel agent in the UK (http://www.thomascookgroup.com). One result of this geographical mobility was greater linguistic awareness and, as Wales states, dialect ‘found a new medium printed on the postcard home’ (2006: 137).

Nineteenth-century awareness of regional dialects was also directly brought about by industrialisation; Wales goes on to state that ‘most Northern cities grew on the strength of the incoming populations from their rural hinterlands’ (ibid. pp.115-6). Population movement from rural areas towards newly-industrialised urban centres created a fear that (particularly rural) dialects would ‘die out’, as discussed by Milroy, who states that ‘strong interest in English…dialects developed in the nineteenth century’ (2002: 14). This was particularly the case with regards to the Yorkshire dialect; we can see evidence of contemporary observations to this effect in the form of those made by antiquarian Joseph Hunter, who stated that ‘more attention has been paid to the verbal peculiarities of Yorkshire than of any other county’ (1829: xx).

We can therefore observe in the nineteenth century two of the key causal factors which can allow processes of enregisterment to occur: geographical and social mobility. In order for features to shift orders of indexicality and become enregistered, Johnstone et al argue that these kinds of mobility can be contributing factors to the process. They state that social mobility can shift speakers’ awareness of features from first to second-order indexicality as ‘the choice among variants could, for some people, be invested with second-order indexical meaning such as class or correctness’ (2006: 89). Second-order indexicals, just as with those which are third-order discussed above, are also enregistered. For third-order indexicality, geographical mobility is usually required. When this happens, according to Johnstone et al, wider awareness of second-order variation can occur in two ways: firstly, as speakers from a particular community leave and go elsewhere, their linguistic variants are linked to their geographical region; secondly, when speakers move into a community from out of the region, local speech forms are noticed and again linked to place (ibid. p.93-4).

My focus here is the enregisterment of nineteenth-century “Yorkshire” dialect, as the industrialisation of much of Yorkshire, particularly the West Riding, led to unprecedented population rises as people moved from rural areas to urban centres (see Wright 1986; Feinstein 1981). In addition, the advance and spread of the railway network led not only to geographical mobility generally throughout the country, but to the prosperity of certain industrialised areas like Hull and York, both of which greatly benefitted from the railways in terms of trade and employment respectively (see Gillett and MacMahon 1980; Feinstein 1981); whereas other areas of the county became prosperous as holiday and leisure destinations, like Scarborough (Singleton 1970:52). These developments would ultimately lead to increased awareness of the features of the “Yorkshire” dialect.

*2.2.* *Nineteenth-century Yorkshire dialect data*

The nineteenth century saw a tremendous output of dialect representation, particularly in Northern England. Beal observes that the ‘growth of urban population in towns and cities such as Newcastle, Manchester, and indeed Halifax’ created a market and a demand for popular literature that was written in local, regional dialects, rather than in Standard English (2004: 204). Indeed, representations of Yorkshire dialect in the nineteenth century can be observed in the form of both dialect literature and literary dialect (Shorrocks 1996: 386), where the former includes works written entirely in dialect (for instance, poems, ballads, songs, dialogues); the latter is dialect represented in novels and plays (for instance, the dialogue of the character Browdie in Dickens’ *Nicholas Nickleby*). The distinction between these two forms of dialect representation lies in the general tendency for dialect literature to be written by local writers for local audiences, as discussed by Leith and Graddol, who state that dialect literature was ‘both printed and sold by local publishers. Many of the dialect writers were workers and they were often self-educated in the new textile factories of Lancashire and Yorkshire’ (2002: 162). It is likely that much of this work was aimed at local audiences and there was considerable demand for these kinds of texts. This is as opposed to literary dialect, which was often written by non-local writers and intended for a wide audience; for instance, Charles Dickens was not native to Yorkshire, yet represents Yorkshire dialect in *Nicholas Nickleby* (1838). Dickens’ works were hugely popular in the nineteenth century, and were read by ‘a very large and diverse audience’ (Pykett 2002: 3), making him ‘a world-famous author’ (Patten 2001: 16) in his own lifetime. We can therefore compare representations of Yorkshire dialect written by local speakers for local audiences with those written by non-local speakers for international audiences. This is important for studying the nineteenth-century enregisterment of the Yorkshire dialect as these sources can highlight which features are salient in representing Yorkshire at a local and international level.

In addition, we can also observe nineteenth-century metapragmatic discourse on Yorkshire dialect. Such discourse is described as ‘talk about talk’ by Johnstone et al (2006: 93), and is fundamental in understanding what social values are indexed by what language features. In the absence of any living speakers of 19th century Yorkshire dialect, I make use of textual data which comes from various sources including: introductory material for dialect dictionaries, essays about particular dialects, travel writing, articles from popular magazines, books written about particular dialects, dialect glossaries, and dialect grammars. I refer to this as dialect ‘commentary’, and many different aspects of the Yorkshire dialect were commented upon by contemporary observers. For instance, we can see comments such as: ‘asking *where* we should look we say *weer*’ (Piper 1824: 10 – italics in original), on the Yorkshire pronunciation of the SQUARE diphthong as the NEAR diphthong /ɪə/; and ‘The absence of þ or th in the definite article is remarkable’ (Addy 1888: xviii), highlighting the use of definite article reduction [DAR] in the Yorkshire dialect. Some commentators are somewhat more general in their discussion of the dialect; for instance, Fisk, an American Methodist preacher, records in his travel writing of his time spent in Yorkshire: ‘Their prepositions and conjunctions are mixed up and interchanged for each other in such grotesque order, and their vowels are sounded so queerly, that every sentence is amusing’ (1838: 669). This overt metacommentary on the features of the Yorkshire dialect serves to link these language features with place. The explicit nature of this link was alluded to by contemporary commentators like Morris, who stated that only Yorkshire speakers were able to speak “Yorkshire” (1892: 44) in his discussion of the ‘intelligibility’ of the dialect to anyone who is not native to Yorkshire, described by Morris as ‘foreigners’ (see also Cooper 2013, 2014).

*2.3.* *Corpus of nineteenth-century Yorkshire dialect material*

The historical data for this paper comes from a corpus of nineteenth-century dialect material concerning Yorkshire dialect. This corpus is in two main sections: (i) qualitative metacommentary featured in 18 texts from the types of sources listed above; and (ii) samples of dialect representation from 27 dialect literature texts (26,376 words) and 20 literary dialect texts (18,229 words) which amount to 44,605 words in total for quantitative analysis (for a full account of this corpus see Cooper 2013, 2014). Ideally, 1,000-word samples were taken from each text, although certain texts did not include this many words of dialect. In order to account for this, the number of tokens for each text were normalised as percentages following Biber et al (2006).

Analysis of the qualitative data highlighted that several Yorkshire dialect features were consistently discussed in the ‘commentary’ material. These include: definite article reduction; alternate diphthongs in words such as *weer* ‘where’; and alternate vowels, particularly the use of <i> for <u> in words like *sich* ‘such’. Additionally, we can see representations which suggest /l/-vocalisation, as in the use of *oud/owd* for ‘old’. Finally, several lexical items were especially frequent and consistently represented. We can see evidence of: *owt* ‘anything’; *nowt* ‘nothing’; *summat* ‘something’; *shoo/hoo* ‘she’; *bairn* ‘child’; *gan* ‘go’; *sen* ‘self’; *mun* ‘must’; and *nobbut* ‘only’.

Typical commentary for these features includes illustrative examples of their use and, in many cases, indications as to their pronunciation. For instance, in the ‘T’ section of his glossary of the areas of Almondbury and Huddersfield, Easther discusses the ‘omission’ of the definite article in “Yorkshire” dialect:

Although it is warmly disputed, it seems to me that the *t* is sometimes omitted. In *Dolly’s Gown, or the Effects of Pride*, I find the expressions, ‘When church did loase,’ ‘Lads ran at apples, spice, and nuts,’ in which cases at least three definite articles are wanting; and I am of the opinion it is often omitted. But it is said that the ghost of a *t*’ is always to be recognized. (1883: 134)

It appears that Easther is here referring to the glottal realisation of DAR, especially with his reference to the ‘ghost of a *t*’. This description is similar to both Ellis’ and Wright’s discussions of a ‘suspended t’, which also appears to be referring to a glottal realisation of the definite article (Beal and Cooper 2014: 12).

Quantitative analysis of the dialect literature and literary dialect also highlighted several features that were similarly consistently and frequently employed in representations of Yorkshire dialect. These included several of the features that were consistently discussed in the qualitative material listed above. Definite article reduction was again very common, as were alternate vowels in words like *sich.* However, in addition to these features we can also see an alternation of <a> to <o> in words like *mony* ‘many’. Again we can see /l/-vocalisation represented in nonstandard respellings like *oud* or *owd* for ‘old’, and the same lexical items listed above.

Examples of these features are typified in the works of Preston, who wrote dialect literature, particularly poems, in the Bradford dialect. For instance, in the poem *Natterin Nan*, we can see examples like: ‘Nut mitch unlike mesen’ where *mitch* illustrates the use of <i> for <u> in ‘much’; and the lexical item *mesen* for ‘myself’ (1864: 3). We can also see ‘he’s nowt bud stoan’, where *nowt* is given for ‘nothing’ (ibid.). Later in the poem, Preston gives ‘We fynd a summat wreng’ and ‘Ta see hur poar owd man’, where we have *summat* ‘something’ and a representation of /l/-vocalisation in *owd* ‘old’ (ibid. p.4). Additionally, there is the use of *barn* for ‘child’ and the seemingly archaic pronoun *shoo* for ‘she’ in ‘Ah barn, ses shoo’; Preston also displays the use of <o> for <a> in ‘mony a time’ for ‘many a time’ (p.5). Finally, in the lines ‘An’m ailin owt at all / T’ poar slave mun tug an tew’, we can see *owt* for ‘anything’, definite article reduction in the form of <t’>, and *mun* for ‘must’ (p.6). This shows a reasonably consistent use of the most common “Yorkshire” features in a 19th century text.

In addition, several of the features which were consistent in the quantitative data appeared in similar proportions in both the dialect literature and the literary dialect, as shown in Figure 1. We can see in Figure 1 that the features: *mun* ‘must’; <ea> in *theare* ‘there’; *nowt* ‘nothing’; *gan/gang* ‘go’; <th’>; <oa> in *goa* ‘go’; *sen* ‘self’; *bairns* ‘children’; <t’>; and <o> for <a> in *onny* ‘any’ all appear in similar proportions in both types of dialect representation, as they occur within a percentage proportion range of around 40:60 to 70:30 dialect literature [DL] to literary dialect [LD]. If we are to continue to assume that DL is predominantly produced for and received by a local Yorkshire audience, and that LD is aimed at a wider, potentially international audience, then the fact that the features listed above appear in almost equal proportions of DL:LD suggests that those features are almost equally salient in representing Yorkshire dialect to a local audience as to a non-local one.

The analysis of the historical data led me to the following hypothesis. Features which were likely enregistered to 19th century audiences meet the following criteria: (i) they are consistently discussed in the qualitative material; (ii) they are quantitatively numerous and consistently frequent in dialect representations in DL and LD; and (iii) they appear in similar quantities in DL and LD, therefore suggesting similar salience to local versus non-local speakers.

*Figure 1. Mean averages of commonly-occurring dialect features in dialect literature versus literary dialect across nineteenth-century corpus*

In order to test this hypothesis, and in lieu of any surviving speakers of nineteenth-century Yorkshire dialect, I constructed an analogous corpus of modern dialect material and compared the results with an online survey of modern speakers.

**3. Corpus of modern Yorkshire dialect material**

The modern corpus was designed to be as analogous to the nineteenth-century material as possible. As a result, when selecting qualitative data, sources in media that are not traditionally published such as web-based sources, were excluded; for instance internet pages such as a wikiHow entry on ‘How to speak with a Yorkshire accent’ (http://www.wikihow.com/Speak-With-a-Yorkshire-Accent), or Youtube videos which discuss the ‘Yorkshire’ accent and dialect such as ‘How To: Be a Proper Yorkshire Pud’ (http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6V54g0314UA). The modern qualitative data therefore came from 7 texts, predominantly in the form of prefatory material from dialect glossaries and dictionaries. These sources include similar overt commentary to that which appears in the historical corpus. Typical comments on “Yorkshire” features include the following, which is taken from David Battye’s Sheffield dialect dictionary. On the topic of the pronunciation of certain diphthongs, he states: ‘Sheffielders enjoy diphthongs and stretch them out and separate them whenever possible. Hence meat becomes ‘meeat’, door ‘dooer’ … In extreme cases it is even possible to manage a triphthong’ (2007: 22). He does not give any examples of Yorkshire triphthongs, though.

The quantitative data was comprised of a smaller corpus of 5,000 words of DL and 5,000 words of LD; this corpus was not as extensive as that for the historical data, as the modern corpus data was to be augmented with the results from the online survey. There was also an apparent lack of available modern quantitative data, particularly DL, when compared with the nineteenth century. However, the modern data which is available bears striking resemblance to the historical dialect material. For example, Arnold Kellett’s ‘translation’ of the gospels into “Yorkshire” dialect includes representations like: ‘An’ Ah’ll tell thi summat else. Ah allus see Joseph as a *gentle* sooart o’ chap’ (2007: 1 – italics in original), where we can see *thi* ‘you’, *summat* ‘something’, and *allus* ‘always’. Later in the text, we see ‘Well, t’ landlord taks another look at Mary, sees t’ state t’ lass is in, an’ ‘e suddenly bethinks ‘issen’ (ibid. p.2), where definite article reduction is represented as <t’>, H-dropping is evident in *‘e* ‘he’and *‘issen* ‘himself’, which also displays the use of *sen*. Finally, Kellett presents ‘Nay, there’s nowt ter bi afeeared on! Ah’ve come ter bring thi some reight cheerful news’ (p.3), where *nowt* is used for ‘nothing’ and *reight* appears for ‘really’.

Analysis of the modern corpus showed that, just as with the historical data, there were several features which were both consistently discussed in the qualitative material and frequently used in the quantitative data. These included: definite article reduction, which appeared very frequently and was consistently represented as <t> or <t’>. We can see modern evidence for alternate diphthongs, again in words like *weer* for ‘where’, but also in *rooad* for ‘road’, where the diphthong /ʊə/ is suggested in the latter case. The phonological features represented in the modern corpus differ from those in the historical one. Notably, representations of H-dropping are much more frequent in the modern data. The lack of such representations in the historical data is likely explained by the fact that this feature was much more of an overtly stigmatised shibboleth in the 19th century (Beal 2004: 180), which was associated with low-class status. Other frequent and consistent phonological features represented with nonstandard respellings in the modern data include *allus/alis* for ‘always’ and *o’er/ower/ovver* for‘over’. Finally, we see certain lexical items represented; although there are fewer lexical items represented overall than in the historical data. The most common examples are: *owt* ‘anything’; *nowt* ‘nothing’; *summat* ‘something’; *sen* ‘self’; and *thee/tha* ‘you’. These features also fell within similar proportions of DL:LD in a similar manner to the features that were frequent and consistent in the historical corpus. Comparison of the modern data with the results of the online survey showed that the patterns found in the textual data reflected modern speakers’ perceptions of what “Yorkshire” dialect was.

**4. Online Survey**

The online survey was created using the online web service www.kwiksurveys.com. Respondents were asked whether or not they were from Yorkshire, and a box was provided for a more specific response to this question. If respondents were from Yorkshire, they were asked to state where within the county they were from, in a format such as ‘Sheffield, South Yorkshire’. Respondents not from Yorkshire were also asked for a specific location in the similar form of ‘town/city, county’. This created three groups of respondents: ‘Yorkshire’, ‘non-Yorkshire’, and ‘International’; the final group were respondents from outside of the mainland UK. Respondents were also grouped by gender, and by age in 10-year brackets from 18-29 to 60 and over. The survey was split into two parts with a comments section at the end. In part 1 of the survey, respondents were asked to provide up to ten features they felt were representative of the Yorkshire dialect; these could be words, pronunciations, phrases, etc. They could progress no further in the survey until this was complete, and the second part of the survey was unseen to the respondents at this stage. Part 2 of the survey was a multiple-choice exercise where respondents were asked to rate 23 features selected from both corpora according to several criteria listed in Table 1. Features were predominantly chosen for the survey if they displayed tokens in both modern and historical quantitative corpora and featured commentary in both modern and historical qualitative corpora.

The survey ran for 1 month; in that time there were 410 respondents. Of those 410 respondents, the group with the smallest number was female Yorkshire speakers aged 60 and over. Only 7 respondents filled in the survey from this group; of those 7, only 6 actually completed the survey. 12 respondents were therefore chosen from each age group for analysis (6 male and 6 female), giving a total of 120 respondents analysed from the mainland UK. There were an additional 21 respondents who were from overseas; these results were considered as a separate group due to the smaller number of respondents, and relative inconsistency of locations represented in the ‘International’ group.

*Table 1: Online Survey Multiple Choice Criteria*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Criterion | Implication |
| I say this | Strong association with Yorkshire |
| I have heard of this |
| This is current, modern Yorkshire dialect |
| This is old fashioned. Nobody talks like this any more |
| I have never heard of this | Weak association with Yorkshire |
| I would never say this |  |

*4.1.* *Survey results*

The survey results highlighted that there was a considerable amount of consistency in the “Yorkshire” features respondents provided; similar consistency was also displayed in the association of certain features from the corpora with Yorkshire in the multiple choice exercise. Table 2 shows the features which, on average, were consistently and frequently listed by all groups of respondents in decreasing order of frequency.

*Table 2.* *Consistently provided “Yorkshire” features by all groups of respondents to online survey*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| “Yorkshire” Features Provided | Respondents, % |
| *Thee/tha* ‘you’ | 54 |
| Definite Article Reduction | 45 |
| *Reight* ‘really’ | 33 |
| *Nowt* ‘nothing’ | 33 |
| Terms of Endearment (e.g. ‘love’, ‘duck’) | 24 |
| H-dropping | 24 |
| Northern English BATH and STRUT vowels /a/ and /ʊ/ | 24 |
| *Ey up* ‘hello’ | 22 |
| *Owt* ‘anything’ | 18 |
| *Nesh* ‘cold, susceptible to cold’ | 16 |
| *Sen* ‘self’ | 16 |

The multiple choice section of the survey also highlighted that the corpus features with the strongest association with Yorkshire were very similar to those listed in Table 2. Figure 2 shows the results for the features which survey respondents most strongly associated with “Yorkshire” dialect.

*Figure 2. Corpus features with strongest association with “Yorkshire” dialect according to multiple choice section of online survey showing average percentage of all respondents*

The features shown in Figure 2 all display large numbers of respondents selecting the criteria ‘I have heard of this’ and ‘This is current, modern Yorkshire dialect’. This illustrates wide awareness of these features in the case of the first criterion, and an explicit link between language and place in the case of the second.

When we compare the results from the 2 parts of the online survey, we can see that there are 7 features which are common to both of the above lists. These features are: definite article reduction, *nowt* ‘nothing’, *owt* ‘anything’, H-dropping, *reight* ‘really/right’, *sen* ‘self’, *thee/tha* ‘you’. Cooper (2013) also notes how these features also displayed the following tendencies in the modern corpus data, in that they all:

1. featured direct commentary in 40% or more of the qualitative texts
2. featured tokens in 50% or more of the quantitative corpus texts
3. occurred within a percentage proportion range of 40:60 to 90:10 DL:LD

This highlights a correlation between the textual data from the corpus and the features listed as “Yorkshire” by respondents to the online survey.

**5. Conclusions**

Agha notes that there are a variety of reflexive behaviours involved in the study of register phenomena. He states that these can include: ‘use of register names’; ‘accounts of usage/users’; ‘traditions of lexicography’; ‘popular print genres’; and ‘literary representations’ (2007: 151). We can see that the dialect is consistently referred to as “Yorkshire” (see also Cooper 2013), giving us a relatively stable register name. Accounts of usage and users appear in the dialect ‘commentary’ material, which was also a popular print genre in the nineteenth century, as noted by Beal (discussed above). Literary representations can be found in both the dialect literature and the literary dialect. Traditions of lexicography can be observed in the production of dialect glossaries and dictionaries and the practise of writing “Yorkshire” dictionaries has continued up to the present day. Agha goes on to state that these must be evaluated in relation to one another so that we can fully understand the reflexive behaviours involved (Agha 2007: 152). These behaviours are all present with regards to the Yorkshire dialect in the nineteenth century, and the fact that there is evidence for them in this historical context shows that we can discuss enregisterment in societies long gone. He also states that interviews and questionnaires can be used to investigate register phenomena (ibid. p.151), which represents a trend in current studies of enregistered varieties. In this paper I have shown that the consideration of the survey results in relation to textual data have highlighted the fact that even without evidence for some of these reflexive behaviours, we can still come to conclusions about certain features’ enregisterment. This is due to the correlations and patterns observable in the modern data, which have therefore informed similar patterns in the historical data.

By comparing the survey data with the modern corpus data, we can see that there is a strong correlation between frequently and consistently-occurring features in the modern corpus and the survey respondents’ perceptions of salient “Yorkshire” features. Based on these correlations, we can conclude that the enregistered repertoire of modern “Yorkshire” dialect contains the 7 features listed above. Therefore, features that were enregistered as “Yorkshire” in the nineteenth century will meet the same criteria given in (1) to (3). The historical corpus data indicates that those features are: definite article reduction, *sen* ‘self’, *nowt* ‘nothing’, *mun* ‘must’, *owd* ‘old’, *gan* ‘go’, and *owt* ‘anything’ (Cooper 2014:166). Patterns in the modern data therefore allow us to identify the enregistered repertoire of nineteenth-century “Yorkshire” dialect, enabling us to discuss the social values indexed by language features in historical contexts.