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THESIS IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE

A study of the comprehensiveness of the EDD to Traditional Cumbrian (1700–1898) and the usefulness of the EDD to Contemporary Cumbrian (1950–present), when compared against the OED, with the aim of determining the necessity for the EDD’s revision.

ABSTRACT:

The dialects of English have been under constant critique since the 16th Century (cf. section 1.2.1.2), labelled as the unsophisticated bastardisations of Standard English. As a result, English dialects have been in a steady state of decline for the last four-hundred years and various authors have endeavoured to preserve as much of their lexis and grammar as possible before they are replaced by the Standard.

Currently, the most complete account of English dialect lexis is Wright's (1898–1905) English Dialect Dictionary (EDD). However, little research on the comprehensiveness and usefulness of this source has been conducted by the academic community, with the only researcher tackling the issue with intent being Beal (2010b) in her study of Wright’s coverage of Yorkshire dialect lexis. Thus, the researcher saw a gap in the literature which he felt obliged to fill, using the groundwork laid by Beal (2010b) to investigate Wright’s coverage of his own dialect of Cumbrian.

This study will explore English Dialect Dictionary’s (1898–1905) treatment of the Cumbrian dialect in comparison to the Oxford English Dictionary. Two research questions and their complementary time-periods will be referenced throughout this study, focussing on the EDD’s comprehensiveness for Traditional Cumbrian (dating 1700–1898) and the EDD’s usefulness to Contemporary Cumbrian (dating 1950–present).

The methodology for this investigation is based on Beal’s (2010b) study of the EDD’s use of Hunter’s (1829) Hallamshire Glossary. She considered the extent and nature of Wright’s referencing, with the aim of determining the EDD’s comprehensiveness for the Traditional dialect of Yorkshire. Her methodology, with revision, is suitable for this investigation’s needs (cf. section 3).

As will be demonstrated, the EDD proves less comprehensive than the OED for Traditional Cumbrian and less useful than the OED for Contemporary Cumbrian. This contests Wright’s self-proclaimed accolade of being the in-antiquate, “complete vocabulary of all English dialect words” (Wright 1898: v). The findings of this research, as illustrated by the conclusions to section 4.1 through 4.4, illustrate the necessity for the revision of the EDD to rectify the oversights Wright made for Traditional Cumbrian and to include the changes to Contemporary Cumbrian which have occurred since the publication of the EDD’s final volume. These revisions, if conducted systematically for all dialects covered by the EDD, are suggested by the researcher to greatly increase the EDD's practicality as a tool for the study of all Traditional and Contemporary dialects.
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1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 OVERVIEW OF THE CURRENT RESEARCH

This thesis investigates the *English Dialect Dictionary’s* (1898–1905) treatment of the Cumbrian dialect in comparison to the *Oxford English Dictionary*. Two research questions and their complementary time-periods will be referenced throughout this study, as they dictate its structure (*cf.* section 3.1). Firstly, this thesis will investigate the EDD’s comprehensiveness for the Traditional Cumbrian dialect (dating 1700–1898). Then, this thesis will investigate the EDD’s usefulness as a resource for the Contemporary Cumbrian dialect (dating 1950–present). For reasons of practicality, this study will only explore written sources of the Cumbrian dialect for both of its research questions.

The EDD’s comprehensiveness and usefulness will be assessed by the means of four research parameters (*cf.* section 3.2). These parameters each analyse a portion of the EDD’s entry structure, considering its inclusion of Cumbrian dialect lexis, its treatment of Cumbrian dialect grammar, its accuracy in Cumbrian etymology and its assessment of Cumbrian dialect definition. The OED will be used in each of these parameters as the authority against which the EDD is compared.

The EDD has remained unedited and unrevised since the publication of its final volume in 1905 (Penhallurick 2009: 312). Despite this, it remains a valuable resource for the study of English dialect lexis today. Ultimately, this research aims to investigate the EDD’s practicality as a tool, offering suggestions for a revised edition which fills some of the gaps left by Joseph Wright which limit the EDD’s comprehensiveness and usefulness for Traditional and Contemporary Cumbrian dialect study respectively.

This thesis opens with a history of Cumbrian dialect lexicography, followed by an overview of the EDD’s structure and a review of its current academic literature. Then, this investigation’s methodology and data will be outlined. Finally, the results and analysis of this study’s data will be provided, along with suggestions for EDD revisions.
1.2 A HISTORY OF CUMBRIAN DIALECT LEXICOGRAPHY

1.2.1 DICKINSON’S (1859) GLOSSARY

1.2.1.1 Overview and Limitations

Dickinson (1859) is recognised as the father of Cumbrian dialect lexicography, with authors such as Fergusson (1873: vi) and Prevost (1899: v) praising his work as the “most complete” and “most notable” collection of Cumbrian dialect words for the 19th Century. His Glossary is a collection of around 7,000 phonetically-spelled headwords (Byers 20051), ordered alphabetically.

Each headword acts as its own pronunciation guide (Dickinson 1859: v) and is accompanied by usage labels which mark the area of Cumbria in which it is used. Definitions follow on, often consisting of short “translational” glosses into Standard English. Very infrequently, entries conclude with short etymologies which list the headword’s language family and etymon (Dickinson 1859: 16, cf. fig 1: busk). Grammatical categories are not specified, and usage examples are sparse and often succinct.

---

1 Figure from the rear cover of (Byers 2005).
2 Searching through Eighteenth Century Collections Online (ECCO) for boscus reveals several examples of books using
Dickinson's major limitation is his inconsistency. Of the fifty entries listed in fig. 1, only six bear etymological information. Six headwords bear usage examples, only one of which is cited. Additionally, Dickinson's headword/pronunciation guides are based on his own "intimate acquaintance with the mother tongue of [his] county" (Dickinson 1859: xi) rather than an organised body of data (Upton 2016: 387), which ultimately questions the accuracy of his work.

Dickinson's etymologies are also questionable. His entry for *bush* is accompanied by the incomplete etymology "Teut. *busch.*" (Dickinson 1859: 16), which suggests the only language contributor to the word is German. Whilst the German *busch* is recognised as a cognate form of the word *bush*, the Latin *boscus* (meaning "wood") pre-dates its usage (OED Online: "bush, n."), invalidating Dickinson's assessment. This information would have been readily available to Dickinson in the mid-19th Century had he thought to reference it, being defined by Bailey's...
Therefore, Dickinson’s Glossary does little to show the likely historical development of its headwords, as is expected in modern lexicography (Durkin 2016b: 237).

### 1.2.1.2 Benefits: 16th–19th Century Attitudes on Regional Dialects

Despite its limitations, Dickinson (1859) plays a significant role in the preservation of the 19th Century Cumbrian dialect. His initiative was his most important contribution, with his work providing the foundations on which future dialectologists could build. Dialect lexicography was a stigmatised subject in Britain between the 16th and 19th Centuries, with academics and commentators evaluating the propriety of provincial Englishes. Most show a “distaste for and criticism of” dialect speech (Penhallurick 2009: 292), with dialect forms being disparaged as “barbarisms,” “harmful” to the English language, as the following extracts demonstrate:

**16th Century:** The English vernacular (and the vernaculars of other nations) was commonly criticised for its rustic, homely nature. Classical languages such as Latin or Greek enjoyed elevated status as the languages of academia, with English and her dialects consigned to the speech of the lowly. Using English in academic pursuits was frowned upon.

Moreover, those Countries (some of which never knew any better than their own native tongue) have their service in the vulgar tongues by mere force and necessity, [...] whereas the Protestant having once had the Latin service, are fallen from Latin to English, that is to say, from the better to the worse [...].

(Sander 1567: 19)

In our ordinary text, I follow not altogether the vulgar English translation, but the best learned in the Greek tongue [...].

(Napier 1593: 12)

There is another praise of this Adrian, and the same in manner eternall: The man was of profound learning, and knowledge, not vulgar, but strange, new, and difficile, and in especiall he was a man of a ripe judgement, in electyng and choosyng fine termes, and apt and eloquent words [...].

(Grafton 1569: 1101)

**17th Century:** “Hard word” dictionary writers continued the previous century’s stigmatisation of dialect lexis. Latin was the language of choice for the most esteemed subjects such as philosophy and physics (cf. Descartes (1664) and Newton (1687)), whilst English was gaining popularity amongst the humanities. For example, Hume’s (1664) History of the Houses of Douglas and Angus, Cavendish’s (1666) Observations upon Experimental Philosophy and Boyle’s (1677) Treatise of the Art of War were all written in the vernacular.

Despite its academic recognition, English still held a lower status than the continental languages. To increase its authority, “hard word” dictionary writers attempted to reform the English language by introducing lexis from established classical languages (Nagy 2012: 440, 443). This

---

*S Searching through Eighteenth Century Collections Online (ECCO) for boscus reveals several examples of books using the word, the most notable of which being Nathan Bailey’s (1753: 121) Dictionary. The copy of Bailey (1753: 1) listed on EEBO was signed and dated by a Mr Elliott 1 1822, suggesting the dictionary was still in circulation around the time that Dickinson was producing his Glossary.
sparked a debate on the “correctness” of provincialisms that would persist until the modern day (Trudgill 1979: 19-22).

Extracts from “hard word” dictionaries reveal contemporary attitudes with most following the same pattern of belittling non-standard variants to elevate the reformed Latinised language of the elite.

THE ENGLISH DICTIONARIE: OR, AN INTERPRETER of hard Englih Words. Enabling as well Ladies and Gentlewomen, young Schollers, Clarkes, Merchants, as alfo Strangers of any Nation, to the understanding of the more difficult Authors already printed in our Language, and the more jpeedy attaining of an elegant perfection of the Englih tongue, both in reading, jpeaking and writing.

Being a Collection of the Chofjeft words contained in the Table Alphabetical and English Expofiitor and ofome thojands of words neuer publijhed by any heretofore.

(Cockeram 1623: 1)

DICTIONARIE, CORRECTED AND AUGMENTED WITH THE ADDITION OF many hundred Words both out of the Law, and out of the Latine, French and other languages, juch as were and are with us in common ufe, but never printed till now, to the perfecting of the works.

THE BARBAROYS WORDS WHICH WERE many hundreds are expunged, to the helpe of young Scholars, which before they used instead of good Words.

(Rider 1649: 1)

THE ENGLISH Schoole-Maʃter: Teaching all his Schollers of what Age foever, the most eajle, jhort, and perfect order of diʃtinct Reading, and true writing our Englih tongue, that hath ever yet been knoune or publijhed by any.

(Coote 1641: 1)

18th Century: Provincialisms of all varieties continue to be stigmatised to elevate the “cultured” or “choicest” language of the newly-emerging standard variety, as spoken by the social elite in the south-east3 (Penhallurick 2009: 292).

In the very metropolis two different modes of pronunciation prevail […]. One is current in the city, and is called the cockney; the other at the court-end, and is called the polite pronunciation. […] All other dialects are jure marks, either of a provincial, rujfic, pedantic, or mechanic education; and therefore have jome degree of diʃgrace annexed to them.

(Sheridan 1762: 30, my bold)

There is another Sett of Men who have contributed very much to the fpoiling of the English Tongue; I mean the Poets […]. Theje Gentlemen […] introduced that barbarous Cuʃtom of abbreviating Words, to fit them to the Meʃure of their Verʃes; and this they have frequently done, jo very injudiciously, as to form juch harjh unharmonious Sounds, that none but a Northern Ear could endure.

(Swift 1712: 21, my bold)

Fig. 2: Summary of 16th–18th Century attitudes towards non-Standard English.

By the time Dickinson (1859) began compiling his Glossary, the Cumbrian dialect was in an advanced state of decline Dickinson’s attitude towards dialect study differed from that of his predecessors. He recognised the Cumbrian dialect was under the threat of extinction after

---

3 Britain’s centre of “good society” was aligned with its centre of political power in the 18th Century. The Union of the Parliaments in 1707 granted additional prestige to southern England (and therefore standardised Southern English) due to the additional political control now exercised by London’s parliament (Dossena 2005: 56). The model for Standard English was based on the variety spoken by the politically powerful, socially successful capital.
Centuries of stigmatisation and sought to provide a record of its lexicon before it disappeared. As such, he presents his glossary as a “rescue mission.” His attitudes are summarised by the following extracts.

Our provincial dialects, instead of being the barbarous jargons represented by the lexicographers of the last century, are in truth the real wells of “English undefiled” [...] –Chambers, 1858.

(Dickinson 1859: ii, my bold)

The main objective of the following work is to form a record of the general idiom of the county of Cumberland, as in use at the present day, and from the end of the last century; and, in doing so, to endeavour to convey the sense in which each word is provincially understood.

(Dickinson 1859: v, my bold)

“[Cumberland’s] dialect should scarcely be subjected to the epithet of vulgar; for though partially unwritten by antiquity, and apparently doomed as to the future, it is far more ancient, though less harmonious, than the English of the present day.”

(Dickinson 1859: x, my bold)

1.2.2 FERGUSSON’S (1873) DIALECT OF CUMBERLAND

1.2.2.1 Overview and Limitations

Fergusson (1873: v–vii) aimed to produce a more detailed analysis of the Cumbrian dialect based on a revised and abridged version of Dickinson (1859), which the researcher thinks he achieved. Whilst his effort contains fewer headwords than Dickinson (Fergusson 1873: vi), his Dialect of Cumberland represents a step forward in Cumbrian dialect lexicography in terms of content and scholarly practice.

Fergusson’s revisions to Dickinson (1859) are extensive. Firstly, he engages with a wider range of material than his predecessor, gathering data from contemporary lexicographic authorities such as Jamieson’s (1808) Etymological Dictionary of the Scottish Language, Wedgwood’s (1859-65) Dictionary of English Etymology and Cleasby and Vigfusson’s (1874) Icelandic-English Dictionary. He also includes discussions on Cumbrian place-names and his general observations on the Cumbrian dialect.

Most importantly however, Fergusson improved Dickinson’s entry structure by providing every entry with a grammatical category and an etymology. Fergusson’s effort pushes dialect

---

4 In the process of being published whist Fergusson was writing his glossary (Fergusson 1873: vii).
lexicography’s methodology closer to that used by modern dictionaries of Standard English, in which each headword is assigned an unambiguous part-of-speech label (Weiner 2016: 222) and a historically accurate etymology (Durkin 2016b: 241). A sample of his glossary is shown below:

Fig. 3: A sample from Fergusson’s (1873: 80-1) glossary.

However, despite his improvements, Fergusson’s revisions are not perfect as his etymologies are sometimes incomplete or incorrect. For example, his etymology for the verb lick, meaning “to beat” (Fergusson 1873: 80), cites Owen’s (1803: 211) Dictionary of the Welsh Language as its source, selecting the Welsh verb llachio as the etymon.

Fergusson’s suggestion that Cumbrian lick is derived from Welsh llachio seems far-fetched. For a linguistic variant to be transferred from one speech community to another, regular contact between the two speech communities is necessary (Tagliamonte 2011: 36). Cumbrian and Welsh natives had little contact throughout the 18th and early 19th Centuries, as their agricultural economies restricted their peoples’ movement around Britain, with locals staying...
close to their homes due to the duties they owned to their land (Davies 2007: 310). This was especially common in Cumbria as agricultural practice was several years behind southern England, with farmers still practising labour-intensive farming (such as reaping with sickles rather than scythes) well into the 18th Century (Rollinson: 1967: 96, 121).

The Industrial Revolution brought changes to Cumbrian and Welsh life which did little to bring the two regions into definitive contact. During the 19th Century, developments in road and rail technology increased the British public’s mobility. This resulted in a change to Cumbria’s economy, with mining and tourism providing most of the county’s income. Generally, its inhabitants remained within the county, gaining employment in heavy industry and hospitality (Rollinson 1967: 125–8).

By contrast, Welsh natives migrated away from their rural homes, with most travelling south to Cheshire and London in search of employment (Davies 2007: 371). Cumbria was not frequented by Welshmen during the 19th Century; most of her visitors were wealthy tourists from Scotland and south-east England (Collingwood 1925: 169-170), suggesting that borrowings from Scots and London English should be more common than those from Welsh. In addition, Winchester (1987), Rollinson (1967) and Collingwood (1925) make no mention of a Cumbrian-Welsh presence large enough to constitute language borrowing, raising suspicion about Fergusson’s etymological accuracy.

The OED entry for *lick* confirms these suspicions, as it recognises Fergusson’s definition, but disagrees with his etymology (OED Online: “lick, v.”). The OED states that *lick* (in its OE form *liccian*) shares a cognate form with the Germanic languages of Old German and Old Saxon rather than the Celtic language of Welsh (OED Online: “lick, v.”). It seems that Fergusson saw a similarity between Owen’s (1803: 211) definition of *llachio* (“to shoot out smartly, to lick, to cudgel”) and the Cumbrian definition of *lick*, assigning *llachio* as *lick*’s etymon based on little more than a similarity in form.
Fergusson’s discussions are also fraught with inaccuracies. His observations on Cumbrian place-names seem to be based mostly on folk etymology. For example, he wrongly analyses the place-name *Ormathwaite*, stating how it retains the "distinctively Scandinavian name" *Orm* (Fergusson 1873: 192). Armstrong et al. (1950: 322) date the earliest recorded example of *Ormathwaite* to the 12th Century, where it appears as *Nordmanthait*. The place-name translates as "clearing of the north men," utilising the ON generic element *þveit*. The ON personal-name *Orm* is not used; its recognition by Fergusson is a result of his misinterpretation of the 16th Century variants *Ormatwhat* and *Ormaythhait* (Armstrong et al. 1950: 322). Fergusson’s confident replication of such inaccurate information places the legitimacy of his research into doubt.

1.2.3 PREVOST’S (1899) GLOSSARY

1.2.3.1 Overview and Limitations

Prevost (1899) follows the same pattern as Fergusson (1873). He starts by presenting the issue of Cumbrian dialect attrition, offering his *Glossary* as a solution (Prevost 1899: v). He continues with a revised edition of Dickinson (1859), to which he attaches discussions detailing his observations on Cumbrian grammar, lexis and phonology (Prevost 1899: xiv–ci).

Prevost adheres to Dickinson’s (1859) model more closely than Fergusson (1873), retaining Dickinson’s regional usage notes and lack of grammatical categorisation. Despite this, Prevost’s improvements are plentiful, the most important being his regimented treatment of usage examples. His approach mirrors that of Wright’s (1898: v–vi), with data gathered from a variety of 18th and 19th Century sources and from transactions with correspondents (Prevost 1899: cii–cvi). His effort represents a step towards the inclusive and systematic method of evidence gathering used by the OED (Hawke 2016: 178), with his usage examples gathered from a diverse range of genres. As fig. 4 demonstrates, Prevost’s entry for *Hackin* cites Stagg’s poem *Auld Lang Syne*; *Hassle* cites a piece of prose written by Sargisson and *Haaf-net* cites the *Carlisle Patriot*, a Cumbrian newspaper.
1.2.3.2 Innovation: Prevost’s Pronunciation Guides

Another of Prevost’s innovations, possibly motivated by the *English Dialect Dictionary* (Wright 1898–1905), is his treatment of pronunciation. His pronunciation guides are like the EDD’s, consisting of an annotated alphabet with each symbol ascribed to a sound and compared to a Standard English morpheme for ease of comprehension (Wright 1898: xvii, Prevost 1899: xiv–xxvi). Also, like the EDD, Prevost’s pronunciation guides are listed in each entry in enclosed brackets.

Prevost’s independent pronunciation guides remove the ambiguity of Dickinson’s combined headword/pronunciation guides. Headword spellings are not corrupted by their need to accommodate pronunciation and pronunciation is more accurately recorded by a regimented approach.

---

5 Prevost is listed in Wright’s (1898: x) “list of voluntary readers” and Wright’s “list of unprinted collections of dialect words” (1898: xii), confirming his involvement with the EDD and therefore knowledge of its conventions.
phonetic representation system (Pointon 2016: 476-7). Compare *haggle* in the following extracts:

**Haggis, N.E., a pudding of mincemeat, to eat with potatoes on Christmas day. Sco.**

**Haggle, C, to tease in bargaining, to overwork, to fatigue.**

**Haggle, N.E. See Hassel.**

As demonstrated by *fig. 5*, Prevost’s representation of *haggle’s* pronunciation is far more detailed than Dickinson’s. His systematised approach represents a further step towards the modern conventions of phonetic transcription (Pointon 2016: 483). His analysis is detailed, indicating the glottalization of the initial consonant, issuing the length and character of vowel sounds, marking the character of consonant sounds and providing stress markers to indicate syllable division. Prevost’s phonetic transcription for *haggle* breaks down as the following:

- ÂA: a shortened version of the vowel sound found in the onomatopoeia, *baa*. (Prevost 1899: xvi-xvii).
- G: the consonant found in the verb *get*, described by Prevost as “always hard” in character (Prevost 1899: xxiv).
- : marking syllable division.
- U: an unaccented short vowel sound, found in the second syllable of words. Often indistinct in nature due to the lack of stress; commonly articulated as ÂA or A. (Prevost 1899: xix)

1.2.3.3 Regional Awareness: The Growing Field of Dialectology

Like his forerunners, Prevost showed awareness of Cumbrian dialect attrition. His commentary situates itself within the growing field of British dialect lexicography, showing increased

---

6 Prevost’s phonetic transcription does not include an entry for the consonant “L,” hence its omission from this breakdown.
historical and regional awareness in contrast to the regionally stigmatised commentaries of the 18th Century (Markus 2007: 266).

The interest which has of late been growing in favour of our fast disappearing dialects leads me, as one who was born and who lived for many years in Cumberland, to think that an amalgamation of all the glossaries hitherto published of that dialect might be of value [...].

(Prevost 1899: v)

Regional dialects were still met with hostility during the 19th Century (Pointon 202: 475). One’s mastery of Standard English was viewed as a key method of social evaluation (Hickey 2007: 94), with regional varieties dismissed as “inelegant” (Mugglestone 2003: 37). The Education Act of 1870 cultivated this attitude in students and schools discouraged the use of provincialisms, enforcing Standard English and Received Pronunciation (Beal 2010a: 3, Markus 2007: 266). School inspectors’ reports of the late 19th Century often pass condescending comments on dialect speech, stressing the importance of “proper enunciation” (Honey 1988: 222). For example, one school inspector recommended the “kindly and judicious use of ridicule” in the removal of “inarticulate utterances” from the speech of Yorkshire schoolboys in 1886 (Honey 1988: 221).

Prevost’s awareness of the damage the education system was dealing to the Cumbrian dialect is progressive, providing benefits for the Cumbrian dialect and the field of dialectology. His preservation of the dialect by systematic means provided a good platform for the Cumbrian dialect’s survival whilst also bolstering the literature available for early dialectologists, issuing a useful methodology for other dialect scholars to emulate.

1.2.4 SUMMARY

The Cumbrian dialect glossaries listed here each have their strengths and weaknesses. Dickinson (1859) provided initiative, building the foundations for his successors to revise. His simple word-list included a broad range of Cumbrian vocabulary, but his approach was inconsistent and misleading with its combined headword/pronunciation guides, sparse usage examples and rudimentary etymologies. Fergusson (1873) improved Dickinson’s practice,
providing a more rigorous format, including grammatical classifications and more detailed etymologies for most of Dickinson's entries. His etymologies were questionable however, seemingly being based on folk etymology. Prevost (1899) improved on Dickinson's combined headword/pronunciation guide system, creating a phonetic representation system to objectively encode the pronunciation of the Cumbrian dialect. He also improved on Dickinson's irregular usage examples, including at least one usage example from a spoken or written Cumbrian dialect source. However, his Glossary fails to acknowledge Fergusson's work and does not include grammatical categorisation or etymological information.

1.3 STRUCTURE OF THE EDD
Markus (2010) provides an overview of the EDD's structure. He starts with the dictionary's microstructure, separating each entry into a “head” and “body” (Markus 2010: 77). The “head of each entry consists of a headword, followed by its part-of-speech, usage label, dialect markers (usually abbreviated county names, but sometimes regions or nations, such as Wales) and finally a phonetic transcription in brackets (Markus 2010: 77).

---

7 For reasons of efficiency, only a brief summary of the EDD’s entry structure is provided here. A more detailed analysis is offered by Markus (2010) and Markus and Heuberger (2007).
The "body" of each entry consists of three paragraphs. The meanings paragraph usually contains the semantic explanation of the headword, organised numerically according to their sense division (Markus 2010: 77-8). The citations paragraph contains quotations from the sources used by Wright organised by meaning and county divisions (Markus 2010: 78). Each entry closes with a paragraph of editorial comment, containing etymological, historical or semantic "remarks" on the entry (Markus 2010: 78).

The EDD's microstructure lists the various dialectal features belonging to each headword (Markus 2010: 79). This includes information on pronunciation variants, grammar, phraseology, dialect markers and the sources and publication dates of Wright's usage examples (Markus 2010: 79). Most importantly, the microstructure reflects the "function" of the data rather than its "form," linking the meanings and citations paragraphs (Markus 2010: 79).
2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 LACK OF CUMBRIAN DIALECT LITERATURE

During this investigation's preliminary stages, the researcher noticed a distinct sparsity of Cumbrian dialect literature. Cumbria appeared to produce far fewer texts of either an artistic or lexicographic nature than her neighbouring dialect regions. To test this observation, the researcher consulted the British Library Catalogue to compare the frequency of Cumbrian texts with that of Yorkshire and Scotland.

This section's inclusion in this paper's literature review is unorthodox, as it presents figures from the researcher's own investigation rather than assessing existing academic literature. Despite this, the data presented illustrates the reason why so little research has been conducted on the EDD's value to Cumbrian dialect study (cf. section 2.3). The researcher thought it useful to make the reader aware of these issues early to explain the limited nature of the sources that this literature review evaluates.

The three regions of Cumbria (or Cumberland), Yorkshire and Scotland. were searched for in the British Library Catalogue through an advanced search, detailed in fig. 7. Cumbrian and Cumberland are both used as search terms due to their interchangeability in the works of Cumbrian authors (i.e. "Cumbrian Dialect" and "Dialect of Cumberland")⁸. Fig. 6 outlines this "trigger word" pattern.

KEY TO BRITISH LIBRARY CATALOGUE SEARCH TERMS AND TRIGGER WORDS

[DIALECT]: the three dialects investigated by the search.

1. Cumbrian (or Cumberland)
2. Yorkshire
3. Scottish

ADVANCED SEARCH: designed to search for each [dialect] in the main titles of British Library Catalogue texts only. The aim of this search is to indicate the number of texts each region has produced, which specifically cover the topic of dialect study.

- Main Title - contains: [dialect] + Dialect

⁸ Hutchinson (1794: 152, 155), Anderson (1815: 1, 2), Dickinson (1859: vii, viii), Gilpin (1866: 38, 39) and Richardson (1871: 5, 6) all follow this pattern, warranting the analysis of both structures, as both allude to the same referent.
• Main Title – contains: [dialect] + Glossary
• Main Title – contains: [dialect] + Dictionary

Fig. 7: Breakdown of the advanced search pattern used on the British Library Catalogue website when attaining the results of fig. 8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CUMBRIA</th>
<th>NUMBER OF RESULTS</th>
<th>DATE RANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cumbrian Dialect</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1821 – 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumbrian Glossary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumbrian Dictionary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1660 – 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland Dialect</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1846 – 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland Glossary</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1747 – 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland Dictionary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1796 – 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td><strong>124</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YORKSHIRE</th>
<th>NUMBER OF RESULTS</th>
<th>DATE RANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire Dialect</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>1807 – 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire Glossary</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1781 – 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire Dictionary</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1812 – 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td><strong>280</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCOTLAND</th>
<th>NUMBER OF RESULTS</th>
<th>DATE RANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Dialect</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>1759 – 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Glossary</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1710 – 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Dictionary</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>1757 – 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td><strong>521</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 8: A comparison of the works of literature listed on the British Library Catalogue produced by the regions of Cumbria, Yorkshire and Scotland.

Fig. 8 shows that Cumbria (or Cumberland) is under-recorded in comparison to its neighbours. Fewer texts directly concerned with the Cumbrian dialect exist than for Yorkshire or Scotland, suggesting that Cumbria is less concerned about her local history and language than her
neighbours. This deficit of literature structured the way in which primary data was gathered for this investigation, as section 3.3.1 will demonstrate.

2.2 EARLY CRITIQUE OF THE EDD
Shortly after the EDD was published, there was a strong response of criticism from dialectologists who aimed to correct the shortfalls of Wright’s work. Several glossaries and grammars of specific dialects were published between 1905 and 1920 which more closely analysed their chosen regions than Wright. For example, Schiling (1906) produced his *Grammar of Oldham*, Brilioth (1913) published his *Grammar of Lorton* and Blakeborough (1911) gave us the *Glossary of the North Riding of Yorkshire*, which deliberately ignores the existence of the *English Dialect Dictionary*, stating:

So far as the compiler knows, no popular work of this character has been published. That a growing desire for such a glossary exists he fully believes.

(Blakeborough 1911: v, my bold)

Another, less subtle, critic of Wright is Gepp (1920). His *Contribution to an Essex Dialect Dictionary* attacks Wright for his “dabbling,” positioning itself as “serious” dialect lexicography by comparison (Gepp 1920: v). Despite this elitism, Gepp’s project is highly relevant to the current research due to its similar approach. Gepp evaluates the usefulness of Wright to the study of the Essex dialect, providing the foundations for a revised dialect dictionary to be completed by future researchers (Gepp 1920: vii). His study deals with the same issues as the current by recognising the imperfection of Wright’s EDD and offering a rudimentary methodology for its repair.

Gepp collected dialect vocabulary from the central-Essex parishes of High Ester, Felsted and Little Dunmow due to their isolation from road and rail links. Isolation is valued by Gepp as he sought the least “tainted” version of the Essex dialect, with the least amount of borrowings from the neighbouring dialects of the Midlands, East Anglia, Kent and London (Gepp 1920: v). This selective approach to data collection will not be used by the current research; all regions of the Cumbrian dialect will be considered.
Data collection methods are not mentioned; neither a survey nor a reading programme is specified, questioning the reliability of Gepp's data. Gepp's only requirement was that each word was verified by a native speaker as a productive lexeme of the dialect (Gepp 1920: vii). Again, this approach will not be used by the current research; a detailed breakdown of this study's reading programme can be found in section 3.3.1.

2.2.1 Gepp's Dictionary Structure

Gepp's dictionary is simple. Its entries are ordered alphabetically, with each headword capitalised. Grammatical categorisation is irregular, seeming only to be used when an entry's part-of-speech is neither immediately obvious nor signalled by its definition. For example, Gepp's entries for ANGLE (noun: "a direction, locality") and BALM (verb: "to smear with sticky stuff or dirt") do not have grammatical categories whereas ASKEW ("(prep.): across") and ATHOUT ("(prep.): without" and "(conj.): unless") do (Gepp 1920: 2-3). This system, which implies the reader possesses prior knowledge of the grammar in question, is avoided by modern lexicographers. Now, the practice adheres to the principles of "discrete classification" in which each headword is assigned a distinct grammatical category regardless of its perceived clarity (Weiner 2016: 222).

Usage examples appear in most entries, but they are neither referenced nor dated making it difficult for the reader to distinguish between actual citations of Essex dialect speech/literature and the author's own inventions. Etymology is sporadic, as shown by fig. 9, below. Over the course of the two pages, only one entry (BEVER) is provided with an etymon:
His irregular lexicographic approach aside, Gepp's sociolinguistic insights are valuable. Like Wright (1898: v) and several other authors cited here (Beal 2010a: 3, Honey 1988: 222, Trudgill 1979: 15) he blames dialect attrition on the growth of transportation technology and education, criticising the railways for their carriage of "alien" vocabulary into the county and schools for their stigmatisation of non-standard English (Gepp 1920: v-viii). His commentary aligns itself with a national concern for dialect attrition in the United Kingdom, with his attitudes neatly summarised by the following quotations:

Rails and main road traffic, beyond a doubt, have made **deadly havoc** of the vernacular. It is high time that some qualified person took our Essex dialect in hand, seriously and completely; for **no dabbling is of any use**. The old speech, though it holds on tenaciously enough in corners, is **generally shrinking** under the influence of the Elementary School and **free intercommunication**.

(Gepp 1920: v, my bold)
The good old English speech, passed out of literary use, supplanted by unworthy modern words, unrecognised by modern ‘education,’ but in its time the ordinary and literary speech of the country [...].

(Gepp 1920: vii, my bold)

2.3 MODERN CRITIQUE OF THE EDD

Modern evaluation of Wright’s (1898–1905) English Dialect Dictionary is limited. Texts concerned with the EDD tend to be descriptive commentaries, which either focus on the dictionary’s merits or focus on its recent transformation into an online resource. Authors such as Wakelin (1977: 46–7), Penhallurick (2009: 301-6), Markus (2010) and Upton (2016: 382–4) only provide brief summaries of the EDD’s structure and its position as a “seminal” work of lexicography, whilst tentatively hedging around the shortcomings in Wright’s methodology. Markus (2007) and Markus and Heuberger (2007) only address the problems associated with constructing the EDD Online application, delicately avoiding any possible updates and improvements which could make the dictionary more useful to the study of English dialectology.

Ruano-García’s (2014) study is marginally more critical, yet still tentative in its approach. His study was concerned with the contribution which Nicolson’s (1677) Glossarium Brigantinum paid to Wright’s coverage of Cumbrian lexis. Whilst he found Nicolson’s contribution to the EDD to be substantial (Ruano-García 2014: 182), his approach again focussed mainly on the merits of the EDD, ignoring Wright’s potential omissions from Nicolson (1677) and failing to comment on how investigating these omissions could help to improve the EDD’s comprehensiveness and usefulness to Cumbrian dialect study.

2.3.1 BEAL’S (2010b) STUDY OF THE YORKSHIRE DIALECT

Beal (2010b) is the only researcher who tackles Wright’s methodology with intent. Her study investigated the contribution Hunter’s (1829) Hallamshire Glossary made to the EDD, based on the extent and nature of Wright’s referencing (Beal 2010b: 43). The Hallamshire Glossary is a translational wordlist for the dialect of the West Riding of Yorkshire and was referenced heavily
by the EDD, providing 445 citations in total (Beal 2010b: 46). As a result, it features as a source in Wright’s “select bibliography” with the abbreviation w.Yks.⁴ (Wright 1898: xvi), proving its worth as a valuable resource⁹.

Beal (2010b) compared letters A–C of Hunter with an early build of EDD Online, addressing the following four questions:

1. How many words in the EDD are attributed to w.Yks.⁴?
2. How many words from the Hallamshire Glossary are in the EDD but are not attributed to w.Yks.⁴?
3. How many of Hunter’s words are not in the EDD at all?
4. Can we explain why Wright omitted these?

(Beal 2010b: 43)

The questions asked by Beal (2010b) set her study apart from her fellow researchers’ as, instead of merely commenting on the EDD’s merits or structure, she critically analyses the usefulness of Wright to the study of English dialectology, with the aim of providing explanations to the EDD’s shortcomings.

Her results are displayed in fig. 10. She found that Wright (1898–1905) directly referenced 114 A–C words from Hunter (1829), labelling them with w.Yks.⁴ (Beal 2010b: 44). A further 30 words were found to be common between Wright and Hunter, but with other Yorkshire dialect texts acting as the citation (i.e. without the w.Yks.⁴ label). Most importantly, Beal (2010b: 44) found 10 words in her sample which were not cited by Wright, but which were included in Hunter.

---

⁹ Hunter’s work was held in high esteem by 19th Century lexicographers and dialectologists. The Hallamshire Glossary was advocated by S. O. Addy (1888–90), who cited Hunter extensively during the compilation of his own Glossary of the Sheffield dialect (Beal 2010b: 46). In turn, Addy is known to have worked with Wright on the EDD. His Glossary also features as one of Wright’s “select” sources and his name appears in Wright’s lists of “voluntary readers” and “correspondents,” indicating a consistent line of contact between the two scholars (Wright 1898: viv, xiii). Beal (2010b: 45–6) suggests, due to their frequent correspondence, that Wright valued Addy’s opinion and referenced Hunter (1829) his recommendation.
Beal's (2010b: 46) investigation shows that Wright cited Hunter (1829) extensively, but that he was “selective in omitting words which might not be considered dialectal.” Her methodology is thorough, providing clear results and convincing arguments for Wright's selective approach to headword inclusion. As a result, her research questions and methodology have been adapted to suit the needs of this investigation (cf. section 3). The following chapter will list the adaptations made to (Beal 2010b) to suit this study's analysis of Wright’s comprehensiveness for Traditional Cumbrian and usefulness to Contemporary Cumbrian.
3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

This study investigates the following two research questions, inspired by Beal’s (2010b) study:

- Given its claims of being “the complete vocabulary of all English dialect words” (Wright 1898: v, my italics), how comprehensive was the EDD to the study of the Cumbrian dialect in its own time-period?
- Given that the EDD has not received an update since the publication of its final volume in 1905 (Penhallurick 2009: 312), how useful is the EDD to the study of the Cumbrian dialect today?

These research questions will be explored through the analysis of the Cumbrian dialect in two time-periods and through the comparison between related EDD and OED entries. The time-periods studied by this investigation are Traditional Cumbrian (1700–1898) and Contemporary Cumbrian (1950–present). The Traditional Cumbrian period was prescribed to coincide with the EDD’s research period (Wright 1898: v), thereby providing accurate data for the first research question. The Contemporary Cumbrian period was prescribed due to the availability of reliable modern Cumbrian dialect literature, thereby providing accurate data for the second research question. OED Online acts as the authority against which the EDD can be assessed in both instances.

“Traditional Cumbrian,” “Contemporary Cumbrian,” “the EDD” and “the OED” are topics which are referred to regularly throughout the remainder of this paper. A primer indicating their importance to this study’s research questions is provided here. For a more detailed description of these concepts’ application in this investigation, see section 3.3.

3.2 RESEARCH PARAMETERS

The research questions outlined in section 3.1 will be studied by means of the following four research parameters. This chapter defines these research parameters and outlines their function. Any text enclosed within square brackets (e.g. [headword], [grammatical category: EDD], [usage example] etc.) refers to a field in this study’s database, the functions of which are outlined in appendix ii.
1. **Inclusion**: does the EDD include the Cumbrian dialect lexis sourced from the researcher’s primary data? If so, does the EDD entry recognise the word as belonging to the Cumbrian dialect?

2. **Grammar**: which grammatical category does the EDD place the Cumbrian dialect word into? Does the EDD’s grammatical classification match the same word’s grammatical classification in the OED?

3. **Etymology**: what is the Cumbrian dialect word’s etymology according to the EDD (if present)? Does the EDD’s etymology match the same word’s etymology in the OED?

4. **Definition**: what is the Cumbrian dialect word’s definition according to the EDD (if present)? Does that definition match the same word’s definition in the OED?

### 3.2.1 INCLUSION

This parameter considers the EDD’s recognition of Cumbrian dialect lexis in comparison to the OED. The first research question will be addressed by testing the EDD’s comprehensiveness against the OED for *Traditional* Cumbrian [headword]s. The second research question will be addressed by comparing the EDD’s usefulness against the OED when used as a reference work for *Contemporary* Cumbrian. In addition, the accuracy of the EDD’s dialect area classifications will be recorded to provide an indication of the EDD’s sensitivity to Cumbrian dialect lexis.

#### 3.2.1.1 EDD Online

**3.2.1.1 EDD Inclusion Criteria**

This investigation’s inclusion parameter addresses similar issues to Beal’s (2010b: 43) study of the extent and nature with which the EDD references Hunter (1829) (*cf.* section 2.3.1). As such, her research parameters have been modified to suit the needs of this investigation. These modifications consisted of; *a*) changing the type of primary data from a single dialect glossary to a corpus of Cumbrian dialect literature and *b*) changing the dialect studied from Yorkshire to Cumbrian. Her modified research parameters read as follows:

**EDD INCLUSION CRITERIA**

1. How many words from the reading programme are attributed to *Cum.* in the EDD?
2. How many words from the reading programme are in the EDD but not attributed to *Cum.*?
3. How many words from the reading programme are not in the EDD at all?
4. Can we explain why Wright omitted these?

---

* Cf. section 3.3.1


**RELEVANT INCLUSION DATABASE FIELDS**

1. [sense specific to Cumbrian?]
2. [headword present in EDD?]
3. [headword present in EDD?]
4. [notes on grammar], [notes on etymology], [notes on definition]

*Fig. 11: Criteria for inclusion data gathering process for EDD Online and their relevant fields in the database.*

**3.2.1.1.2 EDD Inclusion: Data Collection**

Data was gathered using the following method. First, *Traditional* and *Contemporary* Cumbrian dialect [headword]s were sourced from the researcher’s reading programme. [Headword]s were only included as database entries if they appeared within transparent usage examples, which were recorded simultaneously in section 6 of the database (*cf.* appendix ii). For the purposes of this investigation, compounded dialect words are ignored.

[Headword]s were then searched in EDD Online. The relevant EDD entry was checked against the list of criteria in *fig. 11*, and the findings were recorded in their relevant database fields. The following sequence of figures provides an example of the process. The processes covered here are identical for both the *Traditional* and *Contemporary* Cumbrian time-periods to comply with both of this investigation’s research questions (*cf.* section 3.1).
3.2.1.1.3 EDD Inclusion: Data Collection Breakdown

1. [Headword] sourced from the researcher’s reading programme:

Bit, loavins me! it’s nut ya thing—it’s ivverything. When I was young, yan mud ha’ gitten a bit o’ Skiddaw grey cleàth for a cwoat; or a bit o’ good heàmm meàdd linn for a sark ’at wad ha’ worn fower or five year, an’ nivver ha’ hed a wholl in’t; bit noo, yan ’ill be varra lucky if yan gits owder a cwoat or a sark to keep heàll for three or fower week.

Fig. 12: Extract from Richardson (1871: 47) with the usage example for “sark, n.” (meaning “shirt, chemise”) bordered in red.

2. [Headword] and [usage example] entered into their relevant fields in the database:

Fig. 13: “Sark,” listed under its own entry in the database, with Richardson’s (1871: 47) usage example recorded in section 6 of the database.
3. Secondary data gathered for [headword] gathered from EDD Online:

Fig. 14: The EDD Online entry for “sark, sb.1” (meaning “shirt, chemise”), listed in the EDD with a usage example bearing the Cum. dialect marker, as illustrated by the red annotation. The EDD sense for “sark, sb.1” (not “sark, sb.2”) matches that of the usage example provided by Richardson (1871: 47), making it suitable for analysis.

4. Secondary data, sourced from the relevant EDD entry, entered into the database:

Fig. 15: The [headword present in EDD?] and [sense specific to Cumbrian?] fields marked as “Yes” in the database, marking their compliance with the first and second criteria of fig. 11. If the EDD does not recognise [headword], the [headword present in EDD?] field is marked as “No.” If the relevant EDD entry does not bear a usage example with the Cum. dialect marker, the [sense specific to Cumbrian?] field is marked as “No.” Wherever required, the [headword] spellings are identical between the Traditional and Contemporary sheets to aid searching.
3.2.1.2 OED Online

3.2.1.2.1 OED Inclusion Criteria
As stated in section 3.1, the OED is used by this investigation as the authority against which the EDD can be assessed. The OED's inclusion criteria are loosely based on Beal's (2010b: 43) study but, due to the OED's lack of distinct dialect area classification, its criteria are simplified to the following:

**OED INCLUSION CRITERIA**

1. How many words from the reading programme are in the OED?
2. How many words from the reading programme are not in the OED?

**RELEVANT INCLUSION DATABASE FIELDS**

1. [headword present in OED?]
2. [headword present in OED?]

*Fig. 16: Criteria for inclusion data gathering process for OED Online and their relevant fields in the database.*

3.2.1.2.2 OED Inclusion: Data Collection

Traditional and Contemporary Cumbrian dialect [headword]s were sourced using the same method outlined in section 3.2.1.1.2. Once the secondary data from the EDD was collected, the relevant OED entry for [headword] was checked against the list of criteria in *fig. 16* and the findings were recorded in the relevant database field. The following sequence of figures provides an example of the process. The processes covered here are identical for both the Traditional and Contemporary Cumbrian time-periods to comply with both of this investigation’s research questions (*cf. section 3.1).*
3.2.1.2.3 OED Inclusion: Data Collection Breakdown

1. Secondary data gathered for [headword] gathered from OED Online:

![Image](sark_n.png)

Fig. 17: The OED Online entry for “sark, n.”, meaning “shirt, chemise” (OED Online: “sark, n.”).

2. Secondary data, sourced from the relevant OED entry, entered into the database:

![Image](database_entry.png)

Fig. 18: The noun “sark” is entered into the database with the [headword present in OED?] field marked “Yes.” If the OED does not bear an entry with a sense matching that of the [headword]'s appearance in a usage example from the researcher’s primary data, the field is marked “No.”
3.2.1.3 *Inclusion: Hypotheses*

3.2.1.3.1 Research Question 1: EDD Comprehensiveness to *Traditional* Cumbrian

The researcher expects the EDD to prove more comprehensive than the OED for *Traditional* Cumbrian, as the *Traditional* time-period coincides with the EDD’s research period (Wright 1898: v). In the *inclusion* parameter therefore, he expects to find most *Traditional* [headword]s with “Yes” in the [headword present in EDD?] field and “Yes” in the [sense specific to Cumbrian?] field. This would indicate that the EDD recognises most of this investigation’s *Traditional* Cumbrian [headword]s and assigns them to their appropriate dialect marker, demonstrating the EDD’s relative comprehensiveness for the *inclusion* of Cumbrian dialect words from its own period.

3.2.1.3.2 Research Question 2: EDD Usefulness to *Contemporary* Cumbrian

The researcher expects the EDD to perform worse or equal to the OED for its usefulness to *Contemporary* Cumbrian. As recognised by Mugglestone (2011: 90), a dictionary must “engage with current evidence” to remain authoritative for its language. Because the EDD is a synchronic dictionary (Penhallurick 2009: 312), and due to the speed with which the dialects of English can change\(^{11}\), the researcher expects to find fewer *Contemporary* [headword]s with “Yes” in either the [headword present in EDD?] or the [sense specific to Cumbrian?] fields. This would indicate the EDD’s limited benefit to the study of *Contemporary* Cumbrian.

\(^{11}\) Smith et al. (2011: 220) recognised a noticeable change across a period no longer than a generation in the dialect of Lerwick, Shetland.
3.2.2 GRAMMAR

This parameter considers the EDD’s treatment of grammar in comparison to the OED. The first research question will be addressed by testing the EDD’s grammatical comprehensiveness against the OED for Traditional Cumbrian. The second research question will be addressed by comparing the EDD’s grammatical usefulness against the OED for Contemporary Cumbrian. In addition, the accuracy of the EDD’s grammatical classifications will be tested against this investigation’s primary data.

3.2.2.1 EDD Online

3.2.2.1.1 EDD Grammar Criteria

The following criteria outline the secondary data collection process for the Traditional and Contemporary Cumbrian grammar parameter. These are again a modified version of Beal’s (2010b: 43) criteria, edited to suit grammatical investigation. For the second grammar criterium listed in fig. 19, cross-reference with the OED’s second grammar criterium is necessary (cf. section 3.2.2.2.1, fig. 25).

EDD GRAMMAR CRITERIA

1. What is [headword]s grammatical category in the EDD?
2. Does the EDD’s grammatical category for [headword] match that of the OED (if present)?
3. Is the EDD’s grammatical category for [headword] more accurate than the OED in [usage example 1–5]?
4. Can we explain why/why not?

RELEVANT GRAMMAR DATABASE FIELDS

1. [grammatical category: EDD]
2. [relationship1]
3. [grammar most accurate to usage examples]
4. [notes on grammar]

Fig. 19: Criteria for grammar data gathering process for EDD Online and their relevant fields in the database.

3.2.2.1.2 EDD Grammar: Data Collection

The Traditional and Contemporary Cumbrian [headword]s gathered for the inclusion parameter (cf. section 3.2.1.1) were used to gather data for the grammar parameter. Once the inclusion data was collected, the relevant EDD grammatical categories for each [headword] were recorded in the [grammatical category: EDD] field (wherever possible). Once the relevant OED
grammatical categories were also recorded (cf. section 3.2.2.2), the coding in the [relationship1] field determined their similarity. The [grammar most accurate to usage examples] field marked the dictionary whose categorisation most accurately matched the appearance of [headword] in this study's primary data.

Finally, the [notes on grammar] field was used to explain peculiar grammatical relationships. Also, this field provided space to record relevant grammatical information should neither dictionary prove beneficial. The processes covered here are identical for both the Traditional and Contemporary Cumbrian time-periods to comply with both of this investigation’s research questions (cf. section 3.1).

3.2.2.1.3EDD Grammar: Data Collection Breakdown

1. Grammatical category for [headword] sourced from the EDD:

![EDD Online Classifies Sark as Substantive](image)

*Fig. 20: The EDD Online classifies the [headword] “sark” as a substantive (meaning “noun” – OED Online: “substantive, adj. and n.”, EDD Online: “sark, sb.1”).*
2. EDD grammatical category for [headword] entered into the database:

Fig. 21: “Noun” is selected from the drop-down-box in the [grammatical category: EDD] field.

3. The [relationship1] field determines the similarity between the EDD and OED grammars:

Fig. 22: The [relationship1] field contains an =IF function which determines the relationship between the [grammatical category: EDD] and [grammatical category: OED] fields (cf. appendix ii. and section 4.2.2.1). In this instance, both grammatical categories are the same, so the field reads “Match.”

4. The [grammar most accurate to usage examples] field is completed:
Fig. 23: The [grammar most accurate to usage examples] field signals the dictionary which provides the most accurate grammatical classification for [headword]'s appearance in [usage example 1–5] (cf. appendix ii). In this instance, both dictionaries are equally correct, so the field reads “N/A.”

5. If necessary, explanations for mismatched grammatical categories are provided:

![Diagram of OED Online tool](image)

Fig. 24: Should [grammatical category: EDD] and [grammatical category: OED] not match, and the researcher can find a reasonable explanation why, the findings will be entered here.

### 3.2.2.2 OED Online

#### 3.2.2.2.1 OED Grammar Criteria

As stated in section 3.1, the OED is used by this investigation as the authority against which the EDD can be assessed. The OED's grammar criteria are also modification of Beal's (2010b: 43) criteria, following the same pattern as the EDD's grammar criteria (cf. section 3.2.2.1.1). For the second grammar criterium listed in fig. 25, cross-reference with the OED's second grammar criterium is necessary (cf. section 3.2.2.1.1, fig. 19).

**OED Grammar Criteria**

1. What is [headword]'s grammatical category in the OED?
2. Does the OED’s grammatical category for [headword] match that of the EDD (if present)?
3. Is the OED’s grammatical category for [headword] more accurate than the EDD in [usage example 1–5]?
4. Can we explain why/why not?

**Relevant Grammar Database Fields**

1. [grammatical category: OED]
2. [relationship1]
3. [grammar most accurate to usage examples]
4. [notes on grammar]

Fig. 25: Criteria for grammar data gathering process for OED Online and their relevant fields in the database.
3.2.2.2 OED Grammar: Data Collection

The relevant OED grammatical categories for each [headword] were recorded in the [grammatical category: OED] field (wherever possible). Data collection methods for all other fields outlined in fig. 25 are identical to those explained in section 3.2.2.1.2. The following sequence of figures provides an example of the grammar data collection process. The processes covered here are identical for both the Traditional and Contemporary Cumbrian time-periods to comply with both of this investigation’s research questions (cf. section 3.1).

3.2.2.3 OED Grammar: Data Collection Breakdown

1. Grammatical category for [headword] sourced from the OED:

![](image)

Fig. 26: The OED Online classifies “sark” as a noun (OED Online: “sark, n.”)
2. OED grammatical category for [headword] entered into the database:

![Image](image.png)

*Fig. 27:* "Noun" is selected from the drop-down-box in the [grammatical category: OED] field.

3. The [relationship1] field determines the similarity between the OED and EDD grammars (cf. section 3.2.2.1.3).

4. The [grammar most accurate to usage examples] field is completed (cf. section 3.2.2.1.3).

5. If necessary, explanations for mismatched grammatical categories are provided (cf. section 3.2.2.1.3).

### 3.2.2.3 Grammar: Hypotheses

#### 3.2.2.3.1 Research Question 1: EDD Comprehensiveness to Traditional Cumbrian

The researcher expects the EDD’s coverage of *Traditional Cumbrian grammar* to be more comprehensive than the OED. The EDD markets itself as “the complete vocabulary of English dialect words” (Wright 1898: v); as such, it should list and categorise both frequent and uncommon *Traditional Cumbrian* dialect words. The OED, which neither claims to be, nor acts as a “complete vocabulary” of English dialect words (Bailey 2009: 301), is likely to perform poorer.

Therefore, the researcher expects the [relationship1] field to return a high volume of "Match" values, demonstrating the EDD's grammatical accuracy for the [headword]s recognised by both dictionaries. He also expects that the [grammar most accurate to usage examples] field will provide mainly “EDD” or "N/A" values for *Traditional* [headword]s, indicating the EDD's increased comprehensiveness and grammatical accuracy in comparison to the OED.
3.2.2.3.2 Research Question 2: EDD Usefulness to Contemporary Cumbrian

The researcher expects the EDD to prove less useful than the OED for the study of Contemporary Cumbrian grammar, due to the issues mentioned in section 3.2.1.3.2. Contemporary Cumbrian dialect words are likely to have gained or lost grammatical categories since the Traditional time-period due to the influence of neighbouring dialects and of Standard English (Smith et al. 2011: 206–8). As the EDD is a synchronic dictionary, it could not possibly record these changes.

As a result, the researcher expects the [relationship1] filed to return more “No EDD Entry” values for Contemporary Cumbrian than it does for Traditional Cumbrian. He also expects the [grammar most accurate to usage examples] field to provide more “OED” values for Contemporary Cumbrian, demonstrating the EDD’s difficulty to engage with Contemporary Cumbrian literature and its limitations for the study of Contemporary Cumbrian grammar.

3.2.3 ETYMOLOGY

This parameter considers the EDD’s treatment of etymology in comparison to the OED. The first research question will be addressed by testing the EDD’s etymological comprehensiveness against the OED for Traditional Cumbrian. The second research question will be addressed by comparing the EDD’s etymological usefulness against the OED for Contemporary Cumbrian. In both instances, the EDD’s key language contributor will be evaluated against the OED.

3.2.3.1 EDD Online

3.2.3.1.1 EDD Etymology Criteria

The following criteria outline the secondary data collection process for the Traditional and Contemporary Cumbrian EDD etymology parameter. For the third etymology criterium listed in fig. 28, cross-reference with the OED’s third etymology criterium is necessary (cf. section 3.2.3.2.1, fig. 34).
EDD ETYMOLOGY CRITERIA

1. What is [headword]'s key language contributor in the EDD?
2. What is the EDD's complete etymology for [headword]?
3. Does the EDD's key language contributor match that of the OED?
4. If not, can we explain why?

RELEVANT ETYMOLOGY DATABASE FIELDS

1. [etymological root: EDD]
2. [etymology: EDD]
3. [relationship2]
4. [notes on etymology]

Fig. 28: Criteria for etymology data gathering process for EDD Online and their relevant fields in the database.

3.2.3.1.2 EDD Etymology: Data Collection

The Traditional and Contemporary Cumbrian [headword]s gathered for the inclusion parameter (cf. section 3.2.1.1) were used to gather secondary data for the etymology parameter. Once the inclusion data was collected, the relevant EDD etymologies for each [headword] were recorded in the [etymological root: EDD] field. The complete EDD etymology for [headword] (wherever present) was recorded in the [etymology: EDD] field for ease of reference. Once the relevant OED etymology was also recorded (cf. section 3.2.3.2), the coding the [relationship2] field determined their similarity.

Finally, the [notes on etymology] field was used to explain peculiar etymological relationships. Also, this field provided space to recorded relevant etymological information should neither dictionary prove beneficial. The processes covered here are identical for both the Traditional and Contemporary Cumbrian time-periods to comply with both of this investigation's research questions (cf. section 3.1).
3.2.3.1.3 EDD Etymology: Data Collection Breakdown

1. Etymology for [headword] sourced from the EDD:

![EDD Online etymology for "sark, sb.1"](image)

**Fig. 29:** The EDD Online etymology for “sark, sb.1” (EDD Online: “sark, sb.1”).

2. EDD key language contributor for [headword] entered into database:

![EDD key language contributors](image)

**Fig. 30:** The EDD Online etymology for “sark, sb.1” listed Old English and Old Norse as joint key language contributors. Therefore, “OE/ON” is entered in the [etymological root: EDD] field of the database.
3. Complete EDD etymology for [headword] entered into database:

Fig. 31: The [etymology: EDD] field provides space for the full EDD entry to be pasted for ease of reference.

4. The [relationship2] field determines the similarity between the EDD and OED etymologies:

Fig. 32: The [relationship2] field contains an =IF function which determines the relationship between the [etymological root: EDD] and [etymological root: OED] fields (cf. appendix ii). In this instance, the two key language contributors differ, so the field reads “Do Not Match.”

5. If necessary (and reasonable), explanations for mismatched etymologies are provided:
Fig. 33: Should [etymological root: EDD] and [etymological root: OED] not match, and the researcher can find a reasonable explanation why, the findings will be entered here. Where neither dictionary provides an etymology, relevant etymological information will be offered here also.

3.2.3.2 OED Online

3.2.3.2.1 OED Etymology Criteria
As stated in section 3.1, the OED is used by this investigation as the authority against which the EDD can be assessed. The following criteria outline the secondary data collection process for the Traditional and Contemporary Cumbrian OED etymology parameter. For the third etymology criterium listed in fig. 34, cross-reference with the EDD’s third etymology criterium is necessary (cf. section 3.2.3.1.1, fig. 28).

**OED ETYMOLOGY CRITERIA**

1. What is [headword]'s key language contributor in the OED?
2. What is the OED’s complete etymology for [headword]?
3. Does the OED’s key language contributor match that of the EDD?
4. If not, can we explain why?

**RELEVANT ETYMOLOGY DATABASE FIELDS**

1. [etymological root: OED]
2. [etymology: OED]
3. [relationship2]
4. [notes on etymology]

Fig. 34: Criteria for etymology data gathering process for OED Online and their relevant fields in the database.

3.2.3.2.2 OED Etymology: Data Collection
The relevant OED key language contributors for each [headword] were recorded in the [etymological root: OED] field. The complete OED etymology for [headword] is included in the etymology: OED] field for ease of reference. Data collection methods for all other fields outlined in fig. 34 are identical to those explained in section 3.2.3.1.2. The following sequence of figures provides an example of the etymology data collection process. The processes covered here are identical for both the Traditional and Contemporary Cumbrian time-periods to comply with both of this investigation’s research questions (cf. section 3.1).
3.2.3.2.3 OED Etymology: Data Collection Breakdown

1. Etymology for [headword] sourced from the OED:

![OED etymology for "sark, n." from the OED Online.](image1)

*Fig. 35: The OED Online etymology for “sark, n.” (OED Online: “sark, n.”).*

2. OED key language contributor for [headword] entered into database:

![OED etymology for "sark, n." listed as deriving from Germanic.] (image2)

*Fig. 36: The OED Online etymology for “sark, n.” listed the word as deriving from Germanic. Therefore, “Germanic” is entered in the [etymological root: OED] field of the database.*

3. Complete OED etymology for [headword] entered into database:

![OED etymology for "sark, n." fully entered into database.](image3)

*Fig. 37: The [etymology: OED] field provides space for the full OED entry to be pasted for ease of reference.*
4. The [relationship2] field determines the similarity between the OED and EDD etymologies (cf. section 3.2.3.1.2).

5. If necessary (and reasonable), explanations for mismatched etymologies are provided (cf. section 3.2.3.1.2).

3.2.3.3 Etymology: Hypotheses

3.2.3.3.1 Research Question 1 and Research Question 2: EDD Comprehensiveness to Traditional Cumbrian and EDD Usefulness to Contemporary Cumbrian

Due to the amount of overlap between Traditional and Contemporary Cumbrian etymology, the researcher finds it clearer to assess both research questions for the etymology parameter under the same hypothesis. As recognised by Upton (2016: 382) Wright treated etymology with serious caution. His etymologies take two forms; Wright either chose to accept the work of renowned 19th Century etymologists as authoritative or, where no clear etymology could be found, he omitted the etymology completely rather than conducting his own research.

As such, the researcher expects to find gaps in Wright's account of Cumbrian dialect etymology. In his data, he expects the [relationship2] field to return more “Do Not Match” than “Match” values, demonstrating the EDD’s poor comprehensiveness and poor usefulness to the study of Traditional and Contemporary Cumbrian etymology in comparison to the OED.
3.2.4 DEFINITION

This parameter considers the EDD’s treatment of definition in comparison to the OED. The first research question will be addressed by testing the comprehensiveness of the EDD’s definitions against the OED for Traditional Cumbrian. The second research question will be address by comparing the usefulness of the EDD’s definition against the OED for Contemporary Cumbrian. In addition, the accuracy of the EDD’s definitions will be tested against this investigation’s primary data.

3.2.4.1 EDD Online

3.2.4.1.1 EDD Definition Criteria

The following criteria outline the secondary data collection process for the Traditional and Contemporary Cumbrian EDD definition parameter. For the third and fourth definition criteria listed in fig. 38, cross-reference with the OED’s second and third definition criteria is necessary (cf. section 3.2.4.2.1, fig. 45).

EDD DEFINITION CRITERIA

1. What is [headword]’s definition in the EDD?
2. Does the EDD provide a satisfactory definition for [headword]?
3. Is the EDD’s definition more accurate than the OED’s for [headword]’s appearance in [usage example 1–5]?
4. Does the EDD’s definition match that of the OED?
5. Can we explain why/why not?

RELEVANT DEFINITION DATABASE FIELDS

1. [definition: EDD]
2. [relationship3]
3. [definition most accurate to usage examples]
4. [synonymous definitions?]
5. [notes on definition]

Fig. 38: Criteria for definition data gathering process for EDD Online and their relevant fields in the database.

3.2.4.1.2 EDD Definition: Data Collection

The Traditional and Contemporary Cumbrian [headword]s gathered for the inclusion parameter (cf. section 3.2.1.1) were used to gather data for the definition parameter. Once the inclusion data was collected, the relevant EDD definitions for each [headword] were recorded in the [definition: EDD] field (wherever possible). Once the relevant OED data was also recorded (cf.
section 3.2.4.2), the coding in the [relationship3] field marked their affiliation\textsuperscript{12}. The [definition most accurate to usage examples] field marked the dictionary whose definition best defined [headword]'s appearance in this study's primary data.

Coding could not be used in the [synonymous definitions?] field, as the software used could only recognise the similarity between text fields which are identical. As the EDD and OED definitions for this investigation's [headword]s are seldom perfectly matched, the [synonymous definitions?] field was completed manually.

Finally, the [notes on definition] field was used to explain unusual relationships between EDD and OED definitions. Also, this field provided space to recorded relevant defining information should neither dictionary prove beneficial. The processes covered here are identical for both the Traditional and Contemporary Cumbrian time-periods to comply with both of this investigation's research questions (cf. section 3.1).

\textsuperscript{12} In this instance the [relationship3] field determines the existence of EDD and OED definitions rather than their similarity, as is the case for the [relationship1] and [relationship2] fields (cf. section 3.2.2.1.2 and 3.2.3.1.2 respectively). As such, the noun “affiliation” rather than “similarity” is used.
3.2.4.1.3 EDD Definition: Data Collection Breakdown

1. Definition for [headword] sourced from EDD Online:

![EDD Online Definition Screen]

*Fig. 39: The EDD Online definition for “sark, sb.1” (EDD Online: “sark, sb.1”).*

2. EDD definition for [headword] entered into the database:

![EDD Database Definition Screen]

*Fig. 40: The EDD Online definition for “sark, sb.1” entered into the database in the [definition: EDD] field.*
3. The [relationship3] field determines the affiliation between the EDD and OED definitions:

Fig. 41: Unlike the [relationship1] and [relationship2] fields, the [relationship3] field determines the existence of data in the EDD and OED. The field contains an =IF function which recognises the presence of data in the [definition: EDD] and [definition: OED] fields, returning one of five values based on their contents (cf. appendix ii). In this instance, both dictionaries provide useful definitions, so the [relationship3] field reads “EDD and OED Definition.”

4. The [definition most accurate to usage examples] field is completed:

Fig. 42: As the field name suggests, the [definition most accurate to usage examples] field signals the dictionary which provides the most accurate definition for [headword]’s appearance in [usage example 1–5] (cf. appendix ii). In this instance, both dictionaries from equally valid definitions, so the field reads “N/A.” Should the EDD definition better describe [headword] appearance in [usage example 1–5], the field would read “EDD.”
5. The [synonymous definitions?] field is completed:

![Fig. 43](image)

*Fig. 43:* The software used by this investigation is not powerful enough to determine the definition synonymy. As such, the [definition: EDD] and [definition: OED] fields are manually checked against each other by the researcher, with the findings recorded in the [synonymous definitions?] field. In this instance, the EDD and OED definitions are synonymous, so the [synonymous definitions?] field is marked “Yes.”

6. Explanations for mismatched definitions are researched and recorded:

![Fig. 44](image)

*Fig. 44:* Should the [definition: EDD] field bear an unsatisfactory definition or the [synonymous definitions?] field be marked as “No”, and the researcher can find a reasonable explanation why, the findings will be entered here. Where neither dictionary provides a definition, relevant defining information will be offered here also.

### 3.2.4.2 OED Online

#### 3.2.4.2.1 OED Definition Criteria

Again, the OED is used here as the authority against which the EDD can be assessed (*cf.* section 3.1). The following criteria outline the secondary data collection process for the *Traditional* and *Contemporary Cumbrian OED definition* parameter. For the third *definition* criterium listed in *fig. 45*, cross-reference with the EDD’s fourth *definition* criterium is necessary (*cf.* section 3.2.4.1.1, *fig. 38*).
OED DEFINITION CRITERIA

1. What is [headword]'s definition in the OED (if present)?
2. Is the OED’s definition more accurate than the EDD’s for [headword]'s appearance in [usage example 1–5]?
3. Does the OED’s definition match that of the EDD?
4. Can we explain why/why not?

RELEVANT DEFINITION DATABASE FIELDS

1. [definition: OED] and [relationship3]
2. [definition most accurate to usage examples]
3. [synonymous definitions?]
4. [notes on definition]

Fig. 45: Criteria for definition data gathering process for OED Online and their relevant fields in the database.

3.2.4.2.2 OED Definition: Data Collection

The relevant OED definitions for each [headword] were recorded in the [definition: OED] field (wherever possible). Data collection methods for all other fields outlined in fig. 45 are identical to those explained in section 3.2.4.1.2. The following sequence of figures provides an example of the definition data collection process. The processes covered here are identical for both the Traditional and Contemporary Cumbrian time-periods to comply with both of this investigation’s research questions (cf. section 3.1).
3.2.4.2.3 OED Definition: Data Collection Breakdown

1. Definition for [headword] sourced from OED Online:

![sark, n.](image)

Fig. 46: The OED Online definition for “sark, n.” (OED Online: “sark, n.”)

2. OED definition for [headword] entered into the database:

![sark, n.](image)

Fig. 47: The OED Online definition for “sark, n.” entered into the database.

3. The [relationship3] field determines the affiliation between the EDD and OED definitions (cf. section 4.4.1.3).

4. The [definition most accurate to usage examples] field is completed (cf. section 4.4.1.3).

5. The [synonymous definitions?] field is completed (cf. section 4.4.1.3).
6. Explanations for mismatched definitions are researched and recorded (cf. section 4.4.1.3).

3.2.4.3 **Definition: Hypotheses**

3.2.4.3.1 Research Question 1: EDD Comprehensiveness to Traditional Cumbrian

The researcher expects the EDD's coverage of *Traditional Cumbrian definition* to be more comprehensive than the OED, as the EDD places itself as the authority on English dialect lexis (Wright 1898: v). In addition, the EDD's research period coincides with that of this investigation's *Traditional* time-period.

Therefore, the researcher expects the [relationship3] field to return more “EDD Definition Only” than “OED Definition Only” values, demonstrating the EDD's comprehensiveness in *definition* and its ability to define more Cumbrian dialect lexis than the OED. Also, he expects to find more “EDD” than “OED” values in the [definition most accurate to usage examples] field, indicating the EDD's increased accuracy in *definition* than the OED in practical application.

3.2.4.3.2 Research Question 2: EDD Usefulness to Contemporary Cumbrian

The researcher expects the EDD to prove less useful than the OED for the study of *Contemporary Cumbrian definition*. As discussed in section 3.2.1.3.2, the Cumbrian dialect is likely to have changed between the *Traditional* and *Contemporary* time-periods, so the definitions listed by the EDD may now be either obsolete or unhelpful. In addition, new Cumbrian dialect lexis may have been coined after the publication of the EDD’s final volume, which the EDD is unable to recognise and define.

Therefore, the researcher hypothesises that more “OED Definition Only” than “EDD Definition Only” values will be returned by the [relationship3] field, demonstrating the EDD's limit of usefulness to the study of *Contemporary Cumbrian definition*. Also, he expects to find more “OED” than “EDD” values in the [definition most accurate to usage examples] field, indicating the EDD's decreased accuracy in comparison to the OED and the necessity for the EDD's revision.
3.3 DATA
3.3.1 PRIMARY DATA

Primary data was sourced from the researcher's own reading programme of twelve Cumbrian dialect authors in ten texts\(^{13}\). The works of these authors were organised by publication date into the two time-periods of Traditional and Contemporary Cumbrian to best represent the two research questions of this investigation (cf. section 3.1). Traditional Cumbrian dialect literature must have a publication date between 1700 and 1898, whilst Contemporary Cumbrian texts must be published between 1950 and the present day. These two categories were then subdivided according to genre, with each category providing an equal amount of poetry and prose. Four data sets in total were analysed. A simplified diagram of this study's primary data is provided by fig. 48. For a more detailed analysis, see sections 3.3.1.1 and 3.3.1.2.

**BREAKDOWN OF PRIMARY DATA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIMPLIFIED OUTLINE:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research Question 1: Traditional Cumbrian (1700–1898)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Poetry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Question 2: Contemporary Cumbrian (1950–present)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Poetry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prose</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fig. 48: Simplified summary of primary data and its relation to this study's research questions.*

Each author provided twenty pages of material, from which the researcher drew a selection of Cumbrian dialect lemmas. Due to the limited amount of primary data and the limited research period of this investigation, a regimented approach to data collection, such as the systematic principles by which the OED gathers its usage data (Hawke 2016: 178), would be unsuitable. Instead, the researcher chose his sample randomly, with his only criteria being that the selected lemma was embedded in a transparent usage example.

\(^{13}\) The small number of primary texts referenced is due to this study's limited research period. The researcher originally wished to include spoken Cumbrian and examples of Cumbrian in Traditional and Contemporary periodicals, but the task of sourcing and analysing the data proved too great for a twelve-month project.
Each lemma was then recorded in a dictionary-like database, with the lemma listed under the [headword] field and its relevant quotation evidence listed in the [usage example] field (cf. section 3.2.1 and appendix ii.). Complementary secondary data from the EDD and OED was also gathered to complete the entry (cf. section 3.2).

3.3.1.1 Traditional Cumbrian (1700–1898)

This time-period was selected to provide a sample of Cumbrian dialect literature like that which Wright used during the compilation of the EDD, thereby providing the best data to assess this study’s first research question (cf. section 3.1). The sample was divided into two genres, with three authors providing examples of Traditional Cumbrian poetry, and three providing examples of Traditional Cumbrian prose.

3.3.1.1.1 Reading Programme: Traditional Cumbrian Poetry

Due to the scarcity of 18th and 19th Century Cumbrian dialect literature (cf. section 2.1, fig. 8), all Traditional Cumbrian poetry was sourced from Gilpin’s (1866) Songs and Ballads of Cumberland. His work is an anthology “exclusively concerned with Cumbrian dialect literature,” which covers a wide range of authors from the early 18th century to the mid-19th century (Gilpin 1866: iii). Its usefulness is key, as it provides an easy route to older Cumbrian literature which conveniently side-steps the logistical issues of gathering data from Special Collections texts. Gilpin (1866) was also cited heavily by Wright during the compilation of the EDD, contributing usage examples to 266 headwords14, indicating Wright’s trust in his reliable transmission of Cumbrian poetry.

The works of the first three authors listed in Gilpin (1866) were chosen to represent the Traditional Cumbrian poetry sample. These authors and their respective works, with their relevant citations from Gilpin (1866), are listed as follows:

---

14 Figure found by performing a wildcard search of EDD Online, with Gilpin (1866) selected as the only usage example source.
**Author 1: Rev. Joseph Relph (1712–1743)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POEM</th>
<th>CITATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bonny Smirkin’ Sally</td>
<td>(Gilpin 1866: 6–7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s Wrang Indeed Now, Jenny</td>
<td>(Gilpin 1866: 7–8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When Jockey First to Jenny Spoke</td>
<td>(Gilpin 1866: 8–9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Morn in Cheerful May</td>
<td>(Gilpin 1866: 9–10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Come, Dear Nelly, Come Away</td>
<td>(Gilpin 1866: 10–12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell Me, Fair One</td>
<td>(Gilpin 1866: 12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See, How the Wine Blushes</td>
<td>(Gilpin 1866: 13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a Young Lady Who Took It Ill to Have Me Called Her Lover</td>
<td>(Gilpin 1866: 13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Female Charms, I Own My Fair</td>
<td>(Gilpin 1866: 14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What Charms has Fair Chloe</td>
<td>(Gilpin 1866: 14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Age Those Beauties Will Impair</td>
<td>(Gilpin 1866: 15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False or True</td>
<td>(Gilpin 1866: 15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvest; or the Bashful Shepherd</td>
<td>(Gilpin 1866: 16–19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hay-Time; or the Constant Lovers</td>
<td>(Gilpin 1866: 19–23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Agnes Fast; or the Amorous Maiden</td>
<td>(Gilpin 1866: 23–25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Snaw Has Left the Fells</td>
<td>(Gilpin 1866: 25–26)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Author 2: Susanna Blamire (1747–1794)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POEM</th>
<th>CITATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Toiling Day His Task Has Duin</td>
<td>(Gilpin 1866: 49–50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barley Broth</td>
<td>(Gilpin 1866: 50–51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wey, Ned, Man!</td>
<td>(Gilpin 1866: 51–53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poem</td>
<td>Citation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auld Robin Forbes</td>
<td>(Gilpin 1866: 53–54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Meeting</td>
<td>(Gilpin 1866: 55–56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We’ve Hed Sec a Durdum</td>
<td>(Gilpin 1866: 56–57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Traveller's Return</td>
<td>(Gilpin 1866: 66–68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Soldier's Return</td>
<td>(Gilpin 1866: 68–71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And Ye Shall Walk in Silk Attire</td>
<td>(Gilpin 1866: 71–72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Jenny Dear, I've Courted Lang</td>
<td>(Gilpin 1866: 72–74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Waefu’ Heart</td>
<td>(Gilpin 1866: 74–75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m Tibby Fowler o’ the Glen</td>
<td>(Gilpin 1866: 75–76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What Ails This Heart o’ Mine</td>
<td>(Gilpin 1866: 77–78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’ve Gotten a Rock, I’ve Gotten a Reel</td>
<td>(Gilpin 1866: 78)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Author 3: John Stagg (1770–1823)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poem</th>
<th>Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Bridewain</td>
<td>(Gilpin 1866: 192–207)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A New Year’s Epistle</td>
<td>(Gilpin 1866: 207–212)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. 49:** The Traditional Cumbrian poetry sample.

3.3.1.1.2 **Reading Programme: Traditional Cumbrian Prose**

Traditional Cumbrian prose proved less troublesome to source. The works of several dialect authors such as Ritson (1849), Richardson (1871) and Greenup (1873) feature as free-use digital resources on Google Books ©. Gibson (1869) was sourced from the similar online platform, Internet Archive ©. From this selection, only Gibson (1869) and Richardson (1871) contained sufficient material for analysis, which necessitated the researcher to source the remainder of his data set from physical records at Carlisle Library. Graciously, the library's
Local Historian granted this study access to their archived dialect literature, from which Farrall [Wilson] (1929) was selected.

Gibson (1869), Richardson (1871) and Farrall [Wilson] (1929) were chosen to represent the *Traditional Cumbrian prose* sample. These authors and their respective works, with their relevant citations, are listed as follows:

| **Author 1:** Alexander Craig Gibson (1869) – *The Folk-Speech of Cumberland* |
| **PROSE:** (Short Story/Tale) | **CITATION** |
| Joe and the Geologist | (Gibson 1869: 1–6) |
| T’ Reets On’t | (Gibson 1869: 7–16) |
| Bobby Banks’ Bodderment | (Gibson 1869: 17–20) |

| **Author 2:** John Richardson (1871) – "Cummerland Talk" |
| **PROSE:** (Short Story/Tale) | **CITATION** |
| T’ Barrin’ Oot | (Richardson 1871: 20–25) |
| Willie Cooband an’ His Lawsuit | (Richardson 1871: 34–37) |
| Auld Fwok an’ Auld Times | (Richardson 1871: 45–50) |
| Jemmy Stubbs’ Grunstane | (Richardson 1871: 60–64) |
| Auld Willie Boonass Fwok an’ t’ Hare | (Richardson 1871: 79–81) |

| **Author 3:** Betty Wilson (1892) [Farrall 1929] – *Betty Wilson’s Cummerland Teàls* |
| **PROSE:** (Short Story/Tale) | **CITATION** |
| Tea Cosy | (Farrall 1929: 1–4) |
| Black Pheasants | (Farrall 1929: 5–9) |
| An Evening Spent with an Old Friend | (Farrall 1929: 10–16) |
3.3.1.2 Contemporary Cumbrian (1950–present day)

This time-period was selected due to the availability of reliable Cumbrian dialect literature. Originally, the time-period for the Contemporary sample was limited to texts produced within the last twenty years (i.e. no earlier than 1997). Unfortunately, the number of unmolested dialect texts were sparse; as recognised by Wright (1979: 74) the modern Cumbrian dialect is experiencing a process of “exaggeration” in which dialect forms are incorrectly applied in literature in a bid to “resurrect” the language.

This process of “revitalisation” also occurred in Scotland during the twentieth Century, with the invention of synthetic Scots, defined by Adams (2011: 266) as a “literary ‘dialect’ based on but not identical to the natural Lowland Scots dialect.” The language’s inventor, Hugh MacDiarmid, often “manipulated” the meanings of existing Scots words in poetry, sometimes contradicting the authoritative meaning provided by Jamieson’s (1808) dictionary (Tulloch 1997: 411).

Canfield’s (2009) Cumbrian poetry follows a similar pattern. Like MacDiarmid for Scots, her presentation of the Cumbrian dialect is “manipulated;” a fact she consciously admits in the preface to her Few Laal Tyals:

“Perhaps some people might disagree with my words and pronunciations contained in this book, but this is how I remember it.

All these stories are based on actual happenings in my life, or friends’. Some names have been changed to protect the innocent. Some facts and words have been changed to make it easier to rhyme!

I admit to poetic licence.”

(Canfield 2009: i, my bold)

Canfield’s lexis and their implied pronunciations are unconventional, and she has manipulated the spellings of dialect words to alleviate her task as a poet, as fig. 51 demonstrates. Her manipulation has led to inaccuracies, which alienates the experienced reader of Cumbrian dialect literature. Consult the following example:
"We aw got sticks an' med a line, an' pushed 'er oop tu t'gyatt. She bellered an' she snorted, but she knew she'd met 'er fate. So finally she waddled into t'field, an' seen sum grub. That t' farmer hed put oot fer 'er – aw smellin – in 'er tub."

(Canfield 2009: 14, my bold)

**EDD ONLINE: COMPARISON OF YAT, N. AND GYAT, N.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EDD: CUMBRIAN FORM</th>
<th>EDD: OTHER DIALECT FORMS</th>
<th>PRONUNCIATION(S)</th>
<th>DEFINITION</th>
<th>REFERENCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yat, n.</td>
<td>yat, yate, yeat</td>
<td>Isle of Wight: Gheeat</td>
<td>1. jat: with a like the a in Germ. Mann. 2. jīt: with ī like the ee in feet. 3. jī: with i̯a̯ like the ea in fear. 4. jēt: with e like the e in men.</td>
<td>EDD Online: = gate, n. 1. OED Online: An opening in a wall, made for the purpose of entrance and exit, and capable of being closed by a movable barrier, the existence of which is usually implied. (EDD Online: &quot;gate, sb.1 and v.2,&quot; Wright 1898: xvii, OED Online: &quot;gate, n.1&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gyat, n.</td>
<td>gyat, geyat(e), gait</td>
<td>Northumberland: yate</td>
<td>1. gēt: with ē like the e Germ. Reh. 2. gēt: with e as in care. 3. gīt: with ī like the ee in feet. 4. gī: with i̯a̯ like the ea in fear.</td>
<td>EDD Online: sb. A way, path, road. Also used fig. OED Online: 1. A way. 1. a. A way, road, or path. (EDD Online: &quot;gate, sb.2 and v.2,&quot; Wright 1898: xvii, OED Online: &quot;gate, n.2&quot;)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fig. 51: Comparison of yat, n. and gyat, n. in Canfield (2009: 14)*

As demonstrated by *fig. 51*, Canfield (2009: 14) confuses the form of the noun *gyat* with the sense of the noun *yat*; the quoted extract describes a farm animal being pushed *into a field through a gate* (and not up a path or road), so her use of *gyat* is incorrect in the Cumbrian dialect. Therefore, Canfield’s application of *gyat* is *synthetic*, as the word-meaning she uses contradicts the authoritative meanings provided by the EDD and OED. As such, her representation of the Cumbrian dialect is unsuitable for this investigation.

To avoid further instances of *synthesised* Cumbrian, the researcher increased the time-period of the *Contemporary* sample to seventy years, thereby providing the best possible data for the analysis of this study’s second research question (*cf.* section 3.1). This provided a broader range
of reliable dialect literature, such as the works of the great Ethel Fisher MBE (1928–2018, News & Star Online 2018) and Birkett’s (1953) *Martha and Methoosaleh*.

### 3.3.1.2.1 Reading Programme: Contemporary Cumbrian Poetry

*Contemporary Cumbrian poetry* was sourced from Workington Library, Carlisle Library and through generous donations from members of the Lakeland dialect Society.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author 1: Ian Cooper (1979) – <em>Pinning T’ Téal On A Cuddy</em>&lt;sup&gt;15&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>POEM</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>T’ Div’l’s Brew</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>A Burd in t’ Hand</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Jack an’ Jill</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Jack Spratt</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>A Kurstmuss Teal</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Jake’s Hull</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Five Pund Brag</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Cat an’ Moose</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Man On t’ Seat</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>T’ Farmer’s Car</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Villidge Bodderment</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author 2: Rene Roberts (1984) – <em>Summat Ah’ve Sed</em>&lt;sup&gt;16&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>POEM</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Thoughts of a Small Boy – T’unwanted Gift</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>15</sup>This source contains full-page illustrations to complement its poems. Missing pages contained images, which were of no use to this investigation, and were therefore ignored.

<sup>16</sup>This source contains full-page illustrations to complement its poems. Missing pages contained images, which were of no use to this investigation, and were therefore ignored.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author 1: Elizabeth Birkett (1953) – <em>Martha and Methoosaleh</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROSE:</strong> (Short Story/Tale)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choosing the Delegate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methoosaleh Runs a Dog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T' Institute Cleaning Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T' Institute Party</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3.3.1.2.2 Reading Programme: Contemporary Cumbrian Prose**

*Contemporary Cumbrian prose* was also sourced from Workington Library, Carlisle Library and through donations from members of the Lakeland Dialect Society.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author 3: Ethel Fisher (1999) – <em>More Humorous Tales in Cumberland Dialect Rhyme</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>POEM</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yaan Thut Got Away</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She’s Nivver Lived</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spare Parts Wanted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealthy Wives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seaton’s Little Bit of Heaven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakun for Fun</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fig. 52:* The Contemporary Cumbrian poetry sample.
"Country Cures" | (Birkett 1953: 16–17)
---|---
T' Institute Lectures | (Birkett 1953: 17–20)
Martha Visits the Cumbrian Literary Group | (Birkett 1953: 20–23)
Methoosaleh Attacks Officialdom | (Birkett 1953: 23–25)

**Author 2:** Harold Forsyth (2002) – *Hoo's Ta Gaan on?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROSE: (Short Story/Tale)</th>
<th>CITATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matt &amp; Jonty</td>
<td>(Forsyth 2002: 1–2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Plaane Teall</td>
<td>(Forsyth 2002: 2–3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whee Needs a Pwosst Cwode?</td>
<td>(Forsyth 2002: 4–5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streakers</td>
<td>(Forsyth 2002: 5–6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oor Village</td>
<td>(Forsyth 2002: 7–8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Boys I' Blew</td>
<td>(Forsyth 2002: 8–9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comics</td>
<td>(Forsyth 2002: 10–11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>(Forsyth 2002: 11–12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Away Fixture</td>
<td>(Forsyth 2002: 13–14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cupties and Calamities</td>
<td>(Forsyth 2002: 15–16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonty the Football Critic</td>
<td>(Forsyth 2002: 16–19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And th' Seame ta Thee</td>
<td>(Forsyth 2002: 33)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Author 3:** Irving Graham (2006) – *Reet Frae t’ Hosses Mooth*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROSE: (Short Story/Tale)</th>
<th>CITATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reed Dial Crack wid Jobby n’ Joe</td>
<td>(Graham 2006: 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Duck in t’ Middle</td>
<td>(Graham 2006: 1–2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Graham 2006: 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cheap Clogs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Durdar Treacle Quarry</strong></td>
<td>(Graham 2006: 4–5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mainly Aboot Hens</strong></td>
<td>(Graham 2006: 6–8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arthur Peadick (Orthopaedic)</strong></td>
<td>(Graham 2006: 8–9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yence a Eeor</strong></td>
<td>(Graham 2006: 9–10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fust Sundah in March</strong></td>
<td>(Graham 2006: 11–12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fire Wurks</strong></td>
<td>(Graham 2006: 12–14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A Gentleman’s Shave</strong></td>
<td>(Graham 2006: 14–15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nowt Deun Yit</strong></td>
<td>(Graham 2006: 16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ankle Socks</strong></td>
<td>(Graham 2006: 16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Barney Laffs Last</strong></td>
<td>(Graham 2006: 16–20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bella Gits Hur Chimla Swept</strong></td>
<td>(Graham 2006: 20)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fig. 53:* The Contemporary Cumbrian prose sample.

### 3.3.2 SECONDARY DATA

Secondary data was sourced from the *English Dialect Dictionary Online* (EDD Online 2018) and the *Oxford English Dictionary Online* (OED Online 2018). The data collected from these sources was dependant on this study’s primary data, as only the secondary data related to the selected Cumbrian dialect [headword]s was gathered (*cf.* section 3.2.1). The following tables contain an overview of the types of secondary data used by this investigation. A more detailed description of these sources’ application is provided by section 3.2.
3.3.2.1 Secondary Data One: The English Dialect Dictionary Online

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATA TYPE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of Cumbrian dialect lemma</td>
<td>Presence of Cumbria dialect lemma (sourced from primary data) in an entry in the EDD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specificity of lemma to Cumbrian dialect</td>
<td>If the Cumbrian dialect lemma (sourced from primary data) is present in an entry in the EDD, whether the EDD recognises it as specific to Cumbrian dialect by marking it with dialect marker Cum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammatical category</td>
<td>If the Cumbrian dialect lemma (sourced from primary data) is present in an entry in the EDD, the grammatical category assigned to it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etymology</td>
<td>If the Cumbrian dialect lemma (sourced from primary data) is present in an entry in the EDD, the etymology assigned to it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>If the Cumbrian dialect lemma (sourced from primary data) is present in an entry in the EDD, the definition assigned to it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fig. 54: Brief description of the secondary data gathered from EDD Online.*

3.3.2.2 Secondary Data Two: The Oxford English Dictionary Online

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATA TYPE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of Cumbrian dialect lemma</td>
<td>Presence of Cumbria dialect lemma (sourced from primary data) in an entry in the OED.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammatical category</td>
<td>If the Cumbrian dialect lemma (sourced from primary data) is present in an entry in OED, the grammatical category assigned to it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etymology</td>
<td>If the Cumbrian dialect lemma (sourced from primary data) is present in an entry in the OED, the etymology assigned to it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>If the Cumbrian dialect lemma (sourced from primary data) is present in an entry in the OED, the definition assigned to it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fig. 55: Brief description of the secondary data gathered from OED Online.*

3.5 DATA MINING

This investigation’s results were mined using database filters. Each of the four parameters listed in section 3.2 bear their own key fields, which were searched using the database software’s built-in filtering system. This section details the key fields of all research parameters and their respective filtering methods. All processes are identical for both the *Traditional* and
Contemporary time-periods to comply with both of this investigation's research questions (cf. section 3.1).

3.5.1 INCLUSION

The key fields of this parameter are:

- [headword present in EDD?]
- [sense specific to Cumbrian?]
- [headword present in OED?]

4.5.1.1 Filter: [headword present in EDD?]

This field displays the presence of [headword] in an entry in the EDD, ignoring [headword]'s specific use in the Cumbrian dialect. The purpose of this field is to check Wright's general coverage of dialect lexis. Results were filtered from this field in the following manner:

![Fig. 56: Filtering options for [headword present in EDD?] field.](image)

The "Yes" and "No" values shown in fig. 56 were counted by the database software. The number of each value was then tabulated. Finally, each value's percentage ratio in relation to the total number of [headword]s was calculated. "Blank" values (due to the lack of an EDD entry) are ignored.

4.5.1.2 Filter: [sense specific to Cumbrian?]

This field displays the presence of the *Cum.* dialect marker in [headword]'s entry in the EDD, marking its use in the Cumbrian dialect. The purpose of this field is to check Wright's specific coverage of Cumbrian dialect lexis. Results were filtered from this field in the following manner:
The “Yes” and “No” values shown in fig. 57 were counted by the database software. The number of each value was then tabulated. Finally, each value's percentage ratio in relation to the total number of [headword]s was calculated. “Blank” values indicate that [headword] is not present in the EDD.

4.5.1.3 Filter: [headword present in OED?]

This field displays the presence of [headword] in an entry in the OED. This field’s purpose is to act as an authority, against which the EDD’s coverage of dialect lexis can be compared.

The “Yes” and “No” values shown in fig. 58 were counted by the database software. The number of each value was then tabulated. Finally, each value's percentage ratio in relation to the total
number of [headword]s was calculated. “Blank” values (due to the lack of an OED entry) are ignored.

3.5.2 GRAMMAR

The key fields of this parameter are:

- [relationship1]
- [grammar most accurate to usage examples]

3.5.2.1 Filter: [relationship1]

This field displays the relationship between the [grammatical category: EDD] and [grammatical category: OED] fields. Its purpose is to indicate the EDD's grammatical reliability against the authority of the OED.

![Fig. 59: Filtering options for [relationship1] field.](image)

The five values shown in fig. 59 were counted by the database software. The number of each value was then tabulated. Finally, each value’s percentage ratio in relation to the total number of [headword]s was calculated.

3.5.2.2 Filter: [grammar most accurate to usage examples]

This field displays the dictionary whose grammatical category most accurately represents [headword]’s appearance in this investigation’s primary data. This field’s purpose is to check the EDD's grammatical accuracy in a practical scenario (i.e. when applied to functional dialect analysis).
Fig. 60: Filtering options for [grammar most accurate to usage examples] field:

The four values shown in fig. 60 were counted by the database software. The number of each value was then tabulated. Finally, each value’s percentage ratio in relation to the total number of [headword]s was calculated.

3.5.3 ETYMOLOGY

The key field of this parameter is:

- [relationship2]

3.5.3.1 Filter: [relationship2]

This field displays the relationship between the [etymology: EDD] and [etymology: OED] fields.

Its purpose is to indicate the EDD’s etymological reliability against the authority of the OED.

Fig. 61: Filtering options for [relationship2] field.
The six values shown in *fig. 61* were counted by the database software. The number of each value was then tabulated. Finally, each value’s percentage ratio in relation to the total number of [headword]s was calculated.

### 3.5.4 Definition

The key fields of this parameter are:

- [relationship3]
- [synonymous definitions?]
- [definition most accurate to usage examples?]

#### 3.5.4.1 Filter: [relationship3]

This field displays the affiliation between the [definition: EDD] and [definition: OED] fields. Its purpose is to indicate the presence of EDD and OED definitions (*cf. section 3.2.4.1.2*).

![Fig. 62: Filtering options for [relationship3] field.](image)

The five values shown in *fig. 62* were counted by the database software. The number of each value was then tabulated. Finally, each value’s percentage ratio in relation to the total number of [headword]s was calculated.

#### 3.5.4.2 Filter: [synonymous definitions?]

This field displays the similarity between the EDD and OED definitions for [headword]. The purpose of this field is to test the usefulness of Wright’s definitions against an accepted lexicographic authority.
Fig. 63: Filtering options for [synonymous definitions?] field.

The "Yes" and "No" values shown in fig. 63 were counted by the database software. The number of each value was then tabulated. Finally, each value's percentage ratio in relation to the total number of [headword]s was calculated. “Blank” values (due to the lack of both an EDD and OED entry) are ignored.

3.5.4.3 Filter: [definition most accurate to usage examples?]

This field displays the dictionary whose definition most accurately represents [headword]'s appearance in this investigation's primary data. This field's purpose is to check the usefulness of the EDD's definition in a practical scenario (i.e. when applied to functional dialect analysis).

Fig. 64: Filtering option for [definition most accurate to usage examples?] field.
The four values shown in fig. 64 were counted by the database software. The number of each value was then tabulated. Finally, each value's percentage ratio in relation to the total number of [headword]s was calculated. "Blank" values (due to the lack of both an EDD and OED entry) are ignored.
4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 INCLUSION

4.1.1 RESEARCH QUESTION 1: EDD Comprehensiveness to Traditional Cumbrian (1700–1898)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inclusion: Traditional Cumbrian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Headword]s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Words in Traditional Cumbrian sample which are omitted from the EDD: aboot2, ameast, anudder, bowster, bworn, crony, fender, hiding, leet, marketer, publish, reyce, sharp, swol, temper, toitel.

Fig. 65: “Yes” values for Traditional Cumbrian inclusion results from the [headword present in EDD?], [headword present in OED?] and [sense specific to Cumbrian?] fields respectively, along with the 16 Traditional [headword]s omitted from the EDD.

As hypothesised, the EDD proves to be more comprehensive than the OED for Traditional Cumbrian by a margin of 0.8% (cf. section 3.2.1.3.1). Also, most Traditional [headword]s are listed in the [headword present in EDD?] field with “Yes” values. These results indicate that the EDD recognises most of this investigation’s [headword]s on a general level.\(^{17}\)

The EDD struggles with the specifics. The researcher’s hypothesis was incorrect regarding the [sense specific to Cumbrian?] field. The EDD only recognises 75.6% of Traditional [headword]s as belonging specifically to the Cumbrian dialect. Also, despite the high number of “Yes” values for the [headword present in EDD?] field, the EDD still fails to recognise 16 Traditional Cumbrian [headword]s entirely. These results indicate a sizable hole in the EDD’s comprehensiveness for the inclusion parameter and its limitations for the study of Cumbrian dialect-specific lexis from the Traditional time-period.

\(^{17}\) Concerning the study of English dialects generally: the EDD recognises these [headword]s as non-standard English but cannot assign them reliably to their specific application in the Traditional Cumbrian dialect.
4.1.1.1 The EDD’s Omitted Material

Of the 16 Traditional [headword]s omitted by the EDD, 14 are recognised by entries in the OED, with 13 featuring at least one usage example dating between 1700 and 1898. The remaining [headword], temper, is listed in the OED with three usage examples dating to the 17th Century. So, if 14 of the 16 [headword]s omitted by the EDD were productive during the EDD’s research period (Wright 1898: v), why did Wright choose to ignore them?

Beal (2010b: 44) provides two possible explanations. First, she states that Wright omitted all words which he did not consider dialectal. Wright states in the preface to the EDD that only the words used by dialects which originated on the British Isles which bore “some local peculiarity of meaning” were included, with words differing from Standard English in their pronunciation only being ignored (Wright 1898: v). The [headword]s about2, ameast, anudder, bowster, bworn, reyce and swol were therefore likely ignored by Wright for being regional variants of about, almost, another, bolster, bear, rice and sole respectively.

Potentially, Wright chose to ignore the words crony, fender, sharp and temper for a similar reason, as all four [headword]s are listed in the OED as Standard English, bearing no usage labels marking their dialectal application. By contrast, the words hiding, marketer and publish are listed in the OED with usage labels. However, the OED marks these words’ use in general British slang and the dialects of American English, explaining why Wright ignored them in his targeted dictionary of the dialects of England, Ireland, Scotland and Wales (Wright 1898: v).

To complement these reasonably explainable omissions, Beal (2010b: 45) provides a second possibility. She states how Wright also omitted words for “no satisfactory explanation,” due to either oversight or Wright’s resistance to idiosyncratic diminutives. The two-remaining Traditional [headword]s, leet and toitel, fall respectively under these two scenarios. For example, the word leet (verb, meaning “to meet [with]”), which appears to have been omitted

---

18 References for cited OED entries: (OED Online: “about, adv., prep.1, adj., and int.,” “almost, adv., adj., and n.,” “another, adj. and pron. (and adv.).”, “bolster, n.1”, “bear, v.1”, “rice, n.2” and “sole, n.1”).
19 References for cited OED entries: (OED Online: “crony, n.”, “fender, n.”, “sharp, adj. and n.1” and “temper, n.”).
20 References for cited OED entries: (OED Online: “hiding, n.2”, “marketer, n.” and “publish, v.”).
due to oversight, bears a nominalised sibling in the EDD (noun, meaning “a meeting-point of roads”, EDD Online: “leet, sb.1”).

Meanwhile, the word *toitel* (verb, meaning “to topple, to fall”) appears to be evidence of Wright’s resistance to idiosyncratic diminutives. It shares a similar form and meaning to the EDD-recognised verb *toit* (meaning to “to fall over, tumble, upset”, EDD Online: “toit, v., sb.2 and adj.1”), but appears to have been omitted due to Wright’s suspicion that the former was a derivative of the latter, through the addition of a variant -le suffix. The relationship of these two words can be likened to that of Standard English *crump* and *crumple*, in which the -le suffix operates as a verbal formative element with frequentative characteristics, expressing the intensity of the verb’s action (OED Online: “-le, suffix”). Consult *fig. 66* for a comparison of this process between Standard English and the Cumbrian dialect.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROOT WORD</th>
<th>ROOT WORD SUFFIXED WITH -LE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>STANDARD ENGLISH</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>crump</em>, v. = “to draw itself into a curve” (OED Online: “† crump, v.1”).</td>
<td><em>crumple</em>, v. = “to contract and shrivel up” (OED Online: “crumple, v.”).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CUMBRIAN DIALECT</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fig. 66: Comparison between crump, v., crumple, v., toit, v. and toitle, v., expressing the frequentative characteristics of the suffix -le.*

**4.1.1.2 Conclusion: Research Question 1 – Traditional Cumbrian Inclusion**

Overall, these results demonstrate Wright’s reasonable comprehensiveness for the Traditional Cumbrian dialect. The EDD recognises the majority of [headword]s in this study as non-standard, performing similarly to the OED. However, the EDD shows a lack of saliency for the Cumbrian dialect, managing to only categorise 75.6% of [headword]s as Cumbrian dialect-specific lexis. This oversight limits the EDD’s practicality, as it presents the Cumbrian dialect as having a less diverse lexicon than it uses in its literature.

This limitation is especially apparent when using the “dialect area” filters on EDD Online, which only return the headwords which feature the specific dialect marker for the user’s chosen region, making the EDD appear less comprehensive than it could be. The EDD was not revised
before it was digitised (Penhallurick 2009: 312), so all of Wright’s dialect area classifications remain identical to those set in the late 19th Century. As a result, Wright’s oversights remain and, when searching by dialect region, the EDD’s Cumbrian dialect filter produces results with a deficit of 17.9% for the primary data of this investigation, despite these results’ appearance in other entries. To increase the EDD’s comprehensiveness and user-friendliness for Traditional Cumbrian, all these issues will require revision.

4.1.2 RESEARCH QUESTION 2: EDD Usefulness to Contemporary Cumbrian (1950–present)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCLUSION: CONTEMPORARY CUMBRIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Headword]s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Words in Contemporary Cumbrian sample which are omitted from the EDD: aboot2, anudder, cart, chow, collar, digby, famish, famished, fisslement, fixiate, flay1, keen, leuk, mair, manish, mire, nowt2, oalas, ower4, paggered, sarra2, screape, skivvy, struck, varnar

Fig. 67: Contemporary Cumbrian inclusion results from their indicated fields, along with the 26 [headword]s from the sample omitted from the EDD

As hypothesised, the EDD proved less useful than the OED for the study of Contemporary Cumbrian (cf. section 3.2.1.3.2). The number of “Yes” values in the [headword present in EDD?] field fell across the samples from 93.5% to 86.0%. The “Yes” values in the [sense specific to Cumbrian?] field plummeted to 62.9%. In addition, the number of [headword]s not present in the EDD more than doubled to 14.0%.

These results were expected, as the EDD is a synchronic dictionary focussed only on English dialect lexis of the 18th and 19th Centuries (Wright 1898: v). Wright could not foresee the processes of language change which would occur in Cumbrian between the Traditional and Contemporary time-periods as his dictionary was started and exclusively concerned with the Traditional period. Criticising his “omissions,” therefore, would be exploitative. As such, this
section will discuss the EDD's possible oversights, the processes of language change which can
be seen in Contemporary Cumbrian, and the necessary revisions the EDD requires to increase its
usefulness to the modern Cumbrian dialect scholar.

4.1.2.1 Wright: Omission Through Oversight

25 [headword]s from the Contemporary data are missing from the EDD. Of these, 19 appear in
the OED with at least two usage examples dating between 1700 and 1898 (cf. appendix iii). So,
considering these [headword]s were productive in English during the EDD's research period
(Wright 1898: v), with many being productive since the Old and Middle English periods, why
did Wright choose to ignore them for his dictionary?

As mentioned in section 4.1.1.1, the EDD ignored words which offered no “local peculiarity of
meaning” (Wright 1898: v). If a word differed from Standard English in its form only, it was
often disregarded by the EDD as an unimportant variant. The words aboot2, anudder, chow,
fixiate, leuk, mair, manish, ower4, sarra2 and screape fall into this category, being Cumbrian
spelling variants of Standard English about, another, chew, asphyxiate, look, more, manage, over,
serve and scrape respectively.

Wright’s decision to ignore dialectal spelling variants has affected the EDD’s usefulness to
Contemporary Cumbrian (and comprehensiveness for Traditional Cumbrian). The Cumbrian
spelling variants listed above are not all transparent representations of their Standard English
counterparts. Wright’s decision to only include words with non-Standard senses and ignore
words with non-Standard spellings severely limits the EDD’s usefulness by alienating one of the
key methods by which dialects construct their lexicons.

4.1.2.2 Contemporary Cumbrian: Language Change – Diffusion

The Cumbrian dialect has experienced several processes of language change between the
Traditional and Contemporary time-periods. The next two sections aim to address a few of these
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21 References for cited OED entries: (OED Online: “about, adv., prep.1, adj., and int.”; “another, adj. and pron. (and
adv.),” “chow, v.”, “asphyxiate, v.”, “look, n.”, “more, adj., pron., adv., n.3, and prep.”, “manage, v.”, “over, adv. and int.”,
“serve, v.1” and “scrape, n.1”).
processes, illustrated by examples from this investigation’s primary data. The first process discussed will be **diffusion**, defined by Tagliamonte (2011: 60) as a process in which “linguistic features are imported from one speech community to the next.”

Standard English appears to have this effect on the Cumbrian dialect. The *Contemporary* sample contains 27.6% fewer [headword]s than the *Traditional* sample, with noticeably-regional words such as *gation*, *neef* and *parlish* vanishing between the two time-periods, being replaced in *Contemporary* literature by Standard English equivalents (*cf*. appendix i). For example, the Cumbrian dialect variant of Standard English “very” is commonly used in *Contemporary* literature in place of the *Traditional* intensifier *parlish* (*cf*. appendix i: *varra*, Cooper 1973: 23). A similar process of Standard English-dominant diffusion was recognised by Smith et. al (2011: 206–8) in the dialect of Lerwick, Shetland. They found the local variants *peerie* (adjective, meaning “little”) and *ken* (verb, meaning “to know”) were gradually being replaced by their Standard English counterparts in the youngest speakers of the community.

Additionally, only 32.1% of *Traditional* [headword]s appear in the *Contemporary* sample, demonstrating the effect of institutionalised dialect suppression in education and broadcasting during the 19th and 20th Centuries (Beal 2010a: 3, Gepp 1920: v-viii, Honey 1988: 222, Markus 2007: 266). The EDD-omitted [headword]s *collar*, *famished*, *keen* and *mire* could be evidence of this institutionalised reticence in dialect use, as are all recognised by the OED as Standard, perhaps being transferred into Cumbrian during the mid-20th Century.

Diffusion can also occur through contact with neighbouring dialects. Wright (1979: 72–4) comments on the speech of Barrow residents, whom he believes show their linguistic connection with Lancashire through their use of extended vowel sounds in the words *took*, *look* and *book*. The EDD-omitted [headword]s *cart*, *famished*, *skivvy* and *struck* could be evidence of the Cumbrian dialect’s contact with its neighbours, as all four words are listed in the OED with

---

22 References for cited OED entries: (OED Online: “collar, v.”, “famished, adj.”, “keen, adj. and adv.” and “mire, n.1”

Word Count: 26,435
the usage label *colloq.*. This “catch-all” label indicates their affinity with several dialects and
the possibility of their transfer into *Contemporary* Cumbrian via invasive means.

To test the influence of Standard English and of neighbouring dialects on *Contemporary* Cumbrian, the researcher searched the British National Corpus (BNC Online 2018) for these 8
[headword]s, with the aim of finding the frequency of each [headword]’s specific sense on the
first page of results. These results were the compared with 8 Standard English synonyms to
provide an indication of these omitted words' frequency in modern English. The following tables
present the findings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORD</th>
<th>GRAMMATICAL CATEGORY</th>
<th>MEANING</th>
<th>TOTAL NUMBER OF BNC RESULTS</th>
<th>NUMBER OF BNC RESULTS ON FIRST PAGE</th>
<th>NUMBER OF MATCHING RESULTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>collar</td>
<td>verb</td>
<td>4. trans. To seize or take hold of (a person) by the collar; more loosely: To capture. (OED Online: &quot;collar, v.&quot;)</td>
<td>1343</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>famished</td>
<td>adjective</td>
<td>In senses of the vb. &lt; famish, v. = to starve (OED Online: &quot;famished, adj.&quot; and &quot;famish, v.&quot;)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>keen</td>
<td>adjective</td>
<td>6. a. Of persons: Eager, ardent, fervid. (OED Online: &quot;keen, adj. and adv.&quot;)</td>
<td>3655</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mire</td>
<td>noun</td>
<td>2. a. Wet or soft mud; ooze; dirt. (OED Online: &quot;mire, n.1&quot;)</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

23 References for cited OED entries: (OED Online: “cart, v.”, “famous, adj.”, “skivvy, n.1” and “strike, v.”).
24 i.e. identical grammatical category and meaning to [headword]’s appearance in this investigation’s data.
25 Data sourced from BNC Online (2018).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORD</th>
<th>GRAMMATICAL CATEGORY</th>
<th>MEANING</th>
<th>TOTAL NUMBER OF BNC RESULTS</th>
<th>NUMBER OF BNC RESULTS ON FIRST PAGE</th>
<th>NUMBER OF MATCHING RESULTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cart</td>
<td>verb</td>
<td>1. e. to convey (something heavy or cumbersome). To carry or take. (OED Online: &quot;cart, v.&quot;)</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>famish</td>
<td>adjective</td>
<td>5. Excellent, grand, magnificent, splendid, 'capital'. colloq. (OED Online: &quot;famous, adj.&quot;)</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skivvy</td>
<td>noun</td>
<td>colloq. (usually derogatory). A female domestic servant. (OED Online: &quot;skivvy, n.1&quot;)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>struck</td>
<td>verb</td>
<td>66. e. To catch the admiration, fancy, or affection of. (OED Online: &quot;strike, v.&quot;)</td>
<td>3975</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FREQUENCY OF EIGHT STANDARD ENGLISH SYNONYMS FOR CUMBRIAN [HEADWORD]S IN MODERN ENGLISH**

Data sourced from BNC Online (2018).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Part of Speech</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
<th>Usage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mud</td>
<td>noun</td>
<td>1. a. Soft, moist, glutinous material resulting from the mixing of water with soil, sand, dust, or other earthy matter; mire, sludge.</td>
<td>1828</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(OED Online: &quot;mud, n.1&quot;)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carry</td>
<td>verb</td>
<td>2. a. To bear from one place to another by bodily effort;</td>
<td>9823</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(OED Online: &quot;carry, v.&quot;)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>excellent</td>
<td>adjective</td>
<td>3. a. Used as an emphatic expression of praise or approval, whether of persons, things, or actions: Extremely good.</td>
<td>6449</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(OED Online: &quot;excellent, adj. and adv.&quot;)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maid</td>
<td>noun</td>
<td>3. a. A female servant or attendant; a maid servant;</td>
<td>882</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(OED Online: &quot;maid, n.1&quot;)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taken</td>
<td>verb</td>
<td>8. a. trans. (in pass.). Chiefly with: to be attracted, charmed, or captivated by a person or thing.</td>
<td>34,146</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(OED Online: “take, v.”)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 68: Comparison between 8 Cumbrian [headword]s which were not included in the EDD and their respective Standard English synonyms, demonstrating the frequency of each word in English according to the British National Corpus (BNC 2018).

These 8 [headword]s (excluding keen and its Standard English synonym eager) provide a case for the EDD's revision. They are all words which have entered the Cumbrian dialect during the
last Century, which are not recognised by the EDD or OED as dialectal. The [headword]s are marginal in comparison to their Standard English synonyms and, as demonstrated by this investigation, are used productively in Contemporary Cumbrian dialect literature. Revision of the EDD to include these [headword]s (and other like them) would benefit its usefulness to the modern dialect scholar by providing a practical and easy reference for regional-specific dialect lexis which passes relatively undetected by larger lexicographic projects such as the OED.

4.1.2.3 Contemporary Cumbrian: Language Change – Other Processes

The six remaining excluded headwords listed in fig. 67 are not featured in the EDD or the OED. They represent a collection of language changes processes, which the researcher traced through various dialect dictionaries, glossaries and anthologies. The first process explored here will be neologism, defined by McMahon (1994: 190) as “new lexemes, or independent words with their own dictionary entries.” As recognised by Gepp (1920: v-viii), neologism plays a crucial role in dialect change, with modern coinages supplanting traditional lexis. Digby appears to fall into this category, appearing for the first time in a Cumbrian dialect dictionary from the early 20th Century. It is defined by Prevost (1905: 60) as "a 'governess' pony carriage" and is listed alongside a usage note which labels the word as "local and of modern introduction," providing evidence of its early 20th Century coinage in Cumbrian.

Pagered also appears to be a Contemporary neologism. Its origins are later than digby's, being coined between the late 20th and early 21st Centuries, with the only sources recognising its existence being 21st Century Cumbrian dialect glossaries and works of 21st Century Cumbrian dialect literature. Each appearance and its respective text type are presented below.

- Definition from a popular Cumbrian glossary: "exhausted: Aa's fair paggered" (Barker 2007: 23, his italics).
- Definition from a "translational" glossary appended to an anthology of Cumbrian dialect literature: "paggered: exhausted" (Forsyth 2002: 114).

Oddly, digby is not recognised by the EDD despite being used during the EDD’s compilation. This could be due to the word's marginal-ness and its introduction close to the end of the EDD’s research period.
The EDD’s usefulness to Contemporary Cumbrian would be improved by including neologisms such as digby and paggered. No other nationally-important source recognises these words, which limits the knowledge available to Cumbrian dialect scholars of other dialect regions or nationalities. These words’ lexicographic representation is patchy, spread across several sources and three Centuries. Their centralisation is required in a revised EDD to provide a more accessible route to their grammars, etymologies and definitions.

Other, less complicated examples of language change in Contemporary Cumbrian include fisselment which is formed through a process of affixation, defined by McMahon (1994: 194) as “the formation of new lexemes on the basis of simpler ones.” The word is a nominalised variant of the verb fissle, created by attaching the -ment suffix (EDD Online: “fissle, v., sb. and adj.”, OED Online: “fissle | fistle, v.” and “-ment, suffix”). Varnar is formed through the process blending, defined by Marchland (1969: 451) as “compounding by means of curtailed words.” The two words used are “varra, adv.” and “nar1, adv.” (cf. appendix i).

Flay1 is a conversion, defined by McMahon (1994: 197) as the “simple transfer of a lexeme from one word class to another, with no overt morphological signal.” In this instance, the adjective flay1 was formed from the noun flay (OED Online: “fley | flay, n.” and “afraid, adj. and n.”). Finally, oalas is a Cumbrian spelling variant of the Standard English adverb always, recognised by neither the EDD nor OED.

4.1.2.4 Conclusion: Research Question 2 – Contemporary Cumbrian Inclusion

Overall, the omissions and the processes of language change discussed here demonstrate the necessity for the EDD’s revision. Although the EDD remains a reasonably valuable resource for the study of Contemporary Cumbrian, it could be far more useful if it engaged with contemporary linguistics. The removal of Wright’s arbitrary preference for sense-differing lexemes over form-differing lexemes and engagement with modern processes of language change would increase the EDD’s usefulness to Contemporary study of the Cumbrian dialect by
providing an inclusive account of all Cumbrian dialect words, rather than a restrictive representation of only some.

4.2 GRAMMAR

4.2.1 RESEARCH QUESTION 1: EDD Comprehensiveness to Traditional Cumbrian (1700–1898)

| TRADITIONAL CUMBRIAN: RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EDD AND OED GRAMMARS FOR [HEADWORD]S |
|---------------------------------|--------|---------|----------------|------------|--------|----------------|
| TOTAL                           | Match  | Do Not Match | No EDD Entry | No OED Entry | No EDD or OED Entry |
| No.                             | 246    | 204      | 12            | 14          | 14     | 2               |
| %                               | 100    | 82.9     | 4.9           | 5.7         | 5.7    | 0.8             |

Words without EDD grammatical categories: aboot2, ameast, anudder, bowster, bworn, crony, fender, hiding, marketer, publish, reyce, sharp, swol, temper.

Words without OED grammatical categories: adoot, amakily, bit, gation, glim, nicked, peekle, slairy, slwote, smatter, sprafflin(g), stackery, steel, throp.

Words with neither EDD nor OED grammatical categories: leet, toitel.

Fig. 69: Traditional Cumbrian grammar results from the [relationship1] field, comparing the EDD’s coverage of grammar against the OED, along with the lists [headword]s with omitted grammatical material from the EDD and OED.

| TRADITIONAL CUMBRIAN: DICTIONARY GRAMMAR MOST ACCURATE TO [HEADWORD] USAGE EXAMPLES |
|---------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|---------|
| TOTAL                           | EDD    | OED    | N/A    | Neither |
| No.                             | 246    | 17     | 22     | 204     | 3       |
| %                               | 100    | 6.9    | 8.9    | 82.9    | 1.2     |

Fig. 70: Traditional Cumbrian grammatical categorisation results from the [grammar most accurate to usage examples] field, comparing both dictionaries’ grammatical accuracy against [headword]s appearance in the usage examples gathered from the reading programme.

The researcher’s hypothesis was inaccurate for Traditional Cumbrian grammar. As demonstrated by fig. 69, the EDD’s assessment of Traditional Cumbrian grammar was comparable to the OED; both dictionaries returned a reasonably high amount of “Match” values.
in the [relationship1] field and both dictionaries failed to provide grammatical information for the same number of [headword]s.

The researcher also incorrectly hypothesised EDD's grammatical accuracy against his primary data. As demonstrated by fig. 70, the EDD proved less accurate than the OED in the [grammar most accurate to usage examples] field, with 2% more “OED” values than “EDD” values returned by the investigation. As such, the EDD cannot be considered more comprehensive than the OED for Traditional Cumbrian grammar.

4.2.1.1 The EDD Evens the Odds

Whilst a margin of 2% may seem insignificant, closer scrutiny reveals further holes in the EDD's comprehensiveness. The database is organised so grammatical information from both the EDD and OED can be included under the same [headword]. If no grammatical information exists for [headword] in either dictionary, the relevant field is left blank. As a result, the prize for "most accurate grammatical classification" in the [grammar most accurate to usage examples] field was uncontested for 28 of 39 [headword]s listed between the “EDD” and “OED” values in fig. 70.

So, of the 17 [headword]s which took the EDD as their grammatical authority in relation to this study's primary data, only 3 had contest from relevant OED entries (cf. appendix i). The remaining 14 [headword]s were “most accurate” by default due to the lack of relevant EDD information. Conversely, of the 22 [headword]s which took the OED as their grammatical authority, 8 were contested by relevant EDD entries. These two sets of [headword]s are tabulated in figs. 71 and 72 respectively. Thus, in the [grammar most accurate to usage examples] field, only 17.6% of EDD values were contested by the OED, whilst 36.4% of OED values were contested by the EDD, meaning it was statistically harder for the OED to be listed as "most accurate” in comparison to the EDD.

Statistically therefore, the OED provides a more accurate representation of Traditional Cumbrian dialect grammar than the EDD, with these misleading results propagated by a flaw in the researcher's methodology. This result was unexpected for the Traditional sample due to the
EDD’s self-proclaimed position as the authority on all English dialect words and the tailoring of
the *Traditional* time-period to Wright’s research period (Wright 1898: v).

<p>| TRADITIONAL CUMBRIAN: THE EDD’S GRAMMATICAL ACCURACY IN 3 [HEADWORD]S, COMPARED TO THE OED |
|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEADWORD</th>
<th>EDD GRAMMATICAL CATEGORY</th>
<th>OED GRAMMATICAL CATEGORY</th>
<th>USAGE EXAMPLE</th>
<th>GRAMMAR MOST ACCURATE TO USAGE EXAMPLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aback</td>
<td>preposition</td>
<td>adverb</td>
<td>“Five pund sartinly was a tempter for Bob, ’at hed […] been hingin’ up, as t’ sayin’ is aback o’ t’ bar door.” (Farrall 1893: 7)</td>
<td>EDD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fuddled</td>
<td>adjective</td>
<td>verb</td>
<td>“Mull’d yell an’ punch flew roun’ leyke mad, the fiddlers a’ gat fudded.” (Gilpin 1866: 205)</td>
<td>EDD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leane</td>
<td>noun</td>
<td>adjective</td>
<td>“’O, when sweet lassie, ye’re your leane, this heart o’ mine wad joy to know.”” (Gilpin 1866: 50)</td>
<td>EDD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fig. 71:* Table demonstrating the EDD’s grammatical accuracy in comparison to the OED in the usage examples of 3 [headword]s.

<p>| TRADITIONAL CUMBRIAN: THE OED’S GRAMMATICAL ACCURACY IN 8 [HEADWORD]S, COMPARED TO THE EDD |
|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEADWORD</th>
<th>EDD GRAMMATICAL CATEGORY</th>
<th>OED GRAMMATICAL CATEGORY</th>
<th>USAGE EXAMPLE</th>
<th>GRAMMAR MOST ACCURATE TO USAGE EXAMPLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>beàth</td>
<td>adjective</td>
<td>pronoun</td>
<td>“she niver miss’t gitten t’ best price gâ’n beàth for butter an’ eggs.” (Gibson 1869: 17)</td>
<td>OED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meast</td>
<td>noun</td>
<td>pronoun</td>
<td>“She ken’t hoo to bring t’ ho’pennies heàm! Nût like t’ meàst o’ fellows wives.” (Gibson 1869: 17)</td>
<td>OED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28 References for cited EDD entries: (EDD Online: “aback, prep. and adv.”, “fuddle, sb., v.” and “lone, adv., adj. and sb.2”).

29 References for cited OED entries: (OED Online: “aback, adv.”, “fuddle, v.” and “lone, adj.”).

30 References for cited EDD entries: (EDD Online: “both, adj.”, “most, adj., adv. and sb.1”, “nought, sb., adj., adv. and v.”, “either, adj., pron. and conj.”, “such, adj., pron. and adv.”, “one, num. adj., indef. art., sb., pron. and v.”).

31 References for cited OED entries: (OED Online: “both, pron., adv., and adj.”, “most, adj., pron., and n., and adv.”, “nought, pron., n., adv., and adj.”, “either, adj. (and pron.) and adv. (and conj.)”, “such, adj. and pron.”, “one, adj., n., and pron.”).
4.2.1.2 Examples from *Traditional* Data

The grammatical oversights tabulated in section 4.2.1 demonstrate the limit of the EDD's comprehensiveness for *Traditional* Cumbrian grammar. Accurate and complete grammatical categorisation plays a significant role in a dictionary's function, due to the mutual dependence of grammar and definition. This is especially apparent in dictionaries where grammatical categories cannot be easily inferred, and the user cannot draw on the knowledge of their own language to fill in missing information (such as in foreign language dictionaries or dialect dictionaries) (Jackson 1985: 56). The mutual dependence between a language's "Grammar" and its "Dictionary" is described by Jackson (1985: 53–4) in the following passage:

"A *Grammar* describes the syntactic arrangements of classes of items [...] in a language [...] A *Dictionary* aims to list the lexical items (words, idioms, other fixed expressions) in a language and to give *description* of their meanings and usage; within "*usage*" will be included the part a *lexical* item plays in the grammatical system of a language."

(Jackson 1985: 53–4, my bold)
Often, this mutual dependence between “Grammar” and “Dictionary” is ignored by the EDD, at the expense of its own comprehensiveness. For example, this study found two grammatically-differing applications of the pronoun *yan* in the *Traditional* sample. They were both lumped under the same sense in the EDD, with no clear distinction made between the usage examples which specially belonged to either the “numerical pronoun” or “personal pronoun” senses (EDD Online: "one, num. adj., indef. art., sb., pron. and v.").

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEADWORD</th>
<th>GRAMMATICAL CATEGORY</th>
<th>OED DEFINITION</th>
<th>USAGE EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>yan1</em></td>
<td>Numerical pronoun</td>
<td>C. pron.</td>
<td>&quot;Ten things for me, an' <em>yan</em> for thyself!&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. As simple numeral.</td>
<td>(Gibson 1869: 19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. One person or thing identified contextually.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(OED Online: &quot;one, adj., n., and pron.&quot;)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>yan2</em></td>
<td>Personal pronoun</td>
<td>C. pron.</td>
<td>&quot;things mun just be as they ur', an' nut egsactly as <em>yan</em> wants them.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VI. As an indefinite pronoun.</td>
<td>(Farrall 1893: 18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17. a. Any person of undefined identity, esp. one considered as representative of people in general; any person at all, including (esp. in later use) the speaker himself or herself; 'you, or I, or anyone'; a person in general.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(OED Online: &quot;one, adj., n., and pron.&quot;)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fig. 73:* Two grammatically differing homonyms of the pronoun *yan*, with illustrative usage examples and OED definitions.

The EDD’s blending of these two grammatically-differing words into the same sense provides an inaccurate description of the headword’s usage in the grammatical system of the *Traditional* Cumbrian dialect (Jackson 1985: 54). Its comprehensiveness suffers in comparison to the OED, which instead lists each grammatical use of *yan* under its own sense. As a result, the EDD refuses its users access to relevant idiosyncratic information on each grammatical use of *yan* within the general patterns of the *Traditional* Cumbrian dialect (Jackson 1985: 56).
Similar instances of grammatical oversights occur throughout the EDD, including the blended grammatical categories of sec1 and sec2, the omission of owder’s use as an adverb and the failure to recognise meast as a pronoun (cf. appendix i). Revision of these issues would benefit the EDD comprehensiveness by removing ambiguity from its grammatical categorisations. In addition, this would open the EDD’s practicality to Traditional Cumbrian dialect scholars from differing language backgrounds, in place of its current function to students who understand Cumbrian dialect grammar only.

4.2.1.3 Conclusion: Research Question 1 – Traditional Cumbrian Grammar

The examples discussed here illustrate the limit of the EDD’s comprehensiveness for Traditional Cumbrian grammar. Even though the results of fig. 69 seem to indicate the EDD’s grammatical reliability, issues with the EDD’s comprehensiveness appear when its grammars are applied practically. Wright’s poor lexicographic practice produced confusing depictions of his headwords’ grammatical applications when compared to the OED, with grammatically-important sense divisions being ignored for the sake of simplicity. This is demonstrated by the lumped, yet grammatically-differing senses of yan1 and yan2 in fig. 73, above. To increase the EDD’s comprehensiveness for Traditional Cumbrian grammar, instances of poor grammatical categorisation must be removed.

4.2.2 RESEARCH QUESTION 2: EDD Usefulness to Contemporary Cumbrian (1950–present)
**Words without EDD grammatical categories:** aboot2, anaw, anudder, cart, chow, collar, famish, famished, fixiate, keen, leuk, mair, manish, mire, nowt2, ower4, sarra2, screape, skivvy, struck.

**Words without OED grammatical categories:** behint, bit, clart, dummelheed, flaysome, kevel, lantered, scop1, scop2, scrow.

**Words with neither EDD nor OED grammatical categories:** digby, fisslement, fly1, oalas, paggered.

Fig. 74: Contemporary Cumbrian grammatical categorisation results from the [relationship1] field, comparing the EDD’s coverage of grammar against the OED, along with the lists [headword]s with omitted grammatical material from the EDD and OED.

| CONTEMPORARY CUMBRIAN: DICTIONARY GRAMMAR MOST ACCURATE TO [HEADWORD] USAGE EXAMPLES |
|-----------------------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|-------|
|                                | TOTAL | EDD    | OED    | N/A   |
| No.                            | 178   | 11     | 27     | 134   | 6     |
| %                              | 100   | 6.2    | 15.2   | 75.3  | 3.4   |

Fig. 75: Contemporary Cumbrian grammatical categorisation results from the [grammar most accurate to usage examples] field, comparing both dictionaries’ grammatical accuracy against [headword]’s appearance in the usage examples gathered from the reading programme.

The researcher’s hypothesis was correct for Contemporary Cumbrian grammar. As illustrated by fig. 74, twice as many “No EDD Entry” than “No OED Entry” values were returned by the [relationship1] field, indicating the OED’s increased usefulness for Contemporary Cumbrian grammatical study. In addition, the [grammar most accurate to usage examples] field returned almost three times as many “OED” than “EDD” values (cf. fig. 75), demonstrating the limitations of the EDD’s usefulness when applied practically to the study of Contemporary Cumbrian grammar.

**4.2.2.1 Wright’s Grammatical Clarity**

The EDD struggles to concisely categorise its headword’s grammars. Often, its entries open with a list of grammatical categories, followed by a list of usage examples organised by neither sense nor grammar (cf. fig. 76). This system forces the user to infer the grammatical category of each headword appearance in the EDD’s usage examples themselves, which is unsystematic and makes for a poor entry (Atkins and Rundell 2008: 248). Across the Contemporary sample, 5 EDD entries follow this pattern (cf. appendix i).

(1) s.Oxf. It's sech a fine life, ROSEMARY Chilterns (1895) 112. Nfr. Sech a pace, MANN Dudlitch (1902) 115. [Amer.] I hain't had sech a turn in I dunno when, HARRIS Tales, 266.] (2) n.Cy. (J.L. 1783). Nhb. Yes, yeh feul ye (w'i sec a glorwer), BEWICK Tales (1850) 15; Nhb.1, Lakel.2 Cum.1; Cum.3 I didn't ken what to mak o sec a customer as t'is, 3. Wm. Aa caan't abide sek wark, WARD Robert Elsmere (1888) bk. 1. ii. (3) n.Cy. (J.L. 1783). (4) s.Stf. I never seed shut a dirty hole, PINNOCK Blik. Cy. Ann. (1895). (5) Ir. An' sorra the Queen wid her sceptre in sich an illigant han', TENNYSON To-morrow (1885) st. 4. Nhb. He said sich things, CLARE Love of Lass (1890) l. 76. n.Yks.4, w.Yks.123 Lan. BRIERLEY Layrock (1864) iv; Lan.1, e.Lan.1, s.Lan.1, Chs.123 s.Stf. He was sich an ode tongue-waggin' elf, PINNOCK Blik. Cy. Ann. (1895) 12. nw.Der.1 Lin. Wa boáth was i' sich a clat, TENNYSON Spinster's Sweetarts (1885) st. 6. n.Lin.1, Lei.1, War.2, se.Wor.1, Shr.1, Hrf.1 Glo. LEWIS Gl. (1839). e.An.1 Suf.1 Sich a sight on em! Ess.1 Sur.1 It's sich a while ago. Dor. Tellin' sich a pack o' lies, FRANCIS Pastoral (1901) 32. w.Som.1 Very com. form, although 'jitch,' 'jis,' and 'jish' are the most usual, unless when used alone or at the end of a clause. The lit. 'such' is unknown. Cor. 'Tes stitch a cheeld, DANIEL Mary Ann's Christening, 4; Cor.2 (6) Sc. (J.M.) Sh.l. Fir sic a yell, STEWART Tales (1892) 256. e.Sc. Did ye ever see sic inquisitiveness? SETOWN Sunshine (1895) 185. Abd. Sic a weary wardle, ALEXANDER Johnny Gibb (1871) ii. Dmb. I trow there's few sic folk, SALMON Gowodean (1868) 13. Lnk. I'll strive to seem like a' the rest, But sic I mayna be, LEMON St. Mungo (1844) 7. Bwk. We've sic a store, HENDERSON Pop. Rhymes (1856) Dedic. 8. Gall. Wi' sic a soun my lugs were stouned, NICHOLSON Poet. Wks. (1814) 65, ed. 1897. N.l.1 Nhb. Sic a thing! RICHARDSON Borderer's Table-bk. (1846) VI. 315. Dur.1, w.Dur.1, Cum. (E.W.P.) s.Wm. We ha sick a plague with them, HUTTON Dial. Storth and Armside (1760) l. 22. n.Yks.2, w.Yks.3, Lan.1 n.Lan. Sic a thing! Lonsdale Mag. (July 1866) 7; n.Lan.1 For t'mie flagn by at sic a reate. ne.Lan.1 (7) Sc. (J.M.) Bch. For they had gl'en him sik a fleg, FORBES Ajax (1742) 8. n.Yks.1, w.Yks.1, ne.Lan.1 (8) n.Cy. (K.) Nhb. Put all the feasters in sik a fear, RITSON Gatr. (1810); Nhb.1, Dur.1 Cum.3 I set on an' geh them o' sike a blackin' as they will'n't seu forgit, 87. n.Yks.1234 ne.Yks.1 There nivver was sike deed afoor. e.Yks. MARSHALL Rur. Econ. (1788); e.Yks.1, m.Yks.1 w.Yks.1 I cud not thole him at onny sike figure, ii. 289. nw.Der.1 (9) Hrf.1 (10) Ken. Sal i was mighty glad To hear sudge news as dat, MASTERS Dick and Sal (c. 1821) st. 18. (11) Glo.12 (12) Wxf.1 Glo. My dog has gotten zitch a trick, GIBBS Cotswold Vill. (1898) 87. I.W.1 Wil. SLOW Gl. (1892). Dor. I dunno why us be all in zich a tale, HARE Vill. Street
(1895) 203. **Som.** He do... holler hiszelf into zitch a tare, you'd think the clouds must vall, RAYMOND Gent. Upcott (1893) vi. (13) **Dev.** WHITE Cyman’s Conductor (1701) 128.

*Fig. 76:* An example of a grammatically “unclear” EDD entry, with a list of potential grammatical categories followed by a collection of unmarked usage examples (EDD Online: “such, adj., pron. and adv.”).

These “unclear” values play an instrumental role in the OED’s dominance over the EDD for *Contemporary* Cumbrian grammatical usefulness. 10 *Contemporary* [headword]s are listed in the [relationship1] field with “Do Not Match” values, 4 of which are listed with “unclear” EDD grammatical categories. These 4 “unclear” values again provide automatic dominance for the OED in the [grammar most accurate to usage examples] field for their respective [headword]s, as it provides transparent grammatical categorisation where the EDD fails to. Like in section 4.2.1.1 therefore, the OED enjoys uncontested ownership of the title of “most accurate grammatical authority” due to an oversight in the EDD’s methodology.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEADWORD</th>
<th>GRAMMATICAL CATEGORY: EDD</th>
<th>GRAMMATICAL CATEGORY: OED</th>
<th>RELATIONSHIP1</th>
<th>GRAMMAR MOST ACCURATE TO USAGE EXAMPLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aback</td>
<td>preposition</td>
<td>adverb</td>
<td>Do Not Match</td>
<td>EDD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beàth</td>
<td>adjective</td>
<td>pronoun</td>
<td>Do Not Match</td>
<td>OED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fuddled</td>
<td>adjective</td>
<td>verb</td>
<td>Do Not Match</td>
<td>EDD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fust</td>
<td>unclear</td>
<td>adverb</td>
<td>Do Not Match</td>
<td>OED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meast</td>
<td>noun</td>
<td>pronoun</td>
<td>Do Not Match</td>
<td>OED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nowt1</td>
<td>noun</td>
<td>pronoun</td>
<td>Do Not Match</td>
<td>OED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>owder</td>
<td>adjective</td>
<td>adverb</td>
<td>Do Not Match</td>
<td>OED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sec1</td>
<td>unclear</td>
<td>pronoun</td>
<td>Do Not Match</td>
<td>OED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yan1</td>
<td>unclear</td>
<td>pronoun</td>
<td>Do Not Match</td>
<td>OED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition, the EDD sometimes provides contradictory grammars to its usage examples. For example, the EDD entry for *owder* does not recognise its use as an adverb (EDD Online: "either, adj., pron. and conj."). However, the EDD entry contains usage examples which use variants *owder* in the same adverbial manner recognised by the OED. Consult the following analysis:

**RELEVANT OED DEFINITION**

II. Adverbial uses of A. II. "One or other of the two."

3. Introducing the mention of alternatives.

(OED Online: "either, adj. (and pron.) and adv. (and conj.")"

**EDD USAGE EXAMPLES**

• (2) Wm. Ader he'll kill me, er I'll kill him, Robison Aald Taales (1882)
• (19) Cum. Tou's owther fuil or font, Anderson Ballads (1805)
• (20) Lan. He's allus at uther him or me, Burnett Lowrie's (1877)

(EDD Online: "either, adj., pron. and conj.")

**OED USAGE EXAMPLES**

• 1597 – BP. J. KING Lect. Ionas xlvi. 624: The mutable and transitorye either pleasures or profittes of this life.
• 1713  G. BERKELEY Three Dialogues Hylas & Philonous I. 52: Either, Hylas, you are jesting, or have a very bad Memory.
• 1875  B. JOWETT tr. Plato Dialogues (ed. 2) III. 266: A narration of events, either past, present, or to come.

(OED Online: "either, adj. (and pron.) and adv. (and conj.")"

Oversights such as these produce frustrating entries. Their revision would greatly benefit the EDD's usefulness and move the EDD a step closer to the expected conventions of modern grammatical classification in which the information on a headword's grammatical behaviour approximates closely to the norms of average use in that language's syntax (Atkins and Rundell 2008: 45).
4.2.2.2 Grammatical Change between *Traditional* and *Contemporary* Cumbrian

The [headword]s *nowt*2 and *ower*4 appear to be products of the process of *conversion*. As mentioned in section 4.1.2.3, this process of language change involves a word's transfer from one grammatical category to another, with its form and elements of its meaning retained in the transfer (McMahon 1994: 197, Durkin 2009: 114). Neither *nowt*2 nor *ower*4 appears in the *Traditional* sample, yet both words are present in the *Contemporary* sample, suggesting their coinage between the *Traditional* and *Contemporary* time-periods. As demonstrated by *fig. 78*, they appear to be grammatically transferred variants of *nowt*1 and *ower*2 respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONVERSION IN TWO <em>CONTEMPORARY</em> [HEADWORD]S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEAREST TRADITIONAL [HEADWORD]</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[headword]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>nowt</em>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ower</em>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fig. 78*: Table demonstrating a potential process of conversion in two *Contemporary* [headword]s.

The EDD does not provide grammatical information for *nowt*2 nor *ower*4. However, it does list grammatical information for *nowt*1 and *ower*2 (EDD Online: "nought, sb., adj., adv. and v." and "over, prep., adv., adj. and v."). So, because the EDD is still considered a leading authority of English dialect lexis (Upton 2016: 383), the user may incorrectly assign the EDD information for
nowt1 and ower2 to instances of nowt2’s and ower4’s use, which would result in an inaccurate representation of the grammatically-transferred words’ application in Contemporary Cumbrian.

Despite the clarity of these findings, further investigation is necessary to confirm this process of grammatical change. It is important to consider the limited sample size of this study; for nowt1 and nowt2, a total of 7 variants were gathered in the Traditional and Contemporary samples combined. For ower2 and ower4, the total was only 3. In addition, the primary data consisted of only 240 pages of material from 12 authors, restricting the number of variants which could be gathered.

This study had neither the time nor resources to carry out a more extensive investigation of language change, and therefore may encounter criticism for its small sample size (Tagliamonte 2006: 33). However, this example bears relevance, not to conclusively report on grammatical change, but rather to draw attention to the types of language change which may render the EDD’s information deficient.

4.2.2.3 Conclusion: Research Question 2 – Contemporary Cumbrian Grammar

These results demonstrate the limit of the EDD’s usefulness to the study of Contemporary Cumbrian grammar. Despite Wright’s claims32, the EDD’s grammatical categorisation is unhelpful to the modern scholar, with the OED providing a more detailed and more accurate account. Also, due to the EDD’s synchronic construction (Penhallurick 2009: 312), instances of grammatical change which occurred between the Traditional and Contemporary time-periods are not documented and the EDD’s application to such scenarios may result in user confusion.

---

32 Wright (1898: v) stated in the Preface to the English Dialect Dictionary that his work “can never become antiquated” which, as this chapter proves, is not the case.
4.3 ETYMOLOGY
4.3.1 RESEARCH QUESTION 1 AND RESEARCH QUESTION 2: EDD Comprehensiveness to *Traditional* Cumbrian (1700–1898) and EDD Usefulness to *Contemporary* Cumbrian (1950–present)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRADITIONAL CUMBRIAN: EDD ETYMOLOGY COMPARED AGAINST THE OED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Headword]s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fig. 79*: *Traditional* Cumbrian etymology results from the [relationship2] field, comparing the EDD’s assessment of etymology against the OED.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MODERN CUMBRIAN: EDD ETYMOLOGY COMPARED AGAINST THE OED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Headword]s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fig. 80*: *Contemporary* Cumbrian etymology results from the [relationship2] field, comparing the EDD’s assessment of etymology against the OED.

As mentioned in the *etymology* hypothesis, the researcher finds it clearer to assess both research questions for the *etymology* parameter simultaneously, due to the amount of overlap between *Traditional* and *Contemporary* data (*cf.* section 3.2.3.3.1). The researcher’s hypothesis was correct; the [relationship2] field returned far more “Do Not Match” than “Match” values for both the *Traditional* and *Contemporary* Cumbrian samples, demonstrating the EDD’s poor etymological comprehensiveness for *Traditional* Cumbrian and limited etymological usefulness for *Contemporary* Cumbrian.
The researcher did not expect the sheer volume of missing EDD information for *Traditional* and *Contemporary* Cumbrian *etymology*. In both time-periods, more than 50% of [headword]s were returned “No EDD Etymology” values in the [relationship2] field, representing a huge gap in the EDD’s comprehensiveness and its severely limited usefulness. When compared to the diminutive “No OED Etymology” values of around 1%, the EDD’s authority is severely questionable.

### 4.3.1.1 The EDD’s Tentative Etymologies

As recognised by Upton (2016: 382), the EDD’s treatment of etymology is cautious, with Wright choosing to either accept the work of renowned 19th Century etymologists as authoritative or to ignore etymology altogether where no obvious information could be found. Wright’s cautious approach to etymology is contextualised well by Liberman’s (2009: 270) discussion of *dogmatic* and *analytic* etymological dictionaries, printed below.

Two types of etymological dictionaries exist: dogmatic and analytic. The author of a *dogmatic* etymological dictionary will state what is *uncontroversial*, that is, give the date of the earliest occurrence in texts, list the secure cognates, point to the lending language when the source of borrowing has been ascertained, and repeat the solution that has the support of the most distinguished scholars. [...] In the worst-case scenario, the word will be dismissed with the verdict “of unknown origin.

By contrast, the author of an *analytic* etymological dictionary will represent the history of research [...] summarise rather than allude to the existing hypotheses, refer to scholarly literature, and leave the reader with an informed opinion.

(Liberman 2009: 270)

The EDD falls into Liberman’s *dogmatic* category. To illustrate this discussion, consult the EDD and OED etymologies for the *Traditional* [headword] *amang*, reprinted in *fig. 81* below. Wright provides two usage examples as evidence (EDD Online: “among, prep.”); a 17th Century extract from Dampier’s *Voyages* and a citation from *The House of Fame*, written by the celebrated Middle English poet, Geoffrey Chaucer (Skeat 1899: 50). Wright provides no further analysis, resulting in an etymology which presents *amang* as a word of Middle English origin.
**TRADITIONAL CUMBRIAN: AMANG, PREP.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EDD ETYMOLOGY</th>
<th>OED ETYMOLOGY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Z. Vinello’s... are much used among chocolate to perfume it, Dampier Voy. I. 235 (N.E.D.); Bawme helde Among a basket ful of roses, Chaucer Haus F. 1687.] (EDD Online: &quot;among, prep.&quot;)</td>
<td>[originally a phrase, on in + gemang mingling, assemblage, crowd (&lt; gemengan to mingle, combine: see ming v.1); hence, with a noun in the genitive, 'in the assemblage or company of,' then used prepositionally with dative or accusative. Before 1100, the full on gemang(e was reduced to onmang, whence by regular phonetic gradation amang, among. The simple gemang was also used prepositionally without on, giving later ymong prep., mong n.2 Between among and imong, thus used side by side, arose emong. Modern poets also abbreviate among to 'mong. There was a parallel bimong prep.] (OED Online: &quot;among, prep. and adv.&quot;)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fig. 81: Comparison between EDD and OED etymologies for the Traditional [headword] amang.*

The OED etymology for *amang* illustrates the extent of the EDD’s inaccuracy. The OED recognises the word *amang* as a derivate of Old English *on gemong*, with the variants *onmang* and *amang* appearing before the Middle English period through reduction and phonetic gradation (OED Online: "among, prep. and adv."). Instead of engaging with this analytic approach to *amang*'s etymology, Wright adopted a dogmatic system in which he sourced the words earliest appearance in readily available literature and neglected further analysis. This produces an inaccurate representation of *amang*'s history in English, providing a poor starting point for further etymological study33.

Another example which illustrates the EDD’s dogmatism is Wright’s analysis of the *Contemporary* [headword] *fell2* (EDD Online: “fell, sb.2”). His etymology is simple, pointing to Old Norse as the sole lending language, neglecting the closely-related cognate Scandinavian languages entirely. Consult *fig. 82* for a comparison of Wright’s (EDD Online: “fell, sb.2”), Skeat’s (1882: 205) and the OED’s (OED Online: “fell, n.3”) etymologies of *fell*.

---

33 Similar instances were found throughout the EDD, such as the *Traditional and Contemporary* Cumbrian *laal*, which ignores the connection to Old Norse *litell*, listing Danish *lille* “little” as its sole etymon (EDD Online: "lile, adj.” and OED Online: "lile, adj. and adv."). Also, the EDD ignores Old Norse *verja* “to invest (money)” in the etymology of the *Traditional* Cumbrian *ware*, listing a Middle English letter as its only usage example.
CONTEMPORARY CUMBRIAN: FELL2, N.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WRIGHT (1898–1905)</th>
<th>SKEAT (1882)</th>
<th>OED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1. In frith and fell Saul soght dauid for to quell, Cursor M. (c. 1300) 7697. ON. fjall, a mountain.] (EDD Online: “fell, sb.2”)</td>
<td><strong>FELL</strong> (4), a hill. (Scand.) M. E. <em>fel</em>, Sir Gawain and the Green Knight, 723. – Icel. <em>fjall</em>, fel, a mountain. + Dan. <em>field</em>. + Swed. <em>fjall</em>. β. Probably orig. applied to an open flat down; and the same word as E. <em>field</em>; this the mountain opposite Helvellyn is called <em>Fairfield</em> = sheep-fell (from Icel. <em>fær</em>, a sheep). See Field. (Skeat 1882: 205)</td>
<td>[&lt; early Scandinavian (compare Old Icelandic <em>fjall</em>, Old Swedish <em>fjäl</em>, Old Danish <em>fjæld</em>, <em>fjeld</em>), all in senses ‘mountain’ and ‘elevated stretch of land’, in Danish also in sense ‘rock’), probably (with consonantal assimilation <em>-lz</em> &gt; <em>-ll</em>) &lt; a different ablaut grade of the same Germanic base as Old High German <em>fels</em>, <em>fels</em> rock, cliff, large stone (Middle High German <em>vels</em>, German <em>Fels</em> rock) &lt; a different ablaut grade (o-grade) of the same Indo-European base as (with zero-grade) Early Irish all <em>cliff</em>.] (OED Online: “fell, n.3”)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. 82: Comparison of fell etymologies from Wright, Skeat (1882) and the OED.**

Skeat’s (1882: 205) etymology proves fell’s connection to Danish and Swedish was known during the EDD’s compilation; Wright’s decision to ignore these cognate languages makes his etymology less useful to Contemporary Cumbrian as it assumes a simpler linguistic origin. *Fell* is derived from several early Scandinavian languages, and whilst it may have passed into the dialects of English through contact with Old Norse settlers from the 8th Century onwards (Blair 2001: 91–9, Wilkinson 2017), Wright’s ignorance of fell’s pre-Viking conquest usage leaves his readers with a lesser “informed opinion” than his rivals’ works (Liberman 2009: 270).

Similar instances of dogmatism appear throughout the EDD[34], with Wright often presenting the etymology which is supported by the most distinguished scholars (Liberman 2009: 270). Of the 148 [headword]s for which Wright attempted etymologies, 101 were assigned as derivatives of Old English, Old Norse, French or Danish (*cf. fig. 83*). These four languages are recognised by distinguished lexicographers and etymologists, such as Johnson and Skeat, as bearing the greatest influence over English (*cf. appendix iv.*), due to each language’s valued position

---

[34] Wright often assigns a single language for his etymology’s key contributor. Cognate languages from the same family are normally neglected. For example, the [headword]s *ail*, *bairn*, *caff*, *owder* and *yacker* are all listed in the EDD as derivatives of Old English. Their Germanic cognate forms (which the OED recognises) from Old Norse, Danish, Gothic, Dutch, German and Frisian are ignored (*cf. appendix i.*).
throughout the history of British politics (cf. appendix v.). So, perhaps to avoid the critique of his contemporaries, Wright’s etymologies follow their tradition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OLD ENGLISH</th>
<th>OLD NORSE</th>
<th>FRENCH</th>
<th>OE/ON</th>
<th>DANISH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Cumbrian</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Cumbrian</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fig. 83: Frequent key language contributors from the [etymological root: EDD] field of the Traditional and Contemporary samples.*

### 4.3.1.2 Conclusion: Research Question 1 and Research Question 2 – Traditional and Contemporary Cumbrian

Rather than attempt anything revolutionary, where etymology was concerned, Wright appears to have structured his entries around existing evidence, taking a dogmatic approach by selectively drawing on etymological information from distinguished scholars (Liberman 2009: 270). Upton (2016: 382) suggests that EDD etymologies were left intentionally vague to avoid inaccuracies but, in doing so, Wright decreased the EDD’s etymological comprehensive for Traditional Cumbrian and limited the EDD’s etymological usefulness for Contemporary Cumbrian by providing inaccurate or unhelpful starting points for further etymological study. The high number of unattempted etymologies, coupled with the incomplete examples mentioned here call for an update to the EDD, in which etymology is assessed on analytic terms, producing results which leave the reader with an “informed opinion” (Liberman 2009: 270).
4.4 DEFINITION

This chapter is unconventionally structured. First, the results for research question 1 and research question 2 will be presented independently, with the researcher's hypotheses evaluated. Then, for reasons of clarity, both research questions will be addressed in the same discussion on the EDD’s defining practice. Finally, research question 1 and research question 2 will be analysed independently in two further discussions on the EDD’s definition reliability against the OED and the EDD’s definition accuracy against this study’s primary data.

4.4.1 RESEARCH QUESTION 1: Results for EDD Comprehensiveness to *Traditional* Cumbrian (1700–1898)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRADITIONAL CUMBRIAN: EDD DEFINITIONS COMPARED AGAINST THE OED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Table" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 84: *Traditional Cumbrian definition* results from the [relationship3] field, comparing the EDD’s coverage of [headword] definitions against the OED.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRADITIONAL CUMBRIAN: DEFINITION MOST ACCURATE TO READING PROGRAMME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Table" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 85: *Traditional Cumbrian definition* results from the [definition most accurate to usage examples?] field, demonstrating the EDD and OED’s usefulness as a tool for defining the [headword]s in this investigation’s reading programme.

The researcher’s hypothesis was incorrect. The EDD proved to be less comprehensive than the OED for *Traditional Cumbrian definition*, with the [relationship3] field returning fewer “EDD Definition Only” than “OED Definition Only” values (cf. fig.84). In addition, the EDD proved less
accurate than the OED to this study's primary data, with far more “OED” than “EDD” values being returned by the [definition most accurate to usage examples?] field (cf. fig. 85). These results indicate the EDD’s lack of saliency for Traditional Cumbrian dialect definitions, and the superiority of the OED’s comprehensiveness.

4.4.2 RESEARCH QUESTION 2: Results for EDD Usefulness to Contemporary Cumbrian (1950–present)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MODERN CUMBRIAN: EDD DEFINITIONS COMPARED AGAINST THE OED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Headword]s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 86: Contemporary Cumbrian definition results from the [relationship3] field, comparing the EDD’s coverage of [headword] definitions against the OED.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTEMPORARY CUMBRIAN: DEFINITION MOST ACCURATE TO READING PROGRAMME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Headword]s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 87: Contemporary Cumbrian definition results from the [definition most accurate to usage examples?] field, demonstrating the EDD and OED’s usefulness as a tool for defining the [headword]s in this investigation’s reading programme.

The researcher’s hypothesis was correct. The EDD proved far less useful than the OED for the study of Contemporary Cumbrian definition, returning more “OED Definition Only” than “EDD Definition Only” values in the [relationship3] field. Also, the EDD’s definition accuracy against this study’s primary data proved insignificant in comparison to the OED, with more than 50 “OED” than “EDD” values being returned by the [definition most accurate to usage examples?]
field. These results indicate the outdated nature of the EDD’s definitions for Contemporary Cumbrian, and its limited usefulness to the modern dialect scholar.

4.4.3 RESEARCH QUESTION 1 AND RESEARCH QUESTION 2: EDD Comprehensiveness to Traditional Cumbrian (1700–1898) and EDD Usefulness to Contemporary Cumbrian (1950–present)

4.4.3.1 EDD: Poor Defining Practice

As illustrated by section 4.4.1 and 4.4.2, the EDD struggles to accurately define its lexis. For the Traditional and Contemporary samples respectively, 15% and 16.3% of [headword]s returned the “unsatisfactory EDD definition” value in the [relationship3] field (cf. figs. 84 and 86), representing an EDD entry which includes grammatical categorie(s), usage example(s) and an etymology, but no clear definition (cf. section 3.2.4.1). In such instances, Wright chooses to either ignore the word’s definition entirely, or provides one-word “translational” definitions from the dialect word into Standard English. This practice results in a confusing and disorderly entry, leaving the user ill-informed on the headword’s meaning. Both scenarios will be analysed by this section, starting with Wright’s ignorance in definition. Consult fig. 88 for an example:

**FOOL. sb.** and **adj.** Var. dial. uses in Sc. Irel. and Eng. Also in forms faal n.Yks.2; feal n.Yks.2 e.Yks.1; feel Sc. Cai.1 Bnff.1; feul Nhb.1 Cumb.; foo Lan.1 s.Chs.1; fule Sc. (JAM.) Sh.l. [fül, ful, fiel, fiel, fœl, fœl.]

1. **sb.** In comb. (1) **Fool-body**, an idiot; (2) **Fool’s-cap**, the columbine, *Aquilegia vulgaris*; (3) **Fool’s-coat**, the goldfinch, *Carduelis elegans*; (4) **Fool’s fair**, an annual fair held at Lincoln; see below; (5) **Fool-farley**, foolish; (6) **Fool-gowk**, an April fool; (7) **Fool-gowk day**, the 1st of April; (8) **Fool-hard**, foolhardy; (9) **Fool’s holiday**, see **Fool-gowk day**; (10) **Fool-like**, see **Fool-farley**; (11) **Fool-ment**, foolishness, nonsense; (12) **Fool’s parsley**, the lesser hemlock, *Aethusa Cynapium*; (13) **Fool-scutter**, silly, boasting talk; (14) **Fool-side**, a weak side, the part most open to be fooled or gullied; (15) **Fool-talk**, nonsense; (16) **Fool-toad**, an epithet of abuse, implying stupidity; (17) **Fool-toy**, an insignificant fop.

(1) Sc. Fat is the auld feel-body deeing that he canna gang away? SCOTT ANTIQUARY (1816) xxvii. Cor. ‘Twas a reg’lar foolbody,
this hen, ‘Q.’ Troy Town (1888) xiii. (2) w.Yks. Lees
Flora (1888) 125. (3) Nrf. SwaInSon Birds (1885) 58. (4) Lin.
There is an annual fair held in the Broad-gate at Lincoln on the
14th of September, called Fool’s Fair, for the sale of cattle, so
called, as follows: ‘King William and his Queen having visited
Lincoln,... made the citizens an offer to serve them in any
manner they liked best. They asked for a fair, though it was
harvest, when few people can attend it, and though the town had
no trade nor any manufacture. The King smiled, and granted
their request, observing that it was a humble one indeed,’ Brand
Pop. Aniq. (ed. 1813) ll. 324. (5) e.Yks.1 Used in reference to
both persons and things, MS. add. (T.H.) (6) NhB. At Woolmer,
those who thus resisted being made ‘feul-gowks,’ Flk-Lore Rec.
(1879) ll. 85, NhB.1 (7) NhB. Being made ‘feul-gowks’ on
‘feul-gowk day,’ Flk-Lore Rec. (1879) ll. 85. (8) Lan. He ails
nought ‘at aw know on, nobbut he talks to mich off at th’ side,
neaW an’ then; an’ he’s foo-hard, Waugh SnecK-Bant (1868) ii;
awils scartlin an’ writin’ some feulment, Gwordie Greenup
Yance a Year (1873) 3. (12) Chs.1 Rut.1 He’s eaten a green head
of fool’s parsley or some other poisonous thing, you’re sure!
w.Cy. Towards the end of the month [May] the grand fool’s
parsley is decorating the damper hedges, Longman’s Mag. (Apr.
1898) 540. (13) Lan. Thae desarves jollopin’ for talkin’ sich-like
foo-scatter as that, Waugh Ben an’ Bantam (1866) v; Lan.1 (14)
Lan.1 There isn’t a wick soul i’ th’ world at hasn’t a foo-side. (15)
n.Yks.2 (16) w.Som.1 I have heard men, boys, horses, oxen, and
dogs called by this name. (17) w.Yks. Leeds Merc. Suppl. (May
6, 1893).

(EDD Online: “fool, sb. and adj.”)

Fig. 88: The EDD Online entry, “fool, sb. and adj.” The entry does not explicitly define the noun, instead relying on the
user to make inferences on its meaning based on the entry’s compounded forms and usage examples. Also the
simplex noun “fool” (i.e. non-compounded) is not defined.

Landau (2001: 163, my bold) is critical of Wright’s disorderly approach to definition stating:
“definers must put themselves in the place of someone who hasn’t the vaguest idea what the
word means and try to anticipate the kinds of wrong assumptions such a person might
make.” Wright’s failure to include a definition in his entry for “fool, sb.” forces the user to assume
the headword’s meaning from the cited usage examples and compounds. In this instance, the
inexperienced user could likely gain a general understanding of the headword’s use in the
dialects of English, with trigger-words such as idiot and nonsense offering clues. Despite this, the
poor lexicographic practice demonstrated here has the potential to provide EDD users with
inaccurate definitions, especially if the user is not native to the headword’s dialect or the
English language35.

35 As recognised by Lakoff (1973: 164), “the purpose of a dictionary [...] is to fill in what the speaker cannot be
expected to know already.” EDD users from other dialects or languages cannot be expected to know every intricacy of
The EDD demonstrates similarly poor defining practice in its use of “translational” one-word definitions. Between the *Traditional* and *Contemporary* samples, 16 [headword]s bear single-word EDD definition, which offer little more information than the imprecise definitions offered by Cawdrey in his *Table Alphabetical* or Dickinson in his *Glossary* (Osselton 2009: 135, Cawdrey 1604, Dickinson 1859). These [headword]s, and their relevant EDD definitions, are listed in fig. 89.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRADITIONAL AND CONTEMPORARY CUMBRIAN: ONE-WORD EDD DEFINITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRADITIONAL CUMBRIAN (1700–1898)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[HEADWORD]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adoot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>claes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nowt1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>russel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skell</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*the dialect used by an EDD headword or the English language generally. It is the EDD's role to provide the user with such information.*
Fig. 89: One-word “translational” EDD definitions for Traditional and Contemporary Cumbrian [headword].

Whilst many of these definitions may seem self-explanatory to the experienced dialectologist, these “translations” provide further opportunity for users to make “wrong assumptions” on these headwords’ meanings (Landau 2001: 163). By using definitions which are a) comprised of only one word and b) not separated according to sense, the EDD ignores the issue of polysemy in English, lumping several semantically distinct uses of a headword under the same sense in one confusing entry.

An example is found in the relevant EDD entry for nowt1. The EDD lists the noun “nothing” as the word’s definition, followed by a list of usage examples belonging to a myriad of polysemous senses relating to the noun “nothing” (EDD Online: "nought, sb., adj., adv. and v."). A detailed analysis of these usage examples and their relevant senses is provided below, with the aim of illustrating the trouble with Wright’s approach to “translational” definitions. The OED is used as the authority for sense division.

**EDD ENTRY: “nought, sb., adj., adv. and v.”**

1. sb. Nothing.
**Cum.4 Wm.** That 'ats nowt's niver e mich danger, Old saying (B.K.).  
**n.Yks.12; n.Yks.3** Had ribbins for varra near nowt, 3;  
**n.Yks.4 ne.Yks.1** Ah knaw nowt aboot it.  
**e.Yks.1** What Ah diz is nowt if neebody bud mysen.  
**m.Yks.1 w.Yks.1** ii. 285;  
**w.Yks.234; w.Yks.5** Tha'll take nowt an' g'ie nowt.  
**Lan.** Ey knoas nowt aboot him.  
**AnsWorsh Lan. Witches (ed. 1849)** i; Ah ne'er see nocht like it! (F.P.T.);  
**Lan.1, n.Lan.1, e.Lan.1, m.Lan.1, Chs.1**  
**s.Chs.** I've got nout for thee (E.F.);  
**s.Chs.1 Midl.** I think nowt on it, *Bartram People of Clopton* (1897) 140.  
**s.Stf.** I had nowt to do wi' that job, *Pinnock* *Bik. Cy. Ann.* (1895).  
**Der.1; Der.2** Now't but a tinker'd consarn (s.v. Tinkered).  
**nw.Der.1 Not.** He waent do it for note (J.H.B.); There's noot like lazziness for comfort,  
**Prior Renie** (1895) 248;  
**Not.1 Lin.** Thoort nowt o' a noorse,  
**Tennyson N. Farmer, Old Style** (1864) st. 1;  
**Lin.1 n.Lin.1** She was sittin' by th' fire doin' noht.  
**sw.Lin.1** I can't do no't, to mean o't.  
**Rut.1** It's nowt o' the kind!  
**Lei.1 Nhp.1** It all means nout.  
**War.** (J.R.W.),  
**War.23, Shr.1 Glo.** I can ride whoam free and fur nowt.  
**Buckman** *Darke's Sojourn* (1890) vii.  
**Brks.1**  
**All as I do's this year zims to come to nowt.**  
**Hnt.** (T.P.F.)  
**e.Suf.** I don't know nort about it (F.H.).  
**Sur.** He could'na leave me nowt i' his will, *Bickley* *Sur. Hills* (1890) iii. xvi.  
**Sus.** It was nowt but a field, *Jennings Field Paths* (1884) 37.  
**Hmp.1 s.Hmp.** I thowt as it weren't for nowt as I heerd the old ash-tree a-groaning,  
**VERNEY L. Lisle* (1870) iii. 37.  
**Dor.1** To play var nèat.  
**w.Som.1, Dev.2 n.Dev.** That's nort to nobody, *Exm.*  
**Crtshp.** (1746) l. 621.  
**Cor.** I b'lieve I be nort but a dead man,  
**T. Towser** (1873) 10;  
**Cor.2** What's good for nort comes to no hort.  
Hence (1) **Noughtless, adj.** good-for-nothing, valueless;  
(2) **Noughtlike, adj.** of inferior quality, unsatisfactory; (3) **Noughtness, sb.** nothingness, wickedness; (4) **Nowter, sb.** 'a fool's errand.'  

(EDD Online: "nought, sb., adj., adv. and v.")

**EDD: UNREGULATED SENSE DIVISION**

The senses of *nowt1* expressed by this entry's usage examples, listed under their relevant OED definitions. Note the complexity of sense division which the EDD entry ignores.

**A. pron. and n.**

In earliest use normally preceded or followed by another negative (generally equivalent to standard English *anything* in a negative context); this construction continues to occur frequently, but after the end of the Middle English period is chiefly nonstandard.

1. Not any (material or immaterial) thing; nought.

   a. Unqualified or with qualifying phrase or adverb

   **Frø.** We hae nought to gie, *JOHNSTON Poems* (1869) 100.
   
   **Lnk.** Ye've nocht in yer pouches but dirty green rags, *HAMILTON Poems* (1865) 46.
   
   **Sîk.** Saw you noch? *CHR. NORTH Noctes* (ed. 1856) IV. 89.
   
   **Dmf.** Thou hast nàe fràe thy mammie, *CROMEK Remains* (1810) 30.
   
   **Nhb.** I want for nowt that she can gie me, *WILSON Pitman's Pay* (1843) 13
w.Yks.5 Tha'll take nowt an' gi'e nowt.

s.Chs. I've got nout for thee (E.F.)

Not.1 Lin. Thoornt nowt o' a noorse, TENNYSON N. Farmer, Old Style (1864) st. 1

Lei.1 Nhp.1 It all means nout. War. (J.R.W.)

Sur. He could'na leave me nowt i' his will, BICKLEY Sur. Hills (1890) Ill. Xvi

Cor.2 What's good for nort comes to no hort.

b. With postmodifying adjective.

Cum. We had nout better to drink, RITSON Borrowdale Lett. (1866) 4

2. a. No part, share, or quantity of a thing; no aspect, evidence, or quality of a thing or person.

n.Yks.4 ne.Yks.1 Ah knaw nowt aboot it.

Lan. Ey knoas neawt abowt him. AINSWORTH Lan. Witches (ed. 1849) i

s.Chs.1 Midl. I think nowt on it, Bartram People of Clopton (1897) 140.

Rut.1 It's nowt o' the kind!

e.Suf. I don't know nort about it (F.H.).

3. a. Not anything, or anybody, of importance, significance, value, or concern; something or somebody of no importance, etc. Frequently in it's nothing: used as a polite response to an apology or an expression of thanks. Chiefly in predicative use.

Cum.4 Wm. That 'ats nowt's nivver e mich danger, Old saying (B.K.).

e.Yks.1 What Ah diz is nowt tı neeobody bud mysen.

w.Som.1, Dev.2 n.Dev. That's nort to nobody, Exm. Crtshp. (1746) l. 621.

PHRASES

P1. Followed by a limiting particle.

a. nothing but (also besides, except, save): only, merely. Cf. BESIDES adv. and prep., BUT conj. 1a, EXCEPT adj. 1, SAVE prep. 2.

(a) With a noun phrase following the limiting particle.

Cai.1 Elg. 'Tis nocht but richt, in summer nicht, A lassie watch her somebody, TESTER Poems (1865) 220.

Kcd. Nocht save fearsome tales o' Bonny Ran the country roon GRANT Lays (1884) 33.

Ayr. Nocht but dule and dolour pruve, SERVICE Notandums (1890) 91.

Rxb. I'm seeking nowt but what I've rowt for, FORD Thistledown (1891) 186.

Der.1; Der.2 Now't but a tinker'd consarn (s.v. Tinkered).

Sus. It was nowt but a field, JENNINGS Field Paths (1884) 37.

Cor. I b'lieve I be nort but a dead man, T. Towser (1873) 10
(b) After the verb to do. Formerly followed by a verb in the corresponding inflected form; now usually by the bare infinitive, or, after doing, the gerund.

Lin.1 n. Lin.1 She was sittin' by th' fire doin' noht.

sw. Lin.1 I can't do no't, to mean o't.

P2. for nothing.

b. In vain; to no effect; for no result. Also all for nothing.

Shr.1 Glo. I can ride whoam free and fur nowt, BUCKMAN Darke's Sojourn (1890) vii.

Hmp.1 s. Hmp. I thowt as it weren't for nowt as I heerd the old ash-tree a-groaning, VERNEY L. Lisle (1870) Ill. 37.

c. Without payment or cost; free, gratuitously. Also fig.

N.I.1 I got it for nout.

n. Yks.12; n. Yks.3 Had ribbins for varra near nowt, 3

nw. Der.1 He waent do it for note (J.H.B.)

P5. In adverb use.

a. nothing like. (a) With noun: not at all like, not resembling at all; also †nothing like to (obsolete); (b) In other constructions: not by any means, not nearly. Cf. anything like at ANYTHING pron., n., and adv. Phrases 2, something like at SOMETHING adv. 3.

Not. There's noat like laziness for comfort, PRIOR Renie (1895) 248

Lan. Ah ne'er see nocht like it! (F.P.T.)

P8. to come to nothing: to have no significant or successful result or effect in the end; to fail, to amount to nothing.

Brks.1 All as I do's this year zims to come to nowt.

P10. nothing to do with: no connection or involvement with, (of) no relevance to. Usually in to have (got) nothing to do with: to have no dealings or connection with; to be unrelated or irrelevant to. Cf. do v. Phrases 1b(a)(i).

Nhb.1, DUR.1, E. DUR.1 Lakel.2 Ah'll hev nowt ta deea wi' 't.


(OED Online: "nothing, pron., and n., adv., and int.", EDD Online: "nought, sb., adj., adv. and v.")

Fig. 90: The EDD entry "nought, sb., adj., adv. and v.", with its usage examples divided by sense according to the authority of the OED entry "nothing, pron., and n., adv., and int." demonstrating the EDD’s hinderance as a tool for researching Traditional and Contemporary Cumbrian dialect definition.

This approach to definition strangles the EDD’s comprehensiveness for Traditional Cumbrian by restricting the user’s access to polysemous sense. As recognised by Landau (2001: 170), "if a word used in a definition has more than one meaning [...], the particular sense in which it is intended must be made clear by the rest of the definition.” The relevant EDD entry for nowt1 ignores this maxim, blending eleven senses into the same definition, offering no indication of the
headword’s intended use in any of the entry's usage examples. The EDD’s usefulness to Contemporary Cumbrian is negatively affected for the same reason. Further examples of Wright’s poor defining practice are available in appendix vi.

4.4.3.2 Conclusion: Research Question 1 and Research Question 2 – Traditional and Contemporary Cumbrian

Atkins and Rundell (2008: 412) state “if a definition cannot be readily understood by its intended user, it has failed.” By this maxim, the EDD has failed. Its ignorance in definition and use of confusing “translational” definitions restricts its comprehensiveness to Traditional Cumbrian and limits its usefulness to Contemporary Cumbrian by obscuring the polysemous senses of its headwords. To make the EDD a better tool for the study of Traditional and Contemporary Cumbrian definition, its definitions must be made accessible to its users (Landau 2001: 157).

4.4.4 RESEARCH QUESTION 1: EDD Comprehensiveness to Traditional Cumbrian (1700–1898)

The aim of this section is to discuss the extent of the EDD’s comprehensiveness for Traditional Cumbrian definition by expanding on the discussions of section 4.4.3. This section will consider issues such as the EDD’s reliability in definition against the OED, and the EDD’s accuracy in definition against this study's primary data for the Traditional sample specifically.

4.4.4.1 EDD Definition Reliability Against the OED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRADITIONAL CUMBRIAN: EDD DEFINITION RELIABILITY AGAINST THE OED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Headword] definitions attempted by both the EDD and OED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fig. 91: Traditional Cumbrian definition results from the [synonymous definitions?] field, along with the 43 non-synonymous [headword]s marked with the “No” value, demonstrating the EDD’s accuracy in definition against the authority of the OED.*
The results in fig. 91 demonstrate the similarity between *Traditional* [headword] definitions in their relevant EDD and OED entries. For the [headword]s it defined (cf. section 4.4.3), the EDD offered synonymous definitions with the OED for almost 80% of this study's *Traditional* data, indicating the EDD's reasonable accuracy in definition against an accepted lexicographic authority.

Despite this, the high number of "No" values in the [synonymous definitions?] field demonstrate the limit of the EDD's comprehensiveness. The EDD defines 43 *Traditional* [headword]s to a poorer standard than that set by the OED. Five of these [headword]s are categorised as such due to the differing defining practices used by the EDD and OED. The [headword]s *mun*, *sarra1*, *slocken*, *spinnle* and *wind1* are listed in the EDD with underspecified definitions, much like the EDD entry for "nought, sb., adj., adv. and v." (cf. fig. 90).

As demonstrated above (cf. section 4.4.3), the EDD tends to lump semantically independent senses under the same definition, whereas the OED lists each sense under its own definition. This results in a differing purpose between the EDD and OED, neatly categorised by Atkins and Rundell (2008: 408) in decoding dictionaries and encoding dictionaries. Decoding dictionaries provide simple "translational" definitions for one-off comprehension, whereas encoding dictionaries list detailed definitions most suitable to aid the transition of a new vocabulary item from a passive to an active state in the user's lexicon (Atkins and Rundell 2008: 408).

The EDD is a decoding dictionary, best applied to gain a broad understanding of unfamiliar lexis. But, should a Cumbrian dialect user encounter a word they wish to understand completely (and perhaps incorporate into their lexicon), the EDD's limited definitions prove useless and its comprehensiveness to *Traditional* Cumbrian suffers. In such instances, an encoding dictionary, such as the OED, is necessary. The following analysis of *sarra1* and *slocken* illustrates this point.
### TRADITIONAL CUMBRIAN: COMPARISON BETWEEN EDD AND OED DEFINITIONS FOR SARRA1 AND SLOCKEN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEADWORD</th>
<th>DEFINITION: EDD</th>
<th>DEFINITION: OED</th>
<th>USAGE EXAMPLE 1</th>
<th>NOTES ON DEFINITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>sarra1</em></td>
<td>5. To satisfy; to suffice. (EDD Online: “sarrow, v.”)</td>
<td>IV. (Inversion of the construction in branch III. Cf. the converse development of sense in present v. 12, 13, 15.) To dish up (food); to deal out, present (a commodity). 42. a. To set (meat or drink) on the table or before a person; to bring in or dish up (a meal). †Also const. to or into (the table). Also (is) serving = (is) being served. (OED Online: “serve, v.1”)</td>
<td>&quot;And uncle Megs has sent us beef will <em>sarra</em> us aw at dinner.&quot; (Gilpin 1866: 55)</td>
<td>The EDD entry includes the broad definition of “to satisfy, to suffice,” but neglects the more specific OED categorisation of satisfying hunger, in the sense “to set out a meal.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| *slocken* | 1. To slake; to cool with water; to drench, quench, extinguish. Cf. slock, v.1. (EDD Online: “slocken, v.”) | 3. b. To slake the thirst of (a person, etc.). (OED Online: “slocken, v.”) | "Some at the Abbey owre a quart, theirsells to *slocken* 'greed" (Gilpin 1866: 194) | The OED is more specific in its definition, including a sense which specifically relates to quenching thirst. The usage example from Gilpin (1866: 194) speaks of people agreeing to go to a local pub to quench their thirst with a quart of ale. The EDD definition lumps the “quenching objects (ablaze)” and “quenching thirst” senses under the same definition. |

---

*Fig. 92: Comparison between the EDD and OED definitions for *sarra1* and *slocken*, demonstrating the OED’s use of "encoding definitions" and superior engagement with sense division.*

### 4.4.4.2 Pensy: Contradictory Definitions

The [headword] *pensy* presents a troublesome analysis. Its sole usage example in this study's primary data, provided by Gilpin (1866: 67)\(^ {36} \), is cited by several sources under two competing definitions. The EDD cites his extract as a usage example for the definition “delicate, fastidious;...”

\(^{36}\) It reads: "some pensy chiels, a new sprung race, wad next their welcome pay" (Gilpin 1866: 67).
having a poor appetite” (EDD Online: “pensy, adj.”). Prevost (1899: 241) also cites Gilpin under the similar definition “sickly; of weak appetite.”

The OED recognises the same extract under an unrelated sense, creating doubt over its authoritativeness. Gilpin is cited as a usage example for the definition “of a child: fretful, peevish” (OED Online: “pensy, adj.”). So, in this instance the dictionary most accurate to this study’s usage examples cannot be ascertained.

To complicate matters further, both definitions could be valid for Gilpin’s (1866: 67) extract. His poem is about a traveller returning to his home town and passing judgements on the changes which occurred in his absence. “Pensy, adj.”, therefore, could easily describe either the traveller’s sorrow for his town’s impoverished children or his anger at their impudence.

This example demonstrates the problem with introspection in lexicography (Atkins and Rundell 2008: 47). Three editors have arrived at two distinctly different definitions for the same word’s appearance in the same extract. As a result, the EDD’s comprehensiveness for the Traditional [headword] pensy cannot be decided.

4.4.4.3 Conclusion: Research Question 1 – EDD Comprehensiveness to Traditional Cumbrian (1700–1898)

The EDD is not a perfect account of Traditional Cumbrian definition. Its comprehensiveness is limited by the fact that it does not offer encoding definitions; most of its definitions are “translational” and rely on the user’s ability to distinguish between word-senses, instead of providing its own objective explanation. Also, discrepancies in word-meanings between the EDD and OED leaves the reliability of the EDD’s definitions uncertain. Either way, the EDD’s comprehensiveness to Traditional Cumbrian would greatly benefit from a systematic definition overhaul, in which decoding definitions are replaced by encoding definitions.

---

37 OED entry for pensy bears a similar sense to “peevish, adj.”, meaning “Irritable, querulous; childishly fretful; characterized by or exhibiting petty bad temper.” (OED Online: “peevish, adj. and adv. 5.a.”).
4.4.5 RESEARCH QUESTION 2: EDD Usefulness to Contemporary Cumbrian (1950–present)

4.4.5.1 EDD Definition Reliability Against the OED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTEMPORARY CUMBRIAN: EDD DEFINITION RELIABILITY AGAINST THE OED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Headword]s Defined by both the EDD and OED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synonymous EDD and OED Definitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-synonymous EDD and OED Definitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 93: Contemporary Cumbrian definition results from the [synonymous definitions?] field, demonstrating the EDD’s accuracy in definition against the authority of the OED.

The results in fig. 93 demonstrate the similarity between Contemporary [headword] definitions in their relevant EDD and OED entries. The EDD’s accuracy in definition for the Contemporary sample is slightly poorer than that of the Traditional sample, with around 3% fewer [headword]s defined by both dictionaries sharing synonymous definitions. These results demonstrate the EDD’s decreased efficacy for defining Contemporary Cumbrian in comparison to Traditional Cumbrian.

The EDD’s decreased efficacy for defining Contemporary Cumbrian can be partly attributed to semantic change. The Cumbrian dialect appears to have evolved between the Traditional and Contemporary periods, hence the EDD’s definitions have become outdated. The most noticeable process of semantic change for the Contemporary sample is broadening, defined by McMahon (1999: 179) as a process which expands the number of contexts in which a word is used, whilst simultaneously reducing the amount of information presented by said word. Overall, it involves a semantic shift from specific to general meaning. Four Contemporary Cumbrian [headword]s demonstrates this process with their EDD definitions providing more specialised explanations than their modern OED counterparts. See fig. 94 for this comparison.
## CONTEMPORARY CUMBRIAN: SEMANTICALLY BROADENED [HEADWORD]S

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[HEADWORD]</th>
<th>[DEFINITION: EDD]</th>
<th>[DEFINITION: OED]</th>
<th>[USAGE EXAMPLE 1]</th>
<th>[NOTES ON DEFINITION]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **ageànn2** | II. With v. of motion.  
1. Against, in violent contact with.  
(EDD Online: “again, prep.”) | 1. Expressing position or motion towards or facing something.  
4. b. Towards and into contact with; into direct collision with; = against prep. 16.  
(OED Online: “again, adv., prep., and conj.”) | "cum Setterdä efterneun thoo'll fin' sum on 'em still spittin' agean th' wind."  
(Forsyth 2002: 18) | The EDD specifies “violent” contact as part of ageànn2’s meaning. However, Forsyth’s (2002: 18) usage example more closely matches those under the cited OED entry for “again, prep.”, in which the “violent” aspect of meaning is replaced with a general sense of “contact.” |
| **bray2** | 1. v. To beat; to bruise or grind to powder.  
(EDD Online: “bray, v.1 and sb.1”) | 3. To beat, thrash. *dial.*  
(OED Online: “bray, v.2”) | "If a offer t' beat carpets, ah's telt ah divvent *bray* them reet.”  
(Graham 2006: 10) | The EDD specifies the type of “beating” issued; specifically, the crushing or pounding required to break up wheat or stones (EDD Online: “bray, v.1 and sb.1”). Graham’s (2006: 10) usage example demonstrates a semantically broadened form of the verb, applied to any beating. The OED features this relevant definition and was favoured due to its applicability to this investigation’s primary data. |
| **fuddled** | 3. v. To drink heavily, get drunk. Hence (1) Fuddled, ppl. adj. confused, stupefied with drink; drunk; also used fig.  
(EDD Online: “fuddle, sb. and v.”) | 2. a. trans. To confuse with or as with drink, intoxicate, render tipsy.  
(OED Online: “fuddle, v.”) | "Yah want ta use thee brain a bit mair, its gitten a bit *fuddled.*”  
(Graham 2006: 7) | Graham’s (2006: 7) usage example does not refer to confusion caused by alcohol consumption, as the EDD suggests, but to the concept of “confusion” generally. Despite its definition referring to the wrong word class (v. instead of adj.), the OED engages with this semantically broadened sense of *fuddle.* |
2. To throw stones, &c., so as to injure.

(EDD Online: "scop, v. and sb.3")

"Ah can't afford tu scop thum oot."

(Fisher 1999: 15)

"A sheep skin rug n' another rug wah scoppt oot et winder."

(Graham 2006: 10)

Although there is no relevant OED definition for comparison, the EDD entry for “scop, v.” appears as semantically broadened in both of this investigation’s Contemporary usage examples. The object being thrown (“stones”) is generalised and the “with the intent of injury” sense is lost.

Fig. 94: Four semantically broadened Contemporary [headword]s, listed with their relevant EDD and OED definitions, Contemporary usage examples and explanatory notes.

4.4.5.2 Conclusion: Research Question 2 – EDD Usefulness to Contemporary Cumbrian (1950–present)

The EDD’s definitions require revision to increase their usefulness to Contemporary Cumbrian.

For the Contemporary [headword]s discussed here, Wright’s definitions are no longer relevant. The process of semantic broadening has invalidated the generalisations they make about these words’ behaviour and his definitions no longer approximate closely to these words’ application in real communicative acts (Atkins and Rundell 2008: 45). For example, the EDD definition for bray2 implies the carpets in Graham’s (2006: 10) extract are being either “bruised” or “ground to a powder” rather than being thrashed for cleaning. Bruising or grinding a carpet into powder is physically impossible, so the EDD’s definition is inaccurate for this application of bray2 in Contemporary Cumbrian. Archaic definitions such as these limit the EDD’s usefulness to Contemporary Cumbrian and could result in user confusion if applied to their modern use in dialect literature (Saeed 2009: 35–6).
5. CONCLUSION

The results of this investigation demonstrate the EDD’s poor comprehensiveness for Traditional Cumbrian (1700–1898) and limited usefulness for Contemporary Cumbrian (1950–present). In the inclusion parameter, the EDD showed poor comprehensiveness by failing to assign the majority this study’s Traditional [headword]s to their correct dialect area. Due to EDD Online’s reliance on these dialect areas when filtering dialect-specific lexis, the EDD appears less comprehensive than it could be (cf. section 4.1.1).

The EDD showed limited usefulness for Contemporary Cumbrian in the inclusion parameter due to its inability to engage with modern evidence. The Cumbrian dialect has changed since the 19th Century, with processes such as diffusion and neologism bringing new words into the dialect. Since the EDD has not received an update since the publication of its final volume (Penhallurick 2009: 312), its usefulness to the modern dialect in such instances is severely curbed (cf. section 4.1.2).

In the grammar parameter, the EDD demonstrated poor comprehensiveness through its outdated lexicographic practice. For some of this study’s Traditional [headword]s, the EDD lumped grammatically-differing homonyms under the same entry, providing confusing depictions of their use in comparison to the OED (cf. section 4.2.1). The EDD demonstrated limited usefulness for Contemporary Cumbrian for the same reason (cf. section 4.2.2), as well as being unable to recognise instances of grammatical change which occurred between the Traditional and Contemporary time-periods, due to the EDD’s lack of updates (Penhallurick 2009: 312).

For the etymology parameter, the EDD showed poor comprehensiveness for Traditional Cumbrian and limited usefulness for Contemporary Cumbrian through its use of dogmatic etymologies. The researcher found the EDD’s etymologies to be either vague or non-existent for all [headword]s of this study, with Wright either adopting the least controversial word-history from his most distinguished contemporaries or ignoring etymology where no simple answer
could be found. In comparison to the OED, the EDD’s etymologies seem rudimentary and unrefined.

In the definition parameter the EDD showed poor comprehensiveness for Traditional Cumbrian and limited usefulness for Contemporary Cumbrian through its ignorance in definition and its use of “translational” definitions (cf. section 4.4.1). The EDD often ignores definition completely, leaving the user to assume a headword’s sense through engagement with that entry’s usage examples. Also, the EDD’s “translational” definitions do not provide adequate information for the user to clearly understand the intended sense of the entry (Landau 2001: 170), obscuring a headword’s polysemous senses.

Overall, the EDD performed poorly in comparison to the OED. This study illustrates the necessity for the EDD’s revision. Not only is the EDD’s usefulness limited for Contemporary Cumbrian (which frankly, should be expected), its comprehensiveness is lacking for its own research period, with the oversights such as poor dialect area classification and inaccurate grammatical categorisation restricting its practicality to the Traditional Cumbrian dialect scholar. To make the EDD a practical tool for Traditional and Contemporary Cumbrian dialect study, intense revision of its inclusion, grammar, etymology and definition is required, to rectify the issues detailed throughout this paper.
### 6. APPENDICES

#### 6.1 Appendix i: Database

Included on the CD attached to the rear cover.

#### 6.2 Appendix ii: Database Structure and Function

Due to the complexity of this investigation’s database, this appendix provides a key to all the database fields and their respective functions which the reader will encounter throughout this study’s analysis. Each field’s relationship to each of the four research parameters of this study’s methodology (cf. section 3.2) is specified by their respective subheadings. Consult the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIELD</th>
<th>DATA TYPE</th>
<th>FUNCTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[headword]</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Headwords under investigation, sourced from the researcher’s own reading programme and checked against the EDD Online. [Headword] spellings are identical between the <em>Traditional</em> and <em>Contemporary</em> Cumbrian sheets to aid data mining. [Headword]s ordered alphabetically.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[pronunciation guide: EDD]</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Pronunciation guide for [headword] sourced from the EDD. If no pronunciation guide is provided for [headword] by the EDD, the field is left blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[variant forms: reading programme]</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Any particularly common variant spellings of [headword] the researcher notices in his reading programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[variant Cumbrian forms: EDD]</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Variant spellings of [headword] listed by the relevant entry in EDD, marked with the dialect marker “Cum.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[variant forms: OED]</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Variant spellings of [headword] listed by the relevant entry in OED.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[EDD reference]</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Reference to the relevant EDD entry(s) in the compilation of [headword]’s entry in EDCD. If no relevant EDD entries exists for [headword], this field is left blank.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SECTION 2: INCLUSION OF CUMBRIAN DIALECT WORDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIELD</th>
<th>DATA TYPE</th>
<th>FUNCTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[headword present in EDD?]</td>
<td>Drop-down-box:</td>
<td>Indicates whether [headword] has an equivalent entry in the EDD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Yes</td>
<td>• Yes = [headword] is found in Wright (1898–1905)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No</td>
<td>• No = [headword] is not found in Wright (1898–1905)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[sense specific to Cumbrian?]</td>
<td>Drop-down-box:</td>
<td>Indicates whether [headword]'s definition in the EDD features a usage example with the dialect marker “Cum.” If [headword present in EDD?] field = “No”, the field is left blank.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Yes</td>
<td>• Yes = [headword] is found in Wright (1898–1905) with at least one usage example bearing the dialect marker “Cum.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No</td>
<td>• No = [headword] is found in Wright (1898–1905) with no usage examples bearing the dialect marker “Cum.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[headword present in OED?]</td>
<td>Drop-down-box:</td>
<td>Indicates whether [headword] has an equivalent entry in the OED III (Online Edition).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Yes</td>
<td>• Yes = [headword] is found in OED III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No</td>
<td>• No = [headword] is not found in OED III</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SECTION 3: GRAMMAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIELD</th>
<th>DATA TYPE</th>
<th>FUNCTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[grammatical category: EDD]</td>
<td>Drop-down-box:</td>
<td>[Headword]'s grammatical classification according to [headword]’s equivalent entry in EDD. If EDD does not list [headword], the field is left blank.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• noun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• verb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• adjective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• adverb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• preposition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• pronoun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• conjunction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• unclear</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• phrase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• determiner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[grammatical category: OED]</td>
<td>Drop-down-box:</td>
<td>[Headword]'s grammatical classification according to [headword]’s equivalent entry in OED III. If OED III does not list [headword], the field is left blank.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cf. [grammatical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>category: EDD]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| [relationship1] | =IF function | Formula which automatically displays one of the following keywords depending on the relationship between a) [grammatical category: EDD] and b) [grammatical category: OED]:  
  • **Match**: a) and b) are the same.  
  • **Do Not Match**: a) and b) differ.  
  • **No EDD Entry**: a) is blank, but b) is not. Indicates lack of grammatical classification for [headword] in EDD, but not in OED.  
  • **No OED Entry**: b) is blank, but a) is not. Indicates lack of grammatical classification for [headword] in OED, but not in EDD.  
  • **No EDD or OED Entry**: a) and b) are blank. Indicates lack of grammatical classification in both EDD and OED. |
| [grammar most accurate to usage examples] | Drop-down-box:  
  • EDD  
  • OED  
  • N/A  
  • Neither | Illustrates the dictionary whose grammatical classification most closely matches [headword]’s use in [usage example 1] – [usage example 5].  
  • EDD: EDD is most accurate.  
  • OED: OED is most accurate.  
  • N/A: EDD and OED grammatical classifications are equally accurate.  
  • Neither: neither EDD nor OED grammatical classifications are accurate. |
| [notes on grammar] | Text | Additional information relevant to grammar section (i.e. references mentioning [headword]’s grammatical classification in other dictionaries, researcher’s own grammatical classification where neither EDD nor OED provides one) |

### SECTION 4: ETYMOLOGY

| FIELD [etymological root: EDD] | DATA TYPE | FUNCTION  
| Drop-down-box:  
  • Old English  
  • Old Norse  
  • Norwegian  
  • OE/ON  
  • Middle English  
  • Early Modern English  
  • English  
  • English by Compounding  
  • English by Conversion  
  • English by Derivation  
  • English by Variation | Displays root language of EDD etymologies. If no etymology exists, the field is left blank. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old Saxon</td>
<td>Low German, Old Germanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Germanic</td>
<td>Early Scandinavian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germanic</td>
<td>Scandinavian, Gothic, Early Frisian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danish</td>
<td>Frisian, Danish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Frisian</td>
<td>Anglo-Norman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old French</td>
<td>French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>Latin, Greek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>Old Irish, Celtic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>Scottish Gaelic, Gaelic, Irish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Cumbrian, Scots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scots</td>
<td>Natural, Multiple Origins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural</td>
<td>Unknown, Uncertain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**[etymological root: OED]**

Drop-down-box: *Cf. [etymological root: EDD]*

Displays root language of OED etymologies. If no etymology exists, the field is left blank.

**[relationship2]**

=IF function

Formula which automatically displays one of the following key words depending on the relationship between *c)* [etymological root: EDD] and *d)* [etymological root: OED]:

- **Match:** *c)* and *d)* are the same.
- **Do Not Match:** *c)* and *d)* differ.
- **No EDD Etymology:** *c)* is blank, but [present in EDD] = *Yes*, indicating an oversight in etymology by Wright.
- **No OED Etymology:** *d)* is blank.
- **No EDD or OED Etymology:** *c)* and *d)* are blank.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIELD</th>
<th>DATA TYPE</th>
<th>FUNCTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[etymology: EDD]</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Etymology from EDD corresponding to [headword]. Included for ease of reference. If EDD does not provide an etymology, the field is left blank.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[etymology: OED]</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Etymology from OED corresponding to [headword]. Included for ease of reference. If OED does not provide an etymology, the field is left blank.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[notes on etymology]</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Additional information relevant to etymology section (i.e. sources mentioning [headword]'s etymology, possible etymologies where neither EDD nor OED provides one).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECTION 5: DEFINITION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIELD</th>
<th>DATA TYPE</th>
<th>FUNCTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[definition: EDD]</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>EDD definition of [headword]. If no EDD definition exists, the field is left blank. If EDD definition is opaque or if EDD bears an undefined entry for [headword], field will read &quot;unclear, see notes.&quot; [Notes on definition] field will provide explanation for EDD's lack of clarity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[definition: OED]</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>OED definition of [headword]. If no OED definition exists, the field is left blank.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[relationship3]</td>
<td>=IF function</td>
<td>Formula which automatically displays one of the following key words depending on the relationship between e) [definition: EDD] and f) [definition: OED]:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>EDD and OED Definition:</strong> e) and f) both bear values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>OED Definition Only:</strong> e) is blank.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>EDD Definition Only:</strong> f) is blank.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>No EDD or OED Definition:</strong> e) and f) are blank.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• ** Unsatisfactory EDD Definition:** e) = “unclear, see notes” and [headword present in EDD] = “Yes.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[synonymous definitions?]</td>
<td>Drop-down-box:</td>
<td>Field indicating the similarity between EDD and OED definitions for [headword].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Yes = definitions are synonymous.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• No = definitions are dissimilar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[definition most accurate to usage examples?]</td>
<td>Drop-down-box:</td>
<td>Illustrates the dictionary whose definition most closely matches [headword]'s use in [usage example 1] – [usage example 5]. Accuracy determined through examination of EDD and OED usage examples and consultation of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>EDD</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>OED</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

38 Synonymous definitions are permitted as EDD and OED definitions are unlikely to be perfectly identical.
• **N/A**
• **Neither**
additional dictionaries such as Prevost (1899, 1905) and Dickinson (1859). Any inaccuracies found and extra sources consulted will be included in [notes on definition field].
  - **EDD**: EDD is most accurate.
  - **OED**: OED is most accurate.
  - **N/A**: EDD and OED grammatical classifications are equally accurate.
  - **Neither**: neither EDD nor OED grammatical classifications are accurate.

| [notes on definition] | Text | Additional information relevant to definition section (i.e. sources which define [headword], commentaries on the relationship between [definition: EDD] and [definition: OED] and possible definitions where neither EDD nor OED provides one). |

### SECTION 6: CITATIONS/USAGE EXAMPLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIELD</th>
<th>DATA TYPE</th>
<th>FUNCTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[usage example 1 date] – [usage example 5 date]</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Year of publication of [usage example 1] – [usage example 5]. Ordered chronologically. Provides reference for quotes used in [usage example 1] – [usage example 5].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[usage example 1 author] – [usage example 5 author]</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Author of [usage example 1] – [usage example 5]. Provides reference for quotes used in [usage example 1] – [usage example 5].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[usage example 1 page number] – [usage example 5 page number]</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Page number of [usage example 1] – [usage example 5]. Provides reference for quotes used in [usage example 1] – [usage example 5].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[usage example count]</td>
<td>=COUNTA function</td>
<td>Formula which automatically records the number of usage examples cited for [headword].</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.3 Appendix iii: Analysis of 19 Contemporary Cumbrian [Headword]s

19 Contemporary Cumbrian [headword]s featured in OED entries with usage examples which date to the Traditional period. Table displays the number of relevant OED usage examples listed, their date-range and their relevant usage labels (if present).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[HEADWORD]</th>
<th>NO. OF OED USAGE EXAMPLES DATING BETWEEN 1700 AND 1898</th>
<th>DATE RANGE</th>
<th>EARLIEST OED USAGE EXAMPLE</th>
<th>OED USAGE LABELS</th>
<th>REASON WHY [HEADWORD] IS INCLUDED IN STUDY</th>
<th>NOTES AND REFERENCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aboot2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1711–1877</td>
<td>OE</td>
<td>N/A: Standard English</td>
<td>Sense not included in EDD due to lack of “local peculiarity of meaning” (Wright 1898: v). <em>Aboot2</em> is a Cumbrian variant of Standard English <em>about</em>, prep.1. Because it shares the same meaning as the Standard word, Wright omitted it (OED Online: “about, adv., prep.1, adj., and int.”).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anudder</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1711–1884</td>
<td>c1374</td>
<td>N/A: Standard English</td>
<td>Not included in EDD due to lack of “local peculiarity of meaning” (Wright 1898: v). <em>Anudder</em> is a Cumbrian variant of Standard English <em>another</em>, pron. Because it shares the same meaning as the Standard word, Wright omitted it (OED Online: &quot;another, adj. and pron. (and adv.&quot;).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cart</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1864–1898</td>
<td>1864</td>
<td>colloq.</td>
<td>Recognised by OED as Non-Standard.</td>
<td>Featured in humorous sources such as the magazine <em>Punch</em> and Jerome's (1889) novel <em>Three Men in a Boat</em> (OED Online: &quot;cart, v.&quot;). Fairly recent coinage during EDD’s compilation, possibly disregarded by Wright as a passing craze rather than a productive dialect word. However, word remains productive in English to present day (OED Online: &quot;cart, v.&quot; and &quot;cart, n.&quot;).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chow</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1773–1889</td>
<td>1382</td>
<td>Eng. regional (north. and midl.) and Sc.</td>
<td>Recognised by OED as a northern regional variant.</td>
<td>Not included in EDD due to lack of “local peculiarity of meaning” (Wright 1898: v). <em>Chow</em> is a Cumbrian variant of Standard English <em>chew</em>, v. Because it shares the same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>C1 Date</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>collar</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1713–1834</td>
<td>c1535</td>
<td>N/A: Standard English</td>
<td>Diffused into Cumbrian (cf. section 5.1.2.2). Ignored by Wright due to its productivity in Standard English (Wright 1898: v). Collar seems to have diffused into Cumbrian during the 20th Century (OED Online: &quot;collar, v.&quot; and &quot;collar, n.&quot;).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>famish2</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1798–1890</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>colloq.</td>
<td>Recognised by OED as Non-Standard. Odd the EDD ignored famous, as it was productive during the time of the EDD’s production. The geographical spread of the sources listed by the OED suggests that Wright ignored the word due to its popular use in several English dialects, which he perceived as Standard usage (OED Online: &quot;famous, adj.&quot;).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>famished</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1781–1866</td>
<td>a1450</td>
<td>N/A: Standard English</td>
<td>Diffused into Cumbrian (cf. section 5.1.2.2). Ignored by Wright due to its productivity in Standard English (Wright 1898: v). Famished seems to have diffused into Cumbrian during the 20th Century (OED Online: &quot;famished, adj.&quot; and &quot;famish, v.&quot;).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>fixiate</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1835 and 1886</td>
<td>1835</td>
<td>N/A: Standard English</td>
<td>Clipped Cumbrian variant. A clipped Cumbrian variant of Standard English verb asphyxiate (McMahon 1994: 197). Ignored by Wright due to lack of &quot;local peculiarity of meaning&quot; (Wright 1898: v). (OED Online: &quot;asphyxiate, v.&quot;).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>keen</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1720–1871</td>
<td>a1375</td>
<td>N/A: Standard English</td>
<td>Diffused into Cumbrian (cf. section 5.1.2.2). Ignored by Wright due to its productivity in Standard English (Wright 1898: v). Keen seems to have diffused into Cumbrian during the 20th Century (OED Online: &quot;keen, adj. and adv.&quot;).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>leuk</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1753–1887</td>
<td>a1225</td>
<td>N/A: Standard English</td>
<td>Cumbrian spelling variant. Sense not included in EDD due to lack of &quot;local peculiarity of meaning&quot; (Wright 1898: v). Leuk is a Cumbrian variant of Standard English look, n. Because it shares the same meaning as the Standard word, Wright omitted it (OED Online: &quot;look, n.&quot;).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **mair** | 3 | 1758–1861 | c1300 | N/A: Standard English | Cumbrian spelling variant. Sense not included in EDD due to lack of "local peculiarity of meaning" (Wright 1898: v).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Date Range</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>OED Classification</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>manish</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1762–1895</td>
<td>1762</td>
<td>N/A: Standard English</td>
<td>Cumbrian spelling variant. Not included in EDD due to lack of &quot;local peculiarity of meaning&quot; (Wright 1898: v). <em>Manish</em> is a Cumbrian variant of Standard English <em>manage</em>, v. Because it shares the same meaning as the Standard word, Wright omitted it (OED Online: &quot;manage, v.&quot;).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mire</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1755–1871</td>
<td>c1390</td>
<td>N/A: Standard English</td>
<td>Diffused into Cumbrian (cf. section 5.1.2.2). Ignored by Wright due to its productivity in Standard English (Wright 1898: v). <em>Mire</em> seems to have diffused into Cumbrian during the 20th Century (OED Online: &quot;mire, n.1&quot;).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nowt2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1870 and 1887</td>
<td>OE</td>
<td>Obs.</td>
<td>Recognised by OED as Non-Standard. Unsure why <em>nowt2</em> was ignored by the EDD. Perhaps during the EDD’s investigative period, the “to no extent” sense of <em>nowt2</em> was not productive. Or Wright saw no “local peculiarity of meaning” and ignored it (Wright 1898: v, OED Online: &quot;nought, pron., n., adv., and adj.&quot; and &quot;nowt, pron., adj., adv., and n.2&quot;).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ower2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1705–1894</td>
<td>OE</td>
<td>N/A: Standard English</td>
<td>Cumbrian spelling variant. Sense of included in EDD due to lack of “local peculiarity of meaning” (Wright 1898: v). <em>Ower2</em> is a Cumbrian variant of Standard English <em>over</em>, adv. Because it shares the same meaning as the Standard word, Wright omitted it (OED Online: &quot;over, adv. and int.&quot;).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sarra2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1705–1889</td>
<td>1587</td>
<td>N/A: Standard English</td>
<td>Cumbrian spelling variant. Not included in EDD due to lack of “local peculiarity of meaning” (Wright 1898: v). <em>Sarra2</em> is a Cumbrian variant of Standard English <em>serve</em>, v1. Because it shares the same meaning as the Standard word, Wright omitted it (OED Online: &quot;serve, v.1&quot;).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>screape</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1709–1873</td>
<td>1709</td>
<td>N/A: Standard</td>
<td>Cumbrian spelling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Word Count: 26,435
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Usage</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Sense</th>
<th>Noted Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Screape is a Cumbrian variant of Standard English scrape, n1. Because it shares the same meaning as the Standard word, Wright omitted it (OED Online: &quot;scrape, n1&quot;).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skivvy</td>
<td>colloq.</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>Recognised by OED as Non-Standard.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understandable that the EDD ignored skivvy. The word seems to have been coined in 1902, falling outside of the EDD’s investigative period (Wright 1898: v, OED Online: &quot;skivvy, n1&quot;).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>struck</td>
<td>colloq.</td>
<td>1602</td>
<td>Recognised by OED as Non-Standard.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure as to why EDD ignored struck. Could be that during the late 19th Century/early 20th Century, struck was considered Standard English. The OED entry states the “to be favourably impressed” sense of struck is “now colloq.,” suggesting it was once in Standard use (OED Online: &quot;strike, v.&quot;).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.4 Appendix iv: Commentaries on Continental Influence

Extracts from 18th and 19th Century commentaries which discuss the influence of Norse, Danish and French on English.

- “The two languages from which our primitives have been derived are the **Roman and Teutonic**: under the **Roman I** comprehend the **French** and provincial tongues; and under the **Teutonic** range the **Saxon, German** and all their kindred dialects. Most of our polyyllables are **Roman**, and our words of one syllable are very often **Teutonic**.” (Johnson 1799: iii)
- “Many Scandinavian words were introduced at an early date, chiefly before the Norman Conquest in 1066.” (Skate 1887: 9)
- “There has been an **almost continual**, but not constant influx of French words into English for more than eight centuries.” (Skate 1891: 3)
- “The influence of French upon English is too well known to require comment.” (Skate 1882: xvii)
- “It is not too much to say that the Norman Conquest entailed the **dissolution** of the old cultivated language of the Saxon, the literary English” (Earle 1892: 41)
- “Nor was this the only effect of the introduction of a new language into the country. A vast change was made in the vocabulary. The Normans had learnt by the sojourn in France to speak **French**, and this foreign language they brought with them to England” (Earle 1892: 41–2).
- “Now English is certainly one language, yet the vocabulary is separable; and anyone who knows the languages akin to those out of which it is formed, can without much difficulty point out its component parts. Some of the evidence of this we have already seen in our sketch of the English dialect; but much more can be found by a close observer. He will see how the **Scandinavian** settlements in the east and north-west of England are shown by the grammatical forms **till** for “to” (“gang till him” = go to him) **at** for “to” (“what hast at do” = what hast thou to do); by the plural form **are** instead of **beoth**, now common over the whole language; perhaps by the northern conjugation **I is, thou is**, **he is**, which remind us of the **Danish jeg er, du er, han er** (in which **r** stands for **s**); perhaps though this is disputed) by the north country article **t,** “t house,” “t ky,” which looks very like the **Norse et,** a very different form of the article from the English **the**” (Peile 1877: 63–4).
- “The **Scandinavian** pirates who settled in Cumberland were mainly **Norse**, he knows it by the “**thwaites**” in which they settled, the “garths” which they built, the “gills” and the “forces” to which they gave their names; for **thwaite** is the Icelandic “**thveit**” (a piece of land); **garth** is the same in meaning as the English “**yard**” but different in form; **gil** is frequent as a local name in Iceland, as in **Norway**” (Peile 1877: 64).

6.5 Appendix v: Key Language Influencers for English

Summary of the power dynamics and introductory dates of the four languages of Old English, Old Norse, Danish and French across British history.

- **Old English**: the variety of English spoken in Britain from the arrival of the Anglo-Saxons in the 5th Century to the Norman conquest of 1066 (Smith 1996: 26, Blair 2001: 61).
- **Old Norse and Danish**: brought to Britain by Norwegian and Danish raiders in the 8th Century and propagated by their settlement of the Danelaw, Scotland and North-West England (Blair 2001: 91–9, Wilkinson 2017).
- **French**: brought to Britain by the William the Conqueror and his court after the British defeat at the Battle of Hastings in 1066 (Blair 2001: 119). The French language and culture were propagated throughout Britain with French occupying a vital role in law, commerce and art by the 12th Century (Gillingham 2001: 122–3).

6.6 Appendix vi: “Translational” EDD Definitions – More Examples

As mentioned in section 4.4.3.1, the EDD uses “translational” one-word definitions in many of its entries. Single words make poor definitions due to the issue of polysemy; words often hold more than one sense in English, meaning one-word definitions are more open to user
interpretation than several-word descriptions (Landau 2001: 163). The following analysis considers the potential for incorrect user interpretation in three of the one-word “translational” definitions listed in fig. 89, demonstrating the EDD’s tendency to blend multiple senses of the “translational” defining words into the same entry. The senses listed by each entry’s usage examples are, wherever possible, itemised under their relevant OED entries.

- **adoot**

**EDD definition and usage examples:**

2. prep. Without.

**Cum.** Fwok ‘at can’t keep fra’t adoot signin’ t’pledge, GWORDIE GREEENUP *Yance a Year* (1873) 18; **Cum.3** He tok off his specks, an he glower’t at me adoot them, 13. **Wm.** It’s true, adoot a doot (M.P.). **Yks.** He can’t guide his own bairn athoot shutting him up, **MACQUOID Doris Barugh** (1877) xiv; Ihevn’t watched thee... athoot seein’ ‘at thee never thinks for thysel’, **LINSKILL Exchange Soul** (1888) liv. n.Yks.12, m.Yks.1 w.Yks. Nivver a year adoot a summer, *Nidderdill Olm.* (1874) Ye’ll know adoot me telling you, *NIDDERDILL Olm.* (1878) He did it adoot a grummal, **LUCAS Stud. Nidderdale** (c. 1882) 229; **w.Yks.5** Am barn athout him! Shoo’s athout owt til her fortun’. **ne.Lan.1** I’se goan athout it. **s.Wor.1, Shr.1** Hrf. Im’z a week fool az tawks aabout reason, **Why John** *(Coll. L.L.B.).* **Glo.1 Oxf.** An tel é stråyt âfw too, aathowt much to-doo, *Why John* *(Coll. L.L.B.).* **s.Oxf.** Athout spilin’ th’ old un, **ROSEMARY Chilterns** (1895) 77. **Nrf.** Aathowt luking either to the right or left, **SPILLING Molly Miggs** (1873) i. **Sus.** Maidens adout number, **LOWER Sng. Sol.** (1860) vi. 8. **Hmp.1 I.W.** Vorced to zet wi’ clan hands from morning to night athout zo much as a bit of vittles to hready, **MAXWELL GRAY Annesley** (1889) i. 159. **Wil.1** He’s gone athout his dinner. **Som.** Noa man es wise athout a wife, ‘**AGRIKLER’ Rhymes** (1872) i.

(EDD Online: "'athout, adv., prep. and conj.")

**Senses of adoot expressed by this entry’s usage examples, with their relevant OED definitions:**

**III.** Expressing absence, privation, or negation: With or involving the absence or want of; in a state of not having, or so as not to have; so, or such, that there is no... Opposed to with prep. II. *** (The ordinary current use.)

7. **a.** (a) (with object a thing, material or immaterial) With absence of; not with the presence or addition of; not having with it or with one; not accompanied by; not combined or associated with; not having in one’s charge; not carrying or wearing.

**Cum.3** He tok off his specks, an he glower’t at me adoot them, 13.

**Wm.** It’s true, adoot a doot (M.P.).

n.Yks.12 Nivver a year adoot a summer, *Nidderdill Olm.* (1874)

w.Yks. (1878) He did it adoot a grummal, **LUCAS Stud. Nidderdale** (c. 1882) 229

Hmp.1 I.W. Vorced to zet wi’ clan hands from morning to night athout zo much as a bit of vittles to hready, **MAXWELL GRAY Annesley** (1889) i. 159.

7. **b.** (with object a person) In the absence of; in a state of absence from; not with the companionship or attendance of.
w.Yks.5 Am barn athout him!

Som. Noa man es wise athout a wife, ‘AGRIKLER’ Rhymes (1872) l.

8. a. In a state of not possessing: not having (as a possession of any kind, a part, an advantage, etc.); in want of, destitute of, lacking.

ne.Lan.1 I’se goan athout it.

Wil.1 He’s gone athout his dinner.

10. (with object an abstract thing, as a quality, attribute, action, condition, etc.):

a. (depending on or referring to a verb) With absence or lack of, or freedom from; so that there is no...; often forming phrases equivalent to negative adverbs, e.g. without end = endlessly, without fail = unfailingly, without fear = fearlessly, without success = un成功地, etc.

Hrf. Im’z a week fool az tawks aathout reazon, Why John (Coll. L.L.B.).


b. (depending on or referring to a noun.) Characterized by absence of, lacking or free from, not having; often forming phrases equivalent to negative adjs. e.g. without end = endless, without fear = fearless, without number (†tale) = innumerable, etc.


11. a. Followed by a gerund or verbal noun in -ing: equivalent to ‘so as not to’ or ‘and not’ with the corresponding vb., or ‘not’ with the present participle; e.g. to pass by without seeing = 'to pass by so as not to see', 'to pass by and not see', 'to pass by, not seeing'.

Cum. Fwok ’at can’t keep fra’t adoot signin’ t’pledge, GWORDIE GREENUP Yance a Year (1873) 18

Yks. He can’t guide his own bairn athout shutting him up, MACQUOID Doris Barugh (1877) xiv

m.Yks.1 Ye’ll know adoot me telling you, NIDDERDILL Olm. (1878)

s.Oxf. Athout spilin’ th’ old un, ROSEMARY Chilterns (1895) 77.

Nrf. Athowt lukiing either to the right or left, SPILLING Molly Miggs (1873) i.

(OED Online: "without, adv., prep., conj., and n.", EDD Online: "athout, adv., prep. and conj.")

* lig

EDD definition and usage examples:

10. trans. To lay.

Lth. Should e’er blind Fortune’s chancy wheel Ligg us thegither, LUMSDEN Sheep-head (1892) 63. n.Cy. GROSE (1790). Nh. Lie the’ doon, ROBSON Bk. Ruth (1860) iii. 4. Lakel.2 Gah an’ lig ye doon a bit. Cum. An’ mudder was reet; Ah’ll lig doon a wager, FARRALL BETTY WILSON (1886) 15. n.Yks.1 He ligg’d it doon as gin’ t’brunt ‘im; n.Yks.4, ne.Yks.1, e.Yks.1 m.Yks.1 I have liggen ‘t down on one side. w.Yks.1; w.Yks.3 She... ligged it over him i’ bed; w.Yks.5 n.Lan. I s’ try ut lig thy share tull mine, Lonsdale Mag. (July 1866) 19. n.Lin. This here crutch will be a
rare thing to lig her on, PEACOCK J. Markenfield (1872) l. 134, ed. 1874. n.Dev. Na tha wut lee a rope up-reert, Exm. Scold. (1746) l. 150.

(EDD Online: "lie, v.2 and sb.3")

Senses of lig expressed by this entry’s usage examples, with their relevant OED definitions:

II. To deposit.

7. a. To place in a position of rest on the ground or any other supporting surface; to deposit in some situation specified by means of an adverb or phrase. †to lay lake: to offer sacrifice (quot. a1225).

w.Yks.3 She... ligged it over him i' bed

8. With mixture of sense 1. a. To place (a person, one's limbs, oneself) in a recumbent posture in a specified place. to be laid: to lie down, recline (†formerly sometimes without a specifying adv. or phrase).

Nhb. Lie the' doon, ROBSON Bk. Ruth (1860) iii. 4.

Lakel.2 Gah an' lig yedoon a bit.

n.Lin. This here crutch will be a rare thing to lig her on, PEACOCK J. Markenfield (1872) l. 134, ed. 1874.

12. a. To put down or deposit as a wager; to stake, bet, or wager (a sum, one's head, life, etc.). Also to lay a wager.

Cum. An' mudder was reet; Ah'll lig doon a wager, FARRALL Betty Wilson (1886) 15

VI. To dispose or arrange in proper relative position over a surface.

37. Rope-making. a. To twist yarn to form (a strand), or strands to form (a rope).

n.Dev. Na tha wut lee a rope up-reert, Exm. Scold. (1746) l. 150.

PHRASAL VERBS

to lay down

3. trans. To place in a recumbent or prostrate position. Often refl. (†in early use conjugated with to be). †Also, to bring to be of a child (cf. 2 above).

n.Yks.1 He ligg'd it doon as gin't d brunt 'im

n.Yks.4 I have liggen 't down on one side.

to lay together

1. trans. To place in juxtaposition; to add together; †to compare; †to put together, construct; †pass. to be composed of.

Lth. Should e'er blind Fortune's chancy wheel Ligg us thegither, Lumsden Sheep-head (1892) 63.

; w.Yks.5 n.Lan. I s' try ut lig thy share tull mine, Lonsdale Mag. (July 1866) 19.

(OED Online: "lay, v.1", EDD Online: "lie, v.2 and sb.3")

• summat

EDD definition and usage examples:
Something.

**Dmf.** Sae the minister's gaen, heart disease or summat o' that sort, PONDER Kirkcumdoon (1875) 3. **Nhbb.** Thor's summat uncanny in that one, RHYS Fiddler of Carne (1896) 41. **Cum.** FARRALL Betty Wilson (1876) 12; (J.P.), **Wm.** (B.K.), n.Yks.4, e.Yks.1 w.Yks. Gi me a suap a sumat te sup (J.W.); w.Yks.1 'Summat's summat, and nought's nought,' a common phr. signifying that a person had better take or gain a little, than lose the whole; w.Yks.25 Lan. Aw thought there were summat up, CLEGG David's Loom (1894) i; Lan.1, e.Lan.1, m.Lan.1, s.Lan.1, Chs.123, s.Chs.1 s.Srf. PINNOCK Blk. Cy. Ann. (1895). Der.12, Not. (L.C.M.), Not.12, Lin.1 n.Lin.1 Gie me sum'ats to drink. sw.Lin.1 It wants summas doing at it. Lei.1, Nhp.12, War.234 s.War.1, se.Wor.1, Shr.1 Shr., Hrf. BOUND Provinc. (1876). Hrf.2, Glo.1, Oxf.1, Brks.1, Hnt. (T.P.F.) e.An. Will win summat gude wan day, HARRIS East-Ho (1902) 99. w.Nrf. ORTON Beeston Ghost (1884) 8. Suf.1 Ess. HEYGATE Poems (1870) 186. Ken.1, Sur.1, Hmp.1 Wil. SLOW Gl. (1892). n.Wil. (E.H.G.) Dor. BARNES Poems (ed. 1869-1870) 50. w.Som.1 Zaum-ut. Dev.1, nw.Dev.1 Cor. 'Pears to me you'm hidin' summat from me, PHILLPOTTS Prophets (1897) 120.

(EDD Online: "somewhat, sb.")

Senses of *somewhat* expressed by this entry's usage examples, with their relevant OED definitions:

**A. n.** (and adj.)

1. **a.** Some unspecified or indeterminate thing (material or immaterial).

   w.Yks.1 'Summat's summat, and nought's nought,' a common phr. signifying that a person had better take or gain a little, than lose the whole

   w.Yks.25 Lan. Aw thought there were summat up, CLEGG David's Loom (1894) i

   sw.Lin.1 It wants summas doing at it.

   nw.Dev.1 Cor. 'Pears to me you'm hidin' summat from me, PHILLPOTTS Prophets (1897) 120.

2. **c.** Some liquor, drink, or food; esp. in phr. to take something.

   n.Yks.4, e.Yks.1 w.Yks. Gi me a suap a sumat te sup (J.W.)

   Not.12, Lin.1 n.Lin.1 Gie me sum'ats to drink.

1. **f. or something** (colloq.), used to express an indistinct or unknown alternative.

   Dmf. Sae the minister's gaen, heart disease or summat o' that sort, PONDER Kirkcumdoon (1875) 3.

3. **a.** Followed by an adjective.

   e.An. Will win summat gude wan day, HARRIS East-Ho (1902) 99

4. **a.** In more emphatic use: A thing, fact, person, etc., of some value, consideration, or regard.

   Nhbb. Thor's summat uncanny in that one, RHYS Fiddler of Carne (1896) 41.
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