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ABSTRACT
Earlier work on the dialects of Early-Modern English has shown the dialects of English of the sixteenth-to-eighteenth centuries to be perhaps the most neglected and poorly researched of all in the history of the language. Under such circumstances, it is important to identify and then analyse both manuscripts and printed documents that contain examples of dialectal forms and constructions from that period. Although republished by the English Dialect Society, the Rev. William Hutton’s *A Bran New Wark* has remained an essentially-neglected source, not least—one imagines—because of its rarity, spelling conventions, and stylistically-mixed character, all of which render it difficult to interpret. In the present study, I discuss and illustrate these difficulties, and offer an analysis of part of the text at all linguistic levels, from the discourse-analytical and stylistic through the orthographical-phonological to the grammatical and lexical. It is shown that, despite certain difficulties, Hutton’s text gives us a considerable amount of linguistic information at all levels, and that it is especially valuable by virtue of its being one of a group of early studies devoted to the dialects of South-East Cumbria/pre-1974 South Westmorland and the extreme North of Lancashire. Further, given that Hutton had had close contact with this dialect for many years before he published the piece in 1785, that society was still relatively static at the time, and that his stylistic, religious-pedagogic, and antiquarian agendas were conservative, it is not unreasonable to imagine that this text offers us some insights into the Westmorland and North-Lancashire dialects of the early-eighteenth and even late-seventeenth centuries.

1 Westmorland is sometimes spelled *Westmoreland*, though this latter spelling was unusual by the time the county became a part of the new entity, Cumbria, in 1974.
1. EARLY-MODERN-ENGLISH DIALECTOLOGY

In my S.E.D.E.R.I.-XI paper on “The Dialects of Early-Modern English and Their Study” (Huelva, 2000), I reviewed some of the problems surrounding Early-Modern-English dialectology, and the sources for the study of the Early-Modern dialects. The dialects of English of the sixteenth-to-eighteenth centuries emerged as perhaps the most neglected and poorly researched of all in the history of the language (see also Görlach 1988). Under such circumstances, it is important to identify and then analyse both manuscripts and printed documents that contain examples of dialectal forms and constructions from the period. Although republished by the English Dialect Society, the Rev. William Hutton’s A Bran New Wark has remained an essentially-neglected source, not least —one imagines— because of its rarity, spelling conventions, and stylistically-mixed character, all of which render it difficult to interpret.

In this paper, I therefore discuss and illustrate the difficulties, and offer an analysis of part of the text at all linguistic levels, from the discourse-analytical and stylistic through the orthographical-phonological to the grammatical and lexical.

In analysing texts from the Late-Early-Modern period (which may comfortably be dated to at least 1800 for dialectological purposes), it seems

---

2 The English Dialect Dictionary listed this work in its bibliography; whilst Skeat (1911:117-118) included a modest extract with a few glosses, though this is merely a fragment from his edition of 1879, and adds nothing to our understanding of the text. An extract from the work was also reprinted in Denwood & Thompson’s (1950:40-42) anthology. This work is an anthology of dialect literature —prose and drama (primarily the former)— relating to the pre-1974 counties of Cumberland and Westmorland. The editors’ comments in their Introduction (p. 1) again add nothing to the analysis.

Hirooka (1981:323-328), too, anthologised an extract from this text and glossed it. Hirooka’s study includes texts from all historical periods and covering the whole country geographically. Commentaries are in Japanese, but the specimen texts and bibliographies are in English. A Bran New Wark is used to illustrate the Modern Westmorland dialect within the Northern grouping. He includes a slightly-longer specimen from A Bran New Wark than did Skeat (1911:117-118), and glosses more items (some of which are standard), no doubt for the benefit of Japanese students of English. His glosses of dialect words rely heavily on Skeat, and his handful of phonetic transcriptions should be viewed with caution. He is apparently unaware of the /au/-diphthong (cf. below).

Skeat’s selection of this work for his English Dialects, as well as for republication by the English Dialect Society, and the anthologising of the work by Denwood & Thompson and Hirooka are, at any rate, testimony to its potential importance. However, the work remains “essentially-neglected”, in that analysis has been restricted to almost entirely to limited glossing of a text that has so much more to offer.
methodologically sounder generally to work backwards from the-most-conservative Modern sources rather than forwards from inadequately-attested Old- and Middle-English dialects. Indeed, there are no direct forerunners of many Modern dialects, given the sparsity of the historical record, and changes in demographics especially during the Late-Early-Modern period, so that the notion of the reflex becomes impossibly strained. Crucial to such an undertaking as that proposed here are tape recordings of the most-residual vernacular (personal collection, archival sources); Survey-of-English-Dialects (S. E. D.) responses (also including tape recordings and other Incidental Material); local-dialect monographs; English-Dialect-Society and other glossaries, some subsumed in Wright (1898-1905 and 1905); dialect literature and literary dialect; and —above all— Ellis (1889). It is an implicit assumption, both that dialectal decay was slower, or a more-recent phenomenon, in remote-and-agrarian parts of Westmorland and North Lancashire than in many other places, and that the rate of dialect change has often been overestimated by scholars.

2. INTRODUCTION TO THE TEXT AND ITS AUTHOR

The author, the Rev. William Hutton (1737-1811), born of a landed family in Overthwaite, was made Curate of Beetham in 1760, and became Rector/Vicar of Beetham from 1762 until his death in 1811. He formed the main antiquarian collection of Beetham Parish Vestry, and deposited it in 1795 (see Marrison 1987 for a report on, and catalogue of, the Beetham Vestry Library prepared in 1986-1987). In particular, Hutton made a transcript of the parish registers from 1604. In 1770, he completed what is now known as the Beetham Repository, and presented it to the Vestry. Into this manuscript work he copied documents relating to the history of the parish, and supplied a continuous historical narrative to link them. This manuscript contains the very-earliest specimen of the Westmorland dialect, viz. his “A Dialogue in the Vulgar Language of Storth and Arnside, with a Design to Mark to Our Posterity, the Pronuntiation [sic.] of A. D. 1760”. A little

---

3 See below in the References under Hutton, [The Rev.] W. “The Repository”. Whilst the manuscript was deposited in 1770, the work was not printed until much later.
4 The Dialogue, written in the South-Westmorland dialect, first appeared in the Beetham Repository (see Hutton 1760/?/1770: p. 100 of the manuscript). Marrison (1987) adds nothing to our understanding of the Repository, as far as the dialect Dialogue goes, but does offer a kind of context by listing the rest of the collection. The Dialogue subsequently appeared as a publication
later, in 1785, he published his sermon on Christian Neighbourliness in the Westmorland dialect, *i.e.*, *A Bran New Wark*, the second-oldest specimen of the Westmorland dialect. He was well educated, and had broad interests—not just ecclesiastical, but antiquarian and scientific too: he was an amateur scientist, with strong interests in geology and entomology.

His own footnote to the pseudonym Worfat (title-page of *A Bran New Wark*) reads “alias Orfat, alias Overthwaite”, which is where his family had its seat, and which he describes as “a deserted village” in his Prologue (p. 184 in Skeat’s edition). It is just over a mile to the North-East of Beetham (the local pronunciation is /biːθm/), which is in South-East Cumbria, pre-1974 South Westmorland, and the villages are close to the Lancashire border in each case. Beetham falls within Ellis’s D 31 (West Northern), variety iii (Westmorland South of the Watershed), though close to variety ii (Lonsdale). The nearest S. E. D. locality is Lancashire 3 (Yealand). The Prologue to the work is dated “Yule Tide, 1784”, and the work itself was published in Kendal the following year in an edition of only fifty copies (now an extreme rarity), under the title *A Bran New Wark, by William de Worfat, Containing a True Calendar of His Thoughts Concerning Good Nebberhood. Naw First Printed fra His M. S. for the Use of the Hamlet of Woodland*. A second or half-title appears on the fly-leaf at the beginning: *A Plain Address, Written in the Provincial Dialect, of the Barony of Kendal*. Skeat prepared an edition for the English Dialect Society in 1879, in which he followed his first edition of 1785, and noted any variations in the slightly-different, undated—though-clearly-later London edition (rare). He also added notes and a Glossarial Index to supplement the author’s own notes and inadequate glossary. All page references here are to Skeat’s edition. The excerpt below is from the beginning of the section headed “The Parson’s Tale”, pp. 198-200, lines 328-386.

5 Lancashire 2 (Cartmel) is a little further away, across the Kent Estuary. Yorkshire 12 (Burton-in-Lonsdale) lies a somewhat-greater distance away to the South-East. For locations and other details of the S. E. D. localities, as well as the responses in the *Basic Material*, see Orton (1962) and Orton & Halliday (1962-1963).

6 Skeat obviously thought Hutton’s glossary inadequate, and he is quoted on this subject, below, in the discussion of lexis. Whilst there is undoubtedly something to what Skeat says, we should
As noted above, Hutton had earlier written a specimen intended to preserve the pronunciation of the dialect of the villages of Storth and Arnside, as of 1760. These localities are *circa* one and two miles respectively to the west of Beetham. Now, he refers to Amside in his Prologue to *A Bran New Wark* in such a way as perhaps to suggest that its speech is the model in the present work too (p. 184). Since Hutton had been able to observe elderly speakers in this region from well before 1760 even, his works may offer some glimpses of speech learned in the late-seventeenth century.

### 3. SAMPLE TEXT

**William de Worfat [the Rev. William Hutton, Rector/Vicar of Beetham]. *A Bran New Wark, or A Plain Address, Written in the Provincial Dialect, of the Barony of Kendal. 1785***

**THE PARSON’S TALE**

Last saturday sennet, about seven in the evening, (twas lownd and fraaze hard) the stars twinkled and the setting moon cast gigantic shadows. I was stalking hameward across *Blackwater-mosses*, and whistling as I tramp’d for want of thought, when a noise struck my ear, like the crumpling of frosty murgeon; it made me stop short, and I thought I saw a strange form before me: It vanished behint a windraw; and again thare was nought in view but dreary dykes, and dusky ling. An awful silence reigned arround; this was sean brokken by a skirling hullet; sure nivver did hullet, herrensue, or miredrum, mak sic a noise before. Your minister was freetned, the hairs of his head stood an end, his blead storkened, and the haggard creature moving slawly nearer, the mirkness of the neet shew’d her as big again as she was. Scarcely did a rag cover her naakedness. She stoup’d and drop’d a poak and thus began with a whining tone. Deary me! deary me! forgive me good Sir, but this yance, I’ll steal naa maar. This seck is elding to keep us

perhaps remember that, inasfar as the work was directed at dialect speakers (“for the Use of the Hamlet of Woodland”), glosses were unnecessary. For Skeat’s Introduction, see pp. 179-180, and p. viii; for his additional Notes, pp. 210-213; and for his Glossarial Index, pp. 214-222.

7 At any rate, Overthwaite, Beetham, Woodland, Storth and Arnside are so close together that insistence on one particular locality might be overly-precise (cf. the broader “Written in the Provincial Dialect, of the Barony of Kendal”, though that formulation need not of itself rule out a more-localised model within the wider area).

8 Hutton’s footnote: “a week or seven nights, so fortnight, fourteen nights”.

9 Skeat’s endnote: “‘And whistled as he went, for want of thought.’—Dryden, Cymon, 85”.

10 As Skeat suggests in his glossary, *this seck is elding* means ‘the contents of this sack is fuel’.
SEDERI XIV

fra starving. My mother, my brothers and sisters, and my ald neam, O deary me! Whilst she spaake these words, her knocking knees, and diddering teeth melted my heart. Ah! said I to mysell, did net king David, when hungered, eat the holy bread? Did net Jesus and his disciples crop the ears of their nebbour’s corn! Hunger will break through stane-walls. Necessity will disturb the laws of moral obligation; get thee haame my lass, and sin naa maar. I judge thee net, oready thy conscience condemns thee. The Almeety bless ye, Sir, said she, aur wooning is net aboon a dozen stanethraws fra this spot, preia gang with me, and see with your awn een, aur pitiful plight.

We nivver feel greater pleasure than when we relieve distress, than when we du good; it is more blessed to give than to receive: Nivvertheless, sometimes thare is danger and temptation even in the godly deed. Thares a thin partition ’tween good and evil; this minute I feel mysell a saint, the next a dannet. Whence spring aur thoughts? what first mover starts them fra their secret lodgement? mickle talk has thare been abaut it; I confess I cannot fathom this; somat like a flint with gunpowder, strikes fire and springs a mine, when we the least expect it. We passed by the rocking stane oor a bed of scars, they were slippy, and she stottered, she fell: I had liked to have tumbled a top of her snocksnarles. I believe it was pity maade me lift her or help to lift her up. Be it what it wad, up as she raaise, a star fell directly athwart, and shining full in her face, discovered to me the finest flesh and blead that ivver was cumpassed by mortal man. My pulse bet quic k, my quicker thoughts ran oor aur father’s prayer, and I fund mysell safe. Luckily we were come near the hovel; the girl unsnecked the raddle heck. Wretched scene! the hovel or hut belang’d to a widow in a peck of troubles. Tis just aleun weeks sen I buried her husband. Poor Geordie! he was a graadly bain fellow, and wrought his sell to death; What coud a body dea maar for his family? She followed his coffin with neen bams crying efter her, and a tenth sawking at her breast. When she saw me she wept; I wept ano. She sat on a three-legg’d steal, and a dim coal smook’d within the rim of a brandreth, oor which a seaty rattencreak hung dangling fra a black randletree. The walls were plaister’d with dirt, and a stee, with hardly a rung, was rear’d into a loft. Aroun the woman her lile ans sprawl’d on the hearth, some, whiting speals, some, snottering and crying, and ya ruddy cheek’d lad threw on a bullen to make a loww, for its mother to find her loup. By this sweal I beheld this family’s poverty. [....]

11 Hutton’s footnote: “Ano means and all, that is also.”
4. COMMENTARY

It would be inappropriate to present a large textual sample here, as Skeat’s edition is available for more-protracted study. That having been said, a shorter excerpt is very much in order, given the importance of this source (see below, and the Introduction to the Text and Its Author, above), its unusual stylistic character, and given further the fact that Skeat restricts his notes to questions of etymology, semantics, literary allusion, punctuation and spelling, and factual content. It is also important to indicate just how problematic this text becomes, once one goes beyond the lexical. No commentary can be given here on matters of detail from the remainder of the work, as it is so rich in non-standard features that a complete commentary would transcend all considerations of space.

4.1. Discourse-analytical, Stylistic

Skeat (1879) was well aware of the strengths and weaknesses of this text qua dialect specimen: “It is not exactly in the spoken dialect, but rather a piece of literary English abounding in the use of provincial words, written by one who was familiar with the living speech” (p. viii); and again, later “Strictly speaking, the language is not dialectal, but literary English; yet it contains so large a number of dialectal words as to make it well worthy of being reprinted for the Society” (p. 180). I.e., at the suprasentential or text-grammatical level, the work is standard and elaborately literary, just as it is sententially from the point of view of word order and clauses; and in terms of biblical allusions and many other aspects of diction. It does, however, incorporate a substantial number of non-standard lexical items (Skeat’s main concern), also revealing some features of phonology and morphology. It is, in fact, quite unusually extreme in its alternation between a high-flown style and the regional dialect. Contrast, for instance, the two halves of the sentence, 

\[
\text{necessity will disturb the laws of moral obligation; get thee haame my lass, and sin naa maar; or the stars twinkled and the setting moon cast gigantic shadows with the scene inside the woman’s hovel.}
\]

Skeat also felt that the specimen was reliable or genuine (in the linguistically-limited sense just indicated) not only because of its author’s firsthand acquaintance with the dialect, but also because of his motivation:
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Unlike many specimens of (so-called) provincial talk, this piece does not appear to have been written to sell; so that the author was not endeavouring, as is often the case, to put together a quantity of trash (often very incorrect as specimens of dialect) in order to raise a laugh and catch a penny. (p. 179)

Clearly, this is an important point for our present purposes. The piece is, in effect, a sermon or moralising tract, prepared, according to the title, for Hutton’s village parishioners. In the Prologue, Hutton makes it clear that he wishes to instruct the vulgar as well as the higher classes (p. 186), and that familiar language is required to edify his parishioners (p. 184); and notes, further, that no excuse is needed for using a dialect that preserves much of the speech of ages past (pp. 185-186). This last argument, already appealed to by a writer such as John Collier (pseudonym, Tim Bobbin) [1746], is one that would subsequently be repeated in respect of other dialect texts by antiquarians many times over.

The imitation of biblical style is not confined to allusions and diction. There is a repeated use of questions, rhetorical and otherwise, in the work as a whole, that is biblical-didactic, but hardly Westmorland dialect. The use of inversion is usually also biblical, though not after *nivver*, where it is regular in English. As a general principle, it may be stated that Hutton’s style-switching not infrequently renders it impossible to decide whether we are dealing with a dialect feature or some aspect of his (biblical and) archaising style (examples below).

4.2. Orthographical

Spelling and punctuation have not been normalised here, save for the deletion of spaces before punctuation marks. Thus *saturday* begins with lower-case *s*; there is no apostrophe in *thares*; the first person singular reflexive pronoun is spelled both *mysell, mysel*; and so on. *Aleun* is ‘eleven’ and *seun* ‘seven’. The apostrophe in a number of preterites is a literary convention. *Shewed* is presumably an older/biblical spelling rather than a dialect respelling. The consistent spelling *-ing* in present participles\(^{12}\) and nominals cannot possibly have been representative of a dialect in this area, where the termination is *-/ən*/*-\(n\)/ or *-/\(\text{h}\)n/ rather than *-/\(\text{h}\)/ -the author has evidently elected not to respell here, as at numerous other points. Because of the constant style-switching,

\(^{12}\) The traditional terms, *present participle* and *past participle*, have been used here, as being widely accepted though, from a technical point of view, *-ing participle* and *-ed participle* are preferable.
it is not always certain whether a particular form should be treated as standard or non-standard: e.g., do want, was contain /o/ or /a/? Is nought the archaic-poetic form of naught, or is it a respelling meant to suggest /ɒ/? Does death contain standard /e/, or non-standard /ə/? There can be no definite answers to such questions, as Hutton will suddenly respell a single word or include an altogether-non-standard word in an otherwise-standard environment, no matter how stylistically incongruous the result. Other respellings remain unclear for different reasons, as an ‘on’ (a reduced vowel?), and could ‘could’ (a misprint? eye dialect?—though the latter would be unusual in this text). N.B.: a peculiarity of the original is that an exclamation mark is sometimes used instead of a question mark, and vice versa.

Skeat noted that, in the London edition, fraaze is respelled as freaze, hairs as hears, slawly as slowly, naakedness as neakedness, naa as nea, spaake as speake, hungrred as hungered, haame as heame, naa as nea, preia as preia, lodgement as lodgment, maade as meade, raaise as rease, shining as shined, cumpassed as compassed, mysel as myself; unsneck’d is already from the later edition, as the original unsneck’d must have been a misprint; graadly is respelled as gready, and maar as mear. Of the London-edition respellings in the work as a whole, he observed that “the most noticeable point about these variations is the systematic substitution of ea for aa [...] evidently with the idea of giving a more exact notion of the sounds” (p. 209). Just what that might be Skeat unfortunately does not say; see further on this utterly-crucial point, however, under Phonological, below.

4.3. Phonological

Phonological processes. Examples of the elision of historical consonants will be found below. Inorganic initial /n/ appears in neam ‘uncle’, < Old-English ðæm.

Consonants. Nowadays this is not an /h/ area, and the consistent use of /h/ could possibly be a compromise with standard-English orthography—a compromise that would not be at all unusual. Further, the author has certainly not respelled many other forms that might have been respelled, nor has he attempted to produce a stylistically-homogeneous text (see above). That having been said, however, the text is of some antiquity, and /h/ may have been pronounced at that time. Ellis’s (1889) specimens suggest /h/

---

13 I have drawn attention to this phenomenon in pre-1974-South-East Lancashire writing, where the vernaculars traditionally have no /h/ at all. See Shorrocks (1978:52, 56; 1988:101, 104).
was used more widely than the maps based on S. E. D. materials would indicate, and Hirst (1906: 12-13) gives /h/ and /hw/ (or /h/ for Kendal, except when unstressed. /h/ occurs in *behind* ‘behind’. There is no final /l/ in *myself* (1) ‘myself’, *his sell* ‘himself’. Historical /l/ has been lost in ano ‘too, <and all’; *ready* ‘already’; and medial /w/ in *somat* ‘something’. /jl/ occurs in ya ‘one’ (determiner); *yance* ‘once’.

**Short vowels.** /l/ occurs in *iver* ‘ever’; *nivver* ‘never’, *nivvertheless*; *sic* ‘such’. /æ/ occurs in *bet* ‘beat’ (preterite); *after* ‘after’; *hes* ‘has’; *nebbour* ‘neighbour’; *seck* ‘sack’; *sen* ‘since’. /a/ occurs in *belang’d* ‘belonged’; mak ‘make’; wad ‘would’; *yance* ‘once’; the same phoneme probably also occurs in *barns* ‘children’, with pre-consonantal /r/ pronounced. /ɔ/ occurs in *brokken* ‘broken’. /u/ is probably indicated by *somat* ‘something’; and occurs in *cumpassed* ‘embraced’; *fund* ‘found’. /ɔ/ is probably indicated by *net* ‘not’.

**Long vowels.** /i:/, or a diphthong of an /i/-type, occurs in *Almeety* ‘Almighty’; *een* ‘eyes’; *freetned* ‘frightened’; *neen* ‘nine’; *neet* ‘night’. /e:/ occurs in *bain* ‘willing, ready’; *plaister’d* ‘plastered’. /a:/ occurs in *ald* ‘old’; *awn* ‘own’; *slowly* ‘slowly’; *ya* ‘one’ (determiner); in the second syllable of *stanethraws* ‘stonethrows’; and apparently in *sawking* ‘sucking’. /u:/ (or a related diphthong) occurs in *aboon* ‘above’; *oor* ‘over’; *smook’d* ‘smoked’; *wooning* ‘dwelling’.

**Diphthongs.** The respellings with *aa* in *fraaze* ‘froze’, etc., and those with *a + consonant + e* in *hameward* ‘homeward’ (also *haame* ‘home’), *stane* ‘stone’, *thare* ‘there’ occur in those words that regularly have /ta/ in the traditional venaculars of this area, and this is the phoneme that I take them to indicate here. The convention *aa*, in particular, might seem on the surface to be indicative of a long vowel as, indeed, it usually is in other texts (e. g., *laal* ‘little’, etc.), but it is hardly conceivable that these words could have had /a:/ or a monophthongal development of it at this time, even if we allow for the fact that Hutton might have been inclined to produce archaic dialect as well as archaic literary standard. Though *aa* may be one of the less-transparent conventions selected to represent /ta/, it is not wholly unrealistic, especially if /ta/ were generally a rising diphthong at the time. The later replacement of *aa* by *ea* in the London edition is not indicative of a sound change’s having taken place —except, perhaps, that the diphthong might no longer have been so obviously a rising diphthong in word-medial and word-final positions. Since *ea* is used in the first edition to represent /o/, *aa* enables Hutton to observe the phonemic distinction between /o/ and /a/. Thus, to interpret Skeat’s comment on this matter (above), the new *ea* of the London edition might well seem better to represent the sound involved,
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*viz.* /æ/, but — going beyond Skeat’s comment — the substitution of it for *aa* nonetheless obliterates a critically-important distinction between two phonemes!

/æ/ occurs in *little*, /ə/ occurs in *fraaze* ‘froze’; *graadly* ‘respectable, honest, well-meaning’; *haame* ‘home’; *hameward* ‘homeward’; *maade* ‘made’; *maar* ‘more’; *naa* ‘no’; *naakedneas* ‘nakedness’; *raaise* ‘rose’; *spaake* ‘spoke’; *stane* ‘stone’; *thare* ‘there’. /ə/ occurs in *blead* ‘blood’; *dea* ‘do’; *neam* ‘uncle’; in the third syllable of *rattencreak* ‘pot-crook, pot-hook’; *sean* ‘soon’; *seaty* ‘sooty’; *spedal* ‘spell, split stick’; *steal* ‘stool’; *sweal* ‘flame, blaze’. /ə/ occurs in *abaut* ‘about’; *araund* ‘around’; *aur* ‘our’. Contrast the lexical distribution of this phoneme here with that of historical /uː/ in Cumberland and Westmorland generally. /ə/ is probable in *louw* ‘flame, blaze’; *wrought* ‘worked’ (preterite); and, as long as we are not simply dealing with now-obsolete spellings, *loup* ‘stitch’; *stoup’d* ‘stooped’. *Poak* suggests [ɔː*ə*]. /ʊ/ is likely in *du* ‘do’, alternating with /ho/ /dea — the equivalent to the R. P. (Received Pronunciation) vowel would require no respelling, and a reduced vowel is not very likely in this context, where the form is a full verb, not an auxiliary.

**4.4. Grammatical**

The text was written at a time when antiquarian-philological interest centred upon lexis (etymology and semantics), and to a lesser degree pronunciation and morphology, so that many features of these types are indicated. As noted above, the text is in all other respects of an elevated and archaising literary type. It follows that we can expect to draw very few conclusions indeed about non-standard word order, syntactic patterns, or spoken-textual structure. In particular, we should not conclude that English dialects do not vary much at the syntactic level, for little attempt has been made to represent such variation here. The same argument applies (even if sometimes to a lesser degree) to dialect literature and literary dialect generally.

**Determiners.** Definite article: only full forms are given, which can hardly be accurate. Indefinite determiner: *ya* ‘one’; *mickle* ‘much’; *naa* ‘no’. Possessive: highly noteworthy is *its* ‘his’. On *thy* and *your*, see under personal pronouns, below.

**Nouns.** There is an /-n/ plural allomorph in *een* ‘eyes’.

**Pronouns.** Indefinite: *somat* ‘something’. Personal: the neuter pronoun is sometimes used in the North-West to refer to infants and children, even in direct address (*e. g.*, in the Bolton area — cf. *Shorrock* 1999:159,
footnote 1). See here under the associated possessive determiner, above. A second-person singular-familiar form is used by the parson to the poor woman, objective-case thee, associated determiner thy, whereas she addresses him with the historical plural-polite form, objective-case ye, related determiner your. Whether this distinction is intended to be dialectal, literary, or both is hard to say. It is not possible to state with certainty whether the enclitic forms tis, twas are standard literary or non-standard dialect. There is also an enclitic form in preia (earlier apreia, line 166 in Skeat’s edition), which Skeat glosses as ‘I pray mee’, though ‘(I) pray ye’ would follow stylistically, and probably phonologically too. Reflexive: mysel(l) ‘myself’; his sell ‘himself’.

**Pro-form:** lile ans ‘little ones’.

**Verbs.** The construction I had liked to have + past participle ‘I was near to (doing)’ is still in common use in the North-West (see further under 4.5. Lexical, below). Infinitive: mak ‘make’ (though on another occasion not respelled). Preterites: bet ‘beat’; fund ‘found’; maade ‘made’; raaise ‘rose’; spaake ‘spoke’; wrought ‘worked’. Past participle: brokken ‘broken’.

**Primary auxiliary:** be as a perfect auxiliary in we were come could be either standard or non-standard. One suspects it was still ‘standard’ at the time (for one sees it often enough in texts of the eighteenth, nineteenth, and even twentieth centuries with certain verbs), though be as a perfect auxiliary with intransitive verbs of motion or change of state has certainly survived longer in non-standard varieties (see, e.g., Shorrocks 1999:127-129); and there may have been at least a quantitative difference in Hutton’s day, if not a qualitative one.

**Modal auxiliary.** Preterite: wad ‘would’.

**Prepositions:** a top ‘atop, on top of; fra ‘from’.

**Conjunction:** sen ‘since’.

**Adverbs:** ano ‘too’, <and all’ quick ‘quickly’; snocksnarles ‘all of a heap’ (usually of entangled thread); sure is used as a sentence modifier.

**Degree modifier:** aboon ‘above, more than’.

4.5. Lexical

Ano ‘too’, <and all’, bain ‘willing, ready’; barns ‘children’; body ‘person’; brandreth ‘an iron frame over the fire’; bullen ‘a stalk of hemp’; dannet ‘worthless fellow’ (Skeat derives this from one who dows not, cf. German Taugenichts); diddering ‘shaking, shivering’, hence ‘chattering’ (of teeth); dykes —Skeat glosses this as ‘ditches’ (p. 216), but ‘hedges’ is more likely; elding ‘fuel’; gang ‘go’; graadly ‘respectable, honest, well-meaning’; heck
‘half-door’; herrensue ‘heron’; hullet ‘owl, owlet’ (see further in the English Dialect Dictionary (E. D. D.), and in the Oxford English Dictionary (O. E. D. II) under howlet); lad ‘boy’; lass ‘girl’; I had liked to have + past participle ‘I was near to (doing)’, strangely classified by O. E. D. II as “obsolete” and “now vulgar and dialect (U[nnited] S[taet]s)” —this construction is still widely used in the North-West of England and elsewhere, and not just in traditional vernacular, but in more-modified varieties too;\textsuperscript{14} ling ‘a kind of heather’; loup ‘a stitch in knitting’, literally a loop; lownd ‘still, quiet, calm’; loww ‘blaze, light’; mickle ‘much’; miredrum ‘bittern’; mirkness ‘darkness’; murgeon ‘rubbish-earth cut up and thrown aside in order to get turf’; neam ‘uncle’; peck ‘a large quantity or number, especially in the phrase a peck of troubles’; poak ‘sack’; raddle heck ‘wattled half-door’; randletree ‘a piece of wood in a chimney, from which is hung the pot-crook’; rattencreek ‘pot-crook, pot-hook’ (which Skeat gives as a “corruption” of rakencrook [sic., spelled racken-crook just beforehand; i.e., rackan-crook]; sennet ‘week’ (< Old-English sefon nihta ‘seven nights’, according to the Germanic system of reckoning by nights); skirling ‘shrieking, screaming’; snocknarles ‘all of a heap’ (usually of entangled thread); snottering ‘blubbering, sobbing, snivelling’; somat ‘something’ (< somewhat); speal ‘spell, small split stick, chip of wood’; spot ‘place’; stee ‘ladder’; storkened ‘congealed’ (literally ‘stiffened’); stotted ‘stumbled’; sweal ‘flame, blaze’; unsneck’d ‘undid, unfastened’ (cf. sneek ‘latch’); whitting ‘whittling’; windraw ‘heap of dug earth’; wooning ‘dwelling’.

Skeat made the following rather-telling observations on the lexicon of the piece:

I venture to call attention to the remarkable facts (1) that our author only explains very easy words in his very brief glossary; and (2) that, of the harder words, a large number are given in the glossary printed as ‘Gloss[ary] B. 1’ by the E[nglish] D[ialect] S[ociety] [= the glossary from A Tour to the Caves ---].

\textsuperscript{14} I’d like(d?) to have done it ‘I nearly did it, I was in danger of doing it, etc.’ is common in various other areas, e. g., in the Bolton Metropolitan Borough. If like is an adverbial here, then the presence of the infinitive marker is interesting. E. D. D., under like, sense 4, gives “likely, probable; also used adverbially”: Phr. (8) to have like to, see (7, a), the latter being to be like to “to be on the point of, to be ready to; to nearly (do anything), to be in danger of”. Both constructions are widely attested, especially in Scotland and the North of England, as well as those under sense 18 “to be nearly or almost, to be on the point of, to be likely; esp. in phrase to be or have liked to. Cf. liken, v.1 2”. The same constructions, with a past participle, are attested under liken too. Strictly, one cannot tell whether an informant says like or liked before to because of the probability of assimilation, or cluster reduction.
which was written by the Rev. John Hutton, and printed for W. Pennington, of Kendal, in 1781.\textsuperscript{15} When we consider that the ‘Bran New Wark’ was also written by one of the Hutton family in 1784, and printed for the same W. Pennington, I think we may conclude that our author must have been well acquainted with the glossary above-mentioned. My theory is that he probably himself contributed to that glossary, and thought it unnecessary to explain over again words which had already been explained there. The remarkable coincidences in spelling between the “Bran New Wark” and this glossary are very striking. (p. 214)

Skeat compared the two and gave a sufficient number of examples to prove his point (pp. 214-215). He felt that, by using the Glossary to the \textit{Tour to the Caves}..., we effectively had William Hutton’s very own glosses (p. viii). Certainly, half the words in my own glossary here, including the majority of the more unusual ones, can be found in the Glossary to the \textit{Tour to the Caves}..., though with some differences of grammatical form and spelling, as is only to be expected. In all of this, however, we should not overlook the fact that Skeat is writing from the perspective of a scholar, an antiquarian, or an outsider to the dialect, and that Hutton wrote this particular work primarily (though not exclusively) for the benefit of his parishioners, who needed no such glosses.

5. CONCLUSIONS

It will be evident from the above analysis that, despite certain difficulties, Hutton’s text gives us a considerable amount of information at the various linguistic levels. At the phonological level, many interesting features of the spoken dialect are represented, including—in Hutton’s original text—the critical distinction between the diphthongs /əʊ/ and /əʊ/. There are a significant number of non-standard morphological and syntactic features; and many non-standard lexical items—it will be noted, that there is a strong Old-English component here. Further, given that Hutton had had close contact with this dialect for many years before he published the piece in 1785, that society was still relatively static at the time, and that his stylistic, religious-
pedagogic, and antiquarian agendas were conservative, it is not unreasonable to imagine that this text offers us some insights into the Westmorland and North-Lancashire dialects of the early-eighteenth and even late-seventeenth centuries.

*A Bran New Wark* is also especially valuable by virtue of its being one of a group of early studies devoted to the dialects of South-East Cumbria/pre-1974 South Westmorland and the extreme North of Lancashire. Clearly, there would be opportunities in future studies to compare Hutton’s two dialect works with those of two other writers: the important 1781 work of his cousin, the Rev. John Hutton (1740(?)-1806), Vicar of Burton-in-Kendal on the border of Westmorland adjoining Lancashire from 1764 until his death, already referred to above for glossarial purposes; as well as with Mrs. Ann Wheeler’s (1735-1804) dialogues in the Arnside dialect of the late-eighteenth century (Wheeler 1790, 1802, 1821, etc.). The dialect in Wheeler’s dialogues (1790, 1802, 1821, etc.) is none other than that of the parish of Beetham! In the title, *The Westmorland Dialect, with the Adjacency of Lancashire and Yorkshire* (1821), she quite correctly recognises a dialect that does not coincide with county boundaries, but which later dialectologists have found to extend over the area indicated, and to be relatively homogeneous. It is impossible to overestimate the value of this group of texts, coming as they do from the same small area, and at such a relatively early date. Taken together, they arguably form the most important group of specimens for any Modern-English dialect.
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