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## Abstract

But when they try an’ talk bay-windared,

It’s enuff ter bust thi britches.

(Hague1976a: 125)

This thesis employs an interdisciplinary approach and draws on archival texts to investigate representations of Yorkshire speech in the writing of three twentieth century authors from coal-mining backgrounds. Dialect representation predominantly involves the respelling of words in order to invoke the sounds of speech. This representation of vernacular speech engages with the dominant conceptualisation of the relationship between standard orthography and speech enshrined in mainstream literacy education and promoted by ideologies concerning language standards. Dialect representation has traditionally been seen as an attempt to ‘capture’ vernacular speech in writing with scholarship from both linguistic and literary backgrounds focussing on the accuracy of the dialect represented. However, I argue that dialect representation should be approached not as an act of representation but rather as an act of social negotiation.

In this study I reposition the representation of dialect in writing as a complex laminate of social practices. Drawing on practice-based approaches to language, orthography and literacy, as well as socio-linguistic research, I position dialect representation as a culturally determined evocation of vernacular speech undertaken by socially motivated authors. I explore literature in terms of the cultural legitimacy and prestige that this cultural sphere affords socially motivated individuals, as well as in terms of the inherent cultural norms, language standards and literacy ideologies that these individuals must engage with in order to participate in this sphere. My aim is to present dialect representation as a complex act, which has its root in commonplace social interaction, and to engage with it as an act of literacy which is ‘embedded in […] oral language and social interaction’ (Barton 1994: 130-136).

The collected works, ephemera and public responses to the works of Arthur Eaglestone (Roger Dataller), Tom Hague (Totley Tom) and Barry Hines are explored in three case studies which explore issues related to authenticity, legitimacy and inequality.
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# 1. Overview

## 1.1 Introduction

This thesis reports the findings of an archival historical stylistic study of the works of three authors who represent Yorkshire dialect in their writing: Arthur Eaglestone (pseudonym Roger Dataller), Tom Hague (pseudonym Totley Tom) and Barry Hines. The representations of dialect are created through a variety of writing techniques, which mostly rely on changes to the standardised English spelling system (orthography). I employ an interdisciplinary methodology to explore how these authors use dialect representation to negotiate legitimate cultural values and to engage, in socially motivated ways, with language attitudes and ideologies. This interdisciplinary approach is used to position instances of dialect representation within socio-cultural systems, rather than to hold written representations of speech up alongside ‘real speech’ to assess their accuracy. The analysis of these instances of dialect representation looks at them as multifaceted social objects and highlights the representation of vernacular speech in writing as a complex social process. Within this thesis instances of dialect representation are approached as both a complex of ‘social practices’ and a ‘semiotic object’ with unique cultural value (Blommaert 2012: 2).

In previous scholarly discussions of dialect representation there has been a focus of interest in the accuracy or authenticity of the dialect represented. In his influential ‘A Theory of Literary Dialect’ Sumner Ives’ main concern is with how closely literary dialects do or do not reflect real speech. Ives argues that the authors he investigates are concerned with linguistic realism:

The aim of these authors has been the literary use of a genuine […] version of the English language. […] [S]erious writers have employed literary dialect as a means of realism. They have tried to give an impression of literal accuracy, to show actual speech as actually used (Ives 1971: 146)

In exploring this accuracy, Ives does makes allowances for the author’s task: ‘[n]early all examples of literary dialect are deliberately incomplete: the author is an artist, not a linguist or a sociologist, and his purpose is literary rather than scientific’ (Ives 1971: 147). Nevertheless, Ives works to relate written representations of dialect to features of real speech in order to evaluate the linguistic accuracy of these representations. Although Ives’ approach to the question of written representations of dialect speech has been superseded by other more substantial approaches (see 1.2.1.), I refer to him here to foreground the importance he places on the accuracy of real speech. According to Susan Ferguson this concern over accuracy manifests itself in many other critical discussions of dialect representation, usually as a version of the question: ‘is the dialect represented in a way that suggests the actual sounds and style of the particular accent or dialect in the real world?’ (Ferguson 1998: 2). Yet as Michael Halliday explains, speech and writing are not the same, as their ‘relationship is not a direct one […] [writing] never was just “speech written down”; and (at least until very recent advances in technology) the two have continued to occupy complementary domains’ (Halliday 2004: 7). Roger Cole points out that writing can be seen to represent speech only because of the reader’s previous experiences of literacy, rather than because orthography accurately suggests the sounds and style of speech:‘[b]oth standard and non-standard orthography succeed in representing the illusion of human speech only because the reader already knows what it sounds like’ (1986: 6). When considering that dialect representation involves a process of presenting spontaneous vernacular speech in a recognisable and meaningful way in the domain of writing, the question of the accuracy of the dialect represented becomes problematic. This presentation process is one of mediation and involves drawing on a diverse range of social practices and processes, with these practices consisting of specific uses of language in specific contexts of use. In arguing for a ‘sociolinguistics of mediation’ Nikolas Coupland asserts that if ‘we take the fact of mediated re-contextualisation seriously, then “accuracy” is irrelevant’ (2009: 298). If accuracy is taken to be irrelevant then a wider theoretical framing needs to be developed to look at written representations of speech. The correlation between written representations of speech and actual speech in use is only one dimension of the process of mediating vernacular speech in writing.

The relationship between speech and writing in modern British society is complex. Speech is inherently linked with writing in modern English culture as, according to David Barton, ‘[i]n a literate culture […] literacy is embedded in the oral language and social interaction’ of an individual’s surroundings, and speaking and writing are ‘inextricably entwined and cannot be separated: they are both part of learning to use language’ (Barton 1994: 130-136). Both speech and writing are inseparable from each other, as well as being inseparable from the social practices and contexts in which they are used and the social values which they possess. Setting aside discussions of accuracy, dialect representation can still ‘suggest’ ways of speaking in the ‘real world’ because of the way in which literacy and spoken language influence each other and the range of social activities in which they are used. Joan Beal argues that the techniques used to represent dialects in writing are reliant on a reader’s cultural experiences in order for them to recreate the spoken voice mentally (2006: 532). Authors who make use of dialect representation in literary texts have to negotiate the norms of literate and literary culture. Looking at the cultural relationship between speech and writing when considering dialect representation raises the question: why is it that variation in writing can be interpreted in the same way that spoken variation is interpreted?

Language use is socially motivated. Spoken and written language cannot be separated from the social processes and properties that they are involved in and possess as, in Pierre Bourdieu’s words, ‘[n]ot only are linguistic features never clearly separated from the speaker’s whole set of social properties but phonological (or lexical, or any other) features are never clearly separated from other levels of language’ (Bourdieu 1991: 89). ‘Writing speech down’ is a process that not only relies on the ways in which literacy and speech are related, but also on how literary writing and vernacular speech are culturally valued. Social practices are involved in the creation of cultural value (Agha 2003: 231) with the social practices involved in the creation of literary representations of dialect, from literate society, literary culture and regional dialect, drawing on the cultural values which are inculcated in each of these spheres. Looking at the cultural value of non-standard orthography and vernacular speech involves discussing the legitimacy of social practices and cultural objects because, in Bernard Lahire’s words, ‘the boundary between cultural legitimacy (‘‘high culture’’) and cultural illegitimacy (‘‘popular culture’’, ‘‘simple entertainment’’) does not only separate different social classes statistically, as discrete categories, but divides up the different cultural practices and preferences of individuals, across all classes of society’ (Lahire 2008: 168). Although speech cannot be accurately represented in writing, representations of vernacular speech can be used to create social meaning through the complex cultural associations that vernacular speech and non-standard orthography can possess. Considering the socio-cultural values placed on spoken and written English means that dialect representation needs to be positioned as a complex social act and not simply as one of translation from one medium into another.

This thesis as a whole takes the form of an introductory chapter and three case studies. The first chapter of this thesis is an introduction to the methodological approach taken in the three case studies, and also an opportunity to draw together work on literacy and spoken language. I begin by providing a brief overview of the main theories or disciplinary perspectives that are discussed in this thesis, using a poem from Tom Hague as a discussion point. Within this overview, ideological notions of language standards and literacy are introduced as well as social practices, legitimation and indexicality. Following on from this overview I explore in more detail the relationship between speech and writing from a range of theoretical positions including previous work on dialect representation, multimodality and mediation. I then discuss further processes of legitimation and social value with reference to Pierre Bourdieu’s work on legitimate culture and social distinction. I introduce the linguistic environment and literary position of the coal-miner, as each text explored in this study details some aspect of the life of Yorkshire coal-miners and their communities. In this coal-mining section special mention will be made of D.H. Lawrence due to his position as a canonical, and therefore culturally legitimated, literary author who writes about coal-miners. Finally I introduce the archives that have made this study possible; with some explanation concerning the form that the three case studies take.

### 1.1.1 Dialect Representation, Literacy and Social Value

This thesis studies the use of Yorkshire dialect representation in the work of three twentieth century working-class authors from coal mining backgrounds: Eaglestone, Hague and Hines. Their archival papers are used as the source material for this study and each of the three case studies which make up the analysis of this thesis deal exclusively with one of these authors. By dialect representation I mean the variety of writing techniques used to try and represent spoken dialects on the page, which mostly rely on changes to the expected ways that words should be spelled. All of these authors play with standard orthography, in order to suggest how words would be spoken. These changes draw on these authors’ experiences of literature, literacy, how they relate speech to writing, and how they expect their readers do the same. In undertaking this work these authors are, in some ways, attempting to ‘write down’ vernacular speech in order to represent on the page some aspect of Yorkshire speech. Transcribing speech into writing takes advantage of the links between sounds and letters that literate individuals have learned. Because of this, the process of ‘writing down’ speech is at once a simple act and also a problematic one.

In his poem ‘Speikin’ Proper’ Tom Hague uses this linking of non-standard spellings with spoken variation to critique the link between standard spelling and ‘BBC English’. The final lines of this poem show an attempt to ‘write speech down’; however the poem as a whole draws attention to a widespread linking of ‘correct’ speech with ‘standard’ spelling and prestigious, or legitimate, cultural values:

‘Speikin’ Proper’[[1]](#footnote-1)

They tell us it is incorrect

For us to use the dialect

To speak in such an uncouth way

Really isn’t done today

It is a social handicap

Like a muffler and cloth cap

[...]

It will be a matter of regret

If our mother tongue we quite forget

It’s what we’ve spoken all our lives

Amongst our workmates, friends and wives

It is our language of affection

Despite its seeming imperfection

Soa tha c’n talk all BBC

T’owd dialect ull duh fo’ me.

(Hague 199?a)

Hague is talking about speech, but he is doing so in writing and he is doing this in a way that highlights not only the way in which letters and sounds are related but the cultural value ascribed to the linking of ‘BBC English’ with standard orthography. Although Hague’s ‘Speikin Proper’ (199?) is about the low-status of dialect speakers, only the last two lines are written in a non-standard manner. Hague employs standard and non-standard spellings to represent the differences between what he establishes as ‘correct’, or ‘BBC’, English and ‘t’owd dialect’’ as well as highlighting the different socio-cultural positions that these forms of speech occupy. The respellings that Hague uses have been created to give a sense of dialect speech but their use is dependent not on a one-to-one relationship between sounds and letters, but on the way in which literacy is related to and influences spoken language use. The relationship between sounds (phonemes) and written signs (graphemes) will be explored in detail in 1.2.1. whilst 1.1.2. to 1.1.4. will introduce how literacy is embedded in oral language and social interactions (Barton 1994: 130). In using spellings to reflect judgements about speech, Hague highlights how ‘BBC’ English, standard spelling, non-standard spelling and dialect are all used to create distinctions between different social groups, which in this example are the working and middle-classes. Hague’s critique of how differences in language use are positioned and valued link with Bourdieu’s comments on systems of social difference: ‘[t]he social uses of language owe their specifically social value to the fact that they tend to be organized in systems of differences […] which reproduce, in the symbolic order of differential deviations, the system of social differences’ (Bourdieu 1991: 54). Hague’s poetic voice explains that his dialect voice is associated with bad speech behaviour (‘to speak in such an uncouth way’) and to Northern working-class stereotypes (‘like a muffler and cloth cap’). Learning to spell correctly and recognising incorrect spellings are part of the process of engaging with literacy. Hague’s non-standard spellings of ‘so’ as ‘soa’ and ‘do’ as ‘duh’ could therefore suggest illiteracy as they are essentially ‘incorrect’ spellings. However this poem is recognisable as a highly literate literary act, as writing in this non-standard way relies on Hague’s understanding of what is expected of a literate writer, and because of his poetic matching of content, form and style.

The problems of Northern working-class voices being seen to demonstrate low levels of literacy, education and social prestige are highlighted in Hague’s poem. In Lynda Mugglestone’s work on the development of English accents as markers of social status she comments on the relationship between illiteracy and pronunciation, and how non-standard spellings can be used to signify a low-status speaker:

Employing *du* rather that *do* (a favourite device of William Thackeray for his lower-status characters), or *collidges* rather than *colleges* signifies, at least intentionally, the ‘illiterate’ speaker, whose pronunciation is, in consequence assumed to be profoundly ‘negligent’.

(Mugglestone 2003: 177, her emphasis)

In both the examples from Hague and Mugglestone non-standard spellings are associated with illiteracy and speech that does not conform to a spoken standard. In Hague’s example this speech is explicitly linked to that of a working-class speaker, even though the poem itself demonstrates the suggested speaker’s high level of literacy. Representing working-class dialect in writing in this way involves negotiating the cultural association that non-standard spellings have with illiteracy as well as stereotypical beliefs about the working-classes themselves. Both Hague and Barry Hines openly discuss the problems relating to the representation of the Yorkshire dialect of their working-class characters and voices in their writing. In a letter Hague comments: ‘I write dialect poems myself, some of which have been broadcast on Radio Sheffield. Although I speak dialect every day I find it impossible to express the vowel sounds and inflections in writing’ (Hague 1973a). In an interview he also discussed the ‘risk involved in writing things down’ saying that ‘embalming the language makes it kind of dead’ (Gray 1976: 14). Barry Hines, reflecting on writing *A Kestrel for a Knave* over thirty years after it was published, commented that:

If I was writing it today I wouldn’t use dialect. It can be irritating to the reader and whatever methods you try, you don’t capture the voice on the page. [….] [T]rying to reproduce northern working-class speech with the glottal stop as in ‘Going to t’cinema’ doesn’t work at all’

(Hines 1968a [2000]: 206-207)

Hines’ posed a solution to this problem by saying that: ‘The answer of course is to write about middle-class characters who are “Going to the cinema”’ (Hines 1968a [2000] 206-207). As Hines’ entire literary career has focussed on depictions of working-class life it is clear that he is joking. These comments demonstrate that these authors work with the understanding that writing can be used to represent speech, and yet letters fall short of capturing sounds, specifically the sounds of the speech of the working classes.

Hines’ point about glottal stops is demonstrated when Hague writes ‘Soa tha c’n talk all BBC/T’owd dialect ull duh fo’ me’. Hague’s use of <t’> to represent the glottal stop sound [ʔ] that Hines is discussing falls short of capturing this sound on the page unless the reader is already familiar with the way in which the definite article is reduced in Northern English and is realised specifically in Sheffield English. Hague addresses this problem in his comments on the impossibility of expressing the sounds of his speech in writing. The glottal stop in question is not a [t] sound but <t’> is used because the definite article begins with a <t> in standard written English. Hague and Hines cannot stray too far from standard spelling conventions otherwise their text would be ‘irritating’ or inaccessible for their readers. For Hines the use of <t’> makes sense within writing conventions but does not correlate accurately with the sound he is trying to reference. Yet this non-standard spelling is still used in Hague and Hines’ texts to reference the speech of Northern working class speakers. Investigating the representation of Yorkshire dialect in writing involves looking at how letters relate to sounds, but also involves, more importantly, looking at how Yorkshire dialect is positioned socio-culturally in relation to literacy and literature. It is precisely the correlation between standard orthography and ‘standard’ spoken English, in the sense that there is a perceived essential connection between the two, which creates the association between non-standard spellings and regional variation in speech. The belief that there are ‘correct’ and ‘uncouth’ ways to speak, and that written English can be used as the model for the correct pronunciation of words, are both part of the attitudes present in Standard Language Culture.

### 1.1.2. Standard Language Culture

Spoken language use is open to social evaluation from others, with these judgements contributing to complex social stereotypes of people who speak in particular ways, and matched-guise testing has been used to quantify these judgements (Mesthrie 2000 et al: 149-150 ). Hague’s dialect speech is in itself not ‘incorrect’, ‘improper’ or ‘uncouth’, and he may never wear the stereotypical northern dress of cloth cap and muffler; however, ‘it is a fact that people do form such stereotyped impressions on the basis of linguistic features’ (Crystal 1997: 23). Hague’s grievance concerning ‘speaking proper’ is born out of experiences of spoken language. In airing this grievance in his poem Hague draws on the ideological power of orthography by employing standard and non-standard orthographical conventions.

In the same way that classic matched-guise tests employ a speaker who adopts different linguistic guises, Alexandra Jaffe and Shana Walton asked participants in their study, on the ‘social symbolism of orthographic’ choice, to read out texts that were written using different orthographic guises (2000:562). These guises included the use of standard orthography, and orthography that was ‘lightly’ or ‘heavily’ marked for the phonology, lexis and grammar of a speaker of Southern American English (Jaffe and Walton 2000: 564-565). Employing these features of matched-guise testing to look at ‘connections between orthography, sociolinguistic identity and power’ Jaffe and Walton found that ‘participants reading a non-standard text did indeed ‘hear’ embodied voices – whole personas – that weren’t invoked by their readings of standard texts’ (2000: 562). In the same way that social judgements can be made about speakers based on linguistic features Jaffe and Walton found that non-standard orthographical representations of speech could connote social identities:

Specifically, we found that people uncritically and spontaneously read non-standard orthographies as indices of low socio-economic status. When we asked participants to read texts out loud, we found marked shifts in their reading performances of texts in standard versus non-standard orthographies.

[….]

Our data attests marked shifts in reading performance between standard texts and non-standard texts, which we interpret as indices of sociolinguistic attitudes. In general, we find that people interpret variation in the graphic representation of language in the same way they interpret spoken variation.

(Jaffe and Walton 2000: 561- 562)

The readings created by Jaffe and Walton’s participants illustrated the ‘ideological power of orthography’ in the sense that ‘[o]rthography stands for linguistic form, for regularity, for authority, for systematicity’ (2000: 582). The interpretations that Jaffe and Walton’s participants created were based on how they associated standard orthography with prestigious forms of speech and non-standard orthography with socially stigmatized forms of speech. Hague draws on this association to illustrate that standard orthography is linked to ‘speaking proper’ and social prestige. The regularity, authority and systematicity of Standard English orthography has come about through a long historical process of standardisation, which will be explored in detail in 1.1.3. The ideological power of orthography is involved in the perpetuation of Standard Language Culture as the regularity of standardised written English is seen as the model for ‘correctness’ in spoken English.

The belief that there are ‘proper’ ways of speaking is, as explained by James Milroy, the predominant ideology of Standard Language Culture:

An extremely important effect of standardization has been the development of consciousness among speakers of a ‘correct’, or **canonical**, form of language. In what I have […] called standard-language cultures, virtually everyone subscribes to the ideology of the standard language, and one aspect of this is a firm belief in **correctness**.

(Milroy 2001: 535, his emphasis)

The ideological force of orthography has been created by the process and ideology of the standardisation of English (Mugglestone 2003: 8). The ideology of the standard language disguises the socio-political forces that perpetuate these beliefs. The standard variety operates as a ‘social institution’ and the ideologies that inform standardization processes and standard language culture are part of a ‘social behaviour towards language’ (Mugglestone 2003: 61). The Milroys elaborate on the role orthography plays in providing a model for correctness for speech:

[The standard is] maintained through the inculcation of literacy, as the writing system is then held up as the model of ‘correctness’ [….] Thus the writing system serves as one of the sources of prescriptive norms […] because speakers […] have access to dictionaries and grammar-books, which they regard as authorities. They tend to believe that the ‘language’ is enshrined in these books (however many mistakes and omissions there may be in them) rather than in the linguistic and communicative competence of the millions who use the language every day.

(Milroy and Milroy 1992: 27)

Notions of standards and correctness in spoken and written language have developed through a process whereby those in positions of political, cultural and economic power have promoted, prescribed and maintained the forms of language that they privilege and value. How language should be used is seen to be enshrined in books which are involved in the codification of English rather than in the actual usage of everyday language. The standard written system, which has had its variation limited by economic motivations and has had its usage codified and prescribed, provides a model for forms of spoken English which generate social status for their users.

The ideological influence of Standard Language Culture is responsible for how, through a process of becoming legitimated, standard forms delegitimise other forms of language. For Hague prestigious ‘BBC English’ is enshrined in standard orthography and this link is used to legitimate the authority of negative comments about the correctness of his dialect speech. The relationship between Standard English orthography and notions of standards in speech contribute to the social judgements that Jaffe and Walton’s participants make when they relate non-standard orthography to low socio-economic speech. The process of standardization involved the legitimation of not only standard forms of language but also Standard Language Ideology, through the ‘devaluing’ of other forms:

The establishment of the idea of a standard variety, the diffusion of knowledge of this variety, its codification in widely used grammar books and dictionaries, and its promotion in a wide range of functions – all lead to the devaluing of other varieties. The standard form becomes the legitimate form, and other forms become, in the popular mind, illegitimate.

(Milroy 2001: 547)

Legitimacy will be discussed in detail in 1.3. For now, it is of importance to position the standardization process as one of legitimation that holds particular forms of language in a superior, or superordinate, position to others, and because of this renders other forms illegitimate. This will be especially relevant when looking at how notions of standards in spoken language position dialect language use in a subordinate position. Within this study notions of standards and prestige are explored by looking at how Eaglestone, Hague and Hines saw these relationships play out in the world around them and in their own language use. Aspects of language or culture that can be seen as ‘standard’ and ‘correct’, or are seen socially to be ‘prestigious’, ‘middle-class’ or ‘cultured’, are involved in processes of legitimation. Looking at legitimacy is of importance because of the multidimensional relationship that individuals have with prestigious or standardised aspects of language and culture, as well as the negotiability of prestige. Due to the widespread subscription to Standard Language Culture in literate English society, Standard Language Culture influences how individuals engage with speech and writing as well as social judgements concerning their usage. Hines’ comments on the link between class and written English, and Hague’s ‘Speikin’ Proper’ poem which critiques this relationship, reflect how the standardization of first written and then spoken English has affected the form of written language, as well as the development of perceptions concerning the relationship between literacy and speech. To explore in more detail how Standard Language Culture ostensibly appears to be concerned with language standards, and yet is ultimately socio-political, I shall spend some time discussing the historical process of standardisation

### 1.1.3. Standardisation

As discussed by the Milroys Standard Language Culture is ‘maintained through the inculcation of literacy, as the writing system is then held up as the model of ‘correctness’’ (Milroy and Milroy 1992: 27). To understand how the English writing system can be seen in this way it is necessary to investigate the notion of Standard English and how it came to be. Our modern conception of Standard English denotes a variety of English – in terms of the organization of its sounds (phonology), its vocabulary (lexis) and the structure of its words and sentences (morphology and syntax) – which is held in a superior category ‘to geographically variant forms’ in education and by public institutions (Burnley 1989 cited in Mugglestone 2003: 8). The establishment of Standard English, through the processes of standardisation, has resulted in Standard English becoming legitimated as a ‘correct’ or ‘superior’ variety of English. The processes of standardisation are socio-political, which means that Standard English’s position as the ‘correct’ variety of English is socially constructed. What Hague touches on in ‘Speikin’ Proper’ is that statements about ‘correct’ or ‘incorrect’ usage of English are presented as purely linguistic statements, however they are in fact ideological statements. Viewing the conception of Standard English, which is promoted and valorised as the ‘correct’ or ‘better’ variety of English, as an ideological construct raises a moral concern as there is no linguistic basis for the promotion of this variety as ‘better’ than ‘geographically variant forms’.

How spoken and written language are seen to correlate or relate to each other within Standard Language Culture relates to the ideologies which are enshrined in Standard English. To begin to discuss explicitly these ideologies it is necessary to trace the processes of standardisation. Norman Fairclough summarises the overall standardisation process, whereby a dialect developed into a standard written form, with regard to the economic and political factors which motivated this process:

The social dialect which developed into standard English was the […] dialect associated with the merchant class in London at the end of the medieval period [….] Standardization initially affected written language, and has only gradually extended to various aspects of speech – grammar, vocabulary and even pronunciation.

We can think of its growth as a long process of colonization whereby it gradually ‘took over’ major social institutions, pushing out Latin and French, vastly extending the purposes it was used for and its formal resources as a result, and coming to be accepted (if not always widely used) by more and more people. By coming to be associated with the most salient and powerful institutions – literature, Government and administration, law, religion, education, etc. – standard English began to emerge as the language of political and cultural power, and as the language of the politically and culturally powerful.

(Fairclough 2001: 56)

Fairclough sums up succinctly the results of the complicated history of the standardisation of English whilst highlighting how it initially influenced written language and commenting on the cultural and political position of Standard English. Fairclough also traces the development of the standard by highlighting which aspects of English were standardised first. The development of Standard English influenced writing, then the form of written language and then pronunciation, and at each of these stages the standardisation of this aspect of language use was socially motivated and influence by ideology. In order to look closely at the implications of standardisation for written and spoken language as different mediums it is necessary to trace the specific processes of standardisation as outlined by Einar Haugen. Haugen’s processes sheds light on how at various stages of the development of the standard the socio-cultural norms of powerful people became enshrined in Standard English. It is this type of work which Fairclough draws on to position the rise of Standard English as a process of colonisation, which raises questions concerning the power relations present in this process. For Haugen the overall process of standardisation involves four processes: (1) norm selection, (2) norm codification, (3) norm implementation, and (4) norm elaboration (Haugen 1987: 59-62, see also Linn 2013). Relating these four processes to the overall process of standardisation that Fairclough describes demonstrates how the form that Standard English takes in the modern era cannot be separated from social motivations.

(1) Norm selection. In the case of English the norm was essentially self-selected by a culturally prestigious and influential group, and influenced written language first. The process of standardising written English involved looking to spoken language as its model. Walter Ong draws attention to the fact that in the process of an oral language developing a written form ‘the process converts a certain few dialects into ‘grapholects’ with a grapholect being a ‘transdialectal language formed by deep commitment to writing’ (Ong 1982: 8). The dialect which developed into the grapholect used in standardised writing was that of a socially prestigious group, that of the ‘merchant class in London at the end of the medieval period’. (Fairclough 2001: 56). During the period in which the printed word was developed this grapholect was only one grapholect amongst many.

(2) Norm codification. The establishing of an explicit written norm, and its widespread distribution through the invention of the printing press, allowed for the formulation of prescriptive rules concerning grammar, orthography and vocabulary, in grammar books and dictionaries, with these rules and prescriptive attitudes influencing spoken language. Rosina Lippi-Green’s discussion of the needs and aims of early printers illustrates the variation in written norms and the socio-economic concerns involved in developing standardised written English:

In the history of mankind, widespread literacy is a relatively new development, one that trailed along behind technological advances in printing and the manufacture of paper. Early printers had some things to work out, including the question of norms and standardization. If Caxton had to print the Bible in ten different dialects of English, there would be little or no profit in the venture, which was, of course, not acceptable. The solution was to print the Bible in one variety of English, and then to convince everybody that that was the best kind of English. Thus began the movement toward language norms and standardization of the printed (and then, written) language.

(Lippi-Green 2011: 15)

This process of ‘convincing everybody’ was socio-political and involved legitimating the chosen written form. Creating a printed standard involved the creation of a consistent orthography. Once this printed standard was established as the ‘best kind’ of written English its norms were extended to written English in general and then to speech, with the codification of the form of spoken language involving writing down language norms in books:

Codification is aimed at attaining minimal variation in form through setting down the prescribed language code in a written form – in grammars, dictionaries, pronouncing dictionaries, spelling books. The highpoint of codification was the second half of the eighteenth century, and much of the readership for the vast numbers of grammar books and dictionaries which were produced at the beginning of the industrial revolution came from the industrialists and their families.

(Fairclough 2001: 57)

Linguistically minimal variation in form may be seen as the aim of this process, yet through the codifying of the form of written English this variety gains a moral element. The codified variety becomes inherently ‘better’ as its form has been written down and its ‘proper’ usage has been written about by experts. During this period of codification the language of London and also the educated rose to prominence as the ‘right’ ways to speak (Mugglestone 2003: 14). This meant that adhering to particular forms of language use was a question of propriety:

‘The principle design of grammar is to teach us to express ourselves with propriety; and to enable us to judge of every phrase and form of construction whether it be right or not’, Lowth firmly declared, expressing a belief in the binary oppositions of ‘right’ and ‘wrong’ which prescriptivism was often to endorse above the heterogeneities of actual usage. It is in these terms that codification, and its accompanying traditions of proscription, comes to operate as an ideology, a set of assumptions about language behaviour which can in real terms, sometimes exert more influence on speakers’ attitudes than does direct observation of the language itself.

(Mugglestone 2003: 11- 12)

What Mugglestone’s example from Robert Lowth presents is the conception that the codified form of written English can be used to teach individuals how to act socially. Lowth’s statement links back to Bourdieu’s comments in the sense that Lowth is discussing language use, but in doing so he cannot separate grammar from the ‘whole set of social properties’ (Bourdieu 1991: 89) that he believes users of the ‘right’ or ‘wrong’ grammatical constructions possess. Mugglestone also highlights the fact that those who prescribed or proscribed how to use language are using the ‘minimal variation’ of written English as the basis for their judgements, are presenting social judgements as purely linguistic or ideologically neutral comments. The ideology of ‘correctness’ of speech that influences Standard Language Culture has come to be because the codification of English involved a process of prescribing the correct way to use spoken language through the use of written texts. Notions of correctness and mistakes, or propriety and impropriety, as well as ‘best’ forms of English developed and take hold with respects to both the use of written and spoken English. The codification of language in books influenced the way in which spoken language was used and perceived by influencing vocabulary, word structure and grammar and then influencing pronunciation. This meant that Standard English developed ‘at the expense of other, ‘“non-standard” social dialects’, as it came to be regarded as ‘correct’ English, and ‘other social dialects were stigmatised not only in terms of correctness but also in terms which reflected on the lifestyles, morality and so forth of their speakers’. (Fairclough 2001: 57).

(3) Norm implementation. The norms and rules of the standard form were adopted and spread by individuals and institutions through the use of this form in a variety of contexts and through written language. According to Haugen the standardised and codified norms of a language are propagated through their usage in ‘books, pamphlets, newspapers, and textbooks in the language’ and ‘those who have authority over schools or over mass media […] introduce it as a medium of instruction and entertainment’ (Haugen 1987: 61). Haugen also asserts that the implementation of a language norm through education is relatively simple ‘[a]s long as a small, elite group has a monopoly on education’ 1987: 61). In England, Standard English was implemented and promoted in ‘literature, Government and administration, law, religion [and] education’ as it was the ‘language of the politically and culturally powerful (Fairclough 2001: 56)

(4) Norm elaboration. The functions of the norm become elaborated with its usage spreading to replace other previously dominant forms of language, such as Latin. Over the course of the standardisation process Standard English became accepted as the standard form of language and ‘pushes out’ other socially prestigious languages, such as Latin and French, from ‘social institutions’ (Fairclough 2001: 56). In replacing these languages the functions of Standard English have to be elaborated to meet the needs of the modern world. Due to the position and functions of Latin, elaborating Standard English to ‘replace the functions of Latin’ involved ‘amazing inventiveness from the time of the Renaissance’ (Haugen 1987: 61). This elaboration process occurs because a ‘modern language of high culture needs a terminology for all the intellectual and humanistic disciplines, including the sciences, and not to forget the cultural underworld that runs from low to popular’ (Haugen 1987: 61). Standard English comes to occupy a dominant position in all realms of English culture, from the institutional, intellectual and ‘high’ to the everyday, practical and ‘low’.

The norms of Standard English influence the form of spoken and written English. These norms have been developed through socio-cultural processes and so they influence the social meaning and use of both spoken and written English, because of the widespread ideological perpetuation of standard written English as the model for correctness and the devaluation of ‘non-standard’ forms of speech and writing. Although in looking at the processes of standardisation it is possible to see how speech and writing have been made to correlate, ideologically and in terms of their form, the realisation of Standard English in spoken and written contexts involves different resources and ideological stances. Engaging with Standard English in writing involves engaging with literacy and orthography, both of which will be introduced further in 1.1.4. and explored in detail in 1.2. The realisation of Standard English in spoken language involves engaging with the prestige speech variety known as Received Pronunciation (RP):

[T]here is one accent that has a non-localised prestige and is something of a standard (or reference point) for teaching (British) English to foreigners. This is the accent used most frequently on British radio and television, known as Received Pronunciation (or RP), or sometimes Queen’s English, Oxford English or BBC English. The ‘received’ part of RP refers to an old-fashioned use of the word for ‘generally accepted’. RP was promoted in the public schools (i.e. exclusive fee-paying schools) of England and spread throughout the civil service of the British Empire and the armed forces.

(Mesthrie et al. 2000: 24)

Through the promotion of ‘correct’ forms of speech and the subordination of other forms a prestige variety of spoken English, RP, has been associated with standard orthography. Because of the standardisation of written English and Standard Language Culture, RP is seen to correlate more with the model of written English more than other varieties. This prestige variety is seen as the ‘standard’ or ‘correct’ form of English and its association with written English serves to legitimate and perpetuate these perceptions:

Received Pronunciation (RP) may initially be described as the accent associated with the dialect of English generally called Standard British English (SBE). SBE has all of the properties characteristic of prestige varieties in a contemporary ‘standard language’ community: It contrasts with regional dialects as a ‘supra-local’ national language; it is widely used in writing and print. For many speakers, SBE is neither the variety acquired first, nor the one used most frequently in casual conversation (Trudgill, 1999); yet the variety is preeminent in public life due to its social prestige, its links to education and economic advancement. In all of these ways, SBE is en-register-ed in cultural awareness as a valued commodity. Once acquired, the commodity can be displayed in speech and writing, and such display counts as an index of the status position of speaker/author in many venues of social life.

(Agha 2003: 233)

Agha highlights that Standard English is ‘enregistered’ as a ‘valued commodity’, meaning that it has achieved a widespread level of social recognition and high-status (Agha 2005: 38). He also points out that individuals can employ Standard English in speech or writing to make use of the prestige of Standard English to the benefit of their own social lives. The process of enregisterment and the ways in which language use can connote social prestige (indexicality) are discussed in more detail in 1.1.5. The realisation of Standard English in speech or in writing creates social meaning for individuals but the way in which these two mediums are related ideologically influences the social meaning surrounding the use of non-standard dialects in both mediums. The pronunciation features of RP (accent) is associated with Standard English (vocabulary, word structure and grammar), which holds a prestigious position, and the rules and norms of Standard English have been codified and perpetuated in written English (orthography). It is entirely possible to realise Standard English in different accents (Mesthrie et al. 2000: 24); however, RP is associated with Standard English. Therefore RP is an accent associated with prestige and social status and is also seen to correlate with standard orthography because of Standard Language Culture. In contrast, if the prestige of RP is spread across multiple regions, then the regional dialects of an area such as South Yorkshire, and their associated accents, do not possess this level of ‘supra-local’ prestige. These dialects also are not seen to possess the ‘correct’ vocabulary, grammar and lexis because they do not adhere to the norms of Standard English. The association of prestigious ways of speaking with written English mean that the process of becoming literate influences perceptions of speech. In ‘Speikin’ Proper’ Hague’s use of non-standard orthography plays on the association of Standard English orthography with RP and perceptions of correct ways to speak. He can do this because of the way that Standard English influences language use on the levels of orthography as well as spoken dialect and accent. Hague’s critique of Standard Language Culture draws on the way in which language values are inculcated in literacy and how literacy influences language use. What Hague is commenting on in playing with these associations is the social value placed on varieties of speech and orthographic conventions. In this section I have discussed the historical processes which have influenced the widespread ideological belief in correctness present in Standard Language Culture. In order to look at how literacy influences language use and cultural values I will discuss the concept of literacy as an ideological social construction.

### 1.1.4. Literacy

Through the processes of the standardisation of English, standard written English is promoted by social institutions. As this is the form of English which is learned in schools, engaging with standard written English is a necessity for an individual to be seen as literate. Because of the role of literacy in education, the level of literacy that an individual displays can be seen as a marker of whether they are educated or intelligent. In a similar manner to the way in which standards in English are ideological, what is socially accepted as constituting literacy is also not an abstract standard but a socially constructed ideology. Brian Street discusses the difference between perspectives that see literacy as being ‘autonomous’ and those that see it as being socially constructed:

The exponents of an ‘autonomous’ model of literacy conceptualise literacy in technical terms, treating it as independent of social context, an autonomous variable whose consequences for society and cognition can be derived from its intrinsic character. The writers I characterise in this way do not necessarily themselves use the phrase ‘autonomous model of literacy’ but I nevertheless found the term model useful to describe their perspective as it draws attention to the underlying coherence and relationship of ideas which on the surface might appear unconnected and haphazard.

[….]

Researchers dissatisfied with the autonomous model of literacy and with the assumptions outlined above, have come to view literacy practices as inextricably linked to cultural power structures in society, and to recognise the variety of cultural practices rather than literacy-in-itself for their relationship to other aspects of social life. A number of researchers in the new literacy studies have also paid greater attention to the role of literacy practices in reproducing or challenging structures of power and domination. Their recognition of the ideological character of the processes of acquisition and of the meanings and uses of different literacies led me to characterise the approach as an ‘ideological’ model (Street 1985).

(Street 1993: 4-8)

Approaching the study of literacy by linking the practices associated with literacy to ‘other aspects of social life’ allows Street to position literacy as possessing an ideological character. Street clarifies his use of ‘ideological’ by saying that he uses this term ‘not in its old-fashioned Marxist (and current anti-Marxist) sense of “false consciousness” and simple-minded dogma, but rather in the sense employed within contemporary anthropology, sociolinguistics and cultural studies, where ideology is the site of tension between authority and power on the one hand and resistance and creativity on the other (Street 1993: 8). Literacy practices themselves ‘can be viewed as the “social practices associated with the written word”’ (Barton 1994: 37 in Sebba 2009: 26). Social practices are the things that people *do* in order to participate in the meaning-making of social communities, and are discussed in further detail in 1.2.3. This discussion of ‘autonomous’ models of literacy and an ‘ideological’ approach to literacy relates as much to academic approaches as it does to everyday conceptions of literacy. What Street highlights is how the process of becoming literate, the social position of literacy and the cultural spheres in which it is used, such as literature, all display ideological characteristics.

 This practice focussed approach to literacy is part of the New Literacy Studies (N.L.S.) approach ‘which sees literacy as a social practice’ (Pahl and Rowsell 2010: 33). In Mark Sebba’s work on orthography as social practice, which will be discussed in detail in 1.2.3., he summarises the development of N.L.S.:

 In the period since 1980, an approach to literacy has developed which has acquired the name ‘The New Literacy Studies’ (Gee 1990). Barton (1994:22-23) describes how the concept of ‘literacy’ developed rapidly over this period, emerging as ‘a code-word across a range of disciplines for new views of reading and writing’. Fundamental to this view of literacy is that reading and writing are seen as *situated* within a social context. Sylvia Scribner and Michael Cole were among the first to develop a *practice* account of literacy, viewing literacy as a set of social and cultural practices. They conclude their early, important contribution to this field as follows (1981: 236):

Instead of focusing exclusively on the technology of a writing system and its reputed consequences . . . we approach literacy as a set of socially organized practices which make use of a symbol system and a technology for producing and disseminating it. Literacy is not simply knowing how to read and write a particular script but applying this knowledge for specific purposes in specific contexts of use.

(Sebba 2009: 13 his emphasis)

Drawing on Sebba’s summary, and Scribner and Cole’s assertion, reading and writing are activities that need to be ‘situated’ within their socio-cultural backgrounds by looking at how literacy constitutes a set of socially organised practices. This situated practice-based approach to literacy is of importance within this study because it means that it is possible to connect the literacy practices employed by Eaglestone, Hague and Hines with the social practices in which they have encountered or employed spoken dialect. As literacy inculcates particular values which are present in Standard Language Culture (Milroy and Milroy 1992: 27) the ideological nature of literacy informs judgements made about language (Bourdieu 1991: 60-61). Because of the inculcation of the dominant values present in Standard Language Culture through literacy, non-standard orthographical representations of dialect are in dialogue with the ideological conceptions of language standards and literacy, meaning that they are ultimately in dialogue with discourses surrounding propriety, correctness, intelligence, education and social distinction. Approaching written representations of speech as ‘a set of socially organized practices which make use of a symbol system’ makes it possible to explore how literacy, orthography and spoken language are socially valued and organized, by looking at how they are related on the semiotic and practice levels. Seeing literacy as socio-cultural it is possible to investigate literacy-as-practice and orthography-as-practice alongside language-as-practice (discussed in 1.2.3.) and to link all of these to Bourdieu’s practice-based approach to culture and social distinction (discussed in 1.3). This thesis employs a ‘situated’ approach to the study of representations of vernacular speech in writing in order to position these texts within their socio-cultural background. I employ this approach in order to trace the social practices and values that inform these representations. Investigating the ideological character of the acquisition, social meanings and uses of literacy, orthography and spoken language use makes it possible to position Eaglestone, Hague and Hines as active social individuals constructing complex social meanings. In incorporating aspects of the practice-based and situated N.L.S. approach into the study of dialect representation I wish to draw attention to the cultural value of the social practices involved in the representation of dialect.

Taking the position that accuracy is irrelevant when discussing dialect representation is done in order to highlight and investigate the practices that contribute to this creative act and how these practices contribute to value production. The ideological characteristics which are embedded in literacy influence the social values placed on written language and also influence spoken language standards, because of the pervasiveness of Standard Language Culture. However the cultural values, practices and social positions that vernacular speech and literary writing possess, and involve, need to be positioned within wider social systems. The particular types of literacy practices that are taught and promoted by social institutions depend on how these practices are valued socially and the purposes for which they are used within institutions (Barton 1994: 24). The socially accepted view of literacy and what constitute ‘good’ literacy practices also influence how spoken language is valued because of the socio-cultural link between literacy and language practices, embedded in Standard Language Culture. In his discussion of value of RP, Asif Agha, highlights the role that social practices have in the production of value:

Yet my larger purpose is to draw attention to a series of social processes—processes of value production, maintenance and transformation—through which the scheme of cultural values has a social life, as it were, a processual and dynamic existence that depends on the activities of social persons, linked to each other through discursive interactions and institutions. I argue that cultural value is not a static property of things or people but a precipitate of sociohistorically locatable practices, including discursive practices, which imbue cultural forms with recognizable sign-values and bring these values into circulation along identifiable trajectories in social space. Though the specific objects of value I consider here are linguistic forms, the processes of valorization and circulation I describe are quite general. They apply to—indeed, treat language like—any other cultural form.

(Agha 2003: 231 -232)

Agha discusses how cultural value is dynamic and involves the ‘activities of social persons’ and yet is also partly determined by the social history of the practices that are associated or imbued with this value. Agha also positions ‘linguistic forms’ within similar processes to other more general ‘cultural forms’. Eaglestone, Hague and Hines engage with the cultural value of standard speech and literary writing in complex and dynamic ways, each with their own social purposes for doing so, whilst their engagement with, and reaction to, this cultural value is influenced by the social practices that imbue these two cultural forms with value. Employing a socio-cultural lens to look at literacy and language standards makes it possible to unpick the ‘complex of practices’ (Blommaert 2012: 2) which these authors draw on when creating their representations of dialect as well as being able to look at the cultural values which are inculcated in literacy and interacted with by these authors. These practices and values influence the production and reception of the instances of dialect representation explored in this study. In representing vernacular speech through the use of non-standard spelling Eaglestone, Hague and Hines are engaging with notions of standards, national prestige and local prestige simultaneously. For their readers, any access to the social significance or prestige of the spoken varieties represented is accessed through literacy. These writers exploit and also problematize cultural links between orthography and speech through their use of non-standard orthography. In creating dialect respellings they engage with the intertwining of the ideologies enshrined in Standard Language Culture, literacy and social prestige. Before exploring how the mediation process undertaken by Eaglestone, Hague and Hines involves engaging with the legitimacy of spoken and written forms of language use, it is necessary to take a moment to look at the processes by which written and spoken language connote particular social meanings and values.

### 1.1.5. Indexicality and Enregisterment

Looking at the process of standardisation, as well as the socio-cultural construction of literacy, provides the backdrop for investigating instances of the orthographical representation of vernacular speech. Investigating represented speech involves understanding how standard written English is seen to index a particular ‘correct’, or high social status, spoken variety of English (RP), and why non-standard orthography can index ‘incorrect’, or low social status, vernacular speech even through orthography. Because of how ‘literacy is embedded in the oral language and social interaction’ and the relationship between literacy practices and language practices written language carries social meaning in a similar manner to spoken language (cf. Jaffe and Walton 2000). However, speech and writing rely on different systems of signs in order to create meaning. Writing relies on a visual symbol system, as Sebba explains: ‘English words have distinctive shapes (sequences of letters) but are not transcriptions: the individual letters which make up a word do not necessarily tell the reader how that word is pronounced, in any accent’ (Sebba 2009: 110). The relationship between speech and writing on the symbolic level will be explored in detail in 1.2. Because of how the processes and ideologies of standardisation have positioned varieties of speech and literacy socially, orthographic representations of speech draw on how orthography can *index* aspects of speech that cannot be directly *referred* to by visual symbols. Coupland summaries indexicality in relation to speech:

Indexicality is a multi-stage and multi-level process, implying that what a way of speaking 'means' is determined by how it is locally and culturally contextualised, and at what level of cultural 'enregisterment'

(Coupland 2009: 285)

The social meaning of speech depends on context and also how culturally recognised this way of speaking is. Although Coupland discusses speech here other signs can index meaning in similar ways, with writing indexing particular meanings due to what context it is used in and how culturally recognised this way of writing is. Generally speaking indexicality concerns, what Jan Blommaert and Ben Rampton call, ‘the connotational significance of signs’:

[A]ttention turns to indexicality, the connotational significance of signs. So for example, when someone switches in speaking and/or writing into a different style or register, it is essential to consider more than the literal meaning of what they are saying. The style, register or code they have moved into is itself likely to carry associations that are somehow relevant to the specific activities and social relations in play

(Blommaert and Rampton 2011: 5)

Non-standard orthographic representations of dialect create and index a range of social meanings because of how speech and writing are understood culturally, as well as what this change in writing style can connote. The ideological characteristics of Standard Language Culture and literacy, and how they are related to wider social characteristics, are involved in this creation and indexing of social meaning. Barbara Johnstone discusses how pronunciations can connote sets of social characteristics:

When we hear thunder, we often experience lightning, rain and a darkening sky, so the sound of thunder may lead us to expect a storm. Because the sound of thunder evokes storminess in this way, thunder noise can be used to evoke a storm in a staged play. Likewise, if hearing a word pronounced a particular way is experienced in connection with a particular style of dress or grooming, a particular set of social alignments, or a particular social activity, that pronunciation may evoke and/or create a social identity. The relationship between the pronunciation and the identity is an indexical relationship; we can say that the pronunciation indexes the identity. Just as pronunciations can index identities, by virtue of being experienced together with other evidence of them, so can any other kind of linguistic form: words, phrases, grammatical patterns, patterns of discourse, even linguistic consistency or inconsistency over a lifetime (Johnstone, 2009b).

(Johnstone 2011: 6)

Here Johnstone links pronunciation, or other linguistic forms, to the indexical processes whereby social identity is evoked or created by the use of a culturally familiar feature. Within this study the relationship between written language and spoken language is positioned as an indexical one, this relationship operates as one of connotation rather than of reference, with this connotation of spoken language evoking the complex social qualities that the form of spoken language indexes.

The process of indexing social meaning through the written representation of speech involves the use of recognisable, stereotypical or culturally valued linguistic and orthographic forms. Considering the connotational significance of writing is of importance to this study as I focus on the ‘associations’ relevant to ‘specific activities and social relations’ that are in play in representations of dialect over discussing how accurately written language can reference features of spoken language (Blommaert and Rampton 2011: 5). The instances of dialect representation explored in this study draw on the social position of the speech variety which is serving as the model for the orthographical representation. However, this spoken information is seen through the lens of literacy and so the socio-cultural position of literacy colours these interpretations. Literacy and Standard spoken English are ideologically linked with particular social identities because of the ways in which they are valued and used in society. Vernacular or ‘correct’ speech can index particular social identities, and as Jaffe and Walton (2000) conclude, so can orthographical representations of spoken language. Orthography can also index a range of social identities relating to intelligence and education because spelling has been standardised and learning to spell is an integral part of becoming literate. Representations of dialect involve a complex indexical process which draws on how forms of spoken and written language are linked to social identities:

The process by which sets of linguistic forms become ideologically linked with social

identities has been called “enregisterment” (Agha, 2003, 2006). Enregisterment occurs through “metapragmatic” practices that permeate discourse (Silverstein, 1993), practices, that is, by which people show one another how forms and meanings are to be linked, sometimes by talking about the links (“metadiscourse”), sometimes in other ways.

(Johnstone 2011: 1-2)

Many of the aspects of speech and writing that Eaglestone, Hague and Hines’ use of dialect representation engage with have been enregistered and so invoke social identities. The basis of each of the three case studies is the ways in which these authors (and their reviewers or peers) respond to how language use has been ideologically linked to social identities. For example, returning to ‘Speikin’ Proper’, Hague draws on the ideological links between linguistic forms and prestigious social identities (‘correct’ speech is linked to speaking ‘BBC’ English), as well as the ways in which the form of written language are linked to social meaning (standard orthography is linked to ‘correctness’ and ‘BBC English’, meaning that non-standard orthography is linked to ‘dialect’ and ‘incorrect’ speech). Hague’s response to this linking is one of resistance and he queries the social identities that have been linked to his dialect speech. He does not see his speech as ‘incorrect’, ‘uncouth’ or as a ‘social handicap’ even though these labels are culturally familiar to him because of the way that ‘people have shown one another how forms and meanings are to be linked, sometimes by talking about these links’ (Johnstone 2011: 1-2). What Hague’s poem highlights is the fact that literacy practices are involved in the perpetuation of the socio-cultural value of language standards, as not only are forms of spoken language ideologically linked to positive social identities but the same is also true of written language. The notions of correctness that are perpetuated in Standard Language Culture have their root in the way in which speech is seen to follow the rules of the standardised writing system. Standard English not only refers to ‘correct’ forms of spoken and written language but is also a recognisable social commodity, and Hague’s dialect is devalued because of this:

In all of these ways, SBE is en-register-ed in cultural awareness as a valued commodity. Once acquired, the commodity can be displayed in speech and writing, and such display counts as an index of the status position of speaker/author in many venues of social life.

(Agha 2003: 233)

The introduction of the terms ‘indexicality’ and ‘enregisterment’ are of use here to draw attention to the ways in which social identity is invoked through the use of recognisable linguistic, orthographical or cultural forms, and the processes by which these forms gain cultural value. The linguistic and orthographical forms that Eaglestone, Hague and Hines employ are able to connote complex social identities because of how they relate to existing cultural values, and also because of the literary context in which they are presented. Each case study will involve looking at what social identities these authors are negotiating or challenging when they use non-standard orthography to represent dialect speech. Aspects of spoken, written and literary language are interpreted by individuals as markers, or indices, of social standing or social affinities, because of the process of enregisterment. Therefore writing in ‘dialect’ involves the complex negotiation of a social matrix that incorporates markers from various cultural spheres. In this section I have discussed indexicality and enregisterment to introduce how spoken and written language index complex social identities. In 1.1.6. I will explore how the complex social meaning of dialect speech is mediated through the conventions and practices of literacy in order to discuss how the indexical meaning of vernacular speech is changed by this process.

### 1.1.6. Mediation, Legitimacy and Literary Worth

The authors in this study all mediate Yorkshire speech in literature; they are responsible for deciding which aspects of Yorkshire speech they represent and why. Their representations of dialect also involve a process of recontextualisation. Recontextualisation is discussed throughout 1.2. and my usage of this term, and mediation, are influenced by Coupland’s work which is discussed in detail in 1.2.5. The process of recontextualisation, on a very simple level, involves taking something from the context in which it is normally experienced and placing it in another context to create new meaning. This is a common literary process in the sense that writers draw on their life-experiences to create literary texts, and yet even in auto-biographical works an author makes choices about how to present and stylise these life experiences. Eaglestone, Hague and Hines all worked in the coal-mining industry at some point and write about coal-miners and their communities. The importance of language to these communities and the regional identity of the people of, what is now, South Yorkshire is reflected in their works.[[2]](#footnote-2) Investigating how ‘everyday’ speech or vernacular language is mediated in each of these texts raises questions concerning: the normalising and prescribing influences of notions of standards and ‘correctness’, the cultural sphere of literature, and perceptions of class values. The occupation of mining and its working-class associations create a tension for these authors who, for various reasons, decide to represent miners and mining communities in literary works. The world of the mining communities and the literary world are culturally, linguistically and socially very different. This is due to the cultural values, dispositions and expectations that are explicitly or implicitly present within literature and literary discourse. This study’s focus on how the speech of particular social groups is mediated in literary works is undertaken not only to look at these texts as recontextualisations of speech into writing, but also as recontextualisations of the values, specific purposes and specific contexts, or social practices, of distinct cultural spheres. Yorkshire dialect represented in writing is no longer ‘authentic’ speech, and can never be truly accurately rendered as such, due to the fact that writing and speech involve very *different* senses, but its usage creates new and complex social meaning because it draws on how speech and writing are *perceived* to be linked. These authors all engage with literature which in itself is a legitimate ‘social discourse’ (Mugglestone 2004: 178), that privileges certain forms of language, stylistic features and social practices, as well as being a form of culture which can be used to create social distinction.

The literary sphere is the context in which these authors’ works appear and so the ideological influence that literature enacts upon these authors, and their reviewers, will be taken into consideration. Identifying the social roles, identities and political views that these authors held and expressed in their work creates a background from which to explore their use of dialect representation. The representation of ‘authentic’, ‘regional’, ‘vernacular’ or ‘non-standard’ speech within the critical world of literature contributes to the personal or political aims of these writers. Yet the presentation of what is seen by critics as the ‘everyday’ is highly stylised, and the act of highly literate and socially aware writers. Although I believe that the works discussed are of ‘literary’ worth, this study will not undertake a literary reappraisal of these authors’ works. This is for two reasons. Firstly because of the nature of my methodology, I am interested in how style is used to perform social functions in these texts, and secondly because I wish to explore how these works demonstrate each author’s relationship with legitimate forms of culture (Bourdieu 1984: 1-4, 26-28, Jenkins 138-139, 143) such as canonical literature. I am also interested in looking at how perceptions of ‘local’ or ‘non-standard’ language has to be described as such as it comprises ‘the set of things which are excluded from the legitimate language’ (Bourdieu 1991: 90). Legitimacy itself can be challenged or is changeable depending on context and legitimate culture is discussed further in 1.3. The legitimacy of a cultural form is always up for debate; however, some forms of culture are taken as more legitimate than others and play a role in our institutions and in the creation of social distinction: ‘[a]ny legitimate works tend in fact to impose the norms of its own perception and tacitly defines as the only legitimate mode of perception the one which brings into play a certain disposition and a certain competence’ (Bourdieu 1984: 28). Within this study I position the literary sphere as part of legitimate culture, because of its cultural capital and institutional roles, yet by drawing on Bernard Lahire’s work (2008, 2010) its role in legitimising and delegitimising the practices and language use of the authors studied means that its own legitimacy is debated. Literary standards are therefore looked at with the same critical scope as the legitimate cultural norms associated with Standard Language Culture and literacy. Bourdieu and Lahire’s work on legitimacy is discussed in detail 1.3.

These literary texts are socio-cultural objects and they demonstrate the process of design and cultural negotiation that these authors have engaged in as well. The literary context into which these author’s present Yorkshire dialect is influenced by social values and places a cultural premium on style. In this study I am interested in exploring how these authors engage with the influence and values of literary discourse. In order to do this it is at times necessary to situate their texts within existing literary criticism, or to look at them with a literary lens. However, this work is undertaken in order to support my approach to literature and literary discourse as social processes, or part of a ‘social discourse’ (Mugglestone 2004: 178). The works explored in this study are strongly linked to and influenced by region and vocation, and are therefore objects of socio-linguistic study in the sense that we can view ‘written language as a complex of practices as well as a semiotic object’ (Blommaert 2012: 2). Investigating perceptions of language use involves looking at the social practices and beliefs that inform these writers’ texts and how the orthographical conventions they adopt can be seen to relate to speech. My approach to the question of dialect representation looks not only at the socio-linguistic milieu that these authors inhabited but also at the role that literacy practices play in the creation of texts that represent speech. This involves not only employing theoretical approaches that situate speech and writing in relation to each other but also recognising the space that exists in the overlap between the two. In this section I have begun to discuss the process of mediation, cultural legitimacy and literature as a legitimate ‘social discourse’(Mugglestone 2004: 178). In 1.2.1. I look at previous scholarship that explores dialect representation.

1.2, 1.3 and 1.4 expand upon many of the points raised in 1.1 by detailing the theoretical frameworks I have employed when looking at speech and writing, cultural value and representations of coal-miners in literature. In 1.2. I introduce and summarise some of the theory that has so far only been touched upon by separating out speech and writing as different modes and then consolidating them within the larger social system within which individuals operate.

## 1.2 Speech and Writing

### 1.2.1. Dialect Representation

In this section I trace existing scholarship that is of relevance to the investigation of the instances of dialect representation explored in this study, whilst also arguing that studying dialect representation involves the necessary consolidation of disciplinary approaches to orality and literacy. The study of dialect representation has been taken up as subject of specialist interest to scholars from literary or linguistic backgrounds. Generally speaking, and understandably, literary scholars have focused on how dialect representation works as a literary technique and linguistic scholars have focussed how these texts relate to real speech. However, as Street explains, an attempt has been made within literacy studies to bridge the traditional disciplinary oral/literate divide:

[T]he relation of oral and literate practices differs from one context to another. In that sense the unit of study is best not taken as either literacy or orality in isolation, since the values associated with either in our own culture tend to determine the boundaries between them.

(Street 1993: 8-9)

Dialect representation draws on the shifting contextual relationship between oral and literate practices and because of this is difficult to place within traditional disciplinary boundaries concerning orality and literacy. In developing a wider theoretical framework for the study of written representations of vernacular speech I wish to argue that, rather than being a specialist topic, the question of dialect representation is of relevance to discussions relating to orality and literacy in general. This is because mediations of linguistic difference are one of the main ways in which we encounter socio-linguistic difference (mediation will be discussed further in 1.2.5.) and also because of the tensions between linguistic variation and literacy present in the UK education system (Clark 2013). In order to show how dialect representation is of relevance to general issues concerning the relationship between orality and literacy I will first briefly outline some relevant general research, before briefly discussing two summaries of traditional linguistic and literary perspectives on dialect representation. I will then situate aspects of my approach to dialect representation in relation to these two approaches.

Throughout the three case studies I focus my attention on one text in particular from each author, in order to explore how ideas about social practice, social distinction, language ideology and literary criticism are in dialogue when these authors represent Yorkshire speech in writing. There is no specific literary-linguistic research on dialect representation in what can be called twentieth-century working-class literature (there is some literary scholarship concerning Hines’ work, see Salman 1990, Sinfield 2006, Vice 2011). There are however areas of research on dialect representation, coming from a range of methodological backgrounds, that touch on this area, such as the study of dialect representation in Victorian texts (Ferguson 1998, Hakala 2010, Edney 2011,), discussions concerning dialect respellings in the transcription of speech (Preston 1982, 2000, Macaulay 1991), work on non-standard orthography (Jaffe and Walton 2000, Androutsopoulos 2000, Sebba 2007, Shortis 2007b), and discussions of dialect representation within literary art (Ives 1971, Cole 1986). Deborah Tannen’s work provides a linguistic perspective on the similarities and differences between speech and writing, and a variety of approaches to this including the initial proposing of a speech-writing dichotomy and then the abandoning of this in favour of the use of the terms speech and writing practices (1982a, 1982b, Chafe and Tannen 1987, see also Ong 1982). There are also discussions concerning how to approach the accuracy or role of written dialect as reliable information for historical socio-linguistic study (see Hickey ed. 2010).

Joan Beal’s (2006) discussion of the questions raised by the inclusion of dialect representation in a text provides a useful summary of linguistic interest in this technique. Beal points out that a linguistic study of dialect representation involves considering a range of issues and raises some important questions. Firstly Beal discusses how authors use stylisation techniques to signal speech in orthographical terms, which means not only accounting for more general speech qualities, such as rapid speech, but also linguistic variation (2006: 531-533). Considering these issues involves looking at how orthography relates to the identifiable sounds of vernacular speech, but also how lexical and morphosyntactic features are stereotypically associated with a regional dialect through the process of enregisterment (2006: 532-533). Alongside these linguistic considerations Beal also positions literary concerns, such as the role that dialect representation plays in characterisation, narrative and plot within a text and the difficulties authors face in creating non-standard orthographical systems that balance reader accessibility (2006: 533-534). Beal also discusses instances where non-standard orthographical conventions have been used to mask ideology and prejudice or where respellings have ‘asserted and celebrated difference’ (2006: 535-536). Finally, as written texts survive longer than dialect speakers, Beal discusses how dialect writing can be used as historical linguistic evidence by using these texts to ‘trace the emergence and disappearance of salient features of nonstandard dialects’ (2006: 536). Overall Beal summarises that the semiphonetic techniques used to represent dialects are reliant on a reader’s cultural experiences in order for them to recreate the spoken voice mentally (2006: 532).

The literary context in which represented voices appear is also of importance when exploring dialect representation. In a paper that challenges Ives’ work on dialect representation, Roger Cole argued that the ‘artistic effectiveness’ of a literary dialect should be investigated over and above linguistic accuracy of phonological representations (1986: 3). Cole’s perspective highlights the argument that when investigating written representations of dialect in literature, literary and artistic concerns need to be foregrounded. Taking account of texts as works of art, as well literary aesthetics, when investigating dialect representation serves to situate these texts within their socio-cultural backgrounds. In her summary of ‘Recent Studies in Victorian English Literary Dialect and its Linguistic Connections’, Sue Edney states that ‘[c]lass-marking of dialect has, in some ways been the undoing of dialect studies, as political and sociological assumptions about dialect use in literature have outweighed aesthetic, or any other reasons for using local language’(2011: 660). Solely focussing on class distinctions can be problematic for any research. Ideas about class and social distinction are inscribed on researchers themselves and the relationship to class values of the authors in this study is intertwined with their inter and intra-individual relationships. However, I would like to argue, from the position that there is no such thing as an autonomous artistic gaze (Bourdieu 1984: 3-4, discussed in detail in 1.3.2.), that the discourse surrounding the aesthetics of dialect in literature is part of the same discourse surrounding class, politics and society that Edney says is the ‘undoing of dialect studies’. Unpicking the role that aesthetic literary judgements have in enshrining and perpetuating certain value systems and ideologies, with relation to class and dialect, is a complex task, and one that involves reflecting on the study of literature itself. It is for this reason that I have chosen to place literary or aesthetic concerns surrounding written representations of dialect in literary texts under a wider socio-linguistic and socio-cultural lens.

I have found it necessary to expand upon the traditional specialised linguistic and literary approaches to dialect representation by involving research perspectives from other disciplines, and in doing this I have become aware of the relevance of the question of dialect representation to wider discussion concerning orality and literacy. All language use is cultural (cf. Gee 1999: 1) and within society the discourses surrounding ideas about ‘good’ speech and ‘good’ writing may not only coerce or be resisted by individuals, but may also hide, or make explicit, cultural values. These aesthetic judgements about language are linked up with cultural ideologies concerning morality and authority. What I wish to consider in the midst of literary and linguistic discussions of dialect representation is the fact that dialect representation, and the difficulties presented when discussing it, bring to a head the ideologies enshrined in Standard Language Culture, literacy and literary culture, as well as the complex ways in which speech, writing and literary texts are used to create social distinction.

 Taking as axiomatic that it is impossible to capture the pronunciation of speech in writing, and that dialect representation is dependent on the reader’s cultural experience for any accurate rendition of the speech represented (Preston 1985, Beal 2006) means that the socio-cultural significance of mediated speech becomes the focus of study. Approaching dialect representation in this way means that whatever sense of ‘real speech’ these representations invoke are entirely dependent on how linguistic features are situated within existing social matrices:

Not only are linguistic features never clearly separated from the speaker’s whole set of social properties (bodily hexis, physiognomy, cosmetics, clothing), but phonological (or lexical, or any other) features are never clearly separated from other levels of language; and the judgement which classifies a speech form as ‘popular’ or a person as ‘vulgar’ is based, like all practical predication, on sets of indices which never impinge on consciousness in that form, even if those which are designated by stereotypes (such as the ‘peasant’ ‘r’ or the southern *ceusse*) have greater weight.

(Bourdieu 1991: 89)

Bourdieu’s comments on the link between linguistic features, which in this study are represented in texts, and the social speaker illustrate my approach to the question of dialect representation. In presenting his discussion here I wish to highlight that the represented dialect speech in Eaglestone, Hague and Hines’s books cannot be separated from their speakers’ whole set of social properties, nor can it be separated from the social properties that Yorkshire speech, literacy and literary writing possess. Situating dialect representation within systems of social value means that how social meaning is indexed by these authors can be focussed on. Stylised representations of speech are separated from their spoken context: however, they cannot be separated from their social properties. How language sounds is very important, but what these sounds mean is more important and, for this study, what written representations of sounds can index is of even more importance (cf. Blommaert and Rampton 2011: 7). In order to look at the social practices that these authors are engaging with in their work it is worth at this point expanding upon three viewpoints relating to orality and literacy: firstly that speech and writing are two different modes; secondly that literacy and orthography are social practices influenced by ideology; and thirdly that recontextualisations of speech in writing need to be viewed from a methodological standpoint that is not simply the sum of literary and linguistic approaches, but one that sees recontextualisations as new objects. This last point will lead into a discussion of Coupland’s work on mediated vernaculars and Bakhtin’s theory of heteroglossia.

### 1.2.2. Multimodality

Drawing on Gunther Kress’s work on multimodality the process of changing speech into writing becomes a question of how language users draw on the social and modal resources available to them in order to create new meanings. Kress positions his approach to multimodality as ‘a socially founded semiotic theory [….] within a broad frame of an interest in power, representation and communication’ with modes constituting ‘socially shaped and culturally given resources for making meaning’ and which means that language is seen ‘in a new light’ as ‘one means among others for making meaning’ (Kress 2009: 54). This approach allows speech and writing to be viewed in terms of their modal and social affordances and constraints, and this is of use when considering how writing is being used to represent speech. Individuals create social meaning and communicate using the variety of resources and modes that are available to them. These modes could be visual, aural or textual (see Kress 2009: 54). By their very nature each mode has modal and social qualities, or affordances, and restrictions, or constraints, which influence their use and allow individuals to perform social actions. Even though speech and writing are two different modes that make use of the different affordances of the aural and visual modes for their meaning making, when speech is represented in writing it is limited by the modal constraints of writing, but may still index its original cultural affordances. The modal affordances of speech and writing relate to how the mediums in which they operate facilitate meaning making:

*Speech* shares certain aspects of *lexis, syntax* and *grammar* with writing. Sound, the material of speech, is, however, entirely different from the (graphic) material of writing. Sound is received via the physiology of hearing; the graphic material of writing via the physiology of sight. Sound offers resources such as (variation in) energy – loudness of softness –used to produce *stress* as *accent*; and through alternation of stress as *rhythm*, the rhythmic organization of speech. *Pitch* and *pitch variation* – the variations of the frequency of oscillation of the ‘vocal’ chords – produce *tone* in tone-languages such as Mandarin or Igbo and *intonation* in languages such as English. Speech has *vowel quality*, *length* and *silence as pauses* [….] Writing uses graphic means – **bolding**, size, s p a c i n g – to achieve effects which are semiotically similar yet distinct in their specific meanings to those produced by sound in speech.

(Kress 2009: 55)

Here Kress differentiates between the material aspects of speaking and writing which are used to create meaning in the aural and visual modes. The range of techniques and differences used to create meaning in the two demonstrate some of the resources that are available to individuals when making meaning in spoken or written language. The affordances that speech has for creating meaning through the syntax and lexis of a dialect are mirrored in some areas by the shared aspects of grammar and lexis that writing and speech have. However, writing is constrained by orthography when it comes to representing pronunciation. Modes also have social affordances and constraints and the modes of speech and writing are seen as having a ‘cultural, social and political dimension’ (Blommaert and Huang 2010: 7 see also Kress 2010). Both the ‘materiality’ of a mode and its social qualities are of importance when looking at meaning making:

In a social semiotic approach to mode, equal emphasis is placed on the material ‘stuff’ of mode and on the work of culture over often long periods with that material. Social action and affordances of material (Gibson 1986) together produce semiotic resources which are the product of the potentials inherent in the material, of a society’s selection from these potentials and of social shaping over time of the features which are selected. Hence the resources of a mode, say gesture, image, speech, writing, are both similar to and different from culture to culture in their potentials for representation.

(Kress 2009: 55)

Relating Kress’s work to dialect representation involves looking at not only how speech and writing operate on a modal level, but also how the social-cultural positions that the two have, influence their potential for meaning-making or the interpretation of this meaning. For example, looking at writings capabilities for representing spoken dialects, writing is culturally constrained by the social aspects of the codification of written language so in writing down the grammatical constructions or vernacular words present in a dialect they can be seen as non-standard or incorrect (Jaffe and Walton 2000). By looking at the modal affordances and constraints of speech and writing it is relatively simple to separate the two on a modal level. However, when investigating dialect representation the socio-cultural relating of the two needs to be considered in order to understand how orthography can be used to represent variation in speech. Kress asserts that looking at speech and writing from a multimodal perspective means that ‘the differences between speech and writing may be as or more significant than the similarities’ and that ‘[t]his makes it surprising that speech and writing are subsumed under one label, “language”’ (2010: 82). In summarising this relationship Kress points out why looking at speech and writing in this way is of importance: ‘[f]rom a social semiotic perspective the shared label [language] obscures their distinctiveness as modes with related yet importantly distinct affordances’ (2010: 82). The implications of Kress’ work for this study is that writing can never fully represent speech, as it does not have the adequate affordances for representing pronunciation. However, culturally, writing can index dialect speech, as it has the adequate social affordances to do this. These social affordances are available because of the pervasive cultural links between speech and writing, which are present in Standard Language Culture and are represented in work on language ideologies (Lippi-Green 1994, Blommaert 2008).

Hague and Hines’ comments concerning the difficulties of capturing speech in writing highlight the fact that speech and writing operate using the aural and visual modes, and therefore the move from speech to spelling involves a shift in logic: ‘[t]he move from sound to graphic form is therefore a move from the logic of temporal sequence to the logic of spatial display’ (Kress 2000: 18). Changing sound into graphic form, and vice versa, involves a process of ‘transduction’ (Kress 1997:87) whereby meaning is recreated in another mode. This shift in modal logic is also a shift in cultural value as speech and writing not only have modal affordances and constraints but cultural ones as well. For Kress spelling can be used to transliterate visual markers into sounds; however, it is problematic when you are attempting to turn the sounds of real speech into the visual (2000: 19). What the dialect writers I am looking at are attempting is just that. The learned links between symbols and sounds acquired by learning to spell also work in reverse. This would be straightforward if the way we have been taught spelling was as functional as we have been led to believe. Also writing is characterised by its lack of context because of the time involved in its planning and stylisation, especially when encountered in the form of literature, one of writing’s most visible and culturally stratified genres. Speech in its natural form of language-in-use is ‘characterised by variability, negotiability and context-boundedness’ (Blommaert 2008). Mikhail Bakhtin asserts that dialects are changed by and change literature when they are appropriated into it due to the natural ‘elasticity’ of language (1992: 293-294). The work undertaken by writers who write in dialect is therefore a process of modal, yet also cultural, ‘transduction’ as they have to decide how best to represent speech on the page within existing orthographical, literary and social conventions. Spelling does not operate as a pure one-to-one translation of sound to character, so dialect respellings will never be able to create a system that will achieve this. The International Phonetic Alphabet is an attempt to create a one-to-one relationship between phonemes and graphemes but this orthographical system is not widely accessible and requires engaging with a form of literacy that has unique rules and values. Individuals also interpret prestige, standards and variation in language differently because of how their background and experiences influence the social meanings that variation in language can index. Dialect representation is a technique that can index certain social identities by, in Hines’ words, giving a ‘flavour’ of a regional language (Hines 1968a [2000]: 206-207). This can however lead to its use in the creation of stereotypical renderings of regional identities (Beal 2006), because of how aspects of dialect speech become non-standard when represented in writing.

The transduction of natural Yorkshire speech into stylised writing creates a new context. Multimodal theory provides a way of separating out the differences between speech and writing as systems of signs, or semiotic modes. Authors who create dialect representations undertake a process of transduction as they try and bring some of the affordances of speech, such as pronunciation and speed of delivery, into writing. We can consider the design process that an author like Hague has gone through in order to turn the poems that, in many cases, he originally recited, into words on the page, and why he chose to incorporate some semblance of his spoken voice into these texts. The process of ‘capturing’ speech on the page is not a simple process due to the arbitrary nature of the relationship between spelling and speech (Wyse and Styles 2007, Shortis 2007b) as well as the discrepancy between Yorkshire pronunciation and the speech varieties that provided the model for standardised spelling (Fairclough 2001: 56-58). However, although a complex act of design ‘work’ individuals undertake this type of changing and reshaping of language constantly and with relative ease. In this section I have introduced multimodality as a way of thinking about the modal and social affordances of speech and writing. I have also used multimodality as a way of introducing my approach to the design process behind dialect representation. In 1.2.3. I explore how the social affordances of speech and writing are influenced by the social position of literacy and literature, whilst also working to describe the layers of social practice that dialect representation involves.

### 1.2.3. Social Practice

 Social practices inform our embodied understanding of the world around us, and our language use is usually associated with certain activities or specialised in some way in order to engage in these social practices. [[3]](#footnote-3) Viewing writing using Jan Blommaert’s work on the socio-linguistics of writing, which sees writing as a ‘complex of practices as well as a semiotic object’ (2012) involves unpicking the social practices that contributed to the creation of a text. Within Jennifer Rowsell and Kate Pahl’s work on literacy they argue that text-making is a process which involves the ‘sedimentation of identities into written texts’ and that texts can be seen as traces of social practices (Rowsell and Pahl 2007). In research on children’s literacy practices Rowsell and Pahl argue that the process of text making involves a process of ‘sedimentation’ whereby identities are instantiated into texts. This approach foregrounds the materiality and artefactual nature of written texts:

This commentary describes text making as a process involving the sedimentation of identities into text, which then can be seen as an artefact that reflects, through its materiality, the previous identities of the meaning maker [….] In this commentary, we argue that texts can be seen as traces of social practice, and their materiality is important in revealing those traces [….] We suggest that children’s identities can be instantiated within texts, a concept we call *sedimented identities in texts* [….] This theoretical move helps us understand the *layered* nature of identities and how these layered identities can be found sedimented within texts. Texts as artifacts instantiate the layers of lamination.

(Rowsell and Pahl 2007: 388)

Although this work primarily focusses on the ways in which children engage with textual meaning-making, the idea that complex social identities are layered into texts and these texts hold traces of social practices is useful within this study. The specific aspect of Rowsell and Pahl’s work that I wish to appropriate is the idea of the *lamination* of social identity (cf. Holland and Leander 2004). I wish to position dialect representation as a process whereby the different social systems associated with vernacular speech, literacy and literary discourse are layered on top of each other in order to create a *lamination* of social practices and meaning. This argument is made fully in chapter 5 in the summary of this thesis. The representation of a regional variety of English that relates to the distinct social practices and class values of the Yorkshire region and social group laminates this social system onto the system of literary language. In doing this, new social meaning is created as the dialect becomes part of a composite when incorporated into literature. Yet due to the elasticity of language this incorporation of dialect into literature also changes the composition of the highly distinctive phenomenon of literature through the incorporation of these local practices into text (Bakhtin 1981: 294, Rowsell and Pahl 2007). Regional language becomes something else; on the one hand because it is no longer everyday speech but exists as stylised writing, and on the other hand because it appears in the much discussed and revered world of literature it changes the meaning of literary language. There are two main motivations behind this layering of vernacular language into literature that are explored in this thesis: that in the lamination of vernacular speech into literature an author is demonstrating not only their literary skill but their authenticity as a member of a real community; or because an author has a problem with the values that literature, literary language and literary culture enshrine.

Blommaert’s and Rowsell and Pahl’s positioning of written texts in relation to social practice are of use when considering the social practices associated with represented vernacular language, alongside the practices that are enshrined and normalised within literature. If, for example, Hague’s dialect speech is how he engages with his workmates, friends and wife representing it in a literary text inscribes those practices into his writing. The complex of practices that Eaglestone, Hague and Hines’ use of dialect representation engages in involves practices from literacy and spoken language use. It is therefore of use at this point to look at the myriad of practices involved in dialect representation in order to situate spoken and written language within theorisation of these social practices. Writing is not simply ‘speech written down’ (Halliday 2004: 7) and so when considering representations of dialect a shift in focus is required to look at the role literacy has in creating these representations over questions of linguistic accuracy. In order to unpick the ‘complex of practices’ which make up the written representations of dialect explored in this study, the literacy practices involved need to be situated alongside the other social practices that are involved. Within this section literacy-as-practice, language-as-practice and orthography-as-practice will be explored by situating literature with regards to these practices.

 In his discussion of Bourdieu’s theory of practice Richard Jenkins simply introduces practice as ‘what people *do*’ (Jenkins 1992: 59) whilst in her exploration of expletives and masculinity Vivian de Klerk discusses social practice as ‘that which is regarded as normal in the discourse’ and is ‘representative of speakers’ unconscious and internalized resources for interpreting discourse, based on and constrained by previous personal experience and social context’ (de Klerk 1997: 146). Jenkins positions social practices as what people ‘do’ in order to participate in the world socially and de Klerk discusses social practices as activities that inform what individuals consider to be the norm. Within N.L.S. literacy is separated into literacy practices and literacy events:

It is easy to see, once one has been introduced to the notion of a ‘social practice’, how a phenomenon like literacy can be studied in these terms. After all, taking part in the literate world involves *doing* things: signing a cheque, reading a bed-time story or collectively reading a wall newspaper. In the terminology of the New Literacy Studies, these are examples of literacy *events* which form, or form part of, literacy *practices* when carried out on a repeated basis within a particular setting and cultural framework. According to David Barton (1994: 37), literacy practices can be viewed as the ‘social practices associated with the written word’.

(Sebba 2009: 26)

Literacy events are specific instantiations of literacy which are informed by literacy practices. Literacy practices are ‘common patterns in using reading and writing in a particular situation’ (Barton 1994: 37) and ‘practices can be seen as ways of using literacy which are carried from one particular situation to another similar situation’ (Scribner and Cole 1981: 234-238 cited in Barton 1994: 37).

Literacy events and practices are the basic units of analysis within literacy studies. In discussing the biographies of Eaglestone, Hague and Hines reference will be made to the various situations in which they encountered and used literacy, in order to explore their relationship with literacy practices. These practices will be looked at generally and so introducing literacy events and practices is done here to position written and spoken language alongside each other in the everyday usage of social individuals within the socially constructed ideologies of Standard Language Culture and literacy. The ideological character of language standards and literacy has been outlined in 1.1. Within his discussion of literacy, Barton positions written and spoken language alongside each other within the socially motivated actions of individuals:

Although they are very different, written and spoken language are not easy to separate. In fact they are closely entwined, and in daily life people participate in literacy events where reading and writing are mixed in with spoken language and with other means of communication. Literacy events typically involve a written text and talk around the text [….] Writing is based on speech in some very real ways: spoken language is the basis for most people’s learning of written language, for instance, and the very form of written language gets its inspiration from spoken language. Still, it is important to stress that the roots of written language lie only partly with spoken language. Written language has a life of its own.

(Barton 1994: 44)

Barton asserts that it is difficult to separate spoken and written language from one another, especially when looking at what individuals do with language on a daily basis. Dialect representation relies on this mixing of practices associated with spoken and written language which individuals engage with in their day-to-day life. Looking at represented dialect in terms of the phonetic information which it can approximate or trace means that the result of linguistic and literacy practices is seen through a simply linguistic lens. Barton explains ‘one cannot isolate print literacy when trying to understand the complexity of people’s lives’ and that the ‘key to new views of literacy is situating, reading and writing in its social context’ (1994:23). Situating Eaglestone, Hague and Hines’ literary texts within the literacy and linguistic practices that they engaged with means that the everyday practices from which these instances of dialect representation emerged can be traced. Tracing these practices informs the socially-situated analysis of these texts.

Within N.L.S. reading and writing are seen as *situated* within social contexts (Sebba 2007: 13) and ‘literacy is not simply knowing how to read and write a particular script but applying this knowledge for specific purposes in specific contexts of use’ (Scribner and Cole 1981: 236 cited in Barton 1994: 25). The acts of speaking, reading and writing are situated within social contexts, although these ‘specific contexts of use’ are very different when we contrast the practices that inform the use of spoken Yorkshire dialect and literature. Therefore investigating the act of representing dialect needs to be situated with regard to literacy practices as well as socio-linguistic reality. However, the reality of language-in-use needs to be situated alongside literacy. Fairclough asserts that ‘language is a form of social practice’ (2001: 22). Uses of language demonstrate the cultural training and social practices that have contributed to their creation. Like literacy, Fairclough discusses spoken language use as being materially and socially situated:

Linguistic phenomena are social in the sense that whenever people speak or listen or write or read, they do so in ways which are determined socially and have social effects. Even when people are most conscious of their own individuality and think themselves to be most cut off from social influences – ‘in the bosom of the family’, for example – they still use language in ways which are subject to social convention. And the ways in which people use language in their most intimate and private encounters are not only socially determined by the social relationships of the family, they also have social effects in the sense of helping to maintain (or indeed, change) those relationships.

Social phenomena are linguistic, on the other hand, in the sense that the language activity which goes on in social contexts (as all language activity does) is not merely a reflection or expression of social processes and practices, it is *part* of those processes and practices.

(Fairclough 2001: 22-23)

Fairclough’s positioning of linguistic phenomena as social and social phenomena as linguistic serves to bring the two onto a level playing field and links back to Agha’s assertion that in exploring cultural value his approach: ‘treat[s] language like—any other cultural form’ (Agha 2003: 232). Using Fairclough’s discussion it is possible to situate linguistic phenomena, alongside literacy practices, as part of the processes and practices of social contexts. All language use is part of the processes and practices of society and so the shifting of speech into writing done by these authors operates within the social conventions dictated by the sphere of literature that they are operating in. However, the use of non-standard orthographical conventions to respell words is also a form of social practice which engages with the ideological character of orthography.

Sebba discusses how orthography is a form of social practice bound up within the practices concerned with literacy (Sebba 2007: 9). Drawing on the N.L.S. approach to literacy (Barton and Hamilton 1998, Barton, D., Hamilton M., and R. Ivanic 2000, Street 1993) Sebba asserts that orthography is a form of social practice by seeing it as one aspect of literacy and understanding ‘orthography, like literacy itself, in terms of social practice’ (Sebba 2007: 13). For Sebba orthography is:

a topic of great interest not least because it is a point where issues of language as a formal object and of language as a social and cultural phenomenon intersect. It touches on matters of social identity, national identity, cultural politics, representation and voice. It foregrounds familiar linguistic issues of dialect and standard, of ‘norm’ and ‘variation’. It affects, and is affected by, technology and economics.

(Sebba 2007: 6)

Orthography is the point at which abstract ideological issues concerning language use become materialised. Sebba’s approach to orthography-as-practice is born from the assertion that what are orthographic conventions are ‘the products of social practice’ (Sebba 2009: 27). If the conventions of a language have been socially constructed then variation in the use of these conventions can be socially meaningful. For example, when detailing socially constructed conventions associated with orthography Sebba identifies the use of Roman script as the script for English and ‘the correspondence between characters of writing system and words or sounds’ in English as conventions which are the products of social processes and practices (Sebba 2009: 27-28). Within the socially accepted conventions of an orthography, and even if these ‘conventions governing orthography’ are ‘very strong’ (Sebba 2009: 30), there is potential for variation. These variations may constitute a ‘licensed’ choice, such as ‘<judgment> or <judgement> in English’, or in ‘unlicensed’ ways ‘because the conventions themselves can be broken in a way that allows the original meaning to be conveyed, along with additional social meaning which derives from defying the conventions’ (Sebba 2009: 30). For example, Hague’s use of <speikin’> for <speaking> is an unlicensed variation, which he created to convey a meaning that is particular to this breaking of orthographic conventions in the context of his poem. Variation in orthography carries social meaning:

We start from the premise that the possibility of variation is a prerequisite for social meaning; in other words, where there are no possible alternatives for expressing something, the expression representing that thing does not carry social meaning (though its referent may). Conversely, where there is variation, there is in practice always social meaning.

According to this premise, if orthography is to carry social meaning, then there must be scope for variation. Yet in a language like English, orthography is highly standardised.

 (Sebba 2009: 32)

To create social meaning there needs to be the potential for orthographical variation, however written English already has strict orthographical conventions. In order to consolidate his position concerning the need for variation in order to create social meaning through orthography, with the highly standardised nature of English orthography Sebba introduces the concept of the ‘zone of social meaning’:

the deviation from the norm still has to be close enough to the norm to be recognisable to other members of the language community. We can thus identify a relatively narrow *zone of social meaning* sandwiched between two extremes, one in which there is complete adherence to a set of norms (absolutely no deviation possible) and the other where there is complete licence.

(Sebba 2009: 32)

To illustrate Sebba’s point Hague’s respelling of <speaking> can be drawn on once again. In an imaginary world where spelling is ‘absolutely fixed, so that there is one and only one way to spell any given word, then any kind of meaningful deviation is impossible, because it is not possible to produce a form that is identifiable as a deviation from something else’ (Sebba 2009: 33). In this world the spelling of <speaking> as <speikin’> would not be socially meaningful as <speaking> is the only way to spell <speaking>, and <speakin’> would exist as a ‘different word’ or as a ‘non-word’. In an alternative imaginary world where ‘spelling norms specify a set of sound-letter correspondences but allow a free choice where alternatives exist’ (Sebba 2009: 33), <speikin’> would not operate as a socially meaningful deviation of the spelling <speaking> because individuals would be free to write <speaking>, <speikin’>, <speekin>, <speiking>, <spieking> etc. As it stands <speikin’> is socially meaningful because it sits within the zone of social meaning as a recognisable deviation from <speaking>. In this way the practices and social meaning of orthography are engaged in the creation of non-standard orthographical representations of dialect.

Looking at N.L.S., Fairclough’s discussion of language-as-practice and Sebba’s discussion of orthography-as-practice serves to position the act of representing dialect in writing as an act which draws on the practices of literacy, speech and orthography to create unique social meanings. Positioning dialect representation within a socio-cultural or practice based approach to literacy, speech and orthography means that representations of vernacular speech in literary writing can be viewed as emerging from and influenced by everyday language in use, where orality and literacy are entwined. By focussing on the social practices that Eaglestone, Hague and Hines engage with in their writing it is possible to look at how and why they negotiated the socially stratified systems of speech and writing in the ways that they did. Social stratification will be discussed further in 1.2.6. and 1.3. My perspective situates these authors’ texts into the social contexts which have informed their views on language, literacy and literature. This is done in order to view literature as a part of a ‘total social process’ (Lucas 1975 cited in Mugglestone 2003: 191) with literary texts resulting from an individual’s relationship to a variety of social and cultural practices. Literature as a culturally valued object and as a set of practices has an influence on the development of a literate individual’s perceptions of the world around them and their cultural values. It is also possible to view many of the practices associated with literary culture as forms of cultural training and that these social practices have naturalised traditionally middle-class, bourgeoisie or elite societal values (de Klerk 1997: 146). Coupland’s work on the mediation of vernaculars highlights a range of issues relevant to the combined study of literacy, language and orthography. However before discussing Coupland’s work it is of use to reflect momentarily on the problems of consolidating approaches to literacy and spoken language into one approach.

### 1.2.4. Linguistics Plus Literacy Plus Literature Equals Pig’s Ear

How we speak and how we write are bound up in how we conceptualise and discuss literacy. Working with ideas of social practice whilst exploring how speech is inscribed into texts is of use when addressing the problems relating to the scholarly ‘divide’ between orality and literacy (Street 1993: 4-5), and the separation of the study of texts to the realm of literary studies and spoken language to that of linguistics (Blommaert 2012). In recent research the boundedness of approaches to linguistic phenomena such as code-switching or repertoires have begun to change into more fluid approaches (Blommaert 2011, Snell 2013) with the use of a social practice accounts of language, literacy and orthography providing a level of fluidity within this study. How to speak and how to write are influenced by social conventions and are of different levels of value when employed in different contexts. As I have discussed, there is a history of scholarship looking at dialect representation and traditionally these approaches have theorised dialect speech in literary terms or represented speech in sociolinguistic terms. The works of Street, Barton and Sebba that I have previously discussed work to overcome the separating out of orality and literacy, although they do not deal specifically with the issue of dialect representation. Drawing on approaches from N.L.S. it is of use to approach the question of dialect representation as a stylistic technique that is used to create something that is not the sum of its parts but something new. What I mean by this is investigating the overlap of speech and writing as the object of study itself; by focussing on how conceptions of the linguistic and the literary interplay. There are two approaches, from Ferguson and Coupland, which do this and have influenced this study.

Susan Ferguson’s (1998) work uses the term ‘ficto-linguistics’ to describe the uniqueness of the system of language created by an author within a literary text, this system being reliant on the author’s understanding of linguistic information. Ferguson’s approach considers literary texts that employ dialect representation by focussing on their unique position as literary creations and not social reality. Rather than focussing on the accuracy of the dialect represented she looks at how the dialect represented is positioned within the internal logic of the text and what this means. Edney describes Ferguson’s approach as one that ‘demonstrates a comprehensive approach for blending linguistics with literature scholarship and not ending up with the academic version of a pig’s ear’ (2011: 670) with the implication being that bringing the two together could easily result in confused research that does not satisfy the expectations of pre-existing disciplinary approaches. I wish to oppose Edney by arguing that the question is not one of making a pig’s ear out of two respectable disciplines by combining them but one of focussing on the blind-spot of both disciplines (cf. Street 1994:23). In order to make the interplay between the two the focus of study this process involves engaging with interdisciplinary activity and seeking to create, as Roland Bathes puts it, ‘new objects’:

Interdisciplinary activity, valued today as an important aspect of research, cannot be accomplished by simple confrontations between various specialized branches of knowledge. Interdisciplinary work is not a peaceful operation: it begins effectively when the solidarity of the old disciplines breaks down – a process made more violent, perhaps, by the jolts of fashion – to the benefit of a new object and a new language, neither of which is in the domain of those branches of knowledge one calmly sought to confront

(Barthes 1977: 155)

Barthes presents interdisciplinary work as an almost violent process which involves creating a new object of study. The difficulty for the study of dialect representation is not that it is in itself a new object, but that it requires ‘a new language’ as it falls between the remit of existing disciplines which are separated by the oral/literate divide. In many ways the position of dialect representation is at the interface of speech and writing as well as at the interface between ‘high’ and ‘low’ culture. Within academic discourse this technique also has an intermediate status for linguistic and literary scholars, as it is not natural speech or requires involving linguistic theory in textual analysis. Looking at the overlap between speech and writing may not fit into clear disciplinary boundaries or identities; this does not however mean that individuals do not operate with sophistication from within this space.[[4]](#footnote-4) Coupland’s work on the mediation of vernacular language is of use for this reason as he argues that there is ‘sufficient reason to treat mediation as a core sociolinguistic domain’ (2009: 297). In his discussion Coupland not only works to summarise the problems in theorising exactly what ‘vernacular language’ is but also focusses on vernacular language use in the mass-media. Both Ferguson and Coupland’s approaches are employed at various stages of this thesis to investigate the recontextualisation of vernacular speech in literature as a unique, yet also commonplace, object. Further explanation of Ferguson’s approach will be undertaken in the Eaglestone case study where it forms part of the analysis of his text. As Coupland’s work on the mediation of vernaculars has formed the basis of my analysis more generally it is of use at this stage to investigate some of Coupland’s claims in detail. In this section I have discussed my approach to interdisciplinary research. In 1.2.4. I will discuss in detail Coupland’s paper on ‘The Mediated Performance of Vernaculars’. As this paper raises the issue of authenticity I will provide some background to Coupland’s theorisation of authenticity by discussing some of his other work and the influence that Bakhtin has had on Coupland’s discussion. Finally I draw on this discussion of Coupland and Bakhtin’s work to explain my approach to the questions of authenticity raised by dialect representation.

### 1.2.5. Mediated Vernaculars

In discussing how to approach the study of the mediation of vernacular language in the mass media Coupland highlights a range of complex or under-theorised issues. These discussions have been of use in developing my approach to dialect representation because of the extent to which Coupland theorises the representations of vernacular language, the process of mediation, authenticity and meta-linguistic framing, as well as how he positions mediation as a central socio-linguistic concern.

Although Coupland’s paper on ‘The Mediated Performance of Vernaculars’ does contain robust theorisation of many of the topics that he discusses, much of what he presents are questions for further study. This means that in discussing his work I am demonstrating how his theorisation has influenced this thesis and also how the research undertaken in this thesis reflects on some of his questions.

As briefly discussed in 1.2.1. my reasons for focussing on the representation of dialect in literary texts is because mediations are one of the main ways in which we encounter socio-linguistic difference. Though there is a Hoggartian moral distinction to be made between mass-produced media texts and literature (cf. Hoggart 1957: 107), books and novels are a form of mass media and therefore contribute to our understanding of language and social distinction:

Quite simply, mass media are the main contemporary means of constructing and consuming 'difference', including linguistically-indexed difference and that is sufficient reason to treat mediation as a core sociolinguistic domain.

Mass media clearly recontextualise ways of speaking. They cannot avoid doing so, under the conditions of heightened reflexivity that are associated with close monitoring of media texts at their design stage and with cyclical patterns of interpretation in mass media consumption.

 (Coupland 2009: 297)

Coupland’s assertion highlights the importance of investigating mediations of linguistic difference as he argues mediations inform perceptions of language use and that the creation of mediations of speech involves a considered process of recontextualisation. He also highlights the fact that these mediations are created ‘under the conditions of heightened reflexivity’ and I argue that because of the recontextualisation of vernacular language these mediations are also interpreted under these conditions i.e. mediations are interpreted by individuals using their understanding of the vernacular represented as well as their understanding of media context in which they are represented. The contexts of media representations of vernacular language use influence the indexical meaning of that particular linguistic variety because of the conventions of the media in which they are mediated. Whilst discussing what effect media recontextualisations have on the mediated vernacular language itself Coupland states that:

If there is any generalisable 'media effect' on everyday spoken language it may be an upward shift in the complexity of metalinguistic framing, rather than change in the formal constitution of particular dialects.

(Coupland 2009: 297)

In his work in *Style* Coupland briefly summarises the *metalingual function* of language as ‘language ‘glossing’ or referring to itself’ (2007:11) and meta-lingustic discourse as ‘[t]alk about language’ (2007: 39). He also discusses how ‘[m]etapragmatic awareness (awareness of the functional and indexical implications of our utterances) is a core quality of communicative interaction’ (Coupland 2007: 100). Returning to Johnstone’s discussion of enregisterment meta-linguistic discourse can be seen as part of the way in which ‘people show one another how forms and meanings are to be linked, sometimes by talking about the links (“metadiscourse”), sometimes in other ways’ (Johnstone 2011: 1-2) . Therefore changes to the ‘complexity of metalinguistic framing’ involve changes to the possible ways in which individuals can interpret and comment on how the *form* of language influences it’s functional or indexical *meaning.* Although Coupland is discussing an ‘upward shift’ in terms of how dialects change over time, I would argue that much of the archival meta-linguistic evidence that is presented in this thesis, from reviewers or authors, has been motivated by the ‘complexity of the metalinguistic framing’ which the process of mediating dialects in literary works creates. Essentially, the meta-linguistic comments have been made because these texts are complex meta-linguistic objects as they involve ‘writing’ about ‘talk’, and this process of design involves these author’s employing an ‘awareness of the consequences of [their] […] own linguistic/stylistic operations and attending creatively to the form’ of their texts (Coupland 2007: 100). The specific examples explored in this study rely on the orthographic conventions, conceptions of literacy and perceptions of literary art that are associated with the medium of writing in order to ‘construct’ linguistic difference. The fact that linguistic difference is ‘constructed’ and ‘consumed’ through media recontextualisations, and that mediations involve conceptual, ideological or formal understandings of what is to be mediated and into which medium it is to be mediated, means that dialect representation can be positioned as an influential and complex act, which involves and provokes multiple meta-linguistic considerations.

In positioning mediation as a main sociolinguistic concern Coupland also draws attention to the ways in which vernaculars have been conceptualised. The two main points from Coupland’s discussion of the conceptualisation of vernaculars that I wish to address are that vernacular languages are more complex in their ‘indexical profiles’ than they have been giving credit and also that vernacular language tends to be ‘overconsolidated’. Coupland argues that ‘[t]he phenomena we treat as ‘vernacular’ may be constituted in more complex ways than is often assumed’ and highlights the fact that quite often within socio-linguistics vernaculars are discussed in relation to social class in terms of their low-levels of economic status, prestige and social stigmatisation in contrast to Standard English or RP (Coupland 2009: 285). In the instances of dialect representation investigated in this study, very often class relations are invoked by the presentation of vernacular speech in writing, and class is the most salient discourse present in the meta-linguistic comments relating to these instances. However the ways in which vernacularity is constructed and consumed within the instances in this study demonstrates that vernacular language is used and interpreted in more complex ways than simply on the level of social class or in relation to notions of standards. Because of this complexity, Coupland’s discussion of areas of further analysis relating to the classification of vernacularity has been of use in investigating representations of dialect. Coupland goes on to look at further areas of consideration, which need to be explored with regards to socio-linguistic research on vernaculars. He lists the criteria by which vernaculars are currently investigated and argues for each point that more ‘detailed commentary’ and qualification is needed. In Coupland’s terms vernaculars are described as: having complex indexical profiles and a wide range of variation in the social profiles of what is described as ‘vernacular’; being involved in complex multi-stage and multi-level processes of indexicality and social recognisability (enregisterment); and having their ideological values refashioned in media recontextualisations; and being influenced by the reconfiguring of social and sociolinguistic hierarchies (Coupland 2009: 285). The complexity of linguistic phenomena that comes under the umbrella term ‘vernacular’ is therefore worthy of further and more detailed exploration:

Each of these points requires much more detailed commentary. But taken together, these caveats suggest that, while it is reasonable to invoke “standard” and “vernacular” as generally opposable categories, referring to a broad distinction between superposed, authorized ways of speaking and commonplace, local ways of speaking, we have to be wary of overconsolidating these terms. Vernaculars, for example, may have more going for them than is often assumed.

(Coupland 2009: 285)

Coupland calls for conceptions of ‘vernacular’ language or vernacularity to be scrutinised further in order to address this overconsolidation of vernaculars. Exploring the discourse surrounding, and use of, vernacular voices in the works of Eaglestone, Hague and Hines serves to investigate how these authors negotiate and exploit the ‘complex indexical profiles’ that their mediations of vernacular speech possess, but also how they engage with dominant language ideologies that sees ‘language varieties as discrete and bounded codes, linked to discrete and bounded social categories and values’ (Jaffe and Walton 2000: 582). Investigating these authors’ representations of dialect involves looking at how standards and vernacularity interact, rather than seeing them as ‘generally opposable categories’ (Coupland 2009: 285).

In querying the ways in which vernacular language has been classified in socio-linguistic research Coupland also draws attention to how their authenticity has been conceptualised, especially when it comes to mediations of vernacular language. In order to discuss Coupland’s argument concerning the authenticity of vernaculars it will be of use to introduce some of Bakhtin’s work on dialogism, which also forms part of the analysis of 4.4.3. In discussing authenticity Coupland’s comments offer an alternative to scholarly perspectives, such as Ives’s for example, which focus on the accuracy of dialect representation:

Questions of sociolinguistic authenticity are difficult to avoid, although some of

those questions are more searching than others. It is tempting to ask, for example, whether mediated dialect performances have a better chance of retaining their grounded authenticity (whatever that is), “if only the sociolinguistic performances could be completely accurate.”

(2009: 297)

Coupland’s questioning of sociolinguistic authenticity is undertaken not to throw mediations into questions, but to show how conceptions of accuracy or authenticity need to be reconsidered in light of mediations. Coupland goes further in explaining how recontextualising speech in other media demonstrates the dialogic nature of language use and what this means for the conceptions of vernacular speech:

Any residue of the early sociolinguistic assumption that vernacular usage is the natural, non-reflexive, and unsullied speech behaviour of unobserved speech communities has to be set aside when we consider mediated usage. If such 'innocence' (Coupland and Jaworski 2004: 15) ever existed, it lapses under the demands and affordances of mediation. Bakhtin's concept of dialogism gives us the appropriate generalisation: performed discourse is inevitably 'half someone else's', and we need forms of analysis […] that can expose the complexity of styling processes involved. In fact it is difficult to conceive of mediated voice as anything other than stylised voice, and the performative 'as if-ness' of media constructions needs to be theorised in more detail*.*

(Coupland 2009: 297)

Coupland positions mediations as dialogic in nature, because of the ways in which they are stylised, and created through a complex dialogic process. In doing this he problematizes the relevance of the linguistic conception of vernacularity, as authentic language in use, to discussions of mediation because of the complexity, and widespread nature, of the stylisation process involved in the creation of mediations. The stylistic choices that Eaglestone, Hague and Hines make in the creation of their texts are in dialogue with the complex matrix of social meaning in which they themselves and their texts were situated. Coupland’s discussion of the complexity of mediations and the lack of theorisation concerning this process is influenced by the work of Bahktin:

Every utterance participates in the ‘unitary language’ (in its centripetal forces and tendencies) and at the same time partakes of social and historical heteroglossia (the centrifugal, stratifying forces).

Such is the fleeting language of a day, of an epoch, a social group, a genre, a school and so forth. It is possible to give a concrete and detailed analysis of any utterance, once having exposed it as a contradiction-ridden, tension-filled unity of two embattled tendencies in the life of language.

The authentic environment of an utterance, the environment in which it lives and takes shape, is dialogized heteroglossia, anonymous and social as language, but simultaneously concrete, filled with specific content and accented as an individual utterance.

(Bakhtin 1981: 272)

The authenticity of a text or utterance no longer involves how genuine its provenance is if all texts and utterances are produced within a naturally dialogized and heteroglossic environment, where they are partly new but also dependent on what has come before. Coupland’s invoking of Bakhtin’s concept of dialogism as the ‘appropriate’ generalisation to make about the process of mediation highlights the complexity of language in use and the problems of studying mediation. He also raises an issue concerning authenticity in doing this as he highlights that ‘performed discourse is ‘half someone else’s’ (Coupland 2009: 297). In turning to Bakhtin when discussing mediation, Coupland raises the question: how can stylised vernacular language be authentic if it is essentially ‘half’ someone else’s? Bakhtin’s theory of dialogized heteroglossia views the natural or authentic state of language as one where social or ideological forces are constantly serving to unify, disunify and stratify language, and any utterance, whether speech or text, is that of an individual but is also in dialogue with these forces and other voices (Bakhtin 1981: 271-272). Employing a multimodality-informed lens when considering Coupland’s phrasing of the question of accuracy, it is possible to see that speech and writing involve the use of different senses, hearing and sight, and so one mode can never truly ‘accurately’ perform the other. Within a Bakhtinian perspective, and looking at the modal affordances of speech and writing, the accuracy or authenticity of any dialect representation is debatable. However these conclusions need to be foregrounded not because of the importance that discussions of accuracy have to this study, but because of the importance of accuracy and authenticity to socio-linguistic scholarship and to socially motivated individuals.

 In his ‘Sociolinguistic Authenticities’, a paper specifically on authenticity, Coupland discusses authenticity as ‘a quality of experience that we actively seek out in most domains of life, material, and social’ (2003: 417). Combining this definition with Coupland’s comments on mediation as ‘stylised voice’, in ‘The Mediated Performance of Vernaculars’ (2009: 297), the discussions of a text’s authenticity can be seen to link to the negotiations and interrogations of authenticity which speakers undertake when dealing with speech and speakers (Blackledge and Creese 2013a, 2013b, Blommaert and Varis 2011). Socially motivated individuals will assess speakers, texts etc. based on how authentic they think that they are. To be authentic, as discussed by Blommaert and Varis, speakers or texts only need to display ‘enough’ of the ‘emblematic features’ of authenticity to be judged as authentic (2009: 4). What I wish to highlight in this discussion of authenticity is a sense of a ‘real’ authenticity that is conceptually very different from what is ‘perceived’ to be authentic. There is ‘perceived’ authenticity as something that individuals use to judge one another, and social interactions, using criteria that assesses what level of authenticity they possess i.e. authenticity as ‘a quality of experience that we actively seek out’ (2003:417). Whilst on the other hand there is ‘real’ authentic language use as taking place within dialogised heteroglossia, where all utterances are essentially double-voiced. Both of these definitions are of use when looking at dialect representation because of how discussions of accuracy relate to authenticity, in the sense that dialect representation is, conceptually, neither accurate nor authentic and yet through a complex process of mediation it can be seen by socially motivated individuals to be both. Coupland discusses how mediation presents a problem for discussions of accuracy:

If we take the fact of mediated re-contextualisation seriously, then 'accuracy' is irrelevant. This is the familiar Bakhtin-type argument, that a phrase repeated is not in fact the same phrase [….] Late-modernity tends to disembed voices from the social matrices we have taken to be primary (such as the class and regional designations […]) and infuse new meanings into them as they are re-contextualised. Those are the change processes that a sociolinguistics of mediation needs to get to grips with.

(Coupland 2009: 298)

Coupland sets aside the questions of vernacular accuracy, and therefore authenticity, in favour of analysis of the complex social matrices in which vernacular language has been recontextualised. By focussing on the social practices that inform the mediation and interpretation of dialect representation it is possible to reassess the ideological standpoints that judge the authenticity of a text, which are presented in the discourses surrounding Eaglestone, Hague and Hines’ texts and in dialect representation scholarship that focusses on accuracy. Because of the social tensions created between ‘working-class’ and ‘middle-class’ identities there is a general sense, reflected in much of the discourses surrounding Eaglestone, Hague and Hines’ texts, that working-class writers need to justify or prove their authenticity as members of the working-class (cf. Eaglestone 1924, Thesing 2000: xii –xxii). What this focus on the context achieves is an engagement with discourses surrounding the idea of authenticity (Hakala 2010: 389) or authenticity as style (Coupland 2007: 25) and serves to move away from scholarly perspectives that assess the authenticity of dialect representation by how closely orthography can be made to correspond with linguistic features. By positioning mediation as the focus when studying dialect representation I wish to emphasise how the authenticity of a spoken vernacular isn’t of relevance, in one sense, when it is represented in writing as it is no longer natural speech, but that it is still held as evidence for authenticity that can be approved or rejected.

Drawing on Coupland’s positioning of mediations, within this thesis my theorisation of attempts to ‘stylise voice’ in literary writing draws on discussions of Standard Language Culture, Literacy, Multimodality, social practice, social distinction, legitimacy and orthography in order to explore the complexity of this stylisation process. These perspectives are also employed to investigate the complexity of the discussions of language use, or meta-linguistic framing, involved in the discourses surrounding Eaglestone, Hague and Hines’ texts. Letters and reviews or interviews from popular media are used throughout this thesis to provide the means by which this meta-linguistic framing can be analysed. Coupland’s focus on seeing ‘mediated voice’ as ‘stylised voice’ creates a link between the mediation of vernaculars in new modes or medias with work on stylised voices in natural speech (Blackledge and Creese 2013a, 2013b). Performances of stylised or stereotyped voices are a resource common in spoken language, so in Coupland’s terms, it is possible to see dialect representation as heavily stylised and culturally constrained performances of voice. However, in these performances of ‘voice’ the question of authenticity becomes more complex through the process of mediation. The authors explored in this study are in many cases well aware of the social meaning that their disembodied regional voices create in their mediations, the discourses that surround this process and what it achieves for them as writers. This awareness and negotiation of the social meaning of recontextualised Yorkshire voices demonstrates the effect of legitimate culture and literacies on their lives. The recontextualising of Yorkshire speech in literary texts makes visible the dynamic and bewildering nature of heteroglossic language and its indefinite genres whilst also drawing our attention to the social forces that govern the stratified nature of language, by creating texts that can be simultaneously familiar and comprehendible, and yet different. The natural state of language may be ‘dialogized heteroglossia’ and whilst it is possible to say that the social stratification of speech creates inequalities, negotiating within these stratified systems is a necessity for individuals. Eaglestone, Hague and Hines all engage with social forces in different ways and negotiate the legitimacy of different forms of language use and culture. Although all utterances and texts are in some way a crystallization of the dynamic, contradiction-ridden, tension-filled and heteroglossic nature of language, dialect representation is a stylistic technique that brings this natural state of language to the fore, as it involves playing with variation and unification at the same time, and in its focussing on the authentic dialogized nature of language its authenticity and legitimacy is, as explored in later chapters, fair game for criticism from ideological standpoints that see authentic language as language use that displays enough of the right emblematic features to be seen as authentic (Blommaert and Varis 2011: 3-4). Texts that are self-consciously dialogic in this way can present a problem for ideologies that see the natural state of language as being defined by boundaries. With Standard Language Culture influencing language use, due to the use of social norms to perpetuate cultural values, looking at the discrepancy between general perceptions of language use as having standards and authentic speakers (cf. Coupland 2010), and the nebulousness of authentic dialogized heteroglossia it becomes easier to see why accepting that spoken and written language are very different is ‘perhaps the single most difficult point for non-linguists to fully understand’ (Lippi-Green, 1997: 18). In this section I have discussed the complexities of mediation and authenticity. In 1.3.1. I look in detail at legitimate culture, by discussing the work of Pierre Bourdieu and Bernard Lahire.

 In 1.1. and 1.2. Standard Language Culture, literacy, orthography and literary language have been introduced as being ideologically influenced social practices. In 1.3. I discuss how the complexity of the dynamic socially stratified nature of spoken and written language enacts influence upon individuals.

## 1.3. Legitimate Culture and Social Distinction

### 1.3.1. Legitimate Culture

Socio-culturally positioning the medium into which spontaneous speech is mediated allows for a focus on dialect representation as the mediated recontextualisation of vernacular speech, and the ways in which ‘linguistically-indexed difference’ is ‘constructed and consum[ed]’ in a mass media form (Coupland 2009: 297). This means that the position of literature as a legitimate cultural sphere, and its relationship to other legitimate areas of culture, needs to be explored. Discussing legitimate culture will also pave the way for further discussion of Bourdieu’s work, in particular his work on social distinction. Exploring how literary taste and culture, as well as the ‘legitimate consumption of legitimate works’ (Bourdieu 1984: 40), is involved in creating class distinctions adds a further dimension to the study of represented speech.

Certain forms of culture are more legitimate than others and engaging with Eaglestone, Hague and Hines’ texts involves looking at the legitimacy of various practices and forms of language and culture. RP is seen as prestigious over vernaculars in many institutional contexts (Coupland 2007: 83, Agha 2003). Non-standard or bad spellings are seen to undermine the validity of a written text by those who police language and perceived failing standards of spelling provoke media outrage (Shortis 2007b; 22). Literature is held as being ‘better’ than comics, movies, video games and T.V. (Gee 2003, Bourdieu 1984). In many instances where these situations occur there is held to be an abstract, but supposedly empirical standard, of ‘good’ spoken, written or literary language. These views of what is ‘good’ English are essentially political statements as they assert that the arbitrary beliefs that are being articulated demonstrate the best way for people to use language. There is an observable moral link between ‘good’ forms of language and ‘bad’ throughout the ages (McEnery 2006) but many disciplinary perspectives such as Critical Discourse Analysis (Fairclough 2001) and N.L.S. consider how these ideas came to be and what ideologies are influencing them. Within the discipline of linguistics many discussions concern the deficit position that the myriad varieties of English in the UK are positioned into by prestige varieties and Standard Language Culture (cf. Lippi-Green 1997, Snell 2013). Peoples’ perceptions of the legitimacy of ‘good’ or ‘proper’ language forms part of discussions concerning Standard Language Culture and Standard Language Ideology, which is ‘a bias toward an abstracted, idealized, homogeneous spoken language’ (Lippi-Green 1997: 64). From a range of perspectives it is possible to see how literature, as a ‘social discourse’ (Mugglestone 2004: 178) informed by other social process, legitimates particular values and practices. As discussed earlier Fairclough traces the history of the standardisation of spelling and the codification of written language in order to illustrate how these processes have legitimated middle-class speech and cultural values, and to argue that RP is essentially a class dialect, which enshrines the values of the middle-classes (1989: 56-58). Barton’s and Sebba’s work on literacy and orthography respectively, discuss the socio-cultural, and therefore ideological, forces that are involved in literacy and orthography, highlighting the ways in which they legitimate certain practices and cultural forms (Barton 1994, Sebba 2009). Also scholarship on working-class literature points out the cultural bias that canonical literature holds towards representing the middle-classes and their cultural values (Christopher and Whitson 1999, Williams 1982 see also Fox 1992). These disciplinary perspectives trace how traditionally those who have held positions of economic and cultural power have used institutions to reinforce and reproduce this power. Some forms of culture and social practices have therefore been positioned as more legitimate than others. Literature, Standard Language Culture and standard orthography can all be used to enshrine, perpetuate and legitimise dominant cultural values.

For Bourdieu what is illegitimate comprises of ‘the set of things which are excluded from the legitimate language’ (Bourdieu 1991: 90). In discussing legitimacy, and in particular literary art as part of legitimate culture, art has to be positioned socially-cultural within social-stratification. Bourdieu, in introducing his study of social distinction, claims:

There is an economy of cultural goods, but it has a specific logic. Sociology endeavours to establish the conditions in which the consumers of cultural goods, and their taste for them, are produced, and at the same time to describe the different ways of appropriating such of these objects as are regarded at a particular moment as works of art, and the social conditions of the constitution of the mode of appropriation that is considered legitimate. [….]

Whereas the ideology of charisma regards taste in legitimate culture as a gift of nature, scientific observation shows that cultural needs are the product of upbringing and education: surveys establish that all cultural practices (museum visits, concert-going, reading etc.), and preferences in literature, painting or music, are closely linked to educational level (measured by qualifications or length of schooling) and secondarily to social origin.

The relative weight of home background and of formal education (the effectiveness and duration of which are closely dependent on social origin) varies according to the extent to which the different cultural practices are recognized and taught by the educational system, and the influence of social origin is strongest—other things being equal—in ‘extra-curricular’ and avant-garde culture. To the socially recognized hierarchy of the arts, and within each of them, of genres, schools or periods, corresponds a social hierarchy of the consumers. This predisposes tastes to function as markers of ‘class’.

(Bourdieu 1984: 1)

Bourdieu makes reference to the position of legitimate forms of culture within the ‘market’, how legitimate cultural practices are socially constituted, and how the ‘consumption’ of art is part of the processes of social-stratification. Bourdieu’s final point that tastes functions as social markers will be discussed in more detail in 1.3.3. In discussing legitimacy the processes of legitimation need to be positioned within a social system where art is involved in the same social processes, of differentiation and stratification, which spoken and written language are involved in in. This means that, like legitimate language standards and literacy practices, literary art is involved in the complex negotiations that socially motivated individuals participate in within their everyday lives. Although legitimate cultural forms enshrine cultural bias and are involved in unequal social stratification processes, legitimate culture is not engaged with indiscriminately by individuals. In his article ‘The Individual and the Mixing of Genres: Cultural dissonance and self-distinction’ Lahire asserts that an individual’s relationship with legitimate culture is complex:

Instead of overestimating the level of faith in legitimate culture amongst the most culturally equipped*, an understanding of individual cultural nuances would allow us to grasp the various moments in which very different tastes and inclinations express themselves*. Until recently, the theory of cultural legitimacy had implicitly founded itself upon a theory of the individual that supposed his mono-coherence and dispositional homogeneity, whilst neglecting contextual variation. For example, the big reader of legitimate novels or essays would, out of some sense of cultural noblesse oblige, look down upon television (seldom watching it) or would be extremely selective regarding the cultural offerings that he consumed (only watching the most cultural television programmes). Empirical study has, however, now destroyed such alleged ‘‘knowledge,’’ by making it clear that the variation of cultural dispositions, attitudes, tastes and interests is not only possible but frequently occurring; in accordance with the area of practice under consideration, its status, and the circumstances under which the practice is undertaken.

(Lahire 2008: 177 emphasis mine)

Engaging with legitimated cultural forms is only one part of the complex ‘cultural dispositions, attitudes, tastes and interests’ of the individual. What Lahire’s comments touch on is social anxieties concerning what behaviour or practices are befitting those who participate in different cultural spheres. For example Hague’s ‘Speiking Proper’ mixes poetry, a legitimate cultural form, with Yorkshire dialect. Hague was also a reader of legitimate works of literature but also celebrated, and critiqued, many of the seemingly ‘low’ forms of culture with which he engaged. Social perceptions concerning how people who engage with legitimate or illegitimate cultural forms should behave or be valued influence individual’s engagement with these cultural forms. Mediations of vernacular language are complex socio-linguistic artefacts and the relationship between an individual and different forms of culture is not one of ‘mono-coherence’ to an existing cultural category. Everyday approaches to cultural categories place them quite often in binary opposition for example ‘working-class’ versus ‘middle-class’ culture, or ‘high’ and ‘low’ art. Further discussion of Lahire’s work on the variation of cultural dispositions that individuals naturally possess and his work on the various social identities that writers take on, with the identity of ‘the writer’ being only one of them, will take place in 2.7. where it forms part of the analysis of Eaglestone’s work. Looking at the range of cultural norms that these authors engaged with allows their motivations and social identities to be linked to their engagement with literary practices and legitimate culture. In this section I have discussed legitimate culture and the complex relationship that individuals have with legitimate culture. In 1.3.2. I discuss Bourdieu’s work on social distinction in order to explore the ways in which individuals engage with cultural value.

### 1.3.2. Social Distinction

Bourdieu’s work on social distinction has been influential in the analysis of the ways in which cultural values have been contested or accepted in the discourses surrounding Eaglestone, Hague and Hines’ texts. Within socio-linguistic research it is common to talk about how speakers converge or diverge from each other or create complex social judgements based on a few linguistic features (cf. Giles and Coupland 1988: 175-182). Bourdieu’s work provides a wider theoretical framework within which to position the socially meaningful judgements that individuals make about others based on the ways in which they speak, write and consume culture. What this work also makes possible is an alternative to literary discussions of dialect representation in terms of aesthetics (cf. Edney 2011: 660) by positioning literary discourse within the social processes which are used by individuals to distinguish themselves from one another. As Bourdieu’s research on distinction is complex and far-reaching it is of use at this point to look at two brief summaries of this work before exploring some of Bourdieu’s own comments. In a book solely concerned with ‘bad’ language Tony McEnery discusses how Bourdieu’s work relates to social-stratification and cultural value:

Bourdieu’s work, while admittedly drawn from his research on French society and relating largely to features of culture such as art, food and manners, nonetheless is relevant to language, as Bourdieu himself acknowledges. Bourdieu’s claim is a relatively simple one: features of culture are used to discriminate between groups in society, establishing a social hierarchy based on a series of social shibboleths. The consequences of the establishment of such a hierarchy are both to allow members of groups to be readily identified and to impose the hierarchy itself. For example, if a taste for fine wine is supposed to be a token of high social status, then on seeing somebody pouring a drink from such a bottle of wine, other factors aside, one might assume they were of a certain social class. Similarly, if one sees somebody drinking a pint of beer, and this is a marker of low social class, other factors aside, one may also infer their social class. However, if fine wine is priced so as to exclude the lower orders from purchasing it, the social hierarchy has nothing to do with taste as such. Rather, those tokens of taste are controlled in such a way as to impose the social structure that they are a token of.

(McEnery 2006: 9)

McEnery’s illustration serves to point out that in Bourdieu’s terms ‘tokens of taste’, such as in the context of this study the reading of canonical literature or the use of literary language, impose and legitimate the ‘social structure that they are a token of’. In Richard Jenkins’ summary of Bourdieu’s *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste,* Jenkins draws attention to how Bourdieu embeds the distinctions between high and low culture into everyday social activity, in the sense that these forms of culture are used to distinguish individuals from one another:

[*Distinction*] is Bourdieu’s major assault on the notion of pure or innate cultural taste, and the whipping boy is, once again, Kant (not for nothing is the sub-title A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste). Bourdieu’s project is the ‘barbarous reintegration of aesthetic consumption into the world of ordinary consumption (against which it endlessly defines itself)’: Culture is dissolved into culture. Now at this point, some of you may be asking whether our hero is not, in fact, tilting at windmills; do people really believe, these days, in an ahistorical aesthetic sense which is independent of its social context? Well sociologists and anthropologists may not, but some art historians and critics – and many more of their readers (not to mention those who do not read, but know what is art and what isn’t) – certainly do. Here, for example, is Norman Bryson speaking: ‘Painting and viewing are ultimately self-regulating activities . . . this is a serene system’. Bourdieu’s target here, is not quite a straw man. He has in his sights the consistent use of notions of ‘taste’ – as a sort of naturally occurring phenomenon – to mark and ,maintain (in part by masking the marking) social boundaries, whether these be between the dominant and dominated classes or within classes. Cultural classification systems, Bourdieu argues, are rooted in the class system.

(Jenkins 1992: 137-138)

Jenkins summarises Bourdieu’s point that ‘high’ and ‘low’ culture are both used to ‘mark and, maintain […] social boundaries’. Cultural value is ideologically constructed and this influences literature as a ‘social discourse’ (Mugglestone 2004: 178) and ultimately plays a part in how society is stratified in terms of class. In each of the following case studies analysis of the discourses surrounding literary art sit alongside meta-linguistic comment, as both are ways in which individuals define themselves from others or perpetuate these differences. This links back to Bourdieu’s assertion that ‘linguistic features are never clearly separated from the speaker’s whole set of social properties (Bourdieu 1991: 89) and Agha’s assertion that he ‘treat[s] language like—any other cultural form’ (Agha 2003: 232), in the sense that for the socially motivated individual language, writing and other cultural forms such as art, food and dress are all socially meaningful when it comes to making social judgements.

Expanding on his summary Jenkins explains how within Bourdieu’s work the social processes involved in distinction position working-class culture:

Within this model of life-styles and cultural tastes, the working-class aesthetic is a dominated aesthetic, constantly obliged to define itself by reference to the dominant aesthetic (the cultural arbitrary).

(Jenkins 1992: 138-139)

Working-class language, culture and practices are, due to the legitimation of other forms of culture, positioned in a deficit, dominated position, within the spheres of language in use, literacy and literature. Tokens or markers of class, or other social positions, ‘impose the social structure that they are a token of’. As discussed in 1.1. and 1.2. many of the markers of middle-class culture are embedded in language use and legitimated through literacy practices, which positions working-class or vernacular language in a deficit position. In *Language and Symbolic Power* Bourdieu highlights the effect that legitimate forms of language and culture have on those who do not possess them:

Speakers lacking the legitimate competence are de facto excluded from social domains in which this competence is required, or are condemned to silence. What is rare, then, is not the capacity to speak, which, being part of our biological heritage, is universal and therefore essentially non-distinctive, but rather the competence necessary in order to speak the legitimate language which, depending on social inheritance, re-translates social distinctions into the specifically symbolic logic of differential deviations, or, in short, distinction.

(Bourdieu 1994: 54-55)

Bourdieu’s argument is relevant within the context of this study because he highlights the myriad ways in which individuals can be excluded from social domains on the basis that they lack some ‘legitimate competence’, whether this is a linguistic, literacy, literary, or behavioural concern, and therefore relevant to how Eaglestone, Hague and Hines negotiate their relationship with processes of legitimation and legitimate culture. Ways of speaking and writing, as well as aspects of literary culture, converge when Eaglestone, Hague and Hines use dialect representation and are used or perceived as markers of class, identity or another socially appropriate category by themselves or others. Because of the culturally dominated social positions that Eaglestone, Hague and Hines’ working-class backgrounds occupy, whether these backgrounds were perceived by readers or identified with by the authors, an effort needs to be made to explore, in situ, the normalised ideologies present in language standards, literacy and literary culture which these authors negotiate when creating dialect representations. Returning to McEnery’s summary of Bourdieu helps illustrate this point:

If there are forms of language which are identified with a refined form of speech, then those aware of the perception of this form of language, who are able to invest either the time or the money in order to acquire that ‘refined’ form of language, will be able to identify themselves with a particular group in society. Yet more perniciously, if that type of speech is already associated with a particular social class, then there is a zero cost for that social class in using that form of speech, while the speech associated with lower classes is devalued and the onus is placed on them to adapt the way that they speak. In making that adaptation they are tacitly acknowledging the supposedly superior form of speech that they are shifting to when that shift takes place.

(McEnery 2006: 9)

McEnery draws attention to Bourdieu’s discussion of how the biases or norms enshrined in legitimate cultural forms means that for those whose culture it is there is ‘zero cost’ for them in acquiring this culture. Bourdieu argues that for those with the ‘right’ social background and access to education acquiring the legitimate culture is via ‘insensible familiarization within the family circle’ (Bourdieu 1984: 3-4). The biographical sections of the three case studies serve to trace the: social or economic costs of acquiring legitimate cultural forms; the shifting between dominant and dominated ways of speaking and writing; and the re-negotiations of cultural value in which Eaglestone, Hague and Hines participated. This is done in order to show how their representations of Yorkshire speech in literary works involve the complex lamination of a myriad range of socially meaningful markers and social practices. In this section I have discussed the ways in which individuals distinguish themselves from one another by engaging with cultural value. In 1.3.3. I discuss the ways in which legitimacy and social distinction raise further questions concerning the processes through which legitimacy is perpetuated and the relationship between class and art.

### 1.3.3. Morality and Legitimacy

Many of the ways in which legitimate cultural forms and practices are perpetuated and reinforced is through the use of moral evaluations. Within comments on speech, writing and literature it is possible and is seen as generally acceptable to point out the ‘bad’ or ‘good’ uses of English. For example within the case study on Eaglestone we will encounter comments about: speakers who employ ‘trammeling dialects’ or are seen as morally corrupt because they swear; comparisons between the ‘juvenile’ handwriting and spelling of grown men and that of actual children; and discussions concerning the success or failure of Eaglestone’s attempts at demonstrating his literary skill. However moral evaluations are relative and can be disagreed with. In other examples, Hague takes the socially valued ‘well-bred’ speech of Edward Heath to task by translating it into Yorkshire dialect to ridicule him – although Hague’s work in many ways problematizes the moral judgements associated with local and supralocal prestige forms – and Hines writes literature that promotes traditionally working-class values and practices, like socialism and football, to address the fact that growing up he was bored and insulted by what was deemed to be ‘good’ literature. Nevertheless through the discourses and social practices surrounding language, education, art and culture positive values are associated with certain types of objects and activities:

Another common method of expressing moral evaluation is the analogy – comparisons in discourse almost always have a legitimatory or de-legitimatory function. Here the implicit answer to the question ‘Why must I do this?’ or ‘Why must I do this in this way?’ is not, ‘because it is good’, but ‘because it is like another activity which is associated with positive values’ (or, in the case of negative comparison, ‘because it is not like another activity which is associated with negative values’). Sometimes the comparison is implicit. An activity that belongs to one social practice is described by a term which, literally, refers to an activity belonging to another social practice, and the positive or negative values which, in the given socio-cultural context are attached to that other activity, are then transferred to the original activity.

[….]

Whatever may be the case, it is clear that in the matter of legitimation we face a choice between morality and authority. And it is equally clear that in reflecting on the crisis of legitimation, we need to consider not just legitimation, but also and especially the intricate interconnections between social practices and the discourses that legitimize them.

(Van Leeuwen 2007: 99-111)

The process of comparing one activity to another is demonstrated when Hague talks in ‘Speikin’ Proper’ of dialect being uncouth and Eaglestone’s work prompts reviews which comment on the ‘trammelling’ dialect of miners. In these cases vernacular speech is compared with ‘bad’ manners or seen as something that restricts the freedom of the user. The implication being that speaking in the legitimate way would mean that an individual would be seen as refined and would no longer be holding themselves back. Theo Van Leeuwen’s work on legitimation is useful in the context of this study when considering the discussions of morality used to legitimate ideological standpoints in the discourses that surround Eaglestone, Hague and Hines’ texts. Van Leeuwen’s comments on analogy and legitimation are also of use when looking at the moral or meta-linguistic judgements made about speech or speakers based on their representation in literary texts. Negative values may be ascribed to a speaker founded on a comparison that is based on an analogous representation of their speech in writing. In ‘Speikin’ Proper’ negative perceptions of Yorkshire speech are challenged by Hague particularly because his speech is being judged through the lens of literacy practices and literary values. ‘Bad’ spelling or language – bad literacy practices – may be used to represent vernacular speech, but this does not automatically mean that the speech represented is also ‘bad’. The social practices of spoken language are represented through the social practices of written language. This can be used to ‘delegitimize’ the speakers represented (Jaffe and Walton 2000) – especially in the case of negative stereotypical representations of low-social status characters in literature – or can be challenged, as we shall see in Hague and Hines’ work, to exploit the assumptions that are made about people based on their interaction with literacy practices. Many of the problems of writing about coal-mining communities which Eaglestone, Hague and Hines face stem from the perceived legitimacy of literature as an art form and perceptions of the cultural illegitimacy of these working-class communities.

Within each case study a literary book forms the focus of an examination of the social practices and cultural viewpoint that each author and their text present. As I seek to connect the ideologies enshrined in cultural norms to the social practices that inform them my analysis crosses the boundaries of speech, literacy and literary art to consider how they are all influencing and influenced by each other. As literary art is highly stylized the discussions of what constitutes literature and literary language explored in this study provide an insight into the social practices, language attitudes and cultural biases that the proponents of these discussions possess. The literary ‘eye’ or aesthetic is very visible in its usage as a form of social distinction, as the social practices associated with literature are more associated with middle-class values. In exploring Eaglestone, Hague and Hines’ biographies I pay close attention to how they became interested in literature, or why it was not necessarily part of their existing social practices, in order to explore how they engaged with the culture value of literature. Bourdieu highlights the way in which the appreciation of art is usually instilled in an individual by cultural training within their family and how this appreciation is seen as legitimate, although it is in essence the imposition of a set of social norms on the user’s perception:

This typically intellectualist theory of artistic perception directly contradicts the experience of the art-lovers closest to the legitimate definition; acquisition of legitimate culture by insensible familiarization within the family circle tends to favour an enchanted experience of culture which implies forgetting the acquisition.

*The ‘eye’ is a product of history reproduced by education*. This is true of the mode of artistic perception now accepted as legitimate, that is, the aesthetic disposition, the capacity to consider in and for themselves, as form rather than function, not only the works designated for such apprehension, i.e., legitimate works of art, but everything in the world, including cultural objects which are not yet consecrated—such as, at one time, primitive arts, or, nowadays, popular photography or kitsch—and natural objects. The ‘pure’ gaze is a historical invention linked to the emergence of an autonomous field of artistic production, that is, a field capable of imposing its own norms on both the production and the consumption of its products.

(Bourdieu 1984: 3-4 emphasis mine)

Bourdieu highlights how an understanding of literary art, for example, is unconsciously acquired for many people whose families engage them in cultural training that familiarises them with literature. Eaglestone, Hague and Hines all came to appreciate literature on their own terms as they were not familiarised with it by their families or education but through their own volition and socialisation. This links with Johnathan Rose’s work on the role that ‘cultural’ pursuits play in the lives of working-class autodidacts. Rose uses the literary character of Leonard Bast from *Howard’s End* (1910)as a case study to explore how social practices associated with literature and ‘culture’ are naturalised in the ‘leisured classes’ but must be acquired by those from working-class backgrounds:

[E.M.] Forster could not believe that a clerk might be genuinely thrilled by literature. (That prejudice is not dead among academics even today). Aping his betters, Bast pathetically grinds away at his Ruskin and puts in time at concerts. They mean nothing to him, yet he is always hoping for a “sudden conversion. A belief . . . which is particularly attractive to a half-baked mind. ... Of a heritage that may expand gradually he had no conception: he hoped to come to Culture suddenly, much as a Revivalist hopes to come to Jesus.” Yet that is precisely how Culture came to autodidacts: their memoirs commonly climax with The Book That Made All The Difference. For the leisured classes, a gradually expanding intellect is certainly a preferable approach to learning, but the self-educated have only limited time to make up enormous gaps. They must move quickly, they have hungrier minds, and they will passionately embrace any book that opens up a new intellectual landscape.

(Rose 2010: 404)

The effect of economics therefore on the pace at which working-class authors can engage with legitimate intellectual and cultural pursuits cannot be ignored, as well as how economics dictate their access to the material resources, such as books, that are necessary to this process. The use of dialect representation by Eaglestone, Hague and Hines demonstrates the nuanced individual interactions that they have experienced with the cultural norms associated with middle-class or bourgeois values. How they are coerced by, resist and negotiate these values in their writing present an insight into the complex roles the cultural values of literature, Yorkshire dialect and standard orthography play out in their straddling of, what are commonly perceived as, two distinct cultural spheres. What Bourdieu and Rose’s comments highlight is the ways in which aesthetics and cultural practices are tied up in class relations through the processes of social distinction. In this section I have discussed the ways in which forms of culture are legitimated. In 1.3.4. I briefly discuss perceptions of what constitutes artistic, articulate or literate practices as being structured by forces autonomous from these practices.

### 1.3.4. Autonomous Models

Bourdieu’s comment on the ‘autonomous field of artistic production’ in the sense of ‘a field that is capable of imposing its own norms on both the production and the consumption of its products’ (1984: 3-4) is also relevant to fields outside of art. The autonomous model of literacy (Street 1993), Standard Language Culture/Standard Language Ideology (Lippi-Green1997) and also the production and perpetuation of Standard written English demonstrate general perceptions of something structuring literacy and spoken language from the outside, rather than of these fields themselves imposing this structure. What these theories around the autonomous models of art, literacy, speech and writing explore is how perceptions of there being ‘proper’ forms of literacy, speech and art participate in wider social processes, such as social distinction or hegemonic power relations. Bourdieu has extended his approach to autonomous fields by exploring structuralist linguistics as a discipline that has traditionally separated out ‘‘external’ elements [...] from the ‘internal’ elements’ in an attempt to separate the ‘linguistic instrument from its social conditions of production and utilization’ (Bourdieu 1991: 33). Within the socially motivated discussions of language use and literary criticism that make up the discourses surrounding the dialect texts explored, these autonomous models prevail. For example when reviews accept or denounce Eaglestone’s work he is judged in terms of whether he can write ‘articulately’ and ‘well’ or by his failure to do either. To what degree his work conforms to what is considered ‘good’ writing or is recognisable as literary determines whether his book is worthy ‘literature’.

We use language to create social cohesion between ‘our’ group and social distinction from ‘another’ group, and, besides changes in which groups they feel they want to belong to, Eaglestone, Hague and Hines use dialect representation for these purposes (cf. Hermeston 2009 29-33, Coupland and Giles 1988). Bourdieu’s work on language, social distinction and legitimate culture is useful when examining the relationship these authors have with regional speech and literary writing as well as when looking at cultured beliefs about speech and writing. Investigating the cultural, social and political dimensions of the role of dialect representation within these authors’ works allows for an understanding of how cultured ideas about speech and writing informed their negotiation of the complex identity of the working-class author. A position that is made all the more difficult by the normative middle-class values of the literary establishment (Hitchcock 2000, Christopher and Whitson 1999, Williams 1982) and creates tensions similar to that of Richard Hoggart’s scholarship boy who ‘is at the friction-point of two cultures’ (Hoggart 1957: 239). In this section I have discussed autonomous models of art, literacy and language use alongside each other. Before moving on to the coal-mining aspect of this study I will briefly address a few points concerning the use and legitimacy of the terminology employed in this study.

### 1.3.5. A Note on ‘Non-Standard’, ‘Working-Class’ and ‘Yorkshire Dialect’

Throughout this thesis language varieties and stylistic elements of texts are at times described as ‘non-standard’ (such as orthography or forms of speech), this is currently necessary as non-standard is the understandable parlance of linguistics, although I wish to highlight this use of terminology as problematic (Milroy, 2001, Hickey 2010: 6,). Preferably Bakhtin’s use of the term ‘alien’ (čuźoj) could be used to describe forms of language that differ from the standard in literature and language ideology (Bakhtin 1991: 423). ‘Alien’ is used in his sense as other, another or someone else’s rather than referring to estrangement (although standard or legitimate forms of language and culture have an alienating or estranging effect on the authors explored) (Bakhtin 1991: 293-291, 423). The standard is a formally described and enshrined feature of language culture and works as a ‘unifying’ force in a heteroglossic environment. Every other form of language use should not therefore be described as non-standard as what is ‘standard’ or legitimate are culturally biased constructions, albeit with their ideological roots grounded in notions about making spoken or written signs ‘maximally understandable in a particular context’ (Kress and Van Leeuwen 1996: 12). Therefore the term ‘alien’ in Bakhtin’s usage emphasizes the difference of language varieties, cultural norms, or orthographical conventions to what is seen as standard and does not place them in a deficit position. What is standard is the standard for arbitrary reasons, this does not mean that everything else, which people legitimately do and have done with language on a daily basis, is non-standard. Snell discusses how bounded categories, such as the idea that there are ‘discrete dialects of English’, used to describe language use do not reflect linguistic reality (2012: 110). However more will be said on this topic in due course as discussions of what constitute standard, non-standard, prestigious, regional, vernacular, good, bad or authentic forms of speech or writing take place throughout this study. Although I accept that in recontextualising ‘alien’, a term from the glossary of a translation of Bakhtin, I am only really expressing my ideological standpoint towards the term ‘non-standard’ and my uneasiness with how it can be used to describe the majority of my speech and writing practices outside of academia.

‘Working-class’ is also a problematic term. Discussing class is contentious. Ideas about class are negotiated in complex ways in everyday interaction and have historically formed a large part of political and trade union discourses. For individuals how this complex discourse plays out in their lives is in many ways incredibly nuanced and also varies in the degrees that they are consciously or unconsciously negotiating ‘class’ values as this discourse is so heavily entangled with other aspects of social life and other discourses surrounding gender, region, vocation, economics, religion, education etc. Within discussions of literature, and especially within the reviews of the works explored in this study, class is reduced to a kind of ‘either-or’ situation. Authors are either a working-class author or they are not (cf. Blommaert and Varis 2011: 3-4). Why class is conceptualised in this way in discussions of literature is of interest to this study, in terms of the differing cultural values and practices of the cultural sphere of literature in relation to other cultural spheres. Another way to put it is this: why when everyday speech is represented in writing are we concerned with the accuracy of this representation? And why when authors write about the lives of ‘working-class’ people are we interested in the authenticity of their working-class identity? I explore the change in cultural values that occurs when day-to-day social life is represented in literary writing. For the authors within this study there is a disparity between the values, practices and culture of the regional mining communities in which they lived and wrote about, and those that they encountered enshrined in the institutions that they came into contact with. In a very real sense they discuss these disparities in terms of class and their work explores or demonstrates the inequalities that they faced coming from the backgrounds that they did and engaging with the world of literature. It is possible therefore to discuss these disparities in class terms. In this sense we can label these authors as ‘working-class writers’. If literature itself did not play a part in the reproduction of class values they would just be ‘writers’.

Yorkshire dialect in this study refers to the varieties of Yorkshire dialect that exist in the specific regions of Yorkshire where Eaglestone, Hague and Hines lived and worked, and a more general sense of this term as a form of ‘Northern English’ which is simultaneously a ‘cultural construct’ and a ‘reality’ (Wales 2006: 24). Kellet’s *Basic Broad Yorkshire* highlights the fact that for some Yorkshire dialect may be ‘irresistably comical and [they] may well regard Yorkshire dialect in particular as a quaint and clownish speech afflicting loudmouthed, slow-witted inhabitants of the barbaric North’ (Kellet 1992: 3). Why Yorkshire dialect may be associated with these negative qualities is due in part to the biases inherent in legitimate cultural practices. Ellis’s foreword to *Basic Broad Yorkshire* explains the nuances of Yorkshire dialect and also touches on the problems of writing it down:

‘Yorkshire dialect’ is so special that it seems to have become the property of the whole country more than the local talk of any county. Most people feel they know it when they hear it. They don’t all love it, they certainly don’t all understand it, but they accept that it exists.

The belief that Yorkshire dialect is a single entity poses problems when you try to define what it is. It’s not one, but many; books small enough and readable enough to give the real information about the varieties and nuances of Yorkshire dialect are few and far between. Perhaps the best ones in the past have been the simple word-lists that have given a great deal of pleasure to both Yorkshire folk and others. Academic books that are special and need training to sort out, have been written by scholars, but few want to wade through all that.

(Kellet 1992: ix)

Talking about Yorkshire dialect is to speak of a diverse range of linguistic varieties, practices and values. Writing about it in academic prose is a bit like Izaak Walton’s maxim concerning fishing: ‘a hour’s fishing with an angler will teach you better, both for these and many other common things, in the practical part of angling, than a week’s discourse’ (Walton and Cotton 1897 [1985]: 190). An hour’s interaction with Yorkshire speech and culture is a very different thing to a week spent reading academic prose about it, although it is my hope that this study will in some way shed some light on the relationship between Yorkshire dialect and academic prose, by looking at the relationship between Yorkshire speech and literary writing. As I have briefly touched on these authors’ working-class backgrounds, and the fact that they come from coal-mining communities, the specific act of representing coal-miners in literature needs to be expanded upon. This study’s focus on the figure, language and social practices of the coal-miner and coal-mining communities is due to the discrepancy, in terms of legitimacy, between the cultural values, linguistic choices and social practices of these communities and the literary sphere in which they are represented. How these three authors negotiate these cultural differences and engage with the normative and legitimate language attitudes, literacy practices and literary expectations that they encounter is a rich topic for discussion and one that necessitates an inter-disciplinary perspective.

## 1.4. Why Coal-Miners?

### 1.4.1. Miners in Literature

Exploring the works of authors from coal-mining communities is problematic due to the nature of these communities and the type of work that coal miners undertake. By the very nature of the coal-miners’ work their work-environment, and at-work speech and behaviour is inaccessible to those who do not have access to the mines. This means that writers who represent the speech of mining communities do not just have to negotiate perceptions of Northerners or the working-class but also public perceptions of miners and, the importance of mining to community life and the reality of pit-work. The types of knowledge and culture that are privileged in mining are not those that are privileged in the cultural sphere associated with literacy practices. The discrepancy between the two worlds leads to the creation of many stereotypes associated with mining communities that colour interpretations of literary works which include miners or influence the creation of these texts in the first place; although the reality of the miners’ world is unknown to most people, many already feel that they have an idea of what miners are ‘all about’. In discussions of dialect representation there is a notion that it is a technique that can be used to create stereotypical representations of a community of speakers by outsiders (Jaffe 2000: 509, Beal 2006: 536). Eaglestone, Hague and Hines play on expectations and stereotypes of Yorkshire coal-miners for various reasons and they all use a technique that is seen to index ‘authentic’ Yorkshire speech but which in reality is very different from natural Yorkshire speech. It is the problems of negotiating the various stereotypical assumptions concerning coal-miners, Northern communities, Yorkshire speech, the working-classes, illiteracy, being cultured, ‘good’ literature, appropriate speech and moral behaviour that face these authors when representing Yorkshire speech in literature which provides a rich site for exploration.

Eaglestone, Hague, and Hines all write about a region that since the 1984-85 miners’ strike has had its cultural and social landscape significantly changed. Their works are available in local studies libraries, or are part of the discourse surrounding the identity and culture of the region. Therefore, in part, this study serves to contribute to the cultural history of the South Yorkshire region in the twentieth century. Coal-mining villages grew up around a pit to serve as its labour and therefore the industry plays a huge role in the identity and socialisation of these communities (Dennis, Henriques and Slaughter 1956). The coal-miner, historically, is a figure linked to a strong sense of community, regional, political and masculine identity due to his role in the industry and the physical location of pit-communities (Griffiths 2007, Warwick and Littlejohn 1992). Due to the nature of pit work the pit is inaccessible, and therefore unknowable, to everyone except those who work there (Eaglestone 1984: 81). This means that the physical and linguistic environment of the mines is alien to those ‘up-top’ and representations of the miners’ work-place in texts struggle to explain the reality. In *Caverns of Night* a collection of essays concerned with the representation of miners in art, the editor William B. Thesing poses some questions concerning how to authentically represent coal-miners as well as arguing that there is a tension in representing the authentic masculine miners and their work in the artificial and perhaps effeminate aesthetic of art (2000: xxii).

To what extent does a coal-mining site serve as a metaphor for the times or for a given region of a country? As a single metaphor, can coal mining carry the weight of literary and philosophical needs? How can an artist make coal miners and coal-mining aesthetic without making them artificial, without denaturing their authenticity? [….] One of the themes running through all these essays is that coal miners and coal mining are real, authentic, even manly, whereas the aesthetic is artificial, fabricated, even effeminate [….] Every essay in the collection in one way or another struggles with the tensions found in the mixture of authenticity (coal miners, coal mining, the daily reality) and the aesthetic (the form, the artificial, the representation)

(Thesing 2000: xii –xxii).

What *Caverns of Night* and Thesing’s comments highlight is how the miner’s life has been used as a rich source of literary material. These tensions between authenticity and aesthetics are tied up with the inter-cultural process of representing not only the alien underground work environment in literature, but the cultural milieu that these mining communities create. The underground work environment of the mine can therefore be seen as a unique community of practice for a range of reasons (Gray 1976: 4-5). The coal-mine is an environment that is governed by natural forces and is inherently dangerous even though it has been engineered by human scientific progress and the interests of capitalism. The miner’s workplace is physically separate from the pit-top communities simply because they work underground, with the threat of the hazards of the mine enacting an influence upon their behaviour in various ways. Although those working below ground are members of the above ground communities the social dynamics below ground change due to the fact that miners work in a potentially dangerous and entirely male-dominated workplace. Therefore socialisation in the pits is not arbitrated by social or linguistic practices from other social groups, such as women (de Klerk 1997). Because of this, and also the technical nature of coal-mining, the pit-bottom was also the home of ‘pit-speech’, a speech variety that was not ‘respectable’ above ground but whose practices are similar in pits regardless of geographical location (National Coal Mining Museum 2007, Dennis, Henriques and Slaughter 1956: 212-220, see also Griffiths 2007 for a discussion of ‘pitmatic’). Perhaps due in part to this physical and social distance created by the underground environment, the regions in which these pit communities existed, and due to their only being nationally visible during times of industrial action or disaster there are many historically prevalent stereotypes concerning miners and their communities.

For many of the authors of the newspaper letters and reviews discussed in this study this information about the character of the miners and their communities is from second-hand sources and how the first-hand experiences of Eaglestone, Hague and Hines is negotiated and presented is in response to common views concerning these communities expressed at the time they were published. Representing a unique community of practice in a literary work to a community of readers, who hold many assumptions about this community already, involves a complex process of negotiation. This negotiation is even more complex due to the fact that literature, the medium through which this information is mediated, is a genre of written language that involves, for both readers and writers, a level of critical engagement and an understanding of literary skill or technique in order for its cultural assets to be accessible. This negotiation has to be undertaken because, according to Graham Holderness, the absence of the coal-mining industry from literature from the nineteenth century ‘was not mere absent mindedness or anachronism, but a systematic writing of a society’s industrial base out of its dominant literary form’ (1984: 20). The ‘uncouth’ cultural milieu of the mining village and the miner had to be legitimated by Eaglestone, Hague and Hines as subjects of literary worth when brought into the cultural sphere of literature.

### 1.4.2. Lawrence

D.H. Lawrence is perhaps the most prominent English author who represented coal-miners in his work, as well as their speech and community life (see *Sons and Lovers* 1913 [1992] and *The Daughter-in-Law* 1912, Maurice 2004, Eaglestone 1927, 1948). Within canonical literature and literary scholarship Lawrence is the writer to turn to for anything to do with miners (cf. Albert 2000). There are many other authors and literary heritages that explore coal-mining life, yet Lawrence is the most legitimate within literary discourse (Thesing 2000, Maurice 2004). As Eaglestone, Hague and Hines’ literary works are created against the backdrop of Lawrence’s position in literary criticism his work serves as a useful starting point for looking at representations of coal-miners in literature. Lawrence’s essay on ‘Nottingham and the Mining Countryside’ draws together many of the themes that will be explored in this study such as regional dialect, the working environment of the mines, and how to represent miners in literature. In this essay Lawrence discusses life in his hometown of Eastwood, a mining village in Nottinghamshire:

So that the life was a curious cross between industrialism and the old agricultural England of Shakespeare and Milton, and Fielding and George Eliot. The dialect was broad Derbyshire, and always 'thee' and 'thou'. [….] Under the butty system, the miners worked underground as a sort of intimate community, they knew each other practically naked, and with curious close intimacy, and the darkness and the underground remoteness of the pit 'stall' and the continual presence of danger, made the physical, instinctive, and intuitional contact between men very highly developed, a contact almost as close as touch, very real and very powerful. This physical awareness and intimate togetherness was at its strongest down pit. When the men came up into the light, they blinked. They had, in a measure, to change their flow.

(Lawrence 1929)

Some of Lawrence’s comments on the miners and their community can be used analogously to describe aspects of this study. The ‘intimacy’, ‘togetherness’ and ‘comradeship’ of the miners working underground and socialising above ground demonstrate the unique social position that miners occupy. The differences in language use of the miners at the pit-bottom and above ground can be linked to Lawrence’s comments on the miners coming up to the ‘light’ and having to ‘change their flow’. Adequately representing this environment and how this vocation affects the character and language of the miners to those above ground in ways that they can understand, is a task that all the authors in this study have attempted to a greater or lesser degree at various points in their writing careers. This is a task that involves discussing the dangers of mine-work as well as its mundane, technical and social aspects. What is the norm below ground is alien above, and is made even more alien by the fact that an environment that is simply the way of life for the miner is represented through the norms of literature to people who may have no knowledge of rural working-class pit communities, let alone pit-work. When Lawrence speaks of ‘the old agricultural England of Shakespeare and Milton, and Fielding and George Eliot’ he is romanticising this aesthetic over an industrial one, by referring to legitimate literary authors who have written about the agricultural countryside. Arguably Lawrence’s comments are in line with a class aesthetic that sees the industrial landscape as offensive. Within Theodor Adorno’s work he talks of the ‘bourgeois condemnation’ of industrial landscapes as ‘part of the ideology of domination’ (Adorno 1970 [1997]: 64-65). This essay by Lawrence was written for an issue of the *Architectural Review* which was planned to ‘explore the deleterious effects of industrialisation on the face of England’ (Boulton ed. 2004: 285). Lawrence touches on this aesthetic when he says ‘[t]he country is so lovely: the man-made England is so vile’ (Boulton ed. 2004: 285). For Thesing ‘[c]reative works about coal mining, then, are about industrial aesthetics and identities’ (2000: xii). Looking at to what degree Eaglestone, Hague and Hines legitimate their ‘industrial aesthetics and identities’ within a literary aesthetic, or conform to already legitimate ideas about what constitutes a literary aesthetic, provides an insight into the complex relationship between literary practices and language ideologies.

### 1.4.3. Cultural Tension in Literature

In quoting Lawrence here I am enacting the tension that is present in the work of all the authors in this study: that certain types of literature and language are legitimate and therefore socio-cultural value is placed on their use and on certain aesthetics. Yet I would also like to couch my reference to Lawrence within Eaglestone’s criticism of Lawrence’s representation of the miner in the form of Morel in *Sons and Lovers*:

[Morel] the collier father, must not be accepted as a representative worker in the Nottinghamshire coalfield. Lawrence saw his own father (upon whom Morel is based) through the distorting glass of domestic infelicity. Unfortunately, he distorted the collier too. Must we suppose that because Mr. and Mrs Morel of the story never went out together, the Nottinghamshire miners and their wives have somehow ceased to enjoy the pub, the club, the cinema or the chapel? In reading Lawrence, the focus should bear not upon the collier, but on the author himself.

(Eaglestone 1948)

For Eaglestone, Lawrence’s literary representation of the miner in *Sons and Lovers* ‘should be approached with the greatest caution’ for although it ‘has scenes of remarkable power’ it is only representative of Lawrence’s father and should not be seen as a ‘mining novel’ (Eaglestone 1948). Yet at this point in this thesis, and more generally in literary discourse, Lawrence is known and Eaglestone is unknown. Lawrence has become sufficiently legitimized for me to quote him in academic research without justification. He is an author from a working-class background who is now seen as legitimately part of the canon of English literature and in his above quotation he explains the agricultural aspects of his hometown by invoking legitimate literary authors. Although Lawrence himself felt that he could not fully move into the middle-classes or go back to the working classes (Boulton ed. 2004: 33-40). Understanding that literature plays a role in the legitimation of certain values gives us a pushing off point when looking at these authors who demonstrate the resources and opportunities, or materiality (Pahl and Rowsell 2010: 2-3, 133), involved in acquiring ‘correct’ speech or an appreciation of ‘good’ literature.

Each of these case studies looks at the influence that the vocation of coal-mining had on the identity of each of these authors and how they used legitimate literary practices to explore this: Arthur Eaglestone’s aspirations caused an internal tension between his interests and his regional community, a feeling of alienation that was only resolved once he left this community and returned as a WEA tutor; Tom Hague pushed against legitimate culture and Conservative politics because of his strong coal-mining identity, simultaneously insulting the enemies of the miners by mocking stereotypes concerning his own community – whilst also challenging his own class identity and critiquing his community; and Hines showed the role a biased education system has on determining school boy Billy Casper’s future in the mines, with his use of and comments on dialect representation highlighting the cultural norms of literature. In each text examined the author’s use of dialect representation is intrinsically linked with the political, social or literary aims of their writing. The struggles that face the mining communities which these authors present are physical (with coal), involve personal negotiations (with deputies, officials and those who deal with wages) and political (extending from their wage struggles, as an industrial force of labour and with the institutions that govern and determine their day to day lives). Thesing summarises many of the reasons why authors may choose to represent mining life in literature and these include: to document the mines as geographical spaces in ‘journalistic and scientific detail’, to portray ‘soot and smoke’ whether to highlight their harmful effects or to create atmosphere, to ‘use art for the purposes of social reform’ by focussing on the hazards and exploitation associated with mining, or to focus on questions of gender, race and class (2000 xiii). The purposes for the representation of mining communities in Eaglestone, Hague and Hines’ works vary and will be explored in detail. In each of their works we can see a commitment to creating more nuanced public understanding of life for Yorkshire coal-mining communities in the light of stereotypes and assumptions made about these people.

### 1.4.4. The ‘Rough’ Miner

 In the preface to his *A Pitman’s Anthology* William Maurice, writing with his daughter Monica, addresses the hardship of pit-life and the perceived uncouth behaviour of miners when introducing his ‘warts and all’ approach to the creation of this anthology. Maurice does this in order to legitimate the ‘uncouth’ yet ‘fine’ qualities of the culture of the miners’:

This is not a compilation for the critical eyes of the literary stylist, nor will it comfort the social moralist.

Our intention is to portray every aspect of ‘pit’ life as it was, and as it, to some extent remains. The crudenesses, the vulgarities, the indecencies, the swearings, the drunkenness; (not so many years ago when a miner was brought before one of the compliers to be reprimanded for being drunk he protested that it was quite impossible, he had ‘only had a couple of gallons’) all these truly represent some, and no inconsiderable group of miners. It goes without saying that there are others, very many others, whose lives are gracious and entirely admirable. One of us lived for many years in their homes and the other was born in a colliery village and knows them very well. Both are agreed that there are no men of finer quality in the British Isles, and no kinder women.

(Maurice 1944 [2004]: 34-35)

In collecting together poems, songs and stories from various literary authors the compilers do have to make an apology of sorts for the behaviour of some of the represented miners and here Maurice touches on one of the central problems in representing miners in literature; the moral disparity between the cultural practices of the ‘average’ miner and that of the cultured sphere of literature and its associated values. The qualification of the miners as ‘fine’ men is one that is made by various authors within this thesis and the reason that this occurs regularly can only be explained by a general belief that miners are far from fine men for all the reasons that the Maurices’ list. Crude, vulgar and indecent are also the types of descriptions used to discuss socially unacceptable language such as swearing and, in many cases, regional dialects. Investigating how Eaglestone, Hague and Hines demonstrate the ‘fine’ qualities of the miners, and their communities, as well as negotiate how their speech and actions are seen as unintelligent and vulgar serves to explore how relativistic social judgements, concerning speech and culture, influence the sphere of literary discourse due to the legitimised biased ideologies that have been enshrined within this genre.

Examining the representation of Yorkshire speech in historical texts contributes to the language history of these communities. Understandably there is a lack of linguistic research on miners at work underground in the Yorkshire region. Although unfortunately this is the case, this study will discuss the differences in the speech and behaviour of miners below and above ground in relation to the works explored in this study. For example, Eaglestone makes explicit reference to the nature of speech underground. Much of what I know about the linguistic behaviour of miners in the mines is from discussing this informally with former or working miners at the National Coal Mining Museum, or elsewhere, and from books.[[5]](#footnote-5) This point is comparable to the tension in the representation of not only miners but of linguistic information in literature; ‘authentic’ speech or experiences are mediated through someone else and usually in a different medium. What can be said however is that speech in the mines differs from speech ‘up-top’ for a variety of reasons that link with gender, vocation, region, environment and workplace and this difference may be because it features more swearing, technical terms or informalities in conversations that are dictated by the tensions of physical work and the work-place. Dennis, Henriques and Slaughter in *Coal is Our Life* sum this question up in a much more succinct manner due to first-hand experience of pit-work: ‘[t]he point is, one never hears such a conversation in the other places where men gather; this collier felt free to speak in this way in the pit, to his mates’(1956: 216). What Eaglestone, Hague, and Hines achieve is the translation of this ‘rough’ pit and community environment into the ‘polished’ sphere of literature to be read, in the case of Eaglestone, predominantly by middle-class readers with no knowledge of the mines, or, in the cases of Hague and Hines by the communities they lived in and a wider audience. My interest is in this translation, not only of speech into writing, but of one cultural sphere into another and how these authors write miners and their communities into literature using dialect representation. This process is one that involves negotiating ideas concerning the social value of literature and the legitimacy of forms of culture. Now that I have laid the theoretical foundations for the following case studies, drawn together work on literacy and spoken language and introduced the coal-mining aspect of this study some more practical issues concerning the case studies will be addressed in the following section.

## 1.5. Case Studies

### 1.5.1. Methodology

My approach to the question of dialect representation is one that aims to develop existing methodologies for exploring the cultural links between orality and literacy. This study aims to look at the interface between speech and writing, in this case vernacular speech and literary writing, and in doing so serves to probe the boundaries of socio-linguistics, literacy studies and literary criticism. This is done for more practical than theoretical reasons. Although each academic discipline has its preferred part of English language to focus on and explore, individuals operate from the position of spoken and written language users. The sophistication and complexity with which individuals negotiate this space is at present only visible through a combination of academic lenses. In looking closely at how three authors negotiate the socio-cultural overlap between speech and writing this study aims to contribute to on-going discussions about bringing the study of spoken language and literacy together (cf. Maybin 2013). The questions that these analyses present go some way in problematizing and consolidating the ‘dominant lenses through which writing is understood and analysed’ (Lillis and McKinney 2013: 415). The following case studies involve in-depth analysis of texts using a range of lenses in order to undertake a situated exploration of the meta-linguistic framing surrounding the use of dialect representation in the works of three authors. In undertaking this study the collected papers of three authors have been explored. For each author these papers are used to inform an analysis that centres around one of their published works.

As I am interested in the complex social web within which these authors were positioned when they wrote their texts, this thesis involves three case studies. Each case study looks in fine detail at the cultural negotiations that these authors undertook in the creation of their texts and the surrounding discussions that informed or criticised their writing. Although these are literary texts, they are informed by the cultural value of vernacular speech and literary writing. Each text was published in a different era of the twentieth century: Eaglestone’s *From a Pitman’s Notebook* was published in 1925, Hines’ *A Kestrel for a Knave* in 1968 and Hague’s *Totley Tom: The tales of a Yorkshire miner* in 1976. There is a chronology in the case studies even though Hine’s *A Kestrel for a Knave* was published before Hague’s text and his case study is positioned last. This is because my discussion of Hines’ work centres around comments he made about his book over thirty years after it was published. Eaglestone’s case study involves the exploration of issues that are also relevant to the case studies that follow, it is also the discussion for which I have had the most comprehensive archival sources, and so its length reflects this. In contrast the Hines chapter essentially focusses on one issue and is informed by the discussions that precede it, and so less time is needed for analysis. In all three case studies newspaper articles and reviews from each period will play a role in contributing to the discourses surrounding these authors’ representations of dialect, their ‘authenticity’, literary style or their public political identity. Each text represents Yorkshire dialect but raises different questions about the relationship between orthography, speech and cultural value. This means that although the same theoretical framing is drawn on in the case studies, each of these chapters is necessarily shaped by the specifics of the investigated author and literary texts or the information contained in the archival documents that support each discussion. In the Eaglestone case study existing literary criticism, from scholars or reviewers, is used to discuss his works. For Hague, resources which engage in this type of discourse are not available and so in his chapter I explore his writings to provide a sense of the themes and issues his work addresses. The issues explored in Hines’ chapter relate to how his meta-linguistic comments relate to his literary writing and so engaging with existing literary criticism and formulating my own critical position is necessary for the investigation of his use of dialect representation. Also in terms of concluding remarks for these three chapters Eaglestone and Hines’ chapters end with further questioning or exploration of some of the issues their texts raised in relation to relevant theory, whereas Hague’s chapter ends with a more straightforward summary. In Hague’s case I have a responsibility in terms of creating a more comprehensive representation or a more ‘positive’ criticism of his works because of the lack of previous scholarship on his writing. The final summary of this thesis serves to draw together the issues raised in the these three case studies.

Due to the volume of archival resources explored in order to understand the background of the texts explored each of these works is discussed in relation to these resources, rather than within a traditional literature review of the relevant genres or authors. On the one hand this is done to use the literary and socio-cultural discourses that these authors engaged with to explore how they were negotiating their literary identities. For example by looking at class in Hines’ work using his own views on class. On the other hand it wasn’t until the archive texts had been investigated that it became clear what genres of traditional literature they touched on and what problems these texts presented. In some respects then this thesis operates as an exploration of a very specific genre of writing, that of South Yorkshire dialect writing by authors from coal-mining communities. This niche genre links to a multitude of genres, and associated discourses, touching on genres such as working-class literature, autodidact literature, coal-mining cultural history, Yorkshire dialect writing and performative collier poetry (which can be linked to coal-field folk song). Examples of writing from all of these genres are collected in Maurice’s A *Pitman’s Anthology* (2004) which has served as an existing literature review of pre-1944 representations of miners in literature.[[6]](#footnote-6)

### 1.5.2. Collected Papers

As the main focus of this study is on the papers of authors that I have personally collected, or have not been the subject of much published scholarship, representing these papers and the authors that wrote them is central to this investigation. Therefore careful attention will be paid to the autobiographical or biographical archival resources of the authors discussed in their respective case studies. This is to give a clear sense of the background which these authors came from, or at least the background which they present, and to create an understanding of the social practices within which these authors engaged. As Eaglestone and Hague’s works are no longer in print, and overall there is very little scholarship concerning all three of these authors, the biographical sections of these case studies will also serve to display the authors own words, as well as to reflect the research process undertaken in collecting and exploring their papers. These papers have all been archived in the University of Sheffield’s special collections. Arthur Eaglestone’s papers were donated to the University after I made contact with his daughter Ruth Hunt and grandson Andrew Lockett. This was made possible due to the assistance of Rawmarsh musician, author and Eaglestone scholar Ray Hearne. Ruth Hunt also contributed an oral history interview.[[7]](#footnote-7) I arranged the donation of Tom Hague’s papers with his grandchildren Sharon Hall and Russell Hague and I conducted oral history interviews with them about Hague along with Sheila Hall, Sharon’s mother and Hague’s daughter.[[8]](#footnote-8) Professor John Widdowson identified a correspondence he had with Hague that was stored in the archive of Culture and Tradition, previously stored in the National Centre for English Cultural Tradition and Language, as well as informally discussing what he remembered of Hague. Barry Hines’ papers were donated by his wife Eleanor in 2008, after Hines developed Alzheimer’s disease. Neither the Eaglestone or Hague papers have previously been studied, and at the time of writing only Vice (2011) has investigated the Hines papers. It is my hope that this study will encourage others to make use of these resources.[[9]](#footnote-9)

# 2. The Authentic Voice of the Miner in Arthur Eaglestone’s *From a Pitman’s Notebook*

## 2.1 Introduction

R.D. ‘Look here, sonny – what would you like to be if you didn’t work down the pit?’

BOY. ‘A butcher.’

R.D. ‘Then why didn’t you go into a butcher’s shop?’

BOY. ‘Me father made me come in t’pit.’

R.D. ‘Do you like the pit?’

BOY. ‘Aw it’s all reight – when yer get used to it.’

(Eaglestone 1925: 145-146)

This chapter will look at the ‘authentic’ representation of Yorkshire coal-miners’ speech in the work of Arthur Eaglestone (b.1892-d.1980) author of *From a Pitman’s Notebook* (from here on abbreviated to *FAPN*) and later works. The critical success of *FAPN* when it was published in 1925 was due to what reviewers saw as Eaglestone’s ability to write truthfully, and in a worthy way, about the lives of Yorkshire coal-miners, with one reviewer exclaiming that the ‘blind mole thinks’ and another that the ‘miner writes from burrow’ (Hearne 1996: 298). Language attitudes and expectations surrounding authentic, appropriate and literary language use influence Eaglestone’s writing and reviewers’ responses. Eaglestone’s use of non-standard orthography is the point at which ideas concerning appropriate, regional and authentic language use intersect with ideological stances on literacy and art. The formal object of non-standard orthography brings to the fore how socially motivated individuals, like Eaglestone, negotiate their position within the cultural overlap between speech and writing. Successfully negotiating the cultural sphere of literature involves engaging at a high level with ideas about literacy, art and language. At the same time Eaglestone’s book, through its use of non-standard orthography, also presents ‘bad’ and vernacular language. How Eaglestone’s reviewers responded to Eaglestone’s representation of vernacular speech and working-class culture demonstrates how literary discourse is involved in the creation of social distinction.

Eaglestone’s works are no longer in print and although he had a successful career in writing and teaching, his books are only really visible within a local history context. This case study explores how Eaglestone came to write *FAPN* and why he represented coal-miners in the way that he did.Its findings are displayed through a biography of Eaglestone, which looks at his experiences of working in industry as well as how he educated himself, and through three analyses, which look at newspaper reviews of and extracts from *FAPN.* These analyses examine the role that language attitudes play in Eaglestone’s representation of the miners and in reviews of *FAPN*, by examining ‘bad’ language, Standard Language Ideology and the internal language system of the book itself. This is done to explore the social milieu of the period in which Eaglestone was writing and to give a sense of the complex process of negotiation that he undertook when representing his colleagues and community in a work of literature. Investigating Eaglestone’s authenticity in this way is done in order to see how language attitudes and cultural notions influence the *idea of authenticity* that plays out in the writing process and reviews of *FAPN,* rather than judge whether it presents authentic voices (Hakala 2010: 389, Blommaert and Varis 2011, see also Coupland 2010). The complex social and cultural position that Eaglestone occupied when he wrote FAPN is explored by examining the negotiation process, and the difficulties Eaglestone faced, when writing in an ‘authentic’ way about his experiences. Each part of this analysis also contributes to the notion that, in representing the miners, Eaglestone’s writing demonstrates formal and cultural tensions between speech and writing.

### 2.1.1 *From a Pitman’s Notebook*

*FAPN* documents Eaglestone’s day-to-day experiences of working in the ‘New Tollgate Main’ colliery, its real name being the New Stubbin Colliery, and was written under his pen-name ‘Roger Dataller’. It attempts to show to a generally middle-class readership what life was like for those who worked in the mines and lived in the local Rawmarsh community, which supported and was in turn supported by this colliery, between the years of 1922 and 1924. The reason for the use of pseudonyms was due to the fact that Eaglestone depended on his employment in the pit as an assistant timekeeper and could not afford to get into trouble with the management. Although Eaglestone worked in the pit he was an aspiring writer who wished to pursue a more academic career. In *FAPN* Eaglestone represents a working-class community whose work-life is mostly unseen by the middle-class audiences he was writing for. These miners are represented through Eaglestone’s literary talents and these talents were developed through his autodidactic interest in literature. Eaglestone wrote *FAPN* in an attempt to improve the conditions of the miners, whilst at the same time it also provided an opportunity for him to engage with the cultural sphere of literature and to become a published author. His representation of the miners’ speech, under and above ground, influenced reviewers’ judgements of his text as authentic or inauthentic. It was this demonstration of authenticity and talent in *FAPN* that contributed to its success and enabled Eaglestone to move from working in industry to working with literature, as a writer and teacher, through the award of a Miners Welfare Scholarship to study at New College, Oxford.

The role Eaglestone plays as the mediator of the authentic experiences of the coal-miners is complex and negotiates a variety of socio-cultural ideologies. Some cultural aspects of his work are, however, problematic due to the tension between his personal interest in literature and his endeavour to tell the world of the life of the coal-miner. It is not my interest here to critique Eaglestone for the choices he makes in writing *FAPN* – I will leave this task in the hands of reviewers from the time that the book was published –but rather specifically to explore the challenging negotiations involved in making those choices. This chapter is an exploration of the processes involved in the mediation of vernacular speech, in a work of literature for a mass audience. Eaglestone’s biography will provide an anchor point for comparison when looking at the judgements of Eaglestone’s authenticity by reviewers. In focussing in particular on his interest in literature, his work-life in industry and his coming to writing I do not wish to be deterministic and suggest that because Eaglestone had certain educational and developmental experiences it was inevitable that he wrote in the way that he did. However, I will be tracing the relationship between how Eaglestone presents himself and his work colleagues in *FAPN,* and what we can understand of Eaglestone in this period from archive resources by looking at the social practices in which he was engaged. The analyses that follow the biography look at three different ways in which *FAPN* appeared authentic or inauthentic to reviewers: the first deals with moral ideas associated with language use by examining reviewers’ reactions to the miners’ swearing; the second looks at cultural ideas about prestigious forms of language use by looking at the implications of Eaglestone’s use of non-standard orthography to represent speech, including a discussion of reactions to what was seen as Eaglestone’s inauthentic ‘superiority’ to the miners; the third investigates how the internal language system of *FAPN* reflects the socio-cultural pressures that Eaglestone was negotiating at the time that it was written.The biographical aspect of this chapter is necessary to this investigation of authenticity, not as a way of measuring authenticity in terms of accuracy, but to understand why and how Eaglestone mediates vernacular language.

### 2.1.2. Biographical Resources

In order to undertake this biographical research, as well as the subsequent case studies, I draw on the following information: Eaglestone’s unpublished memoir, *A Yorkshire Lad* (from here on abbreviated to *AYL*), written towards the end of Eaglestone’s life and deposited in the Rotherham archives in 1984;[[10]](#footnote-10) Eaglestone’s papers, which include, amongst a vast number of other texts, a scrapbook of newspaper articles tracing Eaglestone’s literary career and his personal letters; an interview with Eaglestone’s daughter Ruth Hunt; newspaper articles from the Sheffield Local Studies Library; existing scholarly work on Eaglestone by Ray Hearne, who attempted to create interest in Eaglestone’s works in the late nineties by reappraising his work, and Jonathon Rose, who uses Eaglestone’s life and career as a way of discussing how a working-class author educated himself; and finally Eaglestone’s published autobiographical works *FAPN, A Pitman Looks at Oxford* and *Oxford into Coalfield*.

The scrapbook of newspaper cuttings in the Eaglestone papers was kept by Eaglestone himself and it is a testament to the man in the fact that he not only kept positive reviews but the negative ones as well. It would have been almost impossible to track down all the articles from various sources contained in this scrapbook and it is this diversity of opinions that enables the analysis undertaken in this case study. The reviews are not limited to UK publications and in most cases where the cuttings are pasted into the scrapbook contextual information, such as the source of the cutting and the date is handwritten next to them. In some cases there is not much contextual information about the date, author or publication. Wear of the scrapbook itself also means that reading the handwritten notes is problematic. Amongst the Eaglestone papers there is also a large number of letters from various figures such as Phyllis Bentley, William Empson and John Middleton Murry. In exploring Eaglestone’s background there are two questions that I wish to answer: Who was Eaglestone? And why did he write and publish *FAPN*? The first question will be answered through a biography of Eaglestone. The second will be answered by paying particular attention to aspects of Eaglestone’s life in this biography and also by exploring Eaglestone’s literary relationship with John Middleton Murry. Answering both of these questions will contribute to an understanding of the position Eaglestone was in when he wrote *FAPN*,which can then be contrasted with criticism of his writing style and narrative voice. This will ultimately facilitate further exploration of *FAPN* with regards to work on language attitudes.

## 2.2 Biography

### 2.2.1. Interest in Literature

Born in Parkgate in 1892, and one of seven children, Eaglestone was raised in the shadow of the local steelworks (Eaglestone 1984: 9). Mining was in the family. Eaglestone’s grandfather, Isaac, had been a miner, immigrating from Staffordshire in the 1880s to work in the Aldwarke colliery near Rotherham. His father Amos worked in the pits as a pony boy before setting up a ‘small mineral water business’ with his brother Walter (Eaglestone 1984: 6-7). Amos was by Eaglestone’s own description not ‘well-read’, and was therefore ‘not interested in books of any description’ (Eaglestone 1984: 8). From this background, where reading and books were not of value, Eaglestone went on to develop a deep-seated interest and love for literature. It was the combination of Eaglestone’s interest in literature, arts and politics that led him to write. Yet it was his experiences of working in heavy industry that provided the subject matter for his writing and therefore the means by which Eaglestone was able to change to a career in academia and literature.

During his childhood education at the local primary and Sunday schools Eaglestone showed promise in drawing:

Anonymously as one in a class of forty others – I think I found salvation in art [….] Spending my pocket money on Indian ink and Bristol Board [drawing paper]

(Eaglestone 1984: 12)

This initial interest and talent for art was how Eaglestone expressed himself as an individual. Teaching in this class of forty involved the ‘oral hammering’ of rote learning and was not wholly satisfactory (Eaglestone 1984: 11). However Eaglestone found literature to be a resource that satisfied his curiosity after taking an initial interest in books, especially the historical adventure stories of G.A. Henty because of their pictures (Eaglestone 1984: 13). At the age of twelve Eaglestone attempted to make the most of the local Public Library to satisfy his interests. After borrowing *Treasure Island* at 7:50pm, beginning reading it as he descended the steps of the library and returning it finished an hour later the librarian was sceptical about whether Eaglestone had thoroughly read it and the denial of a second lend was humiliating enough for a child who ‘had read every word’ (Eaglestone 1984: 5-6). Hungering for books and being an interested and artistically talented young boy, the opening of the local Carnegie library on Rawmarsh Hill by local M.P. Sir William H. Holland was, with hindsight, a moment of great significance for Eaglestone:

For Sir William reached out that day and over the heads of the assembled dignitaries, set the key firmly in my fingers. It was the first step in the devious trail that eventually brought me before the grey gatehouse of New College, Oxford. Of course, I did not notice the sign at that moment, being a mere habitué of the JUVENILE ROOM (closed down later on account of juvenile misconduct!); but as time went on, I became so closely enamoured of the Library, that in one acid moment my mother exclaimed that I might as well pack my clothes in a box and go and live there!

(Eaglestone 1984: 19-20)

Eaglestone’s interest in books and reading was at odds with his home-life and the family soft drinks business. Although borrowing books from the Carnegie library was free, lending was not unrestricted. Eaglestone managed to bypass the restrictions on lenders by volunteering his help to the Carnegie librarian and he was paid a shilling for every night he covered the library counter in the librarian’s absence (Eaglestone 1984: 20-21).

### 2.2.2. ‘Unguided’ Literary Education

In this period of Eaglestone’s life he ‘was reading voraciously at the rate of one book a day’, by authors such as ‘Henty, Stevenson, Doyle, Haggard [and] Weyman’(Eaglestone1984: 20). This unrestricted access to the library’s collection satisfied Eaglestone’s appetite for literature and allowed him to pursue an interest in literature which was not privileged in his home life (Eaglestone 1984: 20). Initially intending to read all seven thousand books in the library collection alphabetically Eaglestone settled into a less systematic and a more fancy-based approach which led him to read books on history, art, politics, philosophy and literature: the quality of a book’s illustrations being important to a child with a keen interest in drawing. The library provided Eaglestone with an early literary education and, being a public institution, the collection was specifically chosen and the ‘literariness’ of the books was to some degree pre-ordained:

Thereafter I roamed at will, searching the while, for pictures to reproduce. Here was an amazing volume on Pompeii, with exquisite line drawings of the wall-paintings – tumblers, dancing girls, warriors – Cassell’s profusely illustrated Battles of the Nineteenth Century was there; an album containing reproductions of Rembrandt, Rubens, Watteau, Corst, Gibbon was there and Froude and Freeman, and of course, Macaualay; Mill on Liberty, and Spencer on First Principles. There was a library edition of Pepys, though no one ever troubled to take it out. For some time in a political fit I turned to the speeches of Gladstone, Beaconsfield, Cobden, and Bright [….] [A]ll the time it must be remembered that, I was reading without guidance, unrelated to any scheme of education. On the positive side, I am quite certain that before a year had passed, I had a better knowledge of the range of English literature than most boys of my age.

(Eaglestone 1984: 21-22)

Without free access to books through the Carnegie library Eaglestone would not have been able to give himself this literary education. This obsession with books led to Eaglestone’s first step towards his writing career as his participation in the library led him to enter and win an essay competition, winning not only a prized book but the consideration by his parents that ‘there was something – however tenuous – in this library business after all’ (Eaglestone 1984: 23). Unfortunately, however much this type of success pointed to a more academic career for Eaglestone, these endeavours were not held in such high regard with his family, and Amos already had plans for the young Arthur to join the family soft drinks business:

When – as sometimes happened – a friend or relation inquired what was going to be “done with Arthur”, my father would answer smoothly, as though the issue could not under any circumstances be disputed: “The Business!” My proficiency with the pencil, and the possibility of “good returns” in the profession of Architecture once being mentioned by an acute, and to me, sympathetic observer, was answered on my father’s part by frigid silence. It was all settled. There were “good returns” in the Business too [….] I had not the slightest interest in the manufacture and sale of mineral waters, and could not see myself doing this for the rest of my life. On the contrary, my recent interest in the Library, and my proficiency with the sketching-block, had started other ideas in my mind. Wistfully I dwelt upon the career of an artist; but I said nothing. I knew a brick wall when I saw one…..

 (Eaglestone 1984: 24-25)

Already at this early stage Eaglestone’s aspirations and interests were at odds with his situation and his father’s plans for his future in the business. This caused a tension between Eaglestone’s professional aspirations and what was required of him. This tension was compounded by his developing political opinions and the politicians and intellectuals that Eaglestone was brought into contact with through these interests.

### 2.2.3. Politics and Activism

Eaglestone’s interest in reading political speeches was brought about by his engagement with the library, but his interests were developed over many years by his participation in the Independent Labour Party and the Young Liberals. During this period when he was working for his father as an adolescent, Eaglestone’s financial security was dependent on the success of the family business and, in contrast to his later careers in the steel mill and mine, allowed him the freedom to pursue these political activities. Eaglestone became interested in ‘Free Trade and Tariff Reform’, ‘Home Rule for Ireland’ and ‘Social Reform’ and he comments that Local Labour leaders took their inspiration more from ‘the New Testament’ and ‘the writings of Ruskin and Morris’ than Marx (Eaglestone 1984: 29). Whilst attending a public debate between Rev. T Swann and Francis Neilson Eaglestone recalls that he was: ‘[l]istening intently to this dialectic [….] [t]he verbal dexterity pleased me. I wanted more.’ (Eaglestone 1984: 30). These experiences left Eaglestone in a position where he was yearning for more intellectual debate. It was nigh on impossible to elicit discussion about anything other than business matters from his father and after attending a local lecture on Oliver Cromwell Eaglestone’s precocious questioning annoyed the speaker (Eaglestone 1984: 31-34). The solution was to enrol in the classes of the Worker’s Educational Authority. The academic rhetoric that Eaglestone encountered was unfamiliar to him, as he was used to the ‘pulpit oration’ of the Methodist chapel; however, the classes provided another avenue to pursue his academic interests (Eaglestone 1984: 35). As an adolescent Eaglestone pursued his combined interests in drawing, literature, politics and rhetoric in his free time and his enthusiasm for them demonstrated his aptitude for academic pursuits. Yet these pursuits suggested a career which was at odds with his father’s plans.

### 2.2.4. Further Education?

The security of the family business allowed Eaglestone to take part in public speaking and other activities; however, it couldn’t last forever. Inspired by Georgism and taking an interest in Land Values reform Eaglestone was convinced to speak publically on the subject (Eaglestone 1984: 38-39). This first attempt at public speaking was unsuccessful but before long Eaglestone ‘found [himself] the secretary of a local branch of the League of Young Liberals’ and subscribing to the liberal *Manchester Guardian* (Eaglestone 1984: 40). Eaglestone acted as a dogsbody for Joseph Pease, the Liberal MP for his constituency, and this brought him right into the middle of political activity in his area. However, whilst looking back on the benefits of this period of intense political activity, Eaglestone reflects that it also had a negative effect on the character of his younger self:

I have no doubt at all that I was at this time, an eager, humourless, and vastly intolerant young person. I could not imagine a Tory who was not a prevaricator, a hard-faced exploiter of the poor: ignorant, yet at the same time designing, public spirited, but only for his own essential purpose.

(Eaglestone 1984: 43)

Eaglestone’s engagement in politics inscribed on him certain views and characteristics as well as allowing him to develop intellectually. He took part in debate and questioning at the speeches of local MPs and attended political talks by Winston Churchill and George Bernard Shaw. These experiences further whetted Eaglestone’s appetite for debate, discussion and reading which led to problems with his father and his career in the bottling factory:

Meanwhile interpenetrating the coining of oratorical phrases and the shaping of political argument was the problem of vocation. What did I want to do? Young Liberal ventures and excursions, engrossing enough in their own fashion were spare-time activities and quite impossible as a means of livelihood. There seemed not the smallest chance of a secondary education; and as for the University, in the present mood of my father (who could have afforded the venture) I might just as well have cried for the moon.

(Eaglestone 1984: 47)

By his own account it was Amos’s views on further education and literary pursuits that hindered Eaglestone’s hopes for a different career rather than financial constraints. However the Eaglestones’ financial security was brought into jeopardy when the family mineral water business came into direct competition with the local brewery, which in turn increased the tensions between Amos and Arthur. The brewery had decided to manufacture soft drinks and supply their own public houses with them, these public houses making up a large part of the Eaglestone family’s business. The decline towards bankruptcy affected Amos enormously and Eaglestone bore the brunt of his frustrations:

Indeed the greater part of his resentment fell upon my head. If I had not preoccupied myself so with the library, with that “useless drawing” (and at “my age”) with politicising, things might have been in better shape. There was no one upon whom he could depend. “Thou art no son of mine!” he would shout as I attempted to defend myself and when I, in turn, became infuriated, it needed all my sorely tried mother’s diplomacy to prevent violence in the house […] “Thou’d better go somewhere else,” he announced. “Alright” I said, “I’ll go. I’d be glad to.”

(Eaglestone 1984: 48)

These extracts give the sense that the relative comfort of the life provided by the success of the soft drinks business allowed Eaglestone to invest his time in the intellectual pursuits that infuriated his father. With the difficulties facing the business and his arguing with Amos, Eaglestone needed to find another place to work. The only option for employment was the local steel mill, and after waiting on the route through town that the mills manager would be walking to work and tentatively asking him for a job, Eaglestone began work in the weigh office as a clerk.

### 2.2.5. The Steel Mill

The stocktaking work was relatively straightforward and Eaglestone was able to pursue his interests in literature whilst on the job:

There were long intervals of silence when the office became a cell in the quiet of the night; when, in the winter, one sealed the door, piled up the fire and did little but sleep and dream and read. The first act of preparation for the night shift was the selection of an adequate book so that by and large, I am afraid, I grew to regard the weighing of wagons as a mere interruption of my study of literature. Now I console myself with the reflection that if I did waste the company’s time, it was on the highest cultural level!

(Eaglestone 1984: 53)

Eaglestone’s pursuit of ‘high culture’ on the job became a necessary part of his new work-life situation. Although the works manager disagreed with and asked him to cease his political activities Eaglestone continued working in the mills for ‘nine or ten years’ (Eaglestone 1984: 76) moving from the weigh office into the ‘stress and bustle’ of the mill proper as an assistant stock-taker (1984: 55). It was in this more active and social role that Eaglestone became acquainted with trade unionism. However as a ‘staff man’ rather than a steel worker he could not become a Union member. Eaglestone was disgruntled by the fact that ‘[s]taff rates of pay were governed by Machiavellian secrecy’ and having no one to represent the staff in these types of disputes Eaglestone and his colleagues formed their own union (Eaglestone 1984: 58). The management of the mill were concerned about this formation and this concern was realised when the staff union successfully negotiated a pay rise with the support of the District Organiser (Eaglestone 1984: 58). This activism continued in other forms when Eaglestone unsuccessfully ran for local election at the age of twenty-one, and at the onset of the First World War rallied local figures to oppose the decision to go to war. The war created uncertainty for Eaglestone about his future and during this period a variety of changes in situation came about. Although eligible to be ‘called-up’, Eaglestone remained in his position in the mills as steel was a necessary industry. Amos died leaving behind a failed business and Eaglestone as the principal breadwinner for the family, meaning that his mill-work became more necessary than ever. The effect of the war and responsibilities of the steel-works and family had the effect of driving him ‘deeper into the heart of literature’, spending considerable time discussing literature with his friend G. Dean Sheriff, a ‘tall curly-haired chemist’ from the mill (Eaglestone 1984: 67).

### 2.2.6. Coming to Writing

Eaglestone’s experiences with literature, his political background and the environment of the war effort culminated in his first real efforts to write whilst working in the Parkgate steelworks. Eaglestone wished to define himself as an individual through his intellectual pursuits as he reports that he began to write as a way of pushing against ‘the anonymity of the mass’:

One day I began writing, and looking back, I cannot disentangle any remarkable thread in that complex pattern except that I merely wanted to. The works had something to do with it, for my setting of pen to paper may have been an unconscious gesture against the anonymity of the mass. The war may have had something to do with it, for nothing was more oppressive than the sense that one was being drawn into the tail of destructive forces over which one had no control. (It was all very well for the Lloyd Georges and Churchills, who were riding the whirlwind and directing the storm!). It may have been the fruit of some intolerable hour that dragged its slow length between midnight and dawn (and there were many such hours) in the clamour and movement of the mill. It is difficult to say. The point is that I began.

(Eaglestone 1984: 69)

Beginning with drawing in the mass of the schoolroom, belonging to the masses that made up the workers in the mills and more generally the war-strained British citizens, Eaglestone strove for a way to define himself as an individual. Commenting on his coming to writing Eaglestone draws on what he says is George Moore’s idea that ‘the storyteller comes into the world fully equipped from the first’. However, Eaglestone asserted that ‘there is always the problem of technique, for language is not manipulated by accident’ (Eaglestone 1984: 69). Eaglestone also commented that he was not in the company of people who had written for publication; however there seemed a very simple way of understanding writing:

 [F]or it seemed elementary common-sense that if one wished to develop a style at all then one must imitate the writer who had succeeded. I had not then encountered Stevenson’s famous passage on “the sedulous ape,” but the interesting thing is, that in one of the tough little notebooks issued by the company for taking wagon numbers, I began by “apeing” Stevenson.

(Eaglestone 1984: 69)

Robert Louis Stevenson’s essay *The Sedulous Ape* (1887) outlines how in his youth when he came across a pleasing passage he would sit down and ‘ape’ its author and that by this process he developed as a writer. This artisanal view of writing, taking those who had been successful then studying and recreating their style in order to practice, is evident in Eaglestone’s writing. In particular, his autobiographical ‘pitman’s’ trilogy shows a concern with demonstrating the craft of the writer explicitly through the following techniques: descriptive realistic or historical recreation of a scene, the use of famous passages from literature as the overall model for his own works, and cultural references from high literary or historical sources. Eaglestone discusses in *AYL* the large number of literary works, authors and historical periods that he developed a fascination for and drew on in his own excursions into writing. This progressed to a short-lived interest in the writing of poetry, however this interest was not extended to the industry that he was currently working in:

I suppose in that period I had the unique opportunity of poeticising iron and steel – the ‘saga’ of metal – but I was never impelled to do so. “A wheel is a wheel is a wheel is a wheel” as Gertrude Stein might have put it. Just that – and nothing more!

(Eaglestone 1984: 71)

Later on in his literary career Eaglestone used his experiences of the steel mills to inform his novel *Steel Saraband* (1938) however the mills did not capture his literary imagination as much as the mines did.At this time Eaglestone was also practising his oration, serving as a Methodist preacher and along with Sherriff had formed a society to discuss literature. It was at this point at the age of twenty-nine that Eaglestone first thought about publication, submitting poetry to *The Bookman* and having one of his poems reprinted in full (Eaglestone 1984: 73). Eaglestone’s focus turned back to prose after this small literary success and it was a change in career that provided him with an inspiring literary project.

### 2.2.7. The Coal-Mine

The steel mill offered no prospects for furthering oneself in Eaglestone’s opinion and his relationship with Muriel, who was the daughter of a local painter and would later become his wife, was developing. So after meeting the owner of the local New Stubbin colliery at chapel Eaglestone was offered a job as an ‘assistant underground timekeeper at a wage well in advance’ of what he had been paid in the mills (Eaglestone 1984: 76). Coal-mining was in the family but working in a colliery was not a career that Eaglestone had ever seriously considered: ‘[c]oal and steel did not mix […] [t]he miner was in a very real sense, a man apart’ (Eaglestone 1984: 76). In *FAPN* Eaglestone writes that he took on the role of time-keeper after he was injured in a roof fall, although from evidence presented in *AYL,* and from speaking to Ruth Hunt, it seems that he only ever worked as a time-keeper underground and so he employed a bit of artistic license in this instance, which is discussed further in 2.2.7. when looking in detail at Eaglestone’s connection with John Middleton-Murry. Due to the very nature of timekeeping and Eaglestone’s liminal position in the colliery hierarchy, a member of both the workers and the management but not wholly part of either group, as well as the physical location of the timekeeper’s office, Eaglestone came into contact with everyone working in the pit:

Soon I grew to know the name of every man employed underground, his working capacity, his reputation with the management and often with his own mates. A constant stream of surveyors, electricians, deputies, horse-keepers, store-keepers passed through the clapping doors

(Eaglestone 1984: 78)

This in-depth knowledge of the mines and also Eaglestone’s belief that few knew what life was like in the mines inspired him write: ‘the mine, to all excepting those who worked within, it was an unknown quantity and that must be borne in mind’ (Eaglestone 1984: 81). The mine itself inspired his writing as he writes that for him the pit captured his imagination:

I think that the main fascination of the pit, for me at any rate, lay in the darkness and I can well understand the part it plays in the writings of D.H. Lawrence. Imaginatively, Lawrence grappled with darkness all his life; others, his companions at school, his father, came to terms with it – he, never, it remained, stirred his unconscious and became an essential feature of his ‘philosophy’. It is from no mere chance that the devil is indicated as the Prince of Darkness and that it is the background, the native dwelling place of demons, warlocks, witches and the like . . .

(Eaglestone 1984: 83)

The darkness of the pits was therefore a subject worthy of imaginative illumination through literature. Finally after spending much of his time in the presence of a constantly-in-use ambulance cupboard, which treated both minor and major injuries, and wondering what the outside world knew of the miner’s life, Eaglestone decided to capture and report his experiences in literature:

Could nothing be done about [the constant injuries]? Quite obviously there was nothing one could do in the sense of making the work less arduous. Did the outside world know of these things? I felt the world did not. Then ought they to know? The accident book was, of course, a pit compilation, but what was to prevent me from taking a literary transcript of so much that I had seen? So far, I reflected, there had been very little of what might have been termed mining literature. There was, of course, Zola’s masterpiece, but who nowadays read Zola? I remembered J.C. Welsh’s admirable but sententious *Underworld*. Nothing more. Had not the time arrived to essay more realistic treatment, in a documentary sense, nearer the bone? I turned these things over in my mind one day as I climbed the hill from the pit and the subject so engaged me that I reached my own door before I realised I was at home.

It was then that I decided to begin a journal, a day to day narrative, mainly bearing upon the pit, though relieved perhaps by a little extraneous material. I felt that there would be something positive about the work, though the problem of publication would raise its own difficulties. I talked to no one, sharing the secret only with my future wife [Muriel]. Week by week the journal grew.

(Eaglestone 1984: 85-86)

In this reflection Eaglestone outlines two important purposes for writing what would become *FAPN*. Firstly as the mine was ‘an unknown quantity’ to everyone except those who worked in one there was very little done to communicate the conditions and accidents to those on the surface – besides perhaps when there was a disaster and the newspapers got involved. Secondly that very little had been done to capture the miners’ ‘art’, as Eaglestone refers to it in *FAPN*’s introduction, within literary art (Eaglestone 1925: 11). Eaglestone qualifies his views on coal-miners as the focus of artistic endeavours, as well as their own roles in the drama of the coal-mine, in the extract ‘A Show’ from *FAPN*:

‘I like to think,’ says Mr. William Archer in *The Old Drama and the New,* the new dramatic movement is only at its beginning . . . . Who knows what genius may even now be ripening, perhaps at Oxford or at Cambridge, perhaps in a coal mine, a factory, or, like Ibsen in a drug store?’

I suppose Mr. Archer is right […] I say I suppose Mr. Archer is right, more right than he thinks. Every man in a coal mine is dramatist, actor-manager, and call boy in one. He is a spectator also, with the strangest of programmes, and attendant as well. Whatever music is played, then he plays it. In comedy he is the comedian, in tragedy the tragedian, and it is pretty fair to say the victim also. For the pit is self-contained, with footlights and all.

 (Eaglestone 1925: 132-133)

This focus on the absurd day-to-day drama of the life of those who worked in the pits, and with Eaglestone seeing these experiences as dramatic in a literary sense, developed into *FAPN* which gained Eaglestone critical praise and international renown when it was published in 1925. However it was through the assistance of an established literary figure that the content, style and purpose of *FAPN* developed and was finally delivered into the hands of the public.

### 2.2.7. Getting Published

Eaglestone’s self-taught literary education and his involvement in rhetoric activities enabled him to use his experience of working in the mines as the content for his book. It was Eaglestone’s interest in John Middleton Murry’s literary magazine, *The Adelphi,* which provided not only inspiration and support to this aspiring writer but also the means by which *FAPN* was published. Eaglestone was impressed by the range of authors that contributed to *The Adelphi’s*  first issue including ‘Murry himself, Katherine Mansfield, D.H.Lawrence, J.W.N Sullivan, Arnold Bennett, Frank Swinnerton, H.G. Wells and Harold Laski’ (Eaglestone 1984: 87). It was Murry’s open invitation to writers for contributions, urging those who were ‘convinced of the importance of something’ to write, that inspired Eaglestone to contact him:

It seemed as though these words had been expressly written for me. I read the magazine through, re-read every page of it, and turned once again to the editor’s statement of faith. “When he is convinced of the importance of something [then—and not till then – let him write for THE ADELPHI][[11]](#footnote-11)” By now, I was profoundly convinced that the British people as a whole knew very little of the dark intermittent struggle, the wastage of life, and mental fibre entailed by the getting of coal. And that they ought to know.

(Eaglestone 1984: 87)

Murry’s open invitation came with a proviso, that contributors write about any subject ‘other than politics which has thousands of platforms and pulpits of its own’ (Eaglestone 1984: 87). Eaglestone wrote to Murry including in his letter a ‘mining sketch’ which Murry replied he liked. After this point Eaglestone ‘began to assemble and type my material, something like the notes for a year and a quarter of New Stubbin experience’ (Eaglestone 1984: 88) which he sent to Murry. The whole collection of writings Murry believed should be ‘published as it stands’ and although he didn’t ‘profess to be in agreement with a good many of your incidental literary judgements’ he admitted that this ‘is natural, and in any case is not an essential part of your writing’ and so he felt that a ‘certain small part of it I should like to publish’ (Eaglestone 1984: 88). Parts of what would make up *FAPN* were published in instalments in *The Adelphi* as ‘From a Miner’s Journal’and Eaglestone’s reflection on this provides an insight into his artistic process, the benefits of writing under a pseudonym and the problems of being a working-class writer:

The first instalment of ‘From a Miner’s Journal’appeared in *The* *Adelphi* in January, 1924, under the pseudonym of “Roger Dataller”. I pitched on this name, partly because Roger was old English, partly because Dataller represented the type of worker paid by the day, and whose pace was generally regarded (sometimes unjustly) as significantly slow. The protective nature of the nom-de-plume I regarded as the utmost importance, for I was still employed at the colliery, and I felt that revealed identity would limit my freedom of action. In addition, although essential names had been carefully screened, and for narrative purposes a certain amount of fiction had been admitted, certain characters were recognisable and transcripts of conversation related word by word. It is easy to call for writings that spring from the heart of industry, but while the author is still in active employment, a thousand pitfalls obtain. No management would wish its day by day activity to be recorded for the public eye, and it is natural that this should be so, for some problems are best considered *in camera*. I took a risk issuing the Journal for publication, because I felt that the end justified the means.

(Eaglestone 1984: 88)

The ‘Dataller’[[12]](#footnote-12) pseudonym was employed for practical reasons, however with Eaglestone pointing out that for ‘narrative purposes a certain amount of fiction had been admitted’ we can see its use creating a distinction between ‘Arthur Eaglestone’ as the man and ‘Roger Dataller’ as the mediation of his real identity in this literary work. The ‘From a Miner’s Journal’ extract was ‘widely noted’ and so the next stage was for Eaglestone to consider publishing the whole journal, with Murry agreeing to publish the book himself. In *AYL* Eaglestone presents some of Murry’s suggestions about how to revise the manuscript of the journal for maximum success:

‘The book’, he wrote, ‘must be a Miner’s Journal, and not the journal of a mining intellectual. I’m not trying to be offensive – only to make my point quickly. And I’m not saying a word against the quality of the intellectual stuff – some is good and some isn’t. But the value of your book, its real chance of success, and its artistic unity, depends upon its being the articulate exposition of the average miner’s experience. [You have for this purpose vigorously to suppress what doesn’t belong in the picture]. You’re a remarkable man, but your gift has to be displayed on this occasion solely in making your people articulate through yourself’.

(Eaglestone 1984: 88, Murry 1924 text in square brackets)

In this letter Murry says that ‘there’s a good book to be made out of’ the manuscript ‘[b]ut that it needs some drastic surgery’ then he suggests cutting away ‘a good two-fifths’ of the text. Murry continues by saying:

I hope you will see my point. Believe me, it is vital. If you see it you will understand why the deletions I have made are so drastic. Save the material for other occasions if you will; but it must be kept out of this book. And if you happen to have any more “pit” material to take its place --- so much the better.

[…]

You must, I think, simply take my word for it that you would only prejudice yourself [and] your book by including the “intellectual” matter – and I don’t think you’d ever find a publisher for it.

(Murry1924)

Murry’s comments provide an insight into the artistic mediation process of Eaglestone’s text in terms of its perceived artistic unity. After promised finances to Murry’s publishing endeavours were withdrawn Murry found Eaglestone an alternative publisher, Jonathan Cape. Murry’s advice highlights the central tension in *FAPN*; the tension between the aim of representing or reporting the ‘authentic’ lives of the miners and Eaglestone’s own interests in literature and literary culture. Much of what will be discussed in this analysis of Eaglestone’s work will relate to Murry’s comments on what *FAPN* must achieve and how it should present the author and those he encounters, especially his comments concerning the artistic unity of the text, the need for more pit material, and how the ‘intellectual matter’ would prejudice Eaglestone and his book. For now it is important to link what Murry hoped Eaglestone would achieve with his journal to what Eaglestone lays out in the introduction to *FAPN*:

This work is not a scientific treatise on the art of coal mining. In endeavouring to present a faithful picture of colliery conditions, I have – as far as is possible – avoided all technical references. And further, it has no specifically propagandist tendencies. I am not particularly concerned with (say) the economic problem of Nationalization. Political platforms there are by the thousand, and the various protagonists have other numerous avenues of expression.

The ‘Journal’ is – if anything – a human plea, resolved mainly by a lifelong acquaintance with the mining community, and an active participation in the working of a *Yorkshire* Colliery, for please remember that New Tollgate Main (needless to say you will not find its name upon the official list) is only representative of a group of collieries in a very small portion of the British Coalfield, where conditions are extremely variable.

(Eaglestone 1925: 11)

Although he does not wish to deal with ‘the art of coal mining’ Eaglestone’s allusion to what the coal-miners undertake as an ‘art-form’ provides them with a level of prestige which places emphasis on the miner as a legitimate figure for literature.We can see how these comments at the beginning of his journal have been influenced by the input of Murry and the philosophy of *The Adelphi* when Eaglestone outlines that this book is not the avenue he would use if he were pursuing political ends, and that he wishes to focus on the human aspect of the coal-mining industry.

*FAPN* was Eaglestone’s first properly published work and it took Eaglestone not only out of obscurity as a writer, but also out of industry and into the academic world. Eaglestone secured a scholarship to New College Oxford under the Miners’ Welfare National Scholarship Scheme in part due to the interest his journal generated (Anon. 1928, ‘Miner Poet: Rawmarsh man who is going to Oxford’)[[13]](#footnote-13). Having always been interested in academic pursuits this was the preferred career path for Eaglestone and he went on to spend the rest of his working life writing and teaching. The Miners’ Welfare Scholarship opened up an academic career to Eaglestone, yet he continued to use his experiences of working in heavy industry as the inspiration in much of his written work. Although seen by many reviewers of *FAPN* as a young author, Eaglestone was thirty-three when it was published having been working from the age of thirteen. After the publication of *FAPN* Eaglestone created a series of autobiographical works which directly followed on from his pitman’s notebook, documenting his time at Oxford in *A Pitman Looks at Oxford* and then his work as a Workers’ Education Authority teacher back in his native South Yorkshire in *Oxford into Coalfield*. Eaglestone’s career as a writer was very prolific during the 1930s and then his published output drops off. He lived for most of his life in Rawmarsh, and by the time of his death newspaper obituaries were focussed more on his most recent work as an expert on the local Rockingham pottery, which is understandable, but this was foregrounded over and above his literary career and work as a teacher:

Pottery expert, novelist dies. One of the leading experts on South Yorkshire’s famous Rockingham pottery and a novelist has died at the age of 88. Arthur Eaglestone, of Haugh Road, Rawmarsh, was the author, along with his son-in-law, of a book on the Swinton pottery.

 (Anon 1980 ‘Pottery Expert Novelist Dies’)

From the papers donated to the archives from Eaglestone’s family we can see that Eaglestone was still writing stories and plays in this later period of his life. Whilst it may be fair to say that there was not as much public interest in Eaglestone’s later autobiographical and fictional work as there was for *FAPN*, it is also fair to say that Eaglestone had access to other forums in which to write. The scrapbook of reviews contains reviews of Eaglestone’s works of literary criticism. There are also many articles promoting or discussing his work as a writer of historical radio plays and a public speaker, as well as the publicising of the film version of his novel *Steel Saraband*. The lack of, or change in, publication in his later years could be explained by the change in priorities of a man with a family who enjoyed working for the WEA and then the University of Sheffield, and also the fact that by the end of the 1930s Eaglestone was approaching his fiftieth birthday. In this section I have introduced Eaglestone background, literary career, Murry’s comments concerning the ‘artistic unity’ of *FAPN* and Eaglestone’s introduction to *FAPN*. In 2.3. I look in more detail at modern and historical discussions of *FAPN* as a work of literature, in order to introduce some of the issues that will be expanded on in 2.4., 2.5. and 2.6.

## 2.3. Literary Skill

### 2.3.1. Authenticity

Eaglestone’s journal of a miner had to demonstrate his literary skill to be a success. Yet it also had to balance ideas concerning authenticity in order to achieve Eaglestone’s aims of telling the world of the miners’ plight. Therefore Eaglestone’s role as mediator of the authentic lives of the miners depends on his literary interests and yet the book itself is an opportunity for Eaglestone to express himself artistically in whatever ways interest him. Murry’s comments make visible the tension present in *FAPN* between the ‘high’ cultural sphere of literature and art and the ‘low’ culture of the working-class miners – or in Thesing’s terms the aesthetics of art and the authenticity of the miners (Thesing 2000: xii)[[14]](#footnote-14)– with this tension being caused by ideological expectations concerning language use, literacy and art as markers of social categories or identities. At the time of his death in 1980 Eaglestone was known more so for his work as a local pottery expert than as a novelist, playwright and author of books on literary criticism. In order to bring a focus back onto Eaglestone his work needed to be contextualised and critically appraised, a task that Ray Hearne attempted in 1995 with his article ‘Roger Dataller of Rawmarsh’. In the same way that Samuel Jonson defended his criticism of Shakespeare in his famous *Preface* by saying ‘[w]e must confess the faults of our favourite to gain credit to our praise of his excellencies’ (Vickers 1981: 567) Hearne’s enthusiastic praise of Eaglestone’s works is tempered by criticism:

Tastes change inevitably, but for all the occasional faults one might detect in some of his work, an excess of pedantry perhaps, and a niggling pomposity at times, it seems to me irrefutable that Dataller’s contribution to the literature of this part of the world, and to the possibilities of a broader collective sense of a South Yorkshire culture, deep-rooted and ever evolving, was by any measure first class and deserving of substantially more widespread recognition.

(Hearne 1995: 299)

Although I am in agreement with Hearne’s praise of Eaglestone, it is his criticisms that will be discussed further in 2.3.2. as his comments concerning ‘pedantry’ and ‘pomposity’ highlight the difficulties Eaglestone faced in negotiating the literary sphere. For now Hearne’s comments sum up two important points that need to be explored further before discussing Eaglestone’s work; his subject matter, South Yorkshire (at the time the West Riding of Yorkshire) working-class culture, and his literary technique.

Much of Eaglestone’s work drew on his experiences of working in heavy industry, living in the Rawmarsh area and engaging with the local community. As the people and industry of South Yorkshire are integral to this region’s sense of identity Eaglestone’s works contribute to this area’s overall history. Rawmarsh and Rotherham residents are asked to comprehend their local history through the understanding that Eaglestone was a local author, because his works have been collected in the Rotherham local studies library. In *FAPN* Eaglestone presents his journal as an honest account of his experiences and so it is important to see *FAPN* at the time of its publication as an attempt to represent fairly not only the coal-miners in their work below ground but also the community that they belonged to ‘up-top’. One reviewer found that reading it meant that the household fireplace became problematic, as burning coals now invoked the human element behind its excavation:

To read “A Pitman’s Notebook” by Roger Dataller (Cape, 6s) is, perhaps, to rob oneself for ever after of that luxuriant complacency that is induced by a blazing fire, for one who has attended to this working pitman’s realistic exposition of the rigour of the miner’s life under ground can never gaze upon live coals again without some emotional recollection of this transcript hewn from the heart of a human mole burrowing with his pick and wedge that we may be kept warm.

(Scribe 1925, ‘The Black Underworld: Pitman’s diary of life under the ground’)

In *FAPN* there is an attempt by Eaglestone to represent fairly his own local community as well as create a text for outsiders that respectfully cultivates an appreciation of the work of the miners and the hardships that this community faces. *FAPN* in many ways addresses negative assumptions that have been made about coal-miners or at least goes some way to contextualise these negative aspects by drawing attention to the conditions in which the miners worked and lived. This reviewer’s emotional response is in line with Eaglestone’s intention for writing which is laid out in the preface of the journal and Murry’s advice that Eaglestone be seen as a miner and not a mining intellectual. Eaglestone’s ancestors were coal-miners and, like many in his local area, he worked in the steel-works and the coal-mine. However the association of the journal’s author as a ‘human mole burrowing with his pick an wedge’ is not strictly true. Yet this aspect of artistic license is necessary to the success of the book and Eaglestone’s aims in telling the public of life underground. Eaglestone has to appear authentic by engaging with familiar stereotypes concerning miners, in order to tell the world about miners. Presenting his real position as a time-keeper and an intellectual would be closer to the truth, but perhaps a step too far from what the public are comfortable with, and Murry’s comments reflect this. Authenticity is subjective and what is considered authentic is constantly debated (Coupland 2003, 2010). To appear ‘authentic’ Eaglestone engages with what his imagined audience expect to be authentic. The literary context in which Eaglestone presents his narratives influences the criteria by which Eaglestone is judged as being an authentic ‘pitman’ or ‘working-class voice’.

### 2.3.2. Literary Reviews

Due to the nature of book reviews if one reviewer could praise Eaglestone’s text for its authenticity another could take his literary skill to task. Eaglestone creates any understanding that his text is authentically ‘hewn from the heart of a human mole’ through his literary skill and talent. In reappraising Eaglestone’s literary career Hearne argues that Eaglestone’s style suffers from ‘an excess of pedantry perhaps, and a niggling pomposity at times’. Hearne’s criticism of Eaglestone in the 1990’s mirrors some of the criticism *FAPN* faced from reviewers in the 1920’s. However in recognising these faults Hearne aimed to create a new interest in Eaglestone, whereas the 1920’s reviewers used criticisms of Eaglestone’s style to dismiss him. Exploring the reviews where reviewers dismiss *FAPN* based on criticisms of his literary style gives an insight into the cultural values to which these reviewers subscribed. The tensions and problems concerning representation, authenticity and literariness present in *FAPN* demonstrate the multitude of social pressures and channels for social distinction that affected Eaglestone as a writer working in a coal-mine in 1920’s Yorkshire. The tensions, criticisms and judgements that surround *FAPN* highlight the complex processes of mediation, recontextualisation and stylisation that Eaglestone undertook. Hearne’s praise and criticism of Eaglestone’s literary style creates an important base for this study of *FAPN*. The main feature for a modern reader is that the pitman’s notebook is peppered with references and allusions to literary works, and at times the writing can feel overly verbose. For example:

It is said of Bayard that he held three excellent things: onset of greyhound, fence of a boar and flight of a wolf. Well, the collier needs them all. They rode home in the olden days, with battle-battered casques and sword-indented breastplates. […] But I never look upon colliers returning home from labour, save as one thinks of tired and triumphant warriors departing from some hard-fought battlefield. There are few perceptible casualties, but the evidence of an earthly warfare is upon them.

 (Eaglestone 1925: 21)

The miners are compared to the mythical horse Bayard from Medieval epic French poetry, invoking chivalric ideals, with a comparison being made between the heroes of the battlefield and the miners returning home. Many other extracts use existing literature as the model for a scene and Eaglestone makes use of a high register vocabulary. A criticism of this type of ‘flamboyance’ was addressed at the time *FAPN* came from a reviewer in the *Manchester Guardian*:

For the author is a very exceptional pitman, and it would be no surprise if Mr. Cape should presently publish for him another kind of book; he quotes La Bruyere and Dorothy Wordsworth; he writes dialogue of literary artifice; he gives us the dramatic and the curious. Occasionally his sympathies, make him a little flamboyant, as in: [A.N.M. then quotes the above quotation ‘I never look upon colliers…’]

(A.N.M. 1925)

For Hearne these faults need to be put into the context of what Eaglestone has achieved and what his works contribute to the literature of the South Yorkshire region. The development of Eaglestone’s style is outlined in his autobiography when he talks of the ‘sedulous ape’ process that he employed when he first began writing. What is evident from the review in the *Manchester Guardian* is that without Eaglestone showing that he understood the ‘craft’ of writing and had a literary education through the use of a high register and literary allusions, with a ‘flamboyance’ perhaps caused by a ‘sedulous ape’ approach to writing, A.N.M. would not be comfortable describing Eaglestone as ‘a very exceptional pitman’. In a similar way to the way in which Standard Language Ideology influences what is considered ‘correct’ speech, ideological expectations of what is considered ‘good’ literature influence literary writing. The deficit in perceived learning of pit-workers is addressed and contested by Eaglestone’s style leading to positive but incredulous responses from critics, such as: ‘[b]lind mole thinks’ (Hearne 1996: 298). Eaglestone’s literary skill and the cultural understanding of miners as uneducated are at odds with each other, leading to these types of responses, although in reality Eaglestone’s cultural identity was much more complex.

### 2.3.3. Speaking on Behalf of Others Whilst Mediating Your Own Conflicted Social Identity

There is a tension between the subject of the journal, the miners, and the literate writer who represents them and speaks on their behalf. Eaglestone is the ‘pitman’ but he himself is not an ‘average’ pitman, whatever that may be, and so readers of this journal are gaining an insight into the lives of coal-miners but also into the life of one ‘exceptional pitman’. The tension is furthered by the multi-faceted nature of Eaglestone’s own personal and political identity as well as his literary persona and the real people and situations that he is attempting to represent. One review of his journal highlights this problem by listing the various characters that Eaglestone seems to be:

Indeed so varied are the diarist’s moods one has difficulty in forming any fixed idea of him. There are passages in which one suspects the scholar working out some real or fancied sin: the pietist eager for the spiritual uplift of his comrades: the soft-hearted humanitarian shuddering at pain even in others: the propagandist putting the case of the minors, or the plain, blunt, hard-working British miner, ribald and blaspheming. He is really no one of these, but may be a composite of them all.

(Anon 1925?a, ‘A Coal Miner’)

This reviewer in the *Bulletin Magazine* finds it hard to pin Eaglestone’s identity down, but they do highlight the fact that it does not sit well to see the writer of the journal as any one of these things, but to see him as a composite of them all. Yet what this reviewer has hit upon is a range of identities that a single social individual could potentially draw on in everyday life and that Eaglestone’s text participates in a wide range of social practices. Within literature there may be an expectation that a character or narrative voice is consistent, yet within society social identities are constructed contextually and may be diverse and incongruous (Coupland 2009: 4). In writing about the coal-mining community we could identify a problem with Eaglestone’s literary identity as he is not singularly any one of these identities, but at the same time he is all of them. The journal format contributes to this sense as it provides snapshots of the daily events or feelings that the author has experienced without working on an overall narrative arc. These tensions of literary style, authentic representation and identity link with Hoggart’s idea of the scholarship boy who is part of two worlds, academia and also his working-class community, but not part of either (Hoggart 1957: 239).

In recent years Eaglestone’s work has been used to inform Catherine Bailey’s *Black Diamonds* (2008: 65-67)*,* a history of the Fitzwilliam family who owned the Wentworth estate and many of the mines near Rawmarsh, as well as his work being employed in Rose’s *The Intellectual Life of the British Working Classes* [[15]](#footnote-15).Rose uses Eaglestone’s work to explore the cultural tensions demonstrated in the lives of various working-class autodidacts, particularly focussing on Eaglestone’s time as a WEA tutor after he graduated from Oxford, which Eaglestone writes about in *Oxford into Coalfield*. In the chapter where Rose discusses Eaglestone, he argues that Modernism was a movement that preserved the cultural position of the middle-classes in the face of more accessible education for the working-classes: ‘[t]he inaccessibility of modernism in effect rendered the common reader illiterate once again, and preserved a body of culture as the exclusive property of a coterie’ (Rose 2011: 394). What Rose also does is position Eaglestone’s career as moving from an investment in elite culture early on, when he was reading high art on the job in the mill and mine, to later being more interested in populist ideas whilst working for the WEA: ‘[as Eaglestone] became more thoroughly integrated into his community of students, he found it even harder to maintain the pose of an alienated intellectual’ (Rose 2010: 424). The status of being an intellectual, and its associated legitimate cultural sphere of literature, changes throughout Eaglestone’s career. However at this point by linking Hearne and Rose’s existing work on Eaglestone we can view Eaglestone’s ‘pomposity’ and ‘pedantry’ as being part of his attempts to fit in with an elite cultural sphere to which, at the time of writing *FAPN*, he did not belong. Whereas later in his career Eaglestone’s interest in high culture causes less tension for him as it has been legitimated by his time studying at Oxford and he works in a teachingposition working to educate workers from his community.

In 2.3 I have discussed authenticity, literary style and the tension between representing individual and group identities in a literary text. These topics have been introduced in order to explore the idea that Eaglestone’s success in what Murry calls the ‘artistic unity’ of *FAPN* (Eaglestone 1984: 88) is achieved by balancing not only language attitudes but also ideas about what constitutes ‘good’ literature in order to be perceived as an ‘articulate miner’. By examining newspaper reviews of Eaglestone’s journal at the time we can look further at the general idea of what it means to be ‘articulate’ in one’s writing. Being ‘articulate’ is a concept informed by Standard Language Ideology, which combines literary criticism with meta-linguistic and socio-linguistic criteria. Invoking the real speech of the miners in a literary text means that reviewers respond to this act using their cultured beliefs about language use (Coupland 2009: 1). In order to explore what it means for Eaglestone to make the miners articulate through him, and to explore what aspects of the miners’ represented speech add to their authenticity, it is necessary to examine meta-linguistic comments made by the reviewers of *FAPN*. 2.4. and 2.5. involve the analysis of two different sets of criteria by which Eaglestone’s authenticity was judged: the inclusion of ‘bad’ language; and the use of non-standard orthography and how it is seen to relate to speech. 2.6. explores how the internal language system, or ‘ficto-linguistic system’, of the book as a whole socially positions Eaglestone. 2.7. reflects on some of the issues raised by these analysis as a form of summary.

## 2.4. ‘Bad’ Language

### 2.4.1. ‘Bad’ Language = Bad Manners

Eaglestone’s representation of Yorkshire dialect contributes to positive and negative value judgements about himself as the author and the people he is representing. For some reviewers the representation of the speech of the miners and local community contributes to the perceived authenticity, and therefore success, of *FAPN*. We can see this process in a review by Hoyle which discusses an extract from Eaglestone’s ‘From a Miner’s Journal’series published in *The Adelphi:*

In this column I have referred more than once to Mr. J. Middleton Murry’s magazine, the *Adelphi*: in the *Adelphi* there have appeared several articles from a miner:

“This morning at the pit-head I encountered Isaac Barnaby. He is a middle sized man, a pit-top worker, and a great follower of hounds. He is busy with his occupation, and in waiting for the chair I discovered that he had been visiting the neighbouring horse-show in the city of S------. ‘It wor yesterday (says he), an’ me an t’ wife wor comin’ across t’ grounds an’ ah saw a young chap – nobbut young. An’ ah sez to th’ wife, “Luk, ah’ll bet that’s t’ Prince !” And it wor! ‘E eard me, bless yer! ‘E raised ‘is hat, an’ a crowd gathered. Ah! quicker’n ought ah’ve seen fer a long time. Ah could a touched ‘im. So ah sez “Eh, lad, tha wants to get on theer stand or tha’ll be crushed to dee-ath!” “And what did he do?” I asked him. “ ‘E smiled an’ ‘e went!” I know Isaac Barnaby. He would speak like that to the Archangel Gabriel.’ “

Now I take it that’s Yorkshire, pure Yorkshire. The miner himself must be Yorkshire. Whoever he is he can write – with an amazing power – of the experiences of a sensitive soul in a coal-mine. These articles are well worth reading, especially by those who have no sort of goodwill to colliers.

(Hoyle 1924)

What this example illustrates is how the highly stylised ‘construction’ of vernacular speech is used as evidence for Eaglestone’s authenticity. The non-standard orthographical representation of Isaac Barnaby’s speech is interpreted by Hoyle as being representative of Yorkshire speech. The fact that Barnaby would talk to pauper or prince in this manner shows to Hoyle that Eaglestone has captured authentic Yorkshire dialect and that he can also write ‘with an amazing power’. Hoyle also feels that being introduced to Isaac Barnaby’s way of speaking will change the negative views of readers’ towards miners and that, in successfully displaying Isaac’s speech, Eaglestone is an authentic Yorkshire man. One reviewer in the *Western Mail* described the following story from *FAPN* told by a young boy to his teacher ‘M’, Eaglestone’s future wife Muriel, as ‘terribly eloquent’, ‘tragic’, ‘pathetic’ (pathos), ‘self-revealing’ and as a more general comment on the book as a whole ‘in repeating the language of the pit-man our author is realistic’ (Anon. 1925a, ‘The Miner in a New Light’):

“Please, Miss they’re goin’ ter bury our Ernest tomorrow, he’s in t’ big bed in t’ room now. Our Jimmy wouldn’t sleep wi’ him last night – ‘e wor frightened – but I worn’t, ‘e can’t hurt ya e’s dead and wrapped in a sheet. So I slept next ‘im and our Alice next to me, an’ our Joe at t’ bottom. Our Jimmy had to go at bottom o’ my mother’s bed.”

(Eaglestone 1925: 101)

The child’s voice adds to the emotive force of this extract for the *Western Mail* reviewer because of the way in which the reviewer has ‘consumed’ the stylisation of this voice as a demonstration of linguistic difference. Even though the inclusion of the voices of the miners and their community allows readers to judge positively their voices as authentic, however, it also allows for other value judgements concerning speech to be made. Eaglestone was aware of the controversial nature of swearing when portraying the miners’ speech and so he censored it. Yet even in this censored form the miners’ swearing still caused controversy.

Eaglestone’s decision to only slightly censure swearing provides a discussion point for some of his reviewers and also one of the most salient examples of language use that provokes much meta-linguistic comment. In *FAPN*’s introduction, whilst declaring that he has made an attempt in writing the journal to represent the world as it is, Eaglestone moves on to point out that, besides censoring obscenities and bawdy humour, he has attempted to represent the speech of those who he has written about as truly as any of his other experiences in this journal:

Throughout these pages I have tried to be absolutely faithful to the light of my own experience. I have related nothing but that which I believe to be strictly true. Yet even so, there have been necessary omissions. I found myself compelled *to thin the swear words* out a little when I found these thick upon the ground. And that peculiar type of humour indicated by the more popular of our women novelists, as the ‘hearty jocularity of the Smoke Room,’ for obvious reasons has been excluded.

(Eaglestone 1925: 11, emphasis mine)

Eaglestone explains the necessity of ‘thinning out’ the swear words in the journal as well as bawdy humour, although in doing this he makes it clear that these aspects of language use are part of the norms of the male-dominated work environment of the mine. Within the miners’ pit-speech we have technical terminology and dialect words that would be used in the pit and above ground as well. What Eaglestone highlights in his comments on the ‘hearty jocularity of the Smoke Room’, is the similarity between these two linguistic environments; they are both male dominated spaces. Swearing would not be as readily used above ground as other aspects of pit-language, such as technical terminology or dialect terms for aspects of the workplace, because of the difference in social norms of these two worlds. In Dennis, Henriques and Slaughter’s (1956) sociological study of a Yorkshire mining community swearing is seen as an essential part of male socialisation in female excluded contexts, such as the pit, the bookies and the smoke room, with a distinctive feature of ‘*pit-talk’* being swearing:

One housewife described the rows of her next-door neighbours, and trying to show just how serious the situation was, she concluded “And they even use *pit-talk* when they get really mad with each other; it’s terrible!” By pit-talk she meant ‘filthy talk’ she explained, and, pressed further, she meant in fact the sexual swearwords. The pit, of course, is the primary principal, and the most rigidly exclusive domain of grown men, and their wives and families are excluded. In other places of male exclusiveness it is permissible but not uncommon to use sexual swear-words but in the pit it is the *extreme* of this liberty of speech for men. No doubt pit work provides factors of danger and nervous tension which give added incentive to swearing, beyond those situations where swearing is simply permitted by the absence of women and minors. A first glance at swearing habits suggests therefore that the group of mature men is a closed group which once entered entitles the members to certain definite privileges, among them obscenity, in given situations.

(Dennis, Henriques and Slaughter 1956: 214-215)

They continue by describing the tendency for swearing amongst miners to increase as the cage descends and they begin to work underground and taper off towards the end of their shift and on returning to the surface (Dennis, Henriques and Slaughter 1956: 215). If the underground environment of the mines is alien to outsiders, then so are the inclusive practices that are employed by tight-knit males groups. Eaglestone’s portrayal of the miner’s swearing *in private,* even when represented in a censored manner, has a different social significance when held up to the *public eye* within the context of a literary text.

This inclusion of swearing in *FAPN* is inauthentic for one reviewer, Mr. J. Eaton Feasey, who cannot believe that miners swear as frequently as Eaglestone shows them doing. Feasey, who admits to having no experience of the underground linguistic environment of the pit, cannot believe that the miners would use ‘bad’ language in the pits when they are such ‘good’ people above ground. In many ways we can say that Feasey misses one of Eaglestone’s aims in writing *FAPN* because he refuses to reassess what he thinks he knows about miners when presented with a text that claims to show real underground activity; however his response links backs to Maurice’s apology for showing miners ‘warts and all’ in his *Pitman’s Anthology* and his assertion that they are ‘fine’ men. Before looking in more detail at Feasey’s comments it is worth taking a moment to look more closely at swearing as one type of ‘bad’ language use. This will also serve as a way of introducing how social judgements are made based on an individual’s or group’s use of a certain type of language. For McEnery in his book *Swearing in English,* bad language means:

any word or phrase which, when used in what one might call polite conversation, is likely to cause offence. Swearing is one example of bad language, yet blasphemous, homophobic, racist and sexist language may cause offence in modern England.

(McEnery 2006: 2)

As all users of language make evaluations of a person’s character from their speech, the use of swear-words creates some general implications:

Consider the word shit. Simply being asked to do this may have shocked you. Even if it did not, most speakers of British English would agree that this is a word to be used with caution. Because of prevailing attitudes amongst speakers of the English language, using the word may lead any hearer to make a number of inferences about you. They may infer something about your emotional state, your social class or your religious beliefs, for example. They may even infer something about your educational achievements. All of these inferences flow from a fairly innocuous four-letter word.

(McEnery 2006: 2)

One of the goals of McEnery’s book is to outline the process whereby bad language becomes associated with ‘a range of factors such as age, education, sex and social class’ (McEnery 2006:2) and because of this process there are moral judgements made about swearing; those who swear are morally corrupt or lacking in ‘good’ values. Eaglestone’s ‘thinning out’ of swearwords allows for most of the speaker’s swearing to be discerned. On the one hand in censoring swearwords Eaglestone is undertaking an endeavour to make the speech of the miners acceptable. He is censoring the speech of the pit for readers in polite society, the pit itself and the ‘pit-speech’ of the miners being an environment and a language variety that the majority of people have no access to. However on the other hand by leaving many ‘milder’ swear words in and allowing the ‘stronger’ ones to be discernible by those in the know Eaglestone can be seen to be attempting to report the miner’s language as it is. Although the most obscene swearwords in the journal are censored they are mixed in with a number of milder ones and are still easily discernible. In examining a scene that contains censored swearing we can see how two different newspaper responses to the swearing of the miners demonstrate the position of swearing in ‘polite’ society and the mines.

### 2.4.2. Swearing as Inappropriate Above Ground and the Norm Below

At regular intervals throughout *FAPN* are ‘Pit Dialogues’ reporting ‘verbatim’ speech in the form of a play-script. In one of the frequent dialogues two miners get into an argument:

‘Pit Dialogues – A Mere Matter of a Water Tub’

RIPPER. ‘Got any watter tubs?’

ONSETTER *(with insolent nonchalance)*. ‘I don’t know.’

RIPPER. ‘Tha doesn’t know?’ *(pointing to a water tub in the middle distance.)* ‘What’s that? Isn’t that a tub?’

ONSETTER. ‘If tha says so, what the bloody hell art tha askin’ me for?’

RIPPER (*furiously)*. ‘Yer damned obstreperous b—‘

 ONSETTER *(furiously wrenching at his coat).* ‘Ah can tackle a big brussen b—like thee any day! Any day! Come on!’

RIPPER. ‘Outside – aye! Not int’ pit! I’ll knock thy bloody nose off outside.’

ONSETTER *(indignantly)*. ‘comin’ in ere shouting like a bloody brass band. Tha great fat . . .’ *(Chokes with supressed emotion.)*

RIPPER *(mildly). ‘*Ow’s thi beans goin’ on, Bill?’

ONSETTER *(mollified).* ‘Aw none so bad.’ And he runs to help with the water tub.

(Eaglestone 1925: 66)

For many reviewers of *FAPN* this style of writing demonstrates Eaglestone’s authenticity. ‘Bloody’, ‘hell’ and ‘damned’ are used alongside a censored but easily discernible ‘bastard’, with the miners also using the high register Latinate ‘obstreperous’ alongside the dialectal ‘brussen’. Eaglestone’s chapter attempts to show that interactions such as this are part of the everyday work-life for the miners in their unique underground environment. Being a group that has their experience embedded in an oral culture and tradition and who in this period have little access to formal schooling the miners language use is different to another speech community’s that privilege literary practices. Also the mine is an exclusively male environment. The cultural differences and the variation in language values of these two spaces become very clear in this pit dialogue, although this dialogue in the alien underground environment is presented in a familiar play-script form, which is a highly stylised way of presenting ‘natural speech’. In this conversation two people insult each other to the point of coming to blows, finally turning to a discussion of gardening and then cooperating.

Two things are worth highlighting from this dialogue in relation to Eaglestone’s attempts to show an unseen community to the public. Firstly, the physical environment in which these miners are working and the effects that it will have on them. Coal-mines are not pleasant working environments, for obvious reasons, and therefore within this work environment tempers may flare. What is important for everyone working in the mines is how to express that anger in a way that does not put others in danger, as can be seen by the fight being planned to happen outside of the mine. Secondly pit-speech in a male-dominated physically demanding work environment is in its nature obscene, with obscenities playing their part in much male-dominated socialisation. What Eaglestone’s comments on censoring bad language highlight is the differences between the community of miners that he is trying to represent and the book reading public who are engaging in legitimate literate culture. Although swearing is seen as a use of bad language and therefore bad manners in ‘polite’ society in other situations it is seen as the masculine norm:

The functions of expletives in Western culture are complex: as an extreme form of slang, they are typically used with the intention (depending on context) to break norms, to shock, show disrespect for authority, or be witty or humorous. Another distinguishing characteristic is the fact that they are part of a shared linguistic code, reinforcing group membership, and indicative of shared knowledge and interests.

(de Klerk 1996: 147)

Even though swearing is a taboo form of language, on another social level swearing works to reinforce group membership; there is social meaning in the use of ‘a shared linguistic code’ that your group employs. Miners would use different language in the mines to emphasise and strengthen the ‘brotherhood which existed amongst miners’ (National Coal Mining Museum 2007) and swearing can be seen to occupy a unique position in the miners’ socialisation underground.

Two newspaper articles, one a review/opinion column from the Sheffield Independent by, previously mentioned, Mr. J. Eaton Feasey and the other a reply to this article by an unknown engineer, demonstrate these views of the miners’ use of swearing as well as the problem of representing the miners’ swearing out of context. They also highlight the differences in responses to Eaglestone’s representation of miners and also the common views held about miners at the time the journal was published. Mr. Feasey is unconvinced by Eaglestone’s representation of the mine-workers:

Not Quite Fair

[Roger Dataller] is a clever writer. He can vividly describe what he sees, and his book leaves a very definite impression on the mind.

But I don’t believe he is quite fair to his fellow workers of the pit.

If you are to believe this book you would think that miners never open their mouths without swearing in the most vulgar useless manner.

I am not going to say that some miners do not talk like that; but I am quite sure there is another side to it.

I am not a miner, nor do I have the pleasure of meeting with them very much. But I do happen to know that some of the best men in this district – some of the most sensible, cleanmouthed, hardworking, God-fearing men – work in and about the pit.

I have met them – dozens of them – at Mosborough, Hoyland, Thorne, Barnsley, Wath, Dinnington, Staveley, and a host of other places. I am thankful that some of these men call me a friend. I should be grieved if they were all to be thought of in the way this book represents

[….]

A Sorry Tale

But it is all a sorry tale as described in this Pitman’s Note Book. Dreadful accidents; dirt; darkness; drink; pilfering and bribing; degrading poverty; ignorance.

But, let us thank the Lord, it is true as I said at first, one cannot describe a whole class of men in this sweeping way.

I believe a lovely book could be written about miners – their culture, religion, courage; their chapels and churches and homes; their music and singing and preaching; their self-sacrifice.

Let Roger Dataller collect material for another note book, and this time shut his eyes to the bad as tightly as formerly he closed them to the good.

(Feasey 1925, ‘A Saturday Talk: About miners’)

For Feasey his experience with miners, above ground, does not resolve itself with Eaglestone’s representation and for him the amount of swearing included in the book is an indication that Eaglestone has not created a fair and authentic representation. This is due to his belief that swearing implies bad manners because it is a form of ‘bad’ language and therefore the miners represented are bad people. Feasey also describes swearing as a ‘vulgar’ and ‘useless’ form of speech. For Feasey this is problematic as he knows of miners who are some of the ‘best men’ in his area.

Feasey makes allowances for some miners using bad language and being involved in the ‘sorry’ activities, such as stealing, that Eaglestone outlines. However his main argument is that any group is not homogenous. By Feasey’s own admission he does not have access to the linguistic environment of a working pit and the language used by its workers. What this demonstrates is the perceived link between speakers who use ‘bad’ language, which in this case means swearing, being bad people. Also Feasey causes a contradiction in his own article as he asserts that miners are not a homogenous group and that within their ranks are some very good people, yet he refuses to be shown other aspects of their lives which people like him have no access to. Because the miners represented are shown to swear constantly the focus for Feasey is on the miners as bad people. What this review demonstrates is Feasey’s linking of language practices and social standing or perceived morality (cf. Niedzielski and Preston 2003: 212-214). This type of meta-linguistic discussion is essential to the reception of *FAPN* as his representation of the miners’ speech is seen to create a sense of authenticity, yet in this case does not correspond to Feasey’s understanding of linguistic reality, which he conflates with moral behaviour. However this compounding of the linguistic with the moral is the norm in everyday theories of language use (McEnery 2006: 1-11) and demonstrates language attitudes and cultural practices from this era in action.

The response to the Feasey’s article by an unknown engineer highlights the view that swearing works like group slang and also reinforces Eaglestone’s reasons for writing. Many of the issues highlighted in this letter are common to literature that attempts to represent the work-life, character and plight of the coal-miner; that due to the fact that they work unseen, what they do and where they work is little understood by those above ground and literary description ultimately falls short of the reality of experience (Thesing 2000: xiii). Because of the relevance of each aspect of this engineer’s letter it is quoted at length:

The Miner As He Is

In The Pit And At Home: An Engineer’s Experience

Sir, -- As one who always looks forward to Mr. J. Eaton Feasey’s Saturday Talks, I feel that his last article calls for a reply from someone who, like myself came to live among and work with underground those to whom he tries to do justice. I am one, probably, out of hundreds who, when the slump came in the engineering trade, obtained employment in a coal mine. From the comfortable airy workshop, where one earned his bread under conditions most satisfactory, to delving half a mile below the earth’s surface, under conditions which must be experienced before being realised, is a great change.

Probably no class of worker has been so maligned or misunderstood as has the miner. His conduct, when down the mine or when on the top – at home or in pursuit of his pleasure – cannot be judged by those who have no idea of the conditions under which he labours. For two years I worked with him, coming home after each shift’s work to bath before I felt a respectable member of society once more. At first I was disgusted, ashamed that human beings should have to toil in such a hell.

Conditions Make The Man

That was my first impression. My second, after becoming conversant with my mates, was that they deserved it. I was sorry, later, to have had this thought. If it were possible to take the workers from the workshops or the offices of the great works in Sheffield and put them down the mine, then I venture to say that the artisans and clerks would appear to a stranger as big a number of black-guards as what the miners appeared to me. The conditions make the man, and all honour to the miner for being the rough, uncouth gentleman he is, instead of the savage which environment tends to make him. I say that no class of worker has a bigger and kinder heart than the miner

Mr Feasey says that if you were to believe the writer of the book he quotes one would gather that miners never open their mouths without swearing. That is a true impression. I was shocked at the foul language used down the pit, from that used by the manager downwards to the last signed on pony boy. I came to realise that the foul language was an indispensable item of the miners’ stock-in-trade. It was nothing—not worth taking notice of. One soon got used to it. I could give hundreds of reasons why this is so: hundreds of cases where ordinary everyday language would not be understood. The first time I came across a pony-boy – he was only a nipper of 14 – I was surprised, not to say disgusted, to see him with a quid of tobacco in his mouth that would have done justice to a burly navvy.

[….]

If there is one thing I hope for above all others it is a better understanding of the miner by those whose occupation flows in more congenial surroundings, so that the burden which the miner is carrying may be lightened.

­\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Enlightened

(Anon 1925d ‘The Miner as He Is: In the pit and at home: An engineer’s experience’)

What the author of this response makes clear is that he believes Feasey’s judgement about Eaglestone’s representation of the miners’ speech cannot stand because unlike Eaglestone and himself, Feasey has no experience of the working conditions of the miner. Drawing on his experiences of the mines the unknown engineer refers to miners’ bad language as a ‘stock-in-trade’, part of what forms their linguistic repertoire and a form of speech which is utilised predominantly in the informal work environment of the pit. The engineer also discusses the miner as a ‘much maligned’ figure and hopes that others can have their views of the miners challenged in a positive way like he has. Here Eaglestone is seen as more authentic because he has represented a nuanced and complicated aspect of language use in a literary text and for those who have the right cultural experiences, like this engineer, he has captured something that demonstrates his authenticity. When first published in *The Adelphi* ‘From a Miner’s Journal’ was preceded by this statement by ‘Roger Dataller ‘attesting his authenticity: ‘[t]he following pages have been written by a working pitman. Not one of your demi-semi-down-an-hour-out-and-away pitmen, but one whose cleansing is a matter of *definite* occupation, of actual scrubbing, above the neck and below – R. D.’ (Eaglestone 1924). Both Eaglestone and the engineer highlight the physically filthy state that they were in below ground as a way of demonstrating not only the strangeness of the change in the physical and social environment of the pit, but also as a way of conveying the materiality of their authentic experiences in a way that makes them intelligible to people like Feasey.

### 2.4.3. The Pit as a Unique Environment

Swearing is presented by Eaglestone, and the unknown Engineer, as a necessary part of the social environment of pit-work, which is taboo on the surface. It works as part of masculine identity construction and in a solely male, and strenuously physical, environment this is to be expected. What this reply to Feasey highlights is that the miners are physically, linguistically and socially separated by the very fact that they work in an underground environment. What is also explored is the idea that those who do not have knowledge of working in the mines should not cast judgement about those who do. In this discussion of Eaglestone’s work, and the nature of coal-miners’ speech, swearing is forming the basis for comments on the linguistic realism of Eaglestone’s book and the authenticity of his representation of a group. The ‘bad’ language of the miners, even though explained as a ‘stock-in-trade’, is equated to negative social behaviour when the pony boy’s tobacco chewing is linked to the negative stereotype of the burly navvy. In both these reviews swearing is used to assess the authenticity of Eaglestone’s representation of the miners. However the engineer’s opinion highlights the problems of representing a linguistic environment that, in his view, has to be experienced to be understood and that the ‘hellish’ conditions of the mine lead to the ‘bad’ manners of the men.

The engineer’s point is illustrated in *FAPN* in the chapter ‘Scene – Underground’ where an ‘official’, acting in lieu of the polite above-ground society, thrashes a young pony driver for swearing. The boy is confused by this attack as swearing is the underground norm:

Stubborn pony and youthful driver. Stubborn pony will not budge, and irascible driver launching out viciously with his clog, cracks into the pony’s ribs. Meanwhile, attentive official advances unperceived, watches for a moment and:

YOUTHFUL DRIVER (*addressing pony*). ‘You bloody awk’ard cow S-s-s-s-s! Gerr on! (a kick) S-s-s-! “Buller!” You bloody – donkey (another kick) ow!’

OFFICIAL (*who has brought his stick smartly about the youngster’s shoulders*). ‘What are you doing?’ (*He strikes again.)*

YOUTHFUL DRIVER (*wildly snatching at the pony’s bridle).* ‘It’s this bloody – Hound! It’ll not work, nor budge nor now’t. It’s this bloody thing!’

OFFICIAL (*catching the lad across the buttocks*). ‘What are you doing, lad? What do you say?’

YOUTHFUL DRIVER (*rubbing himself ruefully and dancing round*). ‘It’s not me as ye wanter bloody well ‘it. It’s that old . . . as’ll not do ‘is work!’

OFFICIAL (*roaring at the top of his voice*). ‘Stop swearing, will you? That’s what I’m thrashing you for. Put your jacket on an’ get out of this pit – straight away!’

YOUTHFUL DRIVER (*reduced in moment*). ‘Ah’m sorry, mester. Ah didn’t know. Ah forgot. Ah didn’t know ye meant about swearin’. *Ah didn’t,* straight!’.

(Eaglestone 1925: 95)

The official here believes that this use of swearing deserves to be punished and so he beats the boy. The boy on the other hand swears in front of the wrong person and pays the price for this use of language. Similarly Eaglestone’s representation of the miners is seen as inauthentic by Feasey when he brings their ‘vulgar’ language out of a hole and into polite society. The task that Eaglestone has in making the miners ‘articulate’ here then means balancing the linguistic reality of the coal-mine with ‘polite’ middle-class beliefs about language use and morality. Swearing is one of the most strongly judged uses of language and yet it forms only one feature of the miners’ speech that elicits value judgements from reviews of *FAPN.* Discussing swearing demonstrates one of the most noticeable and controversial language forms within the journal. However the swearing of the miners is embedded in Eaglestone’s use of non-standard orthography to represent the speech and dialect of the miners. In respelling words to represent speech Eaglestone’s non-standard orthography is in dialogue not only with ideas about standard orthography but also with notions of ‘correct’ and ‘incorrect’ speech.

## 2.5. Prestigious Forms of Speech and Writing

### 2.5.1. Standard Language Ideology and Dialect

As discussed in 1.1.2. the pervasive values and norms of Standard Language Culture influence perceptions of language use. The inclusion of non-standard orthography in *FAPN* invokes discussions concerning the social status of different speech varieties, ‘good’ literature, illiteracy and ‘articulateness’ which link to the discourse surrounding Standard Language Culture (Milroy 2001) and Standard Language Ideology. For many people speaking ‘properly’ and writing ‘correctly’ are in many ways part of the same process. This cultured set of ideas about how language should be used or what it means about a person is part of Standard Language Ideology:

a bias toward an abstracted, idealized, homogeneous spoken language which is imposed and maintained by dominant bloc institutions and which names as its model the written language, but which is drawn primarily from the spoken language of the upper middle class.

 (Lippi-Green 1997: 64)

Eaglestone himself points out how his interaction with literature changed his views on language use in *AYL*. When writing a book that presents direct speech through non-standard orthography this linguistic reality is mediated through Eaglestone’s writing, meaning that it is influenced by his own attitudes to language, and that it is also in this mediated form that readers encounter a variety of speech that they may never have experienced in situ.

The non-standard orthographical dialect representation that Eaglestone uses invokes the modal affordances of speech in a form that lacks these affordances and many of the cultural affordances of the speech variety represented*.* A passage from *AYL* contextualises how Eaglestone developed a reflexivity about forms of spoken language, in the same way that he developed an understanding of the variety of written styles, through engaging with books during his time in the library:

By this means, constantly handling books and enunciating titles I became Language-conscious, steadily driving local speech into the background; there was no dialect equivalent for *The First Principles of Evolution*, for *Great Expectations*, or for *King Solomon’s Mines*. At home, I must have seemed a bit of a prig and something of a nuisance for I remember trying to cure my father of the habit of pronouncing chemist, as “chymist”, unaware that his version was as old as Jenson, or of exchanging his “deef” with deaf. Significantly, my mother frowned upon dialect forms of address – it was always “you” and “me”, in the house, if “thee” and “tha” outside.’

(Eaglestone 1984: 22)

This reflexivity was instilled in Eaglestone through an engagement with traditional ideas about literacy and his education in literature, especially the contributing of Standard English orthography with prestige spoken varieties of English, and Eaglestone altered his speech accordingly as well as commenting on the speech of his father. Respelling chemist as ‘chymist’ to represent pronunciation does not necessarily fully capture the vowel sound but marks his father’s speech as other. Also Eaglestone’s mother created rules about what forms of speech could be used in which spaces. Eaglestone’s resolution to his youthful linguistic priggishness towards ‘chymist’ was that he was unaware of how old it was, implying that age and history provide legitimacy, authenticity and also status. In this instance Eaglestone is validating the authenticity of Amos’ pronunciation by its tradition or ‘historicity’ (Coupland 2007: 180-181); ‘chymist’ is older than ‘chemist’ and therefore has worth, whereas ‘chemist’ is seen as the ‘correct’ form. This ‘priggish’ attitude towards spoken language, created by Eaglestone’s engagement with literature, is indicative of a common Standard Language Culture ideal; standardised writing is seen as the ‘correct’ way to speak because we are taught that there is a correct way to spell. On top of this, literary language has social prestige and specific books are prestigious artefacts: ‘there was no dialect equivalent for *The First Principles of Evolution*, for *Great Expectations*, or for *King Solomon’s Mines’*. Eaglestone’s focus on literary texts as the model for his spoken language link also with the *‘artefactual ideology of language’* whereby ‘particular textual practices can reduce language to an artefact that can be manipulated like most other objects’ (Blommaert 2008: 292, see also 2012). These books can be seen to contain *language* by Eaglestone as Standard Language Culture privileges written practices over spoken. The assumption that Eaglestone can acquire ‘good’ speech by pushing dialect into the background and using prestigious literature as the model by which to change his speech emphasise the role that writing practices, literary culture and standard orthography have in informing language ideologies. There are no ‘dialect equivalents’ of ‘great’ works of literature for Eaglestone because of the lack of variation in legitimised forms of English orthography and ideologies that place varieties of English in a deficit position. Commenting on ‘curing’ Amos of his pronunciation of chemist demonstrates Eaglestone’s later reflexivity about the effects of his engagement with literacy on his language attitudes at that time.

The extract from *AYL* demonstrates that during adolescence Eaglestone was working to drive ‘local speech into the background’ and by the time of writing *FAPN* we can assume he would have diverged from local speech to a considerable degree. The hierarchy that Eaglestone creates surrounding the language of the books he lists and his local language use is more generally part of a deficit model whereby a prestigious form of spoken English is aligned with Standard English and everything else is seen as non-standard (cf. Snell 2013). Because of the process and ideology of standardisation there is a ‘correct’ way to spell meaning that prestige speech is instilled with the qualities of correctness through a cultured link with standardised orthography. What Eaglestone has to negotiate when mediating the speech of the miners in literature is the combination of these social language attitude norms with ideas concerning ‘good’ literature and literacy. Due to the negative views of the speech of the miners, in terms of their dialect and levels of literacy, Eaglestone, by contrast, is put in the prestigious position of the ‘articulate’ miner who can ‘speak’ for his intellectually impoverished fellows. Standard Language Culture and Standard Language Ideology inform these views and by demonstrating his literary talent and by proxy his linguistic prestige what Eaglestone has achieved is given a heightened status in the eyes of some reviewers.

### 2.5.2. Authentic Dialect and Literary Skill

In 2.3 I discussed how in writing *FAPN* Eaglestone had to negotiate popular or dominant conceptions of authenticity and literary style, whilst also negotiating the tension between representing individual and group identities in a literary text. In this section, 2.5.3. and 2.5.4. I draw on reviews of *FAPN* to illustrate many of the ideas introduced in 2.3. Although it is possible to make a distinction between speech and writing as two modes with associated socio-cultural values in professional theories of language, in everyday theories, as in the following reviews, the two are conflated. Ideas about vernacular speech form the basis for value judgements concerning the success of Eaglestone’s representation of the miners and his writing itself is judged in terms of literary value. This is because of the social matrices within which these aspects of spoken and written language are embedded. As speech is mediated through writing it is no longer in the same form. As the two relate analogously social meaning from spoken language practices are laminated onto the written system. Therefore orthographical representations of speech can operate ‘metonymically’ and index social meanings concerning speech in writing (Jaffe and Walton 2000: 582, Sebba 2007: 103-104), which means that opinions of speech contribute to these reviewers’ views on the text. Within reviews of Eaglestone’s work the two main categories for praise or criticism are his literary writing style and how authentically or fairly he has represented the coal-miners. This ‘Dantesque’ reviewer sees Eaglestone as someone who has gained the traditional idea of literacy and is not ‘restricted’ by dialect usage:

You doubt it? Then take a turn with the miners in some Yorkshire colliery. Or let Mr. Dataller (as he has chosen to call himself) give you his evidence. He is no mere observer: he is the miner himself, made sensitively articulate: he speaks the words all miners would say, if their speech could rise above its trammelling dialect. The plain, unvarnished tale of the mines is a rare thing in literature. Mr. Walsh has accomplished it once in “The Underworld”: and that is about all. But these pages from Mr. Dataller’s journal are better than any novel: they give the rough ore of the miner’s life, before it has been tried seven times in the fires of Art: they are written in a stiff and vivid prose that at times might have been plucked clean out of the best work of D. H. Lawrence.

(Anon. 1925c ‘Dantesque’.)

This review sees *FAPN* as a ‘plain, unvarnished tale’ and that Eaglestone’s representation of the miners shows them as they are without excess artifice. Here the prose rather than the speech of the miners is highlighted; however Eaglestone’s literacy displays his linguistic skill and sets him apart from the miners. Eaglestone’s style is literary enough to be compared to a canonical literary writer, who has a history of writing about miners, and yet also manages to show ‘the rough ore of the miner’s life’. Although not directly referencing the dialect of the miners, Eaglestone’s dialect representation seems to be responsible for this view as he is viewed as a miner ‘made sensitively articulate’. If dialect is seen as ‘trammelling’ and Eaglestone is sensitively articulate then his ‘stiff and vivid prose’ is responsible for the ‘articulate’ value judgement and the dialect representation for the ‘rough’ representation of the miners’ life. These two distinctions between Eaglestone’s artistic prose style and the authentic reportage of his dialect representation are succinctly summarised in this review from the *Indianapolis News*:

The collier in the coal pits of England, Yorkshire particularly, needs all the qualities that Bayard had, says Roger Dataller in “From a Pitman’s Notebook.” published by the Dial Press. That is he needs the onset of the greyhound, the fence of the boar and the flight of the wolf. Read these marvellously beautiful sketches of Dataller and you will agree with the statement. As the colliers come from labour they resemble the tired but triumphant warriors coming from a hard-fought field, with battered casques and indented breastplates.

[….]

The reader will be drawn close to the miners by some of the dialogues reproduced by the author. They are often in Yorkshire dialect, but pathetic in the deepest sense. For example: “Ah wanter go outer pit” “What for?” “Ah’m bad. If Ah’m bad Ah’m bad aren’t I?” “You’ve only worked four months in the last year.” “My wife, she’s got bronchitus and ‘eart failure. That’s why Ah’m bad.’ “Go and tell the onsetter to let you out.”

(Anon. 1925?b, ‘From a Coal Pit’)

Eaglestone’s comparison of the miners with Bayard, which caused A.N.M. of the *Manchester Guardian* to criticise Eaglestone for being flamboyant, serves here as a ‘marvellously beautiful’ sketch. Both the Bayard and battlefield comparisons made about the miners are created through the use of literary allusions and the reviewer for the *Indianapolis News* accepts and is impressed by them. On the other hand pathos for the miners is created through the use of Yorkshire dialect. Many more reviews demonstrate these views with the speech of the miners being seen as ‘rough’ and Eaglestone’s writing being seen as ‘refined’. The balance here then is between Eaglestone’s writing style as demonstrating his literary skill but also his use of standard orthography demonstrating his linguistic proficiency with the ‘correct’ form of speech when contrasted with the non-standard orthography used to represent the miners’ speech. Because of the way these non-standard orthographical conventions are seen to relate speech to writing, aspects of literacy are being used as the criteria for meta-linguistic comment. In these reviews no issue is made of the fact that Eaglestone is speaking for the miners or that their voices are mediated through writing (cf. Jaffe and Walton 2000). Linguistic authenticity, in terms of the relationship between orthographic conventions and real phonological features, is irrelevant here as ideological positions concerning literacy and standard language use are being used to realize and judge orthographical representations of speech alongside writing that is seen as displaying enough ‘literary’ authenticity to be legitimated by critical praise. What they do comment on is that Eaglestone is demonstrating the successful balance between presenting the ‘roughness’ of the miners’ speech and life in his refined literary style. This balance also demonstrates Thesing’s authenticity and aesthetics idea, as well as a distinction between a community and culture that are not legitimated, the working-class miners, and one which is, the book buying middle-classes. Viewing this balance as part of the process of mediation that Eaglestone is undertaking in *FAPN,* further analysis of ideas concerning the ‘deprived’ lives of the miners and the ‘refined’ nature of Eaglestone’s literary skill will help to illuminate how language attitudes affect the mediation of the miners’ voices. The use of non-standard orthography to represent the dialect speech of Eaglestone’s miners provokes statement’s about their ‘inarticulateness’ or use of ‘trammelling dialect’ because of the ways in which illiteracy is seen to relate to language capability. However, there are points in *FAPN* where Eaglestone explores the lack of formal schooling and illiteracy of these miners by directly discussing their spelling and literacy practices.

### 2.5.3. A ‘Trammelling Dialect’ Represented Using ‘Juvenile’ Spelling

Eaglestone’s book had to appeal to certain cultural values to be accepted as ‘good’ literature and to be seen to represent authentically the miners. These value judgements are made based on Eaglestone’s literary use of Standard English and dialect representational use of non-standard orthography. However non-standard orthography is more often encountered as ‘bad’ spelling, a use of written language, which like swearing implies that its user should be negatively judged. ‘Bad’ spelling implies that a person is illiterate or uneducated, with what constitutes literacy being informed by ideology (Street 1993). Presenting the ‘non-standard’ speech of the miners alongside their non-standard spelling to a literate social group who privilege legitimate literate culture can be seen as one of the points at which Eaglestone’s ‘niggling pomposity’ and his investment in elite culture are most evident. However one reviewer in the *Daily News* finds the ‘almost fantastically illiterate letters’ of the miners’ evidence of Eaglestone’s authenticity and he is affected by this show of illiteracy as much as he is by the representation of the local school children. The illiteracy of the miners’ is demonstrative of the ‘drabness’ and poverty that the miners’ and their families face:

Mr. Dataller has written a very depressing book. Strange to relate, his gloominess does not spring so much from the horrors he witnessed underground as from the drabness and emptiness of the life in the mining village above. He quotes for us the almost fantastically illiterate letters of miners who have “gone sick,” and wish to be excused from work; shows us their rosy-cheeked, bright-eyed children, doomed to the pit, sitting in a schoolroom hung with pictures of Julius Caesar, Grenville abroad the Revenge, Hiawatha, and Wolfe scaling the Heights of Abraham; and then after the pit has claimed them; tells us of the miner’s difficulties in washing his back, and of Mormon missionaries in a mining village; of how two boys and a girl slept all night in the same bed as their dead brother, shrouded and ready for his coffin, because there was no room for them elsewhere.

Yet Mr. Dataller, in spite of all his humour and irony, is never “superior” to these poor folk. He may bring Mr. Belloc’s essays and Mr. Osbert Sitwell’s poems down to the pit with him to read (the Sitwell was “pinched” by one of the miners – poor man!); he may confess to his hostess at dinner that his ambition was “to write a book like John Masefield’s ‘Captain Margaret,’” yet there are few, if any, signs of priggishness about his book.

(Anon. 1925b ‘The Miner’s Life’.)

Within the aims of Eaglestone’s book the miner’s writing and speech presents them as illiterate and restricted, and this is viewed as indicative of the poverty that they face by this reviewer. Operating within the norms of Standard Language Ideology this use of non-standard orthography to represent dialect speech and ‘bad’ spelling achieves Eaglestone’s aim of showing the public what the miners’ face in their day to day lives. There is no problem with the representation of the miners for the *Daily News* reviewer and Eaglestone avoids appearing superior to them even though this reviewer comments on Eaglestone’s engagement with legitimate literary authors. However there is a problem with the way in which Eaglestone is representing his colleagues for other reviewers and this is due to the presentation of the miners’ illiteracy being contrasted with the intellectual power of Eaglestone. Before moving on to look at these reviews specifically one extract in particular is problematic in terms of the form that it uses to mediate the miner’s speech and writing and what this implies by comparison.

In a chapter called ‘Essays’ Eaglestone documents the badly written sick notes submitted by the miners to the under-manager:

The under-manager’s desk is littered with a hotch-potch collection of letters excusing absence, mostly on the ground of illness, and of indisposition. Weird and wonderful the note-paper our colliers use. One recognizes sugar bags, railway labels, Bible flyleaves, and paper indeterminate, funeral parchment, black-edged envelopes – the cheapest kind of writing material. Sometimes a heavily scented lavender parchment – ornately boudoir-like, *á la Grande Dame!* Whence? Whither? Who can say?

Needless to explain, the spelling is uniformly bad, the handwriting juvenile, in some cases very juvenile, and occasionally feminine. The wife, one feels, has been called in, and takes a hand as she demonstrates – (how often crudely) – that Mr. Jack So-and-So isn’t feeling very well as . . . per example . . .

Dear Sir

I am veary Polly and have got dear-year and cannot come yours truly - -

Or this:

From -- --

‘Please i catched my leg a Satturday lifting a tub and i cant flow my work up so i would feel intirnley thankful to you if you would make a report of it for fear i would hav to be off.’

(Eaglestone 1925: 207)

The resources used to create these letters demonstrate the materiality of the miner’s involvement with literacy practices with the symbolic value of their writing materials being linked not only to material poverty but cultural poverty (Pahl and Rowsell 2010). After commenting on the level of the writing and also the materials used to write the letter Eaglestone contrasts these with the real emergent spelling of children in Marion’s (Muriel’s) class in the local school:

Contrast with these a number of really juvenile essays, written by youngsters some seven years, all members of Marion’s Class at school, and miner’s children in the main.

(I)

My Father 20.4.23.

My father gos to work. When he comes home he his has black sut. he coms home at afternoon. When he comes home he has dinner. he gos to work at nighte. When he comes home he bringht some monny back. He gos to bed after dinner,

(Eaglestone 1925: 208)

Although he offers no comment on these quotes, simply asking that the two forms of writing are contrasted, the introduction to the letters of the miners and the fact that they are held up alongside the emergent spelling of children is problematic in terms of what is being achieved. Here Eaglestone’s position as separate from the miners professionally and also intellectually is painfully evident. Eaglestone can critique these letters not only because he has gained a socially prestigious level of formal literacy and is a much better writer than the miners, but also because his position as a time-keeper brings him into contact with the under-manager’s affairs more readily than other mine-workers. The contrast between the two collections of ‘bad’ spelling do demonstrate a reality for the miners and their children but present two similar styles of writing that imply two different social viewpoints; the first is bad or incorrect spelling employed by adults with a lack of education, which can lead to negative social value judgements about the miners, and the second is the emergent spelling of children in the process of learning the standard, an aspect of the process of engaging with traditional literacy. Both of these forms are described as juvenile, although only one of them is in reality written by children. Within *FAPN* then non-standard orthography is used in three ways: to represent the speech of the miners, to demonstrate the low-levels of literacy that the adult miners have, and to link this form of literacy to the emergent spelling of children in the local area. This contrasting of ‘bad’ spelling with ‘juvenile’ spelling highlights a more general issue concerning the way in which non-standard spelling is judged socially as a marker of unintelligence; that because an adult engages with what, to all intents and purposes, looks like the ‘juvenile’ spelling of children, their intelligence is negatively equated with that of a child. Although variation in orthography is reasonably widespread in modern society (Clark 2013), the dominance of Standard Language Culture means that anything non-standard can be equated with ‘juvenile’ literacy practices. Although I am pointing out a formal problem that I have with the contrasting of ‘bad’ with emergent spelling, and the implications this has for non-standard dialect representation, in *FAPN* these forms operate for Eaglestone in two significant ways. When Eaglestone represents the speech and the bad spelling of the miners, for the *Daily News* reviewer, these elements work to emphasise the poverty that the miners face in relation to cultural ideas and this creates a sense of pathos for the miners; they speak and write badly because in the face of poverty and terrible working conditions they do not have access to formal education. Their lack of literacy is not seen as ‘juvenile’, indexing unintelligence, but is seen as evidence for their lack of access to formal education. However on the other hand when these representations do not work they highlight the main cultural problem that Eaglestone faces with his mediation of the miners’ lives. Eaglestone appears to be too articulate and therefore not authentic enough.

### 2.5.4. Over-Literate and Superior

R.M.F. found Eaglestone’s portrayal of his colleagues inauthentic as he perceived the writer to be creating a superiority about himself that put him above the people he was writing about:

A book like this, I feel, should express either a joy in work or a fierce revolt against bad conditions – perhaps both. But Mr. Dataller’s book is hopelessly disfigured by flunkeyism.

He is so anxious to ride with the manager at the “beano”; to wait for the nervous propitiatory knock of the miners at the door of his little office – he has been made a timekeeper at the mine; to teach the young ones to take off their caps when they come in; to keep miners waiting and cross-examine them impertinently.

At the hotel where the beano party dines, he is angry with the waiters – he calls them menials – because they treat all alike and even address one of the lads as “Sir,” like the other customers [….]

He appears to have some degree of literary appreciation but not much creative power. In a fairly typical passage on the familiar theme of public indifference to the miner’s dangers he writes: --

‘Where trees are lining all the streets and ladies with bright dresses are. Where music wakes and dainty slippered feet tread out a measure … Who cares?

Where black musicians grin, and bones and symbols [sic] crash … Who cares?

Where men with white shirt-fronts lift up their wine … Who cares?’

Perhaps if they did care they might be convinced by Mr. Dataller that many of the accidents are caused by the men’s negligence. And, anyway, what does Mr. Dataller care about the troubles of the pretty girls? Or even about his fellow-miners of whom he writes with such conscious superiority!

Well, Pepys [sic] diary was of value not because of the admirable character it portrayed, though there was a queer sort of honesty about that little man, and perhaps this self-revealing diary is of value too.

(R.M.F. 1925, ‘From a Pitman’s Note-Book by Roger Dataller’)

Eaglestone’s literary skill and the literary importance of his journal are denigrated by R.M.F., who also focusses on his role as a time-keeper and not as a face-worker. The literary aspirations that Eaglestone has for his writing have overcome the purposes of the book and have therefore created for R.M.F. what Murry cautioned against; the journal of a mining intellectual. In many respects R.M.F.’s complaint can be seen to stem from his ideas about what this type of book should achieve, yet his superiority comment specifically addresses instances where Eaglestone writes about his fellow miners. Though R.M.F. does not explicitly comment on areas of the journal where non-standard orthography is employed it is these segments that R.M.F. objects to as many chapters that deal directly with the miners, and what they have to say, employ dialect representation.

When Eaglestone writes of the fact that there is no real documentation of the miners’ life and history a reviewer in *The Outlook* finds what he is saying overly-literate:

‘No medieval parchment has our name, no cunning fingers traced our lineaments, or gave us awkward life upon the old-time screed. And yet we are not upstart here. Our roots are deeply driven in the earth; and all we are and all we have is of the soil – how intimate you who do not know the mine can never guess. Three hundred years and more my horny-handed forebears were wrestling with the coal.’

The passage, a little emotional, a little over-literate, gives the tone of the book. It is the utterance of a “toiler” acutely self-conscious and class-conscious, equally aesthetic and humanitarian in his impulses, and a profound believer in that sublime paradox, the superiority of the average man – “workingman,” of course. When the diarist calls his record "a human plea," he means a plea not for nationalization or class legislation, but for recognition. He wants to have the collier, like the soldier and the sailor, given credit for his human virtues, his fidelity, his courage, his prodigies of effort, his frequent heroism. And the book finds its motto in H. M. Tomlinson's "The Pit Mouth:" "The common people! Greatness is as common as that!"

(Anon. 1925g, ‘Miscellaneous: From a Pitman’s Notebook’)

For the reviewer here Eaglestone’s literary language and sentimentality has missed the mark of representing ‘the common people’, with the concerns of literary artifice superseding the responsibilities of representation. Also they hit on the central problem of this study of Eaglestone’s work. As an intellectual, in mediating his experiences of working in a mine through literature Eaglestone aims to represent the miners in the pit and he is therefore engaging with a ‘sublime paradox’: elevating the everyday to the ‘lofty’ heights of literature, whereby it loses its everyday qualities. The reference to ‘The Pit Mouth’ (Tomlinson 1922) is interesting in the sense that Tomlinson’s text deals with a mining disaster from the uncertain position of those at the pit-top waiting to hear what has happened below, whereas Eaglestone has worked below ground and is trying to speak of that. For these reviewers Eaglestone’s concerns with literature and his literary aspirations are superseding his worthy subject, the common miner. The reviewer in *The Saturday Review* is not convinced of Eaglestone’s authenticity as a miner because his book is too literary:

It is difficult to believe that this book is the "diary of a human mole, the son of generations of miners," as the publisher tells us. One would say offhand that these pages were written by a young literary man who had taken a turn at working in the English mines. Some of the entries in Roger Dataller's note book are beautifully vivid, some amusing, all of them interesting and all very well written. Their sensitiveness and obvious literary emphasis are values extrinsic to their worth as a "human document."

[....]

The material is his; but though he has the feel of its minutiæ, the sense of its palpitant life seems to escape him. Ink is no substitute for blood, even in a note book.

(Anon. 1925f, ‘Biography: From a Pitman’s Note Book’)

The balance here between authenticity and articulation has tipped over into a level of ‘literary emphasis’ that for this reviewer is superfluous to the stated aim of the journal as a ‘human document’. In this review we can also see why Murry cautioned Eaglestone against his inclusion of intellectual material in *FAPN*.What Eaglestone has to balance in terms of expectations within this work are related to his class, the literary establishment and literary critics. What these discussions of Eaglestone’s over-literariness demonstrate is that he is looking to literature to legitimate his endeavour and needs to employ literary language for this to be achieved. His subject matter, the miners and their lives, however, requires another set of criteria; one that emphasises Eaglestone’s authenticity. Looking at a range of responses to *FAPN* in terms of their views on literature and ideas concerning authentic language use allows for an understanding of the socio-linguistic and literary environment in which *FAPN* was published and why Murry was so commanding in his advice to Eaglestone. However by looking at the ‘ficto-linguistic’ system of *FAPN* a more detailed picture of Eaglestone’s relationship with legitimate literary, regional and class culture can emerge. Within *FAPN* Eaglestone creates a linguistic system and it is the judging of how this system operates, with regards to how language is involved in identity construction, that leads reviewers to claim that Eaglestone is an authentic miner.

## 2.6. Literary Language System

### 2.6.1. Ficto-Linguistics and Social Practice

In examining Eaglestone’s dialect representation looking at reviews can to some degree situate it within the socio-linguistic milieu present in the 1920s, whereas *FAPN* itself presents its own internal language system and attitudes. The internal language system can be explored by looking at how dialect representation operates within the text as a whole as a literary device. In doing this it is possible to link its use to the cultural tensions implicitly and explicitly present in *FAPN* and investigate how Eaglestone represents himself and the miners in light of comments on his superiority. In the last three reviews discussed Eaglestone as an author is described as superior, over-literate and as ‘a young literary man’ not a miner. How Eaglestone presents himself culturally in relation to the miners that he claims to be speaking for is influencing judgements about *FAPN*’s authenticity. Using Ferguson’s ‘ficto-linguistic’ approach (1998) it is possible to trace Eaglestone’s identity claims, in relation to speech, culture and social practices, and see how the mediation of Eaglestone’s complex social identity in *FAPN* is problematic for reviewers in light of the stated aims of *FAPN*  as a ‘human plea’ by a pitman.

Ferguson argues that linguistic readings of dialect in Victorian novels leads to the linguistic inconsistencies of these texts being highlighted and arguments concerning accuracy and authenticity being levelled:

While critical discussion of consistency regarding class location predominates, Victorian critics and more recent studies of dialect have also examined for consistency a second aspect of dialect, the actual representation of the speech [….] [T]his question of consistency is often linked to a concern with accuracy: is the dialect represented in a way that suggests the actual sounds and style of the particular accent or dialect in the real world? [….]

Over a century of critical and scholarly discussions of inconsistency at each of these levels of the representation of dialect has led to the widespread acceptance of two important "rules" governing the use of dialect in fiction: the first is that literary dialect, because it is based on the altering of a non-phonetic writing system (standard English) will be, even in its most elaborate state, an approximate and imprecise representation of speech sounds. The second is that some writers in the Victorian era "elevate" particularly virtuous characters from the lower classes by having them speak a relatively (or entirely) standard form of English.

(Ferguson 1998: 2-3)

Ferguson’s comments summarise recent critical discussions of dialect representation highlighting the arguments that position dialect representation as an ‘approximation’ and also the way in which the standard is associated with positive moral values. The dialect representation of Eaglestone’s miners references real speakers. However it cannot capture linguistic fact, it can merely approximate it. At the same time this invoking of linguistic information and speech is achieving something within this literary text as a whole and invokes the social practices associated with this particular speech variety. Also the convention of ‘elevating’ a character by standardising their speech links the use of standard orthography to positive moral and socio-economic values. This merging and mingling of linguistic information within a literary text operates through and is made salient by the social difference that the use of non-standard orthography for the purposes of dialect representation creates. Also without the use of non-standard orthography within a text standard orthography does not serve to ‘elevate’ a speaker, it is only due to the standard being held up alongside the ‘other’ of non-standard forms that this dimension of valuation becomes visible. Although as discussed even the representation of ‘bad’ language in the standard would serve to ‘lower’ a speaker.

Like any other aspect of the ‘real’ world that makes its way into a work of literature, the ‘real’ has been mediated by the author and relies on the affordances of the written mode and literary conventions for its representation of speech. Linguistic fact is as much at the whim of artistic license as any other aspect of an author’s life which they choose to draw on in their creation of a literary text. For Ferguson this literary process is important when interpreting the ‘inconsistencies’ in the representation of dialect in Victorian novels. Although Ferguson’s concept of ficto-linguistics has been developed to look at the work of Victorian novelists, this approach to the representation of language in literary texts is relevant outside of this genre as it provides a framework for examining the mediation of linguistic reality within literary art. In her approach Ferguson draws on the two established ‘rules’, concerning approximation and elevation, which she outlines as the mainstay of previous scholarship on dialect representation, to focus on the ‘narrative consequences of dialect’ over discussions of linguistic accuracy (Ferguson 1998: 3). In doing this she establishes a ‘ficto-linguistic’ approach ‘as opposed to the socio-linguistics of dialect in the novel’ (Ferguson 1998: 3). Ferguson explains this approach further:

By ficto-linguistics I mean the systems of language that appear in novels and both deviate from accepted or expected socio-linguistic patterns and indicate identifiable alternative patterns congruent to other aspects of the fictional world.

Previous discussions of such fictional socio-linguistics have tended to focus on particular deviations from the expected norm -- the exceptional character, like Oliver Twist, whose speech differs from the expected sociolinguistic pattern. Moreover, scholars and critics who discuss this artistic dimension to the shaping of literary dialect often do so because fictional dialect is, from the socio-linguistic perspective, so often irregular or entirely wrong (cf. Ives, Cole, Toolan). What has not been considered in depth is that characters in novels do not speak in isolation. Because their speech relates in style as well as content to the speech of other characters, all quoted language in a novel is contained within and potentially interacts with the language of the narrator. It is this context that constructs the ficto-linguistic system.

(Ferguson 1998: 3)

Looking at the context of which cultural sphere, by whom and how dialect is being represented, and also for what purposes this representation is being created, are part of this study’s aims in situating dialect represented within social systems. Ferguson’s argument for ficto-linguistics aims to situate represented utterances within the literary system in which they are presented and explores how these representations are operating within the text in which they are being encountered. The relationship between the narrator of *FAPN* and the speech varieties represented in the book, as well as the social aligning that the narrator makes are of importance when considering the representation of the miners’ speech. Within *FAPN* Eaglestone, as himself and the narrator, works in many instances to position himself as a miner, similar in many ways to the other miners in his book, and this endeavour for Murry was essential to the ‘artistic unity’ of his book.

 In some instances Eaglestone’s narrative voice and direct speech interact with the speech of the other figures in *FAPN*. One way in which Eaglestone could show himself to be the same as the miners is to represent himself speaking in the same way as them; after all, Eaglestone grew up in the same area and so linguistically it would make a lot of sense for him to speak in the same way as his community. Within the journal Eaglestone consistently represents his direct speech using Standard English and as discussed earlier Eaglestone had worked to move away from the norms of his local speech community. This act, and the process Eaglestone goes through to introduce the miners’ speech and position himself as a Yorkshire speaker, are part of the literary process of creating a successful narrative rather than the process of a scholar documenting language use and should be viewed in this way. In order to understand the ficto-linguistic system of language that is used in *FAPN* it is of use to track the path of the reader through the first instances of speech representation, whether standard or non-standard, and in order to see how these varieties are being presented within *FAPN* it is necessary to examine the explicit affiliations that the narrator makes with regards to social groups and cultural values. In doing this it is possible to see how the author uses the structure of the journal to address issues of reader accessibility to dialect and perhaps why the reviewer from *Bulletin Magazine* found it difficult to pin down Eaglestone’s ‘mood’. This approach can be used to see how the internal-language system of *FAPN* engages in social practices that are affected by the specific social milieu within which Eaglestone was living. Looking at how the miners’ speech is presented, Eaglestone’s interaction in Standard with non-standard speakers, and the inter-individual, intra-individual and inter-cultural alignments that Eaglestone’s narrative voice participates in, we can use ideas about social practice to examine the paradoxical nature of the representation of the miners’ speech in Eaglestone’s literary endeavour.

### 2.6.2. Introducing a Non-Standard Form and Eaglestone’s Regional identity

The first instance of speech representation in the journal is in the second chapter ‘The Pit-Head’ where Eaglestone recounts his first experience of descending into the mine in a cage. In the interaction between a young boy and an older miner all the speech is represented in standard orthography though the miner swears mildly. The next instance includes two speakers who both elide the word *of* to *o’* and one speaker’s h-dropping is marked by apostrophes. Some mining terminology such as ‘draw’ (the number of men being transported in the cage) and ‘dudley’ (water bottle) is explained and then in ‘All the Schools Have Reassembled’, as well as displaying a young schoolboys emergent spelling in a school exercise, the narrative voice of Roger Dataller positions himself as a broad Yorkshire speaker: ‘Well … Aye … Aye … as we broad Yorkshire people say – but the Pit will claim its own.’ (Eaglestone 1925: 24). Within the ficto-linguistic world that Eaglestone has created he has aligned himself with ‘broad Yorkshire people’ although he does not represent himself as a broad Yorkshire dialect speaker within *FAPN*. So far the unique speech community of the miners working underground has been set up through explicit comment about their speech variety being spoken in Yorkshire and by establishing that the miners’ speech contains a range of features which include: swearing, mining slang or terminology – the technical side of this being an aspect that Eaglestone refrains from representing – and the socially stigmatized linguistic feature of h-dropping. The first real introduction to dialect speakers comes in the form of a play script that presents a dialogue between two miners. Below this extract is a linguistic description of the features of Yorkshire English represented in the text. In describing the phonological features represented in the text I have placed these features between slashes to denote that they are abstractions based on orthography and not transcriptions of real speech. Further, more detailed comment will be made concerning transcription, approximation and orthography in 3.3.1. when looking at a poem by Hague:

‘Pit Dialogues’ [‘Feathers’]

JACOB. ‘Ah can eat ought wi’ feathers on – me.’

BILL. ‘Tha can’t!’

JACOB (*bridling*). ‘Can’t I? That’s where tha meks a mistake owd lad. I can set about a duck or ‘n hare or ought.’

BILL. ‘Tha can’t eat ought wi’ feathers on.’

JACOB. ‘I tell thee I can.’

BILL. ‘Tha can’t eat a bloody shuttlecock. So that’s telled thee!’

 (Eaglestone 1925: 31)

**Phonological Features**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Type**  | **Feature** | **RP**  | **Yorkshire**  |
| PRICE vowel | <Ah>  | /aI/  | /a:/ |
| FACE vowel | <meks> | /eI/ | /ɛ/ |
| l-vocalisation | <owd> | /əʊld/ | /oʊd/ |
| Reduction | <’n> and <wi’> | /an/ - /wIð/ | /n/ - /wI/ |

**Lexis**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Feature** | **Description** |
| ‘ought’ | **‘**anything’ |

**Morphosyntactic Features**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Feature** | **Description** |
| ‘…feathers on – *me*’ | Right dislocation |
| <thee> and <tha> | Archaic second person singular pronouns‘tha’ (thou) subject form‘thee’ object form |
| <tell> and <telled> | Regularisation, or ‘weakification’ of ‘strong’ verb paradigm. Retention of Old English inflection<tellan> and <tealde> <tell> present tense, <telled> past participle |

Paul Cooper (2013) gives a full account of the following features in Yorkshire English in his thesis *Enregisterment in Historical Contexts: A Framework*: ‘owt’ (151), ‘thee’ and ‘tha’, (150) l-vocalisation (112) and the PRICE (158) and FACE (20) vowels. This work will be considered further when looking at the common features that Eaglestone, Hague and Hines’ texts share in 4.5.4. In *An Introduction to Regional Englishes* Joan Beal (2010) outlines in general ‘l’- vocalisation (20-21), ‘thee’ and ‘thou’ in middle English (40) and discusses past tense paradigms with regards to Lisotte Anderwauld’s term ‘weakification’ (30-31). Mercedes Durham (2011) provides an overview of research on right dislocation as well as questioning the relationship between its usage and performance of Northern identity in *Right Dislocation in Northern England: Frequency and use – perception meets reality*. For an etymological overview of ‘tell’ please see the Oxford English Dictionary entry (‘Tell, *v.* 2014). I discuss the features represented in extracts from Hague and Hines using similar tables in 3.3.1. and 4.3.1. respectively. In 4.5.4. I also provide an additional table that shows the features common to the three extracts explored based on the use of the same use of non-standard orthography. This is done as a point of comparison in order to consider briefly the features of Yorkshire dialect that have been enregistered across the eras in which these authors were writing.

The title ‘Pit Dialogues’ positions this conversation underground and with the few establishing aspects of the miners’ speech we are in a position to understand that the men speaking are Yorkshire miners with certain features within their repertoires. This is the first conversation where both speakers speak in dialect for the entirety of the conversation and Eaglestone can be seen to be positioning this first instance of sustained dialect representation within a familiar script form. The use of non-standard dialect representation to add to a humorous characterisation or scene is also not uncommon (Wales 2006: 138-139). The miners’ speech is lightly marked for dialect (Jaffe and Walton 2000: 564-566) and Eaglestone’s representation is consistent with existing orthographical rules; apostrophes show that some letters are missing in the word *wi’*. This dialogue serves as an introduction to the miners’ speech and the fact that it is the most heavily marked speech that the reader has seen so far is countered by the script form. Eaglestone provides no commentary on this scene, however his stage direction of ‘(bridling)’ provides information concerning how the reader is to interpret this interaction, and the scene establishes the conventions of the representation of the miners’ speech early on. These dialogues occur at regular intervals throughout *FAPN* with the next one to appear being the incident with the ‘Watter Tubs’ displayed previously. In ‘Watter Tubs’ Eaglestone’s stage directions provide the reader with the tools for interpretation of what appears to be the prelude to a violent altercation peppered with obscenities. After the ‘Feathers’ dialogue Eaglestone’s representation of speech in the diary style chapters is nestled amongst his standard writing in the form of direct quotations, and these are as marked as ‘Feathers’, as well as appearing in further stylised dialogues which are similar in style to ‘Feathers’ and ‘Watter Tubs’. Eaglestone is one of these broad Yorkshire men. However a distinction has been made between the narrator of *FAPN* and these two miners through the use of the stylistic features of the ‘Feathers’ dialogue.

### 2.6.3. Inter-Cultural difference

Eaglestone’s narrative voice aligns himself with ‘broad Yorkshire folk’ in the chapter ‘All The Schools Have Reassembled’ and in ‘Education’ Eaglestone aligns himself as one of the group of miners and works to contextualise the miner as someone who lacks culture but that his employment and circumstances need to be considered. Here Eaglestone creates a distinction between the miners’ cultural norms and those of another socio-cultural group that may have a negative opinion of the miners:

I suppose we are an ignorant lot, uncultivated, dishonest, ungainly even. And yet consider for a moment the nature of our employment working in a humid darkness, illuminated only by the feeble gleaming of some safety lamp.

 (Eaglestone 1925: 42)

Eaglestone positions himself very much as one of these ‘ignorant’ miners although he could not write his book if he had not gone to some level to counter his ‘ignorance’ and lack of cultural cultivation. This statement also serves to give an insight into the miners’ behaviour in relation to ideas about ignorance, with the implication being that they behave in the way that they do due to the nature of their work. This idea of the miners’ ignorance is further explored when Eaglestone moves on to the subject of ‘University Extension lecturing under the Welfare Scheme’ (Eaglestone 1925: 42) an attempt to educate the miners through lectures which Eaglestone points out are generally poorly attended. Relating his experiences of attending one of these lectures on modern music, where the lecturer had ‘an extraordinary repertoire of gesticulation’, Eaglestone highlights the differences between traditional ideas about intelligence and academic literacy, and the physical literacy and environmental understanding that the miners discuss:

The lecturer is very kind. He shakes hands at the door and bids ‘Good night’

But…

‘It’s all book knowledge’, said one chap the other night. ‘I’ll bet yon bloke can’t make a rabbit hutch.’

‘’E’s none so daft’, returned another; ‘’e gets ‘is livin wi’out workin’ an’ that’s more’n you or me can do!’

 (Eaglestone 1925: 43-44)

Finally in returning to the idea of the miners being ignorant Eaglestone draws attention to those who criticise the miners without being acquainted with their hardships:

I suppose we are an ignorant lot, and I am reminded of one great literary gentleman (I name no names) who found it possible to take up his pen in order to dispense a stinging castigation upon the ‘pampered colliers’. And reading what he had to say, straightway I remember W—B—and what had happened to W—B—the week before, and a question that arose within a circle of black-faced sober men. ‘Now who will go and tell them at his home?’…

It wasn’t the literary gentleman who went.

 (Eaglestone 1925: 45)

Throughout this chapter Eaglestone shows his personal affiliation with his fellow miners and common ideas concerning ignorance and education, whilst also attempting to show to some degree the values and skills that this community share in contrast to the values of an institution such as the University. The link being expressed here is between the cultural values of the miners and perceived levels of intelligence. As a whole the chapter does well to underline one of the main problems for reviewers of *FAPN* concerning Eaglestone’s superior attitude towards his colleagues; Eaglestone is neither ignorant nor uncultivated yet he associates himself with the coal-mining community’s positive values. The prestigious variety in this speech community is placed on the dialect that they speak, however the legitimised societal value is placed on prestige forms of English associated with the upper-middle classes. Culturally within literature value and prestige is placed upon standard spelling and literary technique, with a cultural link being formed between standard spelling and prestige forms. Within these scenes Eaglestone is aligning himself in terms of identity with the coal miners and trying to present the norms of their value systems, yet with regards to cultural norms and literary prestige Eaglestone has to align himself with a sphere that is not the norm to this community, that of academia and literature. For Eaglestone he is to some degree part of both of these spheres which is where the tension in his work lies.

### 2.6.4. Inter-Individual Difference

This tension is present in chapters where standard and dialect speakers are shown in conversation. For example the chapter ‘The Deputy’ details an altercation between a dialect-speaking coal-miner and his standard-speaking Deputy, with the rest of the extract detailing the social and moral position that this much libelled professional superior to the colliers occupies. The deputy speaking in standard demonstrates his social position but also his position outside of the miners’ social group. As a narrator Eaglestone’s narrative voice has aligned itself with Yorkshire and with the miners, who are consistently represented speaking dialect. This in some ways reflects the idea that Eaglestone has to make the miners articulate through him. In ‘On Tollgate Hill – 10p.m’ the representation of Eaglestone’s own speech in Standard English shows the inter-individual difference between him and a ‘brawny ruffian’ but also the inter-cultural difference between some members of the community he is representing and the public he is writing for. This chapter goes further to demonstrate Eaglestone’s complex social position and demonstrates how the contrast between the ‘rough’ speech of the miners contributes to judgements concerning Eaglestone’s articulation. Although Eaglestone’s narrator has positioned himself as one of the miners there are similarities between the deputy and him in terms of their use of standard for direct speech and Eaglestone’s position as a timekeeper, putting him in a similar position as middleman between the miners and the management. A difference in morals plays out through differences in speech when Eaglestone recounts his experiences of witnessing a fight in ‘On Tollgate Hill – 10p.m’:

The lamp gives small illumination. I hear a little wheezing, a little panting, and then a choking ‘Lemme gerrup! . . . Ah!’

‘What’s the matter? What’s happening?’ I whisper to my right-hand companion.

‘It’s a feight, that’s what it is,’ he answers; ‘’e’s asked for it, that’s what ‘e ‘as an’ ‘e’s bloody well goin’ ter get it . . . aye!’

[Standing next to the same man, Eaglestone manages to get a good look at what is going on]

The man beside me turns his head. With the utmost nonchalance he bows his nose upon the ground.

‘He’s strangling the man,’ I cry, digging my elbow into his ribs, ‘he’s killing the poor devil isn’t he?’

The brawny ruffian thrusts his arm across my chest where I can feel it pressing like some Iron bar.

‘Thee shurrup! . . . an’ ler ‘em aloane. It’s nowt to do wi’ thee see?

‘But it has – he’s killing the fellow!’

‘’E’s not! ‘E’s ony showin’ ‘im wot’s wot.’

With that he thrusts his hand deep into capacious pockets and four square, stands renewing a former attitude. Where are the police? The man below is squealing now, a little thinly, tailing off into a groan.

‘They’ll tek ‘im inside in a minnit,’ says some one, ‘they’re both about potted.’

Shamefaced I turn away. Oh! I know my duty as well as you know yours. I should have flung myself between. I should have been resplendently heroic. And as I hurry on I am ashamed ... you’re not a saint, my lad, not by very long chalks . . .

(Eaglestone 1925: 68-69)

In this scene the ‘brawny ruffian’ speaks in dialect, although Eaglestone talks in Standard English. Eaglestone as the narrator is shown to speak SE and this is in many ways, especially in the extract above, in line with the Victorian convention of representing virtue through the use of standard (Ferguson 1998). To some degree this scene could cause a problem for some readers – as we have seen – if we are to view this book as a ‘human plea’ whereby the coal-miner’s plight is being shown. Eaglestone’s use of his own experiences and the perceived link between dialect speech and inarticulateness or a lack of education means that as the standard speaker Eaglestone simultaneously is reporting about the miners, speaking on their behalf, and also presenting his own experiences and personal views. In this scene it is Eaglestone’s moral stance that positions him as the outsider and his use of Standard contributes to this sense. The reality that is being mediated through Eaglestone’s endeavour to make the miners ‘articulate through him’ is the social-reality of his inter-individual and inter-cultural relations. This scene also goes some distance to present the central tension of Eaglestone’s book; that he has to try and straddle the seemingly mutually exclusive identities of the miner and the intellectual, when in reality he is mediating aspects of his own complex and nuanced social identity.

### 2.6.5. Intra-Individual Cultural Tensions: ‘Cramp’

The cultural tensions between the community that Eaglestone is representing and his individuality come to a head in the chapter ‘Cramp’ where Eaglestone’s cultural allegiances, aspirations and frustrations are explicitly realised:

All my life I have been bound within the turgid flow of mediocrity. At times when it seemed that I had almost gained a foothold on the firm redeeming slopes of intellectual and spiritual advancement, a hundred hands in situations at once calamitous and unforeseen, have dragged me down again; conditions of labour, of health, finance and bereavement.

One struggles as for one’s very soul for days and weeks on end against the utter placidity of the daily thought and common speech of such a place as Tollgate. The most unthinking miner seems far happier than I. For him the clean strong wind of morning, the thoroughbred dog, lean and elegant, his pint or two at the ‘Nag’s Head’ or whatever ‘Cat and Codfish’ he is supposed to frequent; an undiscriminating appreciation of the ‘Pictures’. He is quite content to live without Debussy or Picasso. Chaliapin stands for less than a name to him. Of Rosing he had never heard. And yet he is content.

(Eaglestone 1925: 91)

In expressing his frustrations Eaglestone references masters of high art and goes on in the second half of this chapter to create a metaphorical allusion between the residents of Tollgate with Gogol’s ‘Dead Souls’ or dead serfs:

But there are occasions when M. and I seem absolutely isolated, walking, the only substantial beings, in a world of dim dream shadows with whom we can never really come into contact try as often as we may. The newly printed lists of municipal electors they nail up in the public place are remembrances of souls that never have been – the ‘Dead Souls’ of Gogol’s masterpiece, how many thousands here I do not care to tell. . . .

Sometimes we both set out to buy a soul or two. We reproach ourselves that we haven’t gone even half-way to meet people of our acquaintance; that we have expected great returns and haven’t spent ourselves enough.

(Eaglestone 1925: 92)

This extract demonstrates the central problem concerning the ‘artistic unity’ of *FAPN* with regard to the figure of the author himself and Eaglestone’s experiences of cultural dissonance. Although Eaglestone works with coal-miners in the pits, was raised and lives in the local area, and identifies strongly in many ways with the miners and Yorkshire he is culturally and professionally not satisfied. What is also interesting is that the extract describes how Eaglestone has not been able to achieve ‘intellectual and spiritual advancement’ because of his circumstances and he talks of being bound within the ‘turgid flow of mediocrity’ where he struggles against the ‘daily thought and common speech of such a place as Toll-gate.’ The ‘common speech’ of Tollgate is highlighted as one of the frustrations that Eaglestone deals with and yet his representation of this speech, using a variety of techniques, is seen as one of the most authentic aspects of his writing. This extract is perhaps the type of writing which compels R.M.F in *The Irish (Times) Statesman* to talk of Eaglestone’s ‘conscious superiority’ and although this may in some sense be true, what this chapter demonstrates is the variety of social practices within which Eaglestone as an individual engages, and what these mean for his process of mediation. In a book in which Eaglestone is attempting faithfully to convey his experiences of living in a coal-mining community we are getting an insight into the frustrations of not an ‘average’ miner but a man who is at times expressing his frustrations with the cultural milieu that he is part of. This serves to highlight not only the complexity of the process of mediation but also the complexity of the social identity which is to be mediated.

With Eaglestone’s position as a ‘typical’ miner contributing to the sensational press responses to the publication of this journal, there is a disconnect between the community being said to be represented and the man representing them. This is picked up on by some reviewers, creating the type of response Murry’s advice was attempting to counteract. Eaglestone wishes to express himself artistically but needs to write in a way that would appeal to a mass audience and therefore be taken up by a publisher. Rather than the author of *FAPN* being a typical miner, Eaglestone is someone who was struggling artistically, financially and culturally. It is this central tension in *FAPN* that puts his representation of local dialect into a complex mix*,* as well as the fact that the journal style of writing allows Eaglestone to demonstrate a change in opinion or temperament on a daily basis, *FAPN* displays this tension and also solves it for Eaglestone as through its successful publication he gains access to University education and as a cultural object its publication demonstrates his literary talents. The book is simultaneously written about the miners for the miners’ sake and about Eaglestone’s experiences as one who is amongst them but focussed on other forms of culture. Putting this into context, Eaglestone’s subsequent autobiographical journals deal with similar themes of cultural dissonance and belonging as in *A Pitman Looks at Oxford* Eaglestone is intellectually satisfied but finds the behaviour of the upper-classes and the institution of Oxford University problematic. In *Oxford into Coalfield* Eaglestone is tasked with educating the working communities to which he once belonged, dealing with a similar response from the miners as in the ‘Education’ extract above. Focussing on the stylistic difficulties, social paradoxes and cultural tensions Eaglestone’s *FAPN* presents is done in order to question the expectations of the cultural spheres in which he operates, rather than to question or critique how ‘successful’ Eaglestone was in his stated aims for *FAPN.* The range of cultured ideas that Eaglestone negotiates and displays in *FAPN* demonstrates the complex social position an individual occupies within society and the difficulties of mediating speech and the idea of authenticity within a literary text. Discussing *FAPN* with regard to ideas about bad language, prestigious forms of speech and writing, and how its internal language system links with the author’s cultural leanings provide further understanding of the socio-cultural norms that Eaglestone was negotiating as a working-class writer aspiring to a more academic career.

## 2.7. Concluding Remarks: Eaglestone’s Socio-Cultural Position

### 2.7.1. The Stratum of Secondary Meaning

Eaglestone’s frustrations expressed in ‘Cramp’ about the level of cultural awareness that his local community possess can be seen to conform to what Bourdieu highlights as the ‘stratum of secondary meaning’ (Bourdieu 1984: 2-3), especially when he talks of Debussy, Picasso, Chaliapin and Rosing, as his perception of culture has changed through his literary education. In many ways Eaglestone is presenting a range of social categories in his journal as a Yorkshireman, pit-worker, writer, philosopher, humanist etc. that the reader can judge him on. Out of all of these competences the category that has the most beneficial possibilities for Eaglestone is that of ‘writer of literature’. Bourdieu asserts that the artistic ‘eye’ is in itself a cultural product which is ideologically constructed and Eaglestone demonstrates that he has acquired this ‘eye’ through his writing and cultural references (Bourdieu 1984: 3-4). Eaglestone’s frustration in ‘Cramp’ is expressed because through a self-imposed literary education he has acquired an artistic ‘eye’ which is focussed predominantly on ‘legitimate works of art’ and *FAPN*, although a human plea, is seen by some reviewers as privileging the artistic mode of literary writing over the ‘authentic’ miners as the object of representation. Eaglestone’s artistic interests and education have meant that he has acquired a second stratum of cultural meaning which he subscribes to but also frustrates him (c.f. Bourdieu 1984: 2-4). The legitimate literary art form for Eaglestone is also linked with prestige speech forms that are not the local norm. Within the discourse surrounding Eaglestone’s journal we can observe meta-linguistic comments that link ways of speaking with moral value judgements and literary technique with levels of articulation, yet by examining the role of the narrative voice in presenting that system of language to the reader we can observe that a similar cultural distinction is being made through the view that certain cultural forms, such as literature, are more legitimate than others. This legitimacy is also linked with prestige speech forms. Within this text then there is a variety of cultural forms all interacting to create social distinction, with Eaglestone distinguishing himself through the ‘construction’ of linguistic and cultural difference within a literary text.

### 2.7.2. Legitimate Culture

Examining the concept of ‘legitimate culture’ further it is possible to view Eaglestone’s journal in inter-individual, intra-individual and inter-cultural terms that can account for the diverse range of cultural tensions that Eaglestone displays and positions the linguistic and literary aspects of his journal within common networks. Lahire’s sociological approach to the investigation of individuals and the range of cultural aspects that they embrace, which are also in many ways class determined, is beneficial to the investigation of an author like Eaglestone. The *Bulletin Magazine* reviewer argues that Eaglestone is a composite of all the identities that he displays and from the chapter ‘Cramp’ we get the sense that Eaglestone struggles to balance all these aspects or at least wishes to present this struggle publically. This may cause problems for a work of literature in terms of characterisation, yet we can understand that in reality an individual’s identity is not a simplistic affair. What Lahire’s (2008) approach to cultural dissonance and self-distinction provides is a way of differentiating the different types of cultural competences that Eaglestone is displaying within his journal and seeing how they are interconnected; literary prowess links with prestigious speech forms, but also the practices of social distinction in which Eaglestone, and any other individual within society, engages. Lahire’s approach is quantitative and based on contemporary analysis of French culture but his conceptual framework for focussing on culture in an intra-individual and inter-cultural manner are relevant to this text based study:

From Thorstein Veblen (1899) to Pierre Bourdieu (1979), via Edmond Goblot (1925), a long intellectual tradition has brought to light the social functions of art and culture in differentiated and hierarchised societies, most notably the profits to be made, in terms of social distinction, from the mastery of the most exclusive and most legitimate forms of culture. For a long time, sociologists of culture have therefore been used to thinking about ‘‘Culture’’ (that is, ‘‘high culture’’) in terms of its relationship with social classes or fractions of those classes, and to acknowledging the inequality of access to culture across society.

(Lahire 2008: 166)

Mastery of literature, an ‘exclusive and legitimate form of culture’ due to the economics of access to reading materials, provides a profitable means of social distinction for Eaglestone. Lahire’s approach involves a move away from looking solely at the inter-class cultural meanings of culture towards ‘a perspective that would consider cultural practices and preferences in terms of intra-individual behavioural variation’ (Lahire 2008: 167). This cultural practice and intra-individual approach allows Eaglestone’s experiences of cultural dissonance, attempts at and reviews of his literary mastery, and the meta-linguistic judgements concerning his miners’ speech to be put into the context of the individual writer from a varied cultural background negotiating everyday cultural identities and literary culture, and for his representation of the miners’ speech to be an aspect of this process. Eaglestone’s mediation of a vernacular speech variety draws into *FAPN* a dimension of social reality that renegotiates the norms of the variety of cultural spheres which interact within his text. Lahire’s study concludes that in many ways what we term ‘atypical’ behaviour in social-groups is actually ‘far from being marginal from a sociological point of view’ (Lahire 2008: 171) and so within a social-group that has a documented history of autodidacts (Rose 2011: 116-145) it is not historically problematic to have a writer like Eaglestone; although for reviewers at the time it was surprising to have a miner who wrote with literary skill. Eaglestone, as a writer: on the level of the individual displayed love for some aspects of culture and detested others; on an inter-cultural level defended the group that he belonged to, as well as criticising other social groups; and presents aspects of himself which he believed would be beneficial to his acceptance into another class or group which he aspired to. Eaglestone’s *FAPN* therefore displays the tensions evident in not only intra-personal and inter-cultural relations, which we negotiate on a daily basis, but also the diverse range of social relationships, political stances and artistic motivations that make up an individual author’s social background.

### 2.7.3. A More Nuanced Understanding of Mediation

Working further with Lahire’s work it is also possible to position the author-miner within a framework that positions the writer-worker as the norm rather than the exception. In ‘The Double Life of Writers’ Lahire offers a critique of ‘field theory’ and employs the concept of the ‘literary game in which authors participate for various reasons and on a variety of levels (Lahire 2010: 443-444). Eaglestone’s involvement in the literary game is not out of professional obligation as at the time of writing the journal this was denied to him although it became his career later on; or at least he took on the career of the writer-teacher over the writer-pit-man. The idea that there is an underlying economic restriction that holds back authors from full-time participation in the literary game normalises the role of the writer-miner, or any other writer-worker etc., as an objective sociological statement. It is the reaction from critics, who are in many ways the gate-keepers of legitimate culture, to Eaglestone’s documentation of his life as a writer-miner that sensationalise Eaglestone’s position as a worker and a writer, and this sensationalist response is due to the nature of coal-mining as a physical job and the enregistered view of miners as uneducated. However normalising the position of the writer-worker would not have offered any consolation to the aspirant Eaglestone reading and writing in his free time from the pits and the steel works as access to legitimate culture was denied to him at that time by economic and critical forces. Eaglestone’s *FAPN* demonstrates the difficulties of any attempt to speak authentically of the coal mine, coal-miners and coal-mining communities. What the discourses explored in this section and contrasted with sociological views of culture achieve is an examination of the simplification of the nuanced social value of speech and written art in everyday theories of language and literature. Socially motivated individuals identities are complex, but because social expectations and cultural spheres are socially constructed, ideologies limit what is seen as ‘normal’, ‘acceptable’ or ‘good’. This means that what is visible within these spheres is what has been legitimated. The ways in which the cultural sphere of literature limits how working-class life, culture and language can be presented is discussed in chapter 4 in relation to Hines’ work.

In chapter 2 I have discussed the life and works of Arthur Eaglestone in order to explore how reviewers responded to his use of dialect representation in *FAPN*. I have attempted to show the ways in which Eaglestone used non-standard orthographical conventions to negotiate perceptions of authenticity, as well as looking at how he socially positions his narrative voice. In exploring Eaglestone’s work I have raised questions concerning the mediation of vernacular speech which touch upon: the complex nature of social identity, the role literature plays in social distinction, and how individuals negotiate the cultural legitimacy of literary discourse. In chapter 3 I explore how Tom Hague’s work demonstrates how language values are socially and culturally relative, and how legitimization processes inform the essentialist models of what constitute ‘authentic’, ‘good’ and ‘literary’ language.

# 3. Legitimacy and Subversion in Tom Hague’s *Totley Tom: Tales of a Yorkshire Miner*

## 3.1. Introduction

Tom Hague was a coal-miner from South Yorkshire who began writing poetry and prose in Sheffield dialect during the 1970’s. In this period the miners’ industrial action brought them into the public eye and their actions and politics were discussed frequently in the media. Hague only had one book published in his lifetime, *Tales of a Yorkshire Miner,* and, much like Eaglestone, his works are situated in a local history/studies context with most of them being available from the Sheffield Local Studies Library. The multifaceted nature of what it meant to be a Yorkshire coal-miner is the main concern of many of Hague’s dialect poems, prose work and newspaper letters. In his writing Hague attempted to address public perceptions of pit-workers and express the solidarity he felt towards his community. He wrote frequently in Yorkshire dialect and, whilst his use of this technique is also engaged in many of the issues concerning authenticity discussed in chapter two, I argue that he predominantly used non-standard orthography and dialect representation to undermine the legitimate views of the establishment. In his writing, Hague shows an awareness of the political nature of language use, as well as the role that language standards play in perpetuating dominant ideologies. For example the ‘Speikin’ Proper’ poem discussed in chapter one specifically aimed to undermine the common belief, informed by Standard Language Ideology, that dialects are inferior in both the content of the poem and in Hague’s use of non-standard orthographic conventions.

This chapter focusses on how Tom Hague employs dialect representation to challenge, criticise and subvert the legitimate authority of a range of dominant aspects of culture. On the one hand, many of Hague’s texts fit in with perceptions of an ‘authentic’ performance of the identity and speech of a Yorkshire coal-miner. To examine this I spend some time discussing one of Hague’s poems in relation to the issue of authenticity. On the other hand, Hague’s texts also show an awareness of, and an opposition to, many legitimate culture norms, as well as the understanding that how you speak and write are political acts. The main focus of this chapter is on legitimacy because of the ways in which Hague challenges legitimate culture and language. Legitimacy will also be focused on in order to engage with the question of the ‘delegitimising’ effect that the use of non-standard orthography can have on the non-standard variety of speech it is being used to represent (Jaffe and Walton 2000: 582).

In the first half of this chapter Hague’s biography is introduced. One of his poems will be analysed in isolation as an example of Hague’s style. Some further discussion of scholarship concerning orthography will be undertaken. The biographical section of this chapter focusses on how Hague came to write both poetry and prose as an outlet for his political beliefs, as well as serving to give a sense of Hague’s sarcastic humour. In this half the focus on Hague’s style and the discussion of orthography are undertaken in order to provide a transition from authenticity to legitimacy. This transition involves building on what has been discussed in chapters 1 and 2, specifically previous discussions of authenticity and also dialect representation as an approximation of speech, by discussing Hague’s poem ‘Chat With A Pit Mouse’. After this discussion, I introduce further research on orthography and legitimacy to position Hague’s dialect representation as an act of respelling which can be used to challenge the legitimate culture. In this discussion I address the issue of the ‘delegitimising’ effect of the use of non-standard orthography to represent a non-standard code discussed by Jaffe and Walton (2000). In doing this I situate the ‘illegitimacy’ of non-standard orthography in relation to wider social processes in order to foreground the issue that legitimacy is a major social process and is not simply contested on the level of orthography. This discussion informs the analysis that takes place in the case studies that follow it. In concluding this chapter I reflect on Hague’s politicised use of dialect representation in relation to McEnery’s work on ‘bad’ language. I argue that Hague’s use of dialect representation is not simply an attempt to ‘write speech down’, but is an act of resistance against the political discourses concerning cultural and linguistic legitimacy.

The second half of this chapter explores Hague’s resistance to legitimate cultural norms. In order to undertake this exploration this half of the chapter is split into three case studies which bring similar or parallel texts together for analysis. This split is necessary because of the variety of poems, stories and articles Hague wrote and the range of voices or positions he performs in these texts. The texts explored in these case studies may be from different genres or written at different times, however they share similarities in terms of the issues or themes Hague was addressing. These three case studies involve exploring: how Hague challenged the legitimate authority of modern art and regional stereotypes; the ways in which Hague subverted the authority of familiar stereotypes concerning the unintelligence and ‘uncouth’ behaviour of coal-miners; and, finally, looking at how Hague criticised the speech, behaviour and power of those who participate in legitimate language and social practices.

## 3.2. Biography

### 3.2.1. Miner Poet

Tom Hague was born on Boxing Day in 1915 and died in 1999. He left school in 1929 at the age of fourteen (Hague, 1976a: inner back cover) and after leaving school Hague worked in a variety of jobs before serving in the Second World War, where he was stationed in South East Asia. After the war Hague found work in the mining industry and continued working as a miner until he retired. When Hague began writing he used the nickname that he had been given in the pits, Totley Tom. He remarked: ‘In my pit there were only three names – Tom, Jack and Jim – and so we were given different handles to differentiate us’ (Holloway, M., 1979). Hague began writing a few years before his retirement from coal-mining and he gained moderate local success. What was significant about the name Totley Tom is that Totley was seen as one of the ‘posher’ parts of Sheffield. Being a miner, Hague’s pit moniker demonstrated the amusing juxtaposition of a miner living in what was perceived as a middle-class area. In reality Hague lived in a prefab on the council estate in Totley and most of his neighbours on the estate were from the working-classes but did not work in the mines (Hall, Sheila. 2011 and Hall, Sharon. 2011).

Pamela Gray, interviewing Hague as part of her folklore thesis research in 1976, concluded her interview by reflecting on Hague’s relationship with the pits:

From the statements Tom made during the course of the interview he has revealed a very strong attachment, and I would go so far as to say, affection, for his work [in the mines].

(Gray 1976: 29)

For Gray, Hague was not a ‘typical miner’. As will be discussed throughout this chapter, Hague’s writing shows his awareness of and his participation in many of the stereotypes of miners and Yorkshireman that were prevalent at the time, whilst also challenging what it means to be a ‘typical miner’. What set him apart for Gray was that he was: ‘a self-taught, articulate man […] a union leader and a published author’ (1976: 25). Besides being a ‘fair scholar but a notable truant’ (Hague 1976a: inner back cover) at school, in adult life he was an autodidact and an avid reader (Hall, Sharon 2011) as well as a socialist (Hague, Russell 2011). Sharon Hall (2011), Hague’s granddaughter, states that being a miner was a means to an end for Hague; emphasising that his ‘strong attachment’ was with reading and nature and not with the mines. These sentiments are reflected in many of his poems and stories which detail the natural world.

It was Hague’s political views and involvement in the national miners’ strike of 1972 that provided the motivation for the start of his writing career. His family remembers the entertaining poems and rhymes that Hague made up for them and his workmates in the years preceding the strike, however Hague only began to write seriously in 1972 when he was fifty-seven (Hague, 1976b[[16]](#footnote-16), Gray, 1976). 1972 was the year that the tensions between the Heath government and the trade unions resulted in the first national strike of coal miners since 1926. Hague began writing because he had nothing to do (Hague, Russell, Hall, Sharon and Sheila Hall 2011). Originally his poems were created to entertain and rouse the miners on the picket line and this is shown in the political subject matter of many of his poetic works stored in the Sheffield Local Studies Library. The first poem he wrote seriously was ‘Egg on His Face’, an attack on the then Prime Minister Edward Heath (Hall, Sharon 2011). Reviews and promotional material for Hague’s 1976 book explain that it was the political situation in 1972 that compelled him to begin to write for a public audience and at the time ‘several of [Hague’s] strike lyrics were being printed and circulated round local clubs’ (Anon. 1972). The strike worked as a catalyst in providing Hague with his subject matter but also an environment in which entertaining himself and his colleagues was of importance. Hague was in his late fifties when he began to write and when he gained some moderate success from his writing career he continued mining and retired when he reached the appropriate age. In contrast to Eaglestone, it seems that Hague was not attempting to court literary approval for his works or to engage with the literati. His only published work was published in 1976, when Hague was sixty, two years before he retired from mining in 1978 (Holloway, 1979). Discussing Gray’s 1976 interview with Hague further provides an insight into some of Hague’s views on language around the time that he had published his only book.

Gray’s interest in talking to Hague was because she considered the ‘particular language of the coal miners [as] now the most distinctive way of considering them as a unified group‘ (1976: 5). As a folklorist she was particularly interested in how they ‘revert to their specialized language’ when ‘within the bounds of their industry’ (Gray 1976: 4), and the role of, what Gray terms, this ‘pit-talk’ in the mining ‘folk group’ (Gray 1976: 5). To explore pit-talk Gray collected examples of ‘folk vocabulary’ through the use of questionnaires and interviewed Hague to support this work (Gray 1976: 9-25). In his interview with Gray, Hague expressed some of his concerns about the difference between vernacular language *in situ* and in writing, whilst Gray’s comments highlight the problems and logistics of gaining access to the mines to investigate language:

It would obviously be to one’s advantage to have a proper tour of the pit and all the workings within, but my conversation with Mr. Hague was the closest I could come to the pit in the limited time that I have spent in England. However, Mr. Hague’s broad Yorkshire dialect and expressive descriptions, achieved with hand motions, have provided me with a closer feeling for the mining material.

In discussion about just how intricate the language of miners is Mr. Hague passed a rather articulate comment. He recognizes the importance of recording this language, yet at the same time harbours feelings of trepidation about outsiders fully understanding the vitality of the whole scene within the pit. There is almost a sort of risk involved in writing things down. Says Mr. Hague, ‘embalming the language makes it kind of dead.’ Dialect is an ever changing phenomenon and must be treated with due respect as such.

(Gray 1976: 14)

Gray’s comments on her interview with Hague highlight two important points which share similarities with reviewers’ reactions to Eaglestone’s use of dialect, explored in chapter 2. The first point is that for Gray the only way to experience, or ‘capture’, the unique vocabulary of pit-talk would be to be in ‘direct contact with the people who employ [this vocabulary]’ (Gray 1976: 14). Gray highlights the problems of access to pit-talk when she makes a point that although she has conducted an extensive literature review of pit-talk, and collated numerous pit-talk words from questionnaires into a glossary of terms, interviewing Hague was ‘an opportunity to hear someone speak the vocabulary that had hitherto at times seemed a remote language’ (Gray 1976: 14). The second point is that Gray’s perception of Hague’s Yorkshire dialect as a performance of authentic ‘pit-talk’ gave her a ‘closer feeling for the mining material’ (Gray 1976: 14). Gray interprets Hague’s use of dialect as the type of speech employed in the mines and so she develops a closer affinity with the mines themselves. On the one hand Gray highlights the impossibility of accessing the ‘folk language’ of ‘pit-talk’ whilst on the other she discusses how it is only through experiencing Hague’s use of dialect that ‘pit-talk’ becomes less ‘remote’ and more accessible. Gray’s interpretation of Hague’s ‘broad Yorkshire dialect’ as being authentically of the ‘mines’ shares similarities with the reviewers that brand Eaglestone an authentic miner because of his representation of Yorkshire dialect, and highlights the role that dialect speech has in providing an ‘authentic’ sense of this environment for outsiders. To further illustrate this notion of dialect representation demonstrating authenticity Gray’s comments also parallel a description of Hague’s writing in a magazine article by a journalist Donald Dunn. Dunn makes a comparison between Hague’s dialect writing and the ‘artificial’ exercises of linguistics:

[Hague’s] use of dialect has no artifice about it. The dialogue is rich, real and revealing. It is worlds apart from the humorous dialect tales that sometimes regale readers of the *Yorkshire Post* or *Dalesman* and equally far removed from the academic exercises in linguistics that occupy a whole sub-section of the English Department at Leeds University

 (Dunn 1976)

Dunn’s discussion of Hague’s dialect writing sees it as lacking ‘artifice’ and possessing authenticity and richness. He sees Hague’s work as differing significantly from two ‘artificial’ uses of dialect in writing. The first is the use of dialect for humorous purposes (Wales 2006: 138-139) in publications which are distributed regionally. The second is the actual linguistic attempts to describe and catalogue Yorkshire speech undertaken at Leeds University, presumably by the Survey of English Dialects. These two examples link with ideas concerning authenticity that have been discussed in previous chapters and also a notion of vernacularity which is discussed in 3.3. For Gray, Hague’s dialect speech possesses an as authenticity linked to the workplace of the miners and, for Dunn, written dialect can be interpreted as possessing the same authenticity that spoken dialects possess. The final point to highlight from Dunn’s article is his discussion of artifice. Although written dialect is wholly artificial, as it has been mediated through the written mode, Dunn judges it to be an authentic representation of Yorkshire dialect.

In the interview with Gray, Hague’s comments on writing language down demonstrate his understanding of dialect as, what Gray calls, ‘an ever changing phenomenon’. (Gray 1976: 14). In discussing the ‘risk involved in writing things down’ Hague discusses the potentially ‘embalming effect’ this process can have and recognises the change in context and form that this process involves. In representing dialect, in many of the works that are discussed later, Hague focusses on the practices, values and politics of the people who speak in this way. In a sense Hague’s use of dialect is linked to the things that people ‘do’ with it rather than on ‘capturing’ the sounds of speech and ‘embalming’ it in text. Finally it is worth pointing out that having his comments on language being described as Hague passing ‘a rather articulate comment’ by a student of folklore would be, as we shall see, the very things that Hague would take pleasure in lampooning and deconstructing (cf. Hall, Sharon 2011). The issue here is that someone in a position where they are considered to be an intellectual is commenting on how ‘articulate’ a miner is, and the presupposition of this comment is that being ‘articulate’ and a ‘miner’ are mutually exclusive social categories. For Gray the unity of the miners is most visible socially in their language use (1976: 4-5) and it was Hague’s poetic use of this that meant that his picket-line poetry was appreciated by his fellow miners. As a member of the National Union of Mineworkers and a self-taught writer it is understandable that the political situation provided a worthwhile subject to which Hague could react. This initial reaction to politics and dealing with life on the picket-line was how Hague began to write, however his reasons for writing need to be contextualised.

### 3.2.2. The 1972 Miners’ Strike

Hague was an experienced miner when he took part in the strike action of 1972. The National Union of Mineworkers (NUM) was attempting to gain a 47 per cent increase in wages for the miners and was campaigning for this increase for a variety of reasons:

The late 1960s had seen rising discontent in Britain’s coalfields, due partly to a precipitate rundown in the industry, partly to a steady slippage in the miners’ position in the earning league, and partly to an egalitarian national power-loading agreement, which cut face-workers’ incomes in the more prosperous areas.

(Marquand 2008: 249)

The publically owned National Coal Board would not offer anything more than a 7.9 per cent pay rise as the Conservative Government, led by Heath, had imposed a cap on wage increases in the public sector. The wage cap was in place due to the economic problems that the Heath government were dealing with. No satisfactory arrangement could be made and so the NUM called for a national strike. The resourcefulness of the miners, including the use of Arthur Scargill’s flying pickets, crippled the Heath government who had to concede a humiliating defeat. The miners viewed this as a great victory but, in the years following this success, the economic cuts and procedures that were in place to bring the country through its financial problems meant that the miners’ demands were never fully met, leading to dissatisfaction from the miners and more strike action. In this situation the militancy and organisation of the miners succeeded however the clash between the miners and the Heath government in 1972 set the stage for the crushing defeat of the miners by the Thatcher government in 1984.

The way in which the NUM presented the negotiations for a wage increase and the call to strike were presented to the miners was within the framework of a ‘class war’, the working-class miners versus the middle class government:

As Scargill later explained to Robin Blackburn, ‘you will not get real control of the society in which we live unless you commit and convince the working class of *the need to struggle*… The issue is a very simple one: it is *them* and it is *us.’* In the 1972 strike,

[We] took the view that we were in a class war. We were not playing cricket on the village green like they did in ’26. We were out to defeat Heath and Heath’s policies because we were fighting a government. Anyone who thinks otherwise was living in cloud-cuckoo land. We had to declare *war* on them and the only way you could declare war was to attack the vulnerable points. They were the points of *energy*; the power stations, the coke depots, the points of supply.

(Marquand 2008: 248-249 original italics)

For the miners then the process of negotiating and striking boiled down to the phrase, succinctly explained by Scargill, ‘Us versus Them’ and the spirit of this statement informs Hague’s first poetic works. In order to provide the voice of ‘us’ within his community Hague’s works as a whole parallel the negotiation of ideas about authenticity and literacy that were present in the previous discussion of *FAPN.* Hague’s dialect representation is presented as an authentic voice by his publishers but when debating with those from outside of his community in newspaper letters he had to negotiate cultured ideas concerning ‘articulateness’.

### 3.2.3. Letter writing

Hague’s political views were in line with many of his NUM colleagues and it was through participating in strike action that he began to write poetry. However, it was through newspaper letter writing that Hague discussed politics with people who held opposing views to him. He was a strong socialist and debated politics in the letters sections of newspapers frequently during the early 1970s. According to Hague’s relations he wrote a large amount of letters to papers (Hall, Sheila 2011)[[17]](#footnote-17) and it was one of Hague’s letters, sent to *The Times* in 1973, that led to *Tales* being published in 1976 (Holloway 1979) when it was noticed by literary agent Herbert Van Thal who contacted Hague (Hague 1976b; Dunn 1976). Major-General Sir Edward Spears wrote into the letters section of *The Times* because he was concerned about the tactics that the miners were employing in the industrial action at the time. Hague only saw this letter by accident as his ‘newsagent delivered to him one day not the customary *Guardian,* but instead *The Times*’ (Dunn 1976). Spears wrote:

I am so shocked that such a fine body of men of whom the country is justly proud should allow itself to be manoeuvred into seeking to obtain advantages by inflicting hardships on the community as a whole in the hope that tortured people will demand that the claims of the miners’ leaders be granted whether they be right or wrong.

These are the methods of the thumbscrew and the rack. Sooner or later the nation will insist that the people who resort to such practices should be made to endure equivalent suffering, possibly in terms of financial penalties.

(Spears 1973)

Spears was a significant figure as he had received The Order of the British Empire, the Order of Bath and the Military Cross, had served as an MP for both Loughborough and Carlisle, was involved in liaising with the French in both world wars, and at one time could count Winston Churchill among his friends (Janus 2011). His critique of the miners is carefully hedged by referring to them as a ‘fine body of men’ and he focusses his attention on the miners’ leaders’ role in leading them ‘astray’. Earlier in this letter he foregrounds that ‘most people have a built-in sympathy for miners’ and he especially feels sympathy for miners having served as an MP in an area which ‘included many of them’ (Spears 1973). His letter provides a shift from talking about miners as a whole to talking about their leaders as a way of justifying his condemnation of this group. Spears’ reference to his own position as an MP serves to bolster his personal position as someone with ‘experience’. The response to this letter, also printed in *The Times,* is typical of Hague and shows his approach to debating with those who were viewed as having ‘more’ cultural or social capital than him:

20/11/1973

Tactics of the miners

From Mr T. Hague

Sir, May a working miner be allowed to reply to Major-General Sir Edward Spears? (November 15)

He mentions public sympathy. This is no substitute for coin of the realm. Sir Edward patronizingly describes us as fine chaps, presumably led astray by agitators. The upper classes really must rid their minds of these fond delusions. Because our limited education renders us inarticulate, that does not mean that we are unintelligent.

The tragedy of this country is that we have a surfeit of educated idiots. The antics of the present Government are a good example of this fact, and six years’ service during the war showed me that officers can reach high rank and yet be bone from the neck up. He speaks of thumbscrew and rack methods. Any miner of my age is fully acquainted with these. I do not recall people of Sir Edward’s class showing undue perturbation in those days [….]

We get the clue to Sir Edward’s thinking when he proposes penalties for recalcitrants. This is just the kind of doctrine to send the balloon up with a vengeance. It is already a crime, in this great and free democracy, for a working man to take issue with Mr Heath, although business and professional people evade his sanctions with contemptuous ease.

Nor is the situation eased by mendacities aimed at arousing prejudice against the miners. I have just heard on TV Mr Heath referring to £50 per week miners as if they were as thick as blackberries. The only people approaching this category are fitters and electricians, who must of necessity work weekends.

It is just this kind of statement which causes irritation and consequent intransigence. It becomes more apparent with each day that Mr Heath is the biggest disaster to hit Britain since the blitz.

Yours faithfully,

T. Hague,

(Hague 1973b)

This letter displays Hague’s distinctive sense of humour as well as his position on political and class issues. Spears’ focus on the role of the leaders of the miners is interpreted by Hague as patronising, and Hague makes it clear that he feels the underlying presupposition that Spears’ statement is based on is that miners are unintelligent. Hague uses the letter form to his advantage peppering his letter with Latinate phrases (inarticulate, perturbation, recalcitrants etc.) as well as intertwining it with colloquial language and phrasing (‘bone from the neck up’ and ‘thick as blackberries’). Anger and low opinion of the Heath government and the upper classes is displayed through insults, however Hague creates a balance to this by positioning himself as someone who has more of a knowledge of ‘how things are’, being a working miner, than a former MP like Spears. Hague’s comment about miners being inarticulate but not unintelligent forms a basis for many of his works; his group is seen as inarticulate and unintelligent because of their speech and vocation, yet Hague’s representation of the dialect speaking Yorkshire miner, in light of these perceptions, works to present him as a complex figure.

Hague’s letter writing, as shown in the letter above, was provoked by his dissatisfaction with the Heath government, which he discussed in a local newspaper interview with Michael Holloway:

But who are the people behind the letters to newspapers? Michael Holloway has been meeting some of the Sheffield regulars. Today he talks to Totley Tom, Tom Hague

[….]

Tom Hague wrote his first letter to the *Morning Telegraph* during the mineworkers’ confrontation with the Heath Government in 1972. It was the first of a long series that has made him one of the most prolific contributors to the Readers’ Letters column.

‘I had never written a line before that. I remember a lady wrote to the Telegraph saying that miners shouldn’t want to live on more than old age pensioners.’

‘I thought it was a bloody cheek. So I wrote saying that if she told me which charity she gave all that money she had over and above what pensioners lived on I would do the same’

(Holloway, 1979)

Hague found letter writing to be a cathartic activity ‘[s]ometimes I feel I have got to sit down and write a letter or bust. There comes a time when a fellow has to say enough is enough’ (Holloway, 1979). He wrote many letters to the local papers and in 1976 had a series of stories and essays printed in the local paper, which positioned him as a visible local figure and as a ‘spokesperson’ for local people:

Author and miner Tom Hague today starts a special series with a unique local touch. Tom Hague has had great success with his first book, Totley Tom, and writes in the South Yorkshire dialect recalling tales of his childhood. He lives at Totley and is still a full-time miner

(Hague1976e)

Sheffield miner and author Tom Hague continues his tales by retelling a story typical of his youth when rough justice prevailed but was sometimes tempered by paternal mercy

(Hague 1976d).

Sheffield miner, author and poet Tom Hague concludes his series on a different note. He has some stringent things to say about modern art, poetry and the media

(Hague 1976c).

The need to set people right or to say something in response is linked with Hague’s strong socialist views which meant that he saw the miners’ strike as completely justified. What seemed to amaze Hague was that others could not see why it was important to provide the miners with a wage increase (many of Hague’s stories deal with the dangers of coal-mining), how working-class people could vote Conservative and that many people had misinformed views of the miners (Hall, Sharon 2011; Hall, Sheila 2011; Hague, Russell 2011). Hague’s letter writing, as demonstrated by his response to Spears’, and his involvement as a letter and article writer for the local papers provided Hague with an output through which to discuss politics, tell stories and, as discussed in 3.3.2., engage critically with cultural topics.

### 3.2.4. Dialect Writing

In 1973 Hague wrote to John Widdowson, who had been working on the ‘Survey of Language and Folklore’, in this letter Hague outlines how and why he writes in dialect. He got in contact as he had attended a lecture by Widdowson and was pleasantly surprised with what he thought would be a stuffy lecture. It is worth displaying this letter in full as Hague says a lot about his attitudes towards: dialect, dialect writing, academic lectures, language use in Sheffield and language use in general, as well as explaining the difficulties he faces when writing in dialect:

Dear Sir.

 I was privileged to attend your lecture at Totley Council School on Sept 19. I am a fifty-eight year old miner who has spoken dialect all my life and I must admit that I was pleasantly surprised. I went expecting to hear some middle class patronising, with the usual painful attempts to reproduce the local accent. Instead it was a most enjoyable experience to listen to someone with such evident first-hand knowledge. The point you made about the pronunciation of ‘master’ and ‘plaster’ was very interesting. Another instance is words such as ‘cook’ and ‘look’ etc. Since the war, there has been an increasing tendency for us to say ‘cuk’ and ‘luk’ but strangely, this does not apply to ‘hook’ and if referring to a person’s profession one invariably says ‘cook’ in the old way. I am sorry to say that I think that unless the dialect is recorded on tape it must eventually die out. I write dialect poems myself, some of which have been broadcast on Radio Sheffield. Although I speak dialect every day I find it impossible to express the vowel sounds and inflections in writing. I wonder if you have noticed the variations in the word ‘haven’t’. (‘’e amt, I amt). *I have been criticised for spelling the same word such as ‘to’ ‘go’ ‘so’ etc. in different ways, but the pronunciation varies with context or emphasis, so I write as I speak*. The dialect in which I write is the one prevailing more or less from Shiregreen to Wombwell although there are of course slight variations almost from village to village. When I worked at Barley Hall colliery, I could nearly always tell which village a man came from although I would have been hard put to say why. *I have written quite a number of short ditties and prose pieces referring to incidents, some amusing, some not, down the pit or about the neighbourhood and times of my youth. My aim in so doing, was to give my grandchildren some idea of the life and manners of days, which, even to me, are somewhat strange now.* After hearing your discourses, I do not suppose that you are in any need of further material, but if you think that they could be any use to you, I would be glad to place them at your disposal

Sincerely Yours

T. Hague

(Hague 1973a my emphasis)[[18]](#footnote-18)

Hague’s comments highlight his concern that if the dialect of his region and generation was not preserved in some form it would be lost, and his purposes for writing dialect poems and stories was to give his grandchildren a sense of what life was like in the past. He also points out that he has been criticised for the way in which he represents dialect pronunciations through respellings and the difficulties that he faces when trying to capture the sound of dialect speech in writing. The overall sense that Hague gives of his attempts at writing dialect poetry is that even if ‘writing speech down’ is problematic it can be used to ‘capture’, in a more permanent form, some aspects of culture which he felt were important. Through this retelling of older stories, and in some way it can be seen that Hague himself was attempting to get to grips with some of the things that ‘are somewhat strange now’, Hague allows his work to be new to the younger generation and familiar and nostalgic to older readers. Although here Hague is discussing how he used his childhood as the inspiration for many of his poems and stories his use of nostalgia is more complex than simple reminiscence, and Hague’s works cover a wide range of subjects with many of them tackling political or class issues. Many of the comments Hague makes about language, in his stories and poems, demonstrate his understanding of the everyday usage of language and the cultural link between speech and writing present in ideas about literacy. Generally speaking, Hague can be seen to value the achievement of as accurate an approximation of speech in the written form over concerns about the overall accessibility of those reading it. This issue of accessibility is discussed in more detail in chapter 4. To some degree the intended audience for his book *Tales* would have been those familiar with the Sheffield dialect as his publisher, as will be explored in 3.2.5., was interested in publishing local interest texts. However at the same time Hague is pointing out that pronunciation is variable and not consistent even within one person’s repertoire and that the orthographical conventions that he is familiar with do not have a culturally agreed upon affordance for dealing with this. Writing down what he said as he said it was the technique that worked best for Hague and demonstrates the difficulties he had in changing sounds into visual signs which could index social meaning. Hague’s comments on tape recording as a way to capture dialect and writing dialect down contributing to the ‘embalming’ of a language highlight the problems he saw in the differences between dialect usage as spoken and in writing.

### 3.2.5. Hague’s Works

Two collections of Hague’s works will be referred to in the following textual explorations, with the main focus of analysis being on the second published collection. The first collection is the *Sheffield Local Studies Library* (*SLSL*) collection of poems which also contains a clipping from the *Sheffield Star* from February 26th 1972. There is no information concerning the date that this collection was stored in the Sheffield Local Studies Library. I can only estimate that it was typed up around 1972-1976 and contains many of Hague’s earliest works. Some of the poems that it contains appear in revised form in the published *Tales* collection.This collection has been written up on a typewriter and includes over thirty poems mostly written in standard with eight poems that are either entirely in Sheffield dialect or feature a reasonable amount of dialect representation. The subject matter of these poems is mostly political. From the newspaper articles that explain how Hague began writing during the strike, and what happened with the poems that he wrote on the picket line after the strike, this collection seems to have come about mostly from Hague attempting to entertain and rouse his fellow miners in a tough period. A ‘staff writer’ for the *Sheffield Star* writes:

[Hague] even managed to see the funny side of the miners’ strike, writing seven or eight “ballads” while out picketing a Sheffield coal depot [….]

Now his miner’s eye-view of the dispute has won him a wider audience with several of his strike lyrics being printed and circulated round local clubs.

The miner/poet is particularly fond of a dialect poem he wrote about the confrontation between union leader Joe Gormley and PM Ted Heath, entitled “Egg on his face.”

“It sums up just what I feel about the way the Government handled the whole dispute,”

(Anon. 1972)

The strike and picket-line environment clearly influenced the creation of these works due to the rhetorical and inspiring nature of these poems, in one Hague uses the phrase ‘unity is strength’ and appeals to the solidarity of the miners, whilst other poems challenge the authority of the government.

The second collection is the *Totley Tom: Tales of a Yorkshire Miner* collection (*Tales*). This is a collection of forty-eight dialect poems, seven standard poems and twenty-seven stories narrated in standard with most of the stories containing direct speech that includes dialect representation. This collection was published in 1976 by the Roundwood Press in Kineton Warwickshire which, in the words of its founder Gordon Norwood, was at the time: ‘[o]ne of the few remaining private presses […] prepared to undertake the design and printing of ephemera and limited editions’ (Norwood 1967) and also was described as specialising ‘among other things, in books with a Midlands flavour and the production of local histories and autobiographies which were often concerned with local reminiscences’ (Ingram, 1978)[[19]](#footnote-19). According to Dunn (1976) the literary agent that noticed Hague’s letter was:

Herbert Van Th[a]l, one-time publisher and now head of one of Britain’s most successful literary agencies. Van Thal wanted to know whether Mr. Hague the letter-writer to *The Times* had ever considered the idea of sitting down to write the story of his life and hard times as a face-worker and family man

(Dunn, 1976)

Hague’s response was:

I thought I might just as well send him the tales I’d jotted down for him to have a look at. He wrote back and said they were fine. If I could let him have any more, he was sure that he would be able to find a publisher. That’s how the book came about.

(Dunn, 1976)

It seems that the initial request was ‘to write a book about mining’, however Hague ‘[sat] down to pen a collection of short stories [and poetry] about mining people which he titled Totley Tom’ (Holloway 1979). According to Sharon Hall writing a book about coal mining would not have been an enjoyable task for Hague. She also believes that Hague submitted more work than was needed for a collection of his stories and poems, as by the time he became involved with the idea of publishing he had already written a large amount (Hall, Sharon 2011, Dunn 1976). This collection of prose and poetry, due to its size and Hague’s experience as a writer, contains a larger variety of themes than the *SLSL* collection and also a larger proportion of dialect poems. The introduction to the *Tales* collection in the inner cover of the book focuses on Hague’s use of ‘rich dialect’:

Tom Hague is a Yorkshire miner. These are his stories, in prose and verse, of the place where he lives, the people he meets and the work he does.

They are told in rich dialect, and he has a unique facility not only for telling a good tale, but for creating visual images with a minimum of words.

(Hague 1976a: inner cover)

This introductory description of the collections states that the stories are based on Hague’s life experiences. This appears to be true, however Hague’s narrative voices are fictionalised versions of himself and the voices of the people he has known. The ‘rich dialect’ refers to Hague’s own Sheffield dialect and the town of ‘Grimsbeck’ that the stories are set in is fictional but occupies a geographical position on the outskirts of Sheffield. Within the collection there are stories that could have come from Hague’s childhood and work-life experiences as well as from his experience of living in South Yorkshire, stories based on historical fact, such as the story ‘Green and Pleasant Land’ which incorporates the details of the Huskar mine disaster, stories that are in some way similar to Hague’s own life experiences and two completely fantastical stories, one involving pixies and the other involving aliens. The narrative voice changes regularly in the collection and there are appearances from: the authorial Hague, a narrative ‘Totley Tom’ voice and the character Tom Earnshaw who acts as a fictionalised version of Hague. Hague became well-known for his work locally and following his retirement from pit-work he began to be able to focus on activities that you would associated with a writer. These included attending a ‘poetry gathering’ (Hague 1976c) and giving a talk at John Widdowson’s Traditional Heritage Museum (Hall, Sharon 2011). Having a passion for reading and writing was not an activity that Hague’s family thought highly of. These were not seen as practical activities for a working man to be undertaking and it wasn’t until Hague’s writing began to receive some recognition and success locally that his family took an interest in it (Hall, Sharon 2011). Hague’s geographical position in Totley seemed to give him enough distance from his own social group of miners, without causing him to be an outsider, as well as an insightful proximity to members of the middle-classes that lived in Totley. Hague continued writing throughout the rest of his life, writing enough to create another collection which was never published[[20]](#footnote-20). Many of Hague’s works address assumptions made about miners being ‘uncouth’ or ‘unintelligent’ as well as regional and class stereotypes. In doing this he uses the stylistic resources that were available to him to challenge these views. In discussing Hague’s background I have drawn attention to how Hague began writing because of his politics and how he would engage explicitly with politics in his letter writing. These political beliefs influence the acts of resistance and critique which Hague undertook in his texts and are analysed in the three case studies which form the latter part of this chapter. However, in order to provide further support for these case studies I discuss some more general issues relating to Hague’s style, by discussing his poem ‘Chat Wi a Pit Mouse’, as well as scholarship concerning orthography and legitimacy.

## 3.3. Vernacular Authenticity, Respellings and Legitimacy

### 3.3.1. ‘Chat Wi a Pit Mouse’

In chapter 2 I explored reviewers’ comments on Eaglestone’s ‘authenticity’ as a Yorkshire pitman and how his representation of dialect contributed to this sense. Hague’s use of dialect representation shares similarities with this discussion of Eaglestone’s authenticity, as Hague’s dialect voices are engaged in a similar discourse concerning the authenticity of vernacular speech. This is because, as discussed in 3.2.5., the inner jacket cover of Hague’s *Tales* presents his texts as being ‘told in a rich dialect’ and explicitly links his stories to ‘the place where he lives, the people he meets and the work he does’ (Hague 1976a: inner cover). Discussing Hague’s poem ‘Chat wi a Pit Mouse’, from *Tales,* provides an opportunity to discuss his work in relation to Coupland’s comments on vernaculars possessing a level of authenticity because of their link to ‘how language really is’ and their ‘historicity’ (Coupland 2007: 181). This will also provide an opportunity to look specifically at the relationship between Hague’s representation of dialect in his poem and research on Sheffield dialect. In discussing the relationship between Hague’s orthography and the sounds of Sheffield dialect through a comparison of orthography and speech, I argue that whilst Hague’s use of vernacular language taps into the *idea* of authenticity explored in chapter 2, it does so because his text involves a complex range of spoken and literate practices, rather than because his use of non-standard orthography authentically or accurately ‘captures’ Sheffield dialect in writing.

In ‘Chat wi a Pit Mouse’ Hague presents a miner at work, albeit on his break at ‘snap time’, engaged in a philosophical discussion with a mouse. Below this poem is a linguistic description of the features of Yorkshire English represented in the text presented in a similar layout to the description of Eaglestone’s ‘Feathers’ dialogue in 2.6.2.

Chat wi a Pit Mouse

 “Cum on aht, an’ ‘a’ sum snap,

Tha needn’t fear ‘at it’s a trap.

Ah knoa ‘ow it feels ter clam,

It ‘appens both to mouse an’ man.

Ah sithee ‘idin’ rahnd yon muck,

Cum on aht an’ try thi luck.

Ah’ll bet thee if Ah shift mi leet,

Tha’ll move like leetnin’ then alreight.

Tha mun live in a rum owd way,

Follerin’ t’ face up day bi day.

Like sum soort o’ gipsy mouse,

Noa time fer a nest ur ‘ouse.

Ah wunder wot tha meks o’ men?

Dusta ponder nah an’ then,

Wot meks us sweeat tuh earn a crust

‘Mid fallin’ stooan an’ flyin dust?

When t’ side o’ t’ gate cums crashin’ in

‘Asta e’er lost any kith an’ kin?

Cum on lad, an doan’t be daft,

Jump in a tub an’ gerr up t’shaft.

Burr ‘oo’s a man ter gie advice

When ‘e’s noa moor flamin’ sense ner mice?

Ah niver listen ter mi wife,

When she begs on me ter quit this life.

Soa cum on mouse, an’ share this bread

Bi t’ end o’ t’ shift we might be deead.

An’ if we’re bahn ter share t’ same end,

Ah’m fain ter ‘ave thee fo’ mi friend!” [[21]](#footnote-21)

(Hague, 1976a: 59)

This conversation between miner and mouse echoes the conversation between ploughman and mouse in Robert Burns’ famous ‘To a Mouse’ (1785). In both poems the miner and ploughman engage a mouse in a (one-sided) conversation concerning the complexities of life. The success of Burns’ work in representing Scots dialect means that his writing has served as a legitimate model for dialect poets (Wales 2006: 111). The orthographical conventions Hague used to represent Sheffield dialect in this poem are in line with many of the orthographical conventions that would be present in a publication of Burns’ poetry. Also, Burns’ work, being of a previous era is the type of culturally legitimate canonical literary work that, as Rose argues, would be cheaply accessible to a working-class reader simply because the author is dead and their books are old (2010: 120-121). However, whilst the thematic and stylistic similarities between Hague’s poem and Burn’s ‘To a Mouse’ can demonstrate Hague’s participation in literary discourse and practices, my focus is on the link between Hague’s writing and ‘the place where he lives, the people he meets and the work he does’ (Hague 1976a: inner cover).

Whilst the table of linguistic features for Eaglestone’s pit dialogue in 2.6.2. outlined a few reasonably salient features of Yorkshire English represented in his ‘Feathers’ dialogue, because of the length of ‘Chat wi a Pit Mouse’ and the complexity of its representation the table below involves a different approach and presentation. In listing the features of Yorkshire dialect represented in this poem I have used IPA conventions to position Hague’s respelt words alongside a phonemic transcription of an RP pronunciation of the standard spelling of this word, and an approximation of the sound of Yorkshire speech being represented. The approximation of Yorkshire speech is a ‘triangulation’ based on Hague’s orthographic choices and existing scholarship, as well as a recording of Hague’s oral performance of this poem (Hague 198?). Although the oral performance and the text could have been compared directly to explore the ‘accuracy’ of Hague’s orthography these two performances of the poem essentially involve different practices and modes. This means that my discussion of the written version of his poem approaches the text as an approximation of vernacular speech, where speech is mediated through orthography by the use of respellings (cf. Coupland 2009: 298). Because of the ‘triangulation’ of scholarship, text and recording involved in recovering an approximation of speech from Hague’s text I wish to argue that Hague’s dialect representation is not a ‘capturing of speech’ but a *culturally determined evocation of vernacular speech[[22]](#footnote-22)*.

 In this table the lexical set vowels refer to the vowel sounds indexed by the standard spelling of the word Hague has respelt, not to the resulting vowel sound that his respelling indexes:

**Phonological features**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Type**  | **Feature** | **RP**  | **Yorkshire**  |
| STRUT vowel | <cum> ‘come’<sum> ‘some’<wunder> ‘wonder’ | /kʌm//sʌm//wʌndə/ | /kʊm//sʊm//wʊndə/ |
| PRICE vowel | <ah> ‘I’<leet> ‘light’ <alreight> ‘alright’ <bi> ‘by’  | /aI/ /laIt/ /ɔ:lraIt//baI/ | /aː//liːt//ɔːlreIt//bi/ |
| MOUTH vowel | <aht> ‘out’ <rahnd> ‘round<nah> ‘now’ | /aʊt//raʊnd//naʊ/ | /aːt//raːnd//naː/ |
| GOAT vowel | <knoa> ‘know’<noa> ‘no’<stooan> ‘stone’<doan’t> ‘don’t’<soa> ‘so’ | /nəʊ//nəʊ//stəʊn//dəʊnt//səʊ/ | /nʊə//nʊə/stʊən//dʊənt//sʊə/ |
| GOOSE vowel | <ter> ‘to’<tuh> ‘to’ | /tu://tu:/ | /tə//tə/ |
| FORCE vowel | <soort> ‘sort’<moor> ‘more’<fo’> ‘for’ | /sɔːt//mɔː//fɔː/ | /sʊət//mʊə//fɔ/ |
| FLEECE vowel | <sithee> ‘see thee’<thi> ‘thee’<mi> ‘me’ | /siː ði//ðiː//miː/ | /sIði//ðI//mI/ |
| FACE vowel | <meks> ‘makes’ | /meIks/ | /mɛks/ |
| DRESS vowel | <sweeat> ‘sweat’<niver> ‘never’<deead> ‘dead’ | /swet//nevə//ded/ | /swɛat//nIəvə//dIəd/ |
| Definite article reduction | <t’> ‘the’ | /ðə/ | /t/ or / ʔ/ |
| Omission of fricatives | <‘at> ‘that’<o’> ‘of’<e’er> ‘ever’ | /ðæt//ɒv//evə/ | /æt//ɒ//eə/ |
| Omission of fricatives, TRAP vowel and H-dropping | <‘a’> ‘have’ | /hæv/ | /a/ |
| Omission of fricatives and KIT vowel | <gie> ‘give’ | /gIv/ | /giː/ |
| H-dropping | <‘ow> ‘how’<’appens> ‘happens’<‘e’s> ‘he’s’<‘ave> ‘have’ | /haʊ//hæpənz//hiːz//hæv/ | /aʊ//æpənz//iːz//æv/ |
| G-dropping | <flyin’> ‘flying’<crashin’> ‘crashing’<flamin’> ‘flaming’ | /flaɪjɪŋ//kræʃɪŋ//fleɪmɪŋ/ | /flaɪjɪn//kæʃɪn//fleɪmɪn/ |
| H and G dropping | <‘idin’> ‘hiding’ | / haɪdɪŋ/ | /aɪdɪn/ |
| GOAT Vowel and L-vocalisation | <owd> ‘old’ | /əʊld/ | /oʊd/ |
| PRICE vowel and G-dropping | <leetnin’> ‘lightning’ | /laItnɪŋ/ | /liːtnɪn/ |
| GOAT vowel, linking R and G-dropping | <follerin’> ‘following’ | /fɒləʊwɪŋ/ | /fɒləɹɪn/ |
| FORCE vowel and linking R | <fer> ‘for’<ur> ‘or’ | /fɔː//ɔː/ | /fəɹ//ʊɹ/ |
| MOUTH vowel and final /d/ devoicing | <bahn> ‘bound’ | /baʊnd/ | /baːn/ |
| STRUT vowel, MOUTH vowel and omission of fricatives | <dusta> ‘dost thou’ (‘dost tha’) | /dʌst ðaʊ/ | /dʊsta/ |
| TRAP vowel, MOUTH vowel, h-dropping and omission of fricatives | <‘asta> ‘hast thou’ (‘has tha’) | /hæst ðaʊ/ | /asta/ |
| Linking R/Medial /t/ and STRUT vowel | <gerr up> ‘get up’  | /get ʌp/ | /geɹʊp/ |
| Linking R/Medial /t/, h-dropping  | <burr ‘oo’s> ‘but whose’ | /bʌt huːz/ | /bəɹuːz/ |

**Lexis**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Feature** | **Description** |
| Snap | Food, snap-time is lunch time (Hair 2007) |
| Clam (Clem) | ‘To pinch as hunger or fasting does; to waste with hunger, starve’ (Oxford English Dictionary ‘Clem/Clam, *v*.’ 2014) |
| Sithee  | ‘I see you’ or ‘I’ll see you’ (cf. Beal 2010: 41) |
| Yon | Archaic adjective which the OED defines as ‘A demonstrative word used in concord with a n. to indicate a thing or person as (literally, or sometimes mentally) pointed out […] Formerly often, as still in some dialects, simply equivalent to that (those); but chiefly, and in later literary use almost always, referring to a visible object at a distance but within view: = ‘that (those)…over there’ (Oxford English Dictionary ‘Yon’, *adj. and pron.’* 2014) |
| Mun | Must (Oxford English Dictionary ‘Mun, *v.*’ 2014) |
| Rum | Odd strange (Oxford English Dictionary ‘Rum, *adj.*’ 2014) |
| Ner | Chiefly poetic rare form of ‘nor’ which is a form of an obsolete usage of ‘neither’ as both an adverb and conjunctive that introduces ‘reference to alternatives or different things, about each of which a negative statement is made’ (Oxford English Dictionary, ‘Nor, *conj.(and adv.)* definition 6’, ‘Neither, *adv.(and conj.)* definition 1a’ 2014) |
| Fain | To be glad or delighted (Oxford English Dictionary ‘Fain, *v.*’ 2014) |
| Gate  | ‘A way, road, or path’ (Oxford English Dictionary ‘Gate, *n.2* definition 1a’ 2014) |
| Shaft  | Mine-shaft |
| Tub | Wheeled container on tracks for transporting coal (Oxford English Dictionary ‘Tub, *n.* definition 5a’ 2014) |

**Morphosyntactic Features**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Feature** | **Description** |
| <thee>/<thi> ‘thee’ and <tha> ‘thou’ | Archaic second person singular pronouns‘tha’ (thou) subject form ‘thee’ object form‘thi’ (thee) object form and has equivalent usage to ‘your’(Cooper 2013: 160) |
| <dusta> ‘does thou’ (‘dost thou’/‘dost tha’) | Archaic forms of ‘do’ and second person pronoun, with pronoun affixed to verb (Oxford English Dictionary ‘Do, *v’.* definition 2(ii) 2014) |
| <‘asta> ‘has thou’ (‘hast thou’/’has tha’) | Archaic second person singular form of ‘have’ and second pronoun, with pronoun affixed (Oxford English Dictionary ‘Have, *v.*’ 2014) |

**Orthographical features**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Feature** | **Description** |
| <an’> | A common example of allegro speech respelling, the reduction of letters and use of apostrophe is used to index fluent, casual, connected speech |
| <wot> | An example of ‘eye-dialect’.  |

Paul Cooper’s (2013) *Enregisterment in Historical Contexts: A Framework* provides support for a range of features represented in this table, including: the STRUT (78), PRICE (108-112, 158) and GOAT (20-21) vowels, definite article reduction, l-vocalisation (112), h-dropping (24-25) and ‘thee’ and ‘tha’ (150). Jane Stoddart, Clive Upton and John Widdowson’s (1999) ‘Sheffield Dialect in the 1990s: Revisiting the concept of NORMs’ provides support for many of the phonological features of Sheffield English, including: the PRICE (75), GOAT (74), FORCE (73), FLEECE (74), FACE (74), DRESS (74) and KIT (73) vowels, reduction of fricatives (75-76), linking R (76), and ‘h’ and ‘g’ dropping (76). Also, Joan Beal’s work on both regional Englishes and dialect representation provide support for: l-vocalistion (2010: 20-21), fluent and casual (allegro) speech (2006: 533) and g-dropping (2006: 533). ‘G-dropping’ has been used to describe features for ease of understanding, although I recognise that Beal describes ‘g-dropping’ as a misnomer because ‘only speakers of English West Midland and North west Midland dialects articulate a final /g/ in this suffix’ and what this term describes is a process of develarisation. Finally the following approximations are supported solely by transcription of Hague’s oral performance (198?): <fo’> as /fɔ/, <sweeat> as /swɛat/, <never> as /nIəvə/, and <fer> as /fəɹ /.

Hague’s respellings draw on norms associated with the ways that letters index sounds in Standard Language Culture. This understanding is dependent on the way that ‘literacy is embedded in the oral language and social interaction’ of an individual’s surroundings (Barton 1994: 130-136). However, in his letter to Widdowson, Hague discussed the problems of representing his speech in writing using respellings: ‘Although I speak dialect every day I find it impossible to express the vowel sounds and inflections in writing [….] I have been criticised for spelling the same word such as ‘to’ ‘go’ ‘so’ etc. in different ways, but the pronunciation varies with context or emphasis, so I write as I speak’ (Hague 1973a). This issue of multiple spellings of the same word is visible in ‘Chat wi a Pit Mouse’ as ‘to’ is spelled as both <ter> and <tuh> both of which suggest the pronunciation of a shorter /ə/ sound instead of /u:/. In representing the vowels of Sheffield English Hague swaps out written vowels for different, but familiar, combinations of letters: <cum> ‘come’, <ah> ‘I’, <aht> ‘out’, <knoa> ‘know’, <soort> ‘sort’. In dealing with consonant reduction Hague uses the existing orthographical convention of marking omitted letters with an apostrophe: <‘at> ‘that’, <‘a’> ‘have’, <e’er> ‘ever’, <‘ow> ‘how’, <flyin’> ‘flying’, <‘idin’> ‘hiding’. However, in representing a variety of pronunciations Hague combines these two approaches resulting in a range of more difficult orthographic choices to be made. These choices are made more complex by the standard spellings which Hague’s respellings are in dialogue with, and which have priority in the written mode. Also, the norms of standard written English mean that Hague’s dialect lexis is in dialogue with a more standard lexical set. In the sense that the standard versions of <dusta> and <’asta> are the archaic sounding <dost thou>/<does thou> and <hast thou>/<has thou>. <gie> for ‘give’ involves representing a change in vowel sound and an the omission of a consonant simply through the removal of the letter <v> without marking this omission with an apostrophe. <dusta> involves affixing the word <thou>, represented as being pronounced with a different vowel and a reduction of the fricative /h/, to ‘do’, which is also represented with a different vowel. <‘asta> involves a similar process with the words <have> and <thou> as well as the marking of h-dropping with an apostrophe. In tracing the changes to standard orthography which Hague undertook in creating his respellings I do not wish to make claims about ‘how’ he wrote, but to gesture towards the complex mixing of spoken and written practices involved in this act. This discussion of the act of mixing is especially pertinent when considering that Hague himself pointed out that he had to both write and speak at the same time in order to create his texts: ‘so I write as I speak’ (Hague 1973a). Hague’s comments support the idea that ‘writing speech down’ is not a simple process of transforming sounds into signs but an act which involves layering, or ‘sedimenting’, spoken and written practices together into a text (Rowsell and Pahl 2007: 388, cf. Blommaert 2012: 2). The criticism of his inconsistent spellings which Hague discusses in his letter to Widdowson demonstrates that his respellings draw attention to ‘actual’ every day speech and his critics have a problem with how the regularity of orthography is being altered to reflect this actual usage, with these comments linking with research on Standard Language Culture and social judgements concerning orthography (cf. Milroy and Milroy 1992: 27, Jaffe and Walton 2000: 582). For example, Hague’s spelling of ‘whose’ draws attention to an example of the ‘irregularity’ of standard orthography as a model for consistent pronunciations. Hague presents ‘whose’ as <‘oo’s> with both the transcription of a standard pronunciation (/huːz/) and the sound approximation of Hague’s spelling (/uːz/) lacking a /w/ sound. Focussing on Standard orthography ‘who’ unlike other words beginning with ‘wh’, such as ‘what’, ‘where’ and ‘why’, is not pronounced with a /w/ sound even though it is spelled with a <w>. The complexity of the sounds of dialect Hague attempted to index with his respellings, and the problems of consistent letter to sound correspondence in both standard and non-standard orthographies demonstrate the need for previous cultural experience of the dialect speech being represented for any accurate sense of the sounds being represented (cf. Beal 2006: 532). However, these respellings are not visible in this text on their own as solely an attempt to ‘write speech down’ but form part of a composite whole. Even without previous knowledge or experience of the variety of speech Hague is representing the foremost sense that his use of non-standard orthography is capable of indexing to readers, in the context of this poem, is a sense of vernacularity (cf. Jaffe and Walton 2000: 561- 562).

Throughout ‘Chat with a Pit Mouse’ Hague lexis includes dialect words (‘clam’, ‘rum’) and also mining terminology (‘shaft’, ‘tub’, ‘gate’). These words are linked to the Yorkshire region and the practices of working in a mine. The poem also contains attempts to represent in writing the temporal affordances and context of casual relaxed speech by using spellings such as <an’> to represent allegro speech and also <wot>, a salient example of eye-dialect. Although the term eye-dialect is often used to refer specifically, in Sebba’s words, ‘to cases where respelt words do not actually sound different from the words spelt in a standard way’, I wish to foreground its indexical significance as ‘a way of *respelling* […] quoted words in such a way as to give an impression that the speaker is speaking colloquially or in a non-standard way’ (Sebba 2007: 169 emphasis mine). This is where the issue of the accuracy of mediated vernacular speech becomes ‘irrelevant’ (Coupland 2009: 298) as the indexical significance of non-standard orthography takes precedence over the sounds of speech simply because dialect representation is undertaken in the written mode. In ‘Chat wi a Pit Mouse’, although Hague is attempting to ‘write his speech down’, by employing respelling Hague has first and foremost indexed that his speaker is speaking in a ‘colloquial’ and ‘non-standard manner’. This is possible because of the way readers ‘interpret variation in the graphic representation of language in the same way they interpret spoken variation’ (Jaffe and Walton 2000: 561- 562) with this interpretation being made possible by the way that ‘literacy is embedded in […] oral language’ (Barton 1994: 130-136). The issue of respelling, indexicality and accuracy will be explored further in relation to scholarship in 3.3.2. The indexing of non-standard or colloquial speech links with the previous discussion of authenticity because in indexing vernacularity dialect representation is involved in discourse concerning authenticity. Coupland discusses how authenticity is implied by the use of vernaculars:

I have used the term ‘vernacular speech’ throughout the book to refer to something like ‘the ordinary speech of ordinary people’, without intending the concept to carry any specific ideological stance in favour of vernaculars, and that it has assumed that vernaculars are authentic speech products. Vernacular authenticity is based in beliefs about ontology – how language ‘really is’, on the ground; how we find it to be when we seek it out ‘in the community’, and when we observe it empirically without influencing it (recall the observer’s paradox). Vernaculars also have historicity, they are the product of (inherent but also socially motivated) linguistic change in the community speech-norms over time […] Vernacular speech clearly has value for sociolinguists. Not only is vernacular speech thought to be an anchor for solidarity and local affiliation, but we study vernaculars because we think they are worthy cultural objects.

 (Coupland 2007: 181)

Although Coupland addresses the focus of scholarly interest in vernaculars, he also summarises general beliefs about their usage. His general comments about how vernaculars are linked the ‘ordinary speech of ordinary people’, seen as evidence for ‘how language really is’ and as are ‘thought to be an anchor for solidarity and local affiliation’ are demonstrated by Gray and Dunn’s comments discussed earlier in 3.2.1. In Gray’s comments Hague’s vernacular speech is seen as authentically linked to the ‘at work’ speech of ‘ordinary’ working miners. Whilst Dunn’s comments position Hague’s written representation of dialect as lacking ‘artifice’, and his dialogue as ‘rich, real and revealing’ (Dunn 1976). What Coupland, Gray and Dunn’s comments converge around is the potential for vernaculars to index ‘authenticity’ because of the link between speech, social practices and place.

 By writing in his vernacular using respellings, Hague is drawing on a style of speech which is generally ‘thought to be an anchor for solidarity and local affiliation’ and is associated with the social practices of many people who live in the Yorkshire region. Gray and Dunn’s comments position Hague’s performance of vernacularity as an index of an authenticity, which is anchored to the region and work, regardless of whether this performance is in speech, the natural mode of vernacularity, or in writing, which involves an ‘artifical’ process of mediation. Representing his vernacular in writing, where it becomes inauthentically rendered, indexes the same values of showing ‘how language really is’ or how language is ‘in the community’ because of its perceived link with a ‘real’ community by an author who has ‘insider’ knowledge of this variety. The actual linguistic accuracy of Hague’s representation of vernacular speech is less important than the way his use of respellings are engaged in discourse concerning authenticity simply because they index vernacularity. As discussed in 2.5.2., one reviewer of FAPN commented that ‘[t]he plain unvarnished tale of the mines is a rare thing in literature’ and that Eaglestone’s journal entries ‘give the rough ore of the miner’s life, before it has been tried seven times in the fires of Art’ (Anon. 1925c ‘Dantesque’). Although few would argue that ‘Chat wi a Pit Mouse’ is an ‘unvarnished tale’, the presentation of a miner at work, in an environment inaccessible to most, could be considered the type of ‘rough ore’ which inspired the ‘Dantesque’ reviewer’s belief in Eaglestone’s authenticity (Anon. 1925c ‘Dantesque’). Although, as Coupland argues, the accuracy of mediated vernaculars is irrelevant, the sounds that Hague attempted to index through his use of respellings are linked to a real speech variety and language practices. The sounds of speech may not be able to be authentically rendered in writing, however Hague’s effort to write in a manner that suggests vernacularity grounds the poem in an authentic sense of Yorkshire dialect and a sense of the ‘realness’ of the workplace. In order to expand further on the indexical significance of respellings, and to move from discussing authenticity to thinking about legitimation, in 3.3.2. I discuss the ideological influence of orthography.

### 3.3.2. Orthography and Legitimation

As many of Hague’s dialect texts challenge the legitimacy of prestigious or dominant beliefs, or aspects of culture, the role that non-standard orthography plays in the discourse of legitimacy requires further discussion. This discussion will involve working from research specifically on orthography, through to research on legitimacy and morality in order to connect the ‘illegitimacy’ of non-standard orthography to legitimacy in general.

In their study of readers’ responses to textual representations of non-standard speech, Jaffe and Walton conclude that the ideological influence of non-standard orthography can ‘delegitimize’ the non-standard speech variety being represented:

Orthography stands for linguistic form, for regularity, for authority, for systematicity. For these reasons, it plays a major role in positioning the language it represents vis-à-vis ‘the standard’: both specific standard languages, and the very idea of ‘a standard’ [….]

We think that our research strongly corroborates claims made by Preston (1985), Edwards (1992) and Leubs (1996): that the use of non-standard orthographies to represent features of non-standard speech runs the risk of delegitimising the ‘non-standard’ code’s claim to be a language (to be ‘like’ the ‘standard’). Our research suggests that it is almost impossible to avoid stigma in the non-standard orthographic representation of others’ low-status speech varieties.

(Jaffe and Walton 2000: 582-583)

Jaffe and Walton’s study offers insights into the authority of standard orthography and the stigma of non-standard orthography. In this chapter, to explore the question of legitimacy in the socially motivated writing of Hague, Jaffe and Walton’s discussion of authority and stigma provides a base hypothesis concerning how Standard Language Ideology influences legitimacy on the level of orthography. In their conclusion Jaffe and Walton raise questions concerning the legitimacy of non-standard orthography for language scholars. Avoiding stigma in the orthographical representations of others’ speech is a major concern for those who study language, whereas Hague interacts with this stigma in his writing. To illustrate this point, the Preston article Jaffe and Walton cite is concerned with ‘the inaccurate representation of informant status (or reporter's regard or estimate of that status) which arises from the use of misspellings in the WRITING OF SPEAKING’ (1985: 328). There is an essential concern in this work by Preston with how the ideological influence of orthography influences the interpretation, or accuracy, of transcripts of speech in disciplines that rely on these transcripts for their research. In this discussion the focus is on *avoiding* stigma by changing scholarly approaches. However, in contrast, Hague *engages* directly with the stigma that his non-standard orthography and dialect index, often in ways that challenge this stigma or undermine the ideologies that create this stigma. To return to Hague’s ‘Speikin Proper’, it is clear to see that Hague had an awareness of the ideological influence of orthography when, in a poem about ‘speaking properly’, he shifts his orthographical style: ‘It is our language of affection/ Despite its seeming imperfection/Soa tha c’n talk all BBC/ T’owd dialect ull duh fo’ me. (Hague 199?a). Whilst it may be ‘impossible to avoid stigma’ (Jaffe and Walton 2000: 582) writing in this way, Hague shows an awareness of the stigma of his dialect voice, when both spoken and represented in writing, in the content of his stories and poems. It is from within this stigmatised position that he renegotiates the ‘legitimacy’ of his voice, as there are other strategies available to a writer like Hague to do this, and although the ideological influence of orthography is pervasive it can be challenged.

Shortis (2007) provides a breakdown of the ‘effects and affects of respelling’ that supports this point, and informs my analysis throughout this chapter:

Respelling can index social, political and cultural stances and dispositions including oppositional stances and covert prestige (Androutsopoulos, 2000; Androutsopoulos & Georgakopoulou, 2003). It can take ludic forms which invoke delight and playful absorption in the manner of the popular appeal of word games and puzzles (Cook, 2000; Crystal, 1993). Respelling can be used as part of identity performance in the context of a society in which identities are multiple and managed (Carrington, 2005b; Carrington & Marsh 2005c; Smith & Kollock, 1999). Respelling nonetheless remains bound to its relationship with the standard orthographic iteration: it feeds off the formal linguistic patterns and naturalised social prestige connotations of the standard forms (Jaffe, 2000a; Jaffe, 2000b; Sebba, 1998; Sebba, 2007). Spelling performance continues to act as a shibboleth which gatekeeps access to educational resources reproducing social class-differentiated access to resources and life chances through the meritocratic ‘playing field’ of competitive public examinations and the looking glass world of social penalties for failure (Cameron, 1995; Carney, 1994; Carrington, 2003; Carrington, 2004; Carrington, 2005a)

(Shortis 2007a:13)

Respelling can be involved in a wide range of acts of identity construction and performance, whilst always remaining ‘bound’ to standard orthography and the institutional role that this standard plays in the social differentiation of individuals in terms of literacy, ‘intelligence’ and class. Shortis’ breakdown is useful in expanding the relationship between non-standard orthography and legitimacy, as the ‘delegitimising’ effect that non-standard orthographies can enact on non-standard codes, can be employed to index ‘oppositional stances or covert prestige’ (Shortis 2007a:13). It is because the orthography employed and the dialect represented, in ‘Speikin’ Proper’, are delegitimised by their relationship with ‘standards’ that supports Hague’s legitimation of his speech as ‘our language of affection’ in this poem. His oppositional stance towards ‘speaking properly’ is reinforced by the delegitimising effect the ideologies enshrined in Standard Language Culture and standard orthography have on his speech. Because of the inherent question of the legitimacy of non-standard orthographies raised by Jaffe and Walton and the possibilities for oppositional stances and identity construction that Shortis’ ascribes to respelling it is necessary to move beyond the level of orthography to consider the general role that language plays in legitimating authority and beliefs.

In his article *Legitimation in Discourse and Communication* Van Leeuwen sets out a ‘framework for analysing the language of legitimation’ (2007: 91). He discusses the role that language plays in legitimating systems of authority, as well as gesturing towards the work of scholars who argue that ‘all of language is legitimation’ (2007: 91). In undertaking this work he outlines ‘four major categories of legitimation’ in the hope that they will be of use ‘for critically analysing the construction of legitimation in discourse’ (2007: 92).:

1) *Authorization*, that is, legitimation by reference to the authority of tradition, custom and law, and of persons in whom institutional authority of some kind is vested.

2) *Moral evaluation*, that is, legitimation by (often very oblique) reference to value systems.

3) *Rationalization*, that is, legitimation by reference to the goals and the uses of institutionalized social action, and to the knowledge society has constructed to endow them with cognitive validity.

4) *Mythopoesis*, that is, legitimation conveyed through narratives whose outcomes reward legitimate actions and punish non-legitimate actions.

These forms of legitimation can occur separately or in combination. They can be used to legitimize, but also to de-legitimize, to critique. They can occupy the best part of specific instances of text and talk which may hardly refer to what it is that is being legitimized, or they can be sprinkled across detailed descriptive or prescriptive accounts of the practices and institutions they legitimize.

(Van Leeuwen 2007: 92)

These four forms of legitimation represents strategies by which legitimacy can be negotiated by individuals or institutions, and Van Leeuwen outlines four broad areas in which to position processes of legitimation. Returning to Jaffe and Walton’s discussion of the delegitimizing effect of orthography as an illustration, they discuss the legitimacy of orthography as an issue of authorization, as the standard orthography is supported by institutional authority, tradition, custom and law, whilst non-standard orthographies and voices do not possess this level of authority. Many of the scholars discussed in this thesis who approach orthography as ideological can be seen to be legitimating their challenges, or critiques, of the authoritative legitimacy of standard orthography by rationalizing ‘the goals and the uses of institutionalised action’ (Van Leeuwen 2007: 92), because logically speaking, if all language use is ideological then legitimating terms such as ‘standard’, ‘correct’ and ‘proper’ are relative and not the ‘natural order of things’ (Van Leeuwen 2007: 101).

Within the works discussed in this chapter legitimacy will be explored generally in terms of authority and morality as Hague renegotiates the ‘delegitimised’ position of the dialect speaker, miner, northerner or aspects of low-culture by critiquing, or appealing to, legitimacy, using strategies associated with these forms of legitimacy. As Van Leeuwen makes clear, these four forms of legitimacy are not clear-cut and do not operate independently and so other forms of legitimation, such as rationalisation and mythopoesis, will also be discussed when looking at Hague’s challenges to aspects of legitimate culture. However within this chapter Hague’s attempts at legitimation will be broadly situated in relation to authority and morality to provide a further, more general, dimension to the analysis of his use of dialect representation. McEnery’s work on morality and language, discussed in 2.4., serves to sit alongside Van Leeuwen’s work on morality as a form of legitimation because of the way the morality of language use and moral behaviour are contrasted within Hague’s works. McEnery situates moral views on language in relation to Bourdieu’s theory of social distinction; broadly speaking the middle-classes used morality to categorise language that was different to their own as ‘immoral’ and situated their own speech as ‘proper’ (McEnery 2006: 4-11). This means that the issue of morality and language use can be approached as one of social distinction and social stratification. In Hague’s works discussed in the latter half of this chapter Hague explores the issue that speaking ‘properly’ does not mean that an individual acts ‘properly’, whilst because someone speaks in what is seen as an ‘uncouth’ way they are not necessarily an immoral or uncouth person. These discussions of the issue of speaking ‘badly’ and acting badly shares some similarities with the discussion enacted by Mr. J. Feasey and the unknown engineer in 2.4.2.

In this section I have widened my analytical scope to consider how dialect representation relates to discourses of legitimation and to approach this technique as an act of respelling as outlined by Shortis. The way in which Hague engages with social stigma, prestige and legitimation determines that analysis of his use of dialect representation involves positioning approaches to orthography within processes of legitimation and social distinction. In summary, although, in Jaffe and Walton’s terms, it is impossible to avoid stigma when representing dialect using non-standard orthography, Shortis highlights that respellings can be used to challenge the ideological prestige of language standards. These challenges can then be interpreted using the generalised forms of legitimation outlined by Van Leeuwen, whilst, drawing on McEnerys work, to consider the role morality plays in social distinction. Hague’s self-conscious use of dialect representation in many ways operates through an understanding of the deficit cultural position he is seen to occupy in order to demonstrate how this deficit position is a cultural construction. In recontextualising his vernacular speech Hague can ‘fashion [his] own ideological values’ (Coupland 2009: 285). The following three case studies investigate the ways in which Hague subverts the legitimate authority of forms of culture, familiar and dominant stereotypes, and finally legitimate language in general. My aim in focussing on legitimation in these discussions is to position the issue of the ‘delegitimizing’ effect that non-standard orthography has on the form of speech being represented within wider social processes of legitimation and social distinction. The first of these cases studies focuses on legitimation by authorisation, with the second and third focusing on moral evaluation. In the poems ‘They Call it Art’ and ‘Ah Knoa What Ah Like’ Hague challenges the legitimate authority of modern art and regional stereotypes.

## 3.4. Subversion of Legitimate Authority

### 3.4.1. Aesthetics as Ideology

In his poem ‘They Call it Art’ Hague’s poetic voice self-consciously reflects on the prestige of modern art in a free verse poem, which is precisely the type of art form that is being critiqued by the poetic voice. In discussing the view on art presented in this poem I contrast this critique with a newspaper article in which Hague criticises modern art. I argue that Hague’s poetic style, use of dialect representation and the subject matter of this poem are involved in the ‘delegitimisation’ of the legitimate authority of modern art not only through his use of ‘rationalisation’ to legitimate his beliefs, but also because Hague’s dialect representation positions the voice in his poem in an ‘illegitimate’ position. Hague’s dialect respellings are involved in an oppositional stance to a legitimate aesthetic in ‘They Call it Art’, a poem which highlights the role artistic taste has in stratifying society.

The cultural capital that is available to individuals who show an awareness of literature and literary practices is institutionally legitimated. The institutionally legitimate authority of forms of art, aesthetics and literary discourse can be seen to be based upon what Van Leeuwen calls the ‘authority of tradition’ and the ‘authority of conformity’. In Van Leeuwen’s work he characterizes ‘legitimation as an answer to the spoken or unspoken “why” question – “Why should we do this?” or “Why should we do this in this way?” (2007: 94). The authority of tradition involves an answer that relates to habitual or customary practices: ‘we do this in this way because that is what we always do’ (Van Leeuwn 2007: 96). Whilst the authority of conformity involves an answer that refers to adhering to current conventions: ‘we do this in this way because that is what everybody else does’ (Van Leeuwn 2007: 96-97). However, in the same way that a personal narrative can be undermined by a ‘so what?’ or ‘why should I be listening to you?’ response from a listener (cf. Labov 1997) the authority of culturally legitimate forms and practices can be just as easily dismissed. In the case of ‘They Call It Art’ the question of the legitimacy of modern poetry, as vocalised by the narrator’s wife, and the authority of the modern tradition and convention of free verse, as well as contemporary artistic practices, are called into question by this voice:

They Call it Art

Ah’ll tell thee what; this modern poitry’s rum stuff.

It’s writ in summat they

call free verse

Not blank

verse tha knoas,

like Shakespeare else Marlowe an’ them

chaps, but summat like what Ah’m writin’

‘ere.

Ah showed sum ter t’ missus t’ other day; she sez; “Call that

poitry? Ah’ve read berrer

poitry in t’ tellyphooan

directory. Damned if

Ah knoa what the

‘ell they’re on abaht ‘afe o’ t’

time.”

Ah sez “doan’t show thi

flamin’ ignorance. Tha’rt

not serpooased to. On’y

them ‘at’s sensitive ter inner

vibrations an’ such c’n mek it

aht; it’s symbolic, like Picasso’s paintin’s.”

“Balls” she sez, “it’s all a

bloody con trick. Noa wunder ‘e

laffed at them gormless buggers ‘at bowt

‘is paintin’s”. Ah sez “Oh; tha

knoas moor ner t’ critics

dosta?” “Critics be damned” she

sez. “Mooast on ‘em is just tryin’ ter mek

aht ‘at they’re superior ter common fooaks, so

they pritend ter see what’s not

theer. These so-called poits dun’t know enuff

words ter use ryme an’ rhythm, ser they pritend ter

think it’s all owd ‘at. It’s time they learnt ther

trade”.

She’s deead common, mah missis!

(Hague 1976a: 138)

The dismissive response to legitimised and prestigious cultural practices by the narrator’s wife is positioned within a form of the very artistic practices that she is dismissing. Commenting on legitimate practices from within them using dialect representation allows Hague to explore the social importance and indexical significance of poetry.

For the wife in the poem the field of poetry is not generally seen to fit with her values, however this is because of the role that poetry, and the critical discourse that is part of its practices, plays in creating social distinction. The poetic narrator’s wife believes that this discourse is essentially a false one because of how it is used to put ‘common fooaks’ in a deficit position and elevate those who engage in this discourse. The undermining of the position of the legitimate modern ‘so-called’ poets is done through a link to trade and craft which for Hoggart were the essential qualities of what art was for the working-classes; a display of the artisanal skill and craft of the artist (Hoggart 1957: 100). The legitimate authority of modern poetry is delegitimised by the wife in terms of rationalisation, specifically in terms of what Van Leeuwen terms instrumental rationalization: ‘whether an action is […] purposeful or effective’ (2007: 104). In this sense the narrator’s wife views writing poetry as an act that is purposeful because the end result is a recognisably well-crafted object which uses rhyme and rhythm. This criticism is also linked to the discrepancy between the fields of ‘high art’ and ‘real work’ due to the cultural premium placed on abstraction in the first and demonstration of ‘graft’ or ‘work’ in the second. The poetic voice of the husband is the one standing up for legitimate high artistic practices and artefacts with his wife acting as a sceptic. However, throughout the whole poem both voices are presented as speaking in dialect, which aligns them with the ‘common fooaks’. This serves to undermine the husband’s attempts to appear ‘cultured’ by writing in free verse, ‘explaining’ Picasso’s symbolism and appealing to critics because he does all of this in an ‘illegitimate manner’. The wife’s ‘illegitimate’ dialect voice is legitimised because she is being rational about activities that are presented as suspect. This means that although the wife’s objections are dismissed by the voice of the husband the final exclamation that his wife is ‘deead common’ is ironic as although she is ‘common’ her position is the one which is being legitimated. Hague’s respellings are involved in the creation of an ideological stance which is in opposition to modern art and the discourse surrounding it. In a poem where high art is being discussed by speakers who traditionally are seen to be excluded from high art, this exclamation serves to reinforce the deficit position that these forms of culture have on whoever the ‘common fooaks’ refer to. The whole poem deconstructs the role high art forms have in creating social distinction, using the stereotypical no-nonsense attitude and humour of northerners (Wales 2006: 28). In this poem dialect speech is explicitly linked to an ideological position concerning aesthetics which denounces ‘high art’. Hague’s newspaper article about art provides further context for this position.

Although the husband’s voice attempts to defend modern art, which ultimately serves to support his wife’s position in ‘They Call it Art’, Hague himself expressed scepticism about Picasso’s work and other modern art forms in an article published in a Sheffield newspaper. In his article he ‘has some stringent things to say about modern art, poetry and the media’ (Hague, 1976). The article as a whole discusses: the economics of art, the ideological function of aesthetics, the pleasure and beauty that stylised language can create and its difference as a form of expression to ‘everyday language’, the problems of those who police high art and those that dismiss it, the simple position of being interested in both ‘high’ and ‘low’ forms of art and the focus of TV dramas on the middle classes and sex. Hague begins by criticising first the art world, then poetry and literature:

Old Pablo Picasso was a sly old bird. He found that there was a market for rubbish, catered for it, and kept his contempt for the customers a secret until he died. No doubt he thought that as the people who could afford his prices must have fleeced someone else, he might as well join the band.

He was able to do this through the pretentiousness of the self-styled cognoscenti. They looked at those noses going round corners, eyes and breasts in anywhere but the right places, reverently ‘oo’d and ‘ah’d’ and discussed the master’s symbolism. People who spoke their minds, or laughed at such meretricious posturing were dismissed as uncultured oafs. To his credit, the old man came clean at last and vindicated the Philistines.

A similar situation extends over the whole field of art. Some sculptor turns out stuff that is reminiscent of a lavatorial plumber’s yard, welds or strings metal cubes into meaningless shapes, and up pops some oh so aesthetic connoisseur to chide us at not recognising genius when we see it.

(Hague 1976c)

Hague’s criticisms may conform to Hoggart’s views on the working-classes approach to art as being ‘essentially a “showing” (rather than an “exploration”)’ (Hoggart 1957: 100) but Hague dismisses these forms of art not so much for the artefacts themselves, which he does not rate, but because of the discourses surrounding them from the ‘self-styled cognoscenti’ and the ‘aesthetic connoisseur’. It is possible to see Hague’s views on art as being as ideological as the practices he is criticising, yet although he makes comments about the ‘whole field of art’ this article is clearly framed as the opinions of one man and therefore may be accepted or rejected by readers, rather than being the ideological position of a cultural institution. Bourdieu argues that it is the artistic aesthetic that creates art, not the art work itself (Bourdieu 1984: 29), and so Hague’s comments link to Bourdieu’s discussions of how cultural taste is used to create social distinction (Bourdieu 1991: 28) .The discourse surrounding the aesthetics of art are equated with processes of social distinction through Hague’s comments on ‘posturing’ or the dismissal of critics as ‘uncultured’ oafs. Hague’s comments on poetry link directly with ‘They Call it Art’ and also highlight the trends that dictate cultural taste:

Poetry too, is suffering from the twitterings of the twee and the posturings of the avant-garde. The in thing now is to avoid rhyme and meter or the rhythm of blank verse and to serve up a mess of chopped up prose which is counterfeited as poetry by the simple device of stopping lines for no valid reason. Thus if one writes:

*I am sitting at the*

*table.*

*I am waiting*

*for my*

*dinner*

one is producing a modern epic.

[….]

Admittedly, poetic judgements must be subjective but it is self-evident that a poet who expresses himself in the terms that come naturally to him in light of his chosen subject will do better than one who feels constrained to follow current and ephemeral trends. This does not mean that one should not put pen to paper unless to bring forth some world shaking and enduring epic. I am sure that there are hundreds of thousands of folk like myself who feel an almost irresistible urge to express some thought or deeply held feeling in other than everyday language.

What I do say is that we should not let ourselves be inhibited from doing our own thing by the trendy would be arbiters

(Hague 1976c)

Hague’s disparaging comments highlight his own taste in poetry but also discuss the arbitrary nature of artistic trends. His main argument is that poets who feel constrained by trends, and therefore certain aesthetics, have had an expressive and rich style of language use taken out of their hands and poetry therefore is not available to them on their own terms. Hague highlights that engaging with traditional literacy practices, such as reading and writing as well as the cultural sphere of literature, are influenced by tastes and trends and that these tastes and trends are tied up with the ways in which people distinguish themselves from others socio-culturally. Hague’s comments on literature chime with Lahire’s (2008) work on the multitude of genres and cultural forms that individuals engage with:

On the subject of literature in general, I find it strange that a nation that has produced Shakespeare, Marlow, the Authorised Version, Blake, the Brontes and other giants should contain so many folk who actually take a pride in having no time ‘for all that stuff’ or confessing that their only reading is Hank Janson and the James Bond thrillers. It is possible to be interested in both.

(Hague 1976c)

Although Hague challenges many legitimate forms of culture in other works he lists legitimate literature here to demonstrate his problem with people’s dismissal of it. From his argument it is clear that it is not necessarily the cultural objects or artefacts that the worlds of art, poetry and literature produce that cause problems for an individual’s engagement with them but the way that they are used as forms of cultural capital and to create social distinction. Both the dialect speaking wife in ‘They Call It Art’ and Hague’s newspaper article aim to rationalise the legitimate authority of modern art, to subvert its prestige, whilst displaying a preference for a more ‘traditional aesthetic’. In doing this Hague explores the ways in which ‘common’ language, art and literature are all involved in the social grouping or differentiation of individuals. Hague’s use of respellings constructs ‘illegitimate’ or stigmatised voices which allows his orthography to contribute to the ideological stance he creates. In a further poem Hague’s performance of stereotypical aspects of Yorkshire identity simultaneously celebrates Yorkshire culture, by poking fun at it, whilst also addressing outsider views of Yorkshire people by engaging with Yorkshire stereotypes.

### 3.4.2. Cohesion and Distance

As discussed in 3.3.2., respellings can be used as ‘part of identity performance in the context of a society in which identities are multiple and managed’ (Shortis 2007a: 5) and these respellings are in dialogue with the authority of standard orthography. In his discussion of the enregisterment of RP Agha discusses the way in which respellings invoke ‘implicit metadiscourses of accent’ (Agha 2003: 237) which index, or invite, judgements about the character of a speaker based on stereotypes. In his poem ‘Ah Knoa What Ah Like’ Hague celebrates a range of stereotypes that his use of Yorkshire dialect respellings can index. However, in exploring this poem I argue that his ‘authentic’ voice undermines the legitimate authority of these familiar stereotypes.

In discussing how respellings can index social characteristics Agha uses the example of representations of ‘Upper Class RP’ (U-RP):

Words represented as U-RP speech (a.ka. ‘Conservative RP)’ are often mis-spelled in the popular print media [e.g. kebinet office/cabinet office, clawth/cloth, craws/cross, lawft/loft]

Here the mis-spelling constitutes an implicit meta-pragmatic commentary on norms of speech. For, armed with the folk-view that every word has a correct spelling and a correct pronunciation, the reader can only construe defective spelling as an implicit comment on the defects of pronunciation-implicit, because no-one has actually said that the pronunciation is incorrect. The mis-spelling of words also invites inferences about the oddity of character (viz. that upper-class speakers are pompous, eccentric, out of touch, etc.) rarely described explicitly in these texts. Such mis-spelling performatively replay folk-stereotypes about the aristocracy in a highly effective way

(Agha 2003: 237-238)

Agha refers to ‘mis-spellings’. Although in the context in which he discusses them, nothing has been spelt wrong, these spellings are deliberate and are respellings of the standard e.g. kebinet office/cabinet office. However, these spellings are socially perceived as ‘defective’ ‘mis’-spellings, because of Standard Language Ideology, and so they create implicit comments concerning the speech of the person they are attributed to. These implicit comments rely on the ways in which written and spoken English are related in Standard Language Culture. These respellings also perform stereotypic renderings of, in this case, the aristocracy which are reliant on how respellings interact with the authority of standard written English and therefore are dependent on how ‘people interpret variation in the graphic representation of language in the same way they interpret spoken variation’ (Jaffe and Walton 2000: 561- 562) and the way that ‘linguistic features [can] never [be] clearly separated from the speaker’s whole set of social properties ‘ (Bourdieu 1991: 89).

Agha’s example of representations of U-RP speech in writing is relevant to Hague’s representation of Yorkshire dialect because of the way in which his respellings contain, or rely on, implicit comments on language or implicit comments on the character and behaviour of his speaker. Because of the widespread usage of stereotypes, they can be seen to possess legitimacy in terms of what Van Leeuwen calls, conformity: the legitimacy given to an act if ‘[e]verybody else is doing it’. In this sense then stereotypes have legitimate authority, because they are widespread. As stereotypes are pervasive and inform popular beliefs and attitudes (Mugglestone :54) they possess currency in the formulation of social judgements made by individuals. This means that the legitimacy of highly enregistered stereotypes must be accepted or challenged in contexts in which they are invoked. For Agha, ‘kebinet office’ creates a picture of a ‘pompous, eccentric, out of touch’ individual simply through the use of non-standard orthography. In his example the legitimacy of this stereotype is being used by newspaper journalists to poke fun. Hague shows an awareness of the ‘implicit metadiscourse’ surrounding orthography when he positions stereotypical aspects of Yorkshire culture alongside his use of non-standard orthography in ‘Ah Knoa What Ah Like’. in doing this Hague comments on and refashions legitimate stereotypes concerning Yorkshire people by engaging with the cultural legitimacy of standard orthography and Yorkshire stereotypes. Agha’s discussion of stereotypes will also be drawn on in 3.4. with regards to morality.

Brass bands, ale and Yorkshire pride are all positively reinforced in ‘Ah Knoa Wot Ah Like’ in which the tastes of a ‘typical’ Yorkshire man are outlined. Within *Tales,* and the SLSL collection, Hague’s narrative or poetic voice often challenges existing stereotypes concerning Yorkshire miners. Like the village of Grimsbeck in which the book is set, a fictional village positioned just outside Sheffield, Hague’s poetic voice is a fictionalised performance of aspects of his social identity. The complexity of Hague’s poetic voice will be explored further in 3.4. In ‘Ah Knoa What Ah Like’ Hague’s poetic voice, that of the Yorkshire miner ‘Totley Tom’, seems to unproblematically engage with and celebrate a range of stereotypical aspects of Yorkshire culture. Through celebrating Yorkshire life and insulting French cooking and ‘nice forrin’ chaps’ Hague engages with stereotypical aspects of Yorkshire culture and the implicit stereotypes associated with Yorkshire speakers. The performance of Hague’s poetic Yorkshire voice and miner identity in *Tales* is complex, whilst Yorkshire humour is seen as typically ironic, no nonsense and ‘double-edged’ (Eaglestone 1925: 161, Wales 2006: 28). On the surface this poem uncritically celebrates Yorkshire culture whilst denigrating others. However the hyperboles celebrating Yorkshire culture, on the one hand, self-consciously poke fun at those who conform to these stereotypes, but also poke fun at those who think that this is what defines Yorkshire men:

Ah Knoa Wot Ah Like

Ter set mi feet tappin’ an’ start mi’ ‘ands clappin’,

Ther’s nowt beats a reight gud brass band.

When they play ‘William Tell’, Ah’m under a spell.

An’ in Yorksher, we’ve finist i’t’ land.

A gud male voice choir fair sets me afire,

That’s summat Ah really can stand.

They mek rafters ring, when they stan’ up an’ sing.

An’ in Yorksher we’ve finist i’t’ land!

Ah like a ding-dong wi’ t’ owd fashund songs,

An’ a pint o’ gud ale in mi ‘and.

Ther’s nowt fo’ gud cheer, like music an’ beer.

An’ Yorksher we’ve finist i’t’ land!

They c’n keeap ther French muck, all that mush as they cuk,

It tastes like wet sawdust an’ sand.

it’s tripe an’ black puddin’ as sets mi ‘eart thuddin’.

An’ in Yorksher we’ve finist i’ t’ land!

Ah wun’t gie a rap fo’ them nice forrin’ chaps,

All smooth like an’ smarmy an’ bland.

Ther’s nob’dy moor finer ner a true British miner.

An’ in Yorksher we’ve finist i’t’ land!

(Hague 1976a: 135)

Each of the stereotypical aspects of Yorkshire life for a working miner is celebrated, but done so using aspects of culture that have been enregistered (Johnstone 2009). Music, beer and food are the main focus, with the role that music and beer play in recreation being highlighted, as well as Yorkshire food being valorised over and above French food, which is stereotypically seen as ‘haute cuisine’. Denigrating other groups to bolster your own cultural position is a form of symbolic power and a way of legitimating your own position (cf. Bourdieu 1991: 33, 57-58, Van Leeuwen 2007: 91-92). In describing ‘forrin’ chaps’ as smarmy and bland the implication is that Yorkshire people are the finest. Arguably, much in the same way that Coupland argued that mass media recontextualisations of linguistic difference are ‘the main contemporary means of constructing and consuming difference’ (2009: 297), stereotypes are one of the main contemporary means through which cultural difference is ‘constructed’ and ‘consumed’. Throughout this poem Hague engages with not only the way in which his respellings implicitly index stereotypical value judgements, but also explicitly engages with the legitimate authority of stereotypes. In terms of legitimation Hague’s poetic voice appears to be legitimating his own activities by appealing to the authority of tradition. Within Yorkshire the activities outlined can be seen as legitimate because they are ‘what we have always done’ (cf. Van Leeuwen 2007: 96). However, the combined listing of these stereotypical activities alongside the use of dialect representation creates a more complex performance of identity. The use of respellings to perform a Yorkshire voice, places this voice in dialogue with the legitimated authority of standard orthography and ‘standard’ speech. In one sense this authority is based on the legitimate tradition of language standards as something which ‘we have always done’ (cf. Van Leeuwen 2007: 96). However this voice not only invokes, as explained by Agha, implicit stereotypical value judgement, it also explicitly details stereotypical activities associated with Yorkshire. These stereotypes can be seen to be positioned within what Van Leeuwen terms, ‘the authority of conformity’ or ‘what everyone else does’ – a form of legitimation by authorization (cf. Van Leeuwen 2007: 96-97). Stereotypes have cultural currency because they have been legitimated by frequency of use rather than because they are true. Hague engages with the legitimacy of these stereotypes as ways in which aspects of culture are presented to individuals. However he positions these stereotypes within a context where anything concerned with Yorkshire is legitimated and anything else is denigrated.

The positioning of these stereotypical aspects of Yorkshire culture, in a poem where the narrator’s voice is that of a Yorkshire man, on the one hand, celebrates group identity whilst on the other positions this group identity in opposition to outsiders. Hague draws on the relationship between non-standard and standard spelling, and the relationship between high and low cultural forms, and the way cultural stereotypes ‘construct’ group difference to create a poem which celebrates Yorkshire culture, but also contains an implicit critique of outsiders who understand Yorkshire culture simply in terms of its enregistered aspects. For Mugglestone, these markers of lifestyle are important because they are involved in the enacting of social cohesion:

Social affinities based on markers of ‘styles of life’ rather than upon fiscal parities of income, or indeed capital, thus function as the matrix in which notions of social cohesion or division within the community (including those of language) are to be enacted. The relevant terms are, in effect, those of ‘status’, not of ‘class’, and this difference is, in a number of ways, important within our conceptions of the role of accent as social symbol [....] Though both are, to an extent, interrelated, the differentiation of ‘class’ and ‘status’ rests in the primarily economic emphasis of the former as a means of social definition in contrast to the priority given to social habits, social manners, ‘way of life’ (amongst which language and pronunciation form a composite part), which are given priority by latter.

(Mugglestone 2003: 67)

Mugglestone discusses the matrix of social affinities within which social differentiation is enacted. She positions accent as only one of the markers by which life-style, in terms of status, is judged socially, with judgements about status involving the consideration of the behaviour and activities of individuals over consideration of their wealth. Status in the context of ‘Ah Knoa What Ah Like’ relates to the social practices, speech and ‘way of life’ of Yorkshire men. Hague’s poem links accent to a range of cultural activities and behaviours, and in doing so uses them to create ‘social cohesion or division’. The covert prestige of working class culture has cultural capital in Hague’s poem and he constructs this position using the performative potential of respellings, and by engaging with the legitimacy of familiar stereotypes.

Hague’s Yorkshire voice is in a dialogic relationship with the standard due to its orthographic representation relying on standard orthography for its social meaning. Hague demonstrates how stereotypes and enregistered beliefs about ‘high’ and ‘low’ culture play out in his own repertoire by using a poetic stylised voice to discuss this dialogue in ‘They Call it Art’. In ‘Ah Knoa What Ah Like’ Hague’s use of respellings creates an ‘implicit comment on the defects of pronunciation’ (Agha 2003: 237) of people who are not from Yorkshire. If Yorkshire culture is ‘the finest’ then those who use other orthographies or dialects have ‘inferences about the oddity’ (Agha 2003: 237) of their character invited about their behaviour. Hague renegotiates the implicit stereotypes surrounding Yorkshire dialect, by explicitly listing them, in doing so he challenges the authorized legitimacy of orthography and cultural stereotypes by using respellings to position his voice in an oppositional stance to other social groups. He does this first through the use of a non-standard voice and secondly by drawing on highly enregistered aspects of Yorkshire culture. Together he creates a poem that explicitly does what it says on the tin, celebrates Yorkshire culture, but also implicitly undermines the legitimacy of other social groups through the use of respellings and hyperbolic celebrations of stereotypes. In this case study I have discussed how Hague’s use of non-standard orthography relates to or undermines the legitimate authority of modern art and familiar regional stereotypes. To engage further with stereotypes, whilst looking at moral evaluation as a form of legitimacy, in 3.5. I explore how Hague engages with the way that respellings index character judgements about illiteracy and unintelligence, and how Hague celebrates the solidarity of the striking miners. Hague’s poems ‘To My Dear Wife Ivy May’ and ‘Miner’ challenge familiar stereotypes through moral evaluation.

## 3.5. Subversion of Stereotypes through Moral Evaluation

### 3.5.1. Unintelligence

In ‘Speikin Proper’ Hague directly addressed perceptions of dialect speech as ‘incorrect’ in order to challenge the legitimacy of these views. In a similar manner in his poems ‘To My Dear Wife Ivy May’ and ‘Miner’, he directly addressed stereotypes concerning miners in order to challenge these perceptions. Within this discussion of ‘To My Dear Wife Ivy May’ I focus on the strategies that the voice of ‘Totley Tom’ uses to explicitly legitimate his poem through moral evaluation, before exploring how Hague’s use of non-standard orthography introduces an element of irony to the poem, which delegitimises the authority of stereotypes concerning miners. I argue that the subversiveness of this poem is mirrored by the illegitimacy of its spelling (cf. Sebba 2007: p.30-31).

One of the main examples Ferguson (1998) used to outline her ideas concerning ficto-linguistic systems, discussed in 2.6., is how the character of Oliver in Dickens’ *Oliver Twist* is represented as speaking a standard variety of English whereas the Artful Dodger is shown speaking a non-standard variety. Ferguson argues that both characters are from similar socio-economic backgrounds and so they should logically, and socio-linguistically, both be represented speaking a non-standard variety. However she asserts that Dickens represents Oliver speaking a standard variety as the standard is linked to virtuous morality (Ferguson 1998). In contrast, Hague associates many positive moral values with Sheffield dialect. In the poem ‘To My Dear Wife Ivy May’ he uses moral evaluation (Van Leeuwen 2007: 97-100) to legitimise his non-standard voice and in doing this he renegotiates the authority of the prestige of legitimate culture. Although Hague’s Yorkshire speech is represented in texts and appears within a sphere that is governed by literary practices, conventions and cultural values, the legitimacy of these aspects of literary culture can be renegotiated using moral evaluation. Some forms of language or culture may be institutionally legitimized, however this does not mean they hold power in every context.

Hague’s poem ‘To My Dear Wife Ivy May’ serves as a preface to *Tales* in which Hague introduces ‘Totley Tom’ the assumed narrative and poetic voice of *Tales* and the Yorkshire miner referenced in the title of this collection. This poem provides an opportunity for Hague to play with stereotypical views of Yorkshire miners and reassesses these views by associating this voice with positive social values. As discussed briefly in 3.3.3.*,* Totley Tom serves as a fictionalised version of Tom Hague. He is also presented as the character of Tom Earnshaw in some stories. This poem associates the voice of Totley Tom with the subsequent stories and poems in the book whilst presenting this voice as straight-talking, honest, uneducated and hardy as well as, ironically, ‘inarticulate’ and ‘unintelligent’. As the topics and style of Hague’s stories and poems change frequently throughout his book, the ‘Totley Tom’ voice allows him to perform a variety of identities and explore various themes. Unlike Dickens who used standard orthography for the virtuous Olivier, the dialect voice Hague uses is the one that is associated with virtue and morality, and also the one associated with Yorkshire miners:

‘To My Dear Wife Ivy May’[[23]](#footnote-23)

These is t' tales o' Totley Tom,

Tha mun jus' tek 'em as they cum.

 'Appen its likely 'at tha'll think

They're a waste o' paper an' gud ink.

But whether they're gud, else if they're bad,

Think on; Ah'm nobbut a collier lad.

Ah learnt mi trade wi' shovil an' pick;

Mi purse is thin but mi eead is thick.

Burr Ah've writ 'em aht best rooad Ah can

Tha can ast ner moor o' any man!

(Hague 1976a: v)

Hague’s poem introduces the poetic voice of Totley Tom who asks the reader to take his tales ‘as they are’. He then pre-empts a negative assessment of these poems as a ‘waste of paper’ by asking the reader to think about Totley Tom’s background. This background is that of a trained miner, who because of this has little money as well as a ‘thick head’. Discussing his ‘thick head’ suggests a physical resilience from the work of mining as well as unintelligence. This suggestion of unintelligence is reinforced by Hague’s use of non-standard orthography which ‘constitutes an implicit meta-pragmatic commentary on the norms of speech’ (Agha 2003: 237-238). The use of respelling is foregrounded as a marker of unintelligence. In doing this Hague uses respelling as a way of performing the cultural stance of an ‘illiterate’ person and references an imagined reader response to this voice, as well as perhaps an imagined response from his wife.

In one sense what Hague’s poetic voice is undertaking is a legitimation of his work through what Van Leeuwen terms theoretical rationalization: ‘[i]n the case of theoretical rationalization, legitimation is grounded […] in whether it is founded on some kind of truth, on “the way things are”’ (2007: 103-104). Totley Tom is legitimating his works by deterministically stating that what he has produced is simply what, as someone trained in mining, he is capable of doing. Although in the final lines he positions his main point as one of morality: ‘Burr Ah've writ 'em aht best rooad Ah can/Tha can ast ner moor o' any man!’ This appeal to morality serves to legitimise his work through moral evaluation. Hague’s poetic voice positions the texts in *Tales* as legitimate works because he has done the best that he can and a man doing his best is a morally good thing. Honesty and ‘trying your best’ are here privileged over any sense of correctness or literary skill. The non-standard voice is positioned within a moral framework. Rather than the standard voice being the virtuous one, like in *Oliver*, the working class miner’s Sheffield voice is shown to be above all else honest. In one sense the poem is presented as a sort of apology by the writer, whose honesty in doing this shifts the criteria for the judgement of his works. Literary criticism influences whether a text is seen as ‘good’ or ‘bad’ with regard to its style however these judgements are renegotiated by Totley Tom focussing on the qualities of honesty and hard-work. The representation of Hague’s dialect in writing divorces it from the contexts that it is connected to when used in a communicative speech act, whilst adding ‘authenticity’ to this poem through this link to vernacularity. The poem as a whole legitimises its speaker through its self-deprecation and awareness of the social significance of its ‘voice’. Written representations of dialect index aspects of speech and stereotypical judgements about speakers (Jaffe and Walton 2000, Agha 2003). In this instance Hague legitimates his dialect voice by shifting focus onto the moral behaviour and emotional intelligence of his speaker. However, this attempt at legitimation cannot wholly be taken in earnest because of the way the content and voice of Hague’s poem interact with his orthographic conventions.

Through his use of non-standard orthography Hague creates an ironic comment on stereotypes concerning the intelligence of miners. The reading of this irony is influenced by conversations with Sharon Hall about the Hague’s use of irony (Hall, Sharon 2011). This comment is created because of the construal of ‘defective spelling as an implicit comment on defects of pronunciation-implicit’ (Agha 2003: 237), the link between bad spelling and illiteracy, and the high level of literacy that is involved in the writing of a poem such as ‘To My Dear Wife Ivy May’. Because Hague uses dialect respellings his poem demonstrates a level of literacy that is at odds with the claims of his poetic voice. The use of non-standard orthography in this poem is evidence that its author has experience of literacy, an awareness of literary discourse, and an understanding of how speech and writing are intertwined. Because of this the mediation of Hague’s dialect voice in this written poem serves to refashion the ideological values that are embedded in literacy and literary language (Coupland 2009: 285). The social identity of the miner is in itself a complex social identity to perform alongside the social significance of Yorkshire speech represented orthographically. Hague engages with many of the stereotypes associated with coal-miners, Yorkshire people and northerners in general by presenting a Sheffield dialect speaking coal-miner saying that he is many of the things that people may already judge him to be. The poetic voice of Totley Tom is, however, ironically double voiced and indexes a multitude of social identities. On the one hand an ‘uneducated’ narrator asks the reader to understand their coal-mining background and to ‘take the poems as they come’, linking the representation of speech to a ‘real’ person and to a linguistically authentic vernacular. On the other hand, performing an ‘uneducated’ voice through a highly literate and stylized technique means that the view of the use of non-standard orthography, or a spoken dialect, as a sign of unintelligence is mocked. This poem, at the beginning of a published book, plays with the irony that a ‘bad’ writer shouldn’t be able to get a book published and Hague’s respellings reinforce this. Hague’s use of non-standard orthography may be presented as if written by an ‘illiterate’ miner, however the form and content of his poem show that it’s author is a traditionally literate person. This act of ‘illiteracy’ is in itself one that involves, amongst many other things, an awareness of the ‘implicit metadiscourses of accent’ (Agha 2003: 237) that respellings invoke. In this sense stereotypical perceptions of users of non-standard spoken or written codes as ‘unintelligent’ or ‘illiterate’ are challenged by this ironic discussion of illiteracy. Yorkshire dialect may in some contexts be seen as less prestigious than RP, but it is the prestige variety for many. Indexing unintelligence in this way means that Hague can play with the covert prestige of Yorkshire dialect. This suggests that those who view Hague’s miner voice as unintelligent aren’t ‘clever’ enough to pick up on the joke and are therefore the unintelligent ones.

Hague’s use of non-standard orthography challenges the implicit judgement’s made about the character of dialect speakers, in a poem where the dialect speaker is claiming to conform to a stereotypical assumption made about dialect speakers. In doing this Hague undermines the authoritative legitimacy of Standard Language Culture through irony and reinforces the legitimacy of his dialect voice through moral evaluation. Hague’s poetic voice conforms to and inverts a stereotypical perception of miners as ‘uncouth’, and therefore unintelligent and unsuited to artistic endeavours. This poem sets up the value system of Hague’s text by creating an initial link between honesty and dialect speech, as well challenging the stereotypes concerning unintelligence (‘mi eead is thick ‘) and illiteracy (‘Ah've writ 'em aht best rooad Ah can’) that respellings implicitly perform (cf. Agha 2003: 237-238). In contrast, the poem ‘Miner’ serves as a different context for the performance of another aspect of the identity of the miner.

### 3.5.2. Solidarity

During the 1972 miners’ strike the solidarity of the striking miners was central to their success. In his poem ‘Miner’, which was performed or written around this time, Hague delegitimises the negative stereotypes associated with miners, in this period of industrial action, by morally evaluating their actions. The values with which Hague positions the miners’ actions in are similar to the values of ‘common decency’ as described by Hoggart (1957: 141). Whilst ‘To My Dear Wife Ivy May’ employed non-standard orthography to ironically mirror the main theme of the poem, ‘Miner’ is written entirely in standard and so does not contain this layer of additional indexical meaning. However, this poem does provide an insight into the general moral legitimation of his groups’ political stance which Hague was engaged in as a striking miner.

The poem ‘Miner’ is from the *SLSL* collection and outlines how Hague saw miners viewed and how they as a group viewed themselves:

Miner

Some folk look down on the miner

As a ruffian in cloth cap and clogs,

A beer-swilling lout,

Always apt to break out

As savage as dangerous dogs.

[….]

For we ply our trade down in secret,

We’ve a mystery that makes us a clan,

From Kent up through Yorkshire to Scotland

We can act if need be as one man.

And if anyone runs into danger

It’s a risk we’re all willing to share,

No need to glance over our shoulder

To see if our comrades are there.

So we don’t much care for your opinions,

You’re welcome to jibe all you can.

There’s a deep, fierce pride in a miner

For he knows that among men he’s a MAN

(Hague 197-)

The poems in the *SLSL* collection have their origins more firmly grounded in Hague’s time on the picket line in the 1972 miners’ strike than his *Tales* collection. The miners’ position in industrial action was a publically contested one and reached to the highest levels of political discourse during this period. ‘Miner’ positions the figure of the miner within the discourse of solidarity associated with trade unionism, as well as highlighting the criticisms that the miners received and the camaraderie that working underground engenders. In this poem Hague shows an awareness of how each social group that was involved in media discussions during the 1972 miners’ strikes had their own perceptions of the miners and their struggle. Although written in Standard English, this poem illustrates the group perception and pride that the miners share as a political force and discusses how little negative perceptions of them matter in light of this. As the poems in the *SLSL* collection have their heritage in Hague’s oral picket line poems and were distributed around clubs there was perhaps less of a concern for him to write the poem in dialect, as his poetry was being read out by people from his own region and social group. The sentiment of the poem is also one that extends beyond Yorkshire and to other parts of the country and therefore can be seen to be more inclusive when written in standard. This poem shows Hague’s understanding of how others view miners and he also challenges comedic stereotypes or negative perceptions of the figure of the miner. It also aims to create cohesion amongst the miners and distance from their critics.

Much of this challenging is undertaken explicitly through Hague’s moral evaluation of the miners. In light of negative perceptions Hague positions miners as men who are above all loyal to each other, take pride in their work and know that they act like ‘real’ men. The ‘Miner’ poem therefore gives a view of how Hague viewed his own group and the qualities of solidarity, masculinity, patience and tolerance that they ascribed themselves and shared in this diverse social group. The legitimacy of those who ‘look down on the miner’ is undermined through Hague’s moral evaluation of the miners as a group. The miners can be proud because they believe that they are displaying the moral values of what Hoggart described as ‘common decency’:

‘Straight-dealing’, ‘good neighbourliness’, ‘looking on the bright side’, ‘openness’, ‘lending a helping hand’, ‘not being stuck-up or a getter-on’, ‘loyalty’; all these are a good deal more healthy [in the view of the working classes] than the commercial values

(Hoggart 1957: 141)

The opposite values to common decency are the ‘commercial values’ of: ‘pride, ambition, outdoing your acquaintances, show for its own sake [and] conspicuous consumption’ (Hoggart 1957: 141). Hague legitimates the miners in terms of similar values to ‘common decency’ through moral evaluation of their behaviour. In both ‘To My Dear Wife Ivy May’ and in ‘Miner’ Hague explores perceptions of miners and reassesses them in light of positive social values; honesty outweighs judgements about unintelligence and literary skill, whilst conviction and pride in comradeship outweigh judgements about the supposed loutish, inappropriate and violent behaviour of miners. Hague undertakes this legitimation work because of the political nature of industrial action and the essential role that solidarity plays in the success of strike action. In this case study I have explored the ways in which Hague challenges perceptions of miners as ‘uncouth’ or ‘illiterate’ through the explicit use of moral evaluation and the indexical significance of non-standard orthography. By addressing and challenging the negative perceptions of miners Hague addressed the social stigma that was ascribed to him by the very nature of him being a Yorkshire miner. Moral evaluation serves as one way in which the legitimacy of class identity or social activities can be negotiated. In 3.5. I explore the ways in which Hague evaluates the social significance and prestige of speech in terms of working class values. In a range of stories and poems Hague criticises those who participate in legitimate language and culture by morally evaluating their behaviour.

## 3.6. Subversion of Legitimate Language

### 3.6.1. The Social Significance of Speech

In ‘Upstarts’ and ‘Sunday School’, from *Tales,* Hague explicitly and implicitly makes comment, in terms of morality, on how language relates to social behaviour and is involved in social stratification. In these texts Hague’s poetic voice or narrator engages, through the social significance of orthography, with styles of speech as an index of social character. Hague also presents the act of an individual changing from one style of speech to another as having significant negative social meaning. In these texts Hague subverts the legitimacy of prestigious speech and behaviour by associating them with immoral values. In doing this Hague legitimises his own background by associating his speech with positive moral behaviour.

‘Upstarts’ begins by referring to a familiar phrase and then musing on how people change when they have made some money:

Upstarts

“Ther’s nowt ser queer as fooaks, tha knoas”,

A sayin’ owd but true.

Tha niver knoas ther nacher

Till they’ve med a bob ur two.

Ther’s sum tha gits can carry corn

Ther’s others as it ruins,

It teks thee cleean ter t’ fair sumtimes

When tha wetches all ther doin’s

When tha sees ther noases stuck I’t’ air,

It fair puts thee in stiches.

But when they try an’ talk bay-windared,

It’s enuff ter bust thi britches.

They stick ther aitches all o’er t’ shant,

An’ strangle all ther vowils.

It fairly sets thi teeath on edge,

An’ gripes thee in thi bowils.

An’ when a chap dun’t gorm[[24]](#footnote-24) thee

Just ‘cos ‘e’s med sum brass,

Tha knoas it dun’t just tek long ears

Ter mek a gormless ass.

Soa as ther meks thi way i’ t’ world

Keeap true ter thisen.

Think on lad, it’s not just brass

As meks us gentlemen

(Hague 1976a: 125)

Throughout the poem Hague’s poetic voice morally evaluates the ‘upstarts’ whose speech and behaviour index that they are ascribing to behaviour more in line with Hoggart’s ‘commercial values’ rather than the values of ‘common decency. The poem’s main moral is that it is not a problem for people to make some money, as long as they know how to carry themselves once they have made it, with adopting the stereotypical ‘posh’ behaviours of disparaging other people’s behaviour, rejecting things as not good enough for oneself and speaking ‘posh’ highlighted as problematic.

In the first stanza the issue of an increase in financial wealth effecting a change upon a person’s ‘nature’ is foregrounded as potentially problematic. In the second this relationship is clarified further by stating that although what the poetic voice is describing is problematic it is not true of everyone. At the time that Hague was writing bay-windows were an architectural feature of more expensive houses, you would not find them on a row of back-to-backs or on a pre-fab, and so Hague is using them metonymically to refer to the middle-classes or to a local cultural idea of ‘poshness’. These statements, criticising the behaviour of the ‘upstarts’ and distancing the speaker from these individuals, share similarities with Mugglestone’s assertion that it is markers of lifestyle, in terms of status rather than class or income, through which social cohesion or division is enacted (2003:67), especially when considering that the remaining stanzas of the poem oppose the ‘Upstarts’ behaviour, speech and communication rather than their newfound wealth. The poetic voice then turns to describing examples of problematic ‘posh’, or middle-class, behaviour and morally evaluating these practices by describing the emotional response that they provoke. The act of ‘looking down one's nose’, in which these ‘upstarts’ engage, is seen as hilariously derisible. Whilst hearing them ‘talking bay-windared’ leaves the speaker shocked. Employing a socially prestigious way of speaking is explicitly discussed as not only an act of violence towards vowels but also as one which involves the unnecessary addition of /h/ to many utterances: ‘They stick ther aitches all o’er t’ shant/An’ strangle all ther vowils’. This positions prestigious speech as an ‘ugly’ way of speaking and inverts the social stigma of ‘h-dropping’ by stigmatizing what could potentially be described as ‘h-adding’. Both of these ways of speaking produce feelings of unpleasant distaste and physical pain: ‘It fairly sets thi teeath on edge/An’ gripes thee in thi bowils’. Drawing on Mcenery’s work, Hague’s positioning of ‘posh’ speech as an ‘ugly’ way to talk identifies this prestige variety as an ‘object of offence’, with this type of value judgement being integral to the categorisation of forms of speech as morally illegitimate or a ‘bad’ way of speaking (Mcenery 2006: 6). The failure of understanding presented in the fifth stanza places the blame for this failure with the hearer and equates the changes in speech and behaviour of the ‘upstarts’ as an act of stupidity. The final statement of the poem positions the activity and behaviour ascribed to the ‘upstarts’ as morally questionable, focussing on the quality of ‘staying true’ to oneself as what constitutes being a ‘real’ gentleman.

‘Upstarts’ explicitly critiques the act of shifting one’s behaviour and speech to be in line with that of middle-class culture when an individual has made some money. This act of linguistic shifting represents an inauthentic cultural shift in this situation. Talking ‘bay-windared’ is inauthentic because of the range of behaviours that go with it. These ‘upstarts’ are the same as any other, yet once they have made a bit of money they begin to converge on the high status ways of speaking and behaving. The poem as a whole provides a meta-linguistic commentary on the attempts of the ‘upstarts’ to ‘speak properly’ in the sense that this act is presented as equally hilarious, because of its inauthenticity, and yet also troubling because these individuals are cohering to dominant ways of speaking and acting. Hague’s poetic dialect voice delegitimises the dominant cultural practices through a moral evaluation of this behaviour, whilst ascribing the values of honesty, authenticity, and courteous behaviour to his own dialect and social practices. Hague relies on how, even when represented in writing, speech can never be separated from an individual’s ‘whole set of social properties ’ (Bourdieu 1991: 89) with accent acting as just one marker of lifestyle involved in the creation of social affinities (Mugglestone 2003: 67). For Hague’s poetic voice it is not ‘just brass / As meks us gentlemen’, meaning that acting with dignity and respect is complex for both the rich and poor alike. Keeping true ‘ter thisen’ involves valuing your linguistic heritage and the biggest crime that these ‘upstarts’ commit once they have ‘med a bob ur two’ is when ‘they try an’ talk bay-windared’.

Hague’s dialect voice is in dialogue with the implicit stereotypes that his use of respellings indexes. The respellings that Hague employs ‘invite inferences about the oddity’ (Agha 2003: 237) of his dialect speaker’s character that involve stereotypical evaluations surrounding ‘illiteracy’, ‘unintelligence’ and ‘uncouth’ behaviour. This means that his dialect voice is further legitimated as his moral evaluation of his speech and culture also serves to morally legitimate his use of orthography, and undermine the legitimate authority of the language standards and ideologies on which these inferences are based. If spoken and written prestige are being associated with immoral activity then their authority is questioned. Hague’s poetic voice is demonstrating his views concerning what is prestigious and this voice also provides traces of the community relations and discourses that were common at the time that Hague was writing. The people who are adopting a different form of speech now that they have made a bit of money are not to be trusted; in Hoggart’s terms, they have embraced the values of the ‘common market’ not of ‘common decency’ (Hoggart 1957: 141). Therefore a moral value is placed on maintaining your linguistic heritage in the face of cultural premiums being placed on other linguistic forms. This moral positioning is in opposition to the moral legitimation of ‘speaking properly’ or ‘good English’, as Hague’s dialect and non-standard orthography are not necessary seen as ‘good’ or ‘proper’ but for Hague are morally superior. In a similar manner to ‘Speikin’ Proper’ Hague uses non-standard orthography to explore how language relates to class and social inequality.

In ‘Sunday School’ the character of Jenny Hardcastle appears to be the type of person that Hague’s poetic voice is criticising in ‘Upstarts’. Jenny comes from the same background as the narrator but marries an ‘up and coming hairdresser’ and moves ‘to live at the posh end of town’(Hague 1976a: 112). When Hague’s narrator runs into Jenny she is talking ‘all cut glass to another posh bit’ (Hague 1976a: 112) and when Hague’s narrator gets to speak to her on her own she reverts back to her original dialect, but asks him not to let on to people in the area about the types of things they got up to as children. Earlier in the story the narrator recounts how Benny Hardcastle had to bring along his sister Jenny whenever he went out to play with his male friends. When the boys had a ‘pee-ing up the wall’ contest to decide who got the final sweet, Jenny began to cry because she couldn’t join in and was given the sweet to calm her down. This extract from ‘Sunday School’ provides a contrast to the issues discussed in ‘Upstarts’ as it presents a humorous interaction between a ‘posh’ and a ‘common’ speaker:

 “Ey up Jinny” I said, “Dosta rimember when we pee’d up t’ wall tergether?” She looked at me all frozen faced for a second, then the common Hardcastle streak came to the top, and she burst out laughing. “Ah thowt it wor thee, tha bugger! Doan’t thee ler on ter anybody rahnd ‘ere abaht that!” Next minute she was chatting away, all well off, to another woman.

 (Hague 1979a: 112-113)

Although Jenny’s ‘talking cut glass’ is similar to the act of ‘talking bay-windared’ presented in ‘Upstarts’, Jenny’s ‘poshness’ is positioned as a sort of ‘sheen’ over her ‘common’ nature which Hague’s narrator finds more amusing than offensive. This less critical discussion of a code-switching individual is perhaps provoked by the linguistic accommodation (Giles and Coupland 1988) that Jenny undertakes when faced with the narrator’s dialect voice. Within these two examples Hague situates the social significance of adopting, or shifting to and from, a supra-local prestige form in relation to the behaviour and character of these individuals. Regardless of the problems of defining what constitutes ‘working’ or ‘middle’ class culture, within Hague’s texts these are powerful social categories. Hague’s exploration of the changes in speech that the ‘Upstarts’, and also Jenny Hardcastle, undertake creates a division of behaviour into one of these two categories. In this sense Hague’s discussion of the code-switching of the ‘Upstarts’ parallels the ‘us’ and ‘them’ rhetoric of the NUM with, in Hoggart’s work, these terms having specific significance for the working-classes

In general Hague’s use of dialect representation to renegotiate cultural value in poetic works is embedded in the same social processes that socially motivated individuals draw on to create and interpret social distinction. Although middle-class values, practices and culture may be more legitimate in terms of authority, socially motivated individuals converge from, diverge with and reposition themselves in relation to cultural forms constantly in order to perform aspects of their social identities (cf. Bourdieu 1991). For Hoggart the reason why those from a working-class background would have a problem with those who are changing the way they speak is because they are going against the group dynamic of the working-classes:

Holding fast to a world so sharply divided into ‘Us’ and ‘Them’ is, from one aspect, part of a more important general characteristic of the outlook of most working-class people. To come to terms with the world of ‘Them’ involves, in the end, all kinds of political and social questions, and leads eventually beyond politics and social philosophy to metaphysics.

(Hoggart 1957: 86)

Arguably those who are changing the way they speak are attempting to move from the ‘Us’ group into the ‘Them’ group. As the working-class ‘Us’ group is opposed to the middle-class ‘Them’ group, whether because that’s simply how the world is divided for the working-classes in Hoggart’s view or because being a miner like Hague your political and socio-economic stance as a member of the NUM has positioned you in a class war against ‘Them’, those changing are taking on the negative characteristics of an opposing group and are therefore associated with the ‘Them’ group. The ‘upstarts’ who change their behaviour and values to conform to the opposing group come to be viewed as inauthentic, as they have forsaken their background. They have chosen the socially prestigious qualities of a way of speaking over their own authentic language use. Whether or not the processes in play in these situations are as simple as this ‘Us and Them’ dynamic it is possible to see Hague’s representation of these characters, or his narrator’s response to them, is in line with one of the primary functions of language use being to ‘express solidarity with or social distance from interlocutors’ (Gee 1999:1, Mesthrie et al. 2000: 180). Hague is playing with how aspects of social behaviour or speech are seen to relate to the common social categories of ‘posh’, ‘common’, ‘working-class’ and ‘middle-class’ and how participation in the practices or language of these categories can be used to judge an individual socially. The main way in which Hague challenges the legitimate prestige of the dominant language and practices presented in ‘Upstarts’ is through a moral evaluation of the behaviour of individuals who engage with these ways of speaking and practices. In 3.5.2. these moral class values will be explored further in relation to the story ‘First Love’.

### 3.6.2. Class Values

Whilst the poem ‘Upstarts’ involves the use of meta-linguistic comment throughout to make its overall point, Hague draws on stereotypical moral perceptions of RP and dialect speech as part of his characterisation in ‘First Love’. In this story these stereotypes are challenged, again, in terms of how they relate to moral behaviour and the issue of morality is used to critique the view of a speaker as ‘cultured’ or ‘civilised’. As ‘First Love’ predominately deals with class differences, a contrasting discussion of the class relations present in some of Hague’s other stories follows. Returning to Hoggart’s ‘common’ and ‘commercial’ values (Hoggart 1957: 141) these general sets of values can be seen to be displayed in ‘First Love’ as Hague uses Sheffield dialect and RP to highlight the socially ascribed assets that he sees as commonly associated with these two language forms. In terms of the moral legitimation of dialect and behaviour undertaken in this story, this type of legitimation can be positioned within another of Van Leeuwen’s categories, that of ‘mythopoesis’: ‘[l]egitimation can also be achieved through storytelling. In *moral tales*, protagonists are rewarded for engaging in legitimate social practices or restoring the legitimate order’ (Van Leeuwen 2007: 105). In terms of mythopoesis the moral emphasis in ‘First Love’ is on the protagonist Jack’s resistance to legitimate ‘commercial values’, with the moral evaluation of the middle-class ‘commercial’ values as immoral legitimating the values of ‘common decency’ which Jack displays.

Hagues’ narrator tells the story of a romance between the working-class Jack Godwin and the upper-class Dora. They first meet when Jack is out poaching on the grounds belonging to Dora’s Uncle. In describing Dora and Jack’s speech Hague employs meta-linguistic comments to index moral cultural perceptions of their speech. The RP speaking character Dora is described as having ‘terribly cultured tones’ indexing that speakers of this variety possess education, cultural knowledge and civility; whereas Hague’s own Sheffield dialect is described as a ‘barbaric tongue’ associating this speaker with being uncivilised and positioning the character of Jack Godwin in an opposing position (Hague 1976: 19). When they first meet Jack reacts negatively to Dora and, in his speech, diverges from her as much as he can: ‘Her haughty tone and manner rubbed him the wrong way and he answered in his broadest accents, “Ah wor jus’ bahn ter mek watter lass.” She stared at him uncomprehendingly.’ (Hague 1976a: 19). Initially these differences are used to show an impossible love in a summer-romance where ‘opposites attract’ and that class differences do not matter when two people love each other. Class then becomes something that will ultimately keep Jack and Dora apart. Dora believes they can overcome their class differences by getting married, yet Jack’s practical understanding of his own situation stops him from wholeheartedly believing in this dream. However Jack’s uncertainties are dissipated by his friend Tom Earnshaw who proposes that the couple emigrate to Canada or Australia and that Tom and their friend Stan will come as well. This dream is shattered when Dora does not return the following summer and a chance meeting between Jack and Dora in the winter reveals why:

 “I didn’t finish my school term because I was pregnant.” Jack was stunned. In the besotted foolishness of calf love he had never considered such a thing. “What happened?” he asked. “I had a little girl.” “A little lass! Wheer is she?” “Mummy and Daddy had it adopted” she replied coolly.

Jack stared at her in disbelief and despair. Her matter-of-fact acceptance at parting with their child, showed him that, despite his love, they were poles apart. “You parted wi’ our bairn?” he cried out. “There was no other way darling”, said Dora. “Don’t shout dear, Mummy’s coming.”

An elegant older edition of Dora appeared. Jack glared at her in hatred. “Wheer’s mah little lass?” he ground out. Dora’s mother looked at him in disdain and turned to Dora. “Is this the man?”

“Ay tha frozzen faced owd cow” shouted Jack. “This is the bloody man! Wheer’s mah bairn?”

“Surely you don’t think that we could have kept it, in our position,” said Dora’s mother. “It” roared Jack, “Are yer talkin’ abaht a bleedin’ pup or summat? What soort o’ folk are yer, ter gie away yer own flesh an’ blood. Why din’t yer tell me? Mi mam ud ‘a’ looked after ‘er an’ bin glad to. We don’t gie us own away!”

 (Hague 1976a: 22)

Jack is outraged that Dora’s mother cannot even ascribe the correct sex-specific pronoun to refer to the baby, merely referring to the child as ‘it’. At the beginning of the story Jack putting on his ‘broadest accent’ when addressing Dora was the antagonistic response of an inverted snob (Oxford English Dictionary, ‘Inverted Snob, n.’ 2014) reacting to Dora, another snob, who addresses Jack as someone below her in standing. Later however Jack’s Sheffield dialect usage and Dora’s (and her mother’s) RP usage represents the non sequitur of a society that can perceive someone as cultured because of their speech who performs, what for is Jack, a barbaric act; giving away one of your own and treating a child as if it is a commodity. Jack’s stereotypically ‘inappropriate’ speech behaviour (he speaks in a ‘barbaric’ way, ‘grinds’ out his words and at one point Dora asks him to stop shouting) is contrasted with Dora and her mother’s stereotypically appropriate speech behaviour (Dora replies ‘coolly’ and Dora’s ‘elegant’ mother shows little emotion). Dora conforms to what is seen as the respected way to deal with her pregnancy and her parents’ decision ultimately preserves Dora’s chances of securing a rich husband. Although in this text Hague reflects stereotypes concerning typical perceptions of ‘good’ and ‘bad’ speaking, his ‘bad’ speaker is positioned as behaving morally.

The act of giving away a child is positioned as morally corrupt and for Jack the fact that Dora was seemingly complicit in this act is unforgiveable. The representation of Jack’s speech using non-standard orthography indexes a range of stereotypes relating to ‘illiteracy’ and ‘unintelligence’. This representation also positions Jack as an ‘immoral’ individual simply because he does not speak ‘properly’, which is highlighted by Hague’s description of Jack’s speech as ‘barbaric’. However Hague’s narrative legitimates Jack’s speech through the evaluation of Dora and her mother’s behaviour as questionable and the narrative focus on the emotional distress the giving away of his baby causes Jack. Finally Jack’s anger gets the better of him:

The woman turned away. ‘Come along Dora’. Dora stood irresolute. All the bitterness of hopeless love, and anger at their behaviour, welled up in Jack ‘Goo on. Piss off ter Mummy!’ Dora looked as though he had struck her, then followed her mother.

(Hague 1976a: 22)

Although Jack’s final statement to Dora is abusive and a deliberately offensive use of ‘bad’ language it is an act which is completely justified within the moral and ficto-linguistic system which Hague creates in ‘First Love’. This point is reinforced in the epilogue to the story when Jack reveals later in life that he has always been ‘haunted’ by the idea that he ‘had a daughter whom he would never know’, although he also shows remorse at the way he treated Dora as he never forgets the way she looked at him when they last parted (Hague 1976a: 22). In this story the implicit stereotypes indexed by Hague’s use of non-standard orthography are in dialogue with his explicit meta-linguistic comments and the moral positioning of Jack in opposition to the RP speaking Dora and her mother. The legitimacy of speech that indexes ‘civility’ or cultural status is critiqued on a moral level. In ‘First Love’ Hague expresses some of the major themes and ideas of his *Tales* collection through the characters of Jack and Dora’s language use and how they are perceived by society. Hague portrays the middle-classes as appearing to be and being perceived as: honest, moral, respectable and intelligent. Yet in actuality they are motivated by commercial gain, respectability and personal comfort. In the case of Jack and Dora, Hague challenges working-class stereotypes whilst stereotyping the middle-classes. This stereotyping of the middle-classes inverts the traditions of stereotypical representations of working-class characters through dialect representations (cf. Ferguson 1998, Beal 2006).

The themes that Hague expresses in ‘First Love’, concerning the character of these social classes and how their speech is perceived, are reinforced in the final story of the *Tales* collection ‘Success’. The character of Charlie Royston develops from a boy living in near poverty who is terrified of the pits, his only real career option, into a successful business man who participates in the activities of the middle-classes. In order to succeed Charlie believes he has to change the way he speaks:

[Charlie] realised that an upper-class accent was a great asset, both socially and in business, so he took elocution lessons and persuaded Irene [his wife] to do likewise

 (Hague 1976a: 142)

Ultimately Charlie’s success leaves him feeling unfulfilled and alone as although he has monetary wealth, and has succeeded socially, he has abandoned the honest family-centric qualities of the working-classes and stepped on everyone that has cared for or loved him in the process. The character of Charlie Royston displays a common motif for Hague; someone who loses a sense of their identity and debases their morality from the working-class model through ‘getting on’ and the end result is commercial success but an inauthentic life and the feeling of being unfulfilled. The clear distinction between class values in ‘First Love’ is played out through dialect usage and are reinforced in ‘Success’ by Charlie’s efforts to change the way he speaks. The moral values displayed in ‘First Love’ form a major theme, which ‘Success’ and ‘Upstarts’ contribute to by reinforcing these qualities and linking them to social ideas concerning speech behaviour and monetary gain. In a similar manner to ‘First Love’, the tale of Charlie Royston legitimates working-class culture and speech through mythopoesis, as Charlie’s move to engage with the speech and ‘commercial’ values of the middle-classes results in a negative outcome for him.

However Hague doesn’t always portray the working and middle-classes as having the same ‘commercial’ qualities. For example Hague’s story ‘Friendship’ shows the middle-class standard speaking Colonel Armstrong’s selflessness altering the prejudice towards him that is held by the miner Jack Denton. The Colonel’s views concerning the miners’ in the 1926 miners’ strike evaluate him as a morally righteous character: ‘[h]e had found them civil without being servile and had admired their fortitude and comradeship in adversity’ (Hague 1976a: 62). Jack Denton’s prejudices are challenged by the Colonel’s morally good actions. Colonel Armstrong, a middle-class character with a conscience, also links with the character of Old William Fletcher in the story ‘Service’ who was explicitly: ‘a Conservative who refused to compromise with his conscience’ (Hague 1976a: 90). Although Hague frequently draws on social stereotypes to support his characterisation and moral evaluation, he can also show more nuanced class identities and class as something that can be performed. The representation of the Colonel is a change from Hague’s letter where he describes many a highly ranked member of the armed forces being ‘bone from the neck up’. These middle-class heroes are just as celebrated in Hague’s collection as the working-class ones. Moral judgements are used to influence how we think about ‘bad’ language use such as swearing, yet they also play a part in our understanding of ‘good’ language use (cf. McEnery 2006). Associating virtuous moral values with speakers of a specific linguistic variety serves to legitimize the speech variety that is being presented through dialect representation and therefore the non-standard orthography that is used to do this. The discourse surrounding the values of common decency serve to legitimize the language variety that is represented using non-standard orthography and Hague employs familiar social stereotypes to undertake this revaluation. In ‘Egg On His Face’ Hague engages with the values and speech of the government and NUM when he translates the stereotyped voice of Prime Minister Edward Heath into the socially stigmatized Yorkshire dialect of his mining community.

### 3.6.3. Recontextualising Social Norms

Hague’s representations of Yorkshire speech serve to recontextualise the values and practices associated with this speech variety into writing, as well as, in many instances, refashion the implicit judgements and ideological values surrounding dialect speech and non-standard orthography. In ‘Egg on His Face’ Hague translates the ‘posh’ speech of Prime Minister Edward Heath into Yorkshire dialect and recontextualises this speech into writing. Hague also translates the speech of the Lancashire born President of the NUM, Joe Gormley, into Yorkshire dialect however this act is less significant as Gormley and his organisation are being celebrated rather than being satirised in this poem. In translating Heath’s speech into Yorkshire dialect Hague’s use of respellings contribute to his effort to undermine the legitimacy of the UK government. In doing this Edward Heath’s actual way of speaking is mocked because he is shown speaking in dialect.

‘Egg on His Face’, from the *SLSL* collection, was one of the first poems that Hague ever wrote and he briefly discussed how proud he was of writing this poem when talking to *The Sheffield Star* in 1972:

The miner/poet is particularly fond of a dialect poem he wrote about the confrontation between union leader Joe Gormley and PM Ted Heath, entitled ‘Egg on his face’.

“It sums up just what I feel about the way the Government handled the whole dispute,” said Tommy who lives at Greenoak Avenue, Totley, Sheffield

(Anon 1972)

 In this poem Hague’s poetic voice discusses the successful challenge to the government that the 1972 miners’ strike involved, with Hague’s use of non-standard orthography being used to invert the authorised institutionalised power of the government. In ‘First Love’ and ‘Success’ Hague delegitimizes speakers of prestige varieties, and the association between their speech and the standard written form, through moral associations. In ‘Egg on His Face’, Hague achieves this through recontextualising Edward Heath’s speech into Yorkshire dialect, creating a speaker who speaks ‘plainly’ but is being clearly unreasonable:

Ther wor a chap called Edward ‘eath

Wi’ fruity voice an’ flashin’ teeth!

‘E sez ter Joe “Tha’ll get nowt ‘ere,

‘Cos Ah’m a man wot ‘as no fear.

Ah’ll tell thee wot, lad, ‘ere’s two quid,

An’ that’s me very ‘ighest bid!”

Gormley sez, “If that’s thi’ top

Then bloody wheels’ll ‘a’ ter stop”.

“Alreight,” sez Ted, “thee go on strike,

Tha’ll not scare me, owd cock.

Ah’ll just sit ‘ere an’ bide me time,

Ah’ve tons o’ coil in stock”.

Joe went ter t’lads an’ they said, “Reight!

It seems this bleeder wants a feight.

Cum on lads, gerr aht on picket,

We’ll show that bastard we can stick it!”

So off we went, an’ shocked all t’nation,

Wi’ shuttin’ dahn all t’power stations.

An’ then when folk began to scream

Ted wakkened up aht on ‘is dream.

From ‘Egg On His Face’ (Hague 197-)

This is a poem with an oral performance heritage as it would have been one of the ‘ballads’ Hague wrote to amuse his colleagues whilst on the picket in 1972 (Anon 1972). The poem brings the economic and political process of industrial negotiations into the local dialect of the miners and is explaining what is happening in a ‘plain’ or ‘straight’ talking manner. The voice represented is Hague’s voice as he speaks the poem on the picket line to others but also the performed version of a familiar militant miner’s voice. As seen in the second stanza, and throughout the rest of the poem, Heath is presented as being dismissive of the miners’ pleas for a pay increase and ultimately unreasonable in his position. It is this position which motivates Gormley and the miners to strike as Heath’s responses become confrontational, to which Gormley responds ‘[i]t seems this bleeder wants a feight’. In the poem the dispute is only resolved when Heath has offered two further wage increases. The final lines focus on the sacrifices that the miners’ have made, although these sacrifices are presented as worth it because they defeated Heath: ‘It’s cost us quite a bit, tha knows/BUT WE GI’ED YON ‘EATH A BLOODY NOSE’ (Hague 197-).

In the first stanza Heath’s odd voice is foregrounded, although throughout the poem he speaks in the same Yorkshire dialect which Union leader Joe Gormley is shown to speak. As the entire poem is written in dialect the political discourse between Heath and Gormley, as well as their respective ways of speaking, are embedded within the indexical profile of Yorkshire English. Respelling the Prime Minister’s speech creates a new indexical profile for Heath’s speech. This also serves to position Heath’s voice within the practices and values of Hague’s speech and political community, and in doing so delegitimises the legitimate authority of Heath’s voice by repositioning him within the social values of this community. Although Hague does not explore morality in as an explicit way as discussed in ‘Upstarts’ and ‘First Love’ his use of dialect, and the content of the poem, serve to position Heath’s actions within the community values of the miners. Heath’s activities can be seen to be in dialogue with some of Hoggart’s ‘common’ and ‘commercial’ values. On the one hand, although Heath is being unreasonable, his speech positions him as talking in a ‘straight dealing’ manner, not the speech of political discourse (Hoggart 1957: 141). On the other hand what he says positions him as too ‘proud’ to engage with Gormley ‘fairly’ resulting in a dispute that revolves around Heath’s initial attempt to ‘out-do’ his acquaintance Gormley (cf.Hoggart 1957: 141). In translating Heath’s speech into Yorkshire dialect Hague changes the social affordances of this speech as it is positioned within a context where the discourse norms surrounding prestige and morality are no longer those of a legitimated government but are those of Hague’s social group. Hague is subverting any perceived institutional respect for the government by translating the ‘prestigious’ speech of the prime minister into his ‘stigmatized’ regional variety as Hague’s dialect is not the typical language variety associated with a Prime Minister.

Although in Hague’s poem he critiques Heath to metonymically delegitimise the institutional legitimacy of the government as a whole, Heath’s speech itself is foregrounded as ‘fruity’. This statement, and the translation of this ‘fruity’ voice into Yorkshire dialect, engages with stereotypes surrounding the Prime Minister’s speech. Through a recontextualisation of Yorkshire dialect Hague is reassessing ideological values whilst at the same time Heath as an individual and his speech are being lampooned. Heath occupied the position of the leader of the country and a politician. However, his own economic and class background is emphasised, because his speech has been translated and by nature of it being represented in a new context there is now a focus on how he would have actually spoken. Heath didn’t simply speak a prestige speech variety. He had a unique way of speaking that was parodied and stereotyped. Hague representing Heath speaking Yorkshire dialect plays with this stereotype. David Marquand provides more context for understanding what Heath’s speech sounded like:

[Heath’s] origins were humbler than Wilson’s: humbler in fact, than those of any previous British prime minister apart from Ramsay MacDonald. He was born into the upper working class in the Kentish seaside town of Broadstairs in 1916; John Campbell, his biographer, thought the ‘tortured’ vowel sounds of his maturity were a legacy of hard-won upward mobility [….]

[Heath] inspired devoted loyalty among his subordinates; his Cabinet was one of the most harmonious of the century. But, despite his love of music, he had a tin ear when it came to words. His speeches sounded lifeless and somehow strangulated. Too often, he veiled his deeply felt vision of Britain and her future in a fog of bureaucratic management-speak, leading *Private Eye* to lampoon him as the managing director of ‘Heathco’, forever bombarding his staff with peppery and linguistically maladroit complaints about slackness and inefficiency.

(Marquand 2008: 232-234)

Heath has changed his speech to adopt a socially prestigious way of speaking, which involves a similar shifting to that which the ‘upstarts’ of Hague’s poem undertake, and in doing this he can be seen to have embraced the legitimate behaviour and ‘commercial’ values of middle-class culture which Hague critiques in ‘Upstarts’. However his speech is not simply a marker of status and values. As Marquand explains, the way that Heath spoke had become a familiar stereotype. In this sense Hague’s translation of Heath’s speech into Yorkshire dialect does not simply engage with notions of prestige, covert prestige, power and legitimacy, but with an existing stereotype concerning the speech of Heath. Hague’s use of non-standard orthography makes an implicit comment on the ‘oddness’ of Heath’s speech because all traces of this speech have been removed. Heath is seen as unable to assert himself linguistically during his time in office leaving the image of him as ineffective and this ‘strangled’ style of delivery has become stereotyped. In Hague’s words Heath has a ‘fruity voice’, although Hague denies Heath the use of it doubling Heath’s inarticulateness and insulting him further. Overall this act of translation positions the legitimate speech and authority of Heath into the values and behaviour norms of Hague’s speech community. The use of non-standard orthography invites implicit judgements about the character of Heath with these characteristics invoking aspects of working-class speech and behaviour rather than prestigious characteristics. Finally, this translation draws attention to the ‘fruity voice’ which Heath actually possessed by denying him the use of it and in doing so Hague creates an explicit comment on the sounds of Heath’s speech to mock him. As discussed throughout this chapter, many of Hague’s works aim to challenge other political positions or draw attention to the inequality between the working and middle-classes.

In concluding this chapter I discuss the linguistic foundation on which legitimate power is established. In this case study I have explored a range of Hague’s challenges to legitimate or dominant language norms and values and how they relate to working and middle class language. In doing this I have discussed the explicit moral evaluation Hague created as well as the implicit meta-linguistic comments Hague’s use of respellings invoke.

## 3.7. Concluding Remarks: Respelling and Legitimacy

### 3.7.1. Language and Subversion

Although the table in 3.3.1. demonstrates how Hague’s orthographic conventions can be seen to gesture towards the sounds of Yorkshire dialect, in this discussion of his engagement with legitimacy processes my aim was to reposition dialect representation as an act of respelling which is engaged in literacy practices and the ways in which individuals’ positon themselves socially. The ideological authority of orthography (cf.Jaffe and Walton 2000: 582) plays a role in the perpetuation of legitimate language and behaviour. The political nature of many of Hague’s poems and the ways in which he employs dialect representation to support his political aims, position his use of respellings as a subversive act. In his engagement with discourses concerning the legitimacy of language, the establishment, industrial action and community values Hague uses non-standard orthography as a way of subverting the authority, or values, that are enshrined in legitimate cultural forms. For McEnery language is the foundation for political power and so Hague’s use of dialect representation engages in the renegotiation of ideological power. In McEnery’s discussion of the social activist Mary Whitehouse’s campaign against ‘bad language’ his case studies highlight the ways in which the use of swearing was employed, successfully or unsuccessfully, to undermine and subvert the authority or values of the establishment (McEnery 2006: 102-129). The use of swearing is not as prominent in this discussion of Hague’s work as it was in the previous chapter’s discussion of FAPN. However, Hague’s use of ‘bad language’, in the sense that his Yorkshire dialect and orthography are positioned as non-standard, subverts cultural and linguistic norms. This engagement with orthographic practices alongside criticisms of legitimate views, artistic aesthetics and the government demonstrates one of McEnery’s main points that political legitimation involves the construction of a legitimate language:

The ultimate basis of any political mandate is linguistic. A discourse of power is established whereby laws can be conveyed. Access to that discourse becomes a token of membership, or at least acceptance, of a ruling group. To subvert that linguistic mandate is akin to undermining the foundations of a building.

(McEnery 2006: 111)

Although Jaffe and Walton’s assertion that non-standard orthography can ‘delegitimise’ the non-standard variety of speech being represented, non-standard orthography itself can be used to challenge the ideologies which are involved in the legitimation of language. In his letter to Widdowson Hague discussed the problems he faced in writing down his pronunciation. What is clear from his writing is that his attempts at representing the sounds of Yorkshire dialect are engaged in the political discourse concerning cultural and linguistic legitimacy which underpins established power. In writing in dialect his use of this technique is predominately involved in the undermining of many dominant, prestigious or legitimate aspects of culture and language. In Chapter 4 Barry Hines’ problem with the way his use of non-standard orthography did not sufficiently achieve his political goals will be explored in detail.

# 4. The Politics of the Standard and the Non-Standard in *A Kestrel for a Knave* by Barry Hines

## 4.1. Introduction

Barry Hines is most famous for *A Kestrel for a Knave* (1968, from here on referred to as *AKFAK*), the story of the beleaguered Billy Casper, and its Ken Loach directed film version *Kes* (1969). Hines was born in the mining village of Hoyland Common near Barnsley into a family of miners, his father worked in the local pit and his grandfather had been killed working down the mines. Hines himself worked as an apprentice surveyor in the mines until he realised that it was possible for him to pursue other options. Throughout his writing career, which includes nine novels and various radio, television and film scripts, Hines has focussed on the lives of northern working-class characters. A resident of Yorkshire for most of his life Hines has made his career out of portraying the passions and problems of working-class characters as well as highlighting the social inequalities that these characters face in their everyday lives. Hines asserts that because of his own relationship with literature and education he has made an effort to write the types of books that would have been of relevance to him growing up; books that represented working-class experiences and practices, rather than middle-class ones (Hines 1998, Hines 2009: 3).

Although Hines makes use of some dialect representation in his other work, *AKFAK* is the only book of his where he uses respellings to try and represent the phonetic qualities of his characters’ speech, specifically the sounds of Yorkshire dialect. *AKFAK* is presented simply as the story of a boy from a ‘Yorkshire mining town’ (Hines 168 [2000]: backcover), whereas Loach’s *Kes* was filmed in and around Barnsley, and includes many local schoolchildren as actors (Ojumu 1999). Hines’ representation of Barnsley dialect in *AKFAK* and his reappraisal of it thirty years later in the afterword to the 2000 edition of *AKFAK* demonstrate the cultural and stylistic tensions that literature, Standard English and ‘speaking correctly’ have for a writer who is invested in the culture and norms of a northern working-class community, as these legitimate culture forms are not ideologically neutral concepts. In his autobiographical work, newspaper articles and comments on his writing, Hines explores the cultural significance of literature in class terms and how his political viewpoint is reflected in his stylistic choices.

In this chapter I look at how dialect representation relates to Hines’ political aims for his literary writing and his resistance of the norms of the literary sphere. I explore how Hines negotiates the ‘ideological structures that imbue language variation with social meaning, and often with social disadvantage’ (Coupland 2007: 86) as well as Hines’ reflection on the normative class and language ideologies present in literary culture. I also work to trace some of the ways in which literature structures social difference.

My analysis involves looking at the role of dialect representation in *AKFAK* whilst situating it in relation to some of Hines’ other works, which also represent northern working-class characters, as well as looking at the discourse surrounding the cultural impact of *AKFAK*. My aim in doing this is to use Hines’ own comments on dialect representation to explore what he considered to be the stylistic and cultural advantages and disadvantages of grammatical and lexical dialect representation over phonetic respellings in order to explore the mediation of vernacular language within Hines’ political aims. Throughout this chapter, I explore the idea that the mediation of vernacular language in literature involves the *translating* of one culture or system of social difference into another, with this translation engaging with dominant ideologies and values. I make the argument that Hines’ use of dialect representation in *AKFAK* draws on the implicit negative social judgements that non-standard orthography can invoke to support his political aims by refashioning the ideological values associated with Casper’s voice. In order to begin to make this argument, in 4.1.1. I introduce Hines’ comment on his use of dialect in *AKFAK* from the afterword of the 2000 edition of *AKFAK* and his political stance on writing and literature.

### 4.1.1. Hines’ Reassessment of Dialect Representation and his Political Approach to Writing

It is the people and the places that surround the pits which has inspired much of Hines’ work and whose lives he has represented, in many cases, to facilitate social change. Many of Hines’ novels have a strong investment in the people and landscape of the region in which he grew up. This regional focus means that Hines focusses on the language, vocations, politics, relationships and interests of the people who live in these rural-industrial areas. In *AKFAK* respellings are used to mark for the pronunciation of Yorkshire dialect:

‘What’s up wo’ thee, shit t’bed?’

‘I’m off out, nesting wi’ Tibby and Mac.’ […]

‘It’s a smashing morning again.’

‘Tha wouldn’t be saying that if tha’ wa’ goin’ where I’m going’ [.…]

‘Just think, when we’re goin’ up t’woods, tha’ll be goin’ down t’cage.’

‘Ar, just think; an’ next year tha’ll be coming down wi’ me.’

‘I’ll not’.

(Hines 1968 [2010]: 16)

In 4.3.1. a linguistic description of the features of Yorkshire English Hines represents will be presented. Hines’ respellings are less marked for pronunciation than the works of an author like Hague because Hines’ writing was aimed more at a national or mainstream audience rather than a local audience or an audience interested in ‘rich dialect’ (Hague 1976a: inner cover). However, he chose to move away even from this ‘light’ marking of dialect. In the afterword of the 2000 Penguin Classics edition of *AKFAK* Hines discusses what he could have done differently:

Writing this afterword thirty years after the book was first published has given me the opportunity to reappraise it and consider how it would differ if I was writing it today [….]

If I was writing it today I wouldn’t use dialect. It can be irritating to the reader and whatever methods you try, you don’t capture the voice on the page. I think the best solution is to use dialect words to give a flavour of the region, but trying to reproduce northern working-class speech with the glottal stop as in ‘Going to t’cinema’ doesn’t work at all. The answer of course is to write about middle-class characters who are ‘Going to the cinema’. I didn’t have this problem when I was adapting the novel into a film script. I wrote it in Standard English and the actors translated it back.

 (Hines 1968a [2000]: 206-207)

Hines recognises that it is not possible to ‘write speech down’ and that readers may find it difficult engaging with non-standard orthography. However, Hines’ representation, or evocation of vernacular speech in many of his texts is not a simple matter of ‘capturing voice’ but is involved in achieving the political aims of his writing. Hine’s comments on dialect representation provide a useful perspective to use when discussing the cultural history of *AKFAK,* and its cinematic version, *Kes.* They also provide context when looking at other books in Hines’ oeuvre that explore the lives of working-class characters whilst giving a ‘flavour’ of dialect speech. Hines reflects that relying on the symbolic value of dialect words over the supposedly referential phonetic information ‘coded’ in dialect respellings is for him a more useful literary technique. This ‘change of heart’ relates to Hines political approach to writing literature about working-class people and so his comments on writing in dialect need to be positioned within how Hines presented his reasons for writing.

The motivating force behind Hines’ writing is his political stance, and he details this in an essay that appears in various places. Most of this essay appears in the programme for a staging of *Kes* at the Crucible theatre Sheffield in 1991, with the rest appearing in *This Artistic Life* (2009 from here on referred to as *TAL*) a collection of essays, short stories and poems:

My novels are mainly about working class life. They are about people who live on council estates or in small terraced houses. The men work in mines and steelworks, the women in underpaid menial jobs – or, increasingly, are on the dole. I feel a strong sense of social injustice on behalf of these people which stems from my own mining background. The hardness and danger of that life (my grandfather was killed down the pit, my father was injured several times) formed my attitudes and made me socialist.

*The mainspring of my work is my political viewpoint. It fuels my energy; which is fine, as long as the characters remain believable and do not degenerate into dummies merely mouthing my own beliefs. However, I would rather risk being didactic than lapsing into blandness – or end up writing novels about writers writing novels. If that happens it will be time to hang up the biro.*

My stories are all conventional in form. They have a beginning, a middle, and a sort of ending (mainly in that order), with the occasional flashback thrown in.

(First section: Hines 1991, italics: Hines 1991 and Hines 2009: v, final section: Hines 2009: v)

The political viewpoint that Hines discusses is informed by socialist thinking and focusses on class inequality. In representing working-class people Hines has made an effort to challenge dominant ideologies present in everyday life and institutions. For example, in *AKFAK* Hinesaddresses what he perceived to be the class inequality present in the education system. Exploring how Hines presents himself in his autobiographical writing and in interviews makes it possible to see how his background informed his views and what he saw as the purpose of his writing[[25]](#footnote-25). Throughout his writing career Hines has maintained an interest in the working-class communities of the North which in an interview with Clare Jenkins in 2000 he described as being ‘odd’ because once he became a writer he essentially became a middle-class person (Hines 2000). Hines’ interest in working-class characters can be seen to stem from the cultural and social inequality that he experienced in his education and witnessed in his teaching career and also how things like literature and sports play a role in creating social distinction between the working and middle-classes.

 In his autobiographical writing in *TAL* Hines details how he came to writing because of a lack of literature that represented people who had any relevance to him and how this affected his engagement with literature (Hines 2009: 67-69). These comments are discussed in detail in 4.2.2. In this sense his reasons for writing link with Raymond Williams’ comments on any novel about the working-classes acting as a form of ‘positive cultural intervention’ because by it is existence it is creating a change in literary culture (Williams 1982: 111). For Hines his work is political; in one sense because of his recognisable socialist stance and in another because Hines’ work represents people that literary culture has overlooked. In his autobiographical work Hines presents his experiences of education, football and literature as integral to his approach to writing and throughout his work he explores the relationship between working-class people and the systems and institutions that govern their lives.

This chapter begins with a biographical section, and then it is essentially split into two sections looking at style and ideology. In the biography section I explore Hines’ experiences of the pits, grammar school, literature, and teaching to trace how his political views were shaped by his experiences and influenced by his engagement with different cultural spheres. Hines’ autobiographical writing, as well as interviews with journalists, complements the values and ideals portrayed in Hines’ literature so that Barry Hines ‘the author’ projects a strong investment in region, people and politics. In the biographical aspect of this chapter, as well as the subsequent explorations, I draw on the following information: Hines’ autobiographical writing in *TAL*, written and oral interviews from throughout Hines’ career and texts from Hines’ collected papers donated by his wife Eleanor Hines.

Following on from this section I look at the techniques Hines uses to create implicit and explicit meta-linguistic comments in his writing. Because of Hines’ move to a ‘flavour’ of dialect approach in his later works I first look at his use of non-standard orthography to represent dialect in *AKFAK* and then at his use of this ‘flavour’ approach in two of his later novels *The Heart of It* and *Unfinished Business*. I then discuss the ideological structures that surround Hines’ writing. Firstly, by looking at the way in which Hines’ use of dialect representation to create Casper’s voice contributes to the political stance that he takes in *AKFAK*. I then discuss the social significance of Casper’s vernacular speech in relation to Barnsley poet and writer Ian McMillan’s foreword to the 2010 edition of *AKFAK* and Fairclough’s work on language and power. I conclude by discussing how Hines’ use of dialect representation supports his resistance to the normative class and language ideologies present in literature.

## 4.2. Biography

### 4.2.1. The Pits and Education

Barry Hines was born in Hoyland Common near Barnsley in 1939 and lived in his childhood on Tinker Lane. From a family of miners, his father and both grandfathers worked in the pits. Hines’ grandfather Doug Westerman was killed whilst working in the Rockingham colliery at the bottom of Tinker Lane (Hines 2000, Hines 2009: 16). After Hines passed his eleven plus he went on to study at the Ecclesfield Grammar School, where he showed talent as a footballer, followed by a period where he worked for a few months down the pit as an apprentice mining surveyor (Hines 2009: 19-20, 86-87, Hines 1998). Although Hines was critical of the grammar school system, it was his success in the eleven plus which meant that he avoided working in the pits long term. Whilst Hines was working in the mines it was the intervention of a family friend and miner, Bill Hawksworth, which convinced Hines to make the most of the opportunity that the eleven plus had offered him. Going to grammar school provided Hines with the opportunity to stay in education past the age of fifteen, unlike many of his peers who went to the secondary modern Kirk Balk (Hines 1998). Initially Hines tried to leave school at fifteen when his ‘mates left secondary modern’ but when he was told that he would need O levels to get a surveyor job he went back to school to get them. For Hines, grammar schools existed to ‘perpetuate the class divisions within our society’ and ‘to try and seduce the working-class students into their ranks’ (Hines 2009: 86). His reason for going to work in the pit was due to ‘“a sort of bravado” towards the other boys who thought him a cissie’ (Benson, 2005: 162) and his reason for choosing a surveyor job was because he wasn’t entirely immune ‘from all the indoctrination’ of the grammar school classroom and thought that it seemed a ‘respectable’ job (Hines 2009: 86). However Hines saw his initial decision to leave school at fifteen as a failure on the grammar school’s part to fully indoctrinate him. As Hines had passed his eleven plus and attended the local grammar school he felt that through his education he was being made to feel different to his friends who hadn’t passed this test. Going to work in the pit was his way of showing everyone that he wasn’t any different. In *TAL* Hines discusses how his experiences in the mine shaped his future success as it prompted him to continue with education:

When I went underground I took perverse pleasure in wearing my old school blazer, as if I was trying to prove to the miners that despite my academic education I was still one of them, and hadn’t deserted my roots. But Bill Hawksworth wasn’t in the least bit impressed by my heroic show of class solidarity. As I crawled by him on the coal face one day, he turned round and saw me. I smiled. I had known him all my life and expected a friendly response. Instead, he shook his head. ‘Couldn’t you find a better job than this?’ he said, disgusted that a boy with a grammar school education should end up down the pit. By his reckoning, that’s what grammar schools were for, to keep you out of the pit, to gain enough qualifications to work in an office and wear a suit and tie, and draw a salary at the end of the month. And have a wife who didn’t worry herself sick every time her husband was late from work.

Bill Hawksworth’s disapproval made a deep impression and shocked me into considering my future. I realised he was right, went back to school and became a teacher [….] [W]hat would have happened if I hadn’t encountered Bill on the coal face that fateful morning? Who knows? But one thing’s for sure, it’s odds on I wouldn’t have become a writer.

(Hines 2009: 20-21)

Wearing his school blazer underground was Hines’ way of showing that he was part of the mining community, even if he had gone to grammar school (and vice versa). Bill Hawksworth’s disgust came from his belief that the grammar school was a way for children to stay out of the pit. Here Hines explores how his grammar school education made him feel different from his peers, but also the currency that this education had for members of his community. Although Hines accepted that the grammar school system was biased and unequal, he had to concede that it provided him with a better opportunity than the pits, but it took a working miner to make him realise this.

Hines returned to school and then went on to study Physical Education at Loughborough College, after which he taught for two years in London before returning to Loughborough to complete his diploma. After this he returned to the north where he taught at Kirk Balk (Hines 1998), the school his friends had been to, before ‘taking up writing full-time’ (Ahad 2009). The tight-knit community of the mining village of Hoyland Common had a lasting impression on Hines and in his life and work he displays an investment in this region and its way of life. Even after moving away to London Hines returned to the Hoyland Common area and once he was established as a successful writer he stayed in the South Yorkshire area, living and working in Sheffield and returning again to live in the Hoyland Common area when he was diagnosed with Alzheimer’s (Ahad 2009). In interviews after his diagnosis there is a focus on the communities that Hines represented. In a *Yorkshire Post* interview with Barry and Eleanor Hines about living with Alzheimer’s in 2009, a couple of years after Hines’ diagnosis, Nick Ahad precedes the interview by commenting that: ‘[i]t is the cruellest irony that the man who brought stories from the pit village to the world can no longer read his own books – or anyone else's’ (Ahad 2009). In another interview the same year with Nigel Armitage for the Yorkshire *On Magazine* Hines was questioned about the pit villages and he commented that his interest was in the communities that lived in the areas and ‘[t]he fact that members of every family worked down the pit forged strong bonds’ (Armitage 2009). Hague’s investment in the working classes is evident in his writing, as well as the tensions of negotiating working and middle-class values systems, and this investment comes from the ‘strong bonds’ formed by his upbringing in one of these pit villages. In this interview Hines does not necessarily lament the decline of coal-mining as a profession, but he does draw attention to the pit’s central role in the communities that surround them. These communities would not have existed in the form that they did were it not for the collieries and therefore many of Hines’ fictional working class communities and characters owe their existence to the pits. Hines’ experiences with the grammar school education system made him aware of the disparity between the culture and values of the pit-villages and the institutionally legitimate world of the middle-classes.

### 4.2.2. Sport and Literature

Whilst studying at Loughborough college Hines was keen on becoming a professional footballer, but he thought that if this didn’t work out then ‘the next best thing seemed to be a Physical Education teacher’ (Hines 2009: 69). Because of his interest in sport Hines had one of his first experiences of class cultural differences when he took part in trial matches to find an England under 18s football team at Cambridge. The way the public schoolboys who trialled spoke and dressed made Hines feel conscious of his own speech and clothes as they carried themselves with ‘a collective air of massive superiority’ (Hines 2009: 89). Hines felt that they were worlds apart, particularly when they played football as even the best public school footballer ‘lacked the urgency and determination of the working-class grammar school boys’ which highlighted for Hines the difference in the importance of football in these cultural spheres: ‘[b]ut then, what had they to be urgent about? Football was not important in their lives. For them it really was a game.’ (Hines 2009: 89). This was the first time in which Hines ‘had been able to place football into some kind of social perspective’ (Hines 2009: 90). Before coming to college Hines had privileged football over literature and was more interested in comics*.* Whilst at grammar school the privileging of academic subjects over sports was a form of cultural training that frustrated Hines:

At grammar school they also tried to convince me that football was not really important, that games lessons were merely half-time breaks between the academic rigours of the week. But what they did not understand was that I was not an academic boy. All I wanted was to be a professional footballer [….]

At school I lived from games lessons to Saturday morning matches year in, year out.

(Hines 2009: 83-85)

The emphasis placed on academic subjects, like English literature, and certain sports like rugby was alienating for a young Hines who just wished to be a footballer. However whilst at college and bored one rainy Sunday afternoon he borrowed *Animal Farm* off his roommate who was studying English. His roommate was doubtful when Hines asked to borrow a book, as he did not have any ‘picture books’, however *Animal Farm* happened to be the thinnest book on the shelf and Hines ‘read it at a sitting’ (Hines 2009: 69). After enjoying reading this first book under his own volition Hines realised that ‘reading books could be enjoyable’ and he began to read ‘proper books’ for the first time moving on to another Orwell book, *The Road to Wigan Pier* (Hines 2009: 69). Up until this point Hines claims that he had not been interested in literature because it was not privileged by his peers, but mainly because he had had a problem with the subject of English Literature:

English Literature was reading books about people who had been dead for hundreds of years. They had to be dead for that long or it wasn’t literature. It was all long frocks and chandeliers. The books came out of the cupboards looking like a pile of house bricks and when you opened them, there were 5,000 words on every page. The teachers were always talking about the author’s style. I wasn’t too interested in that. I wasn’t interested in the problems of keeping silver clean, either. Or the difficulties in getting your daughter married off to a rich young buck. It was all too posh for me. I resented it. I felt I was being imposed upon by middle-class teachers in a middle-class institution glorifying upper-class values.

I wanted to read about a world I could identify with, where people had to work for a living. Nobody seemed to work in literature. I wanted to read about Teddy Boys and courting and sport and adventure, and the only place I found it was in comics. In the sixth-form, when most of the students were reading books, I was still taking *The Rover.* The sports stories were my favourites: Nick Smith the scheming inside forward, and his mate Arnold Tabbs the ex-ironpuddler; Alf Tupper, the Tough of the Track.

(Hines 2009: 67-68)

The literature taught to Hines in school was irrelevant to a boy from a working-class background. The subjects that he wanted to read about were not privileged in literature but they formed the basis of mass-produced ‘literature’. Hoggart’s comments on these types of text make the point that for many people, like Hines, these types of text were of more relevance to them than ‘Literature’:

A reader of [mass produced texts] is hardly likely to tackle anything that could be called serious literature; but there are worse diets, especially today. If we regard them as faithful but dramatized presentations of a life whose form and values are known, we might find it more useful to ask what are the values they embody. There is no virtue in merely laughing at them: we need to appreciate first that they may in all their triteness speak for a solid and relevant way of life.

(Hoggart 1957: 107)

Hoggart’s comments link back to Lahire’s discussion of how individuals engage in various degrees with legitimate culture, and also Hoggart focusses on the relevance of ‘popular culture’ texts to the everyday lives of their readers. For Hines the whole process of studying ‘serious’ literature at grammar school was part of indoctrination into the ‘posh’ middle-classes and Hines resented being ‘made into a snob’ (Hines 2009: 86). Comics provided him with stories and characters that were relevant to him. However going to college provided an environment in which Hines developed an interest in literature. In Ahad’s interview with Hines and his wife Eleanor the two of them look back on Hines’ relationship with books at college:

From there he went to Loughborough University – it was the first time Barry had read a book.

‘I got there and there were all these books, I’d never seen so many,’ says Barry.

‘I thought ‘I better do something else’. Eventually I picked one up and I thought ‘Ooh, that’s not bad that’. It was right good that, when you’ve been a pillock and then you’re suddenly not . . . bloody pillock.’

Eleanor prompts more memories when she says: ‘He was in an environment where it was okay to do that. To read. He hadn’t been in that sort of environment.”

(Ahad 2009)

On the one hand Hines resented studying literature at grammar school because it was all ‘too posh’, on the other this was not a good enough reason to exclude himself from books and literature. Hines’ autobiographical writing concerning his reading of Orwell’s work show that he began to see that not all literature was middle-class or posh but that at grammar school it was being used to reinforce class values. Being in an environment which privileged reading but allowed him the freedom to make choices about what he read changed how Hines viewed literature.

After becoming interested in literature whilst at college Hines ‘discovered the bug to write’ (Hines 1998). He attributed his interest in writing to the fact that he ‘read and wanted to read novels that, like Alan Sillitoe and Stan Barstow’s work, had real working class men and women as their main characters’ (Edwards 2001). After two years in his first teaching job in London, at Rutherford School off Edgeware Road, Hines went back to Loughborough University to do his diploma taking up writing seriously (Hines 1998). For his diploma-year dissertation at Loughborough Hines submitted a ‘thesis written in novel form’ (Hines 196?) called ‘Flight of the Hawk’ concerning a footballer:

After two years I went back to Loughborough to do a diploma. That’s when I started writing. You had to do a thesis, and I wrote a novel. They were so astounded, they didn’t dare fail me. That was the dry run for my first book, The Blinder.

(Hines 1998)

This thesis represents the coming together of two of Hines’ interests in this period; his love of football and his recently developed interest in literature. In the preface to his thesis, for which he received a B grade, he explained why he wrote his essay in this way and it gives an insight into the development of Hines’ own approach to literary art:

This thesis is written in novel form and approaches the physical and mental world of Physical Education from a personal emotional angle, through the thoughts and attitudes of one boy, Jack Barlow.

I am deeply concerned and interested in the relationship between the physical and mental sides of man, believing that the two are equally important for the full development of personality. Too often I sense a deep rift between these two aspects, they are forced apart into apposing factions by ignorant prejudiced people who will not believe in their integration.

[….]

The growth of aesthetic appreciation to me is vitally important and I feel that if Physical Education can awaken the appreciation of the arts, then it has performed a task which is of equal importance, if not greater, than many of its more boosted by-products.

(Hines 196?: preface)

Dave Williams from Loughborough University returned this thesis to Hines in 1996. With the letter he sent he asks ‘[p]resumably the story you wrote was autobiographical?’ as well as adding ‘I thought you said it was easy writing dialect? It do[e]sn’t look it to me!’ (Williams 1996). At this early stage in his development as a writer Hines was conscious that the improvement of both the body and mind was of importance and that the two should not be separated out. His comments on the forcing apart of the two ‘by ignorant prejudiced people who will not believe in their integration’ underline Hines’ disapproval of the eleven-plus as an oppressive force separating young people out into working-class manual labourers and middle-class thinkers (Hines 2009: 19-21). This philosophical preface about the development of aesthetic appreciation reflects the changes in Hines’ life brought about by education and literature. In this event we can see Hines’ interest in sport providing him with the opportunity to develop an interest in literature and writing.

### 4.2.3. Teaching, Inequality and the Role of Literature

Although his experiences on the football field inspired him to write *The Blinder* (1966),it was Hines’ experiences of working as a teacher that provided him with the material for *AKFAK.* Playing football on the ‘rec’ in Hoyland Common provided the means by which Hines understood the unfairness of the eleven-plus:

Most of my friends went to Kirk Balk secondary, just up the road. But I passed the 11-plus. For a lot of children, that was the parting of the ways. But I wasn’t an academic boy and I was very good at sport, so that kept me in touch with my friends. I’d be up the rec with them at half past four playing football. So I was one of them. They’d call grammar school lads snobs. It was the hurt. That terrible sense of failure at not passing the 11 plus.

(Hines 1998)

The separating out of children into different schools did not stop them taking part in the same activities. However, because those who were more successful in their eleven-plus went to grammar school a distinction was made between these children meaning that one group were seen as ‘failures’. Hines had the opportunity to pursue a career other than in coal-mining because of, what Hines saw as, his success with a test that represented the values of a biased education system (Hines 1968a [2000]: 199-208, Hines 2009: 86). Hines however went on to become a teacher, he became part of this system, and he describes how he saw this choice of career in *TAL*:

I thought that if I didn’t make it as a professional footballer, then teaching physical education would be the next best thing. Like football, I didn’t regard it as work. I didn’t want to be a teacher. To my mind they were on a par with the police, agents of repression. No, it just seemed like a very pleasant way of perpetuating my adolescence.

(Hines 2009: 86)

During his grammar school education Hines had found his experiences of being pushed to play Rugby instead of football, not being allowed to play football in leagues and having to read literature about ‘posh’ dead people were all part of a process of turning him into a ‘snob’ (Hines 2009: 86). By his own assertion there are times at which his characters feel like mouthpieces for his own views. However this is a danger for authors of any politically motivated fiction and is perhaps inevitable considering the fact that Hines explores the social inequalities that affect the people he grew up with and lives amongst. His views of teachers being part of this system are reflected in his book *First Signs* (1972), written after *AKFAK* where the character of Tom Renshaw serves as the ‘mouthpiece’ for many of Hines’ views on teaching. Hines highlights similarities between the political struggles of a coal-mining community and that of the teachers in their local schools. Renshaw, the son of a miner, follows Hines’ path and returns from London to his home village in the North to pursue a career as a teacher amongst the people who share his outlook and values. Tom works to demonstrate that teachers ‘do not change society, [they] merely reflect it’ and that if ‘the dockers and the miners, the car workers and the steel workers [were] in control, then we, the teachers, will be in control, and not until’ (Hines 1972: 236-237). What all these sources demonstrate is that around the period that he was writing *AKFAK* Hague was seeing the whole process of schooling as involving the sorting out of children into workers and thinkers, through a process of cultural training surrounding the privileging of certain cultural forms. This taking apart of the effects of legitimate institutions and cultural practices on the everyday lives of working-class people is part of the main political stance of much of Hines’ work. Although whether Hines achieves this without creating ‘dummies merely mouthing [his] beliefs’ is something that Hines is willing to accept as par for the course, by discussing it in his autobiographical work, and is debated by his critics. *First Signs* for example was heavily criticised for what one reviewer saw as its see-through socialist politics, commenting: ‘*First Signs* contains some remarkably fine writing. If only [Hines] would boot the Socialist soap-box offstage, into the wings. He would stand taller without it’ (Turner 1972). Discussions of the balancing of ‘good’ writing and politics in reviews of Hines’ work can only serve as distant background to this discussion of *AKFAK,* yet these discussions share a similarity with the discourse surrounding Eaglestone’s success or failure as an ‘articulate miner’[[26]](#footnote-26). Understanding how Hines has presented his political standpoint is necessary when looking at how he created cultural interventions within the education system and through his writing.

Although Hines never went to the secondary modern Kirk Balk, after finishing his diploma he returned to Yorkshire to teach there:

My last school was Kirk Balk, where my brother and friends went. The head-teacher there in my school days was Ben Robey, the model for Grice in Kes [….]

But when I joined Kirk Balk, it was a comprehensive and the whole ethos had changed. There were young teachers; it was informal, loads better. My three years there were one of my most rewarding times. I'd published two novels by then, including Kes. I was in my early 30s, teaching PE and a bit of English.

I took the non-academic stream. Literature wasn't part of their life. Then Longman's Imprint Books came out, with short stories from Stan Barstow and Alan Sillitoe and Bill Naughton and a book by the Liverpool Poets.

It was the first time kids from a working-class background could read about themselves. About people going to the pub and getting drunk and having fights. For the first time, they became interested in literature. I felt I was putting something back into that community and I was doing with them what I wish someone had done with me.

(Hines 1998)

Hines returned to the school that he never got to go to and used literature from ‘working-class’ authors to teach children from the pit-villages. He worked to engage them with the type of literature that he felt was denied to him in a grammar school environment and would also be relevant to them. In many ways this can be seen to be motivated or facilitated by the ‘ethos’ of Kirk Balk, which Hines praised. This sense of putting ‘something back into the community’ in terms of opening up the sphere of literature to young people is also present in Hines’ approach to writing with the focus of his career on the drama of working-class characters being a type of cultural intervention for Hines.

### 4.2.4. Hines’ Career

As an author from a family of miners, many of Hines’ novels are written about miners or their families, including *The Blinder* (1966 [1969])*, AKFAK*, *First Signs* (1972)*, The Price of Coal* (1979) and *The Heart of It* (1994 [1995]). In most of these novels, rather than showing readers where the miners work, Hines shows us the places where the miners and their families live, socialise, relax and interact with institutions, besides *The Price of Coal* (1979)which deliberately examines the working life of miners. The settings for Hines’ stories are the places in which people live their lives and engage in social practices such as rural villages, terrace housing or city flats; pubs, working-men’s clubs, the bookies, the football grounds and the local shops; the moors and the allotments; schools, libraries, and the job centre. Billy Casper’s Barnsley dialect is very much linked to place, yet so are many of Hines’ other works. Positioning *AKFAK* within Hines’ writing career, his themes and his approach to writing about the working-classes we can see why he moves away from representing dialect in the way that he does in *AKFAK*.

Each one of Hines’ novels presents a specific situation, such as football, education, region, work and sport, vocation, higher education, community and alienation, identity and pop-culture, and how these situations present problems or questions for the working-classes. In many of Hines’ books the political aim of the work is expressed through the dialogue of the characters. Arguably, applying Hines’ own criteria about dialect representation being irritating and not capturing the sound of speech, we can see that having irritating characters discussing class inequality, for the sake of demonstrating a linguistic variety that is not adequately captured in writing, would be counter-productive to Hines’ political purposes. Within Hines’ career as a writer it is possible to look at the functions of dialect representation in *AKFAK,* how it differs stylistically from his approach to regional speech in later novels and how the use of dialect is part of the (on-going) appeal of the book today.

### 4.2.5. A Note On The Status of *AKFAK* and *Kes* Today

The lasting cultural impact of *AKFAK* is of a significant scale that it has been ‘adapted into film, a stage play, a musical and serialised on radio’ leading Hines to remark that ‘”Kes on Ice” hasn’t appeared yet, but don’t bet against it’ (Hines 1968a [2000]: 205-206). A recent addition to this list of adaptations has been the dance version of *Kes* performed at the Crucible Theatre in Sheffield. *AKFAK* has been part of the UK GCSE English syllabus for many years, meaning that it has had a lasting influence on those who had to study it at school. The sheer volume of GCSE resources as well as the online discussions, concerning the impact that *AKFAK* has had for those who have had to study it, are too great to be referenced in this study. The success and cultural impact of Hines’ story has also been due in part to its arguably more famous film version *Kes* which signalled the start of the collaboration between Loach and Hines that would lead to Hines’ books *The Gamekeeper* (1975)and *Looks and Smiles* (1981)being made into films. Due to the commercial and critical success of *Kes* the image of Dai Bradley as Billy Casper making a ‘V’ sign is so famous that Bradley has had bumper stickers printed featuring the image and the tag line ‘Billy sez your too close’ (Macmillan in Hines 2010, cf. Beal 2009 and Johnstone 2009 on the commodification of enregistered signs and urban dialects). With the film also appearing in ‘best of’ lists, it was voted fourth in *Time Out’s* ‘100 Best British Films […] as chosen by the film industry’, and continues to gain favourable reviews (Calhoun, et al. 2011). Although film critic Roger Ebert attributes the initial failure of the film to open in Chicago being in part due to the fact that ‘distributors were afraid that audiences wouldn’t understand the movie’s Yorkshire accents’ (Ebert 1973). These comments can only serve as a gesture towards the discourse surrounding the cultural impact of the film and book, and a discussion of the cultural significance and literary importance of *AKFAK* to the Yorkshire region can only be touched upon in this study. However some of these issues will be addressed when discussing Macmillian’s foreword to *AKFAK* in 4.4.2. which discusses the significance of the representations of Yorkshire dialect to Barnsley residents in both the book and film.

In 4.2. I have explored Hines’ life and writing. The exploration undertaken in this biographical section, concerning Hines’ background, politics, education and teaching, serves as the foundation for the investigation of the political motivations behind Hines’ mediation of vernacular speech. In 4.3. I discuss how Hines uses non-standard orthography to represent speech in *AKFAK* as well as his ‘flavour’ of dialect approach used in his later novels. Discussing how Hines indexes socially significant aspects of speech is undertaken to support an argument that will be presented across 4.3. and 4.4. I argue that Hines’ use of dialect representation in *AKFAK* allows him to engage with language and class ideologies, whilst his shift in style to using a ‘flavour’ of dialect approach still allows him to do this, whilst, in his view, limiting the deficit position in which the cultural norms of literature places representations of working-class life and culture.

## 4.3. Dialect in *AKFAK*

### 4.3.1. Billy Casper

Hines’ use of dialect representation in *AKFAK* can be read as simultaneously a critique of the institutions and social norms that see Casper as ‘unintelligent’ and his speech as ‘non-standard’, and also as a celebration of the cultural norms that Casper, and many in the Yorkshire area, appreciate but are subsumed under supralocal standards and norms. These issues are fully discussed in 4.4. Even though Hines comments that dialect representation is ‘irritating’ for readers his text is only ‘lightly marked’ for dialect, in the sense that it is accessible to readers (Jaffe and Walton 2000: 564-566). Hines uses dialect representation in his other works, but in the discussion of *AKFAK* I am placing emphasis on the phonological aspects of his orthographical representation and how this differs from what Hines described as his ‘flavour’ of dialect approach where he drops in dialect words. In *AKFAK* Hines attempts to link Barnsley dialect to his orthography mostly through the use of respellings and apostrophes which demonstrate how his orthographical conventions relate to Standard English, for example:

It is at first. It’s murder. You can’t judge t’swing right, t’hawk don’t know what it’s supposed to do an’ you just finish up wi’ it all wrapped round you, else hitting t’hawk in t’chest or summat. It’s a right pantomime ‘til you get used to it.

(Hines 1968a [2000]: 86)

**Phonological features**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Type** | **Feature** | **RP** | **Yorkshire** |
| Definite article reduction | <t’> ‘the’ | /ðə/ | **/**t/ or /ʔ/ |
| Reduction | <’n> and <wi’> | /an/ - /wIð/ | /n/ - /wI/ |

**Lexis**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Feature** | **Description** |
| Summat | Archaic dialect form of ‘somewhat’ (Oxford English Dictionary 2014, ‘Somewhat, *n. and adj.*) |

**Orthographical features**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Feature** | **Description** |
| <’til> | An example of allegro speech respelling, the reduction of letters and use of apostrophe is used to index fluent, casual, connected speech |

Mr. Farthing, Casper’s teacher and the only adult to show a genuine interest in his falconry skills, quotes Lawrence when Billy shows him Kes: ‘[i]t reminds me of that poem by Lawrence, “if men were as much men as lizards are lizards they’d be worth looking at”’ (Hines 1968a [2000]: 147). In comparison with Lawrence, Hines’ dialect representation is less marked for pronunciation than Lawrence’s Morel in *Sons and Lovers* (Lawrence 1913 [1992]). Hines’ orthographical conventions are in line with traditional literary techniques for representing northern speech and working class characters, although Hines stresses that you cannot represent glottal stops with a ‘t’’. Understanding how this glottal stop is pronounced in Yorkshire English along with the pronunciation of ‘with’ means that orthographical features such as ‘t and wi’ can ‘accurately’ reference these sounds but only due to the cultural training that a reader has undergone. In a similar manner to Hague’s use of dialect in ‘Chat Wi a Pit Mouse’, the foremost judgement that are indexed by Casper’s voice is that he is ‘uneducated’, because his speech is simply represented using non-standard respellings. This ‘uneducated’ voice is attached to a working-class, northern boy. As will be explored in 4.4.1. the idea that Casper is ‘unintelligent’ is central to Hines political aims for the book. Before making this argument, it is worth looking at two other works by Hague that do not include dialect respellings. Extracts from *The Heart of It* an *Unfinished Business* demonstrate how Hines continued to engage with class and language ideologies without focussing on trying to respell to ‘capture’ phonetic information.

### 4.3.2. Creating Ideological Values through Style: *The Heart of It* and *Unfinished Business*

If we look at Hines’ approach to direct speech and dialect representation in two of his other novels we can contextualise his comments on his use of dialect representation in *AKFAK*, especially when looking at some examples that link language use directly to social class. A few years before the 2000 edition of *AKFAK* Hines had written *The Heart of It* (1994) in which the successful, but artistically and politically impoverished, screenwriter Cal Rickards returns from his life in France to the Northern mining town he grew up in when his communist coal-miner father suffers a stroke. In this novel Hines does not use speech marks to stylise the direct speech of characters, although line breaks do however make it clear who is speaking. There is no distinction made between the speech of various characters in terms of orthography, besides the infrequent use of italicisation for Italian or French speech and a few specific words however it is made very clear that these characters speak different varieties of English. Hines does use contextual information, but characters’ meta-linguistic comments or Cal’s thoughts on style from a scriptwriting perspective, to highlight the linguistic difference and social meaning of spoken language within the novel.

The difference in English spoken by Cal and his French girlfriend Helene is emphasised by her lack of understanding of Cal’s idiomatic jokes or the word ‘rec’ meaning recreational ground rather than its homonym ‘wreck’ (Hines 1994 [1995]:261-265). When Helene meets Cal’s old school friend Tommy she cannot understand a word he says because ‘he spoke so quickly and his [Yorkshire] accent was so broad’ (Hines 1994 [1995]: 263). However neither Helene nor Tommy’s speech is stylised as orthographically different, although Tommy swears frequently. Cal’s scriptwriting is the most highly stylised speech when the dialogue he writes appears in script form throughout the novel and this is true whether this is dialogue for the appalling blockbuster movie he is writing, its working title is ‘It’s a Dog’s Life’*,* or for any other scene that he imagines or writes. Script dialogue is written in a particular way because at some stage it will become speech and Hines himself had no problem with this process: ‘I didn’t have this problem when I was adapting the novel into a film script. I wrote it in Standard English and the actors translated it back’ (Hines 1968a [2000]: 207). However, Hines uses Cal’s scriptwriting, which owes its existence to Hines’ screenwriting experiences, as a way to demonstrate the change in Cal’s artistic output; from writing a trashy film for the money, about a boy transformed into a dog, to writing about the 1984 miners’ strike because of its effect on his family.

Two particular instances emphasise the speech of Cal’s hometown as a northern variety, only one of them is through the use of orthography. Cal’s speech is emphasised as being different to that of his old community when he records himself acting out a dialogue he imagines his father and another miner having during the 1984 strike. The miners are following a NCB van to try to discover the identity of a scabbing miner, with Cal’s comments reflecting an earlier comment about his dad’s use of ‘pit talk, as women called it’ (Hines 1994 [1995]: 192):

I wonder who it is?

I don’t know, but I wouldn’t like to be in his shoes when we find out.

Slow down, they’re stopping

…Well, bugger me! Look who it is: the phantom fitter.

It’s incredible. The idlest man at the pit. He’s been sacked once for absenteeism.

And to think that the union fought to get a sod – (no, cunt. His father would have said cunt). And to think that the union fought to get a cunt like that his job back.

Cal switched it off, then played it back. His accent sounded stagey, like a southern actor playing a northerner. He believed the dialogue, though.

(Hines 1994 [1995]: 53)

Cal’s thoughts concerning the dialogue parallel the problems with dialect representation that Hines discusses later in his afterword to *AKFAK*. Hague’s comments mirror Cal’s in the sense that rendering northern speech using dialect representation is ‘stagey, like a southern actor playing a northerner however as long as the dialogue itself is believable this stylistic feature is redundant; Cal believes this dialogue although it is inauthentically rendered. This approach to represented speech, which draws on Hines’ understanding of the social meaning of speech, is demonstrated in an earlier part of the novel when Cal’s brother Joe is ridiculed by Cal’s middle-class University room-mate:

Cal remembered the time Joe had phoned his digs (the only time) when he was at university and left a tip for the Derby with his room-mate. Tell our Karl it’s a certainty, Simon had said when he got in, parodying Joe’s accent. Tell him it’s . . . what did he say? Tell him it’s *barn* to win. Simon laughed unpleasantly. And what the fuck does that mean in plain English, *barn* to win? Cal felt a sudden rush of affection for his brother who cared enough about him to phone a tip through to London. He knew it wouldn’t have come easily to Joe, and even though he was working hard to lose his own northern accent, he wasn’t having this public school poofter taking the piss out of his brother.

(Hines 1994 [1995]: 87)

Here linguistic difference is the battleground for class difference, and the normalising, but culturally biased, notion of ‘plain English’ is brought to bear on regional norms. The italicisation of the standard but recontextualised word ‘barn’, to reference Joe’s pronunciation of ‘born’, highlight how the ‘posh’ Simon disparages Joe through his meta-linguistic comment on Northern pronunciation. Stylistically Hines creates a sense of the difference between Northern and Southern pronunciation and the social significance of them for his characters by focussing on a different aspect of language; meta-linguistic comment instead of pronunciation. Cal’s attempt to remove his own accent, which represents his attempts at social mobility, becomes less important to his sense of self not so much because of any loyalty that he has to his brother – Cal has no qualms embarking on a sexual relationship with Joe’s ex-wife Christine and Joe punches him when he finds out – but more because of his negative view of Simon’s privileged background. These examples demonstrate Hines’ use of context and content over non-standard orthography and his use of colloquial or informal language to add a linguistic dimension to his writing.

Regardless of Hines’ own comments, the representation of the Barnsley dialect in *AKFAK* is part of its lasting appeal for northern readers (Benson 2005). Hines’ ‘flavour of dialect’ approach is evident in *First Signs, The Gamekeeper, Looks and Smiles* and *Unfinished Business* meaning that in terms of orthography *AKFAK* is the anomaly. However at one point in *Unfinished Business* Hinesuses respellings to position the prestigious speech of the Home Counties in a lesser position. Mature student Lucy talks to her English tutor Dave about the performance of the actress Julie in the play they are staging:

Lucy hesitated. Who was she, assistant props and theatrical novice, to be giving the director advice? Someone laughed at the bar. Lucy glanced round instinctively, convinced that they were laughing at her.

‘I was thinking about Julie . . .’

‘Join the club.’

‘Well, I think the main trouble is that she’s concentrating on the accent too much. She’s never going to get it right, so why bother? She’d be much more convincing speaking naturally.’

‘What, in the voice of a solicitor’s daughter from the Home Countries? It would turn the play into a farce.’

Lucy was furious at Dave’s contemptuous dismissal, and when he picked up his glass to have a drink, she glared at it as if she was going to knock it out of his hand.

‘Well, she couldn’t be any worse than she is now, whatever she sounded like. One minute it’s “grass” then it’s “grarse”. She goes “upstairs” then “apstairs”. There’s no consistency at all. You’re on tenterhooks listening to her, just waiting for her to make mistakes [….] I think that what Alice does is more important than what she says anyway. What really matters is all the work she has to do; all that washing and emptying tubs and getting her husband’s dinner ready. The sheer rotten drudgery of it all. If she can get that right, the audience won’t be bothered about her accent, they’ll be too interested in what she’s doing.’

(Hines 1983 [1985]: 140-141)

Alice’s prestigious accent is purposefully denigrated by the respelling of ‘grass’ and ‘upstairs’ as ‘grarse’ and ‘apstairs’. The main point made by Lucy about the accent in an artistic performance is that the focus should be on what Alice’s character is doing and if this is done right then the audience will be able to suspend disbelief at Alice’s accent. Lucy’s education in ‘the university of life’ provides her with the knowledge to contribute to the successful staging of this play, even though she is a ‘novice’ in education terms and with regards to her engagement with more middle-class activities. Lucy’s concerns about negotiating the power relationship between Dave, the University English lecturer and director of the play, and herself, a mature English undergraduate and ‘theatrical novice’, invoke the negotiations concerning power and legitimacy that individuals undertake in their day-to-day lives. The fact that in a discussion concerning art and language Lucy is worried about her position and is then furious at Dave’s ‘contemptuous dismissal’ of her comments explore the role that these two cultural aspects play in socialisation and discussions of class. Hines invokes the social significance of speech in these examples from *The Heart of It* and *Unfinished Business* through the use of context, character comment and a few choice respellings. Lucy’s discussion of staging can be seen as analogous to Hines’ approach to dialect representation. Focussing on getting the speech right in his novels is not a worthwhile stylistic pursuit for Hines when by focussing on other aspects of the text he can achieve the same sense of ‘authenticity’ or class difference in a simpler and more effective fashion. In doing this he can discuss the values that literature enshrines and through this discourse change them.

However, part of *AKFAK’s* enduring success is due to Hines’ representation of spoken language and Billy Casper’s ‘non-standard’ voice highlights many of the biases and inequalities that are enshrined in the education system in which he participates. Although Hines protests against the use of dialect representation on a stylistic basis, we can see that the problem with dialect representation for Hines is that it invokes the ideologically stratified system of social difference evident in speech within the also stratified and socially meaningful medium of the novel. 4.4. explores the role literature and literary discourse play in social stratification and distinction.

## 4.4. The Mediation of the ‘Everyday’: Casper’s voice as Other

### 4.4.1. Casper as a ‘Mouthpiece’ for Hines’ Ideology

Approaching the character of Billy Casper in terms of Hines comments on his political motivation for writing involves considering Hines’ discussion concerning the difficulties he faced in expressing his political stance without turning his characters into *‘*dummies’ mouthing his own beliefs (and Hines 2009: v). In *AKFAK* , through Casper’s experiences, Hines creates a critique of the education system which labels Billy as a ‘failure’ and his use of a non-standard voice to ‘mouth’ this ideological stance is central to his critique.

Casper is from a working class community, and his only real job prospect is to work in the pits. Hines’ political point was that this is not because Casper is incapable of achieving in any other vocation, but because he has been failed by the education system that is supposed to prepare him for his working life, as well as the majority of adults that he comes in contact with:

In academic terms Billy Casper is a failure. He is in the bottom form of a rough secondary modern school. He has ‘a job to read and write’ as he tells the Employment Officer. Yet once he becomes interested in falconry, he acquires a book on the subject which is full of esoteric vocabulary and technical descriptions. He then goes on to successfully train a kestrel which requires both intelligence and sensitivity. If there had been GCSEs in Falconry, Billy Casper would have been awarded an A grade, which would have done wonders for his self confidence and given him a more positive self image.

(Hines 1968a [2000]: 201)

Hines’ comments here link back to previous discussions in this thesis concerning the privileging of certain legitimate activities and practices, as well as discussions from N.L.S. concerning literacies and education (cf. Pahl and Rowsell 2012). During his careers interview Billy is faced with one of his only real options for employment, and his exclamation of ‘I wouldn’t be seen dead down t’pit’ to some degree stems from his antagonistic relationship with his older half-brother Jud (Hines 1968a [2000]: 171). Jud as a miner conforms to many of the stereotypes surrounding miners, northern men and masculinity (Maurice 2004: 34-35) yet within the context of the story the responsibility of Jud’s vocation, and Casper’s future in this industry, lies on the biased education system, the status quo cultural norms (such as those of working-class masculinity) and the effects of economic determinism (cf. Frazier 2000). All these aspects remove agency from Casper in terms of the continuation of his interests in falconry and can therefore be seen to have affected Jud’s pre-mineworking life.

Hines’ point about his political view informing his writing and that he would rather be ‘didactic than [lapse] into blandness’ are relevant when looking at part of Casper’s conversation with Farthing. Casper articulates the experiences of a young person in a school system that does not privilege their class or region and the fact that he says it in a socially stigmatized way serves Hines’ political purpose. It is not that Casper is unintelligent, the point is that he is seen to be unintelligent. In a discussion with Mr. Farthing, Casper discusses the stigma that he faces in school and in his neighbourhood with his speech being represented in an orthographical style that indexes social stigma (Jaffe and Walton 2000: 582-583):

‘Ar, well…’

‘Well what?

‘You do at least try to learn us summat, most o’ t’others don’t. They’re not bothered about us, just because we’re in 4C, you can tell, they talk to us like muck. They’re allus callin’ us idiots, an’ numbskulls, an’ cretins, an’ looking at their watches to see how long it is to t’end o’ t’lesson. They’re fed up wi’ us. We’re fed up wi’ them, then when there’s any trouble, they pick on me ‘cos I’m t’littlest.’

[….]

‘It’s right, Sir, I haven’t done owt for ages now! That’s one o’ t’reasons why MacDowall’s allus pickin’ on me, ‘cos I don’t knock about wi’ them that I stopped getting’ into trouble.’

‘What happened, did you have an argument or something?’

‘No, Sir, it wa’ when I got my hawk. I got that interested in it that it seemed to take all my time up. It wa’ summer then, you see, and I used to take it down out fields at nights. Then when t’dark nights came back, I never got back wi’ ‘em. I wasn’t bothered anymore.

‘I try to get hold of falconry books an’ read up about ‘em now. I make new jesses an’ things an’ all, an’ sometimes I go down to t’shed an’ sit wi’ a candle lit. It’s all right in there. I’ve got a little paraffin stove that I found, an’ it gets right warm, an’ we just sit there. It makes you feel right cosy an’ snug sat there wi’ t’wind blowin’ outside.’

‘Yes, I’ll bet it does.’

‘It’s stacks better than roamin’ t’streets doin’ nowt. ‘Cos that’s all we used to do. Just roam about t’estate muckin’ about, fed up to t’teeth an’ frozen. I reckon that’s why I wa’ allus in trouble, we used to break into places an’ nick things an’ that just for a bit o’ excitement. It wa’ summat to do that’s all.’

 (Hines 1968a [2000] 101-103)

Casper goes on to state that he feels victimised because he is seen to be a troublemaker by the police and his teachers, and also by his peers because he no longer wishes to engage in anti-social behaviour now that he has an interest in falconry. Casper’s stigmatized, highly stylised voice creates a scene in which his voice is given agency and articulates a particular viewpoint concerning the role of teachers in creating self-fulfilling prophecies and how the lack of motivating activities for young people lead to anti-social behaviour. Hines acknowledges that Casper was a composite of many young boys that he knew but that we all knew someone like him: ‘I had taught plenty of pupils like Billy Casper – I knew boys like that – so [creating the character] was no great feat of imagination’ (Ojumu 1999). Casper’s voice legitimises the angst and feelings of victimisation of many young people (Hines 1968a [2000]: 200-208, Edwards 2001). In this quotation Hines systematically explores the link between the self-fulfilling prophecy in schools, anti-social behaviour, boredom, peer-pressure and finally the privileging of subjects that are of little relevance to young people. Casper is seen to be not academically gifted because he is in a low set at school, a trouble-maker because he got in trouble in the past and is picked on because he no longer wishes to spend time with a group who roam the streets. The effect of this conversation is that with a socially stigmatized voice Casper is shown to talk concisely and with much wisdom on the problems facing young people.

Hines wrote *AKFAK* whilst working in Kirk Balk Comprehensive and linking back to his comments on his time there we can see how Hines’ teaching and writing make an attempt to address the frustrations articulated by Casper: ‘I felt I was putting something back into that community and I was doing with them what I wish someone had done with me’ (Hines 1998). Through Casper, Hines explores the cultural dissonance experienced by working-class children, like himself and his pupils, when they move from their community backgrounds into contact with the institutionalised norms and values of education and literature. Hines took an interest in teaching and creating literature that was relevant to young people in the community that he grew up in. The reason why Casper feels victimised is that no one has taken an interest in him as an individual. Farthing legitimises Casper’s passions, both in his role as a father figure and as his teacher, and in this conversation Casper articulates the effects of a lack of relevant subject matter and a one-size-fits-all approach to teaching on his personal development and self-esteem. He also expresses the frustrations he experiences at the hands of his peers who find his break away from their group an affront on their values. In each of the subjects that Casper discusses he highlights the problems he faces as an individual coming into contact with the values of collective social groups or institutions. What Hines can be seen to be achieving with Casper’s dialect voice in the novel overall is a reassessment of the ideological values surrounding education, language and literature, through a recontextualisation of Barnsley dialect, that positions the voice of an ‘unintelligent’ speaker within a narrative that works to create an affinity for this boy in the reader. However, as discussed previously, using non-standard orthography to represent dialect does not simply index unintelligence. Casper’s speech is also seen by another Barnsley resident, poet Ian McMillan, as effectively indexing Barnsley speech.

### 4.4.2. Dialect on a National and Local Level

The social meaning of Barnsley dialect is not fixed, it is relative, and dialect operates as one aspect of a complex web of social meaning. Representing Casper’s speech does not ‘capture’ on the page the phonetic information required to recreate this voice, it does however serve to index this complex web of social meaning in a work of fiction. For McMillan the fact that Hines writes in Barnsley dialect is part of the ‘poetry’ of this book overall. McMillan’s comments provide a contrasting view to Hines’ rejection of the use of respellings for the purposes of dialect representation.

In terms of the language represented in *AKFAK* we are given an insight into the language community of an area that supplies the pits with their work force. Before the individual male becomes part of a physically separated speech community, that individual would have been a member of the working-class living in the area surrounding the pits and talking in the way that their community did. The representation of Casper’s Barnsley dialect provides an insight into the linguistic community ‘up top’ before the young men join the social group down below and also the socio-cultural significance of the pit. The mines loom over Casper as his only future career path and Jud’s rowdy interests and violent treatment of Casper and Kes link to representations of miners as uncouth, hedonistic and unrefined (Maurice 2004: 34-35). The ambiguity of what will become of Casper in the book’s conclusion creates a situation where it is possible to believe that *AKFAK* shows what could have been the experiences of a child who goes on to work in the mining industry. Hines’ political quarrel is with an education system that is geared up for churning out a two-tier society. Boy’s like Billy Casper who do not succeed in the educational environment will work in the industries and those who do, like Hines himself, are free to pursue other channels of employment:

Most of the people I write about live in [industrial areas and council flats] or in old terraced houses or on vast council estates. They work in the pits and factories, and most of them have failed the 11-plus, and went to secondary modern schools.

I bet most people who live in the flats and work in the steelworks failed their 11-plus too. I bet the architect who designed the flats didn’t fail his 11-plus. I bet he doesn’t live in flats either. Like most people who passed the 11-plus, he will live in a cleaner, more pleasant part of town.

(Hines 2009: 3)

This separation very early on in education was something that Hines took issue with personally; the fact that because on a certain day he managed to get some more marks on a test than his peers he got earmarked for better educational opportunities (Hines 2009: 85-86). What *AKFAK* represents in terms of this study is the childhood socialisation and community relations of a working-class boy living in the shadow of a career as a miner. The book and its subject matter serve as a cultural intervention exploring the bias in education and academic practices through the character of Billy Casper. Hines’ views on the technique of dialect representation, which he uses to represent Casper’s speech, opens up questions about the nature of mediated language and how it is socially meaningful.

Hines shows that the education system reinforces the class system and his use of Barnsley dialect representation shows the disparity between Casper’s cultural norms and the institutional values of the school system. Casper is seen by the adults in his life as a miscreant and a trouble maker, and by his peers as an outsider because of his interest in falconry, yet when motivated by his interest in Kes he is capable of focussed study and skilful application of this knowledge. Although Hines discusses dialect representation from a stylistic and a practical point of view, his use of Barnsley dialect representation is central to the book’s role as a cultural object for the people of the area, even if this Barnsley dialect was shown to them in the film rather than the book (Benson 2005). This move away from representing speech in this way can be seen to stem from Hines’ understanding that to be able to reach a large audience, and for his working-class characters to be taken seriously, he should focus on lexis and grammar over the use of respellings to approximate pronunciation because of the de-legitimising effect that non-standard orthographic representation of dialects can have.

With a clear political focus and an understanding of the application of dialect representation Hines decided to move away from trying to capture pronunciation in his later career. Whereas the completion of *AKFAK* represents the point at which Hines’ experiments with respellings come to an end, the book as a whole represents something else for the people of Barnsley and its surrounding area with the film maintaining Hines’ focus on Yorkshire speech. In his introduction to a Penguin books 2010 edition of *AKFAK* Barnsley resident and poet, Ian McMillan, calls the story ‘our defining myth’, yet he also highlights its universal appeal. McMillan came to the book after watching the film which starred many locals alongside professional actors:

I remember the excitement throughout the town at the idea that a film could be made about our place, starring people who talked like us and who we might glimpse in the market or bump into on the terraces at Oakwell. A rumour that the film might have to be subtitled in the South rocked the chip-shop queue with something that was a seamless mixture of hilarity and solidarity.

(McMillan 2010: v)

McMillan comments on the solidarity felt by people in Barnsley, surrounding their use of language, when they heard the rumour that others would need help understanding their speech. The local language and the cinematic representation of the area have been part of the enduring success of *Kes* and now form part of the cultural heritage of the people and area. Although McMillan saw the film first and then came to the book, for him it is how Hines describes the countryside and the way the people speak that creates the book’s poetry:

Going back to the book with the film in my head is a revelation, though. What the book has in abundance, is poetry. The descriptions of the Lawrentian countryside around the place called the city in the book are strikingly lyrical for a writer known for his straightforward take on socialist realism

[….]

There is also poetry in the way the characters speak and in the way Barry Hines has captured the rhythms and the cadences of the South Yorkshire language. The Leeds poet Tony Harrison wrote that ‘We’re the ones Shakespeare gives the comedy parts to’, but in Hines’ steady hands the language has the shining and obsessive quality of a piece of minimalist music, as in this passage where Jud and Billy talk about the book Billy has stolen from the local bookshop:

‘*A Falconer’s Handbook*. Where’s tha got this from?’

‘I’ve lent it.’

‘Nicked it, more like. Where’s tha got it from?’

‘A shop in town’

‘Tha must be crackers’

‘How’s tha mean?’

‘Nicking books.’

He looked at a picture, then slapped it shut.

‘I could understand it if it wa’ money, but chuff me, not a book.’

If I passed those lines to gang of Barnsley people in a pub they’d be able to recite them perfectly, which says a huge amount for Barry Hines’ skill with dialogue, and for the timeless nature of the way they talk round here.

(McMillan 2010: vi-vii)

McMillan uses a reference to Lawrence to legitimate Hines’ writing style whilst also focussing on his dialogue in light of Harrision’s comments. It is evident in much of Hines’ work that the attention he pays to conversation as well as to descriptions of the natural world are two parts of what could be seen as Hines’ style. Much of Hines’ work puts an emphasis on people and place and this can be seen to be achieved through the ‘poetic’ writing which McMillan highlights. What *AKFAK* and *Kes* mean for McMillan and the people of Barnsley is that the characters speak in the same way that they do and the rural area that it discusses is the area where they live. What is poetic in Hines’ work for McMillan is the sense of place reflected in the language and the natural environment; what is poetic is therefore precisely what is relevant to people, their environment and the people they socialise with. Privileging an underrepresented place in a way that is sympathetic to it is part of the enduring success of *AKFAK*. Other areas of Yorkshire are represented in canonical works of literature, such as *Wuthering Heights* (Bronte 1847 [2008])*,* but Barnsley specifically has less of a literary heritage. Hines has a successful career after *AKFAK* and *Kes* by presenting working-class people in terms of their socialisation with others without ‘delegitimizing’ them through the overuse of a technique that he admits cannot properly capture speech. Within his scriptwriting Hines can have these Yorkshire voices speak for themselves without having to capture it in orthography (Hines 1968a [2000]: 207). As a writer he is committed to the communities he represents, however his comments highlight the problems that dialect representation presents and also that his work is not exclusively aimed at this community.

Hines’ afterword succinctly summarises some of the main arguments from discussions of dialect writing in a short paragraph (Hines 1968a [2000]: 207). He acknowledges that due to the standardisation of spelling attempting to understand non-standard forms can cause problems for reader accessibility. Also the constraints of the written mode mean that the pronunciation aspects of speech are not accessible to readers even though that is what dialect representation attempts to capture. In his script for *Kes*, a situation where the text is written to be spoken, Hines highlights the fact that he didn’t need to use dialect representation as it was the cultural experience of the actors from the Barnsley area that allowed them to translate his standard script into Barnsley dialect (Hines 1968a [2000]: 207). Hines’ solution to the problems of dialect representation is to use ‘dialect words to give a flavour of the region’ and in many of his works besides *AKFAK* he uses these types of words alongside grammatical features of the dialect as well (Hines 1981 [1983], 1975 [1979]). This process aims to legitimise the speech of those represented as it shows them employing a regional variety, yet emphasises the regional or spoken differences in the speech of these characters whilst also putting them on the same orthographical playing field as middle-class characters (the ones that are ‘going to the cinema’). Hines therefore places the emphasis on the indexical function of dialect features in his books over the referential; a few enregistered words can index a certain community or way of speaking without stereotyping them, whereas extensive rewriting of the standard written form cannot communicate the sounds of spoken language and is problematic. Hines also makes the point that writing about working class people in novels is in a sense to put them into a middle-class forum and if we look at the history of the standardisation of spelling as well as the history of the novel then we can see that working-class people have been marginalised in these developments as well (Hines 2009: 67-69). This point, and Hines’ comments on his experiences of literature and education, link with Fairclough’s work in *Language and Power*:

The general point is that education, along with all the other social institutions, has as its ‘hidden agenda’ the reproduction of class relations and other higher-level social structures, in addition to its overt educational agenda.

Because they are indirect and ‘hidden’, neither the social determination of the discourse types of the various institutions (and thereby of discourse) by more abstract levels of social structure, nor their effect on these levels of social structure, are apparent to subjects in the normal course of events. In the words of Pierre Bourdieu, ‘it is because subjects do not, strictly speaking, know what they are doing that what they do has more meaning than they know’. This *opacity* of discourse (and practice in general) indicates why it is of so much more social importance than it may on the face of it seem to be: because in discourse people can be legitimizing (or delegitimizing) particular power relations without being conscious of doing so.

(Fairclough 2001: 41)

Hines articulates many of these ‘hidden agendas’ within institutions and how they reproduce class values in his writing. The discourse that he creates in and around his works serves to legitimate the values and culture of people who are usually delegitimized. For McMillan and the people in the chip-shop queue this is something that makes *AKFAK* and *Kes* important and relevant artistic works. What is present in much of Hines work is contextual information about who’s ‘side’ the reader is on or the understanding that differences between characters are social differences, whether good or bad. In general when Hines writes about characters or families who are dependent on coal-mining for their income he writes of the general struggles that face the working-classes. The issue of the representation of working-class and regional characters and language raised by Hines and McMillan draws attention to the issue that vernacular speech is positioned within a different system of social difference to written literary writing. Because of this there is a process of translation of systems of social difference being undertaken when vernacular speech and working-class culture are represented in literature. However, because of the norms of literary writing and discourse the social significance of vernacular speech and working-class characters is limited by the context in which they are represented. In 4.5. I reflect on Hines political stance towards dialect representation in relation to the indexical significance of vernacular language and issue of discordance of the social categories ‘working’ and ‘middle’ class.

## 4.5. Concluding Remarks: Resisting the Ideological Norms of Literature

### 4.5.1. Being at the ‘Friction-Point’ of Two Cultures’

In Williams’ terms writing literature about the working-classes is a ‘positive’ cultural intervention’ because novels have historically focussed on upper and middle-class life (Williams 1982: 111). Hines’ commitment to writing novels about working-class culture shows his resistance to the normative class and language ideologies present in literature. In an interview with Clare Jenkins in 2000 he shows a concern with whether he is perceived as patronising the working-classes because, being a writer, he considers himself to be a middle-class person. In these discussions Hines shows a fear similar to Hoggart’s scholarship boy who is at ‘the friction-point of two cultures’ (Hoggart 1957: 239). Although Hines showed unease about his use of dialect representation, in *AKFAK* Hines’ resists dominant language and class ideologies by using respellings to refashion the ideological values concerning education, unintelligence and class associated with vernacular speech. Hines’ discussions of class and language reflect how language is involved in social stratification and the ways in which individuals are marked by their use of language as belonging to the working or middle-classes.

Hines’ move away from dialect representation was informed by his main political concern, the representation of working-class culture in literature, but also his social understanding of language use and class. Interviewed in 2000, by Clare Jenkins, Hines discusses how his own use of language reflects his conflicted class identity and uneasy sense of belonging. He then moves on to discuss how writing about working-class people also makes him uneasy as he does not wish to appear to be patronising. In both these examples, in his speech and in his writing, Hines wishes to avoid appearing patronising to working-class people becauase his class identity has become conflicted due to his profession:

Jenkins: When you, when you go back, and you see people like the man you were talking about who you stay in touch with, do you feel that some people have stayed in their class and others like yourself have moved on

Hines: Yeah, yes, and I, and I don’t really know how to, I am very uneasy with it, because if I went to, if I go in The Star at Hoyland Common and I see people that I have grown up with, I mean, I became a teacher and then I became a writer, and I’m, you know, a middle class person, so, what it is, there’s a complication as well with a place like South Yorkshire, there’s a complication with the language, because from, well, if you were brought up in working class areas like I was, and, Sheffield and Barnsley, and I think that it’s even broader in Barnsley, was the dialect, so you were brought up theeing and thaing, so you don’t say um you know, where are you going tonight, you say where are tha going tonight [/tu:ni:t/ ], are we laiking at football tomorrow then […]

I mean when I went to college, you can’t say ay up, you can’t see someone and go ay up how tha going on? You do have to say hello how are you going on? So you’re learning a different language and gradually that language takes over […]

 If I go through Hoyland Common my partner Eleanor she’ll say why don’t you go in The Star for a drink, why don’t you go in you might see somebody you know, the trouble is I don’t really want to see anybody I know because I then have to go back into this false accent which seems to be patronising, so, but if I start, if I’m speaking proper English, I mean I’ve still got, I’ve still got a South Yorkshire accent but it’s not that broad accent like, oh you know that I that I was brought up with, so really I feel quite uncomfortable and it’s this it adds to this sense of no longer belonging anywhere, but funnily enough, I mean what’s odd about it, […] I mean all my writing, is always, I mean, It’s always about working-class people, I left all that nineteen years ago, I don’t think I, I don’t think I’ve written about, any, a middle class person, in all the nine novels and all the, all the television stuff and that I’ve done, it’s always been about working class people, which is odd in a way […] but in some ways I think am I being patronising, I’m uncomfortable with that, I don’t know how I’m received at all

(Hines 2000: transcribed by Escott 2013)

Hines explores his feelings of unease as someone who operates in a middle-class sphere who still has links with the working-class community he grew up in. For Hines South Yorkshire has its own language and that is linked not only to region, ‘Sheffield and Barnsley’, but to the working-class areas of these regions. Hines finds his unease in his class demonstrated in his language use; whether to say ‘ay up’ or ‘hello’ is one example. It is telling in this interview that when Hines is questioned about class he discusses language use and he links his unease at appearing to be patronising by employing a false working-class accent in the pub with the oddness of his career as a writer who has only written about working-class people. Although he describes himself as middle-class, Hines’ unease and fear show that he is resistant to fully adopting this label. Later in this interview Hines states that perhaps one of the reasons that he writes about working-class people is because their lives are more dramatic, in part due to the lack of economic resources available to them. Also he discusses an incident when he was worried about the reception of the recently televised, and Ken Loach directed, *The Price of Coal* by actual miners and whilst travelling on a bus that had just picked up the afternoon shift of miners from a local pit was told that ‘it were alright that Barry’. For Hines this was great praise as, though it was an understated comment, ‘alright’ meant that the miner thought the program was ‘very good’ (Hines 2000). This experience represented for Hines a point at which his unease at appearing to patronise the working-classes was quashed by praise from the very people he wished to represent.

As a writer Hines’ profession is that of a person who is meant to be attuned to language and Hines’ comments demonstrate his understanding of the social roles of spoken and written language. His unease at appearing patronising in his speech or in his writing link with his reappraisal of dialect usage in *AKFAK.* Billy Casper and his community were the type of people that Hines was writing for and he did not want to appear to patronise them by representing them in a way that made them seem irritating or confusing. The use of a writing technique other than the standard brings to a head the systems of social difference of speech and writing. Hines acquires ‘proper English’ but in The Star the regional prestige is the one that will mean he is listened to and so he is worried that people will judge his language use negatively. However in writing the regional prestige is renegotiated, as any representation of speech is put into a new context of social difference. Hines’ political ideology informs his decision to move away from dialect representation. However, his use of dialect representation in *AKFAK* is involved in the refashioning of the ideological values associated with vernacular speech represented in writing.

### 4.5.2. Literature and Ideology

Hines himself comments on his move away from representing dialect in his writing, using respellings, because he believed it was irritating. However, he also makes it clear that for him literary culture possessed middle-class norms. Coupland’s work on mediated vernaculars in ‘The Mediated Performance of Vernaculars’ provides a way to reflect on the ideological influence of the literary context in which Hines mediates vernacular speech. Coupland makes the point that vernaculars ‘may have more going for them than is often assumed’ (2009: 285) in terms of the complexity of their indexical profiles. He also highlights that the context within which vernacular speech is mediated influences its meaning, as:’ [m]ass media clearly recontextualise ways of speaking’ (Coupland 2009: 297). Mediated vernacular speech is more likely to index particular meanings within written literary English because of the inherent norms of this context and the practices and ideologies that must be engaged with before a writer or reader can participate in this cultural sphere. On the one hand, as discussed in 3.3.2., incorporating vernacularity into writing through non-standard orthography can ‘delegitimise’ this way of speaking (Jaffe and Walton 2000: 582-583). On the other hand respellings can be used to index oppositional ‘social, political and cultural stances’ (Shortis 2007a: 13) and also recontextualisations can be used to ‘refashion ideological values’ (Coupland 2009: 285). Disregarding Hines’ own criticism of his text, the use of respellings to represent Casper’s voice refashions the ideological values associated with his vernacular speech.

Representations of vernacular speech in writing can potentially create implicit meta-linguistic comments on the intelligence and education of the individual attached to this voice. This indexical significance, and social judgement, is created because of the ideological norms inherent in traditional models of literacy, Standard Language Culture and the cultural sphere of literature. Vernacular voices become ‘overconsolidated’ in literature and their ‘complex indexical profiles’ are overshadowed when they are held up next to a superposed authorized Standard English because literary texts have specific socio-cultural significance (Coupland 2009: 285). In natural speech any ideas about Standard or ‘correct’ ways of speech can potentially be debated in context and resisted. Although this resistance against ideas about the standard can be achieved in written texts, by their very nature unlicensed variation in orthography is instantly defined as non-standard. There is a larger weight of ideology bearing down upon vernacularity in this context than in others. The nuances of ‘vernacular speech’ and its role in indexing simultaneously class, region, gender etc. are reduced within the written text leading to an over-consolidation. Yorkshire dialect in a spoken context and in *AKFAK* operate within the norms of two different cultural spheres. However the recontextualised context within which Barnsley dialect appears in *AKFAK* is used by Hines to change the ideological values of this ‘vernacular’ language form and this can be achieved because the new context created by Hines is imbued with his own ideology, not with necessarily dominant or legitimate ideologies. Much as Hague legitimates his dialect speakers through moral evaluation, Hines legitimates Casper, a speaker of a vernacular, by placing Billy in a position where sympathy is with him.

Coupland’s point about Standard Language Ideology highlights the role that representations of vernaculars can have in challenging ideology:

Standard language ideology (SLI), where it exists, is invoked and exploited selectively, with considerable differences across social domains and genres. So we might expect media contextualisations of vernaculars to fashion their own ideological values.

(Coupland 2009: 286)

Although dominant, Standard Language Ideology is not always the chief ideological position adopted by individuals. Because of his political ideology concerning education Hines refashions the ideological values associated with a child who is a ‘failure’ at school and has engaged in anti-social behaviour. Malek Salman asserts, in his Marxist criticism of post-war British working-class fiction, that amongst authors such as Sillitoe, Storey, Orwell, Lawrence, Braine and Barstow: ‘Hines is perhaps the only novelist […] who has made a serious attempt to reveal in his work the original causes for the deprivation of his working-class characters’ (Salman 1990: 249-250). In light of this comment it becomes significant to parallel Hines’ development and success as a writer, who maintains a focus on the deprivation of the working classes, with his moving away from a highly stylised technique for representing ‘everyday speech’. Hines accepts the constraints and the social profile of represented dialect and in discussing it he highlights the cultural bias in literature. Dialect speakers, like Hague, would not have to change orthography to represent their speech if standard orthography was already modelled on their speech. Working-class writers, like Eaglestone, would not have to prove their authenticity if texts about working-class life were the norm. What Hines’ discussion of dialect representation demonstrates is that Hines was aware of the role that linguistic variation and literature played in the stratification of society and what this meant for a politically minded author. Looking at Hines’ comments, from the sources discussed, and his use of dialect in his novels it is possible to see the clear link that Hines makes between systems of linguistic difference and systems of social difference.

### 4.5.3. Linguistic Difference, Cultural Difference and Social Difference

Hines explores his unease about which social category he belongs to in his interview with Jenkins by discussing language. Linguistic differences are stratified in a hierarchical system of social difference (Bourdieu 1991: 53-54). Representing dialect in writing involves the mapping of systems of social difference, associated with speech and writing, on top of one another. Hines concern with dialect representation can be seen to stem from a general concern with the legitimacy of working-class culture.

Much like ‘kebinet office’ invites judgements about ‘oddity’ of character because it’s ‘defective’ spelling creates an implicit comments on the ‘defects of pronunciation’ (Agha 2003: 237-238), representations of working-class language and culture in literature invite questions about authenticity and condescension because they are ‘abnormal’ within this predominately middle-class sphere. The ‘defects’ and ‘abnormalities’ are seen as such because of their relationship with standards and norms. Bourdieu comments on the role of the standard in reducing the status of natural language use and other cultural backgrounds:

Thus, for example, the linguistic differences between people from different regions cease to be incommensurable particularisms. Measured *de facto* against the single standard of the ‘common’ language, they are found wanting and cast into the outer darkness of *regionalisms*, the ‘corrupt expressions and mispronunciations’ which school-masters decry. Reduced to the status of quaint or vulgar jargons, in either case unsuitable for formal occasions, popular uses of the official language undergo systematic devaluation.

[….]

However great the proportion of the functioning of a language that is not subject to variation, there exists, in the area of pronunciation, diction and even grammar, a whole set of differences significantly associated with social differences which, though negligible in the eyes of the linguist, are pertinent from the sociologist’s standpoint because they belong to a system of linguistic oppositions which is the *re-translation* of a system of social differences.

(Bourdieu 1991: 53-54 his emphasis)

Bourdieu draws attention to how the natural variation of language is positioned in relation to legitimate language. If the linguistic basis for a cultural group is dismissed as ‘vulgar’ then there is added difficulty in attempts to legitimate the culture and lifestyles associated with this way of speaking. Hines comments and concerns about dialect representation demonstrate how he sees literature taking part in the structuring of social difference. For Bourdieu differences in language use are a ‘re-translation’ of social differences and we can see this in the links between class and speech which Hines discusses. Whether to say ‘ay up’ or ‘hello’ and whether to write ‘going to t’cinema’ or ‘going to the cinema’. He provides the ‘answer’ to the problem of dialect representation to be just to write about middle-class characters, although he says this to highlight the normalised cultural bias in the conventions of literature and writing. The use of non-standard forms to represent natural speech changes the possibilities for interpretation of a linguistic variety to interpretations that are coloured by the social significance of the written word, because of the context in which these forms are used.

For Hines ‘the speakers’ in his texts are *de facto* excluded from the social domain of literature because the majority of literature is not about them or the writing that is about them is not ‘good literature’. In order to limit the effects of the ‘reduced status’ of regional varieties in relation to conceptions of the standard Hines stops using the stylistic technique that differentiates them as speakers of ‘quaint or vulgar jargons’ within the system of social difference that is the literary sphere. Speech and writing create two different contexts within which individuals can be marked. The specific social value of Yorkshire dialect is organized in a system of difference where it can be positioned in various contexts as either a prestige or socially stigmatized variety. Within literature it is placed within a highly stratified system of social difference where any sense of regional difference in spelling has been removed by codification and the stigma of spelling incorrectly is pervasive. Hines’ writing is an act of resistance, an appropriation of a socially stratified expressive style, yet in appropriating the novel Casper is marked by literature as a speaker of a ‘common’ language and all this can index. Hines eventually felt uneasy about how he was marking his working-class characters. Fortunately for the character of Billy Casper enough readers have found that Hines sufficiently challenged the ideological norms that mark Casper as unintelligent within education and his voice as inarticulate in literature.

Before moving on to conclude my thesis as a whole I touch upon the issue of the historical enregisterment of dialect. I do this to briefly consider these instances of dialect representation as supporting evidence for the enregisterment of features of Yorkshire dialect across time. I position these tables in conversation with Cooper’s (2013) framework for considering enregisterment in historical contexts using texts that represent dialect. However, due to the focus and argument of my thesis as a whole this section can only serve as a gesture in the direction of an emerging area of study into historical enregisterment, and also my consideration of these common features in relation to orthography serves as a reflection on this chapter’s consideration of Hines perspective on dialect representation.

### 4.5.4. A Note on Features in Common Across the Texts of All Three Authors

In this section I briefly consider the features of Yorkshire dialect, represented using non-standard orthography, which all three texts by Eaglestone, Hague and Hines have in common.

In 2.6.2., 3.3.1 and 4.3.1 I used tables to explore the use of non-standard orthography to represent dialect in extracts from Eaglestone, Hague and Hines’ works respectively. These extracts were looked at in relation to linguistic descriptions of Yorkshire dialect. As each text was written in a different period of the twentieth century comparing the common features of Yorkshire dialect represented could demonstrate that these features were part of a recognisable register of features which socially index ‘Yorkshire’ speech or ‘Yorkshire’ identity.

In the table below asterisked features are not present in the extract from each author for which I have listed the features of speech represented, but are present elsewhere in the same text.

**Features in common across extracts for each author**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Eaglestone (1925) | Hines (1968) | Hague (1976) |
| PRICE vowel | <ah> | -- | <ah> |
| FACE vowel | <meks> | -- | <meks> |
| GOAT vowel and l-vocalisation | <owd> | -- | <owd> |
| Second person pronouns | <thee><tha> | <thi>\*<tha/thar>\* | <thee>/<thi><tha> |
| Definite article reduction | <t’>\* | <t’> | <t’> |
| Reduction | <wi’> | <wi’> | <wi’>\* |
| G-dropping | <courtin’>\* | <flyin’> | <goin’>\* |

The similarity in representation of the PRICE vowel, FACE vowel, GOAT vowels and l-vocalisation in Eaglestone and Hague’s texts could provide evidence for the historical enregisterment of these features, in line with Cooper’s notion ‘[t]hat the form and/or frequency of textual representations of dialect features indicate that they were enregistered to audiences in historical contexts’ (2013: 16). The shared use of these features by Eaglestone in 1925 and Hague in 1976 could suggest their respellings were made to index features of Yorkshire speech that were part of a set of features that were highly recognisable, or highly enregistered, in the 1920’s when Eaglestone was writing and in 1970’s when Hague was writing. The lack of these features in Hines’ work is in line with his comments that dialect representation ‘can be irritating to the reader and whatever methods you try, you don’t capture the voice on the page’ (Hines 1968a [2000]: 207) in the sense that, as discussed throughout this chapter, this level of respelling was inappropriate for the audience and purpose of his novel. In terms of orthographic practice changing the letters of a word can create new words (e.g. hat, hot, hit etc.) so respelling words can create unfamiliar constructions. Whilst the phonological features that Eaglestone and Hague represent may have been highly recognisable as features of Yorkshire dialect in the period that Hines was writing he perhaps may have considered creating respellings to represent the to be too non-standard, and therefore too ‘irritating’, for his readers.

All three authors attempt to represent definite article reduction, reduce <with> to <wi’> and signal the removal of <g>. Whilst this could also suggest that these features are enregistered across these periods, these features have their representation facilitated by a widespread orthographic practice, the signalling of missing or elided letters through the use of an apostrophe. Again, this practice may have appealed to Hines, at the time of writing *AKFAK*, because of its widespread usage. This practice occupies the position of an essential part of literacy learning. For Hines then, this practice could be consider to be more useful for his purposes as, in terms of orthography, it can be used in a varied enough way to create difference, i.e. <wi’> is different from <with>, but is still essentially enough of the same, i.e. <wi’> involves the same familiar processes as <isn’t>.

# 5. Conclusion

This thesis has looked in detail at the work of three authors whose work is of varying levels of public and literary recognition. In each case study I have traced the social practices involved in their use of dialect representation in order to move away from viewing dialect representation as the *representation* of speech. I have worked to position dialect representation as an act of *negotiation* of social identity that draws on the overlapping spheres of vernacular speech, and literary culture. My aim in repositioning dialect representation is to present it as a complex act, which has its root in commonplace social interaction in order to move away from traditional discussions of it as a ‘marginal’ literary technique or an inaccurate ‘capturing’ of speech and to engage with it as a complex act of literacy which is ‘embedded in […] oral language and social interaction’ (Barton 1994: 130-136). By recognising the complexity and everyday nature of this technique I hope to bring activities which occupy the overlap between orality and literacy into focus.

In this conclusion I will focus on two issues related to my perspective, negotiation and lamination. In order to do this I discuss the effect that literacy has on the identity of individuals with reference to the work of Urszula Clark and James Gee. This discussion foregrounds the issue of identity and current literacy education to support my concluding remarks and my discussion of future research. I then summarise the key points from each case study relating to negotiation before framing dialect representation in relation to the ethnographic concept of lamination. Finally I reflect on opportunities for further comparative studies and what could be the implications of this thesis for classroom literacy research.

### 5.1. Identity and Literacy

My approach to authors as socially motivated individuals participating in the sphere of literature has been influenced by N.L.S., as well as my experiences of working with young people in schools who must engage with legitimate literacy practices, language standards and the prestige of literary culture in order to succeed.

I have worked in a participatory research or ethnographic capacity with young people, on the AHRC ‘Language as Talisman’ (Escott and Pahl 2012, Pahl et al. 2012) and ‘Communicating Wisdom’ projects (Escott and Pahl 2012, Pahl et al. 2012, Gateway to Research 2013). In both these projects the project team worked to address the issues surrounding linguistic and literacy inequality in the post-industrial area of Rotherham, as well as employing a range of disciplinary perspectives to explore the ways in which young people construct meaning (Gateway to Research 2013). I have also worked with Hinde house secondary school in Sheffield on a Widening Participation research project in which I employed participatory research methods to explore *AKFAK* with a year 8 class (Escott, Prichard-Brennan, Year 8 2013). Many of the issues explored in these projects relate to how children can be supported in their negotiation of ‘in-school’ norms, whilst at the same time having their ‘out-of-school’ language and literacies promoted, when their cultural or linguistic norms and literacies are different to those privileged in school. In her article on language variation, linguistic hegemony and literacy teaching Urszula Clark highlights many of the problems which face pupils learning to read and write in the UK. Clark discusses ‘[t]he ways in which literacy in English is taught in school generally subscribe to and perpetuate the notion of a homogenous, unvaried set of writing conventions associated with the language they represent’ as well as how the ‘linguistic norms associated with standard English are predicated upon and replicate white, cultural hegemony’ (2013: 58). The issues that these young people face share similarities with many of the issues that Eaglestone, Hague and Hines engaged with or negotiated through their use of non-standard orthography and literary writing.

The general problem of the hegemonic influence of literacy education, which Clark highlights, and how it relates to social identity is summarised by Gee when he discusses the approach to literacy education developed by Shirley Brice Heath:

[I]ndividuals who have not been socialized into the discourse practices that constitute mainstream school-based literacy must eventually be socialized into them if they are ever to acquire them. The component skills of this form of literacy must be practiced, and one cannot practice a skill one has not been exposed to, cannot engage in a social practice one has not been socialised into, which is what most non-mainstream children are expected to do in school.

(Gee 1996: 65)

Gee contrasts this discussion of the socialization of children into mainstream literacy practices by drawing attention to identity: ‘this practice [of socialization] may well mean a change of identity and the adoption of a reality set at odds with their own at various points’ (1996: 65). Engaging with literacy practices involves a process of socialization which influences the identity of individuals. Mainstream literacy, Standard Language Culture and literary culture all provide a range of discourse practices which require negotiation. Eaglestone, Hague and Hines all engaged with these discourse practices in different ways and used dialect representation to negotiate the cultural values inherent in these spheres. Eaglestone socialised himself into these practices and then later questioned the values of the cultural sphere he had entered into. Hague subverted many of the norms of these spheres because they involved the ‘adoption of a reality set at odds with his identity’. Hines was socialised into many of these practices through grammar school and then in his works aimed to change literature so that it was more accessible to and representative of members of the working-classes. The use of dialect representation is central to their negotiation of these discourse practices and the public presentation of aspects of their cultural identity. In 5.2 I summarise the negotiations undertaken by Eaglestone, Hague and Hines.

### 5.2. Negotiation

Eaglestone, Hague and Hines’ use of dialect representation can be positioned in relation to the social negotiation of identity because engaging with literacy involves a process of socialization and mainstream literacy education supports a dominant cultural hegemony.

In Chapter 2 I explored the works of Arthur Eaglestone. There are three main points to be considered from this investigation. The first is that because of Eaglestone’s use of non-standard orthography, and his use of vernacularity in writing, his use of dialect representation provoked meta-linguistic comments. These comments were never separated from social judgements about speakers. For example Eaglestone’s reviewers discussed his use of ‘bad’ language, his ‘authentic’ use of dialect and how ‘articulate' a writer he was. The framing of vernacular speech within a literary environment had a strong influence on these comments. The language was ‘bad’ because it was not ‘civilised’, the dialect was ‘authentic’ because it had ‘pathos’, and Eaglestone was ‘articulate’ because he could write ‘well’. Eaglestone’s representation of dialect involved the negotiation of the language values of the literary sphere and these values were influenced by traditional models of literacy and perceptions of literature as an art form. The second issue was that of authenticity. Eaglestone’s use of orthography to index vernacular speech was seen as part of his authenticity. In these contexts the indexing of vernacularity in writing was seenas evidence to support the social categorisation of Eaglestone as an ‘authentic member of the working-classes’. Whilst, for other reviewers, the combination of this vernacularity and Eaglestone’s cultural tastes and social perspectives created an ‘inauthentic’ mix. In this context dialect representation was involved in the negotiation of social categories, specifically those of ‘working class miner’ and ‘middle-class scholar’. Finally, building on this second point, because Eaglestone’s dialect representation was seen as evidence for his authenticity his book was accepted by members of the literary establishment as an ‘authentic’ narrative, which allowed him access to a cultural sphere he wished to belong to. In this sense then Eaglestone’s use of the social significance of dialect representation was involved in his attempt to successfully negotiate the discourse practices of the literary establishment*.*

There are a range of points relating specifically to Hague’s work and more generally to dialect representation that were explored in Chapter 2. Firstly, Hague’s use of dialect representation is directly tied to the creation of ‘social cohesion or division within the community’ (Mugglestone 2003: 67). Hague employed respellings not only to create solidarity with his group but to undermine the legitimacy of the dominant language and ultimately differentiate himself and his group from others. In order to do this Hague challenged the stereotypical social categories into which he is placed because of his use of language, cultural preferences and behaviour. As part of his creation of an oppositional stance Hague used dialect representation to recontextualise the ideological norms and cultural values associated with his language and culture. He was able to do this because he explicitly or implicitly challenged many of the implicit norms or cultural biases inherent in language, literacy and aesthetics. Secondly, in this section I explored some general issues relating to dialect representation in more detail. I discussed the notion that a sufficient level of cultural training is needed to engage with dialect representation as an issue that reflects a less visible and more general issue relating to orality and literacy. Understanding writing involves a level of cultural training, with cultural values concerning ‘correct’ speech and a specific way of seeing how writing and speech are related being implicitly embedded in this training. This means that *all readers* have their understanding of non-standard spellings influenced by the general cultural training that literacy education provides, whilst some readers with experience of Yorkshire dialect can read representations of dialect as indexing this way of speaking. Considering the ‘accuracy’ of a represented dialect focusses on the specific cultural training at the expense of the general literacy education involved. Dialect representation taps into a general sense that non-standard orthography is related to vernacularity or a lack of education with this general sense being based on years of literacy education. This can be used by an author such as Hague to subvert expectations, or by an author such as Eaglestone to demonstrate his ‘authenticity’. Thirdly, these points support the argument I made in Chapter 2 that dialect representation is a *culturally determined evocation of vernacular speech*. The actual sounds of speech are presented through a medium which has been entirely socially constructed and the interpretation of these sounds is culturally determined by dominant conceptualisations of the relationship between writing and speech. For socially motivated individuals to ‘recover’ speech from written representations they rely on their cultural training. For scholars this process relies on contextual information and a framework for understanding phonetic information, the International Phonetic Alphabet, which, although it is able to create a one-to-one relationship between sound and symbol, is only able to be employed because of specific cultural training. For both socially motivated individual and scholar, their perception of the relationship between orthography and speech is not caused by a naturally occurring correspondence between sound and symbol, but because of complex socially determined frameworks for conceptualising, and engaging with, the relationship between speech and writing. The way in which literacy education and Standard Language Culture are involved in determining how the relationship between speech and writing are conceptualised by individuals are issues that have not always been included in the remit of studies which focus on the accuracy of the dialect represented, and even studies which attempt to triangulate the sounds of a dialect from historical written texts. Finally, Hague’s delegitimising of legitimate culture through his use of dialect representation ultimately highlighted the way in which language standards are used to legitimate political positions and that to be delegitimised/legitimated is a matter of context*.*

In Chapter 4 I explored the works of Barry Hines. Whilst this investigation built on many points made in earlier chapters, the main issue discussed in this chapter was that literature, as a cultural sphere, is inherently biased towards middle-class culture. By reflecting on his use of dialect representation Hines came to the realisation that in order to achieve his political aims he needed to focus on overcoming the problems of representing working-class culture and values in literature. Hines’ realisation draws attention to the fact that, standard spelling is not seen to correspond to working class language. Hines continued to focus on his political aims for writing rather than attempt to address this fundamental issue relating to language and literacy. His discussion of the social categories ‘working’ and ‘middle’ class highlight the complexity of one individual’s social identity and the cultural restrictions on how they can present themselves in written contexts. In each of these case studies I have worked to position writers as socially motivated individuals. Drawing on insights from ethnographic research, this stance can be expanded further to reconceptualise dialect representation as a process of ‘lamination’ of social practices, which allows an individual to negotiate existing social categories and practices.

### 5.3. Lamination

In 1.2.3., whilst discussing social practice approaches, I briefly introduced the concept of lamination drawing on Rowsell and Pahl’s work on sedimented identity (2007). The concept of lamination which they draw on in their work comes from Dorothy Holland and Kevin Leander’s article on positioning and subjectivity in ethnographic research. This concept is grounded in practice based ethnographic approaches to the positioning of social persons and is part of an attempt to describe a practice theory of identity where individual’s ‘draw on different cultural resources and structures and recast and transform available and organized social positions to shape their subjectivities’ (Holland and Leander 2004: 132). The way in which the metaphor of lamination is presented by Holland and Leander is as part of an attempt to describe the complex relationship between existing social categories and individual subjectivities in ‘specific episodes of (positioning) practice’ (Holland and Leander 2004:132). In introducing this concept they illustrate these processes by discussing the way in which drum shells and cymbals are crafted:

Presently, we draw in particular on the metaphor of ‘lamination’ to describe the hybrid social/psychological entities created by positioning.

The shells of drums are often constructed by laminating multiple layers of wood. Cymbals, it turns out, are not simply cast in a one time process using a single mold. Rather, they are laminated, layer on layer, but along a different axis than the drum, being wound from the inside of the cymbal outward. This layering or winding process affords the cymbal qualities that being a single, undifferentiated piece of molded metal would not, including patina, resonance, and strength. Additionally, the layered construction of the cymbal permits its sound texture to ‘thicken’ over time, becoming both deeper and brighter. The lamination metaphor is also useful in cases in which materials of different substance – a driver’s license and clear plastic, for example, are more or less durably affixed to one another. A multiplicity of resources is possible. Unlike other processes, such as that of creating alloys by melting different substances together, the layers retain some [of] their original distinctiveness, although in a different configuration.

Lamination has theoretical resonance: it is […] good for thinking about the production of the sorts of hybrid social/psychological entities predicated by social practice theory. Episodes of positioning create what we might think of as a laminate.

(Holland and Leander 2004: 131 -132)

The metaphor of lamination is apt for the study of dialect representation because of the way it foregrounds how layers of practices create a composite that allows an individual to position themselves in relation to existing social categories. Represented dialect speech has different layers, affordances and textures. It retains some of the original distinctiveness of real speech whilst the lamination of this real speech into writing changes the qualities of the resulting artefact (cf. Bakhtin 1992: 293-294). Questions concerning the accuracy of represented dialect in texts set to one side the unique layers of practices that have been laminated in search of a one-to-one correspondence between phoneme and grapheme. This process overlooks the unique nature of the object under scrutiny.

Holland and Leander use lamination to explore the complexity of the ways in which persons or groups socially position themselves in ‘everyday discourse, spatial arrangements, text, film, or other media’ in order to produce subjects or to form subjectivities (Holland and Leander 2004: 127). In introducing positioning they discuss how an individual’s self or group identity is shaped by the power relations they are involved in and how these relations create ‘acts that distinguish and treat the person as gendered, raced, classed, or other sort of subject’ (Holland and Leander 2004: 127):

Likewise, regimes of power/knowledge are conceived to create social categories such as the ‘disabled’, ‘troubled youth,’ or ‘attractive women’. A person or group is ‘offered’ or ‘afforded’ a social position when a powerful body, such as a governmental agency proposes a particular sort of subject, a ‘felon’, say, or a ‘sexual harasser’, or an ‘at-risk’ student and calls on an individual to occupy the position. Faced with such an offer, the person may either accept the position in whole or part, or try to refuse it (Bourdieu 1977; Davies and Harre 1990; Foucault 1975, 1988; Harre and Van Langenhove 1991).

(Holland and Leander 2004: 127)

The regimes of power that are involved in orthography, literacy, Standard Language Culture, and literature also create social categories for individuals and groups that they must accept, refuse or change. The legitimate cultural forms or institutionalised power which Eaglestone, Hague and Hines interact with are involved in the constitution of the social categories which they must negotiate. As these power relations play out in the practices associated with orthography, literacy and literature with which they engaged, they had to negotiate social categories that were created by the acceptance or refusal of the social positions that engagement with these domains ‘offered’ or ‘afforded’. Eaglestone occupied the position of the ‘unintelligent miner’ to inform the world of the miners’ life and engage with literary culture, whilst reviewers discuss whether or not he is a ‘scholar in a mine’. Both categories are afforded by differing levels of engagement with literacy practices and the power these practices enact. Hague occupied the social categories of the ‘illiterate’ and ‘unintelligent’ speaker offered by non-standard orthography to critique perceptions of the social position of ‘miners’ and ‘northerners’. In acknowledging the lack of nuance that these social categories afford he works to discredit them and legitimise his own position. Hines reflected on the way in which the modal affordances of writing cannot capture speech and how his engagement with this effort positioned his characters in social categories which he was attempting to challenge. Discussing Eaglestone, Hague and Hines’ works in terms of the social positioning, categories and practices which they engage with in the creation of their texts means that dialect representation can be viewed as a *composite laminate of practices* involved in the *negotiation* of social identity. Throughout this study I have explored the influence that Standard Language Culture has on socially motivated authors. In 5.4. I address a range points concerning my methodology as well as discussing future research.

### 5.4. Further Study

Focussing on three case studies has allowed me to question approaches to dialect representation and to think further about how spoken and written practices influence each other and are tied up in everyday negotiations. The stylisations of vernacular speech explored in this study demonstrate that the creation of dialect representation involves negotiating: general social stereotypes concerning miners and writers; stereotypes relating to illiteracy and unintelligence indexed by non-standard orthography; perceptions of ‘uncouth’, ‘improper’ or ‘incorrect’ language; cultural legitimacy; and the influence and prestige of literary art. The implications of this research for future study involve further comparative studies of similar texts and connecting the insights and issues raised in this thesis with classrooms.

Throughout this study I have made an effort to situate the dialect representation of Eaglestone, Hague and Hines within a social context. In doing this my aim was to align perspectives that investigate the socio-cultural value and significance of spoken language with perspectives that do the same with literacy and literary language. The analysis undertaken in this thesis has been very much influenced by practice accounts of language and socio-cultural models of language and literacy (Bourdieu 1984, 1991, Barton 1994, Gee 1996, Coupland 2007, Sebba 2007) and in undertaking this analysis I have made an attempt to develop a situated, literacy informed, socio-linguistic perspective on written representations of vernacular speech. This has gone some way in exploring current approaches and perspectives on mediated or stylised language use. Although, ultimately, this study serves more as an exercise in aligning and problematizing the approaches it explores than the development of a rigorous methodology. In exploring the laminate of practices which make up represented vernacular speech I have drawn on diverse practice-based accounts of language, literacy and orthography. I have made an effort to consolidate these approaches. I recognise that a robust practice model that can be employed to analyse texts and speech is beyond the scope of this study. In order to further explore my positioning of dialect representation as a culturally determined evocation of vernacular speech and as a composite laminate of practices there are range of areas that could be pursued. A study looking at texts from a similarly socially positioned industry or region would provide a point of comparison for my discussions concerning authenticity and vernacularity. These topics could also be addressed by shifting the research focus to include recently published texts that include dialect representation or are presented in a similar manner to Eaglestone’s ‘real-life’ narrative. Interviewing current authors who use dialect representation, or non-standard orthography, about their writing practices and political reasons for writing in this way would provide further context for my discussion of dialect representation as an act of social negotiation. Whilst these studies would work with similar texts and contexts I believe the theoretical framework I have developed has implications for the exploration of how non-standard orthography is used in other everyday contexts which involve identity negotiation and writing, such as the classroom.

My work on *AKFAK* has led to me co-produce research with local young-people who have had to study this text at secondary school (Escott, Pritchard-Brennan and Year 8 2013). Many of the issues raised by socio-linguistic discussions, such as the dominance of Standard Language Culture and linguistic inequality, were touched upon by student responses to Hines’ use of non-standard orthography. This experience highlighted the importance of literacy, as well as written representations of speech, in influencing conceptualisations of ‘correct’ and ‘local’ language use . However, these discussions are not present in this study and could be explored through classroom research (cf. Taylor 2006, Snell 2013), language perception interviews (cf. Spencer et. al 2012) or reader response research (cf. Peplow 2011, Whiteley 2011). In situating dialect representation in relation to socio-cultural and ideological issues I have become interested in the similarities between the negotiations that Eaglestone, Hague and Hines undertook and the social negotiation that schoolchildren currently undertake. The complex influence that literacy education and literary culture has on an individual’s identity, practices and values has been traced throughout this study. The strategies that Eaglestone, Hague and Hines employ in order to negotiate legitimate culture have also been traced. Returning to Clark’s work on literacy and language, she identifies two issues related to literacy socialization which relate to these discussion of literacy and social negotiation. Clark discusses the main issues facing school situated in socially disadvantaged areas:

[F]irstly how to engage pupils with the discourses demanded by the school curriculum when such discourses may be very different from the ones they are used to at home and in the community; secondly, how to prepare them for the adult world beyond that of the school gates and their immediate locality, including access to further or higher education in ways that do not denigrate or disparage their home and linguistic backgrounds.

(Clark 2013: 67)

There is a similarity between the modern pupils Clark describes and Eaglestone, Hague and Hines, in the sense that all must negotiate, or have negotiated, the existing norms of the linguistic landscapes and cultural hegemony of the socio-cultural contexts in which they are, or were, positioned. Whilst Eaglestone, Hague and Hines have already attempted to transcend the traditional social categories of ‘miner’, ‘northerner’, or ‘working-class’ by drawing on vernacular language to write in ‘creative and innovative ways’, the issues is whether pupils will be given the opportunity to undertake similar negotiations. Eaglestone, Hague and Hines’ use of dialect representation rely on the existence of the notion that the ‘unvaried set of writing conventions’ they encounter represent ‘correct’ English, whilst they also negotiate, or challenge, the ways in which linguistic norms replicate the existing legitimate cultural hegemony (Clark2013: 58). Embedding dialect representation within the issues raised by the modern-day classroom, or practice-based approaches to the interplay between orality and literacy, shifts the focus of investigation away from the literary and linguistic approaches to dialect representation outlined in chapter 1. Approaching these authors as socially motivated individuals could provide a point of reference for pupils of English who are also engaging with similarly complex negotiations of social and cultural values and norms. As Eaglestone, Hague and Hines make explicit many of the problems that the norms and values of literacy, Standard Language Culture and legitimate literary culture their works can be used to explore these issues with young people in ways in which they can engage with these problems without involving linguistic terminology. These texts, or similar texts, could serve as the basis for co-produced research that aims to investigate and develop young people’s critical reflexivity about language use and literacy by engaging them with non-standard orthography.
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1. Whenever quoting from Hague’s poetry I have maintained his punctuation; especially with regard to his apostrophes and speech mark usage. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The boundaries of the main areas that make up Yorkshire have changed during the twentieth century but the areas represented in the works of and the hometowns of these three authors all fall within what is now the South Yorkshire region. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Bourdieu uses the term ‘habitus’ to describe this embodied understanding of the world (Bourdieu 1991: 50). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. For example The Yorkshire Dialect Society’s website demonstrates their commitment to the study of spoken and written language:

Our main aim has always been to encourage the study and recording of dialect. Our equal interest is in speech and literature and members like to hear dialect spoken and to see it written in our publications.

(Yorkshire Dialect Society 2010) [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. I am very grateful to all the miners who spent time talking to me about pit-talk at the National Coal Mining Museum as well as Willie McGranaghan for arranging for me to visit them. Any ethnographic study was outside the scope of this research but may be possible in the future. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. This resource has been referenced for ease that this collection offers and its representations of canonical works. However the local studies libraries in Barnsley, Sheffield and Rotherham have many more relevant texts. Unfortunately they cannot be explored in this study. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Ruth’s comments on many of the events in Eaglestone’s professional career, and her memories of his feelings on them, have provided a great insight into what I had learned of Eaglestone from his autobiographical writing. I am also very grateful to Ruth Hunt and Andrew Lockett for discussing the content of Eaglestone’s life and papers with me on various occasions. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Much of the biographical information I have concerning Hague is due to the help of his relations and I am indebted to them. Their anecdotal stories about Hague have provided me with a comprehensive source of information as well as much entertainment. For example, they told me about how Hague would cycle solo on a tandem bicycle from Totley to the pit, work a full day in the mines, and then complete the 30 mile round trip home. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. The full listings of these collected papers are available from the University of Sheffield’s Special Collections. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. The date attributed to *AYL* is the date that it was donated to the Rotherham Archives where I first encountered it. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. The full quotation appears earlier on the same page [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. ‘A man employed to do service work in the mine and paid by the day’ (Winstanley 1989), ‘Daytaleman – is explained thus in the 1820s: “a day labourer, chiefly in husbandry … a man whose labour is … reckoned by the day, not by the week or year. Daytalemen, about coal pits, are those not employed in working the coal”’ (Griffiths 2007: 12). [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. In most cases where the author of an archival newspaper clipping is unknown I have included the title of the article as well. This is to help distinguish between anonymous reviewers, and has been extended to named authors, as many of the titles of articles about Eaglestone serve as summaries of their content and provide further information as to why they are of relevance.  [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. Eaglestone also addresses the same themes that Thesing does is in his articles ‘The Miner in Literature’ (1927) and ‘Miners in Literature’ (1948) [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. In Roy Hattersley’s review of *Black Diamonds* in *The Guardian* he comments that ‘[t]he verbatim accounts of the miners' attitude to what South Yorkshire called "graft" […] has an air of absolute authenticity’ and he qualifies it with the comment that ‘Arthur Eaglestone remembered: “[t]he most heinous of accusations lay in the terrible phrase ‘He doesn’t like work’” (2007). [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. Many references to newspaper articles have been attributed to Sheffield Newspapers Ltd. This is because the individual articles have been supplied by Jane Salt, from the Sheffield Newspapers Ltd. library department, divorced from their original papers. Attributing these articles to Sheffield Newspapers Ltd. serves a secondary function as these articles may have been published in one of the company’s various papers (the *Sheffield Star* or the *Sheffield Telegraph* for example), may have been published in a paper that has changed its brand name or published in a paper owned by the company that is no longer in existence (*Morning Telegraph*). [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. I have only been able to recover a small amount of these letters, mostly from the library of Sheffield Newspapers Ltd. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. Part of a three letters stored in the Archives of Culture and Tradition, Survey of Language and Folklore Correspondence; the one displayed from Hague to Widdowson and two from Widdowson to Hague (Widdowson, 1973a; 1973b) [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. Norwood (1967) and Ingram, (1978) were kindly supplied by Peter Ashley-Smith of the Kineton and District Local History Group. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. This unpublished collection of poetry and stories is laid out in the same way as *Tales*, typed up from Hague’s handwritten notebooks by Hague’s family and forms part of the Hague Papers [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. For the Hague poems that have been quoted in full permission for their use has been granted by his family and has only been done for his published poems. [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. Jane Hodson personal communication. [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
23. This poem appears underneath the dedication of the *Tales* collection, before the list of contents. The dedication of the book is the title of the poem. [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
24. Gorm = understand [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
25. Within Hines’ papers there is a collection of newspaper clippings and scraps of paper about ‘how to write’ that Hines kept with his writing materials. Amongst them is this quote from Orwell, the author of the first piece of ‘serious literature’ that Hines read and enjoyed. I am providing it here alongside Hines’ comments on writing as it had been typed out and underlined and presumably influenced Hines’ views:

I do not think one can assess a writer’s motives without knowing something of his early development. His subject matter will be determined by the age he lives in – at least this is true in tumultuous revolutionary ages like our own – but before he ever begins to write he will have acquired an emotional attitude from which he will never completely escape. It is his job, no doubt, to discipline his temperament and avoid getting stuck at some immature stage, or in some perverse mood: but if he escapes from his early influences altogether, he will have killed his impulse to write.

(Orwell 1946, underlined by Hines,). [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
26. To illustrate the similarity in theme and tone without further exploration, here are a few more comments from reviewers of *First Signs* that link writing style with authenticity and literary skill with northern identity:

*First Signs* is an honest book, written with great perception and infallible observation. Barry Hines writes with lyrical power and intensity, about believable people in a touchable landscape, and I commend this novel to you

(Gains 1972).

The first eighty pages of *First Signs* are almost a parody of the stumpy-stompy Northern novel. Not as brash as early Braine. Not as intellectual as Storey. Not quite as sensitive as Callow. Not quite as bolshy as Sillitoe, but they are brightly conceived and excitingly written. Barry Hines created a previous book called *Kes*. It was good and made a brilliant film. Like it and buy another by the same author and you may be disappointed, because a Dostoevsky has not been born near Doncaster.

(Gosling 1972). [↑](#footnote-ref-26)