

5-2020

## Speaker into Specimen: The Representation of Dialect in Victorian Fiction

Hunter Hall

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.wm.edu/honorsthesis>



Part of the [Literature in English, British Isles Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Hall, Hunter, "Speaker into Specimen: The Representation of Dialect in Victorian Fiction" (2020).  
*Undergraduate Honors Theses*. Paper 1535.  
<https://scholarworks.wm.edu/honorsthesis/1535>

This Honors Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses, Dissertations, & Master Projects at W&M ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Undergraduate Honors Theses by an authorized administrator of W&M ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact [scholarworks@wm.edu](mailto:scholarworks@wm.edu).

Speaker into Specimen: The Representation of Dialect in Victorian Fiction

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirement  
for the degree of Bachelor of Arts in the Department of English from  
The College of William and Mary

by

Hunter Hall

Accepted for Honors

Deborah D. Morse  
Deborah D. Morse, Exam Director

Kim Wheatley  
Kim Wheatley, Reader

Talbot Taylor  
Talbot Taylor, Outside Reader

Williamsburg, VA  
May 7, 2020

“Mrs. Durbeyfield habitually spoke the dialect,” writes Thomas Hardy in *Tess of the D’Urbervilles*: “her daughter, who had passed the Sixth Standard in the National School under a London-trained mistress, spoke two languages: the dialect at home, more or less; ordinary English abroad and to persons of quality” (30). Young Tess Durbeyfield’s decision to speak “ordinary English” with “persons of quality” is a product of ideological forces that are all too familiar. I grew up steeped in an Appalachian culture that viewed people differently based on how they speak. Often, I would chauffeur my aging great-uncle around the hills surrounding my hometown; he was a physician who spoke with what we know as a southern accent. We would visit a good friend of his, a farmer, who was virtually unintelligible, his vowels swallowed and his consonants slurred. In the South (and elsewhere), a certain amount of ‘twang’ is seen as distinguished or charming; too much of it, on the other hand, signifies ignorance and obsolescence. When attitudes like this are instilled in children generationally, they are more than just individual views of speech—they are examples of social *ideologies* about speech, collective narratives about the way that people talk. As my childhood experience demonstrated, even today certain language users are cast in a light that is at best unflattering and at worst oppressive, strengthening harmful stereotypes based on gender, race, and class.

This thesis explores another time and place in which language was highly stereotyped, and when many modern stereotypes about language users originated: nineteenth-century Britain, specifically the Victorian era. It is useful to take a critical look at nineteenth-century linguistic ideologies because that era was a time of such profound change: the industrial revolution, the advent of new scientific fields, and a shift in class dynamics all made the already linguistically interesting Britain a case study in language change and ideology. What better way to study individual attitudes that contribute to a collective narrative than through literature? How authors

portray language users, and how authors portray the treatment of these speakers, exposes attitudes present in Victorian society. Critical analysis of literary texts reveals those attitudes and indicates how they encode historical and social tendencies of the time.

### **Philology**

In the late nineteenth century, the study of language as a science rose in popularity, spearheaded by academics who called themselves “philologists,” the equivalent of our modern-day linguists. The movement that galvanized scholars to compile words and their etymologies in works such as the Oxford English Dictionary, philology presented the beginning of the study of language as a science like psychology or biology. Max Müller, the first professor of Comparative Philology at Oxford, wrote that “in the science of language, languages are not treated as means; language itself becomes the sole object of inquiry .... We do not want to know languages, we want to know language” (qtd Crowley 14). It was this interest in language as a concept rather than in specific languages such as Spanish or Arabic that inspired scholars to study etymology, dialects, and phonology, all subjects included in the philological movement of the late nineteenth century.

Influential philologist Archbishop Richard Chenevix Trench, best known for his 1851 book *On the Study of Words*, a compilation of a series of lectures on philology, draws on the Emersonian idea of language as ‘fossil poetry’ to justify the study of etymology under philology. He claimed that in studying a single word, we might divine the past and the culture of the people who use it: “in other words, we are not to look for the poetry which a people may possess only in its poems, or its poetical customs, traditions, and beliefs. Many a single word also is itself a concentrated poem, having stores of poetical thought and imagery laid up in it” (8). Trench’s

research on the history of words was hugely influential, in part inspiring and even spearheading the publication of the OED throughout the second half of the nineteenth century. Alexander J. Ellis, another influential philologist, studied dialects specifically, and constructed one of the first dialect maps of England. His work has shaped the way that language is studied, providing a system to categorize sounds (in his terms, ‘glossic’ (*Dialects—Their Sounds and Homes* xii)) that is a prototype for today’s International Phonetic Alphabet. Ellis’s work on phonetics, phonology, and dialectology is a pillar on which the modern-day field of linguistics stands. Despite Müller’s assertion that language was the *sole* subject of inquiry, philologists also used the study of language to draw conclusions about society and history: Aarsleff writes that “[i]t is characteristic that Dr. Johnson, Sir William Jones, Friedrich Schlegel, Jacob Grimm, and N.F.S. Grundtvig [all early linguists; notable amongst these is Jacob Grimm of fairy-tale fame] all considered language study a means to an end rather than the end itself, though they differed somewhat in their conceptions of that end” (*The Study of Language in England 1780-1860* 5, qtd Crowley 15).

Throughout this work I will be making use of the word *dialect*. While I assume that the reader has at least some familiarity with the concept of dialects, it should be noted just how politically charged the distinction between dialect and language is. The definitions of the two are, in effect, the same: they are both speech constructs, shared amongst groups of people often separated by geographical, political, or social boundaries, intelligible within themselves, and often sharing features with other speech constructs. Whether we call one speech construct a dialect and one a language only reflects the political standing of those that use it, not any solid linguistic difference. Why are Spanish and Portuguese, two very similar languages, not considered dialects, while various dialects of, say, Italian that are not nearly as mutually intelligible are considered branches of the same language? The issue is further complicated by

creole and pidgin languages which are created through the contact of a variety of other languages (for example, French-based creoles, which are mainly comprised of archaic French combined with a multitude of other languages that French slaves, laborers, and colonists encountered). Because of the incredible amount that has been written and surely still remains to be written about the distinction between dialect and language, I will not try to create my own theory on this. Instead I will adopt the conventional (yet, in some ways, as we will see, problematic) nomenclature that views the nationalized British English as a language and the various ‘nonstandard’ regional speech forms that are latent throughout Britain as dialects, a distinction that was commonly espoused by nineteenth-century philologists.

The study of philology is important to this thesis because it provides a framework for understanding how authors viewed language in the Victorian age. Despite the fact that the field itself rose to popularity towards the end of the era, the attitudes towards speech that are showcased by philological academics are most likely similar to those of nineteenth-century novelists who showcase speech in their works, responding to phenomena that were in the forefront of public consciousness in the nineteenth century. Alexander J. Ellis, in his 1890 philological work *Dialects—Their Sounds and Homes*, comments that organically-formed dialects are difficult to discover and “rapidly disappearing” (2). Philologist Daniel Jones, in his 1917 *English Pronouncing Dictionary*, states:

The fact that the scope of this book has been limited to the speech of [the Southern English] does not mean that I consider their pronunciation intrinsically superior to any other. On the contrary, it is clear to me that if we consider this type of speech on its intrinsic merits (i.e. without regard to external considerations such as the social position of the persons who use it), it will be found in no way “better” than any other type. (ix)

The concerns and ideas that philologists bring to the table in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries are strikingly similar to the ideas that Victorian novelists espouse in their books even earlier than these scholars were writing, and, as we will see in this work, the strengths and deficiencies of the philologists are similar to those of Victorian novelists.

Something that philologists and novelists were simultaneously conscious of and prone to was *prescriptivism*. Prescriptivism prescribes rules, dictating strictly how language should be used; this is in opposition to descriptivism, the approach to language that allows for inconsistencies, more relaxed rules, and change in the way that speakers use language. As the English language continued to become more and more standardized over the course of the nineteenth century, English language institutions became more prescriptivist, enforcing the social supremacy of Standard English. In his 1857 book *On Some Deficiencies in our English Dictionary*, Archbishop Trench writes:

Let me observe here that *provincial* or *local* words stand on quite a different footing from *obsolete*. We do not complain of their omission. In my judgement we should, on the contrary, have a right to complain if they were admitted, and it is an oversight that some of our Dictionaries occasionally find room for them, in their avowed character of provincial words; when, *as such*, they have no right to a place in a Dictionary of the English tongue. (12)

Trench, therefore, thinks that “provincial” words, those that we see in nonstandard dialects, are not worthy of appearing in the dictionary, showing a penchant for prescriptivism. Despite the modern conception that more linguistic study allows for more accepting views of language, “no such shift from prescriptivism to descriptivism took place” (Crowley 13-14). As Aarsleff says, philologists “considered language study a means to an end rather than the end itself” (5, qtd

Crowley 15), and this “end” was to make the English language an exact practice, not one that is forgiving of eccentricities.

The study of philology turned language into a science and speakers into specimens. As Crowley writes, “The nineteenth century saw the appearance of a language about language, described wholly unselfconsciously by Müller as ‘the science of language’” (15). While the “language about language” that is philology began in the nineteenth century, there has always been another language about language since the first spoken word. Almost every language speaker talks about language in some capacity: “That sounded meaner than it needed to,” we might say. “That was bad grammar.” “He has a funny accent.” Every utterance carries with it social implications; how close participants in a conversation are, where they are from, how old they are—all of these are, depending on how versed you are in language about language, prominent, underlying forces at play in any conversation that you have, and we make comments about them constantly. This is what Asif Agha terms *metalinguistic activity*: “any act that typifies some aspect of language” (17-19), or any act that makes a statement about, stereotypes, or judges an aspect of language. He also calls this type of speech *reflexive* (16). For example, it would be linguistically reflexive for me to typify Agha’s description as academic. The idea of metalinguistics will be a basic tenet of this thesis as I analyze the narration and dialogue in Victorian novels. While philologists made language about language a study, authors had already been writing about speech for decades, and had been writing dialogue in which characters engage in metalinguistic activity.

The nineteenth century, both fiction and nonfiction, was especially linguistically reflexive, and so is this thesis. I will be engaging in *sociolinguistic* analysis of literature, a linguistic approach that is primarily concerned with the social factors of speech. This is, in



general, an underexplored dimension of literary criticism; in writing a novel, an author must make conscious choices about how their characters speak, how their characters speak about speech, and, just as we choose how to speak based on social implications, a novelist chooses how a character speaks based on factors in and outside of the scope of the novel—novelists, especially those who feature dialects in their novels, concern themselves with metalinguistics and sociolinguistics. Therefore, preceding the actual linguistic analysis of Victorian novels, it is necessary to provide a brief (if cursory) overview of the sociolinguistic factors at play in the nineteenth century and sociolinguistic concepts that underly the entirety of the history of the English language.

### **The Victorians and language**

The Victorian age saw England in a state of flux in a multitude of ways: industry was being rapidly mechanized; the railroad and other transportation breakthroughs were making travel easier and faster; faster transport, along with the steam-powered printing press, changed the way that literature was disseminated. In addition to advances in technology, education also greatly affected the language that people consumed and used; in 1870, a state-organized system of elementary education was established, contributing to a system of learning that taught children a ‘correct’ way of speaking. Due to vast shifts in technology and education, the English language and the way that it was used became heavily standardized within the span of a century.

Language change in the Victorian age was, in some ways, dependent on location and travel: to borrow a linguistic term, change can be *synchronic*. The development of travel systems and the newfound near-immediacy of communication (as compared to the snail-paced transportation of mail before the propagation of stagecoaches in the early nineteenth century)

made interlocution much easier than it once was. In *Dialects* (1890), Ellis writes that the disappearance of dialects is due to the “influence of railways (which allow of constant shifting of the population)” (2). Allowing more and more interaction and correspondence between peoples of different regions, along with easier movement of residence, railways presented a new opportunity to transfer language. New transport also eliminated the problem of non-Londoners not having accessible public education; in *Does Accent Matter? The Pygmalion Factor* (1989), John Honey states that boarding and public schools (‘public schools’ in this context being the British equivalent of American private schools) became, by the 1860s, places that parents could send their children to ‘protect’ them from the local dialect, and by the 1870s became the popular option for families that could afford to give their children a ‘proper’ education (25-6).

Language change was also, in large part, dependent on class. After all, the deciding factor of whether someone could afford to travel, to send a letter, or to educate their child at a public or boarding school was money. Ellis writes that a major factor in the standardization of English was “widely diffused primary education (which introduces as much as possible the system of received speech, and fights with dialect as its natural enemy)” (2). Past the standardization of English, this education also created a divide between those who had and had not, and portrayed them as those whose speech was commonly accepted or rejected. This incentivized the rising middle classes and nouveau riche to educate their children in the ‘standard’ mode of speech. Honey points out that the expectation of education, and through this education proper speech, meant that if children (mainly boys) did not go to a school that would impart standardized speech, they would have trouble in a prestigious university like Cambridge or Oxford, and then be at a disadvantage in jobs, the military, and general social security, thus creating the image of a ‘public school man’ who would speak properly (Honey 26). Ellis also points out that “domestic

service (which brings the children of dialect speakers, especially their daughters, who subsequently as mothers become the principal teachers of speech, into close connection with the educated classes, whose speech they naturally strive to imitate),” was also a contributor to the disappearance of dialects in the nineteenth century. Not only did this incentivize the domestic laborers to imitate ‘educated’ speech, but it also drove the upper classes to separate their children from those on the other side of the widening linguistic divide.

In addition to location and class, time was also a large contributor to language change; time-based language change is known as *diachronic*. With the advent of both travel- and class-based distinctions of speech, those who did not have access to, or did not take advantage of, the new advances in technology and education were seen as antiquated. This created yet another divide in English speakers: local to traveled, upper- to lower-class, and modern to archaic. ‘Correct’ speech, which Ellis states is subject to the “whim of fashion,” is opposed to ‘organic’ speech, which is “handed down from mother to child without any reference to books” (2). Language change created a divide amongst the British between those whose conception of language and its landscape was following the new Victorian era (mainly younger people) and those who were still rooted in old, pre-industrial revolution ways of thinking.

### **Speech in the nineteenth century**

One of the most important concepts to understand in the context of language change is *Standard English*. Standard English is a specific and consistently reinforced construct in the English language, especially in the nineteenth century. After the dialect of Southern England was disseminated throughout England in the form of printed material, and subsequently became the dialect that was held as the standard mode of speech, the hegemony of English society began to

consider Standard English as ‘correct.’ By definition, then, regional dialects were considered ‘nonstandard,’ or ‘incorrect.’ Agha writes that “In a common ideological view, Standard English is just ‘the language,’ the baseline against which all other facts of register differentiation are measured” (146).

The sociolinguistic idea of the ‘register’ and register differentiation is also a very important concept. A register, unlike a dialect or language, is a speech form driven by social structures that signifies the status of a speaker. For example, one can be versed in a legal register, and so they are not only aware of legal jargon but know when and how to use it in the context of legal proceedings. Other examples could include sports-announcer registers, skater registers, or, important for this thesis, formal registers. Agha states that registers are “cultural models of action,” that “hint at cultural models of speech” (145). Proficiency in various registers such as Standard English dictated (and continues to dictate) how much an individual can traverse society and how many people they could conceivably converse with; the register range that one might hold gives the individual “portable emblems of identity,” and differences in “register range” are often linked to asymmetries of power (Agha 146).

Another crucial way that speakers in the Victorian era displayed their “portable emblems of identity” is through *Received Pronunciation*. This term, coined by Daniel Jones in *English Pronouncing Dictionary* (1917), describes Received Pronunciation as “most usually heard in everyday speech in the families of Southern English persons whose men-folk have been educated at the great public boarding-schools. This pronunciation is also used by a considerable proportion of those who do not come from the South of England, but who have been educated at these schools” (viii). Received Pronunciation, commonly abbreviated as ‘RP’ and almost always capitalized, has become the accepted term for this mode of speech: Honey explains the specific

use of this term as an echo of “the rather old-fashioned sense of ‘received’ as meaning ‘generally accepted’ as in the terms ‘received opinion’ and ‘received wisdom’, especially by those who are qualified to know” (7). The difference between Standard English and RP is nuanced, and the terms are occasionally used interchangeably. In general, Standard English is considered a register and RP is considered a dialect; Agha defines a Standard Language as a “prestige register” while Honey defines RP as a “social dialect” (Agha 156, Honey 15).

To complicate matters further, we have the issue of *accent*. This is a particularly loaded term because of its amorphous nature; it is often used by laymen to describe many different types of speech—registers, dialects, speech affectations, or any other aspect of someone’s language that could set them apart. “Accent” is often to be avoided in favor of more specific, linguistically accurate alternatives, and the term will rarely be used in this thesis. However, it is important to visit briefly because it was important to Victorian novelists, and it continues to be important in the way that speech is talked about. Honey defines accent as “merely pronunciation, while dialect is this plus vocabulary, grammar, and idiom” (2); accent is, essentially, the phonology, or sound production in the context of language, which is only a small part of dialect. In novels and other writings, authors might make mention of accent. For the purpose of this thesis, an author’s use of the term ‘accent’ will take on virtually the same meaning as “dialect.”

With the basic nuances of dialect established, we can now evaluate how novelists in the Victorian era increasingly utilized what is known as *eye dialect* (Hodson & Broadhead 2013). Eye dialect is the term for an author’s visual representation of a character’s dialect. While this device is used thoroughly in English literature, it notably rose to popularity in the nineteenth century. Examples of this abound, from a character’s use of the nonstandard contraction ‘y’all’ to the visualization of pronunciation of words like ‘yard’ as ‘yahd.’ Jane Walpole states that “eye

dialect can be linguistically illogical, socially offensive, and yet dramatically indispensable” (Walpole 1974, 191). The use of eye dialect, as I will show throughout my analysis of literature, is often biased, and only speech perceived as nonstandard is rendered via eye dialect. As Walpole states:

If a character is at all socially acceptable, then—whether he be a Harvard professor or a Seattle car salesman—his dialogue, though having dictional variations, will be written with grammatical and orthographical correctness. But if the character is from an inferior social class, if he is of an ethnic minority, if he is foreign, rustic, or ill-educated, or if he is from a few choice locations... in other words, if he is in any way beyond the pale, his dialogue becomes branded as substandard by the use of colloquialisms, solecisms, and eye dialect. (193)

Eye dialect will be the main way that I will analyze the use of speech in Victorian novels; it is the most explicit use of dialect, and the way that an author renders nonstandard speech visually reveals what they consider to be nonstandard about that speech.

### **Novels Studied**

For this thesis, I have decided to analyze three Victorian novels that feature heavy use of dialect and special emphasis on the implications of speech: *The Heart of Midlothian* (1818) by Sir Walter Scott, *Wuthering Heights* (1847) by Emily Brontë, and *Tess of the D'Urbervilles* (1891) by Thomas Hardy. I have chosen these novels not only because they all showcase use of dialect, but also because the linguistic forces at work in one novel are different from that in another, comparable to the forces at work in the Victorian era. Over the course of the rest of this thesis, I will explain how each novel makes use of and contributes to sociolinguistic phenomena

present at the time of each novel's conception and how all of these novels are related to one another in their use of dialect.

First, I will analyze *The Heart of Midlothian*, one of the most famous of Scott's Waverley novels, and one that features both Scots and English speech. This novel is unique in the context of the novels studied here because it features interlocution between Scots speech, Standard English, and nonstandard English, and it stands out also because the speech and geography featured are outside of the English-centric scope of many Victorian novels. I also chose this novel because its depiction of language change is mainly geographic and *synchronic* through its depiction of Jeanie Deans's travels throughout Scotland and England.

Next I will look at Emily Brontë's *Wuthering Heights*, which features dialect mainly through the speech of Joseph, the servant of Wuthering Heights, and Hareton, a disadvantaged youth whose speech is improved as he is educated. The nonstandard speech in *Wuthering Heights* is mainly comprised of Yorkshire English, yet seems to take place outside of time and space in an insular rural setting. Not only will I focus on the eye dialect of Joseph and Hareton, and the implications of Hareton's class restoration narrative, but I will also shed light on the way that Brontë depicts speech registers, and how the classed implications of speech in *Wuthering Heights* reflect some of the sociological forces at work in the nineteenth century.

Finally, I will analyze Thomas Hardy's *Tess of the D'Urbervilles*. This novel's focus on the friction between generations and the loss of rurality, also noted by philologists at the time, makes language change an issue of time, a *diachronic* narrative. The emphasis that Hardy puts on different eras of English history and the way that he depicts speakers as representing these eras makes *Tess of the D'Urbervilles* ripe for analysis of the diachronic nature of language change. As we know, the major language changes in the Victorian era happened in the mid-to-

late nineteenth century, and these changes took place well before Hardy wrote *Tess of the D'Urbervilles*. The narrative, then, focuses on these changes and the ways that they have affected the people of Dorset.

All of the novels studied take on language and its implications, whether synchronic, class-based, or diachronic. These novels are all also written by authors who have a vested interest in the dialect of the people that they write about, whether they are from Scotland, Yorkshire, or Dorset, and these authors in some way take on the same issues that philologists were concerned with. This thesis will analyze just how the novels studied portray dialect speakers, the implications of these portrayals, and how the novels' use of language participates in Victorian sociolinguistic ideologies.

### ***The Heart of Midlothian***

I have written about the Victorians in England as students of linguistics and depictees of dialects, but the first prominent example of this kind of writing in the nineteenth century is not even English. Over the course of early nineteenth century, Sir Walter Scott anonymously published a series of so-called "Waverley Novels," works of historical fiction that take place almost exclusively in Scotland. These novels feature frequent and consistent use of eye dialect in their portrayals of the lives of Scots. Scott constantly depicts characters conversing in dialect, such as Peter Plumadas's statement that "An unco thing this, Mrs. Howden... to see the grit folk at Lunnon set their face against law and gospel, and le loose sic a reprobate as Porteous upon a peaceable town!" (*HoM* 37). *The Heart of Midlothian*, one of the most popular of the Waverley Novels, highlights interactions between speakers of Scots and speakers of Standard English, with



many metalinguistic comments about Jeanie Deans, her family's speech, and attitudes towards the Scots dialect in England.

The term *Scots* and its classification as dialect are both contentious: in their 2013 study, Jane Hodson and Alex Broadhead state that *Scots* is the accepted term for the variety of speech derived from Old English used in Lowland Scotland (317). However, *Scots* as an umbrella term is fraught, as there are many varieties of Scots in addition to Scottish Standard English, a variety of Standard English. Hodson and Broadhead write that “when modern commentators treat Scots as a discrete and indivisible entity, they invite the charge not only of imprecision but also of oversimplifying the language in a manner consistent with other, more overtly Anglocentric, representations” (317). In fact, Janet Sorensen refers to Scots as a language instead of a dialect, a distinction which, again, is mostly arbitrary. For the purposes of discussing *The Heart of Midlothian* in the same way that I discuss other novels studied, I will refer to Scots as a dialect, but it is important to keep in mind that Scots is politically and linguistically more distinct from Standard English than other English dialects, an issue that must come into play in analysis of Scott's writing in the context of language and Victorian authors.

In the beginning of this thesis, I mentioned that *The Heart of Midlothian* portrays language ideology as *geographic* and *synchronic*, basing differences in speech on locality. For example, Jeanie's travels bring her to Yorkshire, where Dick Ostler says, “I ha'd know'd a thing or twa i' ma day, mistress”: his speech is described by the narrator as being of Yorkshire “tone” (301). Just as Yorkshire English is alien to Jeanie, so Jeanie's Scots is alien to Londoners like Queen Caroline, who must ask for clarification multiple times during her conversation with Jeanie: “Some thinks it's the Kirk-session—that is—it's the—it's the cutty-stool, if your Ledyship pleases,” Jeanie says, to which the Queen simply replies, “The what?” (402-3). The

geographic differences between characters in *The Heart of Midlothian*, and the subsequent linguistic differences not only highlight the importance of locality to the residents of Edinburgh and the surrounding country, but also the great disparity between the Scottish people and their English rulers.

“I ken,” says a working-class woman in the beginning of the novel, “when we had a king, and a chancellor, and parliament men o’ our ain, we could aye peeble them wi’ stanes when they werena gude bairns—But naebody’s nails can reach the length o’ Lunnon” (38). This quote exemplifies much of the popular angst expressed over the national identity of Scotland at the time, an angst that is realized in the Porteous riots that open the narrative of *The Heart of Midlothian*, and an angst that Scott seems to believe can be soothed by linguistic exchange. One of the main conflicts in the novel is caused by a lack of communication—Effie refuses to speak about her out-of-wedlock affair, so she is charged with a crime she did not commit. Jeanie solves this problem by talking with the Queen. This exchange, more than just bringing Effie’s issue to one of the highest powers in Britain, brings Scots into conversation with Received Pronunciation. Sorensen claims that “Scots is a metonym for a particularly logocentric semiotic, and as such plays a central role in the unified Britain Scott was helping to shape—a historic reminder of the once interpersonal basis of rule” (65), the type of rule that allowed the people to “peeble” rulers “wi’ stanes”. By, in a way, reinstating this type of rule just for a moment, Jeanie bridges the disparity between Scots and English.

In this novel, much more than in the other two studied, there is a cultural gap to be bridged, one that Scott and his protagonists bridge through what Sorensen terms “oral Scots”: Scott “represents Scots as a primarily oral language” through “contraction and phonetic representation,” essentially what we have already established as eye dialect (65-6). Nobody’s

nails can reach the length of London, but the spoken word can through Jeanie Deans and her journey to attain pardon for her sister. Jeanie plays the role of conduit for speech and the Scottish identity encoded in dialect, carrying not only her story, but her home, values, and way of life to London. “Wad it no be better to tell me what I should say, an I could get it by heart?” Jeanie asks the Duke of Argyle. “Just speak as plainly and as boldly to this lady [the Queen], as you did to me the day before yesterday,” the Duke replies (*HoM* 391). Here, as he does elsewhere in the novel, the Duke implies that Jeanie’s use of oral Scots is more truthful or genuine than a rehearsed speech in the more formally coded Standard English.

Jeanie’s perceived innocence and simplicity are directly linked to her use of oral Scots. Every kindhearted person that Jeanie happens upon on her journey to London, be it Mr. Staunton, the Duke of Argyle, or the Queen herself, expresses that Jeanie’s way of conducting herself, which is not only Scottish but rustically so, endears her towards them; Queen Caroline cannot help but smile at Jeanie’s “broad northern accent,” and observes to the Duke that “The Scotch are a rigidly moral people” (*HoM* 401, 403). Sorensen claims that the endearing and trustworthy quality of Jeanie’s speech “represents an honest Scots people” (66), explaining the Duke of Argyle’s insistence that Jeanie show that she have a “Scots tongue” (*HoM* 380). “In associating Scots with an orality of intimacy and feelings,” Sorensen writes, “the text offers it as a mode of communication capable of overcoming the class, cultural, and spatial breaches inherent in the British national project” (66). This is also Jeanie Deans’s purpose in the larger scope of *The Heart of Midlothian* as a national Scottish work; as she bridges the gap between England and Scotland by using oral communication, she does so while holding steadfast to her identity as a Scot.

It is the spoken word which most displays the dialectal differences not only between Scots and Englishmen, but also between different Scots users themselves. For example, Jeanie Deans displays pronounced Scots usage in quotes such as, “May your Ledyship never hae sae weary a heart, that ye canna be sensible of the weariness of the limbs!” (403), while the university-educated Reuben Butler displays significantly less Scots speech: he says, “How do you connect your sister’s guilt, if guilt there be, which, I trust in God, may yet be disproved, with our engagement?” (122). Conversely, the wildly rural Madge Wildfire displays a considerable amount of nonstandard speech; “I will see ye gang up to Holborn Hill backward,” she says, “and a’ on the word of some silly loon that could never hae rapped to ye had ye drawn your knife across his weasand” (316). Out of all of the novels studied, *The Heart of Midlothian* unmistakably shows the most variation within nonstandard speech. This is most likely because Scott was the most familiar with the dialect he depicts, and so has a deep understanding of the nuances of Scots speech.

Variation of Scots in *The Heart of Midlothian*, however, makes our analysis of dialects in the novel more complicated than it might be for other novels, as different levels and varieties of Scots usage index different linguistic stereotypes, and evoke different metalinguistic reactions from the characters in the novel. As already shown, Jeanie’s speech often makes her seem more honest or innocent to others, linking her to a linguistic stereotype of rural purity that we will see later in the analysis of *Tess of the D’Urbervilles*. But unlike in *Tess* and other English Victorian novels, the multiplicity of dialects in *The Heart of Midlothian* means that there is no dialect-Standard binary in the novel, and so the stereotypes that Scott associates with Scots usage are variant, revealing his own prejudices towards certain speakers of Scots. These stereotypes can be explored by examining not only how intense the Scots usage is, but also through how that Scots

usage connects to the speaker's identity, how that usage is received by others, and in what social context that usage appears.

Madge Wildfire, for example, is regularly labeled as a 'madwoman', and ultimately meets her demise at the hands of the English, all because of her archaic and erratic way of speech and thinking, both of which can be tied to her heavy use of Scots. When she is being questioned by Sharpitlaw, Madge "made no answer, unless the question may seem connected with the snatch of a song with which she indulged the embarrassed investigator" (175). In a novel that so often pines for "auld lang syne" (*HoM* 408), Madge and her mother are representations of the oldest times, those of paganism and lawlessness. We see this association in the English Cumbrians' persecution of Madge and her mother: "Shame the country should be harried wi' Scotch witches and Scotch bitches this gate—but I say hang and drown," one of them says (428). This scene, which precedes Madge's death, sees her once more reciting Scots poetry, first a "solemn, affecting" strain, then one "wilder, less monotonous, and less regular," both of them religious and centered around death (*HoM* 432-4).

Madge Wildfire is made out by the "sane" characters in *The Heart of Midlothian* to be untrustworthy, and her "insanity," which is supposedly caused by grief at the loss of a child, manifests itself through her repeated, manic recitations of old Scots songs and poems. It is worth asking how much of the alienation that her speech causes is due to her insanity, how much of it is due to archaism, and how much these two are conflated by those who perceive Madge's speech as alien. For example, when the procurator-fiscal calls Madge a "d—d Bess of Bedlam" and threatens to "take measures" with her that will "make her find her tongue" (175), he is responding to her frequently breaking into verse during their conversation. But in these interruptions, what is truly behind Madge's use of verse? Is it what others perceive as mental

instability, or is it a deep connection to the Scottish past? Scott makes it impossible to know this, as he portrays these verses as both—somehow, Madge is simultaneously an anachronistic ghost of old, pagan Scotland and a crazed, incoherent “madwoman” whose trauma has made her a tragic figure. In truth, these are one and the same; Madge is a relic of a bygone era in a Scotland that must not only keep up with the modernization of written communication, but also must make amends with being a part of a unified Britain. Madge is stranded in a time and nation in which she does not belong. This, not simply the loss of a child, is what creates in her and her mother a virulent angst, and what causes the breakdown in communication between her and the outside world, especially the inhabitants of England.

This explains why Effie does not go ‘mad’ in the same way when she supposedly loses her child: she eventually becomes more metropolitan, modernized, and English than anyone who remains in Scotland. Effie does suffer trauma similar to that of Madge, but copes with it in a different way: she instead becomes much quieter than she once was, and eventually abandons her Scots usage altogether, just as she abandons her Scottish citizenship. Her letter to Jeanie after moving to England demonstrates the “spelling and the diction that of a person who had been accustomed to read good composition, and mix in good society” (*HoM* 496). This letter, which is not only written in Standard English, but also written in a very formal register (“...such are the dangers that might arise from an intercepted letter, that I have hitherto forborne” (497)), signals the final corruption of Effie’s ties to her Scottish heritage. She does not code-switch at all in this letter and does not attempt to connect with Jeanie through any Scottish aphorisms. Effie’s letter is not oral communication, and so does not draw from the tradition of oral Scots. In Effie’s Anglicization she is a foil to Madge Wildfire in that Effie abandons her Scottish identity to find a

new life in London, while Madge's identity is so intensely Scottish that she meets her death across the English border.

Compare Madge Wildfire's use of verse with the Duke of Argyle's. Like Madge, the Duke references old, oral Scottish knowledge, but unlike Madge, the Duke does so accessibly, allowing Jeanie and the reader to understand why he is making these references. The fact that he only speaks in snippets of Scots is telling, as the majority of his speech is in Standard English and in a formal register, showing his desire to cater, even in conversation with Jeanie, to English gentry. "Why, kings are kittle cattle to shoe behind, as we say in the North," the Duke says to Jeanie (407). Notice that here—in fact, every time the Duke quotes a Scots aphorism or proverb—he qualifies it by stating that he is doing just that. This is distinctly unlike Madge, who never explains the purpose or the source of her references. Sorensen calls the "anglicized" Duke's references "folksy fragments of ballads and proverbs" compared to Madge's "nonsense language" (70). The difference between the Duke's use of verse and that of Madge is that the Duke sacrifices his Scots usage, and thereby his Scottish identity, to make his communication more friendly to non-Scots. The difference between the Duke's use of Standard English and Effie's assimilation to English speech is that he still retains the ability to manipulate his speech to appeal to Scottish audiences, namely Jeanie. While Effie's letter is extremely formal, causing Jeanie to perceive "a smothering degree of egotism" in her sister's communication (499), the Duke's standardized speech is tempered by his ability to switch between Scots and Standard English. "Did you wish to speak with me, bonny lass?" he asks Jeanie, "using the encouraging epithet which at once acknowledged the connection betwixt them as country-folk" (*HoM* 308).

Just as Madge is portrayed as archaic for her use of verse, David Deans is portrayed as outdated for his specific brand of religiosity. Scott often describes David as "Douce Davie

Deans,” whose “ideas are rigid” (*HoM* 97): this adjective, “douce,” is a Scots term meaning sober or prudent, often in an outdated way (OED). David is certainly sober; he insists on basing many of his decisions off of strict religious principles, citing his obscure Cameronian school of thought. Cameronianism, a radical subset of Presbyterian Covenanter dissention, is described by William McMillan as “extremist” and “isolated” (141). Covenanters subscribed to the National Covenants of 1581, 1590, 1596, and 1638, which affirmed the liturgical autonomy of the Scottish Presbyterian Church. The Cameronians emerged out of the Covenanter movement in the late seventeenth century, explicitly renouncing allegiance to Charles II as well as maintaining their commitment to the ecclesiastic practices of the early seventeenth century (“Covenanter”). Their numbers dwindled after the death of their leader, Reverend Richard Cameron, in 1680, and Cameronian “reliques” inhabiting the highlands, specifically Dumfries, were, by the time that *The Heart of Midlothian* takes place in the early eighteenth century, virtually nonexistent (“Cameronians” 332). Where they survived, they were relics of a by-gone era, clinging to outmoded forms of worship and strongly opposed to the Act of Union in 1707, which united England and Scotland under one monarch.

The Cameronians are a strangely neglected field of study, afforded little historical analysis and even less analysis in the context of *The Heart of Midlothian*. Part of the reason for this is because they were few in number and remarkably conservative, even in comparison to other Covenanters. Cameronianism was particular to the rural Scots and, to scholars at the time, was fairly inaccessible; a contributor to the 1820 issue of *Spirit of the English Magazines* describes Cameronians as “those reliques of stern enthusiastic Covenanters... those dwellers on the misty mountain tops,” stating that they inflict on themselves “controversial prayers and interminable sermons” (“The Cameronians” 331, 336). While opinion at the time seemed to hold



the Cameronians in high regard, even those that “entertain” them “with the greatest respect and reverence” seem to think of them as relics (“Cameronians” 331). By the time Scott was writing *The Heart of Midlothian*, the Cameronians were a people whose cause was lost to time.

Douce Davie Deans, then, the ever-resolute, pious-ad-absurdum, rural farmer, our Cameronian character in *The Heart of Midlothian*, is part of a movement which is outdated even in the setting of the novel, let alone when the novel was published. The depiction of David Deans was directly inspired by a writer who would have been his contemporary. One of David’s favorite sources of aphorisms is “his friend, Patrick Walker, the pedlar” (*HoM* 460), a Covenanter Scottish biographer in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. So much of David’s dialogue comes from Walker, in fact, that Graham Tulloch claims that “without Walker, Scott could not have conceived the character of Davie Deans as he stands” (151). Scott, then, did research in order to make David Deans’s Cameronian position believable and accurate, drawing inspiration and direct quotes from prominent Cameronian writers.

Scott’s depiction of David Deans as the image of a stereotypical Cameronian—religious, conservative, and rural—lines up perfectly with that of a nonstandard dialect speaker. In Irene Wiltshire’s words, a dialect speaker is “male, manual, non-conformist religious background, and, in spite of his Bible knowledge, resistant to book-learning” (“Speech in *Wuthering Heights*” 27). Who fits this better than David Deans? Through ultra-religious Cameronianism, Scott portrays David as a relic of Scotland’s past, one who is hostile both to England and a more progressive Scotland; he does the same through his depiction of David Deans as a Scots user. David says of Effie’s guilt:

But if a dollar, or a plack, or the nineteenth part of a boddle, wad save her open guilt and open shame frae open punishment, that purchase wad David Deans never make!—Na, na;

an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth, life for life, blood for blood—it's the law of man, and it's the law of God.—Leave me, sirs—leave me—I maun warstle wi' this trial in privacy and on my knees. (108-9)

David's unwillingness to comply with common sense and his unforgiving attitude to what he sees as transgressions against not only Scottish law but also against religious morals are in line with his Cameronian beliefs. It is also in line with the picture of old Scotland that we see Scott drawing in *The Heart of Midlothian*; just as Madge refuses to leave behind her archaic paganism and demonstrates this by quoting verse, David Deans refuses to change and demonstrates this by quoting scripture and obscure political writings.

Now compare David Deans's strict religious adherence and his use of Scots speech to Jeanie Deans's modest religious acceptance and the way that, much like her Scots speech, her Christianity serves to endear her to those that she encounters and casts her in a pure, nonthreatening light. "Though the waters may be alike," she says to Mr. Staunton, an English Rector, "yet, with your worship's leave, the blessing upon them may not be equal. It would have been in vain for Naaman, the Syrian leper to have bathed in Pharphar and Abana, rivers of Damascus, when it was only the waters of Jordan that were sanctified for the cure" (369). This appears in the context of a religious disagreement between Jeanie and the Rector, one which is quickly settled: the Rector says, "Well ... we will not enter upon the great debate betwixt our national churches at present. We must endeavor to satisfy you, that at least, amongst our errors, we preserve Christian charity, and a desire to assist our brethren" (369-70). This is a moment of agreement to disagree that would never happen for David Deans, but it is one that is still rooted in stereotype, one of the pure, humble, and agreeable maiden, and one that, as shown above, takes advantage of linguistic ideology. Within the small generational divide that separates Jeanie

and her father David there seems to lie the difference between an old, hostile Scotland and a new, negotiable Scotland, one that is not only accepting to other sects but is also compliant to the standards set by metropolitan Londoners rather than those set by rural Scotsmen.

Just like Madge and the Duke of Argyle, David and Jeanie Deans represent two sides of the same coin; they both make use of religion and philosophy, but in different ways and to different ends. David alienates—his dialogue shows a consistent underlying hostility towards other characters, even his own family—while Jeanie mediates—she beguiles and disarms the political and religious tension displayed in Britain. Scott even seems to create a dichotomy between what he sees as presentable and up-to-date dialect users and those who are embarrassing and outdated; in short, ‘good’ versus ‘bad’ dialect users. Jeanie is a ‘good’ dialect user; she is reluctant to speak in Scots, she allows herself to be filtered by the Duke of Argyle, and even when her dialect is unfiltered, it is relatively welcome to the English because it appears in the context of compliance and compromise. David is a ‘bad’ dialect user; he is stubborn, unfiltered, and rooted in both the time and place of the Scotland that he once defended as a Cameronian extremist. Here, as in the difference between Madge and the Duke, we see David’s old Scotland left behind in favor of Jeanie’s new, England-friendly Scotland. Sorensen also points out this difference, one between “English-friendly tokens of cultural difference—a difference reminiscent of England’s own past—and those untranslatable or dangerously-doubled markers of cultural difference and social antagonism” (70). Different Scots users in the novel foil each other in that one of each of these pairs is portrayed as canny or rational, while the other is portrayed as archaic and irrational. Madge Wildfire and the Duke of Argyle both reference Scottish aphorisms and verses to make their points, while David Deans and Jeanie Deans both adhere to scripture to justify their choices, yet the ideologies projected onto these users cast some in the role of the old

and stubborn Scot and others in the role of the new, mediating Scot. Here Scott is showing the death of the oral, superstitious way of life of Scottish people, in exchange for a new Scotland where interaction and collaboration with the English is a reality.

And so, in the context of mediation with England, we return to the synchronic nature of language in *The Heart of Midlothian* and Jeanie's movement around Britain, from Scotland to England and back to Scotland again. *The Heart of Midlothian* is full of references to the transport, by carriage or by foot, of people, letters, and by way of both of these, language. "The times have changed in nothing more... than in the rapid conveyance of intelligence and communication betwixt one part of Scotland and another," reads the first sentence of the novel (1). The prologue of *Heart of Midlothian*, as Joseph Rezek points out, begins with Peter Pattieson, "the invented editor of the manuscript we are purportedly reading," awaiting a printed publication arriving by stagecoach (904). This stagecoach crashes, and so instead of printed literature, the narrator receives the story of Jeanie Deans through oral storytelling. This establishes the continued motif of transport (characters walk, ride horses, and take coaches to convey information to each other) and the dichotomy of written and oral language, one of which indicates the arrival of a new way of life (which mainly happens after the events of *The Heart of Midlothian* unfold) and the other of which indicates a more rural, antiquated way of life.

The different types of transportation used by characters in *The Heart of Midlothian* are dependent on class and locale, showing how characters' means can affect how they communicate with each other, and how fast this communication reaches its destination. For example, David Deans in the beginning of the narrative has "struggled with poverty" (*HoM* 81), and sees the riding of horses as a privileged and even pretentious activity: he speaks of "flashy gentles, wi' lace on their skirts and swords at their tails, that were rather for riding on horseback to hell than

gauging barefooted to heaven” (85). The Deans family travels to and from Edinburgh on foot, and Jeanie sets out for London on foot, but the young Lord Dumbiedikes, in his plea for Jeanie’s hand in marriage, says that she “may ride to Lunnon in your ain coach, if ye like” (278). This exemplifies the class-based coercion that is common in many Victorian novels, and which takes place in all of the novels studied, when men of a class higher than that of the women they attempt to woo use their wealth to try to convince these women to marry them. Jeanie Deans, unlike women featured in many other Victorian novels, does not give into this coercion at any point, and does not make use of Dumbiedikes’s funds or transport, walking across the English border to carry her story.

Dumbiedikes is contrasted by the English rector Mr. Staunton in what each can offer to Jeanie—one has but a horse to offer (even though he promises to purchase Jeanie a coach), while another has an actual stagecoach. Dumbiedikes is a remnant of old Scottish hierarchy, a ‘laird’ whose house, comprised of only one room, is derelict (270). Staunton, instead, is a part of the clergy, whose “clerical mansion” is well-furnished, “large and commodious” (340).

Dumbiedikes speaks in thick Scots; “Ye auld limb of Satan,” he says to his housekeeper, Mrs. Balchristie, “wha the deil gies you commission to guide an honest man’s daughter that gate?” (275). Staunton, in contrast, says, “So you have brought the young woman here at last, Mr. Stubbs. I expected you some time since. You know I do not wish such persons to remain in custody a moment without some inquiry into their situation” (344). Here we can directly compare not only the way that the two address their servants, but also the dialect in which they do so: Dumbiedikes uses that of an antiquated Scotland, one where the gentry still use nonstandard speech, while Staunton speaks in a Standard English that is different than the Yorkshire English of those who live near him. Mr. Staunton affords a privilege to Jeanie that she

would not have been able to procure without him: a coach (*HoM* 367). This is a purer way of receiving transportation, as it is gifted to her by a clergyman on her merits and because of her perceived “innocence” (*HoM* 367) rather than as an incentive to marry, and it allows Jeanie to increase her steady pace to London, avoiding further pitfalls.

Her travel is important not only because it demonstrates the changing infrastructure of communication which is encroaching further and further into Scotland at the time of the novel, but also because it demonstrates what is necessary for the mediation between Scotland and England that Jeanie represents. Mediation requires privilege; Jeanie’s trek to London and her journey to her new home in Scotland are both aided by the Duke’s stagecoach. Neither journey would have been remotely feasible on foot, the only mode of transportation Jeanie would have had on her own. Mediation also requires compromise; Jeanie’s speech is managed by the Duke, who decides when and to whom Jeanie should showcase her dialect, and who feels the need to translate some of Jeanie’s speech to the Queen.

Rezek compares the way that Jeanie travels to London to the way that one of Scott’s novels might travel to London, claiming that “Scott uses the centripetal plot of *The Heart of Midlothian* to encode the nineteenth-century project of sending stories to England” (903). Jeanie Deans and the story she carries are essentially, then, analogous to one of Scott’s novels—she is reviewed, edited, and emended by those around her, eventually reaching English ears (Rezek 903-5). Jeanie as a Scott novel is not as radical as David Deans, who is himself a stand-in for Patrick Walker. Jeanie as a Scott novel is more cogent than Madge, who is herself a stand-in for fragmented and opaque Scottish verse. Therefore, Jeanie as a Scott novel is a vision for a new Scottish literature, one that Scott himself heads at the beginning of the nineteenth century.

In fact, Hodson and Broadhead show that Scottish literature began representing dialects earlier and more consistently than London English, Regional English, Welsh, or Irish literature in the early nineteenth century (322). “It was Scots that led the way for development of dialect representation within British Fiction,” they state (328); “What Scott and his contemporaries were to accomplish from 1814 onwards was the integration of Scots speakers into British fiction and an exploration of the possibilities this afforded” (323). What we must ask, however, is at what cost Scott forged this new Scottish-English mediated literature. The old Scots speakers, the archaic, antiquated users of Scots dialect, are flattened into linguistic stereotype, as are new Scots speakers. While there is nuance in degree of dialect in that some characters speak thick Scots, some speak thin, and some code-switch (the practice of changing speech patterns to fit context and audience), there is little nuance in the way that Scott puts the new and the old at odds—Scotland must adhere to the new, English modes of transportation, governing, and communication, or be left in the annals of history. Scott leaves room enough for proud Scottish identity, but the possibility of a Scottish identity that does not fit into a new, mediated British national identity is no more.

### **Wuthering Heights**

“I have just read over *Wuthering Heights* and, for the first time, have obtained a clear sense of what are termed (and, perhaps, really are) its faults,” writes Charlotte Brontë in her preface to the second edition of *Wuthering Heights*, printed in 1850 (ixx). “[I] have gained a definite notion of how it appears to other people... to whom the inhabitants, the customs, the natural characteristics of the outlying hills and hamlets in the West-riding of Yorkshire are things alien and unfamiliar” (ixx). As we move South from Scotland and forward in time from Scott’s

novel, we find *Wuthering Heights* at a crux of the nineteenth century, the midpoint between a pre-industrial revolution 1800 and a heavily industrialized 1900, two points that are almost alien from each other. Instead of taking on rapid industrialization, however, Brontë's work takes place outside of any metropolitan area, in the Haworth region of Yorkshire.

The second edition of *Wuthering Heights* was printed after Emily Brontë's death and was edited by her sister Charlotte, who made emendations to what she calls the "rough, strong utterance, the harshly manifested passions, the unbridled aversions, and headlong partialities of unlettered moorland hinds and rugged moorland squires" (ixx-xx). Irene Wiltshire claims that the changes made by Charlotte were "not only limited, but inconsistent," only affecting the phonology of Joseph's speech (25). Analysis of Charlotte's act of emendation is important in two ways: it reveals her idea of *how much* dialect should be included in a novel, and it shows how fraught and difficult the process of including and editing eye dialect could be. The act of emendation also raises questions about the initial depiction of Joseph's heavy dialect and the importance of accuracy in both the first and second editions of the book. Is Emily attempting to faithfully and accurately represent Joseph's regional dialect? If so, then what part does this representation of dialect play in the novel?

As always, we must first look at *who* is speaking dialect in the novel. The overwhelming majority of nonstandard speech in *Wuthering Heights* is derived from a rural English dialect which we can assume is meant to be specifically from Haworth, Yorkshire, as this is where Emily Brontë lived while she wrote the novel, where she "secluded" herself (C. Brontë xxi). The only character that consistently uses this dialect is Joseph; "There's nobbut t' missis; and shoo'll not oppen 't an ye mak' yer flaysome dins till neeght," is one of the first sentences we hear from him, demonstrating just how alien the Haworth dialect can be (*WH* 10). There are other examples



of nonstandard dialect, namely Hareton's "frightful Yorkshire pronunciation" (*WH* 215) and the speech of characters such as Zillah, who says "Wisht, wisht; you mun'n't go on so. Come in, and I'll cure that: there now, hold ye still" (*WH* 18). However, Hareton's dialect noticeably changes and effectively disappears by the end of the novel, and other occurrences of nonstandard speech either appear in the dialogue of minor characters or are light enough (e.g. contain few enough markers of specific regional dialect) that they are not recognizable as the Haworth dialect.

Joseph's consistent presence in the novel and his continued use of Haworth dialect make him the basis of most analysis of speech in *Wuthering Heights*, such as K. M. Petyt's book *Emily Brontë and the Haworth Dialect*. This exhaustive linguistic analysis of Emily Brontë's transcription of dialect speech asks whether Joseph's speech is simply that of a "stage Yorkshireman' with a scattering of some of the grosser features associated with North Country speech," or if Brontë actually works to record the Haworth dialect (i). Petyt finds that the latter is true, based on his knowledge of Yorkshire dialects and his research in other, less in-depth analyses of *Wuthering Heights* (Petyt i). It is important to keep in mind, however, that this dialect speech is limited mainly to the dialogue of Joseph, who fits into a broader archetype of dialect users who, like Scott's David Deans, are "male, manual, non-conformist religious background, and, in spite of his Bible knowledge, resistant to book-learning" (Wiltshire 27).

The restriction of nonstandard dialect speech largely to just Joseph demonstrates a common phenomenon in Victorian novels that confines instances of faithful regional dialect to the speech of one or two provincial characters, rendering it a way of speech (and a way of thinking) that is confined to the margins, implied to be alien to the reader. Regional dialect is associated with those "resistant to book-learning," whom a Southern reader might see on holiday in Yorkshire or that Emily Brontë might observe on her rare forays outside to go to church or

walk amongst the hills, during which she would rarely even experience an interaction with the peasantry.

Though her feeling for the people round was benevolent, intercourse with them she never sought; nor, with very few exceptions, ever experienced. And yet she knew them: knew their ways, their language, their family histories; she could hear of them with interest, and talk of them with detail, minute, graphic, and accurate; but *with* them, she rarely exchanged a word. (C. Brontë xxi)

Brontë knew these people by observing them, but not by interacting with them, and reflected this in her dialect representation. In essence, Joseph's speech is an example of Haworth dialect of the kind that was collected in dialectal "specimens" in the early nineteenth century. For example, one could find booklets such as "Specimens of the Yorkshire Dialect: To which is added a glossary Of such of the Yorkshire Words, as are Likely not to be understood By those unacquainted with the Dialect," a collection of dialogues, eclogues, and dialect poems that showcased the speech of residents of Yorkshire at the time. These specimens, printed in 1818, feature dialect speech demonstrated through unconventional spelling, much like that used in novels at the time to portray regional dialects, often with a short introduction written in Standard English. In one, Gulwell, a "London Register-Office Keeper" who uses Standard English, speaks to Margery Moorpot, a "Country Servant Girl" (3-8); Margery comes to Gulwell "te ax an ye've sped about t' woman sarvant, 'at ye advertahs'd for" (3). Much like Margery, Joseph is a version of a "country servant" who speaks a quintessential regional dialect, one to be studied and represented on the page.

Despite the fact that Joseph is the only consistent speaker of nonstandard dialect, his dialogue is not the only place that we see speech valorization at play in *Wuthering Heights*. In

fact, the speech of other characters also reveals some of the sociolinguistic forces in English society in the nineteenth century. We see, for example, the ever-shifting oddity that is Heathcliff's speech, commented on by narrators of the novel but never rendered to eye dialect like that of Joseph. We see the transformation of Hareton's speech from 'rough' to standard and the difference in Brontë's attention to detail in Joseph's Haworth dialect as opposed to Hareton's nonstandard dialect. Finally, we see how speech registers index status even within Standard English, showing how two characters who both technically speak Standard English still manifest hierarchical differences through valorized utterances and signs.

Ferguson points out that Joseph's dialect is rendered on the page yet Heathcliff's "gibberish" when he is first introduced as a child and his "foreign" tone when he returns after Catherine's wedding are not (Ferguson 6; *WH* 37, 92). This could be seen as an attempt to muddy Heathcliff's identity and obscure where he was before his reappearance—the reader cannot see *how* his tone is foreign. More likely, however, is that Heathcliff, for the majority of the novel, makes a concerted effort to subvert the class-coded facets of his appearance and manners for which he is judged, and so there is no specific way to render his tone. "I wish I had light hair and a fair skin," Heathcliff says to Nelly Dean, "and was dressed and behaved as well, and had a chance of being as rich as he will be" (*WH* 56). Because of his desire for higher status, and the means to encode this status, Heathcliff intentionally uses relatively standard speech for most of the novel, speech that does not need to be rendered in any eye dialect by the author, as opposed to that of Joseph or Hareton whose phonetics, grammar, and lexicon are distinct enough to warrant that visualization.

Heathcliff's (and, later in the novel, Hareton's) desire to dress and behave "well," and so embody the attractive qualities he believes Catherine sees in Linton, drives a narrative not

uncommon in Victorian and post-Victorian literature. In these narratives, such as that seen in Dickens's *Great Expectations* (1861) or Shaw's "Pygmalion" (1913), characters deliberately alter their manners to occupy a more gentrified status that, in a rigid class system, would not be willingly given them otherwise. "Pygmalion" is particularly notable in this realm of social commentary, as Shaw himself was interested in philological scholarship at the time and corresponded with early linguists. Much of this correspondence consists of general research on areas such as spelling reform, a facet of early linguistic theory that proposed an overhaul of the English spelling system (found in documents such as *The Journal ov Orthoepeï & Orthographi* (*Shaw Papers* XLVI, ff 8-19)). Some of Shaw's correspondence, however, sheds light on sociolinguistics at the time. Despite the fact that these correspondences took place in the early twentieth century, Shaw uses the same linguistic narratives and devices as nineteenth-century authors, and we can use primary sources such as his correspondence to analyze what overarching cultural narratives about sociolinguistics might have been at the time. In a 1911 letter to Shaw, philologist Henry Sweet writes:

It takes these poor devils [nonstandard speakers] ten years of precarious intercourse with the professional and upper middle classes before they become presentable, and even then they betray themselves repeatedly. Most of them know this as well a man can know a thing without being able to remedy it; and they would sell their sould[sic] for a book that would teach them to speak in a high class manner. (*Shaw Papers* XLII)

Writing about the viability of a concept that would eventually become "Pygmalion," Sweet captures an individualistic drive towards class mobility which Brontë seems to be drawing on as she writes *Wuthering Heights*. Despite the fact that he does occasionally "betray" himself through his amorphous "foreign tone," Heathcliff's lack of specific nonstandard dialect, at least

as far as the reader can tell, shows a quick linguistic adaptability, or at least an ability to subvert linguistic stereotypes.

It is the subversion of class stereotypes in Heathcliff's speech that Ferguson uses as evidence for her theory that speech in *Wuthering Heights* is ficto-linguistic, meaning outside of actual speech conventions, rather than sociolinguistic (6). Hareton's narrative, however, is explicitly sociolinguistic and rarely mentioned in Ferguson's analysis: the dialogue and narration surrounding him is the most linguistically reflexive in the entire book. Joseph's speech is rarely, if ever, directly commented on by characters, perhaps because he fits the image that one would expect of a provincial servant at the time, and his steadfast presence normalizes his speech so that it is less remarkable in the daily life of *Wuthering Heights*'s residents. Hareton, however, does not enjoy the same normalization, and the social implications of his speech and manners seem to always be of note to the people around him. Even in the beginning of the novel, Lockwood notes the disparity between the way Hareton's "dress and speech were both rude" and the way that "his bearing was free, almost haughty, and he showed none of a domestic's assiduity in attending the lady of the house" (*WH* 12). This quote is notable not only in the valorization that Lockwood puts on Hareton's speech and appearance, but also because of the frustration that Hareton's "rude" qualities give Lockwood in context of his more upright "bearing," implying that these two cancel each other out. In his social contradictions Hareton is a foil to Heathcliff, in that the former seems to have an inherited position that should afford him standard speech and dress but does not, and the latter has acquired speech and dress that are seen as ill-fittingly upper class. As Wiltshire states, Hareton "succumbs to the kind of degradation that was intended for Heathcliff" (22).

The most decisive factor in Hareton's nonstandard speech, and his general "roughness," is a lack of education, which is withheld from him in childhood and afforded to him as an adult only through the young Cathy's help. Heathcliff, as part of his revenge against Hindley, forbids Hareton from being taught how to read or write. Hareton states, "I was told that the curate should have his——teeth dashed down his——throat, if he stepped over the threshold—Heathcliff had promised that!" (*WH* 110). Hareton's level of education throughout the narrative decides his level of nonstandard speech. Before he knows how to read or write, he says, "I known't: he pays dad back what he gies to me—he curses daddy for cursing me. He says I mun do as I will" (*WH* 110). Marked by phonetic (i.e. 'gies') and morphological ('known't', 'mun') qualities that regularly define Joseph's speech as nonstandard, Hareton's speech at this point in his life is recognizably akin to that of Joseph, if less markedly regional (Petyt 24, 33). Later in the narrative, Hareton even employs a marked syntax: "Where the devil is the use on't" (*WH* 215) has a nonstandard replacement of 'on' for 'of' that is unique to Joseph's speech (Petyt 38). However, after Hareton is discovered to have been stealing books to study for himself, his speech is notably more standard, yet still marked: "Take them! I never want to hear, or read, or think of them again!" (*WH* 291) he says of the books, lacking all of the nonstandard markers seen in his earlier speech. Yet he still is not without dialect; later he says, "I shall have naught to do wi' you and your mucky pride, and your damned mocking tricks" (*WH* 302), demonstrating lingering qualities of the dialectal speech that was prominent earlier in his life. Finally, during one of his last confrontations with Heathcliff, Hareton says "I've pulled up two or three bushes... but I'm going to set 'em again" (*WH* 308), showing almost no nonstandard speech at all.

The way Hareton's speech changes is "worthy of close consideration," writes Wiltshire (22), who also notes the standardization of his speech over the course of the narrative. More than

just the fact that the transformation of Hareton's speech demonstrates his class restoration, it is also notable that the dueling effects of education and provincial life on Hareton's speech mirror the perceived effect of both of these on children, specifically boys, in nineteenth century England. John Honey claims that, before widespread expansion and reform of English public schools in 1870, there was "no firm expectation of a standard accent among boys or masters," due to public schools' poor quality and the population's lack of access to them (24-5). As I have noted, the incentive to "protect" their children from local speech drove many upper-class parents (and those who strove to be upper-class) to send their children away from home, especially from the Yorkshire region (Honey 25). While, for the most part, this shift in schooling occurred after *Wuthering Heights* was written, the first half of the nineteenth century was already marked by the trend of sending children to boarding school: Honey states that "[g]entry families in the northern counties such as Yorkshire and County Durham were beginning to look to boarding schools in London or the Home Counties, specifically in order to 'correct' their children's accents" (23).

It is striking, then, that Heathcliff, in exacting his revenge upon Hareton by limiting his education and effectively making him a lower-class servant, reverses the boarding-school process, firmly rooting Hareton in Haworth and exposing him to Joseph's nonstandard dialect. Honey writes that middle-class families were preoccupied with the notion of their children's accents being "contaminated" because of proximity to servants (30); Joseph's heavy dialect, therefore, is most likely as much of an influence on Hareton's speech as is Hareton's lack of education. Hareton's speech resembles Joseph's before he learns to read and escapes the servant-class fate that Heathcliff set for him; Hareton's narrative fits into the real-world narrative of contaminated accents and 'literate' Standard English. Both of these aspects of *Wuthering Heights*

play into the sociolinguistic ideologies of Brontë's time, and therefore contradict Ferguson's idea that the novel follows ficto-linguistic rather than sociolinguistic lines. While Joseph is portrayed as morally good (or at least not evil) as compared to the non-dialectal and violent Heathcliff, Joseph is also portrayed as occupying a social position that is to be escaped, an escape only possible through facilitation from gentry in the form of educational materials. Joseph is an antiquated, less privileged form of Hareton, one who is a servant and therefore speaks the regional dialect but does not have the opportunities that a young middle- to upper-class adult in the mid-nineteenth century might have, opportunities to receive extra-regional education and have instilled in him the hegemonic ideas of a superior Standard English.

As stated above, however, Hareton's nonstandard speech is different from that of Joseph: in the conclusion to his linguistic analysis of *Wuthering Heights*, Petyt states that the other Brontë sisters' attempts at representing dialect speech are less accurate than those of Emily, and are more like Emily's depiction of Hareton's speech, "by no means as thorough-going and consistent a representation of dialect speech as we find in the words of old Joseph" (45). Hareton's less accurate dialect could simply be a result of its lack of intensity in comparison to Joseph's, causing Brontë to render into eye dialect fewer distinctively regional features in Hareton's dialogue. It could also be because Joseph is meant to be distinctly regional, a product of Haworth, and Hareton is meant to be classed without region, simply a product of his circumstances. While it is true that Hareton's speech, while less intense, shows some of the hallmarks of the Haworth dialect that are also found in Joseph's speech, those hallmarks are also found in *many* nonstandard dialects. Hareton's dialectal quirks could conceivably fit a character from Haworth, Dorset, or Eastern Kentucky, as long as the character is provincial and lower class (and even provinciality is not necessary to a portrayal like this; one of Dickens's



amorphously Cockney characters could certainly express the same dialect markers that Hareton does). In contrast, according to Petyt, Joseph's speech is accurate and unique to a Haworth dialect that could have existed in the nineteenth century and shows that Emily Brontë was a "surprisingly good" observer and recorder of the Haworth dialect (45).

Another important linguistic transformation in *Wuthering Heights* that is not always recognizable on the page occurs with Cathy's first return to Wuthering Heights from Thrushcross Grange. "Her manners much improved" while she was away, Nelly speculates; "instead of a wild, hatless little savage... there 'lighted from a handsome black pony a very dignified person" (*WH* 52). While no comment is made about her speech, the allusion to manners means that there could at least be some change to the *register* that Cathy uses, if not her dialect. Registers can be enacted through etiquette, seen in Cathy's improved manners, and through dress, seen in Cathy's new wardrobe. Registers are also often present in speech, shown via differences within a dialect or language. Agha gives the examples of polite language, informal speech, literary usage, and slang as ways to describe differences among speech forms which link to pragmatic effects such as social practices and the relationship of speaker to interlocutor (145). Cathy's social status and relationship to both Nelly and Heathcliff are clear in the new register that she performs upon her return from Thrushcross Grange, but there is no noticeable difference in the way that her speech is rendered, most likely because both before and after she is speaking Standard English or, more likely after she returns from the gentrified Thrushcross Grange, Received Pronunciation.

The Linton family performs the image of distinguished gentry: they live in relative opulence; Mr. Linton, followed by Edgar, is a magistrate, a gentrified position; and the family attempts to insulate themselves from those less dignified than themselves (*WH* 48, 50). It would follow, then, that they would speak with what is known as '*marked RP*' or '*U-RP*,' which is used

only by the upper class and is much more distinct than unmarked RP (Honey 38, 42); Honey states that historically this dialect is “associated not with the most highly educated but with those who are socially the most highly privileged” and allowed upper classes “to shelter behind a linguistic barrier that distinguishes them not only from the peasantry (who may in fact offer little competition or threat) but also from the rising middle classes and from the intelligentsia” (42). If the Lintons speak with U-RP, or at least some kind of social dialect, then surely they would use nonstandard words or pronunciations. But unlike Joseph or Hareton’s eye dialect, the speech of upper-class characters in *Wuthering Heights* does not showcase any representation of nonstandard speech through unique spelling. The closest that the reader gets to this is through Joseph’s teasing of Isabella Linton: “Mincing un’ munching,” he says to her, “How can I tell whet ye say?” (*WH* 136). This is still not a comment on dialect, rather on the formality of Isabella’s speech, which is indicative of Received Pronunciation, marked or otherwise. In fact, if written out on the page, marked RP might be easily misconstrued for a regional, even lower-class, dialect: ‘stones’ might be written ‘staines’, ‘cost’ might be written ‘cawst’, and ‘to’ might be written ‘ter’ (Honey 39-40).

The fact that upper-class speech, which might not even be standard, is not represented through eye dialect at all while provincial dialects are sheds light on an issue that underlies many texts that showcase dialect: why phonologically represent some dialects and not others? If it is the goal of the author to faithfully represent a regional dialect such as that from Haworth, then why is it not the author’s mission to faithfully represent all speech? Conventional English orthography is, of course, not directly representational of audible speech, and so using this conventional orthography for some dialogue and using unconventional orthography for other dialogue betrays an author’s concept of what is mainstream and what is not. Recall George

Bernard Shaw's interest in an overhauled spelling system that can be seen in *The Journal ov Orthoepeï & Orthographi*, which was sent to Shaw in the course of his research; the journal claims that "the spelling ov a grait meny ignorant personz is more correct than that ov hyly educated individualz" (f 9). Much like a Victorian author's dialect, reformed spelling demonstrates an attempt to use English letters to simply and directly represent the sounds of the language.

"There's nobbut t' missis; and shoo'll not oppen 't an ye mak' yer flaysome dins till neeght" (*WH* 10), the quote that I first used as an example of Joseph's consistent eye dialect, shows this. As Petyt explains at length, Emily Brontë uses existing English spelling conventions to represent Joseph's unconventional speech in a way that is as unambiguous as possible (7-8). Through a fairly consistent and accurate system of phonetic spellings, Brontë spells out the sounds of Haworth speech that are unfamiliar to a reader that is used to Standard English; however, unfamiliar speech is the *only* context in which Brontë uses eye dialect, and her use of phonetic spelling is inconsistent even within Joseph's speech. "It is obvious that Emily does not attempt to give some sort of phonetic transcription of all Joseph's speech," Petyt explains (7). For example, Brontë does not transcribe Joseph's 'patience' as 'payshunce', 'all' as 'orl', or 'minute' as 'minit' (7). Phonetic spelling, then, is only afforded to dialogue that would be unfamiliar or remarkable to Southern readers, but where it is applied, it is accurate to conventions of the Haworth dialect.

This returns us to the questions posed at the beginning of this section. We now know that Emily Brontë *was* attempting to faithfully and accurately represent Joseph's dialect, despite the fact that other characters' dialects are not as faithfully represented. How important, then, is it that Joseph's (or any character's) speech is legible to Southern readers, as Charlotte tried to achieve

by emending the dialogue in the second edition of *Wuthering Heights*? To the narrative of the novel, apparently, not much: Charlotte's emendations, limited and inconsistent, did not effectively make Joseph's dialect more legible in the first place (Wiltshire 25). In fact, in many cases, words which were changed based on phonology, e.g. 'goa' to 'go', were not even changed in every case of their occurrence (Wiltshire 25-26). The legibility of Joseph's dialogue is also not paramount to our analysis of dialect representation in *Wuthering Heights*; much like in the other novels studied, and much like many instances of applied sociolinguistics in the critical analysis of literature, it is not exactly *what* a person says, but the context in which their speech appears that is significant.

By focusing not only on Joseph's or Hareton's nonstandard dialect, but on the speech of all of the characters, the reflexive linguistics of how characters speak to and about each other, and the feelings that speech seems to evoke in the view of the author and reader, our analysis of the novel approaches one that is all-encompassing, taking more evidence and factors into account. It is through this analysis that we can survey many other elements of the novel: class hierarchy, gender politics, personal relationships, and other social structures are present in some way in most speech, as demonstrated through application of sociolinguistic theory (like Agha's speech registers) to literature. Even a surface-level understanding of sociolinguistic forces at work in *Wuthering Heights* reveals dynamics not only between characters but between actual groups of people at the time of the novel's publication, dynamics such as the drive to send children to boarding schools and the insulation of the upper classes from rising middle classes.

*Wuthering Heights*, despite being set in a place seemingly isolated from the normal goings-on of English society, demonstrates and subverts social dynamics in ways that can be refreshing to readers of Victorian literature, ways that Ferguson comments on in her analysis of

*Wuthering Heights*. Brontë plays with dialect, social norms, and extra-societal factors in a way that both comments on and seems to reject conventions of the Victorian era. However, in her depictions of speech and means of expression such as manners and dress, Brontë also takes advantage of the reader's understanding of the structure of the English hegemony at the time, signaling character traits and interpersonal dynamics through indexical cues. By working along these rigid social lines, she reinforces preconceived notions of regional dialect speakers, those who use Standard English, and the gentry who would conceivably use a high-class social dialect. Finally, as we see in most novels in the Victorian era and outside of it that make use of eye dialect, Brontë's *Wuthering Heights* makes a specimen out of the dialect speaker, an example to be studied and commented on by readers who hold Standard English as just that: standard.

### ***Tess of the D'Urbervilles***

Near the end of her life, Tess Durbeyfield, being pursued by authorities and accompanied by her beloved Angel Clare, lies down on the slab of stone that, millennia beforehand, had acted as the sacrificial slab of Stonehenge (*Tess* 504). She falls asleep, returning, for a moment, to a time "older than the D'Urbervilles" (502). This moment is particularly striking because of the way that Hardy returns the narrative to the Neolithic era, seemingly outside of the scope of the narrative that precedes this moment. Return to the primal past, however, is not anything abnormal for *Tess of the D'Urbervilles*. Despite being the most recent of the novels studied both in publication and in setting, *Tess* reaches further back in time than either *The Heart of Midlothian* or *Wuthering Heights*. The entire novel casts Tess, her family, and her fellow Wessex residents as relics of an old Dorset, one that is rooted in nature, purity, and a state of pre-metropolitan rurality that is gradually being erased by advances in technology and new social

order. The old Dorset to which Hardy attempts to return is rooted in speech and verse, making *Tess of the D'Urbervilles* rich for sociolinguistic analysis.

“All I know about our Dorset labourers I have gathered,” Hardy has said, “from living in the county as a child and from thoroughly knowing their dialect. You cannot get at the labourer otherwise. Dialect is the only pass-key to anything like intimacy” (“‘Hodge’ as I know him” 1). Hardy grew up in Dorset and interacted with the peasantry in “a county where old traditions still survived and local ballads were better known and more often sung than the latest London songs” (Baugner 8). However, despite Hardy’s claims of “thoroughly knowing” the Dorset laborers’ dialect (“‘Hodge’” 1), there is a lack of variation and nuance in Hardy’s depiction of the dialect. While not egregious, Hardy at points follows what Baugner calls his ‘literary heritage’ by using spellings that are common amongst authors using eye dialect: ‘feller,’ ‘picter,’ and ‘skellinton’ (the spelling of which also fluctuates to ‘skillenton’ and ‘skellington’ (Hirooka 26-7)) are all examples of Hardy’s eye dialect being beholden, to some extent, to traditional renderings of these words in eye dialect (Baugner 222). Hardy also, despite Tess’s extensive travel throughout Dorset and his description of the interregional differences within Dorset, fails to make clear the differences in speech of peoples from different districts of Dorset. Other than his initial claim of Tess’s “characteristic intonation of that dialect for this district being the voicing approximately rendered by the syllable UR” (22), Hardy never explains any of the actual speech differences throughout Dorset.

While it makes sense that in his writings Hardy would want to portray the oral tradition in which he was entrenched in his youth, he also falls into the common mistake of the Victorian novelist to flatten dialectal speech into one ‘nonstandard’ eye dialect. Unlike the common Victorian novelist, however, Hardy continued his study of Dorset’s oral past in his close

acquaintance with Dorset philologist and poet William Barnes, without whom “Hardy would never have dared to make Dorset, its peasants and their work, its ancient traditions and old-fashioned way of life, its every nook and cranny, the subject-matter of his books” (Baugner 9-10). The fact that this writer that Hardy so admired was a philologist could have informed Hardy’s close association between place, time, and speech.

Part of the reason that *Tess* has so much to offer to a study like mine is because it is so linguistically reflexive. Not only do characters consistently comment on others’ speech, such as Tess’s thought that men from Blackmoor Vale (a vale of the fictional ‘South Wessex,’ a stand-in for Hardy’s actual home of Dorset) “did not speak so nicely as the strange young man,” later revealed to be the educated Angel Clare, “had done” (*Tess* 27): as we have already seen, the author himself often gives in-depth details and comments on characters’ speech. In introducing Tess, one of the first details that Hardy gives is that “the dialect was on her tongue to some extent, despite the village school: the characteristic intonation of that dialect for this district being the voicing approximately rendered by the syllable UR, probably as rich an utterance as any to be found in human speech” (22). Comments like this are consistent throughout *Tess of the D’Urbervilles*, and they provide information on both dialect and ideologies concerning these dialects that is remarkably detailed for any novelist. If we look at the above quote, we see the perceived effect of education on speech (“despite the village school”), knowledge of the regionality of Tess’s speech (“characteristic intonation of that dialect for this district”), knowledge of the phonetics of Tess’s speech (“voicing approximately rendered by the syllable UR”), and Hardy’s characteristic belief in the supremacy of Dorset speech (“as rich an utterance as any to be found in human speech”). It is through passages like this one that we can see in

detail Hardy's knowledge of and passion for philology, and how philology shapes the narrative of *Tess of the D'Urbervilles*.

The knowledge and passion that Hardy shares with philologists, however, is also joined by some of the other baggage that characterized philology in the late nineteenth century. While he attempts to accurately depict Dorset speech and the attitudes that affect Dorset speakers, Hardy adopts the same approach that caused philologists, as I stated in my introduction, to turn speakers into specimens. He created a fictional Wessex that geographically coincided with the real-life regions of Dorset and Devon, complete with thinly-veiled counterparts to actual locales of Southwestern England. In fact, in the Bere Regis region of Dorset, assumedly the real-life equivalent of Hardy's Kingsbere, there is a (now-refurbished) church, the foundations of which date back to the twelfth century, a believable inspiration for the ruined church in which the Durbeyfield family shelter ("Bere Regis"). In creating a virtual Dorset in which he can let language change and ideologies play out in his own fiction, Hardy attempts to create Dorset English speakers who are simply based off of real rural laborers, idealized residents of his home whose narratives he can use to demonstrate the philological phenomena that he has studied through Barnes.

To see the linguistic ideas that Hardy puts into his works, then, it is important to study what Barnes thought about his own linguistic work. In the introduction to *Poems of Rural Life, in the Dorset Dialect*, Barnes states that the Dorset dialect is "purer and more regular than the dialect which is chosen as the national speech" (12). We certainly see some idea of 'purity' of dialectal speech in the writings of Walter Scott, whose protagonist Jeanie Deans uses 'honest' Scots to beguile all that she speaks to, but in Barnes's writings we see an extension of this—Barnes seems to espouse the Dorset dialect's supremacy over Standard English. Barnes's



understanding of the Dorset dialect as “more regular” than Standard English is important, and shows his philological background. He understands that each dialect has its own strict rules and grammar, and is able to subvert the ideology pervasive at the time (and throughout the history of the English language) that Standard English was a ‘pure’ way of speaking, and nonstandard dialects were ‘corrupted’. We see, then, that Barnes, like Scott, sees the speech that he portrays as legitimate, and not necessarily a subcategory or corruption of a nationalized Standard English.

Later in his dissertation, however, Barnes writes that his poetry is geared not towards “those who have had their lots cast in town-occupations of a highly civilized community” (36), but towards the “happy mind of the dairymaid with her cow,” the “innocent evening cheerfulness of the family circle on the stone floor,” and the “rustic brethren,” so that he might teach them how to “draw delight from rich but frequently overlooked sources of nature” (37). Barnes, here, is not one of these “rustic brethren,” but one who might teach them how to think or act in a way that they might be too ignorant to understand. Barnes even claims that “in the towns the poor commonly speak a mixed jargon, violating the canons of the pure dialects as well as those of English” (37), leading one to ask what the difference might be between the poor of the towns and the workers of the fields. In these quotes, Barnes demonstrates that, despite his love for the Dorset people, he still clings to the ideology of ‘civilized’ towns and ‘simple’ rural spaces, including the rustic simplicity of Dorset speech. Barnes, then, is not a scholar who advocates for a descriptivist, accepting view of nonstandard speech, and he does not seem to regard the Dorset laborers’ way of life as ‘civilized’; instead, he is one who is nostalgic for a romanticized Dorset, one that exists only in his lionized poems, and one that he thinks is an alternative to the current, uncivilized county, the towns of which are corrupting the ‘pure’ dialect that he portrays—the

actual Dorset people are those who are moving into the towns and corrupting the dialect, while the fictional Dorset people of Barnes's poetry are those retaining their pure speech.

The issue of 'purity' is one latent throughout Victorian portrayal of rurality and rural dialects, as we see in the honesty of Scots in *Heart of Midlothian*, but 'purity' seems to be brought to the forefront of both Barnes's discussion of dialect users and, even further, Hardy's portrayal of Tess in *Tess of the D'Urbervilles*. The novel's subtitle even labels Tess as "A Pure Woman Faithfully Presented." Tess's 'purities' in the novel are manifold: she is pure through her innocence in victimhood, Hardy's subversion of the sexist narrative of a fallen woman; she is pure through her honesty and integrity, as, for most of the novel, she maintains morality even at her own expense; and, most relevant to this thesis, she is pure through her use of dialect—while Tess does not always use Dorset English, her ability to speak in dialect characterizes her as pure.

The text of *Tess of the D'Urbervilles*, much like that of Barnes's poetry, approaches the Dorset laborer through their speech, using eye dialect to indicate when a character is part of the ranks of the "rustic brethren." From the first pages we see this delineation when Parson Tringham, whose speech is fairly standard, converses with Jack Durbeyfield, whose speech is marked by the Dorset dialect. "In short," the parson says, "there's hardly such another family in England." Durbeyfield replies to this with "Daze my eyes, and isn't there?... And how long hev this news about me been knowed, Pa'son Tringham?" (13). This first interaction between standard and nonstandard speakers showcases a dynamic present throughout much of the novel, a dynamic in which the presence of dialect indicates a less modernized way of life that is not explicitly stated.

What this first interaction lacks, however, is a nuance that Hardy usually includes in his writings that subverts the flattened stereotype of the dialect speaker. In this first chapter, Jack

Durbeyfield is an uneducated, slow member of the working class, an image of a Dorset laborer that is consistent with the ‘Hodge’ stereotype. “What had I better do about it, sir?” asks Jack about his newfound nobility; “Oh—nothing, nothing; except chasten yourself with the thought of ‘how the mighty have fallen,’” replies the Parson (15). The stereotype of the slow itinerant worker, defined by Hardy as “a degraded being of uncouth manner and aspect, stolid understanding, and snail-like movement” whose “speech is such a chaotic corruption of regular language that few persons of progressive aims consider it worthwhile to enquire what views, if any, of life, nature, or society, are conveyed in these utterances” (252), is one that he sees as overly-represented in the public consciousness, and one that is not truly representative of the Dorset laborer. Hodge was a laborer particular to the southern parts of England, specifically Dorset, “where wages were lower, the rural community more fragile and the social separation of employer and employee more complete” (Freeman 174). This harmful stereotype is one that Hardy obviously attempts to subvert in his sympathetic depictions of Dorset laborers in *Tess of the D’Urbervilles*, which makes his choice to portray Jack Durbeyfield as such a comical and unsympathetic character interesting—most likely setting up a stereotype of the Dorset working class that will then be subverted throughout the novel.

*Tess*, more than simply portraying dialect speakers, also comprehensively portrays the nuances of attitudes towards dialect speakers. For example, rapist-turned-preacher Alec D’Urberville asks Tess Durbeyfield, “How is it that you speak so fluently now? Who has taught you such good English?” “I have learnt things in my troubles,” Tess replies (397). This exchange demonstrates, first of all, Hardy’s understanding of just what “good English” means: an English that appeals to the gentrified, to the metropolitan, and to the oppressor. Tess eventually totally acquiesces to Alec’s vision of upper-class living in their lodging-house in Sandbourne, speaking

Standardized English (“I hate him now, because he told me a lie—that you would not come again!” she says, before finally using one dialect marker, “I didn’t care what he did wi’ me!” (485)) and wearing upper-class attire of a cashmere dressing gown with down frill (484). Here Tess is at her least natural and her most steeped in the trappings of modern society; she, instead of adhering to her Dorset upbringing, joins the ranks of those who speak “good English.”

To understand the weight of this transformation, it is important to first understand the weight that Hardy puts on localism and nature and how both of these relate to Tess’s title of “pure woman.” Throughout the novel the connection between nature and Dorset is obvious—rivers, flora, and livestock exemplify the beauty of the land in which Hardy sets his novels. We see this at its strongest in either Blackmoor Vale, a “fertile and sheltered tract of country, in which the fields are never brown and the springs never dry” (*Tess* 18), or at the Talbothays Dairy in Kingsbere, a “verdant plain” where “women whose chief companions are the forms and forces of outdoor Nature retain in their souls far more of the Pagan fantasy of their remote forefathers than of the systematized religion taught their race at a later date” (137, 139). In both of these places, as with other copses and refuges of nature throughout the novel, we see Dorset in an almost prehistoric state; descriptions of the landscape and environment are constantly underlying and interrupting the narrative, landscape and environment which originate before the boundaries of human memory (Padian 222). At Talbothays, in fact, Tess and Angel are “Adam and Eve” (172).

Tess, much like Dorset, is closely connected to the land, and often her happiness and health mirror the state of her environment (or vice-versa). In Trantridge, at the home of the oppressive D’Urbervilles, Tess notes that the newly-built lodge’s crimson bricks form “such a contrast with the evergreens of the lodge,” and that the “sylvan antiquity” of the woodlands lay

“outside the immediate boundaries of the estate” (50). This puts Tess at unease and confuses her, the newness of the edifices conflicting with her preconceptions of the D’Urbervilles as an old family. Similarly, in Flintcombe Ash, just as Tess nips her eyebrows and covers her face, the land is clipped and shorn, overworked by the tenant farmers there, “blown white and dusty” (359-61). And when Alec D’Urberville is tormenting Tess with his affections, the environment is the most oppressive and the least natural:

And the immense stack of straw where in the morning there had been nothing, appeared as the faeces of the same buzzing red glutton. From the west sky a wrathful shine—all that wild March could afford in the way of sunset—had burst forth after the cloudy day, flooding the tired and sickly faces of the threshers, and dyeing them with a coppery light, as also the garments of the women, which clung to them like dull flames. (424-5)

This is Tess at her lowest, and this low is shown through the hellish landscape. Somehow Tess has fallen from the Eden of Talbothays to the apocalypse of Flintcombe Ash, Genesis to Revelations.

We have now seen the extremes of Hardy’s depiction of landscape as time, beginning and end. There is much to be said, however, about what lies between the two points; Padian states that “historical legacy both enables and haunts the protagonist of this novel,” tying Tess inextricably to the movements of time on many levels of “temporal scale” (221-2). Just as Tess seems to, at points, inhabit the very beginning and very end of human existence, she also travels to time within human memory, most notably the Neolithic, which we have seen in her sacrifice at Stonehenge, the Norman invasion of the British isle, and the transition from Jacobean to Victorian that England is undergoing in front of her eyes. The varying ways that Hardy relates *Tess*’s narrative to different points in time is demonstrated through varying time-based,

*diachronic* changes in language, both generational differences and large-scale, centuries-spanning linguistic shifts.

In 1066 A.D., Norman invaders defeated Anglo-Saxon armies at the Battle of Hastings, beginning a drawn-out shift in culture and population. This shift, bringing in Norman-French aristocracy and oppressing Anglo-Saxon peasantry, has had immense effect on the ways that the British speak. It is hard to overstate the influence Norman French has had on the English language: small examples of this include the fact that “pork” is the cleaner, more aristocratic Norman answer to the Germanic “pig”, as is “beef” to “cow” and “poultry” to “fowl”. In fact, in many English etymologies, Francophonic roots coincide with high class, while the Germanic roots that the Angles, Saxons, and other German tribes brought to Britain are pushed to mundane or plebeian connotations. So, if we look at where the Durbeyfield, then D’Urberville, clan were from in the eleventh century or so, we can surmise that, just as Parson Tringham insists in the first chapter, Jack Durbeyfield’s ancestors were part of the Norman invasion (*Tess* 13).

Padian points out that the transformation from D’Urberville to Durbeyfield denotes the transition from “manor to meadow” (230). This is true, but the connotation of the two names carries much more weight than a difference between urban and rural. The two names also denote an invader-subaltern dynamic; the D’Urberville surname is aligned to the French through its explicit Norman ties and its French phonology, while Durbeyfield is not only anglicized, but aligned specifically with the Anglo-Saxons, as “field” is rooted in the Old Frisian (a Germanic tribe) “feld” (OED). This puts the D’Urbervilles and the Durbeyfields at direct odds and shows Hardy’s attention to the roles that both families play in the class struggle in England during the Victorian era. For instance, the “corruption” of “D’Urberville” to “Durbeyfield” and the subsequent claim by Simon Stoke to the D’Urberville name plays along the same lines that

access to a prestige register might, becoming a “sought-after commodity—even one that can be purchased for a price” (Agha 167). Like the Southern English that became Received Pronunciation, which was then purchased through schooling by gentry across the country, the D’Urberville name began with Tess’s ancestors but was eventually coopted by Alec’s. The D’Urberville-Durbeyfield relationship also shows the modern D’Urbervilles as invaders much like the Normans. Alec and his ilk plunder the land, build their own out-of-place edifices and, in the case of Alec D’Urberville, steal and rape the women. The only difference between these invaders and the original Normans is that the new invaders, the *nouveau riche*, use money and status as their weapons in the place of swords and spears, stagecoach drivers take the place of chevaliers, and Standard English takes place of Norman French.

Language change, while apparent in the Norman timeframe of *Tess* through change of surname, is much more explicit in Hardy’s Jacobean-Victorian timeframe:

Between the mother, with her fast-perishing lumber of superstitions, folk-lore, dialect, and orally transmitted ballads, and the daughter, with her trained National teachings and Standard knowledge under an infinitely Revised Code, there was a gap of two hundred years as ordinarily understood. When they were together the Jacobean and the Victorian ages were juxtaposed. (32)

The above quote distills the essence of many of the dialectal differences present in *Tess of the D’Urbervilles*. Throughout the novel, Tess seems to code-switch. “Had it anything to do with father’s making such a momment of himself in thik carriage this afternoon? Why did ‘er?” she asks her mother, showing a good amount of Dorset dialect (30). When she speaks to Alec soon afterward, though, she speaks in perfect Standard English: “But I did not think it would be like this. I came, sir to tell you that we are of the same family as you” (53). She easily traverses both

Dorset English and Standard English: as I quoted in the beginning of this thesis, Tess speaks “two languages,” one of her home in Dorset, and one of Standard English (30).

The two languages are not of old and new, something that Hardy seems to emphasize through the dialect of people of Tess’s age at Talbothays or Flintcombe Ash. Dialect in Victorian England, as in *Tess*, was somewhat more common amongst the older generations, but was also decided by class, regionality, education, and other factors. Instead, generation decided how proficient a person is in either of the languages: the younger people learned to speak the language of the metropolitan gentry, who were expanding into the countryside and imposing a standardized English onto schooling and print, both of which contributed to the younger generation’s use of Standard English. The Jacobean age, that of Shakespeare and the King James bible, did not have a spoken Standard English, instead having a looser standard written English; even members of the court in the sixteenth or seventeenth century such as Sir Walter Raleigh would speak in regional accents (Honey 3, 17). The Victorian age, however, as we well know, had a very standardized spoken English, one that English citizens were expected to use for fear of sounding uneducated or lower-class. Tess, genealogically Norman but Anglo-Saxon by name, also straddles the Jacobean and Victorian; she exemplifies the Victorian age in her modern schooling and, subsequently, standardized speech, but must also represent the Jacobean age. To the modernizing Alec she is a relic—his family has coopted the homes of bygone laborers not unlike Tess into chicken coops, houses “which had so much of their affection, had cost so much of their forefathers’ money, and had been in their possession for several generations before the D’Urbervilles came and built here” (*Tess* 76). She also suffers with the Jacobean in the industrialized Flintcombe Ash, a working-class village as “faded and thin” as Tess’s “fieldwoman” attire (*Tess* 360). Tess is connected to those who cannot help but speak Dorset



English, the unmodernized whose homes and labor are plundered by the industrial nouveau-riche, while still remaining modern in her ability to use Standard English when need be.

This being said, Hardy's actual depiction of the laborers in Flintcombe Ash is dialectically inconsistent. The dialogue of some Dorset characters occasionally lapses into Standard English or barely noticeable dialect. Concrete examples of this are hard to locate, as Hardy's eye dialect does not contain many phonological deviations like that of Scott or Brontë, instead favoring morphological, syntactic, and lexical features (Baugner 14). However, we can see lack of these other hallmarks in speech later in the novel, mainly when characters wax poetic, much like Marian does in Flintcombe Ash: "I should not have thought of him—never! And I loved him so! I didn't mind his having you. But this about Izz is too bad!" (375). Compare this to Marian's earlier dialogue: "Depend upon't, they keep just in front o't all the way from the North Star" (370). Horace Moule writes that Hardy's novels suffer from "an occasional tendency of the country folk... to express themselves in the language of the author's manner of thought, rather than in their own" (qtd. Baugner 2). While Hardy attempts to portray the fieldwomen with whom Tess works as outdated through dialect and manner, his representation of their speech sometimes lapses into modernity, narrative voice undermining Hardy's efforts to render certain laborers like Marian as exclusively speaking Dorset English.

It is the temporality of *Tess of the D'Urbervilles* that leads me to declare it as *historical* and *diachronic*, showing how language (and so much else) changes over time. Much like a philologist, Hardy attempts to show how language has changed, despite his shortcomings in examples such as that of Marian's inconsistent dialect. Of course, like Scott's Jeanie Deans, Tess traverses space and observes synchronic differences, how the "character and accent" of different people have "shades of difference, despite the amalgamating effects of a roundabout railway"

(*Tess* 102). There are also certainly class distinctions: Alec D'Urberville wields his status to coerce Tess, while the Durbeyfields are evicted from their home because of a rapidly expanding system of itinerant tenant labor. Yet Hardy frames all of these through the system of time and change: some regions are different than others, in part because of the rate at which they have become industrialized and altered by the nouveau riche, and there is violence between classes because of the newly-rich gentry like the D'Urbervilles spreading out from London into the countryside. In the novel Tess finds herself stuck between times; she is simultaneously a Norman D'Urberville in ancestry, yet an English Durbeyfield in subjugation; she is Jacobean in her rural, agricultural way of life, but Victorian in education and itinerancy. Tess's temporal unbelonging plays itself out in her speech; as I have shown, Tess is able to express herself in the language of an outdated Dorset and a modernized England, just as she is of aristocratic Francophone ancestry but by name belongs to Anglo-Saxon peasantry.

Hardy seems to go further than Scott or Brontë in portrayal of dialectal prejudice; while Scott attempts to legitimize Scots speech in relation to a nationalized English, and Brontë shows how a nonstandard dialect can be both a hindrance in society and an indicator of class and education (or lack thereof), Hardy shows not only the legitimacy of Dorset speech, but also the discrepancy between contemporary views of a dialect user like the Hodge stereotype and the actual life of a Dorset laborer. Despite Hardy's feeling that the Dorset dialect is somehow purer, richer, or more regular than Standard English, however, he does not seem to employ language as if he holds this belief. The most obvious example of this is the fact that all of the narration and much of the dialogue in the novel is written completely in Standard English. As I have also shown, sometimes even Dorset English seems to blend with Standard English, like in the case of Marian in Flintcombe Ash. Hardy is also partially beholden to traditional eye dialect of his

“literary heritage.” Finally, despite Hardy’s claim that there are varieties of speech throughout Wessex, he barely details any differences between the speech of Wessex’s various regions.

Hardy’s understanding of the Hodge, as partially detailed above, shows that to some extent he does avoid flattening the laborer into a stereotype and is conscious of the devices that contribute to this flattening. “Living on [in Dorset] for a few days the sojourner would become conscious of a new aspect in the life around him,” Hardy writes. “He would find that, without any objective change whatever, variety had taken the place of monotony; that the man who brought him home—the typical Hodge, as he conjectured—was somehow not typical of anyone but himself” (“Dorsetshire Labourer” 253). As I have shown, Hardy does understand at least some of the nuance that exists in identifying and portraying a dialect speaker; he takes care to make sure his fiction, like his hypothetical “sojourner,” lives closely amongst Dorset laborers. This, however, presents a problem rife throughout Victorian novels: the fiction is just that, a sojourner, something that does not *belong* to the people that it portrays.

Obviously, there is no perfect way to portray a dialect on the page, and a fiction novelist can only go so far into the speech of characters without making the prose dense and uninteresting. It is not these individual flaws in Hardy’s depiction of the Dorset dialect that places *Tess of the D’Urbervilles* among the literature of the Victorian era that others the dialect speaker. Instead, these are indicative of the fact that Hardy is not, contrary to what some scholars (including Hardy himself) might think, writing a novel about dialects, and is not an author who is the ally of the Dorset laborer against the encroaching forces of modernization. He knows the Dorset laborer, yes, and he knows the subtleties and dangers of stereotypical portrayals of rural laborers. But what he does in writing a novel about Tess Durbeyfield is show Wessex, not Dorset. He creates a slice of life of the fictional inhabitants of a fictional place, one that might

have the same speech and social structure as the Dorset of his time, but one created for a novel written in Standard English for readers of Standard English. *Tess of the D'Urbervilles*, like the other novels studied, is *about* a people, not *of* a people.

## Conclusion

In this thesis, I have analyzed three novels which were published at disparate points in the nineteenth century, feature heavy use of dialect, and put special emphasis on different aspects of language attitudes and language change. Scott's 1818 novel *The Heart of Midlothian* shows Jeanie Deans carrying her sister's story, and through it Scots, to London to converse with the Queen. Brontë's 1847 *Wuthering Heights* depicts not only the heavy, almost unintelligible dialect of Joseph, but also the narrative of Hareton's transformed speech and Cathy's gentrified register. Hardy's 1891 *Tess of the D'Urbervilles* depicts the titular Tess as a figure stuck between old and new, simultaneously Norman and Anglo-Saxon, Jacobean and Victorian, through linguistic characterization. All three of these novels use language as a narrative device, both through eye dialect and through the way that language speakers are described.

Through close reading, I have shown the different ways that the texts interact with sociolinguistic forces present in British society, including specific ways in which the sociolinguistic landscape of Britain shaped these novels. *The Heart of Midlothian* is characterized by Scott's attempt to come to terms with the union between Scotland and England by depicting a modern, mediating Scots at odds with an archaic, unyielding Scots. *Wuthering Heights* sees worries about the 'corruption' of children's language, as well as attitudes towards the 'standard' RP, playing out in the transformations of both Hareton and Cathy. *Tess of the D'Urbervilles* challenges linguistic stereotypes of rural laborers, depicting older dialects as more

pure than Standard English. *The Heart of Midlothian* is synchronic in its use of geography and regionality to differentiate speakers and dialects, *Wuthering Heights* relies on class-based differences in its narratives of transformation, and *Tess of the D'Urbervilles* is diachronic in its contrast of old and new.

While these novels are all unique in their depictions of language users and language change, I have also shown certain underlying similarities in the novels' use of dialect. All of the authors discussed, in some way wished to faithfully represent the dialect of a people amongst whom they lived. Each novel also contains a narrative of purity and corruption. There is the Scots speech of Jeanie Deans, whose honesty and integrity are tied into her straightforward use of dialect. Cathy's natural relationship with *Wuthering Heights* is corrupted by her gentrification at Thrushcross Grange, while Hareton's speech is purified through education, two contradictory narratives that both involve speech and performed class aesthetics. Tess's status as a "pure woman" is maintained through her proximity to the prehistoric Dorset, which is becoming corrupted by an invasion of industrial nouveau-riche.

In fact, in all three of these novels there is the narrative of a woman who goes away with a higher-class man (often a villainous one) and begins to display the phenomenology of the upper class, which is depicted as a kind of corruption. This happens when Tess gives in to Alec's proposal and moves to Sandbourne, as well as when Cathy returns from Thrushcross Grange as a well-mannered, cleanly lady. Jeanie Deans almost falls into the same situation when she is offered transportation by Dumbiedikes in return for her hand in marriage; instead, Effie is the one who becomes gentrified by a (vaguely evil) man, George Staunton, with whom she moves to London. This trope echoes the idea that the laborer class, or at least an idealized version of it, is

pure, and that acquiescing in modernized or metropolitan mores and speech patterns is a loss of that purity.

Standard English is another element that is in common amongst the novels studied. As I have mentioned numerous times above, the narration in each novel is completely written in Standard English, as it is for every popular novel in the Victorian age. There are plenty of examples of Victorian literature that were by and for dialect speakers: we see this in the poetry of William Barnes and in the dialect specimens that I have cited in this thesis. Other examples of dialect literature include short plays, short prose pieces, and even newspapers written entirely in dialect like *The Bowtun Luminary, un Tum Fowt Telegraph* (Shorrocks 91). However, as I have shown, this is not the type of representation present in the novels studied, or most Victorian literature. All three of the authors featured in this thesis, through the simple act of portraying dialect instead of employing dialect, distance the dialect speaker from the audience of these novels. The author, even if they mean to legitimize or bring closer to mainstream consciousness the dialect speaker and their way of life, instead make this speaker a specimen of rural, lower-class, outdated life. This does not bring the dialect speaker closer to the London reader, and only serves to reinforce structures that make these speakers the Other, characters from a novel about a faraway land, an uneducated class, or a forgotten time.

Because of the way that cultural structures such as art, literature, and science both influence and are influenced by more concrete structures like class and production, Victorian novels were not only informed by social politics of the nineteenth century, they in turn reinforced and, at times, challenged cultural ideologies. The attitudes expressed in these novels—the image of a ‘pure’ laborer, the idea that certain dialect speakers are archaic—originate from and cyclically reinforce broad cultural narratives that were prominent at the time. Authors indirectly

facilitate infantilization and dismissal of the rural dialect speaker, which is why collective organizations such as the National Agricultural Laborers Union fought to combat stereotypes of rural workers in the late nineteenth century (Freeman 172). The cyclical nature of ideology and its effect on the nonfictional populace of rural Britain, the majority of whom, at the time, were dialect speakers, is why it is so important to critically examine dialect representation in Victorian literature. The implications of this representation are pertinent not only to a retrospective analysis of Victorian society, but also to today's society.

If we return to the anecdote that began this thesis, we can see just how similar some of our modern linguistic ideologies are to those of Scott, Brontë, and Hardy. My great-uncle spoke a much thicker dialect than anybody my age, but a fairly understandable one, nonetheless. He was seen by the community as educated and well-traveled. His friend, who spoke with a heavy Appalachian dialect, was, even to my great-uncle, a relic tucked away in the hills of Tennessee, evidence of a bygone era. It is easy to think that we have progressed far since the Victorian era, but in many ways we cling to the same ideologies about standard and nonstandard language that essentially originated with the heavy standardization of the nineteenth century. Analysis of dialect representation in Victorian literature, then, is more than just an academic exercise; it could also allow us to reassess the ideologies present in today's culture.

## Works Cited

- Agha, Asif. *Language and Social Relations*. Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Barnes, William. *Poems of Rural Life, in the Dorset Dialect: With a Dissertation and Glossary*. J. R. Smith, London, 1844.
- Baugner, Ulla. *A Study on the use of Dialect in Thomas Hardy's Novels and Short Stories with Special Reference to Phonology and Vocabulary*. Stockholm University, 1972.
- "Bere Regis." *An Inventory of the Historical Monuments in Dorset, Volume 2, South east*. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1970. 11-22. *British History Online*. Web. 22 April 2020. <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/rchme/dorset/vol2/pp11-22>.
- Brontë, Charlotte. Introduction, *Wuthering Heights and Agnes Grey by Emily and Anne Brontë*. Edited by Charlotte Brontë. Smith, Elder and Co., London, 1850.
- Brontë, Emily. *Wuthering Heights*. 1847. Barnes & Noble, New York, NY, 2004.
- "The Cameronians." *Spirit of the English Magazines*, vol. 6, no. 9, 1820, pp. 331-337.
- "Covenanter." *A Dictionary of World History*. Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Crowley, Tony. *Standard English and the Politics of Language*. Faber and Faber, London, 1989.
- "Deuce, N.2." *Oxford English Dictionary*. Oxford University Press, 2020.
- Ellis, Alexander J. *English Dialects--their Sounds and Homes : Being an Abridgement of the Author's "Existing Phonology of English Dialects" which Forms Part 5 of His "Early English Pronunciation", with a Selection of the Examples Reduced to the Glossic Notation*. K. Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., London, 1890.
- Ferguson, Susan L. "Drawing Fictional Lines: Dialect and Narrative in the Victorian Novel." *Style*, vol. 32, no. 1, 1998, pp. 1-17.
- "Field, N.1." *Oxford English Dictionary*. Oxford University Press, 2020.
- Freeman, Mark. "The Agricultural Labourer and the 'Hodge' Stereotype, C. 1850-1914." *The Agricultural History Review*, vol. 49, no. 2, 2001, pp. 172-186. *JSTOR*, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40275725>.
- G. B. SHAW PAPERS. Vol. XLVI, ff. 257. 1852-1924. British Library Archives.
- Hardy, Thomas. "'Hodge'" as I Know Him." *Pall Mall Gazette*, 1892. *British Library Newspapers*; Gale.
- . "The Dorsetshire Labourer." *Longman's Magazine, 1882-1905*, vol. 2, no. 9, 1883, pp. 252-269. *British Periodicals, Periodicals Index Online*.
- . *Tess of the D'Urbervilles*. 1891. Transatlantic Press, Amersham, Bucks, UK, 2012.
- Hirooka, Hideo. *Thomas Hardy's use of Dialect*. Shinozaki Shorin, Tokyo, 1983.



- Hodson, Jane, and Alex Broadhead. "Developments in Literary Dialect Representation in British Fiction 1800–1836." *Language and Literature*, vol. 22, no. 4, 2013, pp. 315-332, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963947013497876>, doi:10.1177/0963947013497876.
- Honey, John. *Does Accent Matter? : The Pygmalion Factor*. Faber and Faber, London, 1989.
- Jones, Daniel. *An English Pronouncing Dictionary*. Edited by Walter Rippmann. J. M. Dent & Sons Ltd., London, 1917.
- McMillan, William. "The Covenanters After the Revolution of 1688." *Scottish Church History Society*, 1950, pp. 141-43.
- Padian, Kevin. "Evolution and Deep Time in Selected Works of Hardy." *The Ashgate Research Companion to Thomas Hardy*. Edited by Rosemarie Morgan. St Andrews University, UK, 2010, pp. 217-233.
- Petyt, K. M. *Emily Bronte and the Haworth Dialect : A Study of the Dialect Speech in 'Wuthering Heights'*. Yorkshire Dialect Society, Keighley, 1970.
- Rezek, Joseph. "Cooper and Scott in the Anglophone Literary Field: The Pioneers, the Heart of Mid-Lothian, and the Effects of Provinciality." *Elh*, vol. 78, no. 4, 2011, pp. 891-916.
- Scott, Walter. *The Heart of Midlothian*. 1818. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York, NY, 1963.
- Shorrocks, Graham. "Working-Class Literature in Working-Class Language: The North of England." *English Literature and the Other Languages*. Edited by Ton Hoenselaars and Marius Buning. Rodopi, Amsterdam, 1999.
- Sorensen, Janet. "'Strange Orthography and Singular Diction': Scott's use of Scots in *the Heart of Midlothian*." *English Literature and the Other Languages*. Edited by A. J. Hoenselaars and Marius Buning. Rodopi, Amsterdam, 1999.
- Specimens of the Yorkshire Dialect*. Hargrove and Son, Knaresborough, 1818.
- Sweet, Henry. Letter to George Bernard Shaw. *G. B. SHAW PAPERS*. Series I, Vol. XLII, ff. 229-245. 1911. British Library Archives.
- Trench, Richard C. *On some Deficiencies in our English Dictionaries*. John W. Parker and Son, London, 1857.
- . *The Study of Words*. New York: H. W. Bell, 1904.
- Walpole, Jane R. "Eye Dialect in Fictional Dialogue." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 25, no. 2, 1974, pp. 191-196. *JSTOR*, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/357177>, doi:10.2307/357177.
- Wiltshire, Irene. "Speech in *Wuthering Heights*: Joseph's Dialect and Charlotte's Emendations." *Brontë Studies*, vol. 30, no. 1, 2005, pp. 19-29.