NON-STANDARD DIALECT IN PERCY JANES' "HOUSE OF HATE"

Graham Shorrocks and Beverly Rodgers

In this study we examine Percy Janes' use of non-standard Newfoundland dialect in *House of Hate*.¹ All page references to the text are based on the edition published by McClelland and Stewart, Toronto, 1970.² Janes was born in 1922, and published *House of Hate*, his second novel, when he was forty-eight. Growing up in Corner Brook, he spoke non-standard dialect at home, and 90% of the dialect in the novel goes back to that time (Janes, personal communication).

*House of Hate* spans the lives of four generations of one family — that of Saul Stone — as remembered and interpreted by one of his sons, Juju, but concentrates essentially on two of those generations, namely Saul and his wife, Gertrude, on the one hand, and their six children, Henry, Hilda, Raymond, Crawford, Juju and Frederick, on the other. The narrator, Juju, describes how everyone within the Stone household suffers from the hatred that Saul seems to feel toward all around him, and the hostility toward himself that he generates in his own children. The novel is clearly autobiographical, and some have seen little more than autobiography in it. For instance, Cockburn remarked that *House of Hate* was little more than "[thiny and unimaginatively] disguised autobiographical fact" (115).

It is certainly true that Janes has admitted to an autobiographical element in *House of Hate*, but he has at the same time been most insistent that the work transcends mere autobiography (*Interview 1f*). In view, no doubt, of comments such as Cockburn's, Margaret Laurence spelled out the differences between fact and fiction:

Because this type of fiction is so frequently misunderstood and read mistakenly as a literal transcription of actual events, I think it should be made quite clear that this is not a separate area of fiction. As Janes himself has said (the quote appears on the dustjacket of the original edition), "I have added, subtracted, altered, arranged and invented." A novel based on a writer's experience is no less a work of true fiction than a novel which has nothing to do with the writer's own life. The art of
fiction lies in the ability to bring to life on the printed page a whole range of characters and events, and to explore meaningful and universal themes. In this sense it has nothing to do with simply recording the events of anyone's life. And, of course, if six members of a family set out and were equipped to forge a work of art out of their childhood's materials, we would get six quite different novels.

We are dealing, then, not with reality, but with realism. *House of Hate* is a work of art, with a number of themes, such as hatred, fear, escape, the “hunt for love” (320), and the effects of Newfoundland's confederation and industrialization upon individual and family experiences. There can be little doubt about the main theme; as Janes himself observed: “There is really only one major theme in *House of Hate* and that is . . . the destructive force of hate within a family” (*Interview 21f*). This focus on the family — the central unit in our society — gives *House of Hate* a universal significance, which is enhanced by the particularity and realism of its Newfoundland setting.

The realistic quality of the novel is effected in various ways. One is Janes' use of place-names. Another is the use of nicknames. Each of Saul's children is referred to by a nickname: Ank (Henry), Flinksy (Hilda), Racer (Raymond), Crawfie (Crawford), Juju (the narrator), and Fudge (Frederick). But the most important device that Janes uses to create the realism so essential to *House of Hate* is direct speech — direct speech that is vivid and spontaneous in its use of non-standard dialect. Indeed, the dialect is an integral part of the story. Before looking closely at this dialect and its functions, however, it is appropriate to remind ourselves of some of the difficulties that writers face when using literary dialect:

1. Ordinary orthography is incapable of representing dialect speech in an explicit fashion, so that the writer's choice of conventions to represent particular sounds is inevitably subjective.
2. The writer is usually not a linguist, and may well not have a technical understanding of the dialect.
3. The reader has to try to make sense — again subjectively — of what is imperfectly represented by the literary dialect.
4. Writers are influenced by other dialects of the language.
5. Writers must be careful to ensure that readers who are not particularly familiar with the dialect represented by their literary dialect can still understand their writing, otherwise they limit their readership very severely. The desire to obtain as wide a readership as possible can lead to stereotyping, if the writer simply provides “those features which are popularly thought of as being what makes [the] dialect [of a certain region] distinctive” (Hiscock 114).
6. Spelling traditions exist among dialect writers and authors who use literary dialect: these can result in a lack of mimetic precision, and in caricatures and stereotypes.
7. Publishers can influence either the particular orthographical conventions used or the amount of dialect in a work.
8. Literary authors, no matter how gifted, are not writing for linguists. One result of the above considerations is that authors use literary dialect in a sporadic way, suggesting dialect speech rather than seeking to represent it with mimetic exactitude. Literary authors
are usually concerned with dialect as a stylistic means, the importance of which outweighs that of mimetic precision, which anyhow is neither possible nor desirable. As we have indicated, however, there are the dangers of the caricature, the stereotype and unrepresentativeness lurking in the foregoing considerations. It also follows from these same difficulties associated with literary dialect that scholars should avail themselves of the tape-recorder and of the opportunity to work with contemporary writers. The insights gained may then be of some help in analyzing the literary dialect of writers from the past.

We believe that the chief functions of the dialect in *House of Hate* are as follows: (1) It provides a geographical, chronological and social setting for the novel that is highly realistic. (2) It is essential to the characterization of Saul Stone. (3) It reveals the characters of the other members of the Stone household—particularly how they relate psychologically to Saul and his “chilling” influence. (4) It helps to create vivid, spontaneous, highly realistic dialogue that gives the novel a decidedly dramatic quality at times.

There follows a brief sample of Janes’ literary dialect at the three linguistic levels of lexicon, grammar and phonology.

**LEXICON**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>barky tea</td>
<td>strong tea, probably unsweetened (narrator 23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brin bag</td>
<td>burlap sack (narrator 16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hangashore</td>
<td>slacker, one who shirks responsibility (Saul 23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>missis</td>
<td>term of respect for a mature woman (<em>Dictionary of Newfoundland English</em>, 330) (Saul 22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flounder</td>
<td>strike over the head and knock down (Gertrude 274)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hulderin’</td>
<td>smothering with affection, protecting, shielding (Saul 88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lanch out</td>
<td>give, pay out reluctantly [<em>launch out</em>] (Saul 47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'low</td>
<td>suppose [<em>from allow</em>] (Gertrude 61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moochin’</td>
<td>being idle, or playing truant from something (<em>Dictionary of Newfoundland English</em> 332) (Gertrude 178)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pony up</td>
<td>pay up, “cough up” (narrator 114)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>streeling</td>
<td>slouching along; walking aimlessly and slowly, dragging one’s feet (narrator 195)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
like a birch broom in the fits — extremely untidy, in a chaotic state [used of hair] (narrator 21)
saucy as blacks — very saucy [blacks = protestants] (Saul 88)
shocking — terribly (Gertrude 23)
wonderful — extremely (Gertrude 123)

GRAMMAR

In the system of personal pronouns, in the second person, you is singular and ye plural. The third person singular masculine has the old South-West of England unstressed objective form un.

Probably the most obvious feature of the verb is the generalized -s ending in the non-past tense (except with auxiliaries). Examples: you keeps, you makes, I hates (Gertrude 192); I wants me tea! (Ank 209).

A non-standard use of the progressive is evident in the imperatives: Don’t be bawlin’ (Gertrude 40, 78); Don’t be fussin’ (Gertrude 78).

PHONOLOGY

The convention ee represents dialectal /iː/ in breekin’ ‘breaking’ (115), discipleen ‘discipline’ (88), eece ‘ace’ (52) and mischeevious ‘mischievous’ (84), etc.

The spelling e represents /e/ in ketch ‘catch’ (103). ai represents [ɛ], an allophone of /ɛ/, in air ‘either’ (304).

/ɑː/ is represented by a in lanches ‘launches’ (47), and more particularly before /r/ in accardin’ ‘according’ (52), arder ‘order’ (134), drars ‘drawers’ (66), fortune ‘fortune’ (123), harse ‘horse’ (37), t’understarm ‘thunderstorm’ (41), etc. The spelling a represents a different value, around [ə], in fella ‘fellow’ (66) and yella ‘yellow’ (111). Here we are dealing with low variants of the phoneme /ə/.

The Newfoundland use of /ɔː/ corresponding to standard /ɔɪ/ is widely marked: b’y ‘boy’ (47), inj’y ‘enjoy’ (277), t’ilet ‘toilet’ (87); biled ‘boiled’ (37), jined ‘joined’ (97), pisoned ‘poisoned’ (179), etc. Note the use of two conventions, i and ’i, to represent the same phoneme in words which have the oi spelling in written Standard English. The diphthong /ai/ is represented by eye in eye-Talian ‘Italian’ (188) and Eye-neece ‘Eunice’ (124).

In geographical terms, the dialect used in House of Hate is a fairly generalized Newfoundland dialect. To attempt a very narrowly localized dialect would be to overtax both the reader and the orthography. That having been said, Janes does a great deal more than those authors who suggest a dialect by the merest handful of conventions; he gives us a reasonably strong impression of a variety of Newfoundland traditional vernacular, but without overfacing us. For instance, spellings such as t’ick ‘thick’ (131) and mudder ‘mother’ (71) suggest the [t] and [d], or [t] and [d] — for alveolar variants occur too, and postalveolar variants in the environment of /r/), in contrast to standard [θ] and [ð] respectively, that are typical of many Newfoundland dialects. The feature largely reflects the influence of Hiberno-English — so many of Newfoundland’s settlers having come from southern
Ireland. The vocabulary of the direct speech ranges, naturally enough, from words which are common to all varieties of English to words which are (more) distinctively Newfoundland. Examples of the latter are baywop ‘person from an outport’ (pejorative) (146), bread-and-lassie ‘bread and molasses’ (15), all hands ‘everyone’ (70), firk around ‘move quickly and aimlessly’ (157). Very considerable use is made of widely-known colloquialisms, vulgarisms and slang words and phrases: crap ‘garbage, meaningless talk’ (221), gob ‘mouth’ (37), mug ‘face’ (52), knock up ‘impregnate’ (31), and chum ‘close friend’ (57).

Saul and Gertrude did not, of course, come from Milltown (Corner Brook); they moved there at an age when their speech habits had been formed. Saul was born in Conception Bay, his family having come from Ireland. Gertrude came of a family that hailed from the English West Country. Born in Placentia Bay, she had later worked in St. John’s. Although it might be tempting to see a trace of her ancestry in her use of the old prefix a- before a past participle, we should note that Saul also uses this feature: “I’ve a hearrrd . . .’” (301). Similarly, the BE + after + present participle construction, which marks perfective aspect with recent time reference, is a feature of Hiberno-English that we might expect to find in Saul’s speech, but it also occurs in Gertrude’s: “‘How many times am I after tellin’ you?” (Gertrude, 37; Saul, 170). We might note also Gertrude’s use of the tag sure, e.g. “‘We was only havin’ a bit o’ fun, sure’” (78), and further her use of the dental stops [t, d] (or alveolar stops [t, d]) rather than the interdental fricatives [θ, δ]. Again these are features that we associate mostly with Hiberno-English, but which have become quite general in many Newfoundland dialects. Proximity to Saul might account for some changes in her speech, but, more importantly, we would think, Gertrude had spent her “most impressionable years” (17) in “the thick Irish atmosphere” (12) of St. John’s, where

The drawling, word-champing dialect that came to her naturally from dim origins in Somerset, with modifications added by the isolation and local conditions of Haystack, now became overlaid with the colonial Irish spoken by nearly everyone in St. John’s. (17)

Such mixing of dialects is in fact typical of what has gone on in places such as St. John’s and Corner Brook.

The novel spans the period 1892-1963. Newfoundland in 1892, when Saul was born, was, the narrator tells us, a barren and inhospitable place. The climate and conditions were harsh, and “bodily labour was the condition and law of his [Saul’s] existence” (11). The literary dialect reflects the speech of working people in the earlier part of the twentieth century. Saul and Gertrude speak a non-standard dialect, and so do their children. However, as time progresses,
material conditions improve and opportunities arise. Thus, the narrator, who avails himself of an extensive education, loses much of his local dialect — at least as far as his active repertoire is concerned. (The dialect remains a part of his passive repertoire.) The speech of Hilda, Racer, and Crawfie also changes somewhat, as their social position improves. With the next generation, the effects of education are apparent. When the narrator returns home, and visits his eldest brother, Ank, he notes:

The old pattern was repeated in almost every other detail, with no appreciable change in morals, manners, or even in speech on Ank and Mavis’ part, though later on I noticed that Ank’s better-educated children were veering away from the traditional *patois* of our class. (199)

This change brings us to the social functions of dialect: it is very much a marker of social class — of social and educational status. Saul, who is illiterate, Gertrude and all their children to begin with are clearly labelled as working-class people by their speech, although eventually the narrator’s speech changes as he pursues a higher education and leaves Milltown, and Hilda, Racer and Crawfie show signs of bidialectalism. Non-standard dialect use is indicative of group solidarity, of the degree of belonging to a group. Thus, when Juju returns home after confederation and finds himself involved in one of the family’s card-games, his speech is subjected to mockery by his siblings:

“*Pauusss,*” he [Ank] kept saying, imitating the way I pronounced the word “pass,” with a sarcastic grin and mocking inflection about as subtle as a fist in the face.

The others all laughed with various degrees of sympathy (on Ank’s side). (192)

They feel that “Juju is after gettin’ high notions” (192).

Hilda and Racer have become at least to some extent bidialectal, as time has passed and conditions have improved.11 Juju says of Racer:

I was amused at the way his careful realtor’s English was totally forgotten and our childhood *patois* rushed back into his mind when he was heated with whiskey and anger . . . (219)

It is, of course, usual for speech to vary with context. Similarly, Hilda shows signs of bidialectalism, and of a degree of upward social mobility, as she “corrects” her own speech: “I hope Rome and me . . . and I . . . won’t be like him and Mom when we gets old” (264).

While to the linguist a non-standard dialect is just as good as the standard form of a language — it is different from but not inferior to the standard — judgements of dialects within society at large are usually negative. The narrator seems to share the usual social attitudes toward dialect. For him dialect is the speech of a class (“the *patois* of our class” (199)); it is associated with the barren conditions, harsh life, poverty and “its Siamese twin ignorance” (319) of pre-confederation Newfoundland. It is also, inevitably, the speech of his father, of a family characterized
by emotional poverty and ignorance, from which he wishes to distance himself. Hence we read of “the drawling, word-champing dialect that came to her [Gertrude] naturally from dim origins in Somerset” (17), of the somewhat disparaging “patois of our class” (199), and of “the gobbled syntax of unlettered Newfoundlanders”:

“Aw, they needs a good lash in d' arse, the whole bloody lot of ’em,” Ank would growl in the local patois which our family speech had hammered down from the Irish and West Country of our heritage and the gobbled syntax of unlettered Newfoundlanders. (36)

The use of the terms patois and syntax here might seem to lend to the narrator’s utterance a linguistic authority which it does not in fact possess — Juju’s judgement is a social one, but it is the social judgement that is important here.

Dialect is integral to the character of Saul Stone. It locates him geographically, chronologically and socially, as is indicated in our discussion of the contribution that dialect makes to the setting. And Saul’s fate does indeed seem to be very firmly tied to time and place — to the harsh realities of pre-confederation Newfoundland. Indeed, so close is the tie that the narrator hypothesizes that the barrenness of the land, the harshness of the climate and conditions, and the resultant physical poverty may have led to a parallel poverty of the mind:

Might it not reasonably be, I asked myself, that he in turn had been blighted and desiccated and warped by the conditions of his own early years? . . .

Was there any truth in my idea that by some strange process of diffusion this physical misery and the implacable hardness it gave him somehow passed into his moral and emotional and spiritual nature as well? . . . (318f)

The narrator suggests too — for it would follow from the hypothesis — that Saul is not particularly unusual, that there is a “nation-wide inferiority complex,” and that “emotional constriction — and from such causes — has always been a well-known feature of Newfoundland life” (319). To Juju, no doubt, Saul’s strongly marked dialect speech is a part of that harsh, barren, poverty-stricken environment from which he himself craves escape. The brutality in Saul’s nature is reflected by the coarseness and violence of his language, as he hands out one tongue-lashing after another:

“There’s needer one o’ ye acted right! . . . Ye ought to be ashamed to look me in the face. If I’d a done to me own fawder the half — no, the quarter — o’ what ye’re after doin’ to me, I’d never a lived to tell the tale. . . . I goes to work and drags me guts out fer ye a whole lifetime, and I don’t get no more t’anks for it. No sir. A kick in d’arse, and a foul word behind me back. Oh, don’t t’ink I don’t know! I’ve a hearrrd yer whisperin’ and back-bitin.’ Sure signs, ye’ll get nutting more out o’ me.” (300-01)

Coarseness and violence in language are not the same as non-standard dialect, but for Juju we suspect that they are, for the three are generally inseparable in his father’s speech.
Saul's character so dominates the novel, that other characters are essentially determined by the extent to which they are like him, by the degree to which they come to resemble him. It is possible that Hiberno-English features in Gertrude's speech indicate his influence on her although it is at least as likely that they result from her time in St. John's and the mixed character of urban dialects.

Ank, Saul's eldest son, although the first to rebel against his authority, finally turns out to be more like his father than any of the other children. When Ank cries out, "'All I wants is a little bit o' time to meself" (43), we are reminded of the young Saul's dream of "the beauty of privacy" (30); similarly, when Ank complains (from being forced to make his younger siblings "stand sound") that "'they needs a good lash in d'arse, the whole bloody lot of 'em'" (36), we are reminded of how much Ank is already beginning to take on the worst characteristics of Saul. Even Ank's comment about Flinksy's getting married seems to echo Saul's response to the suggestion of Ank's own marriage: "'Married!... Lord Jesus, ye're not hardly dry behind the ears yet.'" (48). As Ank grows older, the similarities between him and Saul seem to become even more disturbingly apparent. Consider the following excerpt from the middle-aged Ank's drunken mutterings:

"Old Man ... old bastard ... right after all ... maybe ... right after all ... goddam women ... never let you alone ... cunts ... never ... work yer guts out ... no t'anks ... expect no t'anks ... kick in d'arse ... that's all ... Lard Jesus ... kids ... cost a bloody fortune ... goddam slave ... that's it ... slave ... bringin' in money ... t'rew away ... finished wit' dat ... fuck it! ... nutting but work ... all work and no pay ... ha-ha- ... no more ... by Jesus ... never done nutting but work ... all work ... since when I still t'ought I only had it to piss through ... so they looks down on me ... young farts ... down on me ... me own flesh and blood ... Jenny, my duck ... sweetheart! ... what did I ever get out of it? ... fosh in d'arse ... curse 'em all! ... sufferin' Christ ... I'll kill 'em ... if they keeps on ... kill 'em ... kill ... kill ... kill ..." (206-07)

Although Saul never drank, we can note parallels here between Ank's language and Saul's at many levels: similarities in the dialect (e.g. 'Lard 'Lord'), the violence of the sentiments ('kill'), and the coarse diction ('bastards, cunts, arse, fuck, piss, farts'). Despite the fact that Saul would never have used a word like 'cunt, Ank's words here remind us of a number of Saul's speeches, such as the tongue-lashing (300-301) cited above. Compare:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work your guts out</th>
<th>Work and drags me guts out</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No t'anks</td>
<td>No more t'anks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kick in d'arse</td>
<td>A kick in d'arse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both men feel cheated by life; they resent the way in which they have had to work to support their families and the lack of any thanks.
Hilda is the only one of the Stone children to have lived down her nickname. She has gained substantial contentment from her marriage to Rome and their thriving business, and has “risen above all obstacles and above her own and her husband’s limitations to a success in life far more genuine and impressive than anything we boys had achieved” (250). Her two main worries are her weight, and the fear that Rome might be too strict with their sons: “...but I don’t like the thought that they’ll grow up afraid of him’” (260). Rome has never displayed any tendencies toward violence, but Saul’s legacy is all too evident in Hilda’s fear. In other respects, however, she is mature enough and sufficiently free of Saul’s influence to be able to pity him:

“I knows what he’s like, and I don’t forget what he done in times gone by. But I pities him too, you know. He’s gettin’ old, and sometimes I can’t hardly stand it to look at his face. So down. I hope Rome and me ... and I ... won’t be like him and Mom when we gets old. ... We never knows what we’ll come to, Juju b’y. It don’t pay to be too hard on people — specially your own.” (264)

Hilda’s language is interesting here. We noted above that her “correction” of her own speech (“... Rome and me ... and I ...”) suggests bidialectalism, a degree of upward social mobility; it correlates with her material success, and with her improved social standing. In a number of other respects, however, her speech clearly remains non-standard: the generalized -s ending on verbs, done as a preterit, and the negative can’t hardly. Whether the “correction” that she makes to her speech here has anything to do with the presence of her newly-returned, better-educated brother is a moot point: it need not have, since the construction in question is something of a social shibboleth that is readily acquired and easily leads to hypercorrection. Furthermore, in this context it might be that Hilda is reassuring herself that she is able to overcome being “warped” — that she is able to distance herself from Saul, his manners, his way of talking, and his house of hate.

Racer appears to be bidialectal in his mature years. He was abroad for six years during World War II, and his subsequent business and prosperity demand a different variety of speech. Because, however, we are only exposed to direct speech from Racer within the family group, where his speech is dialectal and abusive, we are dependent on the narrator’s observation about “his careful realtor’s English” (219) for our knowledge of his bidialectalism. Such switching of codes is, of course, very natural.

Crawfie achieved a degree of success at school, and eventually secured a minor teaching appointment. When he returns home with his wife, Eunice, he still uses a number of non-standard features when talking to, say, Juju:

“You got no idea what it’s like down there, Juju b’y!” he began, his eye big with memory. “If you so much as looks at a girl sideways, people think you got to marry her. I was only after takin’ the wife out twice ...” (125)
In his argument with his father (132-135), however, his speech is much closer to the standard than Saul's:

"I see there's some people pretty quick and nasty with their tongue, and then when they're in the wrong they haven't got the manners to admit it, or the guts to stand up to what they said in the first place. Some people got more bark than bite, when it comes down to brass tacks." (134)

Crawfie's more standardized speech here is a reflection of his education and his employment. It also marks his distance from Saul at this time: he has left home, found a job and got married; he is also prepared to fight with Saul in defence of his wife, Eunice. Fudge, by contrast, does not succeed at school and does not manage to escape from the influence of his parents. He remains alarmingly immature. What little direct speech we have from Fudge is markedly non-standard: "I haven't got no plans, Mom" (272). "Gimme sometin' d' eat, Mom" (276). "You knows I'm queer-lookin'. Can't get no girls" (277). "Anyway, I might as well inj'y meself while I got the chance. I believes ...?" (277).

We have commented on some aspects of Gertrude's dialect. In that she is of the same generation and class as Saul, and remains close to him throughout his life, it is not surprising that she should speak non-standard dialect just as he does. The narrator, by contrast, acquires a high level of education, spends twenty years outside of Milltown, and consciously strives to distance himself from Saul and all that he represents. Thus, the narrator speaks Standard Canadian English. His accent has obviously changed markedly by the time he returns after an absence of eight years. Gertrude comments on his ass-ent ("accent"). The narrator protests that he does not have any accent, but Gertrude insists:

"Yes you have! You got that real Canadian twang. Some words you says I can't hardly understand you a-tall. I s'pose Newfoundland talk is not good enough for you now, after bein' away so long." (167f)

The narrator's vocabulary and grammar are standard — cf. the conversation in which the narrator defends his acquisition of a typewriter against Saul's complaints: "I am independent, I say. I consider that I have full and complete liberty to act by myself. Is that clear? Is that finally and utterly clear, once and for all?"

His carefully measured speech stands in stark contrast to Saul's dialect — to "the gobbled syntax of unlettered Newfoundlanders" (36), as he calls it. He consciously rejects his father's speech, just as he rejects his father, and the country, climate and social conditions that he feels may have brought about the hatred in Saul. The rejection is a part of his quest to escape from hate (the first word of the novel) to love (the last word of the novel). Whether Juju detests the conditions in pre-confederation Newfoundland because they brought about the hatred in Saul (cf. 318-20), or whether he has rather transferred his detestation of his father to his surroundings (the island, its climate, its speech), as Horwood suggested (n.p.), is
a point that cannot be resolved here. Saul and the old Newfoundland are inseparable in Juju's mind, and the reader sees everything through the latter's eyes only. At any rate, his dislike of most things about pre-confederation Newfoundland is intense: even the shape of the coastline offends him! It is "like a graph gone mad" (11). (We suspect that confederation has effected few changes on that score.)

From these examples it will be seen that the dialect in House of Hate goes far beyond mere local colour, or simple considerations of setting. The dialect speech is integral to the entire novel, providing a geographical, chronological and social setting that is essential to the novel's realism; and constituting a significant element within the characterization, not the least of which is to define relative psychological proximity to or distance from Saul. Thus, of all the children, Ank's speech most resembles Saul's and Juju's resembles it least.

Further, the vividness, realism and dramatic quality of the direct speech in House of Hate owe much to the fact that Janes' literary dialect operates at all three linguistic levels of phonology, grammar and lexicon. The caricatures or stereotypes that might result from only a handful of (relatively fixed) conventions are avoided in Janes' work.

To conclude, Janes has, we feel, been successful in avoiding the more obvious dangers: he steers a fairly happy middle course between the incomprehensibility that would result from too detailed a representation of the dialect and the unrepresentativeness, lack of realism, caricatures and stereotypes that might have resulted from contenting himself with a few, highly conventionalized devices. As has been illustrated, his literary dialect operates at the three linguistic levels of lexicon, grammar and phonology. Janes does not simply settle for a handful of conventions (perhaps at one linguistic level only) — a technique that would run the risk of his literary dialect amounting to nothing more than "token local colour." Rather, he has elected to represent dialect speech in a sufficiently detailed manner for it to fulfill the functions of setting and involved characterization discussed above. Dialect, then, is integral to House of Hate.

Notes

1 Thanks are due to George Casey, Tom Dawe, Bob Hollett, William Kirwin, Betty Miller and Harold Paddock for useful comments and suggestions. We are especially indebted to Percy Janes for reading an earlier draft and pronouncing our citations on tape. Such deficiencies as doubtless remain are our own responsibility.

2 The same publisher's 1976 reprint (New Canadian Library No. 124) contains an Introduction by Margaret Laurence. The pagination of the text itself is, however, identical to that of the first edition.
Cf. Hiscock’s comment on Lowell’s use of dialect in *The New Priest in Conception Bay*. “One cannot separate Lowell’s use of dialect from the story. It is as much a literary tool as, say, humour or foreshadowing.” (114).

Cf. Shorrocks (1981) and Shorrocks (1988, qf), where a number of these points are raised.

Cf. Brunner for an early but important demonstration of this basic fact.

The influence of publishers on literary dialect is a subject about which singularly little is known. Gash, in a rather informal account of negative attitudes to dialect generally, refers to his own experiences, as a novelist, of hostility towards literary dialect on the part of publishers, literary agents and editors. In Janes’ case, there was no interference by the publisher (Janes, personal communication).

Cf. Chapman (74, 182-85). The cited comments of Thomas Hardy and George Eliot are particularly illuminating. See also Mace (18-22), Shorrocks (1981) and Shorrocks (1988, qf).

*Dictionary of Newfoundland English*, 176.

What is colloquial, vulgar or slang can of course be a matter of debate. However, the seventh edition of the *Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English* lists chum as colloquial, crap as vulgar, and gob, mug and knock up as slang.

For examples of a- before past participles in the South-West of England, see responses in Orton and Wakelin to the Survey of English Dialects questions IX.3-2-3, 5-7.

Contrast with this the lack of change on the part of Ank and Mavis, as the quotation from p. 199 indicates.

Reviewers and critics generally have applauded Janes’ dialogue, no matter how censorious they have been in other respects. “... he handles idiomatic dialogue with much skill,” Cockburn (116) (from an otherwise extremely negative assessment); “The language of the Stone family, brilliantly conveyed in Janes’s book ...” O’Flaherty (175); “Mr. Janes has a splendid ear for speech and idiom ...” Porter (1); “The narrator has a good ear for dialogue ...” Thompson (2); *Toronto Star*: “The author is obviously at home with the coarse, hodge-podge dialect, a technique that often degenerates into token local colour. Here it adds tart humour to a story that has none of the cuteness or stridency that can invade regional fiction, and a grasp of human nature that takes it beyond that category.”
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