National Library of Canada
Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Canadian Theses Service
Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

NL-339 (r. 88/04)

Canada

THE LANGUAGES OF A WORKING-CLASS NOVEL:
A STUDY OF LEWIS GRASSIC GIBBON'S *GREY GRANITE*
AND M. M. BAKHTIN'S GENRE THEORY OF THE NOVEL

by

PING LI

B.A., SHANGHAI INTERNATIONAL STUDIES UNIVERSITY, 1982

M.A., SHANGHAI INTERNATIONAL STUDIES UNIVERSITY, 1987

THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF

THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

in the Department

of

ENGLISH

© PING LI 1990

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

JULY 10TH, 1990

All rights reserved. This work may not be reproduced in whole or in part, by photocopy or other means, without permission of the author.

National Library of Canada
Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Canadian Theses Service
Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-315-69666-8

Canada

APPROVAL

Name: PING LI

Degree: MASTER OF ARTS

Title of thesis: THE LANGUAGES OF A WORKING-CLASS NOVEL: A STUDY OF LEWIS GRASSIC GIBBON'S *GREY GRANITE* AND M. M. BAKHTIN'S GENRE THEORY OF THE NOVEL

Examining Committee:

Chair: Dr. Chin Banerjee
Associate Professor

Dr. Jerry Zaslove
Associate Professor
Senior Supervisor

Dr. Paul Delany
Professor

Dr. Allen Seager
External Examiner
Associate Professor
Department of History
Simon Fraser University

Date Approved: Apr 4 1990

PARTIAL COPYRIGHT LICENSE

I hereby grant to Simon Fraser University the right to lend my thesis, project or extended essay (the title of which is shown below) to users of the Simon Fraser University Library, and to make partial or single copies only for such users or in response to a request from the library of any other university, or other educational institution, on its own behalf or for one of its users. I further agree that permission for multiple copying of this work for scholarly purposes may be granted by me or the Dean of Graduate Studies. It is understood that copying or publication of this work for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Title of Thesis/Project/Extended Essay

The Languages of a Working-Class Novel: A Study of Lewis Grassic Gibbon's Grey Granite and M. M. Bakhtin's Genre Theory of the Novel

Author: _____
(signature)

Ping Li
(name)

Aug. 9th, 1990.
(date)

ABSTRACT

This thesis is a study of the Scottish writer Lewis Grassic Gibbon's (1901-1935) *Grey Granite* as a working-class novel, within the parameters of the Soviet-Russian critic M. M. Bakhtin's genre theory of the novel. Many critics tend to locate a single vision of socialism, communism, nationalism, Diffusionism, or organicism as Gibbon's final voice. However, with full awareness of the problems in the traditional approaches to working-class literature which often single out and eulogize one particular political voice to the exclusion of other voices, this thesis argues through textual analysis that the art of Gibbon's novel lies in what Bakhtin calls the 'interillumination' of different voices embodying different world views that are derived from the socio-historical contradictions of early twentieth-century Britain.

These contradictions are deeply felt by the author as a revolutionary Scottish intellectual with a working-class background. *Grey Granite* creatively evokes and mixes different languages, including dialects characteristic of a working-class culture, to portray the historical emergence of the working-class movement amid confrontations of various classes, political parties, ideologies and individuals in an open-ended, dialogic world that also deeply involves the reader with moral dilemmas and political commitments.

On the theoretical level, this thesis adopts, and demonstrates the viability of the historical and generic critical approach based on Bakhtin's theory of the novel. A Bakhtinian historical poetics would emphasize the polyphonic embodying of different voices -- the dialogic, involving different subjects in dialogue with the voices of the other's languages and cultures; the carnivalesque, with its diversifying, ludic languages of a popular culture subverting from below the unitary, dead-serious language of the official culture; and the historical, confronting, but not dissolving itself in the socio-historical contradictions and conditions that have shaped the formation of literary genres and particular texts. These generic features are more germane to understanding the working-class novel and, as in this analysis of *Grey Granite*, offer a way of mediating, explaining and transcending the problems that have beset the continuing theoretical controversy over the sub-genre of the working-class novel.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank Professor Jerry Zaslove, supervisor of my studies, who has helped me so greatly to clear up various questions relating to Bakhtin's genre theory of the novel. I am indebted to Professor Paul Delany, who has put his knowledge of England and Scotland at my disposal. I am also grateful for the support and guidance of the English Department Graduate Programme. Finally, I must thank Mr. Shan Qiang He for his continuing support and valuable suggestions for my thesis through its various evolutionary stages.

DEDICATION

To my parents.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Approval ii

Abstract iii

Acknowledgments v

Dedication vi

Introduction viii

I. Ideology, Form, and Dialogism 1

II. James Leslie Mitchell/Lewis Grassic Gibbon: a Double-Voiced Man 25

III. The Song of Polyphony 45

Postscript: Towards a Definition of the Working-Class Novel 79

References 85

Selected Bibliography 107

Introduction

The concept of working-class literature was formed as a result of industrial revolution, the emergence of a working-class with a distinctive culture, as well as political movements and class struggles in which the working-class and its culture were shaped and defined in particular socio-historical and economic relations with other classes in capitalist society. The concept itself, often used by Marxists and other critics interested in the relations between literature, culture and society, poses a challenge to the traditional notion of mainstream literature that purports to transcend class interests in its formation and acceptance as the property of all mankind. Out of this challenge comes the thorny question of political criticism versus aesthetic values, a question not just confined to working-class literature, but relevant to literature and criticism as a whole.

Is working-class literature just new in subject matter? Or does it bring in new forms characteristic of a working-class culture? To what extent are the techniques and forms of non-working-class literature ideologically informed and hence problematic if used by working-class writers in making artistic creation out of their experience? Questions like these have often been asked in discussing working-class literature, providing interesting subjects for theoretical explorations based on various world views and ideologies. Even Marxist

critics are divided on this subject with theories from different schools of Marxism competing for theoretical solutions. The problem is not only theoretical, but also practical, bearing on the criticism of particular texts and the diverging conclusions about our aesthetic response.

On the whole, when it comes to the discussion of particular texts, critics of working-class literature tend to fall back on sociological discussion of 'content' and historical backgrounds. Too often they invoke 'Realism', 'the image of the typical worker', 'reflection of reality'; and judge a work of art according to whether it is 'true to the real situation', which is often a deduction from a doctrinaire theory.

Meanwhile, critics of traditional literature and with aesthetic concerns have developed various sophisticated theories of the text and language that have severely challenged traditional notions of mimesis and reality. These sophisticated textual analyses often land the critic in endless play of words, allegories of reading, or philosophical repetitions about reality and language. They are weak in exploring the social, moral or educational function of literature. In a world still beset by material problems such as poverty, pollution, discrimination, and oppression, the charge of bourgeois elitism against these critics is not totally beside the point.

However, theories of language and the text have raised problems about reality and mimesis that Marxist critics cannot

afford to ignore, if they want to avoid obvious naivety and simplicity in their criticism. How can we combine the strengths of both? Or is a dialectical synthesis possible? Where does the working-class novel stand between its socio-historical contexts and the tradition of aesthetic forms in the historicization of the genre?

These are the ideological and formal concerns lying at the back of my study of the working-class novel, which uses Bakhtin's theory of the novel and language and Lewis Grassic Gibbon's *Grey Granite* (the last novel in his trilogy *A Scots Quair*) for textual analysis. There is something similar in the backgrounds of the critic and the novelist I have chosen. Bakhtin's theory, largely unknown in the West until the 1970s, was created in the 1920s when Russian formalism challenged many critical assumptions of traditional Marxists, populists, or 'realist' critics of literature. Gibbon wrote in the early 30s when there was a polemic between Realist literature as commitment on the one hand, and Modernist literature preoccupied with language and its revolution on the other. Both Bakhtin and Gibbon are concerned with different languages and popular culture, and both break new grounds beyond the narrow confines of academic polemics. Bakhtin's theory of language and speech genre -- dialogism, polyphony, carnival, etc.[1] -- goes far beyond a narrow sociological approach or a purely linguistic, formalist concern and generates a more comprehensive philosophy of language and of life. In a similar way, perhaps on a minor

scale, Gibbon also transcended the 'either/or' polemic of his time. He came from the labouring class, and he was Scottish -- an outsider (like many Modernist writers) to English literature and to the intellectuals of the 30s, who were either reducing literature to socialist commitment with few formal concerns, or evading the social responsibility of literature by following the Modernism of the previous decade, which was already at a dead-end in the 30s. Gibbon's success in creating a working-class novel with great linguistic innovation and artistic fascination draws not only from the socio-historical context of class conflicts and revolutionary struggles in which he grew up and participated, but more importantly, from his background of a rich Scottish popular culture of working men and women (from farmers and labourers to craftsmen and workers) in opposition to the middle-class English culture.

In the first chapter of my thesis, I intend to introduce some major approaches to the working-class novel and the problems they have raised concerning the genre, with a Bakhtinian critique. In the second chapter, I will focus on the heterogeneity of Gibbon's thoughts in the context of his social and cultural backgrounds. The third chapter is a textual analysis of *Grey Granite*, using some Bakhtinian concepts about the novel as a genre and combining formal analysis with the experiential and ideological concerns of the times which Gibbon lived in and which he embodied in his work. Through both theoretical discussion and textual analysis, I hope to explore

some generic features of the working-class novel and locate them in a historical context, so as to contribute towards the definition of the working-class novel as a sub-genre within the novel.

CHAPTER I

IDEOLOGY, FORM, AND DIALOGISM

Although the concept of working-class literature is not a well-delineated one, there has been much written on the subject, especially since the 1950s, in cultural and literary studies of social history. The genre of the working-class novel, it seems, is more successfully approached from a socio-historical viewpoint than from a purely aesthetic one. However it may be defined, this genre is definitely shaped by, and shapes, in turn, the historical emergence of the working-class since the industrial revolution in the eighteenth century.[1] These historical movements have generated works of art which have drawn upon the lived experience of a distinct working-class culture as a way of life and are themselves part of the historical emergence of workers as a new class, with new chronotopes and cultural values.[2] These works not only challenge the existing norms and conventions, but also modify, or radically redefine the problems themselves. A fruitful discussion of the working-class novel should take historical changes in all spheres of life into consideration instead of confining itself to artistic problems, since art is about life and is part of the totality of life itself. On the other hand, an examination of the genre in terms of history and ideology would also give new insight into our notions and norms about art, many of which may be reified, highly abstracted from the historical contexts that have shaped them and made their

aesthetic function possible.

This chapter will examine some critical approaches to the genre of the working-class novel. These approaches reveal problems in linking the genre to working-class political movements (class consciousness) on the one hand, and, on the other hand, the formal problems of the genre within the larger genre of the novel itself. I believe that the interaction between historical and formal approaches would yield a definition in a dialogic illumination. The great Soviet-Russian critic Mikhail Bakhtin's theory of the novel and popular culture and his historicization of the genre can also shed light on our topic, especially his view of the novel as a multi-voiced polyphonic dialogue deeply invoking individuals at the moments of their historical emergence.

> [In the novel of historical emergence, man] emerges *along with the world* and he reflects the historical emergence of the world itself. He is no longer within an epoch, but on the border between two epochs, at the transition point from one to the other. This transition is accomplished in him and through him. He is forced to become a new, unprecedented type of human being. What is happening here is precisely the emergence of a new man. . . . It is as though the very *foundations* of the world are changing, and man must change along with them. Understandably, in such a novel of emergence, problems of reality and man's potential, problems of freedom and necessity, and the problem of creative initiative rise to their full height. The image of the emerging man begins to surmount its private nature (within certain limits, of course) and enters into a completely new, *spatial* sphere of historical existence.[3]

Bakhtin is also helpful in the sense that while the various critical opinions have tackled some real historical and artistic problems of the genre, a dialogic discussion would contribute

towards a synthesis on a higher level. In Chapter One, I will use some Bakhtinian concepts to engage in a dialogue with these approaches and discuss the problems that have beset them.

Among critical trends on working-class literature, the most extreme view is founded on the premise that all art is class art; therefore, literature could or should be a weapon in revolutionary struggles for changing the world. Many left literary critics take this for granted. In order to achieve this purpose, these critics think that we should embrace working-class novels, as well as works by radical middle-class intellectuals, with a clear socialist intention and perspective. They admit that there is no definition that could encompass all the details of every variety of socialism, since the nineteenth and the twentieth centuries have seen the accumulation of a large and often conflicting body of socialist tactics and theories, especially in the 1920s and 30s between Marxist parties on the one hand and Labour parties of the British variety on the other. Nonetheless, these critics define the socialist novel as one which, by being written in the historical interests of the working class, reveals a standpoint consistent with that of the class-conscious sections of this class. Under this rubric there is also room for the work of socialist intellectuals, regardless of subject matter. Working-class literature, though still in its embryonic stage, represents a potential threat to the dominant literary culture.[4] As Jack Mitchell puts it: as early as the 1880s and the 1890s, the

British socialists

> were intensely aware of the importance of art and literature in propaganda work. . . . They grasped the necessity of creating a body and tradition of militant socialist and working-class literature which would be independent of bourgeois hegemony.[5]

The aim is to tear the blinkers from the workers' eyes, reveal the true nature of capitalist exploitation and prepare them ideologically to know 'what to do'. And so it is an effective way to crystallize class consciousness and test the values of humanity and solidarity, thereby furthering the cause of the working class. As Jack Lindsay says,

> The fundamental point about 'proletarian or Marxist literature' is not, then, that it is simply concerned to depict the working class, but that, whatever it depicts, it has the revolutionary and concrete concept of human unity at its core. . . . What we have said is that the restoration of health and vigor to art begins with the recognition that the working class with its allies is alone capable of solving the problems of man, of achieving a free and equal world-society.[6]

The clear-cut distinction remains a neat, theoretical and monologic norm. Once we return to the historical context that reveals the process of the formation of the revolutionary commitment, we find, instead of an ideal 'human unity at its core', multiplicity, heterogeneity, and dialogism. To avoid the possible reification of any ideology that would become official monologue incapable of self-examination, we need the living context where the emergence of working-class consciousness is shaped by dialogism between different cultures, ideologies and class interests. It is not simply a formulaic confrontation between capitalists and workers. There are many complex aspects

such as official culture, popular culture, the country and the city, the position of the revolutionary intellectual, the relation between men and women, and so on. Nor should we have an orthodox dialectical reduction that subsumes various contradictions under one major contradiction of the working class versus the bourgeoisie, thus denying the polyphonic nature of the world. Working-class culture, for example, deserves special attention because the novel is rooted in unofficial cultures of various historical periods.

From the perspective of some socialist critics in their revolutionary commitment, however, there is not much regard for popular culture or the lived experience of the working class from below that might resist being appropriated under one revolutionary/intellectual slogan. These critics complain that the workers never take matters into their own hands to improve the harsh conditions under which they live and work; they endure, but they never act. Thus, Engels' comment that the working-class figures in novels as a passive mass, 'unable to help itself and not even showing (making) any attempt at striving to help itself'[7], is often quoted to show the urgency of awakening the workers through literary works. They stress art's potentiality for serving revolution, and reject the notion of literature as passive contemplation. Eager to preach, they fail to respond to the rich folk culture of the working class both as the object of representation and as potential readers. Only one voice is heard, that of the revolutionary intellectual.

The strength of this approach lies in its conscious identification with working-class interests. After demystifying bourgeois art as ideology trying to cover up class contradictions and struggles within capitalist society, the revolutionary writers and critics openly declare their intention of making art serve the working-class movements. This service is not only a logical result of their critical weapons of de-mystification, but also bears the distinctive mark of the historical emergence of working-class movements, for the writers and critics are not just describing the conditions of the workers or pronouncing certain actions to be taken; they also participate in the very cause through the art of writing. Whatever reified literary and aesthetic canons there are, are thus exposed to historical change. Writers and critics can no longer hide behind the 'objective' mask of art transcending reality, but they are dragged into 'zones of familiar contact'[8], made to declare their interests and to admit their subjectivity in the interface with other subjects. Instead of the objectivist 'art for art's sake', this approach returns art to reality, and restores art as a human activity, in which humans engage in various confrontations, compromises and identifications.

The class emphasis, however, can be abused in an unexpected way. If the opposite of the autonomy of art is an art that serves definite moral, social, or political functions, then the latter has not proved any better in actual practice, from the Medieval religious tracts to socialist realism. The advocates of

'engaged' literature tend to set their tenets as absolute norms replacing their opponents, rather than entering into a dialogue in which ideas are sharpened or modified through interaction. To go beyond the double bind of literature as autonomous versus literature as tendentious, the same critical spirit must be ready for self-examination as well. It is at this juncture that our issue at hand cannot be solved through content only. The form should embody a revolutionary dynamic in order to avoid any univocal reification of the content.

One counter notion argues that political commitment in literature is not enough in depicting working-class life and experience. Only the combination of politics and imaginative writing can create a realistic portrayal of the plight of the working class, with a message of hope and the possibility of future change. These critics hold that the successful creation of working-class literature lies in an understanding of the dialectical unity of form and content. Graham Holderness has noted such an achievement in the twentieth-century novel,

> Although socialist fictions inevitably operate in a cultural terrain peripheral to the dominant ideology, its practitioners are able to found a genre capable of producing, at a later stage, in the writings of Tressell and Grassic Gibbon and Lewis Jones, novels of such artistic power and political impact that they could hardly be ignored by bourgeois culture: texts which called forth from literary criticism strategies of negotiation designed to isolate them from the historical movement as 'classics' of artistic achievement.[9]

In many different ways, the experience of the class, the group and the work process has been entering the orthodox literature, though often in tension with received forms and emphases, with a

special stress on direct relationships between human beings, typically a greater concern for working-class people than for others.[10] Thus, it is not the concern of writers merely to inject revolutionary content into conventional or even outworn literary forms.

However, to express the desire for a new literature that would justify a usually neglected culture is much easier than to actually bring such a literature about. The real controversy comes from the familiar doctrine of orthodox Marxist criticism: the novel remains once and for all a thoroughly bourgeois genre pervaded by a liberal ideology which is unsuitable for conveying the lived experience of the working class and it can never hope to expunge this ideology since it is generally tied to the rise of the middle class.[11] These critics argue that since the novel has been concerned historically with the individual, and its narrative structures operate through one -- or a series of -- individual consciousness, its philosophy is always essentially 'liberal'. Liberalism, so the argument runs, is the philosophy of individualism, and socialism the philosophy of collectivity, and therefore, any works, even those that purport to be socialist, must, if they focus on individuals, be embedded within liberal philosophy. To these critics, 'The process of normalization or naturalization which inheres in the bourgeois ideology of the realist novel, operating largely through the constructions of individual characters and plot is clearly foregrounded and mythicized in a manner that reveals rather than

obscures its contradictions.'[12]

The remedy, for some critics, is to replace the individual with the collective experience. Instead of engaging emotionally with individual lives, working-class literature could express a sense of collectivity, abandoning the creation of personality, of a hero, for the task of rendering ordinary people in ordinary circumstances en masse. Writing, then, is seen not as a private, essentially individual practice, but as the product of collective, shared experience, an activity perfectly compatible with an active political life. It is regarded as a symbol of working-class power, with a message to convey: the strength and potential power of a united working class at the moment when it becomes aware of itself and its own abilities to fight for class solidarity and its emancipation under the capitalist system.

Raymond Williams calls this feature of working-class literature 'the collective feeling' -- 'often precarious but never wholly defeated -- which is the decisive working-class consciousness of our society as a whole.'[13] This kind of literature aims at portraying great collective and conscious struggles, the mobilization of workers, the prolonged and bitter strikes, the daily positive militancy, mass meetings, committees, and the sheer effort of everyday work and making ends meet, and other cultural activities. The central individual hero has been replaced by a 'new element', the revolutionary group or the working class. The class which lives through and creates them becomes a collective 'hero'. The novelists are not

so much concerned with the uniqueness of the hero's destiny as with its representativeness and typicality. The problem confronting the novelist is not merely one of substituting a group for a hero, but how to relate the central fact of the class struggle to the lives of individuals.[14]

The division between the individual bourgeois hero and the working-class 'collective hero' is a perceptive comment about some nineteenth-century bourgeois novels, for example, the industrial novels in which the heroes and heroines embodying Victorian family values try to bring the 'anarchic' working-class masses under control.[15] The portrait of the working class there is certainly informed by a conservative ideology that feels threatened by the rise of industrialism and the labour movement in England.[16] One of the very techniques employed is to portray the working class *en masse*, devoid of individual feelings, whether these are unique working-class feelings which would challenge bourgeois feelings, or basic human feelings that define our very humanity. One metaphor constantly associated with this portrait is working men as barbaric animals in need of domestication by bourgeois civilization. To oppose this ideology, however, does not mean that we have to seek a 'truer', more 'realistic' representation of the working class as mass heroes in making history. Any portrait claiming 'realism' and 'typicality' is likely to be another myth. The working class was historically formed in definite social, economic, cultural and ideological

relationships with other classes and has evolved in the process of social change. Individual workers are likewise exposed to various cultural influences and have different economic interests. The very notion of the working class as a whole is itself an abstraction, though a useful term in certain contexts. Dialogism, therefore, exists between the working class and other classes as well as within the working class. To write about the working class poses further differences between art and reality, and the mediation of different cultures (official, unofficial), ideologies and genres. Instead of pursuing the myth of a realistic representation of the typical working class, we should rather apply Bakhtin's dialogic principle to working-class literature, and see the text as a site of various voices in dialogic confrontation and negotiation with each other, each voice as containing the words of the other, with a sideward glance at other texts. Various speech genres filled with ideological values would be the focus of critical attention. In a polyphonic novel, the individual hero would be just another generic feature, in a dialogic relationship with other textual features instead of providing and pronouncing the final word of truth. Allan Sillitoe has successfully portrayed some lone, rebellious and irreverent working men as heroes in his working-class novels, which in itself is in dialogic opposition to the generic feature of the hero as a rising member of the lower middle class in other provincial novels of the 1950s.[17]

There are critics, though, who have less hope for the novel form under capitalism. They think that all working-class writing is ideologically contaminated and is absorbed without trace by the dominant culture, until the specific historic moment which brings into being new forms and new languages.'[18] Roy Johnson, in defining the term 'proletarian novel', argues that according to Marxist theory, since the superstructure of philosophy, art and culture in general is largely determined by the economic 'base' on which it is built, there cannot be an independent and distinct culture which arises from working-class life even though the working class may have a sense of its own consciousness with a revolutionary theory of class struggle as well as its role in history. Therefore, such proletarian artistic production, under capitalism, is ultimately likely to be artistically inferior to bourgeois culture.'[19] In a similar way, Raymond Williams points out that the reason why many talented working-class novelists have long been neglected, with only the occasional exception, is due to the available *forms* of the novel and the set standards, centred predominantly on problems of the upper and middle classes and dictating certain ideological assumptions and modes of perception which are radically at odds with the experience that working-class writers have long been struggling to articulate. 'These offered few points of entry for working-class writers, unless they left their class and pursued individual causes through conventional themes. Where most working-class writers turned, instead, was (apart from essays, pamphlets, and journalism, directly related

to class causes) to autobiography and memoirs, or to popular verse.'[20] Once they adopt the available forms of the novel, the possible consequence, as Johnson suggests, could be 'either a middle-class person who has never experienced the mind and body-numbing reality of heavy manual labour, or a working-class person, who, though he may have had the experiences first hand, has absorbed middle-class values to such an extent that he feels a duty to write about labour in an ennobling manner.'[21]

If the working-class writer has problems with a bourgeois form, then the bourgeois writer feels a gap between himself and his proletarian subject: a gap of experience which renders the worker's life 'mysterious' to an outsider's vision in the style of Thomas Carlyle, or in a passionate but completely negative protest against the misery and human impoverishment of work under capitalism, along the classical line of Zola's *Germinal*.[22] Thus, these critics urge proletarian writers to attempt a demystification of that mythological vision, or a recovery and repossession of those estranged and alienated powers.

The conflict between the generic features of the bourgeois novel on the one hand and the opposing collective working-class socialist consciousness on the other hand, leads some critics to advocate *documentation* as a way of 'faithfully' reflecting the conditions of the working class in order to avoid aesthetic problems of the bourgeois form. They think that this is a way so transparent that no problem of form can intercede; yet the aim of creating a literature of political commitment can also be

gained at the same time. One of the solutions is to organize the novel around a plot structure which would juxtapose a presentation of the typical 'ordinary world of people and of things' with significant moments of political drama. Behind the realistic presentation, in documentary technique, of the harsh aspects of working-class life, lies the utilitarian belief that revealing facts will dispel middle-class notions about working-class fecklessness, let the silent majority be heard and clear the way for a solution. Under this notion, detailed pictures of unemployment, trade unions, strikes, and slums become the inevitable symbols of the appalling conditions of the workers, who are unable to lead a full life. However, others refuse to accept such a simple solution. They argue that the seemingly informative and objective document of working-class conditions may work in the 'flat, undramatised method of presentation against any value it might have aesthetically.' This writing, therefore, may fall into the trap of overemphatic naturalism, by depicting 'the surface of working-class life in all its sordid squalor' while failing to 'allow the reader to penetrate beneath that surface to see either its potential richness or the possibility of the working class changing its own conditions of existence.'[23] In the opinion of Mary Eagleton and David Pierce, writers from the working class can write about working-class culture, day-to-day life, feelings, tensions and aspirations typical of a majority of the working-class population, whereas middle-class writers, in the absence of this inside knowledge, must recreate working-class life through

descriptions of the visible conditions and practices of the working class by adopting documentary techniques which have several defects and cannot fully achieve their 'objective' purpose.[24]

If there is no 'transparent' form, what options are available for a revolutionary writer and critic? Is the novel form really exhausted in the hands of bourgeois writers? This view is challenged by many critics who see the world as heterogeneous and dialogized. They believe that it is possible to talk of 'working-class' writing outside that so-called historic moment which can generate new forms and new languages, exactly because 'ideology' is not homogeneous. These critics argue that '[t]here is not one unified class ideology which exists without contradictions, nor is ideological hegemony imposed from above, but demands all kinds of negotiations and concessions between the dominant and subaltern groups.'[25] Established cultural institutions are not simply one-way conveyor belts for ruling class ideology. Cultural relations are matters of negotiation, contest, struggle. 'The frontiers shift, bits are bought, incorporated and changed by different sides in the struggle.'[26] To many of these critics, the existing class relations, the dominant ideology, the author's class experiences, the relationship between the writer and the public, and the demands of the form itself all interact with and impinge on the subject matter of the novel. There is no evenness of development between historical conditions, ideology and fiction.

In addition, class changes cannot bring about a totally transformed ideology, capable of establishing its place in the novel. In fact, elements of earlier forms of social organization can also be found in fiction. These critics firmly believe that working-class literature has its deep roots in a popular and radical culture: qualities that have survived generations of orthodox critical reduction and neglect. Therefore, working-class writing can exist within the dominant cultural formation, but in contradiction to it, in which case its very existence begins to challenge 'literature' as an ideological construct. They further optimistically point out that the adaptation and use by the workers of literary and other forms designed by others for their own purpose is a strength, not a weakness.

To show whole, determining social relationships requires a new perspective. These critics find some flexibility in the genre which, they think, can be made into 'a site of ideological struggle'. This does not mean simply naturalizing the form, or exorcizing the nightmares of the bourgeois imagination, but adapting them to express a proletarian vision which can interrogate as well as present 'reality'. As Graham Holderness paraphrases Karl Marx, 'The bourgeois novelists, as well as the philosophers, have already interpreted the world; the point, however, is to change it.'[27] Therefore, within the dominant literary culture, there can be possibilities of escaping from the liberal ideology which is so closely linked to the realistic

novel and of introducing into its structures a proletarian and socialist consciousness.[28] According to their theory, when reality changes, then art has to develop new conventions to cope with such changes. Therefore, it is absolutely possible to 'beat the bastards on their own terms'.

Not only genre, but also language is ambiguous. Based on the conviction that language, literature and society form an indivisible whole, some critics feel that the incorporation of working-class speech into literature entails very serious problems. Above all, there is the conflict between regional and social dialects. Then, the written word is not a mode of discourse that has been developed by the working class; furthermore, the working class is excluded from the dominant literary language by the educational apparatus, and its own cultural language is essentially oral. The incorporation of working-class dialects serves at best only to render a detailed and truthful picture of working-class life. The mimetic concern, however, does not bother some critics, who acknowledge the distortion of the written mode and see the recourse to a bourgeois literary language in working-class fiction as more accessible to the reader. The contradictory linguistic registers ascribed to characters and the world beyond are not a form of collision but are used to indicate the nature of the imprisonment of the working class within a bourgeois and bourgeois-literary ideology, as well as a reflection and revelation of the divisions in literary and social processes.[29]

One of such divisions is that between men's and women's experiences in working-class life. Some feminist investigation into 'gender identity' has contributed much to a recognition of women's cultural experience and those critics comment positively on the way in which some working-class novelists portray female life and experience, foregrounding the female point of view. The great contribution of this approach is to reveal aspects of working-class culture hitherto denied by patriarchal precepts imposed from above, and to shake up any norms that are not based upon the living cultural experience of the working class, including women.[30]

In sum, the more recent approaches have effectively challenged the traditional notion of homogeneity -- whether within the capitalist society under the hegemony of bourgeois culture, or within a distinct working-class culture -- as well as the Realist notion of mimesis in the representation of the 'typical' working class. It would be undialogic to take these new approaches as a simple denial of the more traditional ones. For example, the contradiction between the working class and the bourgeoisie has been one of the major contradictions in capitalist society. To posit an undifferentiated women's experience in opposition to all men's, or a writing difference as the *only* difference (opposition, contradiction) would greatly reduce the complexity, multiplicity and heterogeneity of this world, which these new approaches have contributed to if taken in a dialogic way. The valuable aspects of the traditional

approaches would then co-exist with the new approaches in a relationship of dialogism instead of sectarian mutual denial. That is one of the reasons that the Bakhtinian approach is more than just another approach: it enables us to critically benefit from all other voices and engage in a dialogue with them.

More importantly, though he has not commented specifically on the sub-genre of the working-class novel, Bakhtin has made invaluable contributions to the definition of the novel. The historicization of the genre and its formal problems lie at the root of all the controversies introduced in this chapter. Put in the historical perspective, Lukács's claim that the novel is the epic of the bourgeoisie, and the distrust of the novel by Marxist critics as *formally* individualistic and inadequate to embody collective values, both recognize the impact of bourgeois society on the development of the novel and the hegemony of bourgeois ideology within capitalist society. The novels discussed under this model do bear the marks of bourgeois values. After all, the last several hundred years have seen the major development of capitalism in European countries which cannot but bear on the cultural products of the time, especially those which bourgeois cultural institutions have singled out among the canons of their values.

However, such a view of the novel may have erred in tying cultural production too tightly to material production. Marx has pointed out 'the uneven development of material production relative to e.g. artistic development.' He says, 'In the case of

the arts, it is well known that certain periods of their flowering are out of all proportion to the general development of society.'[31] Cultural production is shaped, but not totally determined, by material production. A narrow sociological approach is inadequate for the complexity of literary production and consumption. M. M. Bakhtin distinguishes between '*small time* (the present day, the recent past, and the foreseeable [desired] future) and great time -- infinite and unfinalized dialogue in which no meaning dies.'[32] Various and infinite contexts of understanding should liberate the text from any narrow confines of 'small time', or at least recognize it as such.

In terms of the historicization of the novel as a genre, we need to question whether great novels contain only one single voice, or if there are multiple, conflicting voices, some of which may be suppressed by critics in order to reach a conclusion best suited to their ideology. Even such a typical author of bourgeois individualism as Defoe has had his works interpreted in many different ways. Many critics see irony in his portrayal of his various individualist heroes and heroines. Whether the irony is conscious or unconscious, intended or unintended, it shows the novel as a site of uncertainty and indeterminancy rather than determined by the context of 'small time'.

To define the novel as a genre, it is also necessary to be as comprehensive as possible in tracing various trends in depth. Bakhtin has traced the novel to its Greek origin and to its

roots in popular culture of various ages. His view of the novel as polyphonic, open-ended and subversive is based upon a comprehensive examination and understanding of the genre. The novel is older than the bourgeoisie, and it is also capable of transcending the values of the middle class, by positing different voices and different languages in its dialogic imagination and interillumination.

Bakhtin situates the novel in the context of popular culture, which also widens the scope of study of the genre. Various alternative traditions (e.g. working-class novel) can also yield fruitful insights towards the definition of the genre. To put the working-class novel in relation to popular culture, rather than to the 'bourgeois' novel only, is actually to return the novel to where it really belongs -- to the people from below. This alternative is not a simple denial of the previous canons or the institutional approach; it subverts them through a widening of the dialogic scope and a testing of various voices in life.

A relevant example which can cover all the points mentioned above is D. H. Lawrence's *Sons and Lovers*. It is a novel written by a miner's son and about the miner's family life. It has also become one of the canonical texts studied in universities. The novel does contain bourgeois individualism. Paul Morel's mother comes from a middle-class family and is a former school-mistress. She tries to impose middle-class values upon her husband and her family, urging her sons to climb the social

ladder. Paul Morel follows a route that alienates him both from the mining community and from middle-class respectability. But he also feels the lack of life when considering the pursuit of art as a bourgeois artist. Apparently, the novel leads to a dead end of romantic disillusionment, of idealism being crushed by reality. Much can be said about Paul Morel as an individualist who is alienated from the working-class community. The novel centres on this individual experience and portrays its failure while the working class remain in the background. Examined in this light, the novel does not yield any positive image of the working class, and the form of the novel thus reduced is only suitable for the image of the (failed) bourgeois individualist.

Traditional exclusive focus on realistic representation and the portrayal of images and heroes may have led us to such a dead end, for the focus of the attention may have eclipsed other, more characteristic aspects of the novel. The presence of the miner father leaves indelible marks throughout the novel, though he is seldom treated positively. This character may well have remained a passive object to be portrayed and delineated, except that he has brought into the novel a distinctive working-class dialect, which reveals all the dead-serious norms and standards in an ironic and carnivalist light. It opens up a crack in the otherwise sealed, deadened world and introduces an alien, foreign culture into the official culture of middle-class values. Thus the novel is engaged in an open-ended dialogue through the indeterminacy of the dialogue between different

voices, between the author, the text and the reader. The chronotope embodied in the dialect comes from below, from the mine underground, from the popular culture of the working-class community. It is embodied, not described, because it consists of the very language which stands at the centre of the culture like a hologram, even bits and pieces being capable of showing the whole..

In Bakhtin's opinion, this feature lies at the heart of the novel:

> Characteristic, even canonic, for the genre is the spoken dialogue framed by a dialogized story. Characteristic also is the proximity of its language to popular spoken language, as near as was possible for classical Greece; these dialogues in fact opened the path to Attic prose, and are connected with the essential renovation of the literary-prose language -- and with a shift in languages in general. Characteristically this genre is at the same time a rather complex system of styles and dialects, which enter it as more-or-less parodied models of languages and styles (we have before us therefore a multi-styled genre, as is the authentic novel).[33]

Heteroglossia is essential for an open dialogue in a polyphonic novel. For the working-class novel in particular, dialect appears as an important device for evoking the working-class way of life, and the workers as subjects engaging in dialogues with other voices. If our world is made of languages, if the very medium of the novel is language, what better ways are there for portraying different historical forces than by adopting the very means with which these forces distinguish themselves in the world?

It is from this perspective that I will examine Lewis Grassic Gibbon's novel *Grey Granite* as a working-class novel. Bakhtin's heteroglossia and polyphony would lend special strength to our discussion of a Scottish author writing in half-Scots, half-English, about the Scottish working class in a dialogic relationship with English culture and in opposition to capitalist dominance, in a novel consisting mainly of dialogues, monologues, or unknown narrative voices. It is also hoped that our discussion of this specific cultural product will throw some light on the sub-genre of the working-class novel, which should not be a term used in contradiction, but is really a development of the genre of the novel under new historical conditions.

CHAPTER II

JAMES LESLIE MITCHELL/LEWIS GRASSIC GIBBON: A DOUBLE-VOICED MAN

After the untimely death of Lewis Grassic Gibbon, his friends found out that, unlike what they might expect from a man who was most famous for his Scottish works, Mitchell's

> . . . surviving library bears witness to a pervasive interest in those authors belonging to revolutionary, or at least innovatory, literary movements which consciously challenged traditionally accepted standards, such as Shelley and the Romantics, Rossetti and the Pre-Raphaelites, Gorky and the Socialist Realists, Morris, Wells, Shaw, and even, latterly, MacDiarmid himself. This, however, is the only uniform theme discernible throughout Leslie Mitchell's reading, and, apart from complimentary volumes from Jannes Barke, Neil Gunn, Eric Linklater and MacDiarmid, his book collection contains only a few stray volumes by Scottish writers.[1]

Gibbon's catholic tastes as shown in his collection of books -- a multiplicity of languages -- had a very strong impact on his development from a country lad to a writer on cosmopolitan and universal themes, as well as purely local ones. Just as Bakhtin asserts in his analysis of polyglossia, 'After all, one's own language is never a single language: in it there are always survivals of the past and a potential for other-languagedness that is more or less sharply perceived by the working literary and language consciousness.'[2] These various languages imprinted with various ideologies enter the world of Gibbon, of his works, and the world of his readers and listeners. They enable Gibbon to free himself from a single authorial voice with a limited perspective to the complex emergence of a new world, a new chronotope which shapes individual lives and informs various

Utopian visions.

Born Leslie Mitchell, Lewis Grassic Gibbon was brought up in a hard-working crofting family, whose way of life was one of sternly repetitive work in a hard country, with few farm machines, few concessions to holidays or fun. The country lad hated the tedious farm labour and was often described as 'completely different from the others', seemingly always engrossed in books.[3] Although the boy loved books and demonstrated at an early age an unusual talent for writing, that only brought to his parents disappointment and shame.

Although Gibbon's collection of books speaks out his preference for Englishness, and he has openly shown his dislike for the dirt and discomfort in the Scots' farming community, he is best known for his excellent and vivid presentation of the red-clay lands of the Mearns and its people in *A Scots Quair*. In fact, it is typical of Gibbon to be torn between a love for his native homeland, and a bitterness akin to hatred for the background of his youth. The close tie with the land is impressively reflected in his essay 'The Land', in which he recalls the personality of the Mearns, 'how interwoven with the fibre of my body and personality is this land and its queer, scarce harvests, its hours of reeking sunshine and stifling rain, how much a stranger I am, south, in those seasons of mist and mellow fruitfulness. . . .'[4] In the same essay, he also presents the other side of the land: 'a grey, grey life, dull and grey in its routine', and

> As I listen to that sleet-drive I can see the wilting hay-ricks under the fall of the sleet and think of the wind ablow on ungarmented floors, ploughmen in sodden bothies on the farms outbye, old, bent and wrinkled people who have mislaid so much of fun and hope and high endeavour in grey servitude to those rigs curling away, only half-inanimate, into the night.*[5]

In such circumstances, books offered a welcome means of escape from the 'narrowness and bitterness and heart-breaking toil in one of the most unkindly agricultural lands in the world.'[6] Paradoxically, when he did indeed escape from the crofting life first to journalism, then to the armed forces, finally to a hard-working existence as freelance writer in Welwyn Garden City, England, it was his unforgettable depiction of those red-clay fields and the men who worked them that made him famous as a Scottish writer.

Gibbon's peculiar sensibility towards all signs of suffering and cruelty can be traced back to his boyhood. His schoolmaster described him as a 'kindly boy'. Later in his life, he indignantly attacked the government for the empty promises to those who labour 'in pelting rains and the flares of head-aching suns', suffering from 'a murderous monotony, poverty and struggle and loss of happy human relationships.'[7] These sentiments, it is believed, had probably acquired a political edge by the time Gibbon turned his back on the regions of

---

**bothies*: permanent living quarters for workmen, esp. a separate building on a farm used to house unmarried male farm workers. *outbye*: away from the populous part of a district. *rigs*: an extent of arable land, long rather than broad. The annotation in the footnotes explains some Scottish words not included in *The Concise Oxford Dictionary* (1982) and is based on Mairi Robinson, ed., *The Concise Scots Dictionary* (Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 1985).

crofting life in 1917 in order to start work as a cub reporter with *The Aberdeen Journal*.

Gibbon's escape from the toil on the Mearns does not mean a cutting-off of his bonds with the land, whose traces can still be found in his later commitment and his writings. Yet certainly by then he had grown out of a mere country lad. His personal growth becomes a paradigm of the opening-up of new possibilities and Utopian visions out of a world-wide crisis and the breakdown of the old order. His stay in Aberdeen was unhappy. This urban experience confirmed his sense of social commitment and engaged him in the quest for social improvement. Two years later, he moved to Glasgow, the harsh reality of which stimulated an early interest in left-wing organization. His experiences in Glasgow were evidently even more traumatic than in Aberdeen. According to Angus Calder,

> The 'Scottish Scene' was very ugly. After World War I, the country's characteristic heavy industries -- coal, iron, shipbuilding -- had lost export markets, but although new consumer-goods industries maintained prosperity for many in southern England, Scotland neither created nor attracted such industries. Mass unemployment led to mass emigration: In the ten years leading up to 1931, nearly 400,000 Scots (say about one person in twelve), left Scotland, and despite high natural increase population actually declined. Politically, Scotland had swung precociously to the left. In 1922, the Labour Party had returned the largest bloc of Scottish MPs and the eccentric constituency of Motherwell had actually elected a Communist. But the abortion of the General Strike was followed by further disillusionment in 1931 when a Scottish premier, Ramsay MacDonald, defected from the Labour Party to head a 'National' government, and his former party, which had held over half Scotland's seats, was reduced from 37 to a mere 7.[8]

Not only in Scottish history but also in modern European history, that was particularly a gloomy period. The disruptive and disillusioning effects of World War I formed a general challenge to the stability and certainty with which the world had hitherto been understood. The old orders and social relations were altered by the war. Rapidly deteriorating social conditions made unique demands upon artists at that time. By the early 30s, art had acquired a stern political aspect, and the general increase in political awareness was reflected in Gibbon's writing.[9] The First World War itself had an even more profound effect upon the intellectual climate in the early part of the century, leading many people to revise their deepest thoughts and beliefs; in fact, this may be regarded as the cataclysm which finally cut modern man off from the comparatively stable values of Victorian society. As Virginia Woolf puts it,

> . . . young men . . . were forced to be aware of what was happening in Russia; in Germany; in Italy; in Spain. They could not go on discussing aesthetic emotions and personal relations . . . they had to read the politicians. They read Marx. They became communists; they became anti-fascists.[10]

The crisis had generated a 'time of transition' in many radical intellectuals. It was the 'going over' to the side of the workers, into 'unfamiliar country' -- the territory of the politicized workers, where political and literary theory were held to be one with Communist Party practice.[11] It was during these years of turmoil, in the late 20s and the early 30s, that Gibbon was formulating his ideas on history and politics. The

First World War seemed to be a particularly potent leitmotif in his writing, which was a mixture of reflections on modern intellectual developments of political consciousness and thoughts and feelings distilled from personal experience. There was never any doubt that his own sympathies lay with the lower classes in the class war. People from the upper classes are never described as enlightened or noble in his writing, for the ruling classes are branded as the formulators and broadcasters of civilization, who have subjugated and distorted the ordinary folk.[12]. Douglas Young observes, 'He tends to produce caricatures of aristocrats, associated with Discipline, Order, Fascism, the desire to confine and inhibit human nature.'[13] Yet, his passionate social concern for the down-trodden has a different emphasis from those of his contemporaries, like Spender, Auden, or Orwell. Thus, although he avoids the sentimental idealization of the workers to be found in many commitment writers of that age, he can adopt an equally doctrinaire attitude which sees all workers as wretched victims of the blighting effect of capitalism. The modern working man has been deformed physically and spiritually by the influence of his environment, and this applies to the farmworkers of the Mearns as well. To him, the urban proletariat in the slums of Glasgow is the miniature of the suffering all over the world:

> The hundred and fifty eat and sleep and copulate and conceive and crawl into childhood in those waste jungles of stench and disease and hopelessness, sub-humans as definitely as the Morlocks of Wells -- and without even the consolation of feeding on their oppressors' flesh.[14]

The failure of the General Strike in 1926 made Gibbon believe that, although it is through no fault of their own, the working classes are not strong enough to be expected to lead the way in political activity. The working classes are not immune to the bad influence of civilization and their spontaneous uprising alone cannot lead the revolution to victory. This belief emphasizes in Gibbon's mind the need for strong leadership by an exceptional individual, rather than from the masses led by the Party. Only a great personality like Spartacus or Ewan Tavendale (one of the major characters in *A Scot's Quair*) could lead a successful revolution.[15]

No matter how unorthodox Gibbon's theory of leadership is, his essays in *A Scots Hairst* and novels like *A Scots Quair* indicate that he would favour the Marxist plan for a revolution of the united forces of the proletariat to overthrow the ruling classes of the present capitalist system, assume control and set up a communist state which would guarantee equality and freedom for all. Accordingly, communism becomes a system which can offer the means to achieve his personal political objectives rather than a mere vision embodying these ends themselves. To him, the modern predicament could only be solved by violent revolution rather than by a process of gradual change. For this reason, he was opposed at that time to any kind of Fabian Socialism. The Labour Movement was scorned; its leaders were portrayed as self-interested hypocrites who would betray the workers for their own benefits as soon as they had the chance to co-operate

with the establishment and acquire social status.

However, Gibbon's political views were often heterodox. At different stages, Diffusionism and Communism provided the required philosophical basis for his instinctive feelings, but neither could hope to hold him completely. It was very difficult to tie him down to any precise political creed. Although Gibbon clearly had Marxist sympathies, it cannot be shown that in his politics he was an orthodox Marxist. In 1917, his enthusiasm for the Russian Revolution had been great, but he became disillusioned by later events in Russia and was not blind to what he called 'the blood and iron government of Stalin'.[16] The Communists who knew him insisted that he was a Communist, and MacDiarmid alleged that he was expelled from the Party for his adherence to Trotsky. MacDiarmid calls him 'a Socialist internationalist of the type whose politics emphatically did not begin at home.'[17] Gibbon's own version was given in a letter to Neil Gunn: 'By the way I'm not an official Communist. They refuse to allow me into the party!'[18] Alexander Gray, his schoolmaster, on the other hand, testified that towards the end of his life, Gibbon was much less extreme in his political views and objected to the dogmatism of the Communist Party.[19] No matter how diversified his political views were, Gibbon had no illusions about his comrades, just as his character Ewan in *Grey Granite* recognizes '[if] it suited the Party purpose [Comrade] Trease would betray him to the police tomorrow, use anything and everything that might happen to him as propaganda and publicity,

without caring a fig for liking or aught else.'[20]

As an artist, Gibbon remains critical of all ideologies. In an article published in the *Left Review* just before his death, Gibbon wrote: 'I hate capitalism; all my books are explicit or implicit propaganda. But because I'm a revolutionary, I see no reason for gainsaying my own critical judgement.'[21] He knew that bad art would never be good propaganda. And he would never distort art to make a political thesis. All art, to him, is no more than the fine savour and essence of the free life.

Gibbon's views on nationalism were equally ambiguous. He declared that he himself was 'some kind of nationalist', but only 'temporarily and opportunistically'.[22] He regarded nationalism merely as a temporary cultural aberration. His dislike of nationalism lies in an ultimate cosmopolitanism, encouraged in Gibbon's early days by Wells. Wells inspired him to dream of a future where national differences would disappear in a cosmopolitan utopia.[23] Out of this grew his attitude to Scottish Nationalism, which was strong at that time and was closely linked with the literary revival that took place in Scotland in the late 20s and early 30s. He was on the whole opposed to political nationalism in Scotland and to a self-conscious nationalism in literature and the arts. In *A Scots Hairst*, he expounds on the theme of 'what a curse to the earth are small nations. . . .'

> I think there's the chance that Scotland, especially in its Glasgow, in its bitter straitening of the economic struggle, may win to a freedom preparatory to, and in

alignment with, that cosmopolitan freedom, long before England: so, a cosmopolitan opportunist, I am some kind of Nationalist.[24]

However, his attitudes towards Scottish nationalism did not stop him feeling proud of Scottish culture. In 'Literary Light', Gibbon emphasizes that Scotland *is* still capable of producing great art. He praises MacDiarmid and Lewis Spence as true poets, 'in the sense that life, not editors or anthologists, demand of them their poetry.'[25] As William Malcolm says, 'Mitchell the radical and scholarly cosmopolite can, with little ideological modification, transmute into Grassic Gibbon, the quintessential but equally demanding Scot.'[26] Yet, with his objection to political nationalism, Gibbon found it hard to support a nationalist approach to literature and so, as we shall shortly see, scorned the idea of a 'Scottish Renaissance'. This ambivalence leads us to what is perhaps the most paradoxical issue of all in Gibbon's career: British versus Scottish identity as embodied in the issue of the English language versus the Scots language[27] with its diverse dialects.

The heterogeneity of Gibbon's personal background at a time when 'things fall apart' is best embodied in the dilemma and the fascination of polyglot languages facing the novelist. Gibbon began publishing novels and short stories in English, not an altogether uncommon phenomenon among Scottish writers, who very often would cast their narratives in English prose while reporting the demotic speech of the natives as colourfully as they could. In other words, they respected the historical

division between literary English and oral Scots. As Cairns Craig points out in his introduction to *The History of Scottish Literature*:

> The continually anticipated extinction of both Gaelic and Scots pointed, it seemed, to an end to Scottish literature which would not be much delayed after its linguistic bases had been eroded and Scotland had become just another part of the English speaking world. . . . Behind them (Scottish writers) is a tradition which many assumed to have died; before them the apparent inevitability of absorption into English -- or American -- culture. Looking back to what they saw as the failure of an independent tradition, Scottish writers might locate the break differently -- the Reformation and the acceptance of English as the language of religion, the removal of the Court to London in 1603, the dissolution of the Scottish parliament in 1707, the end of Scotland's intellectual golden age with Carlyle's departure to London in 1832 -- but the finality of the rupture seemed inescapable. Even past cultural success, therefore, had to be seen, from the totality of Scottish life, as a defeat: the success of the Reformation, for instance, dooming Scots as the language of intellectual exchange, and the success of the Enlightenment being built upon conceptions of a 'universal' culture to which specifically Scottish experience was irrelevant. In a context where the prevailing critical orthodoxy -- as expounded by critics like T S Eliot and F R Leavis -- emphasised the central importance of 'tradition' to the continuing creativity of the present, the failure of the tradition implied inevitably that Scottish writing would not be able to regenerate itself or to retain any significant contemporary vitality.[28]

This dilemma, as MacDiarmid acknowledged as well, resulted from the fact that Scots writers 'will reach a large public' and that 'the English language is an immensely superior medium of expression.'[29] Thus, the issue of language has an overwhelming significance that sets their writing quite apart from that of the English writer. The language of literature, for every Scottish writer, is a matter of choice, and those choices form an integral part of the act of writing. Cairns Craig, after a

brief survey of Scottish literature in the twentieth century, further states that although the texture of Scottish life (e.g. religious, educational, legal, linguistic forms) remains distinct from that of England to an extent which is little recognized in England, let alone the outside world,

> [the] balance of the cultural organization of the society is quite different. To the extent that much of Scottish middle-class society models itself on English values, distinctively Scottish culture has more affinity with the working classes than English culture, is more imbued with a continuing sense of a living 'folk' culture. And to the extent that the element of the middle classes who are active in Scottish culture are professionals -- legal, religious, educational -- the tonality of Scottish culture is much more abstract and philosophical than in England. . . . Scottish writers are both more working class and more philosophical than is normal in English culture; their engagement is with a continuing 'folk' history and with absolutist values that do not fit into the comfortable ethics of Anglicanism and the English spirit of compromise.[30]

The identity crisis not only gave rise to a language and literature debate but also reflected the social and economic decline in Scotland, a dominant preoccupation of those years of Depression. In addition, Scotland had the continuing problem of cultural decline and loss of national identity to contend with. Furthermore, the debate was also a consequence of Edwin Muir's advocacy of the adoption of the English language and literary tradition in his critical study *Scott and Scotland*,[31] in which he states that Scotland does not have enough life of its own to nourish a writer of his scope. To him, 'this linguistic division means that Scotsmen feel in one language and think in another; that their emotions turn to the Scottish tongue, with all its associations of local sentiments, and their minds to a standard

English which for them is almost bare of associations other than those of the classroom.'[32]

The curse of Scottish culture is, for Muir, 'the lack of a whole language, which finally means the lack of a whole mind.'[33] He concludes that until Scotland has a common language for its prose and poetry, its thoughts and feelings, this evil division in the Scots mind and the Scots language must continue. Therefore, English is the only practical means for Scotland to create a national literature. The hostile reaction of MacDiarmid is to set about liberating language from contention and complacency by advocating Synthetic Scots (a combination of the resources of the etymological dictionary with the expressive sound of the spoken language). He uses this as a means to search for a lost cultural continuity and help Scotland take her place in a radically new world out of the shadow of English culture, in which independence would be granted to both individuals and nations.

Gibbon was also very conscious of the peculiar and unique position of Scottish writers, the predicament resulting in the arguments of the relation of a writer to language and culture. On the one hand, he praised MacDiarmid's effort to demonstrate 'richly and completely . . . the flexibility and the loveliness of that alien variation of the Anglo-Saxon speech which is Braid Scots'[34] so as to bring 'Scots language into print again as a herald in tabard, not the cap-and-bells clown of romantic versification.'[35] On the other hand, he was dismissive of the

Scottish literary Renaissance, finding that modern Scotland as a nation almost lacked a Scottish literary output. Language was for Gibbon the critical factor. What he dreamt of was to resuscitate a fully functional Scots prose that would convey the rich texture of a revitalised Scottish consciousness. In a letter to Helen B. Cruickshank, he wrote:

> He (Hugh MacDiarmid) praises the Modern Scot; I unpraise it; He talks about the Scots literary renaissance; I say there isn't any such thing -- merely a dodge on the part of second-rate Scots who can't attract a sufficiently large English public; He is the extreme Nationalist; I characterize the Nationalists as 'brosy barbarians'.*[36]

Gibbon was fully aware of the inferior position of Scots in literary production in Scotland. Scots, in the eyes of the common people, is 'the speech of bed and board and street and plough, the speech of emotional ecstasy and emotional stress.'[37] And so, to the bourgeois of Scotland, it is 'coarse and low and common and loutish, a matter for laughter, well enough for hinds and the like, but for the genteel to be quoted in vocal inverted commas. It is a thing rigorously elided from their serious intercourse -- not only with the English, but among themselves. It is seriously believed by such stratum of the Scots populace to be an inadequate and pitiful and blunted implement . . . .'[38] Contrary to such beliefs, Gibbon thinks that the real tragedy lies not in such vulgar, opinionated views, but in those 'truly Scots writers', who try to write as 'a good Englishman' while admitting that Scots is 'a real and a haunting thing'.[39] The result is really heart-breaking:

---

* *brosy*: coarse, clumsy.

> The prose -- or verse -- is impeccably correct, the vocabulary is rich and adequate, the English is severe, serene . . . . But unfortunately it is not English. The English reader is haunted by a sense of something foreign stumbling and hesitating behind this smooth façade of adequate technique: it is as though the writer did not *write* himself, but *translated* himself.[40]

Paradoxically, Gibbon's attitude to English language is completely free of hostile nationalist sentiment; indeed he invariably praises the English language, describing it in his essay 'Glasgow', for example, as 'that lovely and flexible instrument, so akin to the darker Braid Scots.'[41] In his prefatory note to *Sunset Song*, Gibbon shows deference towards 'the great English tongue', asking for 'latitude', 'forbearance' and 'courtesy' in prospect of his impending experiment to 'import into his pages some score or so untranslatable words and idioms' and confining this exercise to limits which are felt to be 'in fairness to his hosts.' (p. 14) And he even settled in England, in Welwyn Garden City, and wrote many 'good' pieces in English, in spite of the fact that his disciples have tended to take him at his words and prefer to ignore his English prose while worshipping the Scots of *A Scots Quair*.

Gibbon's overriding concern with Scottish culture and his attitude towards both English and Scots led him to appeal for a salvation of Scotland:

> There is nothing in culture or art that is worth the life and elementary happiness of one of those thousands who rot in the Glasgow slums. There is nothing in science or religion. If it came (as it may come) to some fantastic choice between a free and independent Scotland, a centre of culture, a bright flame of artistic and scientific achievement, and providing

> elementary decencies of food and shelter to the submerged proletariat of Glasgow and Scotland, I at least would have no doubt as to which side of the battle I would range myself. For the cleansing of that horror, if cleanse it they could, I would welcome the English in suzerainty over Scotland till the end of time. I would welcome the end of Braid Scots and Gaelic, our culture, our history, our nationhood under the heels of a Chinese army of occupation if it could cleanse the Glasgow slums, give a surety of food and play -- the elementary right of every human being -- to those people of the abyss. . . .[42]

This linguistic uncertainty, also reflected in Gibbon's literary production, gave rise to the conception of the Scot as, in some sense, schizophrenic, self-divided for developing his alternative personalities under his *noms de plume*. The publication of *Sunset Song* under his pseudonym Lewis Grassic Gibbon (a name derived from his mother's maiden name) brought him fame in literary circles. Despite the fact that discerning readers, writers, and critics of the time had put Lewis Grassic Gibbon above Leslie Mitchell, and to succeeding generations his reputation stands mainly on his Scottish work, Gibbon himself was not certain about his success in Scottish writing. He thought that *Persian Dawns, Egyptian Nights*, a collection of short stories of the Middle East he wrote in English, was much better than *Sunset Song* technically, which was published the same year as the collection. Yet, however doubtful he was about his great achievement in *Sunset Song*, Gibbon quickly accepted the verdict and adapted himself to it. 'He was shrewd enough to see that there were now two definite sides to his writing, an English and a Scottish one.'[43] It pleased him to develop the distinct and separate Lewis Grassic Gibbon and Leslie Mitchell

projections. He began to discover or invent different characteristics for the two names, and in the guise of one would speak of the other as 'my distant English or Scottish cousin'. He placed two typewriters in his study, one for Gibbon, the other for Mitchell. He even embarked on a collaboration between the imaginary cousins and published the finished work as such.[44] Nevertheless, the practice has been overemphasized by psychologically oriented critics. As we shall see in the discussion of *A Scots Quair*, in Chapter III, an author's work can only be treated as whole in a historical context and not split schizophrenically into two, as has been done with Gibbon.[45]

Gibbon's 'split personality' did not prevent him from creating masterpieces in Scots. He placed Scotland within a commendably wide potential and cultural context, in which language is the key. His intentions in deploying and promoting his native Scots tongue were certainly not nationalist, although they did reflect his general fondness for Scotland. True to character, his attitude to Braid Scots was ultimately -- to employ the author's own terminology -- cosmopolitan. He showed a lasting interest in scientific experiments geared towards the creation of an international language. His own aim to create a universally intelligible prose style which retained a distinctively Scottish flavour was itself part of a greater scheme of a polyglot character. In the long term, he saw this experiment as an elementary step towards his ideal of a cosmopolitan language, which is finally foreseen, in 'Glasgow',

as a synthesis incorporating the best features of the individual tongues of the world, the ultimate objective being to create the conditions whereby man 'sings his epics in a language moulded from the best on earth.'[46]

Gibbon's natural affection for his native tongue subsequently manifested itself in a typically cosmopolitan manner, the author ascribing to the Scots language a major role in this universal hybrid, affirming: 'I think the Braid Scots may yet give lovely lights and shadows not only to English but to the perfected speech of Cosmopolitan Man: so I cultivate it, for lack of that perfect speech that is yet to be.'[47] His attitude to language thus confirms his tendency to look beyond Scotland and indicates the universal scope of his vision. His championing of Scots has a more precise significance as a pointer to his political opinions, however, in signifying the proletarian character of his sympathies: he appreciated the importance of Scots in modern times as the language of the lower classes, identifying Braid Scots in 'Literary Light' as 'the speech of bed and board and street and plough.'[48] Thus, class questions were uppermost in his mind even when he was considering Scotland itself.

Gibbon's life and his works provide a fascinating instance of what Bakhtin would call 'polyglossia' and 'heteroglossia'. The dilemma which he and other Scots writers were trying to deal with is the moment when 'languages of various epochs and periods of socio-ideological life cohabit with one another.'[49] Each

language would embody distinct systems of world views characteristic of the cultural and social contexts, out of which that language evolves in history. Standard English would imply not only the dominance of a mainstream culture, but also middle-class values as well as more 'positive' hopes of liberation from the narrow confines of one indigenous culture, of the most cosmopolitan Utopian vision of higher forms of evolution or revolution. Gibbon's Scots, on the other hand, retains the warmth of the popular culture and lower life, the sardonic humour of Scottish unofficial culture which laughs at all the pretentious monologism and human folly in the larger background of the eternal landscape of nature. Gibbon may profess various sentiments and pursue various 'isms' during his lifetime, all of which would leave distinct traces of history in his works. But these various world views he has been engaged with find their expression in the polyglossia of different languages and heteroglossia within a language: English, Braid Scots, oral speech genres, poetic genre, propaganda, scientific discourse and so on. As Bakhtin points out,

> . . . language is heteroglot from top to bottom: it represents the co-existence of socio-ideological contradictions between the present and the past, between differing epochs of the past, between different socio-ideological groups in the present, between tendencies, schools, circles and so forth, all given bodily form. These 'languages' of heteroglossia intersect each other in a variety of ways, forming new socially typifying 'languages.'[50]

The 'language' issue, then, is not just a matter of linguistic innovation or 'the cap-and-bells clown of romantic versification'; nor is it a literary slumming. It leads us to

the images and contradictions of the author and his world as realized in the bodily form of literary works, which becomes in turn a scene of dialogic relations between different ideological signs and characters. The languages evoke a multiplicity of different world views and different heroes, all created as 'objects of an authorial attitude',[51] yet ending up on the same plane with the author in a dialogic relationship. Such an approach through languages and speeches as utterances opens up possibilities of meaning in Gibbon's works beyond the narrow confines of such labels as 'Marxist commitment', 'diffusionism', or 'Scottish tradition', and beyond the level of mere linguistic analysis which is blind to the working of words in different social, cultural and literary contexts.

While the various languages of Mitchell/Gibbon with different, even conflicting world views leave indelible traces in his works and provide an encouraging starting point for the following textual study along the lines of Bakhtin's genre theory of the polyphonic novel, they are not simply 'reflected' in his *Grey Granite* or *A Scots Quair*. Ideologies are mediated through different genres in their textual realization, which may effect an artistic embodiment of visions on a higher level than the often monologic polemics of the non-artistic real world. Mitchell/Gibbon as an author with various positions and languages has to be produced and evaluated through textual analysis, which is, however, open to the cultural and historical context of his times and ours.

CHAPTER III

THE SONG OF POLYPHONY

Grey Granite is the last novel (after *Sunset Song* and *Cloud Howe*) of Lewis Grassic Gibbon's trilogy *A Scots Quair*. Its depiction of the modern urban scene of the labour movement, class confrontation, communist agitprop, urban poverty and industrialization, written by a left-wing author from the Scots peasantry with sympathy for the poor and with revolutionary zeal, qualifies the novel as 'working-class literature'. Indeed, it has been listed as a classic of the working-class literature of the twentieth century. Not surprisingly, the text yields to various Marxist and radical readings. However, just as the author is heterogeneous, the text is also complex, consisting of different voices that resist appropriation under any single ideology. For example, a feminist critic like Deidre Burton can say,

> Its complexity and contradictions, and its problematic refusal to idealize the man who should somehow have been the 'hero' of this proletarian novel, make it difficult to reconcile politically in any traditional straightforward and unqualified way. On the other hand, . . . these complexities and contradictions render it a powerfully interrogative text.[1]

Different critical responses, I believe, result from polyphony in the text, which makes the novel an unfinalized product of dialogism, open to various possibilities with unrealized potential and demands. If we acknowledge that the working class is not a myth created by a political party or a particular theory, but a distinctive social class that has emerged in the

process of historical change, with a distinctive unofficial popular culture, then the working-class novel is characterized by a portrayal of the working-class members in a definite historical context of various dialogic relationships, a portrayal deeply rooted in a working-class culture and voiced in their distinctive language. In *Grey Granite*, this feature is foregrounded in various narrative voices embodying different experiences and ideologies. Conflicting world views are thus brought into the text which serves as a site of ideological struggle. Truths become relative, while the reader is urged to seek among various voices for alternative solutions to the problems in the text as well as in the real world in which he lives.

This polyphonic feature needs justification not only within the discussion of the trilogy as a working-class novel, but also in the context of its more general criticism. *Grey Granite* is usually judged by many critics of various backgrounds as artistically inferior to *Sunset Song* (the first novel in the trilogy). Many critics praise a unified voice in the latter for evoking an organic community in close bond with the land, and consider the former to be fragmentary and divisive, in an urban scene without any sense of community, and without a coherent message towards the end. At best, this fragmentariness is apologized for as the only credible realistic description of the modern world of alienation. Aesthetic standards here clearly bear an ideological bias, which we have dealt with in discussing

similar theoretical assumptions about the novel as a genre in the first chapter of this thesis. In my reading of the trilogy, I would like to point out that the single voiced communal myth is an abstraction from some lyrical passages such as Chris's wedding dance party (pp. 114-131), and carries the ideological significance of nostalgia for the land, which is just one of the voices in the trilogy, instead of a 'realistic' portrayal of a way of living.

Two passages on the third page of the prelude in *Sunset Song* serve well for illustrating the double-voicedness and polyphony in this novel. Here the narrator is recounting the history of Kinraddie, and showing a past that is as divisive as the modern society:

> But in the early days of the nineteenth century it was an ill time for the Scots gentry, for the poison of the French Revolution came over the seas and crofters and common folk like that stood up and cried *Away to hell!* when the Auld Kirk preached submission from its pulpits. Up as far as Kinraddie came the poison and the young laird of that time, and he was Kenneth, he called himself a Jacobin and joined the Jacobin Club of Aberdeen and there at Aberdeen was nearly killed in the rioting, for liberty and equality and fraternity, he called it. And they carried him back to Kinraddie a cripple, but he would still have it that all men were free and equal and he set to selling the estate and sending the money to France, for he had a real good heart. And the crofters marched on Kinraddie Castle in a body and bashed in the windows of it, they thought equality should begin at home.
>
> More than half the estate had gone in this driblet and that while the cripple sat and read his coarse French books; but nobody guessed that till he died and then his widow, poor woman, found herself own no more than the land that lay between the coarse hills, the Grampians, and the farms that stood out by the Bridge End above the Denburn, straddling the outward road. Maybe there were some twenty to thirty holdings in all, the crofters dour folk of the old Pict stock, they had no history, common

> folk, and ill-reared their biggins clustered and chaved amid the long, sloping fields. The leases were one-year, two-year, you worked from the blink of the day you were breeked to the flicker of the night they shrouded you, and the dirt of gentry sat and ate up your rents but you were as good as they were.* (p. 17)

The narrator first adopts an ironically conservative tone lamenting the 'ill time' for the gentry and 'the poison of the French Revolution', words probably taken from the landed gentry or a priest frightened of the common folk's jubilant cry italicized in the text. Amid these two voices of class confrontation comes the voice of a radical Jacobin laird Kenneth, whose heart and mind are all set upon the ideology of 'liberty and equality and fraternity', words taken verbatim from the French Revolution, but who is crippled and nearly killed in the practicality of rioting. These words remain an idealistic slogan with the laird whose action is suicidal, rather than a practical, workable alternative to the system of inequality. The common folk's voice: 'equality should begin at home,' combines the slogan with a commonsensible proverb whose missing word 'charity' is a better description of the laird's revolutionary zeal. The slogan becomes internally persuasive and is assimilated into their voice, because it finds an echo in their urge for equality for themselves who actually live and suffer from the system of class oppression. The slogan comes from French, is rendered into English with little change in the choice of words. 'Fraternity' is already elegant in English,

---

*_Auld Kirk_: the established Church of Scotland. _dour_: (of persons) dull, stubborn, determined. _biggins_: prob. = big yins: older children. _chave_: to toil back-breakingly. _breek_: to put into trousers.

which has the more down-to-earth synonym 'brotherhood'. For the Scottish, it is a slogan imported from English which is in turn imported from French, with all the outward form of an alien voice from alien cultures. Yet this voice finds an echo in their heart and triggers a more vernacular paraphrase in a concrete Scottish context, as the last sentence from the quotation shows. The 'you' marks the introduction of the folk's voice directly into the narrative and engages the reader's sympathy through identification.[2]

The identification, though, is only partial, for in these two passages alone, amid various voices, we can sense an ambivalence through which these voices may reinforce each other as well as undercut each other, preventing them from becoming absolute monologic truth. The crofters are 'dour folk of the old Pict stock, they had no history, common folk. . . .' They alone can hardly be expected to lead a practical revolution or carry out any reform. Yet their grievances are legitimate and as the socially oppressed they do have justice on their side. The narrator is torn between various voices. The laird's words and actual experience themselves illustrate a contradiction, which is also deeply felt by the narrator, between sympathy for the laird as a remarkable person 'with a good heart' and sympathy for the crofters as the oppressed class. The narrative voice is thus filled with other voices, distanced, mediated and stylized. It is all these voices, including the narrator's, that define the authorial intentions. As Bakhtin points out, 'Ultimate

semantic authority -- the author's intention -- is realized not in his direct discourse but with the help of other people's words, created and distributed specifically as the words of others.'[3]

The author also has generic considerations overriding the expectation of a 'realistic' presentation in his trilogy:

> So that was Kinraddie that bleak winter of nineteen eleven and the new minister, him they chose early next year, he was to say it was the Scots countryside itself, fathered between a kailyard and a bonny brier bush in the lee of a house with green shutters. And what he meant by that you could guess at yourself if you'd a mind for puzzles and dirt, there wasn't a house with green shutters in the whole of Kinraddie. (p. 31)

What is Scotland itself? Any description is bound to be stylized, in a dialogic relationship with other genres and other texts. In this short paragraph that appears early in *Sunset Song*, there is a reference to the Kailyard genre and its bestseller *Beside the Bonnie Brier Bush* (1894) by 'Ian Maclaren' (John Watson), a genre that exploits a sentimental and romantic image of small town life in Scotland, in a vernacular style. There is also the reference to George Douglas Brown's *The House with the Green Shutters* (1901) which uses techniques of the anti-kailyard realist genre to focus on the sordid life of Scotland, in opposition to the sentimentalism of the kailyard school. Gibbon's narrator is telling the story with various genres and texts in his mind. He is also pointing out here that 'realist' descriptions are just as self-conscious as other generic techniques. Dialogism is unavoidable in writing. It is languages of heteroglossia that become the object of

representation in the polyphonic novel.[4] As Bakhtin says,

> True dialogic relations are possible only in relation to a hero who is a carrier of his own truth, who occupies a *signifying* (ideological) position. If an experience or a deed does not pretend to some *signifying power* (agreement/disagreement), but only to *reality* (evaluation), then the dialogic relationship can be minimal.
>
> But can a *signifying* meaning become the object of *artistic depiction?* With a more profound understanding of artistic depiction, the *idea* can become such an object for it.[5]

The different voices in *Grey Granite* fully develop the polyphonic nature of the trilogy and finally push it to the edge of art form, which in turn fully engages the reader in a way Brechtian epic theatre engages its audience.

Grey Granite follows the pattern of an hourglass: different voices representing different interests and belief systems are formed in the first half of the novel into a united front in which they still keep their identity while reinforcing each other's voice in a common struggle against the dominant capitalist authority; the latter half of the novel, however, sees the falling apart of these voices as the confrontation becomes more stringent and violent and the reader is drawn into a situation of no easy solution.

The first direct cut into the working-class life is through interweaving the third person narrative voice with the first person narrative by an anonymous working-class family of an unemployed father, a grumbling mother, and a discontented daughter in a vernacular style. The shifts are effected through no quotation or italicization. Thus, first the father reflects:

On the Broo since the War and five kids to keep, eating off your head -- och, why did you live? -- never a minute of quiet to yourself, nothing but the girnings of the wife for more silver, the kids half-barefoot, half-fed, oh hell.*

And the wife would turn as she heard him come back, lie wakeful and think on the morn's morning -- what to give the weans, what to give the man, fed he must be ere he took the streets to look for that weary job he'd not find -- he'd never find one you had come to ken. Hardly believe it was him you had wed, that had been a gey bit spark in his time, hearty and bonny, liked you well: and had hit you last night, the bloody brute coming drunk from the pub -- a woman couldn't go and hide in booze, forget all the soss and pleither, oh no, she'd to go on till she dropped, weans scraiching, getting thin and like tinks, and the awful words they picked up every place, the eldest loon a street-corner keelie, the quean -- oh God, it made a body sick.†

And the quean would turn by the side of her sisters, see the faint glow of the dawn, smell the reek of the Paldy heat -- would she never get out of it, get a job, get away, have clothes, some fun? If they couldn't afford to bring up their weans decent why did father and mother have them? and syne nag and nag at you day on day, on this and that, the way that you walked, the way you behaved (*take care that the loons don't touch your legs*), the way that you spoke -- nothing pleased the old fools, and what you brought home they thought should be theirs, every meck that you made, nothing for yourself, stew in the reek of the Cowgate's drains till you died and were buried and stank to match. My God, if a lassie couldn't do anything else she could take a bit walk out to Doughty Park, fine there, though the place was littered with Reds, fair daft, the Communionists the worst of the lot, aye holding their meetings and scraiching and bawling that the workers all join up with their unions and fight for their rights and down with the gents.**

**Broo*: the Labour Exchange, now the Unemployment Benefit Office; unemployment benefit received from it, *on the broo*: on the dole. *girning*: whining, complaining.

†*soss*: a state of dirt and disorder; a dirty wet mess; a wet, soggy mess of food. *pleiter*: a wet, muddy spot; a (disagreeable) messy task. *scraiching*: screeching. *tink*: contemptuous term for a person, specifically a foul-mouthed, vituperative, quarrelsome, vulgar person. *keelie*: a rough male city-dweller, a tough. *quean*: girl.

***syne*: from then, since. *loon*: a scoundrel, a sexually immoral person.

> But no decent lassies would listen to them, for they knew the Communionists were awful tinks who wanted to break up the home. (pp. 369-370)

The passage evokes vividly the daily concerns of a working-class family as experienced differently by each member, except the common pain of poverty. The father is bitter about being 'on the Broo' and feels burdened by the whole family in poverty. The wife is also concerned about survival. But she also cherishes the romance they once enjoyed, and hates the violence and drinking her husband indulges in -- the pub being his territory and the home hers.[6] The daughter is also bitter, in a way characteristic of the younger generation. She hates poverty, rebels against the conventional morality of her parents, and dreams of freedom and fun. Thus in this brief passage are presented three different voices with different consciousnesses within the working-class community. Gender and generation permeate the whole trilogy and are important in the last novel, as we shall come to them later in our discussion.

The last few lines about the Communists, however, are less spontaneous and more gossipy: they are the voice of political propaganda as well as conventional morality, inculcated by the official culture. Though this alien voice is assimilated into the daughter's voice, it is probably part of the parents' moral injunction, so persuasive that the daughter does not italicize or parenthesize it in her consciousness and mark it as alien, as she does with the more explicit moral injunction. Between the shifts of narrative voices are the third person references to

the characters, highlighting the presence of the narrator, who incorporates, and shows gaps between, different voices and languages. Apart from the gaps between different members of the working class, the most ironic gap is that between their human condition of oppression and dreams of freedom on the one hand, and the official propaganda and morality on the other: the urge to break free from the home of poverty and the fear that the 'immoral' communists would break up their home. The so-called working-class consciousness, then, is really a conscious recognition of their own voice as well as alien voices, not necessarily a repudiation or cleansing, which is neither necessary nor possible, but a recognition as such. The characters may or may not realize this in the novel, but the reader is expected to.

It is significant that the image of the Communists is refracted in the voice of the reactionary propaganda and in that of the common workers in the novel. Thus it is defined in relation to others, as a subversive force in the capitalist society, challenging traditional morality and being vilified by the authorities. Later, some more direct portrayal and self-portrayal of the Communists as extreme terrorists do not totally engage the reader's and some other characters' sympathy, while the persecution and vilification of the Communists by reactionary authorities serve to warn the reader not to take a reactionary position in their disapproval of the communists. The reader has to make his choice in relation to various voices.

The revolutionary 'hero' Ewan Tavendale starts out in the novel as a college student whose sole interest lies in flints and who views history with a cold scientific eye. He sets his 'grey granite eyes on Ellen Johns as though she were a chapter on phospher bronze,' (p. 383) though the schoolteacher has been very attractive to many men. Unlike his mother Chris who is sometimes identified with the land and Scotland, Ewan speaks English only. At the beginning of the novel, he quits school to become an apprentice at Gowans and Gloag's, so that he can relieve the financial burden of his newly widowed mother.

As Ewan and the working-class apprentices know well, though, there is a gap between the college apprentice and the common ones, not only intellectually in his education background and stand-offish manner, but also in career prospects: the college 'toff' will be promoted to the office in six months while they are just cheap apprentice labour. One day they start baiting him with insults to his mother (who has also been accused of putting on airs by other common characters). It results in a bloody fist-fight. Of course, there is much jealousy on the part of the young workers. As one worker Alick's sister says, 'you're jealous he's brains and you haven't, that's all.' (p. 371) However, Ewan does act like a 'toff'. The fist-fight serves as a carnival ritual, involving bodily contact, blood-shedding, and animal imagery.

> Ewan dripped blood like a half-killed pig, but he didn't know that, infighting, they were both thick-streaked with blood and snot, holding and fighting. . . . (p. 374)

This carnivalesque fighting symbolically eliminates for the moment the distance between them through the identification of their common animality, blood and snot. As Bakhtin says of the ritual,

> [During carnival,] what is suspended first of all is hierarchical structure and all the forms of terror, reverence, piety, and etiquette connected with it -- that is, everything resulting from socio-hierarchical inequality or any other form of inequality among people (including age). All *distance* between people is suspended, and a special carnival category goes into effect: *free and familiar contact among people.*[7]

Paradoxically, the workers' jealousy is turned into respect for a brave fighter, while Ewan in the fight has 'never felt so well or so keen for life.' (p. 373) Both sides undergo change. Carnivalization breaks down social barriers and brings about greater human intimacy of a utopian nature. Carnivalization is also reflected in the mixing of different narrative voices in the section about the baiting and the fighting (pp. 372-374). It starts with Ewan at work, his interior monologue showing contempt for the workers' addiction to low entertainments. Then it shifts to third-person narrative, to a billingsgate dirty rhyme insulting Ewan, to the voice of an anonymous worker whose vernacular speech uses many generic 'you's, back to Ewan's thoughts affected by the excitement of his preparation and the actual fight, and then ends in third-person narration. These different voices relativize each other, undercut each other, with the Scots-speaking workers drawing the English-speaking Ewan into 'a zone of familiar contact'. The third-person narrator likewise employs an animal imagery characteristic of

the 'Speak' throughout the trilogy -- a sardonic, blasphemous and ludic voice of the folk culture.

Ewan becomes capable of identification with the workers, but he does not merge into them. When Ellen initiates him into socialism, he accepts the mission as an intellectual: '. . . *the working classes to be captured and led; all right, I'll give the keelies a chance.* Ellen said *And don't be so horribly superior; you'll never lead if you can't be an equal. . . .*' (pp. 387-388) Throughout the novel, Ewan and his communism remain heterodox, alternating between doctrinaire ideology/intellectual perception and spontaneous emotional identification with the workers.

During the unemployed workers' march for raising the P. A. C. rates, the sight of a worker being beaten by the police prompts Ewan to take part in the fight and lead the workers to a victory. In the New Year's Eve dance organized by his League (which is distinct from the Labour Party and the Communist Party), Ewan experiences a baptism of carnivalization,

> And as they cheered him and cried his name, the dirty, kind words of mates in the Shops, a great chap that Ewan, just one of themselves . . . it seemed to Ewan in a sudden minute that he would never be himself again, he'd never be ought but a bit of them, the flush on a thin white mill-girl's face, the arm and hand and the downbent face of a keelie from the reek of the Gallowgate, the blood and bones and flesh of them all, their thoughts and their doubts and their loves were his, all that they thought and lived in were his. And that Ewan Tavendale that once had been, the cool boy with the haughty soul and cool hands, apart and alone, self-reliant, self-centred, slipped away out of the room as he stared, slipped away and was lost from his life forever. (p. 430)

These two incidents happen in the middle of the novel, the

narrow pass in the pattern of the hourglass, where different voices tend to agree with each other in opposition to social injustice. Ewan is a socialist, not yet a hardened communist; he consciously mixes himself with the workers and is seen by them as one of them.

The unemployed workers' march is narrated in the voice of an anonymous Broo man. He is cowardly, not an active follower of the Communists who organized the march. Nevertheless, he joins in: 'God blast it, you'd grievances enough to complain. . . . some gype had shoved the handle of a flag in your hand, it read DOWN WITH THE MEANS TEST AND HUNGER AND WAR, the rest of the billies made joke about it, they would rather, they said, down a bottle of beer.'* (pp. 393-394) The slogan is shoved to them as an alien voice, and is accepted with a playful joke. The cowardly worker's voice and his mates' irreverent humour serve as a filter deflecting any ideological rhetoric in the alien voice and assimilating the internally persuasive discourse. Soon the worker feels a sense of communal solidarity in the march and finds a new, more brave voice inside himself:

> They couldn't deny you, you and the rest of the Broo folk here, the right to lay bare your grievances. . . . Communists like Big Jim might blether damned stite but they tried to win you your rights for you.† (p.394)
> A new song ebbing down the damp column, you'd aye thought it daft to sing afore this, a lot of dirt, who was an outcast? But damn't, man, now --
> Arise, ye outcasts and ye hounded,
> Arise, ye slaves of want and fear --

**gype*: a foolish, awkward person, a silly ass, a lout. *billie*: a fellow, lad; a friend, comrade.

†*stite*: gibberish.

> And what the hell else were you, all of you? Singing, you'd never sung so before, all your mates about you, marching as one, you forgot all the chave and trauchle of things, the sting of your feet, nothing could stop you.* (p. 395)

The worker's new voice is a combination of his grievances and the International, what Bakhtin calls the 'internally persuasive discourse':

> Internally persuasive discourse -- as opposed to one that is externally authoritative -- is, as it is affirmed through assimilation, tightly interwoven with 'one's own word.' In the everyday rounds of our consciousness, the internally persuasive word is half-ours and half-someone else's. Its creativity and productiveness consist precisely in the fact that such a word awakens new and independent words, that it organizes masses of our words from within, and does not remain in an isolated and static condition. It is not so much interpreted by us as it is further, that is, freely, developed, applied to new material, new conditions; it enters into interanimating relationships with new contexts. . . . The semantic structure of an internally persuasive discourse is *not finite*, it is open; in each of the new contexts that dialogize it, this discourse is able to reveal ever newer *ways to mean*.[8]

In the description of the hunger-march, there are still other voices: Ewan, the intellectual, having just come out of a bookshop, witnesses the police brutality and joins the fight on the workers' side; the *Runner*, a reactionary newspaper, sides with the police; so does the Reverend Edward MacShilluck, who is in turn embarrassed by the housekeeper's mentioning of the poor worker beaten by the police and dying in hospital; Bailie Brown, the Labour politician, insists that the workers should wait 'a three or four years till Labour came into power again' (p.397); Lord Provost Speight, furious at the Communist agitation, vows

---

*_afore_: before. _trauchle_: tiring labour, drudgery.

not to alter the P. A. C. rates; Duncairn's Chief Constable lies about the police's defeat and their brutality; the anonymous worker recounts the workers' excitement after their victory and Ewan's bravery during the fight; Chris argues with Ma Cleghorn and arouses her sympathy for the workers, so that Ma decides to get Feet the policeman out of her lodging house.

These voices secure the image of the working-class movement firmly on the basis of dialogism and polyphony. It is not just communist agitation subsidized by the Russians, as the Provost claims. It is a valid and viable historical movement involving the working class as its main force as well as people of various backgrounds sympathetic to the socially oppressed, with their own belief systems for social justice: Ewan as a socialist intellectual bent on social reform, Chris as the widow of a Christian socialist priest and daughter of the crofters. During this movement, the workers are awakened and realize themselves as a distinct class positioned in definite political, social and economic relations with other classes. At the moment of maximal dialogism between various voices, they evolve a new voice of their own representing a new class consciousness. Thus truth and meaning are generated through dialogic interaction and interillumination. Polyphony offers a convincing artistic ground for Gibbon's communist sympathies.

Of course, the artistic product of a polyphonic novel outlives the acute contradictions that an author may feel in his particular historical period. Both Dostoevsky and Gibbon were

beset by the isolation and alienation of capitalism and did not have any particular personal world views of 'heroic prophets', either in themselves as historical human beings or in their 'heroes'. As polyphonic novelists, however, they overcome the monologic dualisms of the isolated and alienated individual heroes by the meeting of several multiple consciousnesses, the mapping and evaluation of which are 'the task of an historical poetics', neither to 'be divorced from social and historical analyses' nor to 'be dissolved in them'.[9] The value of these voices do not lie in themselves *per se*, but rather in their meeting, interaction, and mutual illumination.

The latter half of the novel sees these voices falling apart, each drifting away with their own version of truth and their own conviction. There is a sense of urgency for a solution as the authorities and the communists resort to violent confrontation. The unemployed workers stick to the communists while the employed workers are generally more conservative with wage increases and under suppressive reactionary rule, at a time when production of armaments is increasing and the authorities become more repressive. This pattern of widening out is also a continuation of distinction between different voices that have not merged even at the moment of a united front.

From the very beginning, Ewan's socialism has a mechanistic, scientistic and quasi-religious paradigm of history as its theoretical base:

> *You don't quarrel with History and its pace of change any more than you quarrel with the law of gravitation. History's instruments, the workers, 'll turn to us some time* -- (p. 414)
> A hell of a thing to be History! -- not a student, a historian, a tinkling reformer, but LIVING HISTORY ONESELF, being it, making it, eyes for the eyeless, hands for the maimed! -- (p. 459)

Ewan's words are filled with Communist ideology and its rhetoric of propaganda. They come from doctrinaire textbooks and fit in with his indifference to humans and his exclusive interest in granite and flints. Here is another form of modern alienation: men invented a version of history and started to worship it as absolute truth to be realized and served at the cost of instrumentalizing the workers, though this version of truth claims to liberate them from the machines of capitalism. Ewan's communist ideology is countered by other characters in the novel, nearly all of whom are women.

Ma Cleghorn, a down-to-earth, warm-hearted landlady tells Chris,

> *Och, this Communism stuff's not canny, I tell you, it's just a religion though the Reds say it's not and make out that they don't believe in God. They're dafter about Him than the Salvationists are, and once it gets under a body's skin he'll claw at the itch till he's tirred himself.** (p. 417)

The folk wisdom in this vernacular voice shows an intelligent reading of Ewan's discourse, which contains 'eyes for the eyeless, hands for the maimed,' -- the discourse of the Bible. Just like the Christians, the Communists can play a subversive role championing the cause of the poor; but they are also easily

---

**not canny*: unnatural, supernatural.

institutionalized as the Salvationists are. Later, Ewan more explicitly links the mechanistic view of history with God:

> And he thought of Trease saying that he and the rest of the Reds were nothing, they just worked the will of history and passed. . . . And suddenly Ewan's mind trembled on the verge of something, something that he couldn't name, maybe God, that made this strange play with lives and beliefs: . . . (p. 463)

The two faces of the Communists are kept throughout the whole novel -- as a subversive force opposing capitalist system, and as another potential form of institutionalized violence and terrorism.

Indeed, the Communists do have a Machiavellian philosophy of resorting to every dishonest means to achieve their end. When Ewan is arrested, Jim Trease the Communist leader

> . . . said plain that of course the Communists would exploit the case to the full -- for their own ends first, not for Ewan's. They'd do all they could for him, but Ewan was nothing to them, just as he, Jim Trease, was nothing. (p. 454)

Towards the end of the novel, Ewan and Jim are foreseeing their future of underground work and occasional terrorism, and Ewan realizes that Jim would betray him or Mrs Trease if it suits the Party Purpose.

Mrs Trease, though supportive of her husband, is curiously not a Communist herself. She prefers pop songs to revolutionary songs: 'Fegs, revolutionary songs gave her a pain in the stomach, they were nearly as dreich as hymns -- the only difference being that they promised you hell on earth instead of

in hell.'* (p. 482)

The male-female split can even be traced in the anonymous couple: the man reluctantly takes to the street to demonstrate, while the woman shows apprehension about possible violence. The man's sense of solidarity with the marchers is accompanied with a defiance of his wife's nagging. Overall, women keep a humanistic doubt about men's commitment to social causes. By this I do not suggest that all women share one undifferentiated view of the world. In fact, earlier, Chris has a rejoinder to Ma Cleghorn's negative view of communists as quasi-religious, defending them in the context of social injustice:

> Chris said she supposed she thought the same, had always thought so, but that didn't matter, if Ewan wanted God she wouldn't try and stop him; there was plenty of mess to redd up in the world on the road to where He was maybe to be found. (p. 417)

However, she does share some doubt with other female characters about the Communists, and her doubt is deepened through Ewan's arrest and the exploitative pursuit by the communists of their own ends. It is Ake Ogilvie, a coarse and warm-hearted joiner from Segget, who secures Ewan's release through blackmailing the Provost. When they go to see Ewan released, Chris and Ake are surrounded by the Communists and their banner-waving mob (no longer individualized in this case) eager to exploit the incident for propaganda.

> *No, not me*, [Ake] had said to Jim Trease. *I'm no body's servant, the Broo folk's or the bobbies'*. Chris had liked him for that for she felt the same, had always

---

*_Fegs_: indeed!, goodness! _dreich_: dry, uninteresting.

felt so and felt more than ever that she belonged to herself alone. (p. 457)

However, Ewan is made into a mouthpiece for propaganda. 'And the Paldy folk grabbed hold of Ewan and raised him up on the Steps: *Come on, gi'es a word, Ewan!*' (p. 457) He is thus put on a pedestal and speaks a rostrum rhetoric: 'the Communists were right. Only by force could we beat brute force, plans for peaceful reform were about as sane as hunting a Bengal tiger with a Bible.' (p. 457) Ironically, 'he fainted away on the Windmill Steps.' (p.457) He has been raised onto the realm of high rhetoric, without the life-sustaining touch of the land. The Broo folk are here presented as masses, instruments of the Party, in contrast to the earlier march in which we can read the individual consciousness carrying on a dialogue with other voices. Nor do we have any folk humour to relativize the dead-serious rhetoric of the Party. There is a little sensual humour, though, directed by an anonymous voice at Chris: '*God, that his mother? I could sleep with her the morn and think her his sister. . . . Sulky-looking bitch. . . . Get out, she's fine. . . .*' (p. 457) This humour would pull Chris down from the pedestal of aloofness, implying a counter-argument against her as an individualist and relativizing our previous reading of the incident.

The voices of dissent in the novel are usually ignored or dismissed as liberalism by some Marxist critics who find a ready echo to their ideology in the hero Ewan. Roy Johnson, for example, applauds the 'deadly serious' intention of the trilogy

'to show a materialist, militantly Marxist view of history as the outcome of perpetual class struggle', and defends Ewan's lying about the gas-explosion on the grounds of the higher, selfless interest of the Party.[10] Johnson is right in arguing against other critics who ignore the political radicalism in the text and reduce the trilogy to Nationalism, Diffusionism, or merely the personal, the social, and the mythical levels of meaning. However, his narrow Marxist reading of the novel is equally reductive. It is against this patriarchal doctrinaire critical assumption which projects the historical inevitability of the Communist victory onto the text that feminist critic Deidre Burton has expressed doubt, by arguing that the women's voices occupy a more important position and deserve more attention than some Marxist critics would like to admit. She argues convincingly against a privileging of Ewan over Chris. The weakness of this feminist reading, however, is that it still shares what feminists would call patriarchal conceptions about characters in the novel. To her, there should still remain a homogeneous consistency in characterization -- much like taking sides, which she expressly warns against. Her reason for endorsing Chris as the more reliable heroine is built on such formal standards as, 1) Chris's developing consciousness holds more space than Ewan's; 2) her consciousness formally closes the trilogy. The meanings of the text have to be generated in the *process of reading* and are certainly more complex in their realization than by formally counting the space each character's consciousness occupies in the novel, or by locating the telos in

whoever formally closes the novel, especially in an open text such as *A Scots Quair*. Burton's conclusion that 'Chris's vision -- liberal, and a refusal of direct radicalism as it may be -- is none the less the more powerful and all-encompassing,' and that 'we are left with a sense of three women, Chris, Ellen, and Ma Cleghorn . . . as the people who are to be trusted in their dealings with others . . . '[1] errs in a feminist simplification little better than those by other 'isms'. For one thing, Ake sides with Chris, and Chris has sided with, and does not finally deny, Ewan's commitment to his cause. More importantly, *Grey Granite*, falling apart towards the end, foregrounds the polyphonic feature of the novel, i.e. no bearer of *the truth* can be located in any of the characters. If we look back to the middle section, we can find that even the moment of labour solidarity and triumph does not mean a monologic victory for any one character or party. Truth is generated on the border between voices. The point is that the latter part of the novel follows polyphony of a different kind, with a deeper involvement of the reader.

While the voices of dissent challenge the doctrinaire communist ideology and its Machiavellian practice, they are also undercut by the Communists in many respects. Though Ellen Johns expresses doubt about Ewan's self-importance and shows disgust at his tactics of lying about the gas explosion, she finally capitulates to the authorities at the threat of losing her teaching job and all the material comforts that she craves. Ma

Cleghorn remains one of the masses subject to the bourgeois fantasies in bad movies and the official propaganda that there is no corruption in Duncairn (p. 474). Even Chris appears myopic when she shows disbelief at the police brutality:

> Chris said that was daft, they couldn't do things like that in this country, any body knew the police were fair and anybody accused got a fair trial. Trease nodded, faith ay, if you were of the middle class and wore good clothes and weren't a communist. Och, anything else -- a sodomist, a pervert, a white slave trafficker, a raper of wee queans -- any damn thing that you liked to think of. But if you were a revolutionary worker you got hell. Fair enough, for the Reds weren't out to cure the system, they were out to down it and cut its throat. (p. 452)

In this context, despite a propagandist overtone due to his professional habit as a Party demagogue, Jim Trease is more perceptive and realistic than Chris. Indeed, the Communist violence, which is more talked about than practised by the Reds (as if they were deliberately challenging the liberal view in the reader), has to be taken not only in the context of their doctrines but also in the context of the actual reactionary violence which Ewan, for example, undergoes at the hands of the police who beat and sodomize him in jail. Our doubt about the Communist tactics is then counter-balanced by the more urgent and pressing question: how to resist the open violence of the authorities? No one in the novel has offered any satisfactory and practical alternative.

There are several major events in the novel, usually described in the voice of an ordinary worker, followed by short paragraphs of more biased opinions and reactions from other

voices. We have examined such an example about the successful hunger march. Let us now examine the incident about the gas explosion to appreciate a different kind of polyphony.

The incident is narrated by an anonymous worker as a witness, who feels during the explosion 'as though a great hand had battered, broadnieved, against the houses that pack Footforthie. Windows shook and cracked, ...' (p. 484) He conveys the horror of the relatives and the victims:

> men were running out from Gowans clapping their hands to blackened faces, some screaming and stitering over to the Docks to pitch themselves in agony into the water. And as they did that the blister burst in another explosion that pitched folk head first down on the ground, right and left -- Forward, against the green pallor of the Docks, a rain of stone and iron stanchions fell. (p. 484-485)

In this voice, there is the frequent use of the generic 'you', to mark as a feature of the folk voice and to engage the reader's empathy. The voice is also distinguished from later ones by an intuitive apprehension of the worst possibility, an apprehension from a worker who knows his fellow workers as individuals and shares their common fate: 'Next minute the crowd was on the run to the Docks, some crying the fire had broke out in a ship, but you knew that that was a lie. And John -- Peter -- Thomas -- Neil -- Oh God, he was there, in Furnaces, Machines -- it was and it couldn't be Gowans and Gloag's.' (p. 484) This immediacy of identification and empathy is significantly absent in the following snippets of reactions from other characters. First, we have the response of the editor of the *Tory Pictman*, who are eager to exploit sensational journalism 'about the

charred bodies, the explosion, the women weeping, the riot that broke out against the Gowans house . . . .' (p. 485) The news leader in their paper is

> full of dog Latin and constipated English, but of course not Scotch, it was over-genteel: and it said the affair was very regrettable, like science and religion experiment had its martyrs of the noble cause of defending the State. The treacherous conduct of extremists in exploiting the natural grief of the Duncairn workers was utterly to be deplored. No doubt the strictest of inquiries would be held -- (p. 485)

The official language is here cast in a negative light as lacking the kind of compassion found in the vernacular voice of the anonymous worker. The cold, over-genteel, impersonal and passive-voiced language is used to justify the pointless loss of the workers' lives in the name of 'the noble cause of defending the State.' Behind the name of the State lie the profits of the capitalists such as 'Sidderley, the English armament people,' who may sell the gas cylinders 'to blow Chinese workers to bits' (p. 426), and the horrible effects of gas-attacks Ewan has read to the workers out of a book by a hospital attendant during the War. Thus, there is an interaction between Ewan's earlier voice, which includes excerpts from a book for imaginative sympathy and identification, the worker's first-hand vernacular account of the accident, and the leader of the bourgeois newspaper 'full of dog Latin and constipated English'. Ewan's earlier voice explodes the news leader's official propaganda. The horrors of gas-attacks are ironically realized in the worker's description of the accident, ironic because many workers at that time booed Ewan. They were more concerned about their own wages: '//

doesn't matter a damn to us what they're going to do with the wee round tins. If you're a Chink or a Black yourself, that's your worry.' (p. 427)

Next comes the voice of the Church. The Reverend Edward MacShilluck

> said the catastrophe was the Hand of Gawd, mysteriously at work, *ahhhhhhhhhhh, my brethren, what if it was a direct chastisement of the proud and terrible spirit of the times, the young turning from the Kirk and its sacred message, from purity and chastity and clean-living?* (p. 485)

The paragraph ends melodramatically with the Reverend slipping into his servant Pootsy's room for yet another sexual exploitation.

The third voice is Jim Trease's comments and instruction to Ewan. His voice contains literally and metaphorically Ewan's words, so that later we will have only Ellen's reaction to Ewan.

> Jim Trease said to Ewan they hadn't done so bad, twenty new members had joined the local, damn neat idea that of Ewan's to have the Gowans windows bashed in. . . . And be sure and rub in the blood and snot well and for God's sake manage a decent collection, . . . Eh? Of course the Works had been well-protected, that kind of accident would happen anywhere. But Ewan had been right, that was hardly the point, he could rub in if he liked that there had been culpable negligence. . . . Eh, what was that? Suggest it had all been deliberately planned to see the effect of poison-gas on a crowd? Hell! Anyhow, Ewan could try it. But for God's sake mind about the collection -- (p. 485)

As mentioned earlier, the accident has in one way proved Ewan's far-sightedness as a socialist intellectual, head of the Independent League and not yet a believer in violence (p. 439). And, in the fourth voice, which is not directly linked to the

accident but shares the underlying anti-war theme, Ewan's socialist agitprop has taken roots in Alick Watson and become internally persuasive in this worker-turned soldier, who starts communist subversion in the barracks. But here, in the third voice, Trease's and Ewan's concern lies totally in exploiting the accident for recruitment and collection. Ellen reacts to their tactics, *'Ewan, it's just cheating. It's not Communism!'* (p. 486) The communists may justify the lie in the interests of their noble cause of liberating the working class. However, doubt creeps in when we do not see any compassion shown to the injured and the dead, not even to their comrades who have once followed the Communists actively -- Norman Cruickshank and Bob (p. 486). Bob has dropped out of the labour movement and seems to have wasted his love on an unworthy girl, who uses him as a mere instrument for material comforts. The Communists have seen the workers likewise en masse as mere instruments for History, instead of as individual subjects with emotions and feelings. Ewan is no longer capable of the emotional identification he once experienced when he witnessed a hunger marcher being beaten by the police (p. 396, p. 404). In the jargon of a hard-core Communist, Ewan has matured into a disillusioned, hardened Communist capable of sublimating his personal feelings into a cool dedication to the historical mission of the proletariat. To the humanists, however, this is a form of alienation that we have become too familiar with in Stalinism, Maoism, and other communist dictatorships.

It has been suggested by critics with organicist, feminist, or other ideologies that Chris's voice is the final one to be trusted in the trilogy: the voice of the land, of transcendence that sees

> the best deliverance of all [in] Change who ruled the earth and the sky and the waters underneath the earth, Change whose face she'd once feared to see, whose right hand was Death and whose left hand Life, might be stayed by none of the dreams of men, love, hate, compassion, anger or pity, gods or devils or wild crying to the sky. He passed and repassed in the ways of the wind, Deliverer, Destroyer and Friend in one. (p. 496)

Chris is by now constantly complaining of her tiredness, appearing and sounding older than her real age.[12] She represents the wisdom of transcendence over all the worldly concerns for humanity she has demonstrated earlier in the novel. Returning to the rural land remains a personal choice for her, not a politically viable alternative for the ills of civilization and social injustice and the contradictions that press so urgently on the reader for solution. The rural solution is generically pastoral.

In his short comparative study on Lawrence and Gibbon on the theme of the country and the city, Raymond Williams has noted that Lawrence 'sees available revolutionary movements as simply fights about property; he wants a different vision, a new sense of life, before he commits himself; otherwise it will be not regeneration but a final collapse.'[13] Gibbon, however, is different in his treatment of the available revolutionary movements.

> The spiritual feeling for the land and for Labour, the 'pagan' emphasis which is always latent in the imagery of the earth (very similar, through its different rhythms, to the Lawrence of the beginning of *The Rainbow*), is made available and stressed in the new struggles: through the General Strike, in the period of *Cloud Howe*, to the time of the hunger marches in the period of *Grey Granite*. Even the legends sustain the transition, for their spiritual emphasis makes it possible to reject a Church that has openly sided with property and oppression. More historically and more convincingly, the radical independence of the small farmers, the craftsmen and the labourers is seen as transitional to the militancy of the industrial workers.[14]

Williams further notes that the feelings of loss of their land and the country experience by displaced farmers and craftsmen have been exploited for the pastoral tradition by organicist critics (such as Leavis) and

> against their children and their children's children: against democracy, against education, against the labour movement. In this particular modern form, the rural retrospect became explicitly reactionary, and given the break of continuity there have been very few voices on the other side. That is why Grassic Gibbon is especially important, since he speaks for many who never speak for themselves in recorded ways.[15]

To focus exclusively on Chris's last voice of the land would ignore many important and distinctive features of the working-class novel in Gibbon, and make him a disciple of the pastoral Lawrence of *The White Peacock*, a much inferior and nostalgic Lawrence without his mythic visions of *The Rainbow* and *Women in Love*, to say nothing of the working-class Lawrence of *Sons and Lovers*.

Grey Granite does not idealize any single class or any single voice as having the final say in the historical process of change and transformation. The reader is presented with

various problems and solutions which are themselves problematic, as well as various choices which have strengths and weaknesses. Like the audience in a Brechtian play, he is faced and involved with problems in the works of art which are real problems in the crisis of the 30s. Instead of offering any illusory panaceas, art unsettles illusions and challenges any rigid ideological systems, thus shocking the reader into a realization of the human condition and pressing him to find solutions amid various voices. Instead of facile emotional identification with any 'good' characters, the reader must exercise critical contemplation to examine every voice in relation to other voices, including the narrator's, the author's and the reader's own voice.

The various voices in the text sometimes reinforce each other by incorporating each other's words, sometimes undercut each other through 'internally polemical discourse -- the word with a sideward glance at someone else's word.'[16] The reading process is typical of what Wolfgang Iser calls the characteristic of the modern text, full of blanks, negations and indeterminancy.

> Actualization of the text unfolds itself as a constant restructuring of established connections. The whole process of transformation is thus serial in character. Its object is not to discover a point at which all the established connections may converge; on the contrary, it resists all attempts at integration into a single unified structure, and this continual, onward-moving resistance leads not to chaos but to a new mode of communication. Instead of being compressed into a superimposed pattern, everyday life can here be experienced as a history of ever-changing viewpoints.[17]

Formally, *Grey Granite* may appear to fall apart towards the end. Aesthetically, as a modern text, the refusal of the various voices to converge into a single unified voice is a strength. It brings the reader into the actualization of the text, leaves blanks for the reader's voice to fill in, and opens the text to reality. Behind the conflicts in the text lie the real problems and anxieties that the left-wing intellectuals like Auden, Orwell, Spender, Jack Lindsay, and Lewis Grassic Gibbon were experiencing amid Fascism, Stalinism, Douglasism, and the working-class political movement, which also bear on the question of literature as commitment, the position of the revolutionary intellectuals, and many other issues of the 1930s described as the necessary components of progressive modernism of the post World War I literature in Britain. The same concerns and contradictions have since played an important role in the theoretical controversy over working-class literature, which I have discussed in my first chapter.

Today in 1990, with the crumbling of Communism in Eastern Europe, Gibbon's doubts about Stalinism and orthodox Communism seem prophetic in its foresight, certainly more visionary than the later 'fellow travellers'[18] who praised communist dictatorship without having had any experience of actually working inside the Party as Gibbon did. This hindsight about Communism, however, does not leave us much wiser than Ewan in the novel, or the left-wing intellectuals of the 30s. Given the exigencies of the complex situation at the time, any

hypothetical choice that we can point out would still involve taking positions and making compromises. *Grey Granite* has withstood the test of history precisely because the author's vision of history is polyphonic and realized through novelization.

If there is any last voice to guide our reading of *Grey Granite* and Gibbon's trilogy as a whole, it is the voice of the unfinalized dialogue. As Ewan says to Chris before they part for ever on their distinct journeys of life:

> *There will always be you and I, I think, Mother. It's the old fight that maybe will never have a finish, whatever the names we give to it -- the fight in the end between FREEDOM and GOD.* (p. 495)

The eternal you and I, engaged in the never finished battle, embody the dialogicality of our human world in the 'I/Thou' relationship, whether it be the hidden polemic in our daily discourse with an awareness of another's hostile words, or the 'literary discourse [which] more or less sharply senses its own listener, reader, critic, and reflects in itself their anticipated objections, evaluations, points of view.'[19] Such an awareness of the unfinalized dialogue, of the other voice with whom we engage in the dialogue, carries a profound criticism of capitalism which forces a single, merging consciousness onto the multiplicity of individual consciousnesses and drives them into solitude, into *lack of recognition.*[20] Capitalism is finally a denial of dialogue with the other, a dialogue which lies at the base of our very humanity as languaging animals, and will accompany us through transformation of various social

institutions that are finally the products of language and subject to our dialogic imagination. As Bakhtin says of the polyphonic novel:

> Everything . . . tends toward dialogue, toward a dialogic opposition, as if tending toward its center. All else is the means; dialogue is the end. A single voice ends nothing and resolves nothing. Two voices is the minimum for life, the minimum for existence.[21]

Postscript: Towards a Definition of the Working-Class Novel

A definition involves a classification establishing the relationship between the object being defined and other relevant things. Since everything in nature is related in various ways to various things, a definition is bound to be an abstraction and can never claim final authority. It does help our understanding of the world, though, to explore, through definition, the major relationships that characterize the object of our study.

A working-class novel is first of all a novel. It shares all the generic features of the novel as described by Bakhtin, although the main feature is paradoxically that the novel is beyond definition, involving a carnivalization of various genres and styles during different historical periods. A novel is polyphonic, dialogic and carnivalesque. Deeply rooted in popular culture, it relativizes all the deadly serious belief systems of monologic official voices through mockery, stylization and double-voicedness. It is progressive and utopian, born in the rich soil of popular culture during the breakdown of medieval Christian ideologies and official cultures and evolving through interaction with unofficial cultures of different historical periods. This undefinable, open-ended quality, realized in the sub-genre of the working-class novel, demands that we see that the sub-genre is not born in vacuum, isolated within a supposedly homogenous working-class culture. Rather, the sub-genre exists in dialogic relationship with other sub-genres

within the novel, and other genres of literature. Novels about middle-class life, romance, fantasy, adventures, etc. may be dialogic in various ways, if they are really 'novels' as defined by Bakhtin. But different sub-genres of the novel, in so far as there is any formal and ideological difference at all, would constitute a dialogic relationship among themselves. The creation of the hero and the heroine in Gibbon's trilogy, *A Scots Quair*, who hold different belief systems which are in turn relativized against the voices of the working class in the novel, is in opposition to the other more trustworthy heroes of other novels, belonging to other genres (e.g. the bourgeois novel). Gibbon has mentioned specifically the 'kailyard school' and the anti-kailyard realist school as two of the sub-genres he is aware of during his composition of the trilogy. The dialogic novel does not deny or supplant the monologic forms of the novel; rather it widens the scope of dialogue and supplements the earlier forms.

There are many definitions of the novel. I have chosen Bakhtin's definition with full awareness that not all canonical novels in English literature can fulfill the demands of polyphony to the maximal degree. However, Bakhtinian norms are especially congenial to our discussion of the working-class novel for two reasons. First, the novel is deeply rooted in popular culture. This is particularly important for an appreciation of the working-class novel. Official canons have not been very receptive to the existence of working-class

culture, as can be seen clearly in T. S. Eliot's dismissal of D. H. Lawrence and F. R. Leavis's subsequent canonization of Lawrence in the terms of middle-class morality. The choice of definition is in this sense a political choice. Secondly, monologic forms/definitions of the novel do not work well with the working-class novel. They have given rise to many contradictions which I have introduced in my first chapter. The polyphonic novel, on the other hand, opens a new realm of human consciousness that puts those contradictions into perspective. Because of the specific historical and ideological questions that have been posed about the subject, monologic forms have been especially problematic with the working-class novel, although they may have produced canonical works of other genres or subgenres. In choosing the mode of the polyphonic novel, though, I do not mean to privilege it as the only genre to the exclusion of other genres. As Bakhtin says:

> Thus the appearance of the polyphonic novel does not nullify or in any way restrict the further productive development of monologic forms of the novel (biographical, historical, the novel of everyday life, the novel-epic, etc.), for there will always continue to exist and expand those spheres of existence, of man and nature, which require precisely objectified and finalizing, that is monological, forms of artistic cognition. But again we repeat: *the thinking human consciousness and the dialogic sphere in which this consciousness exists*, in all its depth and specificity, cannot be reached through a monologic artistic approach.[1]

Just as there is the generic context, there is also a cultural context. The working-class novel is deeply rooted in working-class culture, which is itself heterogeneous and is formed in definite socio-historical contexts, in dialogic

relationship with other cultures. In Gibbon's trilogy, there is, for example, a sense of continuity between peasant culture and working-class culture in their irreverence and mockery of authority and middle-class refinement. But the sense of large-scale solidarity among the industrial workers is beyond the farmers and labourers scattered on the farm land forming small, closely knit communities. On the other hand, industrial workers who grew up in the city do not share the same kind of feeling for the land as Chris does. In *Cloud Howe*, there is an open confrontation between the townsfolk and the spinners. Since different sub-genres are shaped historically by different cultures, the working-class novel does introduce a new perspective embodying a different set of cultural values with which the reader will see a new world. It is the introduction into the novel genre of a new chronotope. The industrial workers tied to the mechanical rhythm of the machine and the clock, the unemployed workers plodding in search of a job, the workers in the hunger march or on the picket line, create a different historical time and space from that of farmers or labourers toiling in the fields to the rhythm of nature.

The best embodiment of these different cultural experiences lies in the use of different languages. For the working-class novel, dialects have been an essential formal feature for the intrusion of a distinctive working-class point of view, especially in opposition to the genteel, standard English spoken by middle-class characters. This feature of language does not

mean a rigid linguistic categorization without context. 'Pure' dialects are neither desirable nor accessible. However, although spoken dialects invariably get distorted in written form (sometimes intentionally to make them more accessible), the new cultural values embodied are unmistakably there, untranslatable into standard English. The point here is of course not replacing other voices with a new voice; rather it is the opening up of the novel form to polyglossia and heteroglossia, to the different historical and cultural experiences that these languages embody in a dialogic relationship. In *Grey Granite*, for example, we have not only the workers' voices in a vernacular style, but also newspaper language, propaganda rhetoric, Biblical phrases, the language of the pulpit, the English of the intellectuals, the town gossip, etc.. These differences are not to be accounted for through a linguistic analysis only; they are utterances made in particular contexts and have to be analyzed through metalinguistics, so that the subtle differences are perceived through the living context of dialogic interaction between these utterances.

Since these languages are taken from the lived experiences of historical change, the working-class novel is likewise open to changes in working-class experiences. There is no static, definitive image of the working class, nor standard ways of 'reflecting' the 'typical' working-class speech. The wives of Nottingham workers, in Lawrence's world, are often more middle-class than the wives of Duncairn workers in Gibbon's

world, because in the former case, the women come from lower middle-class families and are married into well-to-do miners' families. There is likewise a difference between the employed workers more concerned about their wages and the more desperate unemployed workers. Stay-at-home women would gain a new voice, usually more feminist, when they themselves become workers. Thus the working women in Lawrence's *Sons and Lovers* and 'Tickets, Please' speak a different language from that of Mrs Morel and that of the miners. Gibbon's workers are more militant than Lawrence's, but Allen Sillitoe's working-class hero is more individualistic than the workers in both Gibbon's and Lawrence's novels (except perhaps Mellors in *Lady Chatterley's Lover*). These variations involve different historical contexts and the author's backgrounds as well as personal visions, and are in line with the open-endedness of the sub-genre. In so far as they embody various working-class experiences through various languages in a dialogic imagination, the working-class novels do offer us a new set of cultural values that are worth preserving and developing for the benefit of our general human culture.

References

REFERENCES - INTRODUCTION

1. These three terms constitute the heart of Bakhtin's ideas in his discussion of the novel genre. In a broad sense, *dialogism* is the study of language and its operations as a social and shared act through different social languages. To Bakhtin, 'A language is revealed in all its distinctiveness only when it is brought into one relationship with other languages, entering with them into one single heteroglot unity of societal becoming.' [Mikhail Mikhailovich Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination*, ed. Michael Holquist, trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist (Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1981), p. 411.] The interaction between these overlapping and often conflicting social languages (official, vernacular, technical, literary, the jargons of different age-groups, etc.), however, is not explicit but rather implicit, since any utterance is a response to and in relation to other languages. The *polyphonic* interplay of various voices comes closer to the living context of verbal exchange than to the set of abstracted rules of language. Changes at all levels of society, therefore, will create this endless process of *dialogization* against forces *monologizing* languages into an official or unitary language. *Dialogic* relations 'are an almost universal phenomenon, permeating all human speech and all relationships and

manifestations of human life -- in general, everything that has meaning and significance.' [M. Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, ed. and trans. Caryl Emerson (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984), p. 40.]

Bakhtin sees the destruction of all barriers between languages as coming from the unheard, unofficial voices in society. He calls this 'ceremonial of the ritual of decrowning' *carnival* (Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, p. 125.), the concept he borrows from popular festivities, esp. rites and spectacles originated in ancient times of Greek and Roman life. This *carnivalistic* act of crowning/decrowning, Bakhtin thinks, offers various languages opportunities for *dialogical* activities against a unitary language tendency.

In Bakhtin's genre-theory, *dialogism* is most fully developed in the novel. 'Every language in the novel is a point of view, a socio-ideological conceptual system of real social groups and their embodied representatives.' (Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination*, p. 411.) Thus, *polyphony* in the novel *'is dialogic through and through.* Dialogic relationships exist among all elements of novelistic structure; that is, they are juxtaposed contrapuntally.' (Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, p. 40.) Bakhtin transposes *carnival* into literature in two ways: 1) *carnival* scenes, acts, images, curses and parodies can be found directly in literature, such as Rabelais' and Dostoevsky's

novels; 2) the idea of *carnivalization* is applied to literary history with its genre-shaping power; i.e. *carnivalization* becomes a literary and generic tradition.

REFERENCES - CHAPTER I

1. In *The Literature of Labour*, Klaus traces the origins of working-class literature back to the eighteenth century. In his opinion, from the 1820s onward, no decade is without its significant contribution to this literature. The most often discussed works of this century include Robert Tressell's *The Ragged Trousered Philanthropists* (1914), Patrick MacGill's *Children of the Dead End* (1914), D. H. Lawrence's *Sons and Lovers* (1913), Lewis Grassic Gibbon's *A Scots Quair* (1932-1934), Walter Greenwood's *Love on the Dole* (1933), Walter Brierley's *Means-Test Man* (1935), Lewis Jones's *Cwmardy* (1937) and *We Live* (1939), Jack Common's *Kiddar's Luck* (1951), and *The Ampersand* (1954), Allen Sillitoe's *Loneliness of the Long Distance Runner* (1959) and *Saturday Night and Sunday Morning* (1958), and David Storey's novels. For a selected list of works before this century, see H. Gustav Klaus, *The Literature of Labour: Two Hundred Years of Working-class Writing* (Sussex: The Harvester Press, 1985), pp. 268-272. As this sub-genre is still open to many interesting theoretical discussions in

terms of definition, no canonical list can pass without question.

2. Literally, 'time space', the term chronotope refers to the intrinsic connectedness of temporal and spatial relationships that are artistically expressed in literature. That both categories are interdependent to the privilege of neither may owe to its derivation from the theory of relativity in which time without space is inconceivable. Bakhtin is especially interested in the emergence of real historical time and space in literature with concomitant value judgements. In the epic and other early genres of literature, high value is put on the past, and space is arbitrary and ahistorical, for man's journey is vertically towards heaven. Thus chronotope conveys a closed system of absolute values. In the novel, high value is put on the present in a historical process of change, and space would include authentic historical locations with their distinct connotations of human history that are non-interchangeable. See Bakhtin's 'Forms of Time and of the Chronotope in the Novel' in his *Dialogic Imagination*, pp. 84-285.

3. M. M. Bakhtin, *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*, Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist, eds., trans. Vern W. McGee (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1986), pp. 23-24.

4. For a more detailed entry into the discussion, see H.

Gustav Klaus' essay 'Socialist Fiction in the 30s: Some Preliminary Observations,' *The 30s: A Challenge to Orthodoxy*, ed. John Lucas (Sussex: The Harvester Press, 1978), p. 14; 'Introduction,' *The Socialist Novel in Britain: Towards the Recovery of a Tradition*, ed. H. Gustav Klaus (Sussex: The Harvester Press, 1982), pp. 1-6; and David Smith's 'Introduction: Definitions and Limitations,' in his *Socialist Propaganda in the Twentieth-Century British Novel* (London: MacMillan, 1978), pp. 1-3.

5. Jack Mitchell, 'Tendencies in Narrative Fiction in the London-Based Socialist Press of the 1880s and 1890s,' *The Rise of Socialist Fiction 1880-1914*, ed. H. Gustav Klaus (Sussex: The Harvester Press, 1987), p. 49.

6. Jack Lindsay, *After the Thirties: The Novel in Britain and Its Future* (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1956), p. 87.

7. Friedrich Engels, 'Letters to Margaret Harkness,' *Marxists on Literature: An Anthology*, ed. David Craig (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1975), p. 270.

8. 'Familiarization facilitated the destruction of epic and tragic distance and the transfer of all represented material to a zone of familiar contact; it was reflected significantly in the organization of plot and plot situations, it determined that special familiarity of the author's position with regard to his characters (impossible in the higher genres); it introduced the logic of

mésalliances and profanatory debasings; finally, it exercised a powerful transforming influence on the very verbal style of literature.' (Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, p. 124.)

9. Graham Holderness, 'Anarchism and Fiction,' *The Rise of Socialist Fiction 1880-1914*, ed. H. Gustav Klaus, p. 121.

10. Raymond Williams, 'Foreword' to Jack Mitchell's *Robert Tressell and the Ragged Trousered Philanthropists* (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1969), p. xiv.

11. The doctrine comes from Georg Lukács' *The Theory of the Novel* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press, 1971), although he was not an orthodox Marxist at the time.

12. Roger Webster, '*Love on the Dole* and the Aesthetic of Contradiction,' *The British Working-Class Novel in the Twentieth Century*, ed. Jeremy Hawthorn (London: Edward Arnold, 1984), p. 51.

13. Raymond Williams, 'Foreword' to Jack Mitchell's *Robert Tressell and the Ragged Trousered Philanthropists*, pp. xii-xiii.

14. H. Gustav Klaus, *The Literature of Labour: Two Hundred Years of Working-Class Writing*, pp. 126-7.

15. See C. Gallagher's *The Industrial Reformation of the English Fiction: Social Discourse and Narrative Form*,

1832-1867 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985).

16. See Martin Wiener, *English Culture and the Decline of the Industrial Spirit 1850-1980* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981).

17. Some critics, with a fixed notion of the typical working class, question how far such gestures indicate a significant political response by the working class and how far they are simply the expression of radical individualism by a few lively members. See Mary Eagleton and David Pierce, *Attitudes to Class in the English Novel from Walter Scott to David Storey* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1979), Chapter Seven.

18. Carole Snee, 'Working-class Literature or Proletarian Writing?' *Culture and Crisis in Britain in the 30s*, eds. Jon Clark et al (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1979), pp. 166-9. She argues against this point in her essay. Also Terry Eagleton, *Criticism and Ideology* (London: New Left Books, 1976), p. 26.

19. Roy Johnson, 'The Proletarian Novel,' *Literature and Ideology*, II (1972), pp. 25-36.

20. Raymond Williams, 'Region and Class in the Novel,' *The Uses of Fiction: Essays on the Modern Novel in Honour of Arnold Kettle*, eds. Douglas Jefferson and Graham Martin (Milton Keynes: The Open University Press, 1982), p. 63.

21. Roy Johnson, 'Walter Brierley: Proletarian Writing,' *Red Letters*, II(1976), p. 6. In his essay, Johnson tries to show that the working-man in Brierley's novel is given middle-class characteristics and his story is narrated in a middle-class manner, with the author striving all the time for a form of literary *politesse* which is not only quite unsuited to the subject of working-class life but represents a superannuated middle-class world-vision and inhibits the development of a genuinely working-class form of literary expression. See also Carole Snee's counter argument in 'Walter Brierley: A Test Case,' *Red Letters*, III(1976), pp. 11-13.

22. Jack Mitchell, *Robert Tressell and the Ragged Trousered Philanthropists*, p. 145.

23. See Roy Johnson's discussion on Walter Brierley in 'Walter Brierley: Proletarian Writing'.

24. See, for example, their chapter on 'The Ungovernable: Novels of the 1840s and 1850s,' *Attitudes to Class in the English Novel from Walter Scott to David Storey*, pp. 33-52.

25. Carole Snee, 'Working-Class Literature or Proletarian Writing?', p. 169.

26. Dave Morley and Ken Worpole, eds., *The Republic of Letters: Working-Class Writing and Local Publishing* (London: Comedia Publishing Group, 1982), p. 96.

27. Graham Holderness, 'Miners and the Novel: From Bourgeois to Proletarian Fiction,' *The British Working-Class Novel in the Twentieth Century*, ed. Jeremy Hawthorn, p. 32.

28. For more detail, see Carole Snee's 'Working-Class Literature or Proletarian Writing?', pp. 165-192. She argues that *Cwmardy* by Lewis Jones is a novel 'which galvanises the collective will of the community and reveals to individuals, not their own power, but the power of the class to which they belong, though it does not entirely dispense with traditional fictional conventions.' It is the descriptions of mass activity, the common experience of the group, its shared culture, language and heritage, the loss of 'individual identities' within the crowd, that enable Jones to 'break with the liberal ideology which surrounds the novel form.'

29. Roger Webster, '*Love on the Dole* and the Aesthetic of Contradiction,' pp. 49-61; Francisco Garcia Tortosa, 'Language and Ideology in *Left Review*,' *English Literature and the Working Class*, eds. Francisco Garcia Tortosa and Ramon Lopez Ortega (Graficas Nova: Publicaciones De La Universidad De Sevilla, 1980), pp. 58-75; Ramon Lopez Ortega, 'The Language of the Working-Class Novel of the 1930s,' *The Socialist Novel in Britain: Towards the Recovery of a Tradition*, ed. H. Gustav Klaus, pp. 122-143.

30. Deirdre Burton finds much to praise in Grassic Gibbon's

treatment of women's cultural experience. See Burton's essay 'A Feminist Reading of Lewis Grassic Gibbon's *A Scots Quair*,' *The British Working-Class Novel in the Twentieth Century*, ed. Jeremy Hawwthorn, pp. 35-46.

31. Karl Marx, *Grundrisse: Foundations of the Critique of Political Economy*, trans. Martin Nicolaus (New York: Vintage Books, 1973), p. 108 and p. 109.

32. Bakhtin, *Speech Genre and Other Late Essays*, p. 169.

33. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination*, p. 25.

REFERENCES - CHAPTER II

1. William R. Malcolm, *A Blasphemer and Reformer* (Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 1984), p. 9.

2. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination*, p. 66.

3. For more biographical details, see Ian S. Munro's *Leslie Mitchell: Lewis Grassic Gibbon* (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1966).

4. Grassic Gibbon, *A Scots Hairst*, ed. Ian S. Munro (London: Hutchinson & Co Ltd, 1967), p. 78.

5. ibid, p. 69.

6. ibid. p. 69.

7. ibid.

8. In 1932, when *Sunset Song* was published, over a quarter of all Scottish workers were unemployed; in the worst hit areas, the number was well over half. See Angus Calder, 'A Mania for Self-Reliance: Grassic Gibbon's *Scots Quair*,' *The Uses of Fiction*, eds. Douglas Jefferson and Graham Martin, pp. 103-110.

9. Apart from *A Scots Quair*, spiritual and intellectual development in a fallen world is also reflected in his other works such as *The Thirteenth Disciple*, *Stained Radiance*, etc.. In these novels, characters, shocked by social suffering and distress, make their journey through darkness in search for a new and revolutionary answer.

10. Virginia Woolf, 'The Leaning Tower' (1940), rpt. in *Collected Essays* (London: Hogarth Press, 1966), II, p. 172.

11. These left-wing writers believed that only the workers could save the things they valued and loved. They were the hope of a better future, who would fight to save all that was gentle, generous, lovely, innocent, free. See Valentine Cunningham, *British Writers of the Thirties* (London: Oxford University Press, 1988), especially Chapter Seven, pp. 211-240.

12. This could be explained from his diffusionist point of

view,

> All human civilizations originated in Ancient Egypt. Through the accident of time and chance and the cultivation of wild barley in the Valley of the Nile, there arose in a single spot on the earth's surface the urge in men to upbuild for their economic salvation the great fabric of civilization. Before the planning of that architecture enslaved the minds of men, man was a free and happy and undiseased animal wandering the world in the Golden Age of the poets (and reality) from the Shetlands to Tierra del Fuego. And from that central focal point in Ancient Egypt the first civilizers spread abroad the globe the beliefs and practices, the diggings and plantings and indignations and shadowy revilements of the Archaic Civilization. (Gibbon: *A Scots Hairst*, p. 124.)

13. Douglas F. Young, *Beyond the Sunset: A Study of James Leslie Mitchell* (Aberdeen: Impulse Books, 1973), p. 26

14. Grassic Gibbon, *A Scots Hairst*, p. 84.

15. Douglas Young has made a quite detailed presentation of Gibbon's theory of strong leadership. Such a leader should not be an ordinary man of the people, nor identifiable with any social class; but, from compassion, he will identify himself with the masses. He should be a ruthless man, for the situation demands ruthlessness. He will have to devote himself totally to the cause of the downtrodden, and this will inevitably mean the sacrifice of any private life, a conflict between public obligations and personal loyalties and responsibilities. See Douglas Young, *Beyond the Sunset*, pp. 24-5.

16. 'Controversy: Writers' International (British Section),'

Left Review, 1, No. 4 (1935), 179-80.

17. Ian S. Munro, p. 173.

18. ibid.

19. Douglas Young, *Beyond the Sunset*, p. 23.

20. Grassic Gibbon, *A Scots Quair* (New York: Schocken Books, 1977), p. 482. All subsequent references to this text will appear in the body of the paper.

21. 'Controversy: Writers' International (British Section),' *Left Review*, 1, No. 4 (1935), 179-80.

22. Gibbon, *A Scots Hairst*, p. 93.

23. See Munro's biography and Douglas Young's *Beyond the Sunset*.

24. Gibbon, *A Scots Hairst*, p. 91 and p. 93.

25. ibid. p. 152.

26. Malcolm, *A Blasphemer and Reformer*, p. 10.

27. In *A Scots Quair*, Gibbon uses 'Braid Scots', which is not the only language in the Scottish literary tradition, the other two being English and Gaelic. 'Braid Scots' and English are used by most Scots raised in the Lowlands. There is no definitive answer as to whether or not Scots should be accorded the linguistic status of a 'language'.

It should also be noted that what exactly comprises 'standard Scots' is debatable, for Scots is diversified through different regions, historical periods and literary genres. In my thesis, I use the term 'the Scots language', not to argue a linguistic point, nor to suggest any linguistic homogeneity to the denial of difference in dialects within Scots. Rather, 'language' is used in the sense of verbal embodiment of cultural values, for Gibbon is much concerned with the issue of cultural identity behind the use of English and 'Braid Scots'. As a term in literary analysis, it is loosely used in such categories as 'poetic language', 'legal language', 'newspaper language', etc.. The phrase 'the Scots language' can be found in many books on Scotland and scholarly writings on Gibbon, usually as a useful term for cultural and literary studies rather than as an implicit argument for linguistic or historical accuracy. For those interested in 'Braid Scots', see Billy Kay, *Scots: the Mither Tongue* (Edinburgh: Mainstream Publishing Co., 1986); Roderick Watson, *The Literature of Scotland* (London: MacMillan Publishers Ltd., 1984); and Glanville Price, *The Languages of Britain* (London: Edward Arnold, 1984), pp. 186-193.

28. Cairns Craig, ed., *The History of Scottish Literature* 4 vols. (Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 1987), IV, pp. 1-2.

29. C. M. Grieve, quoted in Duncan Glen, *Hugh MacDiarmid*

(Christopher Murray Grieve) and the Scottish Renaissance (Edinburgh and London: W. & R. Chambers, 1964), p. 73 and p. 78.

30. Cairns Craig, ed., *The History of Scottish Literature*, p. 3.

31. Edwin Muir, *Scott and Scotland: The Predicament of the Scottish Writer* (Edinburgh: Polygon Books, 1982/London: George Routledge and Sons Ltd, 1936).

32. ibid. p. 8.

33. ibid. p. 9.

34. Gibbon, *A Scots Hairst*, p. 152.

35. ibid. p. 153.

36. Gibbon, Letter to Helen B. Cruickshank, 18 Nov. 1933, quoted in Munro's *Leslie Mitchell*, p. 153.

37. Gibbon, *A Scots Hairst*, p. 145.

38. ibid. For more detail of Gibbon's attitude towards Scots, see his essay 'Literary Lights' in *A Scots Hairst*, pp. 142-156.

39. ibid. p. 145.

40. ibid. p. 144.

41. ibid. p. 92.

42. Ibid. p. 87.

43. Munro, *Leslie Mitchell*, p. 103.

44. ibid. The bibliography attached to *A Scots Hairst* divides Gibbon's works into three groups. They are books:

By Lewis Grassic Gibbon:

Sunset Song 1932

Cloud Howe 1933

Grey Granite 1934

(*A Scots Quair*, the trilogy comprising the above novels, was first issued in 1946.)

Niger: The Life of Mungo Park 1934

Scottish Scene (in collaboration with Hugh MacDiarmid) 1934

By James Leslie Mitchell:

Hanno 1928

Stained Radiance 1930

The Thirteenth Disciple 1931

The Calends of Cairo 1931

Three Go Back 1932

The Lost Trumpet 1932

Persian Dawns. Egyptian Nights 1932

Image and Superscription 1933

Spartacus 1933

The Conquest of The Maya 1934

Gay Hunter 1934

By James Leslie Mitchell and Lewis Grassic Gibbon:

Nine Against The Unknown 1934

45. One of the most exemplary cases of name-changing and self-transformation in literary history is George Orwell, a pen name with working-class, rural, classless, or royal, associations according to different critics. In their two-volume biography of Orwell, Stansky and Abrahams challenge Samuel Hynes's view that Eric Blair chose to be George Orwell in his work through an effortless name-changing/self-transformation. In fact, they argue, it was Victor Gollancz who chose Orwell out of four possible pen names suggested by Eric Blair:

> At first Blair found in Orwell a nom de plume; then, later, virtually a second self, a means of realizing his potentialities as an artist and moralist to become one of the major English authors of this century. Orwell he became; but he was Blair before Orwell, and there was always in Orwell the residue of Eric Blair. . . . The creation of George Orwell was an act of will by Eric Blair, and it was carried on at almost every level of his existence, affecting not only his prose style but also the style of his daily life. Becoming George Orwell was his way of making himself into a writer, at which he brilliantly succeeded, and of unmaking himself as a gentleman, of opting out of the genteel lower-upper-middle class into which he was born, at which he had only an equivocal success. But the significant result of the creation was that it allowed Eric Blair to come to terms with his world. Blair was the man to whom things happened; Orwell the man who wrote about them. [Peter Stansky and William Abrahams, *The Unkown Orwell* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1972), pp. xvii-xviii.]

The act of naming, however, ought to caution us against pinning down any absolute name/identity pair, or accepting the myth of self-creation through an act of will. The commentaries on the name George Orwell run so large a spectrum, revealing different critical responses to

Orwell's works, that we should abandon the traditional notion of an author as 'a principle of unity in writing where any unevenness of production is ascribed to changes caused by evolution, maturation, or outside influence.' [Michel Foucault, 'What is an Author?' *Critical Theory Since 1965*, eds. Hazard Adams and Leroy Searle (Tallahassee: Florida State University Press, 1986), p. 144.] The 'author-function' does not refer, purely and simply, to an actual individual in so far as it simultaneously gives rise to a variety of egos and to a series of subjective positions that individuals of any class may come to occupy. As Bakhtin puts it, the author as a creator is positioned in a realistic context of tradition, culture and society. In his composition, he is carrying a dialogue with the reader, with previous authors, and with his characters. The author is not totally in control of what he has created, nor can he be. (Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination*, pp. 259-422.)

Gibbon, by using two names simultaneously (one inherited from his father, one chosen from his mother's maiden name) and even two typewriters, has effectively challenged the myth of the author as a unified monologic source of expression and creation. Just as there are various voices in his works, so are his two names indicative of various masks he adopts in his dialogic imagination, a carnivalization of different 'identities'.

46. Gibbon, *A Scots Hairst*, p. 93.

47. ibid.

48. ibid. p. 145.

49. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination*, p. 291.

50. ibid.

51. ibid. p. 116.

REFERENCES - CHAPTER III

1. Deidre Burton, 'A Feminist Reading of Lewis Grassic Gibbon's *A Scots Quair*,' *The British Working-Class Novel in the Twentieth Century*, ed. Jeremy Hawthorn, p. 45. Her focus is really on *Grey Granite* instead of on the trilogy as a whole, because Ewan is the 'hero' of the former, while Chris is the 'heroine' of the latter.

2. Graham Trengove's essay 'Who is you? Grammar and Grassic Gibbon' [*Scottish Literary Journal* 2, 2 (December, 1975)] has a fascinating discussion on Gibbon's language, though it does not deal adequately with the more important ideological implications. Bakhtin thinks linguistics is incapable of treating 'dialogic speech', unless it utilizes metalinguistics. See his *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*,

pp. 182-183; and *Speech Genre and Other Late Essays*, p. 123.

3. Bakhtin, *Peoblems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, p. 188. Also see his *The Dialogic Imagination*, pp. 313-315.

4. Gibbon's anti-realist caution anticipated a later complaint in *The Left Review* that *Grey Granite* fails to report faithfully how the workers really feel about their environment. See Stuart Laing, 'Presenting "Things as They Are": John Sommerfield's *May Day* and Mass Observation,' *Class, Culture, and Social Change: A New View of the 30s*, ed. Frank Gloversmith (Sussex: The Harvester Press, 1980), pp. 146-147.

5. Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, p. 286.

6. The situation is similar to the Morels' in *Sons and Lovers*, except for the class difference in the latter. For a recent study of the man/wife difference in terms of territories in the working-class family in *Sons and Lovers*, see Paul Delany, '*Sons and Lovers*: The Morel Marriage as a War of Position,' *The D. H. Lawrence Review*, vol.21, No. 2, (Summer 1989), 153-165.

7. Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, p. 123.

8. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination*, pp. 345-346.

9. Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, p. 36.

10. Roy Johnson, 'Lewis Grassic Gibbon and *A Scots Quair*: Politics in the Novel,' *The 1930s: A Challenge to Orthodoxy*, ed. John Lucas, pp. 42-58.

11. Deidre Burton, 'A Feminist Reading of Lewis Grassic Gibbon's *A Scots Quair*,' *The British Working-Class Novel in the Twentieth Century*, ed. Jeremy Hawthorn, pp. 40-41.

12. Some critics have questioned that Chris should feel so old, since she is still in her forties.

13. Raymond Williams, *The Country and the City* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1973), p. 268.

14. ibid. p. 270.

15. ibid. p. 271.

16. Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, p. 196.

17. Wolfgang Iser, *The Act of Reading* (Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987), p. 210.

18. See David Caute, *The Fellow Travellers: Intellectual Friends of Communism* (New Heaven: Yale University Press, 1988).

19. Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, p. 196.

20. ibid. p. 286.

21. ibid. p. 252.

1. Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, p. 271.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. PRIMARY SOURCES

Gibbon, Lewis Grassic. *The Speak of the Mearns*. Edinburgh: The Ramsay Head Press, 1982.

_____ *A Scots Quair*. New York: Schocken Books, 1977.

_____ *A Scots Hairst: Essays and Stories*. Ed. Ian S. Munro. London: Hutchinson and Co. Ltd., 1967.

II. SECONDARY SOURCES

Adams, Hazard and Leroy Searle, eds. *Critical Theory Since 1965*. Tallahassee: Florida State University Press, 1986.

Aitken, A. J. and Tom McArthur, eds. *Languages of Scotland*. Chambers: Edingurgh, 1979.

Bakhtin, Mikhail M. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M. M. Bakhtin*. Ed. Michael Holquist. Trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981.

_____ *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Ed. and Trans. Caryl Emerson. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1984.

_____ *Speech Genre and the Other Late Essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1986.

Batsleer, Janet et al, eds. *Rewriting English: the Politics of Gender and Class*. London and New York: Methuen, 1985.

Bech, Hedwig, ed. *Essays on the Contemporary British Novel*. Munich: Hueba, 1986.

Bergonzi, Bernard. *Reading the Thirties: Texts and Contexts*. London: MacMillan, 1978.

Bold, Alan. *Modern Scottish Literature*. London and New York: Longman, 1983.

Campbell, Ian. *Lewis Grassic Gibbon*. Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press Ltd., 1985.

_____ 'Chris Caledonia: The Search for an Identity.' *Scottish Literary Journal*, 1, 2 (Dec. 1974), 45-57.

Caute, David. *The Fellow Travellers: Intellectual Friends of Communism*. New Heavens: Yale University Press, 1988.

Clark, Jon et al, eds. *Culture and Crisis in Britain in the 30s*. London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1979.

Clark, Katerina and Michael Holquist. *Mikhail Bakhtin*. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1984.

Comfort, Alex. *The Novel and Our Times*. Vancouver: Pendejo Press, 1964.

'Controversy: Writers' International (British Section).' *Left Review*, 1, No. 4 (1935), 179-80.

Craig, Cairns, ed. *The History of Scottish Literature*. Vol. 4. Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 1987.

Craig, David, ed. *Marxists on Literature: An Anthology*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1975.

Craig, David and Michael Egan. *Extreme Situations: Literature and Crisis from the Great War to the Atom Bomb*. London: MacMillan, 1979.

Crawford, Fred. *Mixing Memory and Desire: The Waste Land and British Novels*. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1982.

Cunningham, Valentine. *British Writers of the Thirties*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.

Delany, Paul. '*Sons and Lovers*: The Morel Marriage as a War of Position.' *The D. H. Lawrence Review*, Vol. 21, No. 2, (Summer 1989), 153-165.

Eagleton, Mary and David Pierce. *Attitudes to Class in the English Novel from Walter Scott to David Storey*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1979.

Eagleton, Terry. *Criticism and Ideology*. London: New Left Books, 1976.

Gallagher, C.. *The Industrial Reformation of the English Fiction: Social Discourse and Narrative Form, 1832-1867*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985.

Gifford, Douglas. *Neil M. Gunn and Lewis Grassic Gibbon*. Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1983.

Glen, Duncan. *Hugh MacDiarmid (Christopher Murray Grieve) and the Scottish Renaissance*. Edinburgh and London: W. & R. Chambers, 1964.

Gloversmith, Frank, ed. *Class, Culture and Social Change: A New View of the 30s*. Sussex: The Harvester Press, 1980.

Görlach, Manfred, ed. *Focus on Scotland: The Predicament of the Scottish Writer*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Co., 1985.

Gray, Nigel. *The Silent Majority: A Study of the Working Class in Post-War British Fiction*. London: Vision Press, 1973.

Hart, Francis Russell. *The Scottish Novel: From Smollett to Spark*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1978.

Hawthorn, Jeremy, ed. *The British Working-Class Novel in the Twentieth Century*. London: Edward Arnold, 1984.

Henderson, Philip. *The Novel Today: Studies in Contemporary Attitudes*. London: Buther & Tanner, 1936.

Hewitt, David and Michael Spiller, eds. *Literature of the North*. Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 1983.

Hoggart, Richard. *The Uses of Literacy*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1959.

_____*Speaking to Each Other*. 2 vols. London: Chatto & Windus, 1970.

Hunter, James. *The Making of the Crofting Community*. Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers Ltd., 1976.

Hynes, Samuel. *The Auden Generation: Literature and Politics in England in the 1930s*. New York: The Viking Press, 1972.

Iser, Wolfgang. *The Act of Reading*. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1988.

James, Louis. *Fiction For the Working Man 1830-1850: A Study of the Literature Produced for the Working Classes in Early Victorian Urban England*. London: Oxford University Press, 1963.

Jefferson, Douglas and Graham Martin, eds. *The Uses of Fiction: Essays on the Modern Novel in Honour of Arnold Kettle*. Milton Keynes: The Open University Press, 1982.

Johnson, Roy. 'The Proletarian Novel.' *Literature and Ideology.* II (1972), 25-36.

_____ 'Walter Brierley: Proletarian Writing.' *Red Letters.* II (1976), 5-8.

Jones, Gareth Stedman. *Languages of Class: Studies in English Working-Class History 1832-1982.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Kay, Billy. *Scots: The Mither Tongue.* Edinburgh: Mainstream Publishing Co., 1986.

Kettle, Arnold. *An Introduction to the English Novel.* 2 vols. London: Hutchinson & Co. Ltd., 1951.

Klaus, H. Gustav, ed. *The Rise of Socialist Fiction 1880-1914.* Sussex: The Harvester Press, 1987.

Klaus, H. Gustav. *The Literature of Labour: Two Hundred Years of Working-Class Writing.* Sussex: The Harvester Press, 1985.

Klaus, H. Gustav, ed. *The Socialist Novel in Britain: Towards the Recovery of a Tradition.* Sussex: The Harvester Press, 1982.

Lindsay, Jack. *After the Thirties: The Novel in Britain, and Its Future.* London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1956.

Lindsay, Maurice. *History of Scottish Literature.* London: Robert Hale, 1977.

Lucas, John, ed. *The 30s: A Challenge to Orthodoxy.* Sussex: The Harvester Press, 1978.

Lukács, Georg. *The Theory of the Novel.* Trans. Anna Bostock. Cambridge and Massachusetts: MacMillan, 1971.

Malcolm, William R.. *A Blasphemer and Reformer: A Study of James Leslie Mitchell/Lewis Grassic Gibbon.* Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 1984.

Mander, John. *The Writer and Commitment.* London: Secker and Warburg, 1961.

Marx, Karl. *Grundrisse: Foundations of the Critique of Political Economy.* Trans. Martin Nicola. New York: Vintage Books, 1973.

Mitchell, Jack. *Robert Tressell and The Ragged-Trousered Philanthropists.* London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1969.

Morley, Dave and Ken Worpole, eds. *The Republic of Letters: Working-Class Writing and Local Publishing*. London: Comedia Publishing Group, 1982.

Muir, Edwin. *Scott and Scotland: The Predicament of the Scottish Writer*. Edinburgh: Polygon Books, 1982/London: George Routledge and Sons Ltd., 1936.

Munro, Ian S.. *Leslie Mitchell: Lewis Grassic Gibbon*. Edinburgh and London: Oliver & Boyd, 1966.

Murray, Isobel and Bob Tait. *Ten Modern Scottish Novels*. Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 1984.

Price, Glanville. *The Languages of Britain*. London: Edward Arnold, 1984.

Sinfield, Alan, ed. *Society and Literature 1945-1970*. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1983.

Simon, Brian, ed. *The Radical Tradition in Education in Britain*. London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1972.

Smith, David. *Socialist Propaganda in the Twentieth-Century British Novel*. London: MacMillan, 1978.

Smith, Elton Edward. *The Angry Young Men of the Thirties*. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press, 1975.

Snee, Carol. 'Walter Brierley: A Test Case.' *Red Letters*, III(1976), 11-13.

Spender, Stephen. *World Within World*. London: Readers Union Ltd., 1953.

_____ *The Thirties and After: Poetry, Politics, People (1933-1975)*. London: MacMillan, 1978.

Stansky, Peter and William Abrahams. *Orwell: The Transformation*. London and Worcester: The Trinity Press, 1979.

_____ *The Unknown Orwell*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1972.

Stevenson, Randall. *The British Novel Since the Thirties: An Introduction*. London: B. T. Batsford Ltd., 1986.

Thompson, E. P.. *The Making of the English Working Class*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1963.

Tortosa, Francisco García and Ramon Lopez Ortega, eds. *English Literature and the Working Class*. Graficas Nova: Publicaciones De La Universidad De Sevilla, 1980.

Trengove, Graham. 'Who is You? Grammar and Grassic Gibbon.' *Scottish Literary Journal*, 2, 2 (Dec. 1975), 47-62.

Vicinus, Martha. *The Industrial Muse: A Study of Nineteenth-Century British Working-Class Literature*. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1974.

Volosinov, V. N.. *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*. Trans. Ladislav Matejka and I. R. Titunik. New York: Seminar Press, 1973.

Watson, George. *Politics and Literature in Modern Britain*. London: MacMillan, 1977.

Watson, Roderick. *The Literature of Scotland*. London: MacMillan Publishers Ltd., 1984.

West, Alick. *Crisis and Criticism: and Selected Literary Essays*. London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1975.

Wiener, Martin. *English Culture and the Decline of the Industrial Spirit 1850-1980*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

Williams, Raymond. *Culture*. Glasgow: William Collins Sons & Co. Ltd., 1981.

_____ *The Country and the City*. London: Chatto & Windus, 1973.

_____ *The English Novel: From Dickens to Lawrence*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1970.

_____ *Culture and Society: 1780-1950*. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1958.

Willis, Paul E. *Learning to Labour: How Working-Class Kids Get Working-Class Jobs*. Surrey: Gower, 1977.

Wilson, P. Joyce. 'Freedom and God: Some Implications of the Key Speech in *A Scots Quair*.' *Scottish Literary Journal*, 7, 2 (1980), 55-79.

Wolmark, Jenny. 'Problems of Tone in *A Scots Quair*.' *Red Letters*, II (1981), 15-23.

Woolf, Virginia. *Collected Essays*. Vol. II. London: Hogarth Press, 1966.

Worpole, Ken. *Dockers and Detectives: Popular Reading. Popular Writing*. London: Verso, 1983.

Young, Douglas F.. *Beyond the Sunset: A Study of James Leslie Mitchell (Lewis Grassic Gibbon)*. Aberdeen: Impulse Books, 1973.