

GRAHAM TULLOCH

ROBERT GARIOCH'S DIFFERENT STYLES OF SCOTS

In 1977 Robert Garioch was asked by Duncan Glen, as editor of *Akros*, to describe his poetic language. He did so very succinctly;

My language is my native local Scots, plus words and expressions of any other date or provenance, from speech, dictionaries and books: I follow the practice of most writers in Scots, at least since they became self-conscious sometime about the eighteenth century. Latterly I have been inclined to spell less phonetically, assuming, e.g. that a reader will not usually pronounce the final letters of `and' and `of'. Also I use Scots of different styles for different purposes, and try to use it as any writer would use any language.¹

This description is very helpful and what this paper aims to do is largely to flesh out these comments with details. In particular it takes up Garioch's comment that he used `Scots of different styles for different purposes'. Indeed, the whole question of his language will be examined from this particular angle.

It is an obvious comment that Garioch wrote a number of poems on a number of different subjects and we must therefore expect to find a number of different styles of Scots. Nevertheless amongst these different styles I think it is possible to identify three basic styles or registers. I do not want to suggest that *all his* poems fit neatly into three stylistic categories: there are other intermediate or mixed styles. But these are the most important; many of his poems do fit more or less into these three categories and, more importantly, the classification provides a useful way of approaching the question of what Garioch meant by `different styles for different purposes'.

The three registers I propose are as follows. The first I will call `formal'. It is used in formal reflective poems like `The Muir', `The Bog' and `The Wire'. In this register the poet usually speaks in his own voice. There are a lot more poems in the second register, which I will call `colloquial'. It is typically used by Garioch when he adopts a persona, as in the translations of Guiseppe Belli's Roman sonnets or in `Bingo! Saith the Lord'. It is also used when he speaks to us in his own voice, but

informally, as in 'Scottish Scene', 'The Lesson' and 'Nemo Canem Impune Lacesit'. Finally, in a few poems he imitates a broad Scots accent of a kind used normally only by working-class people or children. I will call this register 'broad'. Poems in this register are 'Fi'baw in the Street' and 'Heard in the Cou-gate'.

It will be noticed that the labels I have given to these three registers do not suggest that they are arranged all along one axis. While 'formal' and 'colloquial' can be considered as labels for levels of formality (and 'informal' would be an alternative label to 'colloquial'), the term 'broad' does not relate to the same scale. In fact it seems to me that such inconsistency of labelling is unavoidable; as Caroline Macafee has recently noted, styles in literary language are 'multidimensional'.² The labels I have used are merely for convenience; they do not in themselves sum up all the characteristics of each register. While on the question of labels, it is worth noting that I use the word 'colloquial' in a way slightly different from Derrick McClure in his article 'Scots: its Range of Uses' where he makes a very useful attempt to suggest ways of classifying different styles of Scots used in literature.³ In his terms, my 'colloquial' register includes many 'literary' elements.

In 1933 Garioch wrote an article on writing Scots for *The Scots Observer* called 'Purity or Smeddum — The Alternatives of Scottish Dialect'. As it happens, in it he talks of three styles of Scots; that of the uneducated child, that of the partially educated 'growin bairn ... warslin awaw wi unken tongues' and the mair it less mature style of a man whaw hiz widened the scope of his vocabulary through contact wi ither local dialects, an wi Standard English works'.⁴ He also provides an illustrative poem for each style. Garioch's three styles partly overlap with the three registers I have identified but there are a number of differences and, for the purposes of looking at the whole of his poetry, I find my three registers more useful. Indeed, two of the three illustrative poems Garioch did not include in his *Collected Poems*. The other, 'Buckie-Wife', he did include, renaming it 'Buckies'; it is an example of a poem in the broad register.

We can now look in more detail at the characteristics of the three registers. I will begin by looking at spelling since it provides the most obvious distinguishing marks. Furthermore, anyone concerned with the study of Scots since at least the eighteenth century will recognise that spelling is always a crucial concern,

perhaps the crucial concern.

In the later editions of his poems Garioch had only small differences in spelling between the formal and colloquial registers. Small as they are, these differences are significant. On the other hand broad register poems have a spelling markedly different from that of the two other registers. It is necessary to limit these comments to the later editions because Garioch, after adopting certain spelling practices in the early collections of his works, later changed his spelling practices radically.⁵ I will return to this matter later. In the meantime my comments are based on his spelling in the 1966 *Selected Poems* and the 1977 *Collected Poems*. (For the most part they also apply to the 1983 *Complete Poetical Works*, edited, after Garioch's death, by Robin Fulton. However in that edition there are certain exceptions, of which also more later).⁶

The basis of the spelling in both the formal and colloquial registers is the 'Scots Style Sheet' put together by the Makars' Club in 1947.⁷ Amongst other things, the style sheet, which was really more than anything else a spelling sheet, called for the avoidance of apostrophes (which earlier writers had freely used to indicate the absence in Scots of a consonant found in the corresponding English word), the use of the traditional Scottish *ou* for the [u:] sound, and Scottish *ch* instead of English *gh*. Garioch follows all these suggestions in both the formal and colloquial registers, writing *and* and *of*, *wi* and *as* where earlier writers might have used *an'*, *o'*, *wi'* and *a'*, as well as *doun*, *about* and *pouer* instead of *doon*, *aboot* and *pooer* and *lauch*, *richt* and *sicht* rather than *laugh*, *right* and *sight*.

However, with other spellings, while the formal register follows the style sheet, the colloquial register does not. We can best understand why this is by looking at the apparent aims of the style sheet. One of its most important aims was to provide some kind of Standard Scots spelling which did not contain spellings associated with particular areas inside Scotland. So, even though Early Scots [ø:] (or [y:]) has developed into a number of different sounds in different areas of Scotland,⁸ the style sheet recommends the use of a *u* spelling for all these sounds, either combined with *i* in *ui* or in the combination *u+consonant+e*. Garioch almost always follows this recommendation in both the colloquial and the formal registers although there are occasional exceptions, like *tim* and the verb *yaise* instead of *tume* and *use* or *tuim* and *uise*. But in other similar cases where the style sheet advocates a standard spelling, Garioch

generally uses the standard spelling in the formal register and a local one in the colloquial register. For instance, the style sheet recommends the spelling *ane* and *ae* for the words meaning 'one'; rather than local forms like *yin* and *yae*. Garioch allows himself one instance of *yin* in 'The Muir' (as well as two instances of *ane* as an indefinite article) but he keeps to *ae* in that poem for the form of the numeral used before a noun, whereas he uses *yae* in the colloquial register of 'Keep Aff the Girss'. Likewise, in 'The Muir' Garioch keeps carefully to the style sheet's *-na* for the enclitic negative but in colloquial register poems he often uses the east mid Scots *-nae*. Finally we may note the use of the east mid Scots *o'd* 'of it' in the colloquial register of the Belli sonnets where 'The Muir' and 'The Bog' stick to *o't*.

A second aim of the style sheet is a return to older spellings instead of some of the more phonetic spelling that had developed in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Although the style sheet does not mention these particular words, by this logic *my* should be used instead of *ma* and *I* instead of *Ah* or *A* since *my* and *I* (which also happen to be the English spellings) are the normal older Scots spellings of these words. Garioch always uses *my* and *I* in the formal register but often uses *ma* or *A* or *Ah* in the colloquial register. Similarly the spellings *whit*, *whitna* and *whatever* appear in the Belli translations while 'The Muir' has *what*, *whatna* and *whatever*.

Finally the style sheet tries to use the spelling to signal some of the differences between the history of Scots and the history of English. Hence it advocates the spelling *-an* for the present participle and *-in* for the verbal noun where English has *-ing* for both. There is no widespread differentiation along these lines in present-day Scots speech but the recommended spellings do reflect the historical fact that in Scots the endings of the participle and the verbal noun go back to different Old English origins whereas in English both derive from the Old English verbal noun. While the suggestion appeals to those many writers who wish to draw attention to the separateness of Scots, to call for a differentiation in spelling according to grammatical function is to invite trouble, especially as the style sheet does not specify which spelling is to be used for the verbal adjective. Not surprisingly, this recommendation has been followed somewhat erratically, if at all, by recent writers. As for Garioch, he often avoids the problem by using *ing*. Yet he does stick more or less to the *-an/-in* distinction in 'The Muir' whereas in the Belli translations he is inclined to use *-in* for all three functions. The Belli

sonnets, it is true, are more recent and this change may simply arise from increasing impatience with a troublesome rule but the difference does seem appropriate: *-in* is used in many parts of the English-speaking world as a spelling in certain kinds of colloquial registers whereas *-an* is a much more unusual spelling without these associations of colloquialism. Furthermore the historical association of the use of the *-an/-in* distinction make it fitting for use in 'The Muir', a poem which, as we shall see, has a number of archaic elements in it.

To sum up, in the two registers Garioch usually bases his spelling on the 'Scots Style Sheet' but diverges from it in certain spellings in the colloquial register which make that register more local,⁹ more phonetic and less historical in its spelling.

Poems in the broad register have a quite different spelling. Even if we look only at the title of the best of these poems we find it illustrates two of the differences. In the title of 'Fi'baw in the Street' we find both the use of an apostrophe to indicate the realisation of the phoneme /t/ as a glottal stop and the spelling *aw* in a word with vocalised [ɪ]. In the formal and colloquial registers the glottal stop is not indicated and the spelling of the words which in English are *all* and *ball* would be *aa* and *baa*. In the remainder of the poem we find the glottal stop indicated in *pi'`put'*, *bi'`but'*, *tha'`that'* and *wa'er`water'* and the *aw* spelling in *aw`all'*. Other spellings found in the broad register but not normally in the formal and colloquial registers are: *oo* for the [u:] sound rather than *ou* (*doon*, *roon`round'* and *oot*), *-ny* for *-na* or *-nae* (*dinny*), *ti* for *to*, *o* for *of*, *an* for *and*, *wir* for *we're* and *thull* for *they'll*. The overall effect of this is to give the poem a quite different appearance on the page so that the spelling very distinctly sets the broad register poems apart from poems in the other two registers.

At this stage we might well stop and consider for a moment what exactly these variations in spelling are intended to achieve. The explanation that is most likely to spring into one's mind is that they are intended to represent differences of pronunciation. In fact, when we look at writers who have experimented with the spelling of Scots (which probably means almost all Scottish writers since at least the eighteenth century) we find that phonetics is only one of their considerations and frequently not the most dominant. Garioch is no exception. The glottal stop is a special case since its presence in the words indicated by Garioch is typically a feature of less educated speech and the speech of children. The speakers in all the broad register poems apparently

belong to these categories and we would therefore be likely to follow the indications of the spelling and retain this pronunciation in reading these poems aloud but avoid it in the formal and colloquial register poems where this feature of spelling is absent. Apart from this special case, however, it is not likely that the different spellings are intended to indicate differences of pronunciation. To cite one case, by looking at the rhymes we can discover that the *aa* of the formal and colloquial registers is intended to be pronounced exactly the same as the *aw* of the broad register. For instance, in 'Garioch's Repone til George Buchanan' *caa*, *haa*, *faa*, *aa* and *smaa* and also *twa* rhyme with *raw*, *braw*, *saw*, *jaw*, *haw*, *craw* and *shaw*. (The presence of *twa* in this list is interesting in other ways. This pronunciation would be found in, for instance, Fife or the Borders; but the normal Edinburgh pronunciation would be [twe:]; hence Garioch's occasional use elsewhere of the spelling *twaē*. This borrowing of pronunciations from other forms of Scots parallels similar borrowings of vocabulary which we will examine later). Again, to cite another case, Garioch himself in reading his poems aloud often pronounced *-na as* if it were spelt *-naē*.¹⁰

For the most part then the differences in spelling do not represent differences in pronunciation. But, if the spellings are not for phonetic representation, why do they vary? Their main function seems, in fact, to be to influence the readers' attitude to the language. This is something other Scottish writers had been doing for some time. In Garioch's own time the compilers of the 'Scots Style Sheet' were, as Albert Mackie says, 'ettlan to spell the leid in a menner that wad be mair in keepin wi its place as a language wi a lang historie in script and prent'.¹¹ In other words they were trying to make Scots look like a literary language and not like spoken dialect which had somehow got into print. So the 'Scots Style Sheet' spelling conventions of 'The Muir' are intended to reinforce other aspects of that poem's very literary style. At the other extreme the more phonetic spelling of 'Fi'baw in the Street' is intended to make us feel that here we are encountering a language which is founded entirely on speech and not at all on written models. The situation is neatly illustrated in the three spellings of the enclitic negative: *-na* in the formal register, *-naē* in the colloquial and *-ny* in the broad. The first has all the status of being the traditional Scots spelling and therefore looks the most literary; *-naē* represents current pronunciation but is not a great departure in spelling; *-ny* also represents current pronunciation but has moved

decisively away from the traditional spelling and thus looks the least literary of the three. The importance of the spellings lies in these varying degrees of apparent 'literariness', not in their phonetic value. As far as pronunciation goes, *-nae* and *-ny can*, in fact, represent the same pronunciation, since in 'The Canny Hen' Garioch rhymes *windaes* and *shindies*.

As I have said, all these comments on spelling are based on the later editions of his poems as revised by Garioch. In the two early collections of his works which Garioch himself printed, *Seventeen Poems for 6d* (1940) and *Chuckies on the Cairn* (1949), he used quite different spelling conventions. However, by the time he published 'The Muir' in *New Saltire* in 1963 he had changed over to the 'Scots Style Sheet' conventions. In the early editions he uses a modified form of the spelling which developed in the nineteenth century. He does not use the apostrophe beloved by later nineteenth century writers (except in certain poems to represent the glottal stop) but some of his spellings, like *o* for *of* and *an* for *and*, are in origin apostrophe spellings without the apostrophe. He also uses *oo* rather than *ou* to represent [u:], *tae* and *ti* rather than *to* and *-aw* rather than *-aa*. But, when we compare formal poems like 'The Bog' and 'Winter' from *Chuckies on the Cairn* and 'Quiet Passage' from *Seventeen Poems for 6d* with the way they are printed in *Selected Poems* and subsequent editions, we find that in the later editions they have been changed to 'Scots Style Sheet' conventions. In particular it is worth noting that *aw* and *oo*, both used in later editions as markers of the broad register, have been replaced by *aa* and *ou*, and *ma* and *A*, later reserved for both colloquial and broad register poems, have given way to *my* and *I*. 'Fi'baw in the Street' which appeared in *Seventeen Poems for 6d* is, on the other hand, very little changed when reprinted. For that broad register poem Garioch considers his older spelling style to be still appropriate.

Finally, a few words on the 1983 *Complete Poetical Works*.¹² A large part of this edition is identical with the *Collected Poems* and to that part all the comments made earlier about Garioch's spelling practices do apply. But the *Complete Poetical Works* includes a number of poems printed from Garioch's notebooks. In the case of some early poems, for instance 'Modern Athens', this means that the spelling does not conform with Garioch's later practice since they were originally written in his older style of spelling and, since they were not published by him, in the period after he had changed his spelling

conventions, they remained in the notebooks with unrevised spelling. 'Modern Athens' is quite clearly a poem of the formal register but, printed as it is in the older style of spelling, it includes many spelling features that in the rest of this edition are reserved for broad and/or colloquial register poems. Similarly some of the very recent colloquial register poems such as the new Belli sonnets display, in a rather sporadic fashion, features of spelling (like broad register *oo* instead of colloquial or formal *ou*) which Garioch might have edited out in making a final copy for printing.¹³

In turning to vocabulary the main thing to bear in mind is again that the formal register is the most literary and the broad register the one which comes closest to imitating everyday speech. It would seem that Garioch was in two minds about using everyday Scots speech as a poetic language. In his address 'To Robert Fergusson' he laments that:

our couthie city
has cruddit in twa pairts a bittie
and speaks twa tongues, ane coorse and grittie,
heard in the Cougait,
the tither copied, mair's the pitie,
frae Wast of Newgate.

From this it seems that current spoken Scots is 'coorse and grittie' and he further goes on to call it the corrupt twang of Cougait'. Yet at the same time he believes that this 'corrupt twang' is nearer than English 'tae the leid Fergusson sang' and Fergusson was a poet he admired and imitated. It seems therefore that he would like to use what remains of Fergusson's language in present-day Edinburgh speech but he feels it has become corrupt. Not surprisingly in these circumstances, the number of poems in the broad register, in which Garioch attempts to imitate this 'corrupt twang', is small.¹⁴ (One, incidentally, is, as we have seen, called 'Heard in the Cougate'). Comparing his own situation with that of Fergusson, Garioch writes:

ye had at your fingernebb
real levan words to weave your webs
of sound and sense, of smiles and slebs,
whilst Embro callants
ne'er thocht to runkle up their nebs at
guid braid Lallans.

To remedy his lack of such resources Garioch, like MacDiarmid,

felt that Scots poets should draw on resources outside their own native Scots speech. He borrowed obsolete Scots terms, terms from other local dialects inside Scotland and even terms from Standard English.

With these general points in mind we can now look in detail at the different lexical features of the three registers. The most obvious difference between the vocabulary of the formal and broad registers is that there are fewer purely Scottish words in the broad register. (By purely Scottish words I mean words which are not part of the common stock of vocabulary shared by Scots and English). In this respect the broad register reflects the realities of contemporary speech which is nowhere near as dense in purely Scottish terms as most literary Scots texts. In 'Heard in the Cougate', for example, the main purely Scottish vocabulary element is basic words like *bonny* and *muckle*. On the other hand this register includes some of the new arrivals in twentieth century Scots like *see us* meaning 'give me' ('Seez-owre the wa'er') and *teuchter* 'a Highlander'. There are also colloquialisms borrowed from other branches of English like *the nick* 'gaol' and *bobbies* 'policemen' in 'Fi'baw in the Street'. Since this register is based on present-day speech we would not expect to find archaisms and indeed there are no clear cases. There are some doubtful cases because, even with the *Scottish National Dictionary* with its notes on current usage at hand, it is not always easy to establish the extent of the use of certain words in present-day speech. If there are elements of archaism in broad register poems Garioch's comment would no doubt be, at least with regard to the several broad register poems with child speakers, that children's speech is conservative; in his memoirs of his childhood he writes that 'speech does persist, especially among children. Right now, I hear them in the street, speaking much as we did, and so do the wee Indians'.¹⁵

When we look at the formal register we are concerned with a language based on literary rather than spoken models. With regard to archaism the relevant question becomes, not whether a word is still used in speech, but whether it is still used in writing. Using the *SND's* literary quotations it is possible to identify certain cases of the use of literary archaisms, as we would expect from Garioch's own acknowledgement that he used them.

Let us consider the vocabulary of 'The Muir' as an example of his formal register. Garioch had special problems in writing this poem because it deals with nuclear physics. It is a reflection

on man's understanding of his world in the light of new discoveries in physics. He had to provide a suitable language to do this. Sensibly he kept a lot of the accepted scientific terms: *cathode-blip*, *electron*, *nucleus*, *quantum* and *trajectory*. At the same time he tried to provide some distinctively Scottish terms. For example he used *virr*, a Scots word meaning 'human or mechanical energy', to express the idea of energy in the general scientific sense. He also combined the Scots words *haar* and *chaumer* to convey the notion of the *cloud-chamber*, an invention of the Scottish physicist Charles Wilson. (Another new compound, in this case not used to express a scientific concept, is *kennan-sel* which apparently means 'conscious self'). For the central concept of the atom he usually sticks to the normal word but he also revives from earlier English (not Scots) the use of the alternative form *atomy* to convey the same meaning.

Garioch's other problem was to provide sufficiently formal language for his very formal theme, man's view of his situation. He needed to do this, like other poets of the twentieth century Scottish Renaissance, because Scots had been for so long almost wholly associated with informal contexts. He solved this problem partly by determinedly pushing informal words like *dunsch*, *shougle*, *splairge* and *trauchle* into formal use.¹⁶ He also returned to the Middle Scots makars' tradition of aureate diction. As well as using the word *aureate* itself, he revived from these poets words like *estivall* (from Alexander Hume), *flume* 'river', *preclair* 'illustrious' (used by Dunbar) and *supern* 'in the heavens'. He also revived much more recently obsolete words like *dyvour* meaning 'bankrupt', *fang* 'seize', *lume* 'bowl', *practick* 'practice' and *samyn* 'same'. Although these words had fallen out of use in the twentieth century they had all been common enough in the nineteenth; however, some of his revivals are of quite rare words. *Flecker't* meaning 'mangled' is not found in older Scots and is only cited from Jamieson in *The Scottish National Dictionary*. It seems pretty likely therefore that Garioch's source is Jamieson, that rich mine of the Scottish Renaissance poets. Archaism, then, plays an important part in the vocabulary of 'The Muir' but this is not to deny the presence of plenty of words still current in written or spoken Scots usage like *fremmit*, *gyte*, *pech*, *sinnon*, *thowless* and *tuim*.

Garioch, as we have seen, says that he uses Edinburgh Scots and 'words and expressions of any other date or provenance'. As well as his archaisms we should consequently expect words from other dialects. 'The Muir' offers several examples. Garioch's

horrific description of hell:

whaur the frusche flesh of folk jurmummilt aa
 God's ire maun gorroch and amidwart thraw
 intill the sempiternal buller, doun

contains two words which are neither Standard Scots nor Edinburgh Scots. They are *gorroch* meaning 'stir about' from south-western Scots and *jurmummle* meaning to 'crush or mix up' from southern Scots. Both seem to be rare words; it is quite probable that Garioch picked up *gorroch* from Crockett's *The Raiders*, its one citation in the *Scottish National Dictionary*. *Jurmummle*, on the other hand, could have come from Hoy: or dictionary sources. We may also note in passing how Garioch expands his potential vocabulary by the unusual application of *frusche* to flesh; it means 'brittle' or 'crumbly' but it is usually applied to wood, cloth, soil or pastry.

While the great majority of the Belli sonnets are in the colloquial register there are a few which belong to the formal register. One of these, 'Immoral Reflections in the Coliseum' (No.1619), provides us with a further example of Garioch's methods for providing suitable diction for the formal register. While it includes current Scots terms like *stramp* 'trample on' and *gowl* 'howl', it also contains revivals of obsolete terms like *pash* 'smash' and *pend* 'arch', a word now probably in this sense confined to history books. *Walter*, glossed by Garioch as 'turn over', seems to be obsolete now except in Ulster and Shetland. Probably he took the word from Jamieson whose definition 'overturn' is closer to his own meaning than the usages recorded in citations in *The Scottish National Dictionary*. Regarding *connach* 'spoil, destroy', a north-eastern word used by Fergusson, the *SND* says: this is probably not native Edinburgh dialect, but a reflection of Fergusson's Aberdeenshire parentage'. Fergusson in his turn would seem to be Garioch's most likely source for this word. Finally for *waymenting* 'lamenting' Garioch goes to older Scots or Middle English. Altogether, for a short poem, there are a considerable number of archaisms and words from local varieties of Scots.

When we turn to the colloquial register we find rather fewer purely Scottish words than in the formal register although there are still quite a number. As with the broad register we find a number of colloquial terms from English like *aggranoying*, *bevy*, *bugger-aa* and *wide-boy* and we also find twentieth century Scottish colloquialisms like *rammy* meaning 'a fight'. At

the same time, despite the colloquial, up-to-date tone of these poems, there is a noticeable sprinkling of archaisms. Some cases are doubtful, like *bangster* meaning 'bully', but others are fairly clear. The word *donsie* meaning 'a fool' seems to have become obsolete by the second half of this century if not before yet it appears in a thoroughly colloquial poem called 'The Keach out of the Creel' which begins:

Whit's up? Ae! whit a rammy! Whit's adae?
See as thae folk in Consolation Street!
Some polis catcht a mugger on his beat?
Somebody got duin-in? Whit dae ye say?

It is interesting to note the presence in this passage of the twentieth century Scots colloquialism *rammy* and the English vogue word *mugger* alongside the archaic *donsie*. The title too includes an archaism; it is a variation on the ballad title 'The Keach in the Creel' (meaning the tossing about in the basket') and, as such, preserves *keach* or *keytch*, a word obsolete since the later nineteenth century. Other archaisms found in the colloquial register are *wansonsie* 'wicked' which, like *donsie*, Garioch probably took from Jamieson and *grugous* meaning 'grim' which had died out in the early nineteenth century but had already been revived by MacDiarmid. Despite this, the number of archaisms is much less than in a formal poem like 'The Muir'. In short, in the number of archaisms and in the density of purely Scots words, the colloquial register falls, as we might expect, somewhere between the formal and broad registers.

Finally let us turn to the grammar of the three registers. Garioch's work would provide an interesting case for study of how far the traditional grammar of Modern Scots remains intact in literary Scots: briefly, one may note that much of it survives, like the demonstratives *thae* (plural of *that*), *thir* (plural of *this*), *thon* and *yon* as well as the enclitic negative, but other elements have disappeared, such as the shortening of *sall* to '*se*', earlier frequently found in combination with various pronouns, like *ye'se*, *we'se* and *I'se*. However I will concentrate here on the grammatical features which differentiate the three registers.

The differences in grammar between the three registers often follow the pattern of the lexical and spelling differences. Consequently, just as there are a number of archaic words in the formal register so, too, do we find archaic grammar. To quote the *SND*: '*Ane* had become the conventional literary form for the indefinite article in Middle Scots and this usage survived

... in formal prose until the early eighteenth century, rarely later'. So when Garioch uses *ane* as an indefinite article in the following passage from 'The Muir' it is an archaistic revival in keeping with the many revived words in that poem:

Sae even when they think of Hydrogen,
wi jist the yin electron, maist of men
feel theirsels wannert in ane fremmit airt.

(Two other grammatical features of this passage deserve mention in passing. Firstly, *yin* is both an exception to Garioch's general rule of avoiding local forms in the formal register and also represents a departure from traditional Scots grammar which would require *ae* or the local form *yae* here. Secondly, we can note that Garioch feels there is no inappropriateness in using Scots *theirsels* in the formal register even though in English *themselves* is considered to be a non-standard alternative to *themselves*. *Hissel*, on the other hand, seems to treat as more colloquial, at least when using the spelling *he's sel* to indicate the east mid Scots long vowel of the first syllable. In the Belli translation 'Mammie's Counsel' the last line reads:

Wha duisnae save he's sel, my lass, *is* drounit).

With the colloquial register we find that, just as it includes new twentieth century Scots vocabulary so it also includes a major twentieth century innovation in grammar. This is the plural second person pronoun *yese* or *youse*.¹⁷ The old *thou/ye* distinction has disappeared in twentieth century Scots except in a few dialects like that of Shetland. In its place we often get a *ye/yese* distinction with the arrival of *yese* or *youse* being ascribed to Irish influence.¹⁸ Whatever its origin, it tends to be a feature of less educated speech and, whereas Garioch uses the traditional *ye* for both singular and plural in the formal register, he uses *yese* regularly in the colloquial register of the Belli translations, for instance in 'Judgment Day':

Fowre muckle angels wi their trumpets
... sail aipen the inspection;
they'll gie a blaw, and bawl, ilk to his section,
in their huge voices: "Come, aa yese, be wauken".

Yet, in the same passage, alongside this very contemporary usage, it is interesting to find Garioch using *sall*, a form which the *SND* notes as no longer current. As with the vocabulary an element of archaism is not excluded in the grammar of this register.

As well as *yese* there are other pronominal forms which characterise the colloquial register, the emphatic *ah* and *hiz* for *I* and *us* and also *mines* an absolute form of *mine* created on the analogy of *yours* and *theirs*. The following examples are from the Belli translations; from 'The Mowdert Spinster':

Ah'm no like Rosie, and Ah'm mo like Sairey,
from 'Hell':

Gentil Jesus, kirsent and circumcised,
please wad ye ludge the Turks and Jews doun thair,
and gie hous-room til hiz in Paradise

and from 'The Guid-Natur'd Guidman -- I':

Thae sevin year I've had him he's been kind;
nae bickerin; onie new thing ther is
in Rome, is mines.

While there are only a few poems fully in the broad register ('Fi'baw in the Street' and 'Heard in the Cougate' are the clearest examples) there are a number of other poems which are very much on the borderline of the colloquial and broad registers. At least one of these has a feature of grammar, not found in the formal register in Garioch, which would probably have occurred in the broad register if Garioch had written more extensively in it. In the first of the 'Twa Festival Sketches' we find the pronoun omitted with the verb *ken* when it has the force of the English *you know*:

there was a richt rammie gaun on,
folk millin about, ken?

This idiom, frequent in present-day speech, would have been very appropriate to the broad register.

Finally, in the few poems fully in the broad register, I have noted only one feature of grammar not found in the other registers. In 'Fi'baw in the Street' the boy-narrator says

ma knees is skint and bluddan.

While this could be identified, and was possibly intended by Garioch, as a piece of non-standard English it can be looked at in another way. We can also see it as a survival of the old Scots rule that, where the verb is not immediately preceded by a noun, the form of the verb which in English only functions as the third person singular can be used even with a plural subject. No doubt it would please Garioch to have us identify this as a survival of earlier usage since, as we have already noted, he himself

remarked on the conservatism of children's speech. At the same time it is no doubt significant that this usage only occurs in the broad register. It may be historical Scots but the inescapable influence of Standard English usage has labelled it 'illiterate'. As Derrick McClure notes: 'This feature might be seen as more appropriate to a "colloquial" than to a "literary" register, but the association is due simply to Standard English influence and is an unnecessary one'.¹⁹ Whether or not the association is necessary, Garioch seems to accept it and to avoid this historical Scots usage in his more literary registers and to reserve it for the uneducated speech of the boy in 'Fi'bwaw in the Street'.

These then seem to me to be the main distinguishing characteristics in spelling, vocabulary and grammar of the three registers. As I have made clear, in many cases the distinction lies in the relative frequency of certain features. Hence, while the use of colloquialisms from present-day English is particularly a feature of the colloquial and broad registers, it can occasionally be found in the formal register, as with Garioch's use in 'The Muir' of *bivvy* (an army slang shortening of *bivouac* meaning 'a tent'). On the other hand certain features are indeed totally absent from one or more of the registers: *yese* is not used at all in the formal register. But for the most part we are talking in terms of relative frequency. Equally, as I said at the beginning, not all Garioch's work fits neatly into these three categories. Some poems sit on the borderline between registers, like 'To Robert Fergusson', mostly a formal register poem but with some colloquial register features; in others Garioch deliberately shifts between registers in the course of the poem, as in 'Fable' where the register suddenly switches to broad for the muckle rat's speech: 'Git the hell ou' a that'. Nevertheless, if we bear in mind that there are exceptions in, and variations on the three registers I have outlined, I do think they help us to understand what Garioch had in mind when he wrote of using 'Scots of different styles for different purposes'.

NOTES

- 1 Quoted in Duncan Glen, 'Editorial: Poetry or "Scot Lit"?', *Akros*, 11:33 (1977), 3-12. Garioch is quoted on p. 7.
- 2 'Sociolinguistic Approaches to Scots Language', *Scottish Language*, 2 (1983), 20-32. This reference, p. 28.
- 3 In *Languages of Scotland*, ed. A.J. Aitken and Tom McArthur (Edinburgh: Chambers, 1979), pp. 26-48.

- 4 This article was reprinted in *Lallans*, 18 (1982), 5-8 under the title 'On Scriverin Scots'. Quotations here are from the *Lallans* reprint, pp. 7-8.
- 5 I do not know when Garioch decided to change his spelling practices but the new conventions are to be found at least as early as his translation of George Buchanan's *Jephthah* and *The Baptist* which was published under his full name, Robert Garioch Sutherland (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1959).
- 6 All three editions were published by Macdonald in Edinburgh. Quotations in this paper are from the *Complete Poetical Works*.
- 7 The style sheet has been reprinted more than once. See, for instance, *Lines Review* 9 (1955), 30-31.
- 8 See the 'Introduction' to *The Scottish National Dictionary*, para. 35.
- 9 The localness of Garioch's Scots calls for more comment. While Garioch, due to his subject matter, is rightly considered as very much an Edinburgh poet, it is noticeable that his language, whether in the colloquial or the broad register, is never as specifically 'Edinburgh' as the language of many recent Glaswegian writers is 'Glasgow'. By 'local' in this context, therefore, I generally mean something as broad as east mid Scots, or even broader, rather than uniquely Edinburgh features. In this connection Paul Johnston's recent comment is significant: 'Speakers in Edinburgh seem to have an exceptionally low consciousness (within a Scottish context) of such a thing as "Edinburgh accent/dialect". The "Edinburgh accent", as popularly regarded, is a variety of S[tandard] S[cottish] E[nGLISH]'. (See 'Irregular Style Variation Patterns in Edinburgh Speech', *Scottish Language*, 2 (1983), 1-19. This reference is in note 9.)
- 10 There are two Scotsoun tapes which include, amongst other things, Garioch reading his own poetry: 'Robert Garioch' (SSC 045) and 'In the Mind of a Makar' (SSC 061).
- 11 See 'The Spelling of Scots', *Lines Review*, 9 (1955), 29-30.
- 12 I have written in more detail on this particular edition in my review of it in *Lines Review*, 88 (1984), 11-15.
- 13 On the other hand it is possible that Garioch was in the process of again revising his spelling practices and he may have intended these spellings to remain in any printed edition.
- 14 Elsewhere Garioch makes clear that he used the 'corrupt twang' in this case as a reaction to the language of other poets: 'Vexed by the englishness of other people's poems, I reacted by presenting "Fi'baw in the Street", glottal stops and all. I thought I was being rude, but it was well received'. (See 'Early Days in Edinburgh' in *As I Remember*, ed. Maurice Lindsay (London: Hale, 1979), pp. 45-58. This reference, p. 58).
- 15 'Early Days in Edinburgh', p. 52.
- 16 In this and other respects Garioch is following the practice of other writers of 'synthetic Scots'. For an examination of the practices of other poets see J. Derrick McClure, 'The Synthesisers of Scots', in

Minority Languages Today, ed. Einar Haugen, J. Derrick McClure and Derick Thomson (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1981), pp. 91-99.

- 17 While *youse* and *yese may* be plural pronouns in origin, they are found *as* singular pronouns as well:
Priests will aye threip: "The Fiend sall git his graip
in ye, fir sayin, `May the Deevil flee
awa wi yeze!' to some chiel." (The Theologian').
- 18 The idiom seems to have spread from Glasgow, the centre of Irish influence in Scotland. Similarly it appears in both Liverpool and Australia, two other areas which have had a strong Irish element in their population.
- 19 `Scots: Its Range of Uses', p. 34.

Flinders University