Fried pies (also called hand pies) are a traditional Appalachian treat. They’re a little bit of trouble—but well worth it! And having two people work together makes it much easier. My husband, who loves making his old family recipes, taught me to make these before we were married. Once you taste them, you’ll understand why I think he’s quite a catch.

**Ingredients for Filling**
- ¼ cup water (or more if needed)
- 1 quart apples, peeled (or not) and sliced
- Sugar
- Allspice
- Nutmeg

**Method**
For the filling, you can reconstitute dried apples, just as you might for a traditional Apple Stack Cake. But we usually use fresh heirloom apples that cook down nicely into the right apple-buttery consistency. Usually, we use June apples off of the trees in the orchard, or if it’s later in the year, we use Pound Pippins or Sheep Nose apples. We prefer apples that break down easily and do not retain their shape, though a few small chunks in the filling won’t hurt anything at all. We use fresh apples in season, peeled, sliced, and cooked down until soft. You can also peel and slice more than you need and store the extras in the freezer for later.

Our usual batch of fried pies uses about 1 quart of prepared apples. If they’re frozen, they need to be thawed, then put in a large saucepan with about ¼ cup of water. Cook them until they’re about the consistency of thick applesauce. When they are almost ready, add a little allspice, a little cinnamon, and just enough sugar to make them a touch sweet, but not enough to cancel out the lovely green-apple tartness of the fruit. We taste the filling and add sugar in very small increments (teaspoons) until we are satisfied with the balance between tart and sweet. The filling can be made ahead and stored in the fridge for a couple of days, but fried pies are much better if the filling is slightly warm during the filling process. And though they are certainly good warmed over, fried pies are always at their peak hot and fresh off of the cast iron!

**Ingredients for Crust**
- 2 cups flour
- ¼ cup butter
- ¾ teaspoon of salt
- ¾ teaspoon of baking powder
- ¼ teaspoon of baking soda
  (this cuts the sourness of the buttermilk)
- Buttermilk

**Method**
Whisk (or sift) the dry ingredients together into a large bowl. Add ¼ cup butter and cut it into the flour.

Once the butter is cut into the flour mixture, add buttermilk until the dough is a sticky paste, then turn onto a well-floured surface. There needs to be about a quarter cup of flour on the surface where the dough is worked. (This will seem like too much flour if you’re used to making bread, but trust us on this one.) Then add some more flour to the top of the paste, and work enough in to make the paste into dough. Knead until the dough is rollable. Work it as much as you have to, but also go as lightly as you can to keep the crust tender.
Flour the large surface again and take out a small plate or a saucer. We usually use one that’s about 6” across, but you can make them smaller if you like. (Smaller pies are easier to turn in the pan.) Pinch off a ball of dough a little smaller than an egg. Roll the dough out on a floured surface until it is about 1/8” thick and round. Drape this over the bread-and-butter plate (sort of in the manner of putting a pie crust over a pie pan), and trim the edges with a sharp knife so that it is perfectly round. Now it’s ready to fill.

**Filling the Pies**

Making fried apple pies is a good job for two cooks—one fills while the other fries.

Heat your skillet to medium, making sure that there’s about a ¼” of oil in it. By the time you fill your first couple of pies, it will be hot enough and ready to use. We use canola oil and a little bit of butter for frying. The butter makes the pies brown and beautiful. After each batch, add a little bit of oil and a pat of butter to make sure that you maintain the proper depth for frying.

The pies need to be filled just enough so that they’re satisfying to bite into, but not overfilled. Remember that the pies will end up being half-moon shaped. See example above. Find the center of the plate on which you have stretched out your dough. Put the filling to one side of the center in a heap, leaving about ½” of crust uncovered around the outside edge. (See diagram, page 2.) Be sure not to overfill the pies, or they will burst while cooking and/or they’ll be hard to turn. Using a small dish of water, dip your fingers and run them around the edge of the crust to dampen it. (See diagram, page 2.) This will help the dough stick together and will keep your filling from seeping out when you fry the pies. Fold the top side of the dough over the filling and pinch the opposite edges of the dough together. Use the tines of a fork to press the dough together, then flip it over and press the other side. (See photo side.) This will also help keep the filling from oozing out and burning during the frying process. And it looks nice!

Place the filled pie in the hot skillet and fry over medium heat until golden brown. This takes about three to four minutes per side. Place them on a plate with paper towel or brown paper to cool just a little. This also helps soak up a little of the oil.

The number of pies this recipe makes actually depends on what size saucer you use. When we use a 6” bread-and-butter plate, we usually end up with around 8 pies. If we use a coffee cup saucer, we end up with about a dozen. Don’t go too big, or they will be unwieldy and hard to turn.

My final advice? Don’t bother to eat dinner. Just make pies and call it a meal.
From 1880 to 1930, the people of Appalachia experienced a medical transformation that would change their perception of medicine forever. There was a strong push throughout these years to increase the acceptance of modern, professional medicine among people in the region. Prior to this time, the popular understanding of disease and treatment was largely based on a simple grasp of nature, as well as a reliance on the supernatural. In other words, a shift took place during this period, wherein the persons of Appalachia came to abandon the folk medicine of the past and embrace an arguably improved philosophy of healing based on scientific discovery. With this monumental shift in philosophy, many of the ailments that existed in the collective consciousness of the region were stamped as scientifically non-existent, or they had their definitions replaced with those in medical textbooks. However, certain illnesses continued to exist in an understanding of disease shared by many people from Appalachia, even into the twenty-first century. These surviving, collective notions about health provide a reminder of the folk medicine tradition that was lost as modern medicine found its way into the region.

“White liver” is one of the folk illnesses that have managed to survive to a certain extent in the minds of people from Appalachia. This diagnosis is reserved for people who possess an abnormally strong sex drive. According to the tradition, a sufferer’s sex drive is so heightened that he or she utterly exhausts their partner, sometimes draining the life out of them in the process. The typical sufferer is a man or a woman who is on their third or fourth spouse, having “worn out” their previous partners (Cavender and Crowder 639). The concept of nymphomania has existed for centuries, but the idea that there is a link between libido and the color of one’s liver is to my knowledge unique to the Appalachian region. This paper uses the sexual disorder of white liver to examine the medical transformation in Appalachia between 1880 and 1930, while exploring how this particular folk illness survived the tides of time.

Prior to the last two decades of the nineteenth century, the people of Appalachia were hard pressed to find well-educated physicians. Sandra Barney, the author of the 2000 book Authorized to Heal: Gender, Class, and the Transformation of Medicine in Appalachia, 1880-1930, blames the lack of professional practitioners on the geographical spread and small size of many Appalachian communities at the time. For a lot of people in the region, the closest trained physician could be miles away. As a result of this, it was common for citizens of many rural mountain areas to first turn to self-proclaimed healers and other traditional practitioners if they happened to get sick (Barney 15-16).

Healing traditions have a rich history in the American South. According to Molly C. Dougherty of the University of Florida, these practices “were brought to the South with the early settlers, and they evolved as ideas and procedures were incorporated from European medical practice, African traditions, and American Indian traditions” (85). In her essay on female healers, Dougherty focuses on the role of the southern woman in maintaining the traditional practices of the region. She explains that while passing on knowledge regarding the treatment of the sick between generations of women is not unique to the American South, the southern tradition of healing does contain several distinctive characteristics. These
characteristics stem from the “types of rural areas where folk medicine practices have predominated and from the healers’ use of indigenous plants and animals” (85). Dougherty goes on to explain that folk healing has been especially important in this region of the United States because of its relatively late adoption of modern infectious disease control techniques and the scarcity of medical staff.

A hallmark of the southern healing tradition was the use of herbs and medicinal plants that were readily available to women in the rural areas of the region. Dougherty mentions comfrey, ginger, and catnip as a few examples of easily accessible plants and herbs that were frequently used for medicinal purposes. Home remedies were made from ingredients such as these and given to the patient in the form of teas and syrups for ingestion, or in the form of dressings that could be placed directly onto sprains and sores (85).

Everything that Dougherty writes about the healing traditions of the South are just as true for communities in Appalachia. Anthony Cavender writes in his 2003 book titled Folk Medicine in Southern Appalachia, “when self-treatments or the interventions of family members and friends failed to bring relief from sickness, Southern Appalachians usually sought the assistance of a physician or, depending on the ailment and circumstance, a variety of folk healers” (147). The author continues by stating that “most everyone in Southern Appalachia knew something about medicinal plants…Many communities had men or women known as ‘yarb doctors’ or ‘herb doctors,’ who were recognized as being exceptionally well versed in the knowledge of medicinal plants” (147).

Before the influx of industrial capitalism to the region, the physicians of Appalachia were in many ways similar to medical practitioners working in other rural areas around the United States at the time. There were big inconsistencies in the level and quality of the formal education of these doctors (Barney 15). Barney writes about these physicians that “they were defined by their allegiance to a unique philosophy of practice rather than by their possession of significant medical knowledge” (15). It was uncommon for these early Appalachian practitioners to have medicine as their only source of income. Most of them had to take to alternative side jobs or social activities to make ends meet. A certain part of the financial struggle of the early doctors can be attributed to the ineffectiveness of their treatments. In this era, the rural people of Appalachian mountain communities did not seem particularly interested in the limited advantages offered by modern medicine. Instead, the Appalachians turned to the traditional, local caregivers they had learned to trust over the course of generations. The only time they would seek medical help was after every other treatment had been unsuccessful (Barney 16).

The citizens of rural Appalachia had their way of life fundamentally challenged by the introduction of industrial capitalism to the region. Ronald D. Eller writes in his 1982 book, Miners, Millhands, and Mountaineers, “In Appalachia, as in the rest of the country, the decades from 1880 to 1930 were years of transition and change. What had been in 1860 only the quiet backcountry of the Old South became by the turn of the century a new frontier for expanding industrial capitalism” (xix). According to Ronald L. Lewis, industrial enterprises such as coal, salt, timber, iron, and agricultural processing had been important to the region’s economy for a long time, even before the era of industrialization (59). He states that the expansion of the railroad and the increased investment in basic industries were responsible for the transformation of Appalachia (59).

As industry got its foothold in the Appalachian region, the traditional way of life changed in many rural mountain communities. For example, the expansion of industrial employment lead to the building of towns and villages (Eller xix). The increase in infrastructure and the newfound concentration of potential patients were two of the important factors that attracted more educated physicians to Appalachia during the medical transformation.
The last two decades of the nineteenth century also saw the science of medicine begin to mature. In 1883, a group of scientists led by the German physician Robert Koch discovered the cholera pathogen, a highly important step in cementing the modern principles of bacteriology. In 1888, the famous French scientist Louis Pasteur founded the Pasteur Institute—the world’s first biomedical institute. Pasteur, Koch, and their respective research groups were all pioneers in a new era of “scientific medicine” based on bacteriology and germ theory. With these leaps in medical advancement, physicians saw an increased demand for their services and respect for their profession.

The industrialization of Appalachia played a significant role in bridging the gap between the region and the rest of the country. Appalachians would finally benefit from the advancements that had been made in science in both America and overseas. According to Sandra Barney, “the scientific advances of the 1880s and 1890s began to bolster younger, better educated physicians’ claims that they possessed special knowledge” (16). Barney does specify that these advances were slow to make it into the curriculum at the schools that produced doctors who tended to practice in the Appalachian region, namely the University of Louisville, the Medical College of Virginia, and the College of Physicians and Surgeons in Baltimore. Regardless, their professional reputation in the eyes of laymen was improving rapidly, which made medicine a sustainable profession even in the mountains of Appalachia. Despite this increase in the influx of physicians, there were still big differences between small towns and larger cities in terms of the availability of physicians.

The belief in “folk illnesses” was a common occurrence in Appalachia. Folk illnesses are diseases or conditions that are not considered “real” in the eyes of official medicine, and that can only be found in specific cultures or societies. In other words, the term “folk illness” is used to describe syndromes that members from a distinct group claim to suffer from, but that are not recognized by the biomedical categories of disease. The culture-bound syndromes that fall under the umbrella term of folk illnesses share several common characteristics, including the fact that their respective cultures can provide causal explanations, diagnosis, and preventative and treatment measures for the different ailments (Cavender 135). Anthony Cavender emphasizes in his book, *Folk Medicine in Southern Appalachia*, “Though physicians tend to relegate folk illnesses to the realm of superstition, it is important to keep in mind that they are, nonetheless, very real to those who believe in them and are consequently a source of considerable concern and anxiety” (135). Cavender also writes that certain folk illnesses do correspond to “real” syndromes that are recognized by the biomedical model of official medicine (135).

One of the best-known Appalachian folk illnesses is the infant-specific disease “bold hives” (Cavender 135). Also referred to as “little red hives,” “boll hives,” and “bull hives,” this culture-specific syndrome is characterized by the belief that infants were born with hives inside their bodies. The idea was that these hives needed to be forced out before they turned inward where they transformed into bold hives (Cavender 135). If the hives were to turn inward, they could cause serious troubles for many normal bodily functions. It was a common belief that these hives could have adverse, even lethal effects if they turned inward and wrapped around or attacked the heart and the lungs (Cavender 135). Official medicine has established the development of rashes in infants the first few weeks following the birth as a common occurrence. People who subscribe to the folk idea of bold hives naturally saw babies’ development of a rash—often referred to as ‘hiving’—as a cause for celebration because this provided evidence that the hives had turned out instead of inward, meaning the child was safe.

Like most folk illnesses, bold hives had distinct symptoms and preventative measures associated with it. Appalachians who looked for signs of bold hives in their babies would look for symptoms like “smiling while sleeping; excessive stretching of arms and legs…; eyes looking upward and rolling around; and fingernails turning blue or black” (Cavender 136). In order to protect infants from the dangers of bold hives, many people in Appalachia resorted to methods of “hiving” that often included spoon-feeding babies with different herbal
teas. Other modes of treatment involved scarifying and magical remedies like passing the affected child back and forth from mother to father through a horse collar a total of three times.

Anthony Cavender makes the argument in his book that linguistics provide evidence for the concept of bold hives originating in Scotland. To make his claim, the author references an entry of the phenomenon in the *Scottish National Dictionary* that quotes a 1904 issue of the *Caladonia Medical Journal*:

If an infant is all out of sorts it is said to be hivie: diarrhea, vomiting, thrush—all these conditions come under the adjective. Oot-fleein' hives is where we get a rash of any sort... In-fleein hives (not corresponding to a known disease). Sudden death is accounted for by the fact that the hives have guan inwan. (qtd. in Cavender 137)

Cavender goes on to provide evidence for the notion that the folk idea of bold hives came over to America with Scottish settlers. He does this by invoking a statement from Dr. David Rorie, a physician and student of Scottish folk medicine, who claims that the concept of hives “crops up in many of those trans-Atlantic medical advertisements with which we are so abundantly favoured, and in the fiction of the United States” (qtd. in Cavender 137).

White liver is another folk illness with roots in Appalachia that is considerably less known than bold hives. It is a sexual disorder characterized by an abnormally strong sex drive. The sufferers of the condition are described as having an unnatural libido that contributes to the wasting away of their sexual partners (Kerr 609). In his 1993 article about the folk illness, Harry D. Kerr of the Medical College of Wisconsin explains that the term refers to a person who “has fallen under the spell of someone whose sexual appetites are killing him or her by draining away their vitality” (609). According to Anthony Cavender, the American folklorist Vance Randolph provides the earliest and most complete description of the syndrome in his scholarly work on folk culture in the Ozarks. Randolph writes,

> When a lively, buxom, good-looking woman loses several husbands by death, it is often said that her inordinate passion has ‘killed ’em off,’ and she is referred to as a ‘white-livered widder.’ Usually it is only a figure of speech, but there are people who actually believe that a ‘high nature’ is correlated with white spots on the liver, and that this condition has often been revealed by post-mortem examination. (qtd. in Cavender 141-142)

The condition supposedly affects both men and women. It is also contagious, and it can be transmitted from one person to another either through blood or sexual intercourse (Cavender 143).

There is not a lot of historical information available on the cultural phenomenon of white liver disease. Scholars suspect this is because talking openly about topics relating to sex was considered taboo in the past. Because of the scarce documentation of this folk illness, it is hard to nail down the origin of this concept. It should be noted, however, that the concept of hypersexuality, especially in women, was a frequently referenced ailment in medical literature in the nineteenth century. In her article, “Nymphomania: The Historical Construction of Female Sexuality,” Carol Groneman examines an extensive collection of journal entries and other medical writings from both American and international publications starting from the middle of the nineteenth century. In the introduction to her article, she writes:

> In the nineteenth century, however, nymphomania was believed to be a specific organic disease, classifiable, with an assumed set of symptoms, causes, and treatments. Like alcoholism, kleptomania, and pyromania - diseases that were identified in the mid-nineteenth century - a diagnosis of nymphomania was based on exhibited behavior. (Groneman 337)

Taking into consideration the nineteenth century western world’s interest in and fascination with female hypersexuality, it is not unreasonable to suggest that the cultural concept of white liver—or a similar phenomenon—might have existed in Appalachia.

The origin of the association between a person’s liver and their sexual drive remains a mystery. Anthony Cavender speculates whether the association might be derived from humoral pathology. He also cites an entry for “white liver” in the *Scottish National Dictionary* that describes the illness as “[a] condition ascribed to a man who has been widowed several times, from the notion that the ‘bad breath’ resulting has been fatal to his wives” (145).
An essay published in the *Journal of the History of Sexuality* in October of 2002 by Anthony Cavender and Steve Crowder suggests a continued awareness of the cultural phenomenon of white liver, even in the twenty-first century. In their study, the authors interviewed residents of south-central Appalachia about their familiarity with the condition. Cavender and Crowder spoke to a total of 173 informants. Out of these 173, nineteen provided information that was used in the writing of the essay. An additional eight interviewees said they were familiar with the term “white liver.” Several of the informants produced very interesting and detailed accounts of their experience with white liver. One sixty-seven-year-old woman from Carter County, Tennessee, admitted to having suffered from the condition for a majority of her adult life. Cavender and Crowder write:

She believes that she contracted the disorder when she was in her early twenties while washing clothes with a group of women neighbors. One of the women in the wash group, who was said to have white liver, cut her hand on a scrub board, and blood flowed from her cut into the wash water. The informant maintained that an “open sore” on her arm was infected by the woman’s blood. Following the event, she said that her “nature” became so powerful that it almost destroyed her marriage. She confessed that her problem was not only that she exhausted her husband but that she also felt an inclination to obtain sexual satisfaction with other men. Whenever her husband left the farm she requested to be locked into a closet to prevent an affair with a neighbor or maybe a drummer like the “Watkins man.” She never sought help from a physician for white liver because that “was something you didn’t talk about.” She eventually experienced relief from her symptoms while undergoing a knee operation a few years ago. “When they were operating on me,” she said, “I had this feeling that something left my body” (Cavender and Crowder 640-641)

In conclusion, Appalachia experienced a medical transformation in the fifty years from 1880 to 1930 that overlapped with the general transformation of many of the region’s rural, agricultural societies. The last two decades of the nineteenth century saw the influx of industrial capitalism to the area. The increase in industrial employment led to building of new infrastructure, as well as a centralization of the population, which made Appalachia a viable workplace for professional, well-educated physicians for the first time. Around the same time that the Appalachian region was undergoing its transformations, the science of medicine experienced a considerable maturation. Thanks to the increase in young, well-trained physicians with strong scientific backgrounds, the new philosophies of “scientific medicine” were brought to the people of Appalachia. This new knowledge replaced much of the traditional understanding of disease and treatment methods. The folk illness known as white liver has existed in the collective consciousness of Appalachians for decades. Despite the arrival of “official medicine,” this cultural phenomenon has stood the test of time. White liver lives on in the consciousness of the people of Appalachia as a reminder of the folk medicine tradition that once dominated in the region.
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Mary Dorthula White & Saint Garnet: Saints or…?
Roger D. Hicks, M. Ed.

The author will examine, compare and contrast two major works of Appalachian fiction and their protagonist narrators, Mary Dorthula White in Mildred Haun’s classic work, *The Hawk’s Done Gone* and Saint Garnet Ferrari in the equally important novel *The Patron Saint of Ugly* by Marie Manilla. The two works were written and published nearly seventy-five years apart by two native Appalachian female authors of vastly different backgrounds and lifestyles. The two characters under examination in this work also led vastly different lives and arose from contrasting backgrounds. Yet the two protagonist narrators share several key characteristics of Appalachian people as those traits were initially described and discussed by Loyal Jones in his seminal work *Appalachian Values*.

It is worthy of mention that *The Patron Saint of Ugly* is a fairly traditional novel other than the fact that it is written in the form of a series of audio tapes which Saint Garnet Ferrari is making to mail to a Vatican examiner who is assessing her for possible consideration as a candidate for sainthood. *The Hawk’s Done Gone* has been a subject of critical argument since its publication as to whether or not it is a collection of short stories or a less than perfect novel. It is comprised of a series of short stories which are primarily narrated by Mary Dorthula White and based on the lives of herself, her family, and various members of the greater rural East Tennessee community in which it is set. However, the basis for the disagreements about its classification is rooted in the fact that it has a central cast of recurring characters, a coherent timeline, one localized setting, and the primary narrator who is both a key character and the narrator of most of the stories.

Mary Dorthula White in *The Hawk’s Done Gone* is a middle aged to elderly native Appalachian “granny woman” or midwife and herb doctor in East Tennessee in the area where Mildred Haun grew up in Cocke County. She is poorly educated but literate enough to maintain a family record of births, deaths, and marriages in a family Bible. Mary Dorthula is married to a man of less than desirable character, Ad Kanipe, who married her after the death of his first wife and the birth of Mary Dorthula’s illegitimate son whose heritage as the bastard son of an unknown occupying Civil War soldier is a matter of some scorn and disgrace in the rural mountain community in which the family lives. The extended family includes the children of Ad Kanipe from his first marriage, the first-born son of Mary Dorthula, Joe White, and the children she and her husband had together after their marriage. Their spiritual life is rooted in a pair of local churches whose denominations are not mentioned and whose nebulous doctrinal differences serve as a source of conflict between characters throughout the book. Both these churches fall within the broad classification of Holiness/Pentecostal.
Ostensibly, the White/Kanipe family are subsistence farmers although Ad is never gainfully employed and neither are his sons from the first marriage. Mary Dorthula maintains the family farm and home and serves as the local midwife, herb doctor, and provider of burial preparations for the dead. She is frequently demeaned, feared, belittled, accused of witchcraft and, yet, simultaneously respected in the community due to the services she provides at both ends of the life cycle.

Saint Garnet is a young native Appalachian woman from the fictional town of Sweetwater, West Virginia. She is the daughter of parents whose backgrounds are markedly different both from each other and from the characters in The Hawk’s Done Gone. Saint Garnet’s mother, Marina Ferrari, is the daughter of old Charlottesville, Virginia, wealth and a Protestant who was enrolled at Wellesley College when she met her husband, Angelo Ferrari, the factory worker son of Italian immigrants who are also devoutly Catholic and classic examples of the immigrant working class. Saint Garnet has been born with a body which is covered with a plethora of florid birthmarks which are an ever-changing map of the world. Saint Garnet is under examination by the Vatican for possible consideration of sainthood due to the fact that her community and an ever-growing portion of the greater world believe that she is able to heal those who are afflicted with a variety of problems which cause them to be designated as “ugly.” She disputes her sainthood and the novel is a series of audio tapes, created in the first person, which she is recording for the Vatican examiner who has personally visited her at home in Sweetwater, West Virginia.

Both women are surrounded by sizable extended families which are comprised of a collection of supporters, detractors, defamers, and leaches. The White/Kanipe family tends to live off the work and labor of Mary Dorthula and they populate the small mountain farm which she inherited. They live in relative isolation and the farm is described as being at the base of a mountain which indirectly designates it as a head of the hollow homestead. The Ferrari family tends to live off the factory work of the father, Angelo Ferrari, and the wealth which accrues to Saint Garnet as the novel progresses and she moves from the family starter home which her father bought with his labors to the mansion on top of a hill which overlooks the town of Sweetwater and was originally built by the builder of the town and its factory. That home was also inherited by Garnet upon the death of the childless eccentric owner.

To set the stage for the methodology of examination of these works and their protagonists, we shall refer to the aforementioned work Appalachian Values by Loyal Jones, which lists and describes ten key cultural characteristics of Appalachian people which Loyal Jones first wrote about in an article in 1973 in the magazine “Twigs”; which was published by Texas Tech University. It was eventually published as a book by the Jesse Stuart Foundation in 1994 after the article had become widely used and discussed by Appalachian scholars. For the purposes of this examination, we will utilize only four of these ten cultural traits as they appear in the two works under discussion. Those traits are Religion; Familism; Independence, Self-reliance, and Pride; and Love of Place. Both characters demonstrate all of these four cultural traits in their lives, work, and beliefs. Throughout both works the remaining six cultural traits discussed by Loyal Jones are also present but less directly related to the focus of this examination.
First, we will look at Religion, one of the key traits demonstrated clearly by both Mary Dorthula White and Saint Garnet Ferrari. Loyal Jones began his discussion of religion in Appalachia by saying “Mountain people are religious. This does not mean that we always go to church regularly, but we are religious in the sense that most of our values and the meaning we find in life spring from the Bible” (Jones 39). As we stated earlier, both women are involved in church life in their communities. Mary Dorthula White and her children frequently attend, on an intermittent and revolving basis, much as Loyal Jones described above, two separate churches which are not clearly classified as to denomination. Those churches are “The New Jerusalem” whose name is actually used as the title of one of the stories and a second church mentioned only as Preacher Jarven’s church. In the story, “Melungeon Colored,” Mary Dorthula uses the church and the minister’s preaching as a metaphor for a terrible storm. “I wondered why the wind had to blow like that, why the branch had to roar. I got to thinking maybe the world had already come to an end. I thought maybe that was hell. Preacher Jarven said it would be raining lightning bolts all the time in hell” (Haun 107). The New Jerusalem Church is described as being “...over in Hancock County where all the Melungeons went and tore down stove pipes a shouting.” (80). It is further discussed as the church of choice of the character Effena, whose husband Linus, in a discussion with his wife, says “We’ll get up soon in the morning and take you to that damblasted New Jerusalem if that’s what you are taking such a spasm for” (95). Following the death of Mary Dorthula, her daughter Effena, in the story “Pa Went A-Courting”, discusses the church as a site for trysts between her father, Ad Kanipe, and a much younger woman of ill repute. “Pa went plumb hog wild. As old as he was. He took her to meeting and poke suppers and everything that come along” (183).

Saint Garnet is much more deeply integrated in her church, the small local Catholic Church which is perpetually dealing with the strife between the two Catholic immigrant populations of Irish and Italians. Eventually, part of that strife is alleviated by the appointment of a priest who is half Irish and half Italian. Garnet attends her church regularly under duress from the family due to the deeply held beliefs of her grandparents and father who insist that everyone attend mass regularly. The church is especially important to the family when Garnet’s father and brother are killed in an automobile wreck in winter when the father is attempting to drive past an icy curve on the mountain below their home. Garnet’s grandmother Ferrari blames her son and grandson’s deaths on his daughter-in-law’s Protestantism with these words: “What about-a my son! She kill-a my son! That no good son-ama-beetch with her no-priest, pajama-judge marriage that is-a no marriage! She kill-a my son and-a my grandson too!” (Manilla 217). This conflict, combined with the deep grief based depression of Marina Ferrari, results in Garnet and her mother being shipped off to the home of her maternal grandmother in Charlottesville until the death of that grandmother.

Religion is an integral part of the lives of both characters and a key concept in both books. The characters’ lives are, in many ways, deeply affected by and subservient to their religious beliefs. Both women live simultaneously within and without the church community, but neither makes a concerted effort to totally separate themselves from the institution.
Love of Place is in many ways the next most important Appalachian cultural trait which dominates their lives. Loyal Jones has spoken of Love of Place in this manner: “Sense of place is one of the unifying values of mountain people, and it makes it hard for us to leave the mountains, and when we do, we long to return” (Jones 99). Mary Dorthula speaks of the mountains which surround her home as if they are neighbors, family members, friends, and loved ones. “Letitia Edes Mountain climbs up over there in the west, and Reds Run Mountain is in front of the house, jig-jagging up to the top like a stair-step covered with spruce pine that stay green all winter long” (Haun 6). Mary Dorthula White has never lived outside the hollow in which her home sits. She also never expresses any desire to do so. Saint Garnet, while she is being forced to live in the home of her wealthy maternal grandmother in Charlottesville, has the following exchange with the grandmother. “The grandmother spoke. ‘We must secure your future with a solid education. There’s no telling what they’ve been teaching you in West Virginia.’ My mind flew back to all those nuns who genuinely loved me” (Manilla 265) is the unspoken response by Saint Garnet the narrator. Saint Garnet immediately leaves the high dollar Eastern preparatory school into which her grandmother forces her to enroll upon the death of the grandmother. In his discussion of Love of Place, Loyal Jones quotes the poetry of Albert Stewart, “I shall not leave these prisoning hills though they topple their barren heads to level earth and the forests slide uprooted out of the sky.” (Jones 104). That sentence from one of Appalachia’s greatest poets expresses exactly the emotions of both Mary Dorthula White and Saint Garnet Ferrari.

Familism is the next cultural trait which we will discuss and is a prevalent aspect of the lives and relationships of both characters. Familism is a word and a trait which is often confusing to those who are unexposed to scholarly discussion of it. Familism is best described as a double-edged sword which can be both beneficial and destructive to native Appalachians. Loyal Jones describes familism in this manner: “Family loyalty runs both deep and wide and may extend to grandparents, uncles, aunts, nephews, nieces, cousins, and even in-laws. Family members gather when there is sickness, death, or a disaster. Supervisors in northern industries have been perplexed when employees from Appalachia have been absent from jobs to attend funerals of distant relatives” (Jones 75). We see familism expressed strongly and often in both works under our examination. Saint Garnet’s closely knit Italian-American and Appalachian family always eats dinner together in the home on important occasions and simultaneously falls into ages old disagreements and petty frictions on these occasions: “Merry Christmas!” Dad yelled to the fam-i-ly, his chin lifted. Uncle Dom and Grandpa ambled forward, both smirking, loading ammunition into their clabber-jaws to ruin it for Dad” (Manilla 117). Mary Dorthula White also suffers on a daily basis from the conflicts within her family and still manages to benefit from their expressions of love for her. As Mary Dorthula narrates the story “Melungeon-Colored”, which is about the birth and murder of an unwanted child of Melungeon heritage, she expresses familism perfectly in describing the seating arrangements at her granddaughter’s funeral. “Me and you are supposed to set up hyear with Mos and his woman, ain’t we?” I heard Ad asking. Then it come to me who that woman was. It was Mos’s new woman. He hadn’t waited till the dirt settled on Cordia’s grave…I wanted to tell Mos how it was. But I knowed that would disturb Effena’s peace…” (Haun 111).
Familism is one of the most interesting aspects of Appalachian Culture. It has manifested itself in the great majority of Appalachian families and, on a daily basis, results in heart rending acts of charity among relatives as well as equally destructive arguments, fights, and lifelong vendettas.

The last cultural trait we will examine in these works of fiction is Independence, Self-reliance, and Pride which Loyal Jones described as “…perhaps the most obvious characteristics of mountain people.” (Jones 52). This amalgam of self sufficient traits is the basis on which many aspects of life in Appalachia are built. West Virginians refused to agree with the political beliefs which were prevalent in mother Virginia leading to the Civil War and the schism resulted in the statehood of the Mountain State. They are also key factors in the fact that Appalachian soldiers ranging from Sergeant Alvin York to Jessica Lynch are often turned into public heroes and heroines. These traits are manifested from cover to cover by both Saint Garnet Ferrari and Mary Dorthula White. Mary Dorthula is the primary breadwinner in her family in a remote mountain community in which employment outside the home is impossible to find. Her inherited land provides the sustenance for her extended family including the deadbeat husband Ad Kanipe and his ne'er do well sons by his first wife. Saint Garnet’s ability to heal the afflictions of strangers and her inherited home provide the sustenance for her extended family including the Uncle Dom and his brutal son. As a result of her monetary support of the entire family Saint Garnet exerts a level of control over most of her family. The most interesting manifestation of these traits in the book occurs when Saint Garnet actually banishes her Uncle Dom and her grandfather from the house with a fire poker in hand after her grandmother has been struck by the grandfather and knocked to the floor. “You son of a bitch. I want you out of my house. Grandpa looked at me with loathing and opened his mouth, so I clocked him in the head with the poker, not fatally, just enough to knock his newsie cap onto the floor and deliver a lovely welt” (Manilla 294). Marty Dorthula White is never able to achieve this level of manifestation of Independence, Self-Reliance, and Pride. She is a more ancient nineteenth century version of an Appalachian woman. She manifests these qualities in her support of the family, her ability to fend for herself and her children despite her husband’s refusal to work, and her unfailing support of her illegitimate son Joe, and his own illegitimate daughter.

Each of these books, in its own unique way, is a wonderful manifestation of Appalachian womanhood. Each is worthy of preservation and utilization into the unforeseeable future in which native Appalachian culture is ever more likely to be assimilated irrevocably into the great polymorphous melting pot that America outside the boundaries of Appalachia has become. Both books are temporally, socially, and culturally related to the eras in which they were produced. Each of them is a shining example of female authors who have been bred, born, and reared in “these prisoning hills.”
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The “War” On Coal: Realities of Life in the Kentucky Coalfields

Ryan Sergent — Payne
Union College

During the summer of 2017, I traveled around Central Appalachia searching for people whose lives had been affected by one or all of the Policy Wars that have brought large changes to the area in one way or another. The War on Poverty, The War on Drugs, and the War on Coal are all things on which almost every person in the United States has some sort of knowledge. When it comes to Central Appalachians, people are most familiar with the War on Coal and are more than willing to let anyone, who is asking, know their opinions on the subject and how much it has changed their lives. During the conversations I had with people living in the Kentucky coal fields, opinions varied and emotions ran in different directions, but one thing was always at the center of this conversation: coal and its decline. Often thought of as the lifeblood of Central Appalachia, this subject is always a sore spot for those that have created a life digging for the black gold that inspired companies from across the United States to enter these mountains and build communities. Because of the history of coal in these communities and the feelings surrounding it, the implications of the “War on Coal” are often lost in a whirlwind of emotions. My goal for this section of my research was to explore the thoughts, understandings, and emotions surrounding this “War” in Appalachia. What I found was a group of broken people split into factions based on their beliefs on coal and the role it should play in the lives of Eastern Kentuckians. Some are hoping for something new in the future that will allow them to have a fruitful life in Eastern Kentucky, while others still hold onto their hopes and the promises they have been given that coal will return. In this paper, I will place the oral histories I collected alongside academic and official documents to bridge the gap between those who are living it and those who are reporting on it.

First, I would like to define the “War on Coal” and talk about how it differs from the other Policy Wars in America’s history. The “War on Coal” is surrounded by enormous amounts of publicity and Appalachians feel very strongly about the implications of this “war.” Some Appalachians see it as an attack against their way of life, while others see it as a plan to save the mountains they love. This war is often attributed to former President Barack Obama, but it is the only policy “war” that was not proudly declared by the President spearheading the effort, such as was seen with President Johnson and the “War on Poverty.” Also, when comparing it to the other policy “wars,” it is the only “war” that was not organized with a specific outcome in mind and documents and information surrounding it can be found only in a few places, whereas with the other policy “wars” the documents and plans organizing them and all the data created from the efforts to defeat the enemy of the “war” came directly from the president’s office or the organizations he created for the specific task of carrying out the goals of the “war.” It is often argued that the “War on Coal” is not a policy “war” at all, but
something created by the people who were affected by the changes in the coal fields brought forth by the Environmental Protection Agency and the regulations designed to keep the environment safe. This realization, and the fact that it is not like the other policy wars seen in the past, is often used as a reason to dispute its categorization alongside the others. The ones that do consider it to be the same as the other policy wars do so because it is seen as a plan to better mountain communities, but it is believed to have done the exact opposite. The “War on Coal,” like the other policy wars that came before it, planned to give Appalachia the help it needed to grow and flourish, but it seems that Appalachia received bits and pieces of betterment that brought forth changes that appear to have done more harm than good. This is blamed on many different aspects of the “war,” but when exploring this topic, it is easily seen that this recent decline in the jobs and quality of life in eastern Kentucky began way before former President Obama and the EPA.

The time I spent on the ground in Harlan County, my home, and other surrounding counties led me to many dining room tables, couches, and porches where people are struggling to maintain their life in Eastern Kentucky. Throughout my research, I tried my best to allow my interviewees to have a conversation with me. I prepared just a few questions, mostly used for jumping off points and things that could restart a dead conversation. As many of you could guess, most of the conversations did not begin by me asking about coal and how the “war” had affected their lives, but when you are in an area that is made entirely out of a series of connected coal camps from the early 1900’s, it is not a far journey to coal when talking about anything to do with their lives. So, when the discussion finally made it to the “War on Coal” with people who live in these counties, I received an array of responses. And because it is impossible to remove all bias out of a situation, regardless of how hard you try, some of the responses caught me off guard. Leonard Lester, a pastor in Knox County, referred to the “war” as “uneducated, unfair, [and] ill-advised” (Lester). He also stated that he felt that:

> It is part of an agenda. A globalist agenda that wants to control versus assisting people in becoming the best they could be. Ignoring opportunities, and possibilities. Choosing lies from the natural gas companies about how much cheaper and cleaner it is and that’s just not true at all. (Lester)

Dorothy Franks, an educator who had been with KCEOC for over thirty years, also felt the same sentiments towards the “war” stating that “the government didn’t know the importance of coal before they began this push to get rid of it” (Franks). The question I found myself asking was, did they really push to get rid of it, or is this understanding something that has been created out of the fear of losing jobs and a change coming to a way of life that some of these people have known for generations?

When I began asking this question in a slightly different way, almost everyone felt that the coal industry was being attacked by the EPA and the Obama Administration. Joe Hubbs, a retired miner living on the Letcher and Harlan County line stated:

> They come into these mountains saying they are trying to keep our waters clean and our mountains tall, but there won’t be no point in that if there are no people here to protect the things for. Obama and his EPA are waging a war on the only way of life we have here. And they wann’a take it away from us with a smile saying they are saving us from something. It’s a disgrace. (Hubbs)
Answers and feelings towards this subject all stated almost the exact same thing, with just a few different words and sometimes a little more anger. People seem to have a general idea of what the EPA’s “agenda” was when it came to the coal fields, but if I asked the question, “what do the EPA regulations do for the mines and the communities?” I received answers like those given to me by Ricky Whitehead, an unemployed miner, “Kill Coal that’s what they… do” (Whitehead). Others, like Claudia Greenwood, a former educator living in Knox County, feel that the EPA is just clueless about life in this area:

I don’t feel that the people who come up with these rules and regulations realize how important that is to our way of life here, and I don’t think they did it on purpose or to intentionally hurt us. I just think they didn’t know. They didn’t take the time to learn about us and who we are as a people before they came in and started changing things, telling us what we were doing was wrong. I think they just didn’t know. (Greenwood)

Because I was unsure myself I began asking, what exactly does the EPA have to do with this and what is their goal with these new regulations?

After some digging, I was able to find out that these regulations fit into a piece of legislation from the 1970’s, something that was around way before the Obama Administration and this most recent descent of coal. These regulations are part of the RCRA or The Resource Conservation and Recovery Act. The RCRA is a:

program implemented by the EPA and its partner states, tribes and local governments, [that works to] protect our communities and the environment from the threats of solid and hazardous waste, cleans up land and water, conserves resources, and empowers citizens by delivering information and opportunities that enable communities to participate in decision-making processes. At its core, RCRA is about protecting communities and resource conservation. To achieve this goal, [the] EPA develops regulations, guidance and policies that ensure the safe management and cleanup of solid and hazardous waste, and programs that encourage source reduction and beneficial reuse. (United States Environmental Protection Agency)

Because the main focus of the EPA is to protect the environment it requires certain permits be obtained and that specific criteria be met when it comes to mining and cleaning coal. The same type of regulations are applied and are expected to be met when dealing with the aftermath of the production of burnable coal. These permits and necessities are just one part of owning a mine and the fees are to be paid for and met by the owners of these coal companies (United States Environmental Protection Agency), who often see them as impossible to meet and deem them too expensive to obtain, leading to the closing of mines and loss of jobs.

While researching the topic, I was unable to find a definitive list of the criteria and permits needed to keep a mine running under these regulations, nor was I able to find any information to support the claim that all of these permits and criteria were too expensive for these companies to obtain. The above statements were collected from the EPA website and word of mouth heard in the interviews I conducted and the things I heard growing up in Harlan County. The decline of coal in my home
town is often credited to the Obama Administration and the EPA’s “attack” on the coal companies. The following quote was taken from an interview I did with Dwayne Hughes, a man living in Harlan County who was once a miner, but lost his job when his mine became a coal reserve:

The government just wants to make it impossible for these companies to make it. They want to keep draining money out of them, hoping they will shut down. I heard that the mine my cousin works at was just hit with two hundred thousand dollars of sanctions because they didn’t meet EPA regulations. How do they expect them to keep things running taking money like that from them? The truth of it is, in my opinion they don’t. (Hughes)

Statements like these are made almost every day in Harlan County. People are flabbergasted at the amount of money these sanctions seem to be costing the companies they rely on for work, but they either ignore or are unaware of the amount of money made every year by these companies.

The coal industry grossed over forty-eight billion dollars in 2016 (The Statistics Portal). This is of course split between the companies and investors that feed the industry, but many companies still make billions of dollars in profit on their own. For example, Peabody Energy, an energy company operating mainly in Pennsylvania, made over 4.7 billion dollars in 2016 (Peabody Energy) and only paid a six percent tax on this amount, still leaving them with a profit of over four billion dollars (Pope). This company had billions open that could be spent to make the changes needed to meet the criteria put in place by the EPA, and these billions are from one year alone; this number does not include the other one hundred and thirty-two years they have been in business (Peabody Energy).

These sentiments pushed me towards the questions: What exactly does the EPA and their regulations do for the mountains, and do these regulations really help the intended target? I began to wonder what would happen if the people who are calling for the destruction of the EPA and the roll back of all of their regulations received what they wanted, and what would happen to mountain communities? One situation I read about really caught my eye, not just because the experience is heartbreaking, but because it was all too familiar to my own community. In her book *Fighting King Coal: The Challenges to Micromobilization in Central Appalachia*, Shannon Elizabeth Bell explored life in a few Appalachian communities as a missionary in her early teens and then again in her adulthood. In her book, she uses excerpts from her own interviews to convey the situations she saw during her time in Appalachia, one of which recounted the experience of Maria Lambert, a woman living in a town that found out that their water had been contaminated with coal waste, also known as “slurry.” This excerpt is from Maria’s memory of the town meeting she attended where the contamination was discussed:

Different people stood up and told about their water and told about what they believed was happening, and told about the different illnesses – the brain tumors, the gallbladder problems, stomach problems, children’s teeth falling out, and all of these things. …And it’s like my whole life flashed before my eye, because my children had lost their teeth, my parents had cancer, we’d had our gallbladders removed, and all of these things was, it’s just like oh no, it’s not just us – it’s the whole community, and were not even blood related. (Bell 1)
Slurry, for those who do not know, is the liquid waste generated in the process that removes “non – combustible materials such as sulfur and rock” from the coal. It is made up of “water, chemicals, and particles of coal, which contain a host of heavy metals and semi – metal compounds … including arsenic, beryllium, cadmium, chromium, cobalt, lead, mercury, nickel, and selenium” (Bell 1). All of which are toxic to the human body.

This experience was felt by those in Prenter, West Virginia, a coal camp just like the ones in Harlan County. As I read this, I began to see the same sort of experiences in the people around me: my grandfather died of cancer, my mother lost her teeth at a young age, a group – myself included – of sixteen young teenagers, ranging from thirteen to seventeen years old lost our gallbladders in one summer. This event, of course, was somehow linked to genetics, even though we all came from separate families, and brushed to the side. But in my research, I began to see that these types of occurrences happen across communities and state lines. This added another set of questions to my list, and this time I was asking directly. I began asking questions about illnesses these people watched their family members suffer with or that they had suffered from themselves and what illness they had seen either in their own communities or in others they had visited.

The answer I received ran the list of those mentioned by the woman living in Prenter: cancer, gallbladder issues, teeth and stomach problems. But I also received answers like asthma, severe allergies, skin conditions, COPD, black lung, etc. When I compiled the list of answers I received from these people many of the illnesses overlapped in large quantities regardless of location and family. The only thing all of these families had in common was their proximity to the coal mines. Many of the miners I spoke to all seemed to have the same experiences, not only in their own communities, but in the communities they went into to find work. Lee Payne, “a shakily employed coal miner,” as he refers to himself, stated:

> It’s always the same: the houses, the living conditions, the community. Nothing is ever different. Regardless of what city or state I found myself in for work I always, weirdly, felt at home. I’ve worked in Tennessee, Virginia, lived in West Virginia and worked five years at a mine there. I even worked in Pennsylvania for half a year trying to find a better life than I had here. I've been everywhere and everything is always exactly the same. So, I always end up back home because what’s the point of leaving if it don’t get any better. And it ain’t gonna’ get any better. (Payne)

Many of the men that I spoke to had some of the same experiences; they had all gone elsewhere looking for better work or a higher wage but always found their way back into the towns and communities in which they grew up because, as they all said, being elsewhere was the same as being at home. This lent more to my suspicion that the coal mines have something to do with, not only the sickness in the area, but many of the other issues seen in everyday life in the Kentucky coal fields.
Others in Appalachia who are experiencing the same changes and facing the same issues are looking at the changes in a different light. Instead of fighting against the “War on Coal,” they are looking at a future where coal is not the answer. Jimmy Siler, a former pastor in Knox County, stated that:

The Coal Industry is not coming back. But even if they did mine more coal, they have machines that can do the job of several people who once worked in the coal mines. Another thing is we're not using the coal, that we once were as a country. Because natural gas is cleaner and everything so I don’t ever see coal coming back, like it once was, And I think what people are going to have to do is look for other alternative ways to make money. What I’m saying is, the industry is changing from coal related to different things and I think [these different things] is where we’re moving and where people need to be looking as far as industry. We have to think about what can be possible in this area. I’m sure there are other resources we have other than coal if we would just look for them and develop them. (Siler)

As things in the Appalachian Coal fields continue to change, so does the outlook of the young people still living in the area. Many of them have taken the standpoint that life will get better and they can find a way to thrive in an area that seems to be dying. Others, like Joseph Sergent, a single father living in Harlan County, stated:

There’s nothing left. No Jobs, Schools ain't worth anything, and even if you do try to get out you always end up right back here. You're stuck and even with the mines considered gone they are the only jobs for people like me to get. You get your cards and you go in, whether you want it or not, and you do it to put food on your table, because that is all there is. (Sergent)

This is the sentiment felt by many of the young men in Harlan County; they are told their whole lives that the mines are all there is open to them and many of them would rather struggle with dangerous, but familiar, jobs than to venture out and take on a new struggle outside of the mountains. This has left the mountains and the young people of Harlan County on shaky ground. When it comes to the future of coal in Harlan County and those surrounding it, many have different opinions about what the future looks like. This, many believe, is to be blamed on the War on Coal, former President Obama, and the EPA, all of which have contributed to the changing of the mountains of eastern Kentucky.
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**Abstract**

This manuscript tells the story of researching the lifespan of one senior woman using a narrative study and an oral history approach. Told within a dramatic framework, three players, a primary and secondary researcher, and a senior woman named Florence, portray both the research process and results. Central to this manuscript are the stories Florence tells about food.

Keywords: narrative, lifespan, food

**Prologue**

*Whitney:*

Within the framework of this research drama, we learn about the importance of food across the lifespan from a senior woman’s perspective. I am Whitney, an associate professor of psychology at a community college in the southeast. I am committed to understanding the experiences of women, particularly lifespan issues of senior women. Marianne was my major professor in graduate school. Marianne was intrigued about the senior experience; she is a senior woman and comes from a family who are long-lived. Florence, the heart and center of our story, was 89 years old at the time of the research. Florence, Marianne, and I chose to write about the research experience as a drama, a play in four acts, in keeping with the narrative methodology we used and the story Florence told.

*Whitney:*

Our research began with an interest in lifespan development of senior women. Lifespan development can be described as a process of expansion and growth over the duration of a person’s life in which he/she works out the possibilities of that life (Merriam-Webster, 2016). Several experts proposed models to explain ways in which individuals expand and grow through the course of the lifespan (Erikson, 1950; Freud, 1962; Havighurst, 1972; Levinson; 1978; Levinson & Levinson, 1996; Lowenthal et al., 1975; McGoldrick & Carter, 2005; Piaget, 1953). These developmental frameworks help build an appreciation and
understanding of the complexity and mystery of human lives. While a number of theories focus on the development of children (Freud, 1962; Piaget, 1953) and adults (Havinghurst, 1972; Levinson, 1978), few describe lifespan development in its entirety. In addition, models that do encompass the entire lifespan (e.g., Erikson, 1950; McGoldrick & Carter, 2005) do not take into account the unique life experiences of women. Marianne and I pursued this focus on lifespan development in more detail. We agreed on the importance of an exploratory study of the lifespan of a senior woman.

Act I: The Study of a Senior Woman

Marianne: Most developmental frameworks are normative, that is, based on the generalized experiences of a group of people; however, no framework is universal (Blocher, 2000). We make the case that, perhaps, women’s lives involve a weaving together of many strands and, thus, ever changing life cycle roles; while women have traditionally played a central role in families, they also have a variety of life experiences apart from the roles of wife and mother (McGoldrick, 2005). Women may encounter developmental phases and/or tasks during the lifespan that deal not only with families, marriage, and mothering, but with education, adolescence, work, caretaking, friendships, loss (McGoldrick, 2005), and spirituality (Choate, 2008). Other experts describe potential issues for women across the lifespan. These include mood and anxiety disturbances, body image, trauma and violence, disabilities, gender socialization, family and work balance, self-care, physical health and illness, substance use and abuse, and positive aging (Worell & Goodheart, 2006). One limitation of most developmental theories is they ignore the unique development of women, race, and ethnicity (Chivers, 2003; Gilligan, 1982; McGoldrick & Carter, 2005). We decided to develop a research question to address this limitation related to women, and in this case, a white Appalachian woman.

SCENE ONE: THE RESEARCH QUESTION

Whitney: Marianne and I confirmed that the purpose of this narrative study was to explore and describe the story of the life of one senior adult woman. We wanted to use an oral history approach to gather narrative data. Marianne had just completed a study using narrative inquiry; she and I read several sources to learn more about narrative inquiry. We formulated a general research question which was “What stories does one woman tell about the events and experiences of her life?” Specific questions related to lifespan development include: “What stories does one woman tell about her a) birthplace and childhood, b) adolescence, c) young adulthood, d) adulthood, and e) senior years?”

SCENE TWO: DELIMITATIONS, LIMITATIONS, AND STRENGTHS

Marianne: Delimitations of the study include its single participant, one senior adult Caucasian female, who, at the time of the study, lived in a small city in the southeastern region of the United States, specifically in Appalachia. Appalachia is a geographic region in the area of the southern Appalachian mountains. Whitney had a previously established relationship with Florence; Florence was
her grandmother. This presented an important decision point in our work. What criteria would we use to choose Florence as our participant? Was it okay for Whitney to use a member of her family as the participant?

**Whitney:** We chose Florence because we believed she could articulate an in-depth description of her life. Whitney was aware of Florence’s cognitive abilities and descriptive powers. She was familiar with some of Florence’s stories and was curious about other stories she would tell from across her lifespan.

**Marianne:** Limitations of oral history include results in pictures that are idiosyncratic, narrow, or ethnocentric; the sample may be biased; retrospective evidence may lead to distortions (Yow, 2015) or repressions of memory (Leavy, 2011); interviewers carry personal expectations into interviews (Leavy, 2011) and into analysis and interpretation of the narratives (Yow, 2015); interviews may lead to distorted responses (Patton, 2001); and the interviewee may give the interviewer what she wants to hear (Yin, 2015).

**Whitney:** Despite its limitations, Marianne and I agreed that oral history research has multiple strengths. These include: uncovering the multilayered contexts of individuals’ lives (Edel, 1984); obtaining references to larger society and shared realities; the tendency for individuals to be more, rather than less, candid with the passage of time; the ability to discover habitual thinking that results from the culture in which individuals live (Yow, 2015); and the development of trust and rapport (Holstein & Gubrium, 2003; Yow, 2015).

Because trustworthiness of the data is inherent in the procedures of data collection and data analysis, we included a pre-data collection interview as part of the interview process (Merriam, 2008) as well as engaged a participant, Florence, who could clearly articulate her experiences throughout her lifespan (Thomas & Pollio, 2002). Rich, detailed description provided evidence for any hypotheses and interpretations made by the researchers, and member checking with Florence helped fairly represent her experiences (Creswell, 2013). In addition, through our analysis, we looked for consistency between the stories told by narrator and the number of times the stories were told through multiple interviews (Dennis, 2003). Finally, we asked the following questions regarding Florence: 1) Was she there? 2) Was she in a position to know? 3) Does she have a reputation for probity? 4) Was she of sound mind at the time of the interview? (Harris, Cash, Hoover, & Ward, 1975)

**Act II: Methodology**

**SCENE ONE: NARRATIVE INQUIRY AND ORAL HISTORY APPROACH**

**Whitney:** One qualitative approach that lends itself to the interpretation of meanings individuals bring to their lives is narrative inquiry. This method involves “living and telling, reliving and retelling, the stories of the experiences that make up people’s lives, both individual and social…narrative inquiry is stories lived and told” (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, p. 20). A number of methods exist for conducting narrative inquiry including biography, autobiography, life history, and oral history (Creswell, 2013). We employed the oral history approach.
Oral history is defined as “the recording of personal testimony delivered in oral form” (Yow, 2015, p. 4). This approach is a fitting method for exploring women’s experiences across the lifespan because it opens new areas of inquiry, challenges accepted judgments and assumptions, introduces new evidence from underrepresented populations, and brings recognition to individuals who were previously ignored (Leavy, 2011). Until the 1990’s, much of the work written about women was from a male perspective with male observation and interpretation (Gluck & Patai, 1991). We found support in the literature for allowing women to tell their stories, and some even view these stories as revolutionary (Christ, 1986; Solinger, Fox, & Irani, 2008; Leavy, 2011).

SCENE TWO: PROCEDURE

_Whitney:_ I studied Denzin’s (1978) strategy for organizing and synthesizing life history research. This strategy remains a classic in life history approaches (Bochner, 2016). Marianne and I integrated his strategies with Yow’s (2015) description of oral history to collect and analyze data.

_Marianne:_ Before we began, both Whitney and I participated in pre-data collection interviews (Merriam, 2008). We did this to clarify our assumptions, or pre-understandings, about the topic, and in this case, the participant. Whitney’s pre-understandings included an emphasis on physical health and strength, a deep commitment to spirituality, and appreciation of family. My pre-understandings were the need for balance, a commitment to meaningful work, and a strong wish for more time for personal growth and development. We reviewed our “pre-understandings” regularly during the data analysis.

_Whitney:_ Before Florence’s interview, Marianne and I developed an interview guide to help me follow an order that made sense and that contained topics related to the study. Topics included birthplace and childhood, adolescence, young adulthood, the adult years, and the senior years. When I interviewed Florence, I began with broad, open-ended questions then progressed to focused, open-ended questions in order to gain specific details about the stories. One example is “Tell me about your birthplace and your earliest recollections.” As Florence shared stories from each life course, I followed up with open-ended probes and questions that led to specific details about the stories. Examples of these include: “You mentioned __________. Tell me more about that.” “You mentioned __________. Can you provide an example of that?” I recorded three 90-minute interviews with Florence.

SCENE THREE: DATA ANALYSIS

_Whitney:_ First, I transcribed the interviews. Second, I re-storied the narrator’s life as described by Creswell (2015). Third, Marianne and I identified themes that were central to the participant’s stories (Denzin, 1978). Finally, we reported the themes. We detail one of those themes, food, in Act III.
**Act Three: Florence’s Narrative**

**Whitney:** The findings represent an integration of what Florence told me and how Marianne and I re-storied Florence’s life from the lifespan development perspective. Re-storying provided a causal link among ideas and offered information about interaction, continuity, and situation (Creswell, 2015). Moreover, various aspects of individual testimony can be chronologically arranged to reveal development (Yow, 2015). The final result was a co-constructed oral history narrative for the participant. We asked Florence to read the co-constructed oral history and provide feedback related to the narrative. Florence said that we had gotten the story right. A few of the names were misspelled, but other than that, the narrative was correct.

**SCENE ONE: FINDINGS**

**Marianne:** Whitney and I identified several themes in the oral history. These included faith, activity, relationships, and helping. In addition to these themes, we noticed that woven throughout the oral history were multiple stories about food. Due to the limitations of this manuscript, we focus on the theme of food. In this act, we introduce you to Florence and present portions of her narrative that describe these experiences.

**Meet Florence**

**Whitney:** Florence was born in 1921 in the mountains of Asheville, North Carolina. Her parents were James and Nettie, and she had three siblings. Bessie, one of her sisters, was the oldest. Freddie, her brother, was the second child. Florence arrived next, and later, her younger sister Mary came into the world. Florence adored her home place and described friends and extended family who lived nearby.

**Florence:** Well, Kerry and Wesley were the Foxes, but there was nine children in that family. And Wesley and Kerry were the youngest cause they were my age. But they had a sister Faye, and she always did all the cooking for the family because she was older. And she was real good to us. Always had somethin’ good to eat. Then the Noahs…they was so good to us. Good cooks, and lived out way out in the country in Walnut. And I always enjoyed going there…Oh, and we had an aunt that lived over on the next hill from my mother, and they had a real nice place. And they just had one son, so he didn’t have anybody, and he stayed with us. Well, he was over there playing with us about all the time, eatin’ with us and everything.

**Whitney:** In addition to telling stories about eating with friends and neighbors, Florence recalled memories of food in her own home.

**Florence:** My mother was a good mother. She always cooked, and when we would go to school in the summer, in the fall she would have a big pot of corn on the cob or somethin’ waitin’ on us to have a snack. We always eat supper after 5, about 6 o’clock, cause my daddy was always gettin’ home. And we’d eat supper about 6 o’clock, and she always had such a good supper…Well, always on the Fourth of July we had rice puddin’, and she had… an electric stove and all, but she kept
her cook stove cause she had a big kitchen. And she always cooked that rice puddin’ in that cook stove, and it would be delicious. Never eat a puddin’ like that. And I taught David how to make it, and David makes it now…Well, that’s my mother’s recipe…and she made it. She made a cake. If she made pies, she didn’t make one for Saturday. She’d always make cakes and pies for Sunday. And we’d have two or three kinds of pie and a cake, and she didn’t care how many people we brought home from church with us…Our friends, she’d feed ‘em every one and not say a word. I mean, you don’t see people like that no more, do you…when we’d come in, she’d have that table set, and ever who we had she’d set them a place, too. And she had a big kitchen, and she always had a table for the family that we used when nobody wasn’t there, and she would set it. And…she made good…baked chicken, delicious baked chicken. And…we always had…our own meat house, and she always had ham, plenty of ham cause they grew their own pigs and killed their own pigs. On Thanksgivin’ Day was always pig killin’ time, and…that night that they killed the pigs…She always had…liver and…tenderloin. I believe it was tenderloin and that liver. That’s what we had that night for supper cause she always cooked it the day that…they killed the pigs. And…Grandpa and Uncle Carl and Uncle Ott, they all come to help take care of the pigs. And that day when they left, it was in the meat house, and everything was taken care of.

**Whitney:** In later childhood years, food was not as plentiful because of the Great Depression.

**Florence:** Nobody had any money and didn’t go and buy anything. You bought what you needed, and I know my daddy and Uncle Pete were the onliest two men up there where we lived that had a job. Everybody else had to go and pick up their commodities every week that the government give ‘em… Those men that worked on and built that road now, this is during the Depression,…they worked three days a week, and they made a dollar a day. Now you tell me where would you feed a family on three dollars a week? How could you now?…Huh, three dollars won’t even fix a meal, will it, let alone a week. But now, that’s what they’d do. They’d go to…where the commodities were given out and they’d get in line and get their food in the bags that was given you. See, it would be like…cornmeal and sugar. And you only got so much.

**Whitney:** Florence also told stories about her mother sharing food with friends and family who lived in the area.

**Florence:** Well, they all come the same day…sometimes. They’d meet there, but most of the time they’d one at a time. And…they’d come and get their milk and butter. And mother, mother’d give them a bag of food to take home with ‘em. And Aunt Cindy said to her when she come that day, “Nettie, do you have any a cup of coffee you could give me?” She said, “I haven’t had any coffee to drink all week.” And she hadn’t. And my mother always had coffee on the stove, and she said, “You come on. I’ll go get you some coffee.” And she gave her some coffee and give her somethin’ to eat…But that was just one time…Many times…they’d ask for somethin’ when they’d come…cause my mother always had chicken and she always had her own meat. She had her meat house, and she had her
cow, and she had the milk and butter, and she’d share. And…my mother was a
good woman, and that’s the reason everybody liked her. We had food, and we
could help other people…Grandma Jones didn’t, see, the old people didn’t draw
money, there wasn’t nothin’ to draw, and…Roosevelt’s the one that started that,
wasn’t he?…But on Friday night when I got home, me and Mary, we knew we was
goin’ to Grandma’s. Lot of times I’d go by myself, but Mary usually went with me,
little Mary. And…we went…to take groceries to her to do her the next week…My
mother would have…it bagged and ready to go, everything for her to have next
week to eat. That’s what she had. She kept her up..

Whitney: During adolescence, Florence recalled only one story about food. This involved
the community’s efforts to help her family when their house was destroyed
by fire.

Florence: And…everything we had was gone except what few clothes she’d put on the line
that day. That’s all we had, and daddy, the Depression, you know, the banks had
done closed. But daddy had put all…his money…in that desk. He didn’t have no
money in the bank when the banks started closing. He…got his out before they
closed, and…all he had, everything he had, burnt up, money and all had burnt up
in the house. And…we didn’t have nothin’ either. And…the people…that lived in
that area, all of ‘em gave us…food, gave all kinds of food to us

Whitney: Florence’s family rebuilt their house and settled into daily life as usual. Years
passed, and as a young adult, Florence married. Not long after the marriage,
Florence and her husband Wesley moved to Kingsport, TN, for Wesley’s job. Their
first son was born soon after, and then Wesley was drafted to fight in World War II.

Florence: He went to the service and was gone two years. And, of course, I kept my house
here, and I’d come back and forth, and I’d stay out here a while and then I’d go…
with my mother and daddy. See, I didn’t have no expense. I didn’t have to buy no
food or nothin’…They kept us up.

Whitney: Florence’s family also helped with her son.

Florence: Well, Mary’d come and get Cooter. Of course, we called him Walker. We didn’t
call him Cooter then…After she worked at S&W and all them people up there got
to know him,…she’d take him up there and feed him and take him all over town.

Whitney: When Florence was not with her family in Asheville, she spent time adjusting to
life in Kingsport. Part of the adjustment involved developing a taste for
city water.

Florence: That first three weeks I lived here, I liked to die. Couldn’t drink the water, the
awfulest water you ever tried to drink in your life was in that spicket. It’s good
now. You couldn’t drink it. You just couldn’t drink it, that’s the truth. And I, oh,
law, I thought I’d die. And finally I got to drinkin’, and I got used to it. It was awful.
It was the awfulest water I ever tasted.
Whitney: While their husbands were overseas, Florence and her friends enjoyed outings for dessert.

Florence: We went with Edna and Emma, and at night a lot of times, we’d walk down that street all the way to Five Points. There’s a drug store down there, and we’d walk there and get ice cream. That’s where you got ice cream. You didn’t have ice cream parlors then. And they were our friends, and we went with ‘em all the time when Wesley was gone.

Whitney: Florence remembered this time of her life fondly.

Florence: Wesley was good to me, and his parents were good to us, and my parents were good to us, all the time helpin’ us out...You know, you don’t think about it then, but you think about the things that they give you, and if they just give you a little food to take home with you...that’s good times, you know?

Whitney: As the years passed, Florence gave birth to two more sons, David and Mike.

Florence: Well, when they were in school over here, they all left about the same time. While they were eating their breakfast, we had our daily Bible reading every morning, and they liked, they got used to that...Well, I cooked their breakfast, their dinner. That Walker, I’d give him money to buy his lunch. Do you think he’d spend that money to buy lunch? Why no. He walked home and kept that money right in there in a jar in the closet, every penny...When he went to Robinson, them people up there, they liked him...Everybody liked Walker, and...if they seen him, they’d ask him had he eat, and they’d give him something to eat, and he wouldn’t spend his money. And he’d come home and walk home from Robinson. He’d walk...Now Mike and David would spend their money...I’d give them lunch money, you know. They’d spend their money, but Cooter never would spend his money, never would. Always kept it in a jar. I remember that.

Whitney: She went on to talk about daily life at home.

Florence: I cooked, cleaned this house every day, run the vacuum every day I lived, run this vacuum every day I lived. And...on Sunday...it’s hard to believe, we’d get up, and I’d get up early and start my dinner for Sunday dinner. What I hadn’t cooked on Saturday, I finished it before we went to church. And when we went to church on Sunday morning, to Sunday school...we didn’t wait...Dinner was done. ...And...on Sunday afternoon in the summer time, they’d go out to the park and play most of the time, and we’d ride ‘em most of the Sundays. We’d take ‘em to Bristol, get ‘em ice cream or somethin’.

Whitney: When Florence’s children grew older, she decided to get a job. She described how her neighbor helped her during this time.

Florence: Cis next door...she was one of the best neighbors I ever had...When I worked a lot of days...I always came home for lunch. And when I would drive up, she would have me somethin’ out there, soup or somethin’ a waitin’ on me. Lot of
nights that I always got off at five, she’d have me a banana pudding and she’d have all kinds of good things…And if the boys or Wesley went huntin’, squirrel huntin’, she’d make squirrel dumplins. She and I would have squirrel dumplins for our supper…She was always so good to me.

**Whitney:** It was during this time that Florence’s father died of a sudden heart attack at home. As Florence told this story, she described the meal her mother had prepared right before the incident.

**Florence:** Well, my daddy worked every day he lived. Worked the day he died. Got home at five o’clock…And my mother always had supper ready and on the table cause he’d come home at five o’clock…In our kitchen, on one end of it was like a sun parlor. It was all windows, but it was…the…first day of spring in March, and he sat down, and…my mother poured, always poured him a cup of coffee…Fifteen minutes after he got home he was dead.

**Whitney:** As the years passed, Florence became a caretaker for her aging mother Nettie. Nettie spent the winter months with her daughters staying one to two months with each one. Florence enjoyed the time her mother lived with her.

**Florence:** She’d always cook for us. She’d have our supper cooked when we’d come home from work…And she’d make things that we liked…and she’d cook good soup beans. Best soup beans you ever eat. She’d cook ‘em. She’d make boiled custard and things that they liked. That’s what she’d fix.

**Whitney:** Years went by, and Florence became a senior adult. The next story she told about food involved another death…her husband’s. She had asked her neighbor if she would ride with her to pick up some dinner.

**Florence:** And I said, “Do you care if we run up to Kentucky Fried Chicken and get Wesley some chicken planks?” I said, “He told me last night that I hadn’t bought any in a good while, and he surely likes them”. And…not chicken planks, but chicken wings,…they’re so good. And every little bit I’d…go up there and get a dinner…and whatever we wanted. So Cis said, “No,” and, “I’d like to get some, too.” So we went up there, and Cis drove…to the window, and I got some chicken, and she got what she wanted, and we come on.

**Whitney:** Not long after they arrived back home, Wesley collapsed. After his death, Wesley’s pension from the plant helped support her.

**Florence:** And that’s how I live now. I buy my groceries and things off of when I get that money…I buy my groceries and things that I have to have during the month.

**Whitney:** At the end of her oral history, Florence mentioned food one last time.

**Florence:** And I don’t cook much anymore. I used to love to cook, but I’m not able, and I just do what I can.
Act IV: Discussion

SCENE ONE: SALIENT THEMATIC MATERIAL AND RELEVANT ASPECTS

Whitney

In this act, Marianne and I discuss the themes we identified in Florence’s narrative related to food. These include food and relationship, food and hardship, and food and tradition.

Food and Relationship

Marianne:

Almost every story Florence told about food involved her family and friends. As a child, she had neighbors who cooked for her. She also had a “good mother” who provided hearty meals such as cakes, pies, and corn on the cob. Additionally, when her house burned down, people in the community shared food until Florence’s family could get back on their feet again. We believe these experiences contributed to a mentality for Florence that food meant love. Florence carried this mentality into adulthood as she continued to give and receive love through food. She cooked breakfast and dinner every day for her family. She provided lunch money to her children when they were in school. Also, when she started working full-time, “one of the best neighbors” she ever had helped her by sometimes giving her lunch and dinner. In addition, while Florence worked, her mother Nettie prepared meals for the family while she wintered with them. Even when Florence told stories about the deaths of her father and husband, she began by describing the meals that were prepared prior to their deaths. The convoy model of social support (Kahn & Antonucci, 1980) postulates that each individual is surrounded by a convoy, a set of people to whom the individual maintains reciprocal emotional support. These social networks help to buffer stress and depression and enhance the individual’s morale and well-being (Bankhoff, 1983; Litwin, 1995). Since “cultures around the world and across time have bound women, food, and love together” (Parkin, 2006, p.1), perhaps the emotional support provided by an individual’s convoy could include the love involved with both giving and receiving food. Barbara Swell, a teacher of Appalachian cooking and traditions, agrees. She states, “it’s not just about what’s on your plate, but who you are eating it with” (Casey-Sturk, 2016, para. 28). In addition, food, especially in rural Appalachia, was a community effort. All of the family was involved in the final product. To sit down to a meal was indeed a family and community experience (Casey-Sturk, 2014; Sohn, 2005).

Food and Hardship

Whitney:

Another theme we identified was that of food and hardship. Florence told many stories about hard times and ways in which food was associated with these hard times. As mentioned previously, Florence’s home burned down during her adolescence. The community provided food for her family until they got back on their feet again. In addition, she told several stories about a lack of food during the Depression and sharing food with those who were in need. While her husband was away at war, Florence’s family kept her and fed her, and she passed the time with friends by taking walks to get ice cream. Hardship related to food is a common theme in the history of Appalachia. Sauceman (2015) refers to this area as the “hardscrabble part of America.” Many families shared
labor on the farm, and neighbors provided help to each other in difficult times (Casey-Sturk, 2014). Winters, in particular, were tough, and survival was not to be taken lightly; yet despite these struggles, “food represented a reprieve. Food was not only a basic requirement for staying alive but a joyful escape” (Dill, 2010, para. 1). Perhaps Florence’s positive experiences with food during trying times resulted from having not just a nourishing meal but also a needed escape from the harsh realities of life. In addition, Ray’s (2016) presidential address at the 2016 meeting of the Association for the Study of Food and Society noted the importance of attention to the “good taste of poor people” and reminded the audience of what can be learned about food from those living in poverty. Florence and her narrative provide us information about the richness of foods such as wild game and fresh vegetables. Regardless of the hardships, Florence celebrated these foods.

**Food and Tradition**

*Marianne:* Finally, we identified themes in Florence’s narrative related to food and tradition. Florence’s stories contained descriptions of foods including corn, chicken, squirrel, pork, cakes and pies, soup beans, and rice pudding. The mention of these foods is in keeping with a list of the most traditional Appalachian fare including cornbread, fried chicken, pork chops, wild game, greens, soup beans, apple stack cake, fruit cobblers, and puddings (Sohn, 2005). Florence and her family reflected Appalachian tradition by eating the most common foods to the region. Without cookbooks, Sohn emphasized the importance of passing down the knowledge of recipes from one generation to the other. And traditions continued as adults and children were involved with planting, tending, harvesting, and preparing the food for the table (Casey-Sturk, 2016, para. 15). Many of those living in Appalachia today are unaware that a large number of the traditions of Appalachian food did not begin with the Appalachian settlers and their Celtic tradition; they reflect a combination of Cherokee heritage, mountain resources, and the traditions of the settlers (Black, 2016).

*Whitney:* Other traditions related to food include seasons, celebrations, and daily routines. Florence shared that, as a child, fall meant corn on the cob for an after school snack. Her mother baked cakes and pies for Sundays. Thanksgiving was hog killing time, and for supper that night, the family always had liver and tenderloin. The Fourth of July meant rice pudding, and meals were always on the table at the same time every evening when her father came home from work. In Appalachia, people raised, gathered, and prepared meals for their families, and mothers passed the same traditions on to their own children (Sohn, 2005). Florence demonstrated the passage of traditions in her own family as she cooked for them every day, started each morning with breakfast and Bible reading, and made special efforts for Sunday dinners after church. While preparing and serving food is part of Appalachian tradition, the culture is about more than food on the table; connecting with Appalachia involves “family, friends, history, and traditions…The food is tangible, but it’s the intangible wonder of the traditions that truly keep today’s Appalachian kitchens at the heart of the home” (Casey-Sturk, 2014, para. 32).

**SCENE TWO: FUTURE RESEARCH**

*Whitney:* We intended this study to be exploratory in nature. We felt giving voice to one senior woman’s experience would provide the foundation for future studies involving a larger sample of participants.
Marianne: We have several ideas about next steps in our explorations. We noted in our findings the importance of food and relationships. While the importance of relationships for women is confirmed in the literature, a detailed analysis of ways in which food contributes to relationships is missing. Teasing out ways in which love is both given and received through food at different ages and stages of life intrigues us. We would also like to further explore the relationships between food and hardship and food and traditions for women.

Whitney: We also recommend a narrative study of senior adult men. Earlier we noted that men and women experience life differently and encounter varying developmental issues during the lifespan. Describing senior adult men’s experiences and then comparing and contrasting those with women could provide rich, nuanced description of their lives. Since we have heard that food is the way to a man’s heart, we wonder about the stories men would tell about food and if they involved relationships, in particular.

Whitney: We believe studying a wide variety of cultural groups would add to the current understanding of the lives of both senior women and men. For example, the participant in this study was a Caucasian woman who lived in one geographic region of the United States. Future studies could include men and women of different races, cultures, geographic regions, religions, sexual orientations, socioeconomic statuses, and education levels in order to describe the experiences related to food for a wide variety of individuals. Following the initial findings, within- and across-case analyses could be performed in order to make comparisons between groups.
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In the nineteenth century, scholars and theatre practitioners have speculated that the Appalachian accent resembles Original Pronunciation in Shakespeare’s plays. In 1929, Charles Morrow Wilson (qtd. in Montgomery) reiterated the idea that the Appalachian accent resembled Shakespeare’s speech in his article in *Atlantic Monthly*:

“There is a land of Elizabethan ways...Appalachia and Ozarkadia...speech of the Southern mountains is a survival of language of the older days” (Montgomery 1999, 67–8).

“Shakespeare in Appalachia” compared Appalachian accent to those sounds in Shakespeare’s speech, known as Original Pronunciation. I hypothesized:

1. The Appalachian accent in early- to mid-20th century retained characteristics of Shakespeare’s speech, known as Original Pronunciation.

2. The Appalachian accent resembled Scots more than Irish because:
   a. Scottish Highlanders were given incentives to settle in the Appalachian Mountains.
   b. Scots Irish tended to settle in the Piedmont and coastal Carolina.

The following Appalachian and Original Pronunciation accent sources informed assessment of the accent changes. Joseph Hall’s (1942) *The Phonetics of Great Smoky Mountains Speech* with Howard Richardson and William Berney’s phonetic writing in the 1945 Broadway play *Dark of the Moon*. Because Richardson & Berney’s play was set in the Great Smoky Mountains of Tennessee and North Carolina and John the witch comes from Bald Mountain, Hall’s (1942) *Phonetics* accurately supported the accent of this regional setting (5). Sources of Original Pronunciation, the presumed speech of Shakespeare’s day, included David Barrett’s (2012) “Shakespearean Original Pronunciation for Actors” and his 2013 dissertation on “Performing Shakespeare in the Original Pronunciation”, and David Crystal’s *Oxford Dictionary of Original Shakespearean Pronunciation*. To compare and contrast Appalachian and Original Pronunciation accents, speeches made by wives who are persuading their husbands to reveal a secret to them were selected: Barbara Allen...
from *Dark of the Moon* and Lady Percy, Hotspur’s wife, from *Henry IV Part 1*. At the Shakespeare Theatre Association from January 14–20, 2018, participants responded to the performance of Barbara and Lady Percy’s speeches in Appalachian and Original Pronunciation accents. Participants who offered remarks included a native Appalachian speaker from Yancy County, North Carolina and several Shakespearean actors and directors. This paper reviews preliminary findings concerning the similarities and differences between Appalachian and Original Pronunciation accents.

**Appalachian**

In the Broadway play *Dark of the Moon* (1945), Howard Richardson and William Berney wrote some of Barbara Allen’s language in an Appalachian accent including:

- “Gawd”
- “ain’t”
- “git”
- “mounting”
- “heap o’ wood”
- “whar” (where)
- “corn”
- “hawg”
- “allus” (always)
- “fer”
- “hit”
- “jes”
- “them”
- “thar” (there)
- “somethin’”
- “agin” (against)
- “willin’”

Some of Richardson & Berney’s (1945) phonetic writing in *Dark of the Moon* suited the Appalachian accent. In keeping with colloquial American speech, Richardson & Berney (1945) dropped “g’s” in “willin’” and “somethin’”. Linguist Joseph Hall, who recorded native speakers and wrote about Appalachian accent in his *Short History of English*, shared H.C. Wyld’s (1929) generalization:

> The tendency to shorten, reduce, or eliminate vowels in syllables that are weakly stressed...is common in Germanic languages, and is traceable in English through its entire history. (48)

Hall (1942) noted that the final or “dark “l” may be heard in words such as...cold” (104). Therefore, second half of the diphthong GOAT [oʊ] and emphasized “o” in *cold* [koʊld] were minimized in Barbara Allen’s speech. Because Hall (1942) noted, “[l] is unrestored in...*folk*” (88), the [l] in “folks” [foʊks] was eliminated. However, Hall (1942) observed a “counter-tendency” in Appalachia:
In the pronunciation of accented syllables as an elusive operation of analogy. If it is incorrect to say [raltn] for writing, then it is incorrect to say [mauntn] for mountain, once should say [maunln]. (49)

Hall (1942) elaborated:

‘Misplaced –ing’ appeared only in mountain [maunln]. This is reported to be as common as [mauntn] in…Haywood Co., N.C. (71 ff. 42).

Richardson & Berney’s spelling of “Mountain” spelled “Mounting” resembled some early recordings of twentieth-century Appalachian accents. This intrusive “g” demonstrated Barbara Allen’s use of the tendency toward hyper-correction.

Richardson & Berney’s (1945) “pin/pen merger” in “get” as “git” is characteristic of American Southern accent. The New Orleanian inclusion of “ink” in “ink pen” exemplifies the “pin/pen merger” because “ink” differentiates “pen” from “pin”. Hall (1942) noted this “movement of [e] toward [I] before nasals [n, m, ng]…in children and adolescents…and to a degree in the speech of everyone” (19). Although Hall (1942) noted, “Sometimes…[e] moves toward or becomes [e]…[in] isolated examples…again [agæən]” (20), he noted, “For against, many speakers use the archaic [agIn]” (91). Shakespearean listeners at the Shakespeare Theatre Association accepted Richardson & Berney’s (1945) pin/pen merger in [agIn]. Since Hall (1942) observed, “[l]axer and lowered varieties of [l], often reaching [e], may frequently be heard in different…” (15), the character Barbara Allen pronounced “different” and “differ” as “deffer” and “deff’rent”. Because Hall (1942) noted, “In the syllables –em and –en, [l] is probably more common than any other sound (53), [e] was used in the abbreviation of “them” as “‘em” in Barbara Allen’s speech. Conversely, since Hall noted the occurrence of [e] in thing (16), [e] substituted for [I] in “thing”. These changes demonstrate assimilation of Hall’s phonetic observations and Richardson & Berney (1945) prose.

Because Hall (1942) observed the loss of the Middle English voiced “th” [ð] in “them” (85) and Richardson & Berney (1945) dropped the voiced “th” in initial consonant cluster of “them” (53), the “th” was dropped in “‘em”. Since Hall (1942) noted, “Loss of other consonants is less frequent…[d] is sometimes dropped in don’t: [aʊn t] “I don’t know” (86), the [d] was dropped in [aʊn t], but retained the [d] for [hit don t] for the sake of clarity.

In the Appalachian accent, the Old English pronoun “it” “preserves its initial historical [h]” (Hall 1942, 86). In a conversation with Kathy Lyday, Elon University’s Appalachian literature expert, she noted the replacement of the Norman pronoun “hit” for “it” is characteristic of Appalachian speech (2017). Since Hall (1942) transcribed “haven’t” as “[helnt]” (25), the Old English “h” could be added before “ain’t”; to avoid confusing with “ain’t” with “haunt”, an Appalachian ghost, which Hall transcribed as “[hænt], [hæent]” (33), the intrusive “h” was not spoken. However, because Hall (1942) elided the “t” in “it” with “ain’t” (92), I spoke [ðaæ talnt] for “that ain’t” in Barbara Allen’s speech.
Since Hall (1942) observed, “Ye for you is very common in older speakers” (39), I spoke [ji] in Barbara Allen’s speech.

Hall (1942) noted the “Old English hw is preserved in a group of words spelled with wh (in words such as) what [and] where” (105). Although the whispering sound is rarely used in American speech today, I voiced hw in “what”…(and) “where” in Barbara Allen’s speech (25). Since “why” also initiated a question, I aspirated the hw [ʍ] in this question as well.

The sound “aw” was spoken in r–colored and r–less stressed syllables. Hall’s (1942) r–colored phonetic spelling of “corn” [kəːn] differed from Richardson & Berney’s (1945) r–less “cawn” in Dark of the Moon (25). Yet, Jessica Fern Hunt, a sixth generation North Carolinian native and a theatre alumna of Appalachian State University, agreed with the non–rhotic pronunciation as “cawn.” Richardson & Berney (1945) also used “aw” in “Gawd” (25). However, Hall (1942) noted that the unrounded “ah” [ɑ] is “usual”, but the rounded version of “ah” [ɒ] is “frequent” (28), adding that “a few old men have been heard to employ the rounded variant in Aye God [al god]…younger speakers always say [gad]” without lip rounding (28). Since Hall (1942) noted that younger speakers tended to use “ah”: [ɑ] and “what” could be pronounced with “[ɑ], [ɒ], or [ʌ]” (29), I asked “what” [mat] with the “ah” sound. Since Richardson & Berney’s (1945) spelling of “hog” as “hawg” [ɔ] agreed with “hog” on Hall’s [ɔ] list, instead of adopting Hall’s “occasional unrounding to [ɒ] and [ɑ] in…hog” (32), I spoke “hog” with “aw” as Richardson & Berney wrote phonetically in Dark of the Moon.

Hall (1942) diphthongized “ay” in “highway” by elongating the last syllable in “way” “[weː]” (17). Richardson & Berney (1945) wrote “al” instead of “aw” in the first syllable of “always” (25) even though Hall (1942) listed “always” in the [ɔ] word list (31). Instead, Richardson & Berney (1945) substituted “uh” [ɑ] for the [ɛ] diphthong in “allus” (25). When I spoke “aw” in “allus” in Barbara Allen’s speech, Appalachian speakers from North Carolina and Kentucky at the Shakespeare Theater Association who heard Barbara Allen’s speech did not question the pronunciation of “allus”.

Richardson & Berney (1945) added the colloquial word “fer” in Appalachian accent in Dark of the Moon: (25) because Hall (1942) observed:

As pronounced by older speakers, for is almost always [fɔɻ] stressed and [fɚɻ] unstressed; younger speakers say [fɔɻ], [fɚɻ] stressed; [fɔɻ], [fɚɻ] unstressed. (34)

Richardson & Berney’s (1945) “fer” in Dark of the Moon suited Appalachian speakers and Shakespeareans.

Richardson & Berney (1945) preferred the “eh” sound in “jes” instead of “just”. In support of this choice, Hall (1942) observed, “In unschooled speech [ʌ] (“uh”) is sometimes replaced by [ɛ], as in…just” (40–41).
Since Hall (1942) included the intrusion of “mp” as a substitute for the diminution of the unvoiced “th”, I spoke “something” as ʌmpm̩ completed with a syllabic “m” instead “-ing” (84, 91). Because Hall (1942) noted that “the occasional employment of [æ] for [ʌ] in bus, fuss, gush” (41), “others are probably hypercorrections…[bɜɻ] for bus (91), and an intrusive “r” appears in “lower central and back-rounded vowels” (94–5), I voiced a “r” in in “urs” [ɜɹs] when Barbara included John in “us” (Richardson & Berney, 25).

Richardson & Berney (1945) wrote “where” and “there” as “whar” and “thar” (44, 45), following Hall’s (1942) example of:

```
a number of old people, and a few others, [who] will say [dɒəɹ] there, a form which is perserved as a kind of fossil in over there [ɒvəɹɒɹ], heard on Cosby Creek (25).
```

However, when I spoke “there” using “ahr” (ɑɹ), Appalachian speaker Hunt rejected this pronunciation. Her feedback led to a review of Hall’s phonetics. Although [æ] as in “cat” is present before r-colored diphthongs in “barely” and “there” and “where”, Hall stated:

```
It is a decidedly open sound, verging somewhat on [a], and seems to be formed in many cases by widening the mouth as though in the pronunciation of [a], but by holding the tongue position for [æ]. It may, in a given utterance, suggest both [a] and it is no doubt often misrepresented a [ə]. (24)
```

Because Hall (1942) illustrated “hardly” as [hɑɹɪɻɪ], instead of widening my lip corners into [æ], I dropped my jaw to form “ah” [ə] (19). Further, Hall noted,

```
Speakers who tend to round [ə] before p, b, t, d etc. also tend to round this vowel before r. A picturesque character of the remote and isolated Hazel Creek (Swain Co., N.C.), who in the author’s belief is one of the last of the mountain men in the Smokies, uses [ɒ] in started, raised [ɒ] in arm, dark, yards, and the (lowered) [ɔ̞] in barking [bɔɹkəɹ]. (29)
```

Whereas Hall (1942) noted, “retroflex central vowels [ɜɻ], [ʌɻ]…are by far more common than any others in where… [ɜ] or [ʌ] is also very frequent in…there [albeit]…(as an expletive)” (25). Instead of using Hall’s retroflex central vowel, I lifted the back of my tongue to transform “ah” in /ʍɑɹ/ into “æ” in /ʍæɹ/ for Richardson & Berney’s (1945) spelling of “where” as “whar”.

In a conversation with Lyday in 2017, she cited the Norman construction of adding “a-” to the gerand in “a-kissing.” Barbara uses this phrasing in in Richardson & Berney (1945) in Dark of the Moon, but not in the excerpt chosen for presentation.

Hunt, an Appalachian speaker, made some interesting suggestions in a conversation at the 2018 Shakespeare Theatre Association. She recommended that I curb my Minnesotan tendency to shape an Italian short “o” for the “ou” diphthong
because North Carolinian Appalachian speakers tend to diphthongize the “ou” sound in words such as “goat.” Although Hunt observed that North Carolinian Appalachian speakers used “oo” to a lesser extent than with other American English speakers, Hall (1942) noted that [u] may be placed more forward than in other American accents with the vowel broken into two syllables in words such as “approve” [əpɹüv] (37–8). When Barbara tries to convince John to be baptized, I added an extra syllable in [pɹüv] to add emphasis.

Perhaps Hunt’s (2018) most interesting observation concerned my tendency to place the accent forward instead of in the middle of the mouth. The great American placeholders “uh” and “um” demonstrate where many Americans place their accents. Point your index fingers towards the center of your cheeks and the middle of your mouth where the accents of many Americans live. Hunt (2018) noted that the Western North Carolinian accent is not as forward due to Highland Scottish and West Country English influence. However, Richardson & Berney’s (1945) f-dropping in “of” in “heap o’ wood” could indicate a more Irish influence (25). Yet, the forward placement is characteristic of the Scots Irish who settled closer to coast. The location of the accent and the “o’ wood” construction needs further research before an informed opinion can be developed.

**Original Pronunciation**

To compare the Appalachian accent with Original Pronunciation, I transcribed Barbara Allen’s monologue according to Hall’s transcription of the Appalachian accent and in Original Pronunciation according to David Crystal’s *Oxford Dictionary of Original Shakespearean Pronunciation*.

Vowel shifted from Appalachian accent to Original Pronunciation in the following ways:

- **[æ] and [a]**
  - In “bad”, the lip corners relaxed from wide [æ] to neutral [a].
  - “[L]ast” [læes] shifted from a diphthong to a General American [æ].
  - “Man” simplified from a disyllabic diphthong [mɛIən] to [man].
  - The vowel in “and”’ [æn’ən] centralized and was deemphasized to “uh” [ə].

- **[ɛ], [e], [ɪ̝], and [i]**
  - In “bread” [bæx’əd], a syllabic break fronted with a mid–close jaw to [e].
  - In [gIt], the jaw dropped slightly and [ɪ̝] fronted slightly to [get] in OP.
  - l[sprɛ̝ŋ] became [sprɛ̝ŋ] and [de-fə] became [dlfə] as the jaw closed slightly and [ɛ] moved back to [ɪ̝].
  - The Appalachian [agIn] lowered and elongated to [ɛ] in [aɡɛ:nst].
  - In “vittles,” [vɪtlz], [ɪ̝] retained the [ɪ̝]
  - “Heap” [hip] elongated and lost the “h”: [iːp]
  - In the most unusual pronunciation change, [dʒɛs] became the unique Original Pronunciation sound [ɤ] in [dʒɤst].
[ʌ], [ə], [ə] and [u]

- In “nothing”, [nʌðən] moved back as the jaw closed slightly in [no:tlən].
- “What” lowered and moved back as [mət] used an “ah” sound in [mət].
- In “enough”, “Sunday”, and “other”, the central “uh” [ʌ] vowel moved back to the unrounded variant [ʌ] of [o] as the jaw closed slightly in [ənograf], [sʌnədɪ:], and [ˌɪðəri].
- “Some”, “lunch”, and husband shifted from the “ah” sound in [səm], [lʌntʃ] to [sʌm], [lʌntʃ], and [hʌzbln].
- “But”, pronounced [bət] in the Appalachian accent, moved back with the jaw closing to mid-close in [bət].
- The standard pronunciation of [tu:] elongated slightly to become [tu:].
- The syllabic break in [pəvəd] was eliminated as the [u] unrounded and the jaw opened slightly to [pəvəd].

[ɔ], [oː], [a] and [o]

- In “Gawd”, which Richardson & Berney (1945) spelled phonetically as “aw” [ɔ] in [gʊd] shifted as the jaw opened and the lip corners rounded to the back vowel [o] in [gʊd] common in the British isles. Older Appalachian speakers sometimes use this rounded back vowel.
- However, “hawg” spelled phonetically shifted from [ɔ] to its back open, rounded variant [hʊg].
- The open “ah” back vowel in “wrong” [rən] rounded to [rən].
- “One” [wʌn] lost the “uh” (schwa) short syllable (off-glide) as jaw closed to mid-closed and the [o] vowel elongated to [oːn].
- For “brought”, the [bɹɔt] elongated [bɹɔ:t].
- For the word “not”, the open unrounded back vowel [a] “ah” like you say in the doctor’s office to its rounded variant [nɒt].
- The “o” in “heap o’ wood” centralized and opened slightly to “uhv” [əv]

[ɜ], [o], [a] and [o]

- The unstressed preposition “Fer” [fɚ] moved back as the jaw opened, the lip corners moved in slightly and the vowel elongated in “for” [fə:].
- “Person” [ˈpɜrson] opened and elongated to “ar” [ɚ:] like the Pirate “ar”.
- “Church” [tʃɛətʃ] merged two syllables into on using the “ər” in [tʃɛətʃ].
- The preposition “to” “pronounced as tuh” [tə] moved back as the jaw closed and the “oo” elongated to [tu:].
- The intrusive “r” appeared in the pronoun “us” [əs], which became abbreviated to “s” in Original Pronunciation.

Diphthongs: [əɪ], [aɪ], [əʊ], [oʊ], and [əʊ]

- [əɪ] (as in ICE)
  - For the pronoun “I”, [a:] became [əɪ] shifted from an elongated open front vowel [a:] to a diphthong of “uh” [ə] followed by [ɪ].
  - This [əɪ] sound occurs frequently in a Dublin accent, which might indicate a link to 18th and 19th century Scots–Irish immigration.
In “easy” the Long E lengthened in the first syllable and the second syllable shifted from [ɪ] typical of Received Pronunciation to the Dubliner [ə].

“Real” [ɹɛl] in Appalachian accent, rose, closed, and lengthened to [i:] and lowered, retracted, and opened to “ah” on [riː] in OP.

• [ə] (AY)
  o The “ay” sound typical in “Sunday” opened from [sʌndeɪ] to an elongated “eh” vowel [ɛː] in [sʌndɛː].

• oʊ
  o The diphthong “so” [soʊ] lost [ʊ] as an elongated [oː] in [soː].
  o “Cold” koʊld with a weakened [ʊ] used an elongated [oː]: [koːld].

• [ʌɪ]: “oy”

• [aʊ]: “ow”
  o In “allowed”, [laʊwd] elongated the first half of the diphthong “ow” [aʊw] with a glide to “w” to become “uh” + [ʊ] as in “book” in OP in a striking resemblance to a Dublin sound [ləʊd].
  o Richardson & Berney’s (1945) phonetic spelling of “mountain” as “mounting” featured lip widening and added the hypercorrect, intrusive [g] mæʊntɪŋ, which became the Dublin [əʊ] sound, məʊntin with g-dropping in Original Pronunciation.

Long Diphthongs: [ɪɚ] (here), [ɛɚ] (their), [ʊɚ] (poor), [ɔɚ] (ore), [aɚ] (car)
The Long Diphthongs [ɛɚ] as in (their), as in [ɔɚ] (ore), and as in [aɚ] (car) made significant, if not inconsistent, changes. Neither [ɪɚ] (here) nor [ʊɚ] (poor) were used in Barbara Allen’s speech.

• [ɛɚ] (their)
  o “Where” [mæɹ] centralized and closed slightly to [mɛː]

• [ɔɚ] (ore)
  o “’Course” [kɔɹs] and [lɔːrd] opened slightly and elongated as the lip corners pulling towards each other to [kɔːs] and [lɔːd].
  o Richardson & Berney’s (1945) phonetic spelling of “corn” [kɔn] as “c–a–w–n” elongated to [kɔːn] in OP.

• [aɚ] (car)
  o In [hɑɹdɪ], an open “ah” elongated and the initial “h” dropped in “ardly” [ɑɹdi].
  o “are” [æɚ] opened slightly and the lip corners relaxed to [ɑɹ] as in “pass.”

The triphthongs [aɪɚ] as in “Fire” and [aʊɚ] as in “Power” were not present in Barbara’s speech.
**Consonants**

The plosives [t] and [d] made significant changes.

- The “t”. For example, the “t” in “Tha t’ain’t” [ðəæ təɪntɪn] elided with a word beginning with a vowel in Appalachian, but not in Original Pronunciation.
- “T” was minimized at the end of “don’t” [doun’t] in Appalachian, but pronounced [do:nt] in Original Pronunciation.
- In Original Pronunciation, “i” [ɪ] was dropped and the “t” elided with “and” for [ant].
- The final “t” was dropped in [dldn] so the “n” became it’s own syllable, but “didn’t” separated into two words [dld nɔt] in Original Pronunciation.
- In Appalachian, for “I don’t”, “d” was dropped in [a: oun’t] once and retained in [hlt doun’t] for clarity, but “d” was retained in [do:nt] in Original Pronunciation.
- In the Appalachian accent and Original Pronunciation, “d” was dropped in the word “and”.
- In the Appalachian accent, the intrusive “h” was added to “it” [hlt]. “H” was kept in “hardly” [hɑɹdɪ] in Appalachian, but dropped in [ɑ:ɹdɪ] in Original Pronunciation.
- In “nothing”, the “th” was retained [nʌθəŋ] and the “n” became syllabic [n] in the Appalachian accent. In Original Pronunciation, “t” replaced the voiceless “th” [θ] in [no:tln].
- In “something”, th” [θ] was replaced by “mp” [sʌmpm] and “–ing” became a syllabic [m] in the Appalachian accent, but in Original Pronunciation, “th” and “–ing” were retained [sʌmpθ].
- In the Appalachian accent, the hypercorrect “–ing” [mæuntln] differed from correct ending in “mountain” [mɔntln] in Original Pronunciation.
- “L” varied in the medial position. “L’ was dropped in “folks” [foʊks] in the Appalachian accent and [fo:ks] in Original Pronunciation.
- In “saying”, “y” [j] was spoken in [se:jIn] in the Appalachian accent, but omitted in “saying” [se:In] in Original Pronunciation.

**Original Pronunciation**

- The American molar “r” in the Appalachian accent in “wrong” [ɾaŋ] was replaced by the firmer trilled “r” in the initial position “wrong” [ɾoŋ] in Original Pronunciation.
- Medial syllables were elided “diff’ernt” [dɛ-fənt] and several [sɛv. ər] in the Appalachian accent even though Richardson & Berney (1945) did not change the spelling. In Original Pronunciation, medial syllables were pronounced in “different” [dlfaʃant] and ‘several” [sɛ:vərəl].
## Conclusion

The Appalachian accent featured characteristics of other Southern accents in American English including the pin–pen merger and vowel breaking and elongation. However, the Appalachian accent circa World War II retained fewer Original Pronunciation characteristics than expected. Scots back vowels were abundant in Original Pronunciation as expected. However, Irish vowels appeared as well.

1. When Barbara Allen’s speech from *Dark of the Moon* was transcribed from the Appalachian accent to Original Pronunciation, Irish diphthongs appeared:
   a. \[\text{məʊntIn}\]
   b. \[I = [\text{əɪ}\]\]
   c. \[\text{pə:ʃɔn}\]

2. Original Pronunciation used Scots back vowel \[x\] in “just” \[dʒɔst\], which did not occurred in the Appalachian accent.

3. Wherease Original Pronunciation drops the “h” in the words beginning with vowels \[ɑːdIəɪ\], the Appalachian accent sometimes uses an instrusive “h” as in the Middle English pronoun, “Hit”.

4. The Appalachian accent uses the Old English gerund “a–+verb+ –ing” as in “a–kissing.”

5. The Appalachian accent used the short English “I” for the final syllable “ee” in words like “easY.”

The Appalachian accent bore less resemblance to Shakespearean Original Pronunciation than anticipated in Barbara Allen’s excerpt from Richardson and Berney’s *Dark of the Moon*.

The research question posed in Shakespeare in Appalachia could benefit from further investigation. Popular sources such as Rick Aschmann’s (2017) “North American English Dialects, Based on Pronunciation Patterns” on Inland South accents in the region between Greenville, South Carolina, Asheville, North Carolina, Knoxville and Chattanooga, Tennessee, and Birmingham and Linden, Alabama, the crowdsourced “Dialect Blog” (2011), and comments from North Carolinian speakers of the Appalachian accent informed this study of Appalachian accent. Paul Meier’s (2012) *American Southern*, which served as an inspiration for this article, and his (2012) “Original Pronunciation (OP) of Shakespeare’s English,” would provide excellent sources for further investigation of the impact of Shakespearean speech on the accents of Appalachia. ☞
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Voices huddled along waters’ edges
singing lines panegyric of rolling hills,
God, and granny witches. They praised
her feeble hands, patchwork quilts, myths
about godless souls, machines, but their
prudence did not stop the dig or the fear
of coal dust in our mouths. Now we pine
for those lost landscapes, immortalize
romantic turns of phrases, sell imitation
granny-quilts at retail price,
but those, those were their days,
their thoughts and their ways.

How do we build this time,
write our tales, replant our thyme?
With a little more acid to taste
the mud where coyotes roam
instead of red wolves, their bones arcane
in red clay along those deified waters’ edges.

With resurrections of blackbirds
they shot for kicks, so silence will erupt
under lakes of drowned history,
the void necessary to let our skins speak,
tongues bite, climaxes reach, tradition sink.
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